University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

ScholarWorks@UARK

Graduate Theses and Dissertations

12-2021

Reflective Conversations: Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness

Jonna Lynn Myers
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd

 Part of the Higher Education Commons, Higher Education Administration Commons, and the Higher Education and Teaching Commons

Citation

Myers, J. L. (2021). Reflective Conversations: Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/4305

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu.

Reflective Conversations:
Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Human Resource and Workforce Development

by

Jonna Myers
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Bachelor of Arts, 2010
Arkansas Tech University
Master of Science, 2012

December 2021
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

_____
Carsten Schmidtke, Ph.D.
Dissertation Director

_____
Kenda Grover, Ed.D.
Committee Member

_____
Mandel G. Samuels, Ed.D.
Committee Member

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this pragmatic qualitative research study is to examine the impact of a faculty development program's reflection component on teaching effectiveness as perceived by the faculty participants. This study utilizes Schön's (1983) reflective practice, which calls professionals to move from the technical rationality position of development and practice (theoretical and detached) into a reflective position (practical and applicable). Schön contends that this movement occurs by focusing on reflection in the forms of reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversations. This study specifically examines the reflection component embedded into the inaugural class of the Excellence in Teaching Program (ETP) at pseudonymous South Central University (SCU), which was designed using questions modeled after Schön's reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action frameworks. This study affords participants the opportunity to engage in reflective conversations about the reflection component of the ETP. The participants identify four themes, including violated expectations curb motivation, perceived meaningfulness promotes engagement, feedback promotes reflection, and the notion that learners will learn whether developmental programming is perceived favorably or negatively.

Keywords: faculty development, reflection, reflective conversations, reflective practice

©2021 by Jonna Myers
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my dissertation committee:

Thank you for your time, patience, and feedback.

I am grateful for your encouragement and hard work.

DEDICATION

Stephen:
I think you've earned those season tickets.
#ThunderUp

Lydia Faith and Brynn Grace:
Don't ever quit just because it's hard.

Heartfelt thanks to my family and friends:
Mom
Scott
Natalie and Kylie
Nana and Papa
Bryan and Janey
Steven, Jessica, Emersyn, Dede, Zoie, and Kobe
Jake, Jessica, Beth, Jane, and Micah
Adam, Lindsay, Noah, Finn, and Millie
Peter, Alisha, Josie, and Norah
Collin, Paige, Kai, and Bodie
Marti & Vicki
Olivia
Patsy
Hank and Sarah

To the doctoral student looking for ideas and examples and motivation:
KEEP GOING.
You're so much closer than you think.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

Introduction to the Research

The landscape of American higher education is in a unique period of uncertainty and change. A generation of leadership is retiring, and men and women from subsequent generations are quickly replacing them (Kleinhans et al., 2015; Strage, 2018). External funding is unreliable (Squire, 2017), and competitors and substitutes vie for the time and dollars of students (Taylor & Cantwell, 2015). Thus, traditional colleges and universities are constantly challenged to find innovative ways to operate within the dynamic industry that is higher education (Casarejos et al., 2017; Meotti, 2016).

One way that colleges and universities seek to adapt their institutions to the changing demands of the marketplace is through faculty members (McKee et al., 2013; Wangenge-Ouma & Langa, 2010). Faculty are uniquely positioned to interact with and influence students' academic performance, persistence, matriculation, and identification with the school (Crone, 2010). Scholars have linked the performance of faculty members to student satisfaction (Ardi et al., 2012) and recruitment and retention efficacy (Weisblat & Sell, 2012). Bland and Schmitz (1990) highlighted the interconnectedness of faculty and institutional vitality in this way: "Whether faculty activities are considered productive or not depends on whether they relate both to the faculty member's personal and professional goals and to the institution's mission" (p. 45). There is ample evidence to support the notion that faculty members play an important role in the success of students and the institution.

While faculty members clearly add value to the vitality of institutions of higher education (Ardi et al., 2012; Crone, 2010), the demands on the time and resources of faculty members are increasing exponentially (Baruch, 2013; Kopansky-Giles et al., 2017; Reader et al., 2015; Reid et

al., 2015). In the field of higher education, there is increasing pressure to cultivate faculty members who simultaneously fill the roles of scholar, researcher, educator, mentor, volunteer, committee member, and collaborator (Bendermacher, 2017; Kopansky-Giles et al., 2017; Reader et al., 2015; Sanford & Kinch, 2016). In addition to those functions, faculty members are expected to be well-versed in the latest advancements within their respective disciplines, university processes and procedures, student retention strategies, and innovative teaching practices (Campion et al., 2016; Reid et al., 2015). Kumar (2018) asserted, "When compared to teachers of the previous generation, who required only expertise in their own fields, today's teacher requires competencies going beyond disciplinary expertise" (p. 64). However, most faculty members step into teaching positions with little or no pedagogical training (Norton et al., 2005; Postareff et al., 2007, 2008). It is in this climate that many faculty report feeling overwhelmed and underequipped (Dean, 2018; Sheets et al., 2018; Thomas et al., 2019).

Faculty Development

In this dynamic environment and in an effort to combat these challenges, many institutions incorporate faculty development initiatives. Faculty development is a concept that has appeared in higher education literature since the early 1970's (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Eble, 1972; Gaff, 1975; McKeachie, 1974). Since that time, it has been defined broadly and implemented differently across contexts (Burbank & Kauchak, 2003; McLean et al., 2008). Still, the primary aim of faculty development is simple: to grow faculty members in their various roles and responsibilities (Sorcinelli et al., 2006; Torraco, 2005).

There are a number of benefits and unique challenges associated with faculty development. Some scholars contended that strategic faculty development results in a greater sense of cohesion and community among faculty members (Lumpkin, 2011; Wygal, 2011).

Others have found that faculty development improves the instructional effectiveness of faculty members (Hines, 2015; Sorinola et al., 2015) and equips faculty for the diverse and dynamic responsibilities they face in higher education (Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

Some of the negative consequences associated with failing to develop faculty members include an increased perception of collegial isolation among faculty members (Quinlan & Åkerlind, 2000) and hampered institutional vitality (Campion et al., 2016). Others contend that by neglecting to engage faculty in meaningful faculty development, institutions of higher education miss opportunities to improve individual job performance (Millis, 1994; Steinert et al., 2012), enhance faculty enthusiasm for teaching (Phuong & McLean, 2016), and better the university community for the learning, working, and life that occurs there (Saric & Steh, 2017).

Faculty members bring their own perceptions about faculty development. They have described organizational efforts for faculty development as elusive (Adams, 2009), ineffective (Fernandez et al., 2005), and a waste of time (Berk, 2010). Others have labelled the lack of faculty development initiatives as a sign that they are not supported in their professional, organizational, and leadership development (Gibson, 2006; Premkumar et al., 2017). Torraco (2005) asserted that faculty development initiatives are overwhelmingly lacking in institutions of higher education. Similarly, McKee et al. (2013) contended that a significant gap remains between understanding the importance of faculty development and implementing effective faculty development initiatives and programming. In summary, scholars have yet to agree on the "recipe" for faculty development programming that is effective across contexts (Calkins & Harris, 2017).

Reflection in Faculty Development

There is a widely accepted recognition that university faculty members need to reflect on their professional responsibilities (Boyer, 1990; Cranton, 2001; Ghanizadeh, 2017; Hubball et al., 2005; Kumar, 2018; Light, Cox, & Calkins, 2009). Almost a century ago, Dewey (1933) proposed several key dimensions of reflection and supported the idea that *how* learners think impacts the process of learning. Later, theorists like Mezirow (1978) and Brookfield (1995) incorporated a transformative dimension by calling educators and learners to examine the power structures and assumptions that influence learning environments and processes. Schön's (1983) concept of the *reflective practitioner* and Light et al.'s (2009) notion of the *reflective professional* revolve around the management and navigation of one's multiple identities within professional contexts. Today, there is substantial scholarship affirming the idea that reflection fosters personal growth and development, improved teaching practices, better curriculum development, and enhanced scholarship (Jay & Johnson, 2002; Kreber, 2002; Loughran, 2002; Somekh et al., 1995).

Amundsen and Wilson (2012) performed a conceptual review of faculty development literature in order to classify the key features that make it successful. They identified six foci as being the most impactful for student outcomes and institutional vitality: skills, method, reflection, institution, discipline, and action research (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012). They found that across the literature, increased participation leads to improved outcomes, while reduced faculty participation mitigates the positive outcomes (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012). Notably, the reflection focus supported the idea that development initiatives without an intentional reflection component (i.e., a seminar) were far less successful in improving student outcomes and were perceived more negatively by participants (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012).

Similarly, Roblin and Margalef (2013) found that when institutions fail to incorporate collaborative action and reflection into teacher professional development, behavioral and attitudinal shifts within faculty members were superficial and short-lived. Taczak and Karas (2019) examined the writings of faculty members who reflected on their personal growth following the incorporation of high-impact teaching practices into their courses. They found that when intentionally embedded, reflection bolsters the meaningfulness of the learning which occurs within the context of faculty development, but that without a reflection component, their faculty development initiative would hold little or no meaning for participants (Taczak & Karas, 2019).

Problem Statement

If colleges and universities neglect to incorporate reflection components into faculty development initiatives, the ramifications include decreased institutional vitality (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Campion et al., 2016), teaching effectiveness (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Blackwell et al., 2012; Kumar, 2018), and affective commitment of faculty members (Christofilios et al., 2015; Stevens, 2020). Faculty developers should facilitate opportunities and environments in which faculty members are called to reflect on their roles, experiences, challenges, and best practices (Adams, 2009; Kumar, 2018; Richlin & Cox, 2004; Sorcinelli et al., 2006). “Reflection is arguably one of the most underused practices in higher education because of the various ways that it’s defined, understood, and practiced” (Taczak & Karas, 2019, p. 33). Without reflective components, faculty developers cannot truly engage faculty members meaningfully (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Lorenzetti, 2009; Saric & Steh, 2017; Taczak & Karas, 2019), which leads to negative outcomes for students, for faculty members, and for institutions of higher education.

Purpose Statement

The objective of this study is to explore how faculty members perceive the impacts of reflection on their teaching effectiveness after the completion of a faculty development program in which reflection was embedded. The impetus behind this study is the desire to gain a greater understanding of how to design faculty development programming that is meaningful for faculty members and impactful on their professional performance with regard to teaching. When organizations can craft faculty development initiatives that afford faculty members the chance to reflect on their own experiences and to make meaning of the roles and responsibilities that their organizational context demands, the potential for improved teaching techniques and strategies is augmented (Adams, 2009; Richlin & Cox, 2004).

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following question:

> How do faculty members who participated in a faculty development program perceive the effectiveness of the reflective component on developing their teaching effectiveness?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework undergirding this study is Schön's (1983) reflective practice theory, which calls for a greater emphasis on reflection for professionals to understand, evaluate, and interpret their experiences for the purpose of continuous learning. In his seminal work, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, Schön (1983) calls professionals to move from the technical rationality position of development and practice (theoretical and detached) to the reflection-in-action position (practical and applicable). He contends that without

engaging professionals in a robust reflective process, learning becomes artificially detached from real-world application (Hoban & Erickson, 2004; Schön, 1987; 1983).

Technical Rationality

The concept of technical rationality holds that "professional activity consists in instrumental problem solving made rigorous by the application of scientific theory and technique" (Schön, 1983, p. 23). This philosophical approach has been widely regarded as the standard approach to decision-making in most Western contexts (Polkinghorne, 2004). It is rooted deeply in the Cartesian scientific paradigm, which proposes that knowledge originates outside oneself but can be uncovered when one detaches from one's environment to objectively observe and interpret "reality" (Berman, 1981). Technical rationality considers scientific inquiry to be the only means to discover true knowledge (Imre, 1984).

However, for many practitioners working in a variety of professional contexts, the laws of science are insufficient to solve the problems encountered every day (Kinsella, 2007). People and situations are unique; thus, there is no one-size-fits-all formula for many of the challenges faced by educators, managers, and others (Bassot, 2016). Along with scholars like Moore (1970), Schein (1972), Brooks (1967), and Gartner (1976), Schön (1983) identified gaps between the scientific nature of professional knowledge and the demands of practice in the real world. His answer to the limitations of technical rationality lies in his theory of reflective practice.

Reflective Practice

Schön (1983) contended that technical rationality restricts one's ability to think innovatively about problems because it fails to account for uncertainty and hinders reflective practice. He conceded that when the ends are fixed and clear, the scientific nature of technical rationality is appropriate. However, the challenges faced by many practitioners are not fixed and

clear (Bassot, 2016). “Increasingly we have become aware of the importance to actual practice of phenomena—complexity, uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value-conflict—which do not fit the model of technical rationality” (Schön, 1983, p. 39).

Schön’s (1983) reflective practice theory insisted that focused self-examination of one’s actions associated with a specific problem can reveal beliefs and assumptions about their practice and can promote change. Reflective practice is the reoccurring, nearly instinctual, habit of focusing on one’s professional actions during and after an event. By engaging in the process of examining a situation, the practitioner becomes more aware of their implicit knowledge base and can learn from their experience. He advanced three interrelated constructs—reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversation—as the mechanisms for that focused self-examination (Schön, 1983). Those constructs are outlined in Table 1 and described in greater detail in subsequent sections.

Table 1

Dimensions of a Reflective Practitioner as Applied by Schön to Professional Educators (Schön, 1987, 1983)

Dimension	Description
Reflection-in-Action	Occurs while the instructor in engaged in instruction. Manifest as the instructor alters teaching methods on the spot.
Reflection-on-Action	Occurs primarily after action but can also occur before. Manifest as the instructor alters teaching methods after reflecting on completed class.
Reflective Conversation	Engaging in the act of reframing a situation or problem to allow practice to “talk back.” Can be internal (private) or external (shared with colleagues).

Reflection-in-Action

Schön (1987) contended that when individuals learn to do something new and practice doing it over the course of their careers, the familiarity of action makes the execution of professional responses nearly automatic. He refers to this *knowing-in-action* as the performance of everyday routines, and these routines can be thought of as intuition or instinct (Schön, 1983). In the event that professional practices deviate from the familiar or when unexpected challenges arise, Schön (1983) posited that individuals' thought processes interpret the "surprising" event in terms of their previous experiences. This manner of reflection is known as *reflection-in-action*, which is spontaneous and emerges in the moment. Reflection-in-action "tends to focus interactively on the outcomes of action, the action itself, and the intuitive knowing implicit in the action" (p. 56). He asserted that professionals embrace the artistic intuitive processes, which some practitioners bring to situations of uncertainty and instability (Clinton, 1998; Schön, 1983; Stockhausen, 2006).

Reflection-on-Action

When practitioners reflect-in-action, they engage in the act of describing their own intuitive understandings (Schön, 1983; Stockhausen, 2006). However, there are certain occasions and professional contexts in which reflecting on and formulating judgments in real-time, or reflection-in-action, is impossible. Sometimes, practitioners need time and space to evaluate possible actions that could have improved an event after the fact. This form of reflection is referred to by Schön (1983) as *reflection-on-action*. When practitioners engage in reflection-on-action, they build a collection of ideas, models, and patterns that can be used to improve future practice (Bleakley, 1999). This type of reflection can occur before, during, or after an event (Schön, 1983).

Reflective Conversation

The term *reflective conversation* was coined by Schön (1983) to capture the conscious reflection in which a practitioner engages during or after discovery. This time affords space in which practitioners can evaluate how their new experiences align or deviate from previous understandings (Downey & Clandinin, 2010; Russell, 2018). Schön (1983) referred to this time as allowing practice to "talk back." These reflective conversations can be oral or written, individual or corporate, but this dimension is important for the overall process of reflection (Dodge, Copp, & Stevens, 2018; Russell, 2018; Schön, 1983).

Schön's (1983) reflective practice theory was chosen as the theoretical framework for this study for two primary reasons. The first reason was that the faculty development initiative that was examined in this study was designed around the concepts of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action. Thus, this population was uniquely positioned to participate in reflective conversations with the researcher. The second reason reflective practice was chosen for this study is the strong emphasis that Schön placed on pragmatism and application. This pragmatic qualitative study needed a theoretical foundation that guided the study toward practical, applicable outcomes. Following the model proposed by Schön (1983), this study facilitated reflective conversations regarding the participation of faculty members in reflection within the context of a faculty development initiative.

Introduction to the Methodology

To better understand the experiences of faculty members who participated in critical reflection for the purpose of faculty development, this study employed a pragmatic qualitative design. This approach was selected because it afforded the researcher the opportunity to ask "open-ended questions of people and observe matters of interest in real-world settings in order to

… improve programs" (Patton, 2002, p. 136). Semi-structured interviews were used as the primary mechanism for data collection because they allowed participants to share their perceptions of the reflective component of their faculty development program and their understanding of how those reflections influenced their teaching following their participation in the program. Findings were triangulated using the reflections that they submitted in the faculty development program.

The applied social sciences—fields like education, social work, and administration among others—have long relied on qualitative research to guide systematic inquiry about people, processes, and practices (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Over many decades, the term *qualitative research* has been defined in a myriad of ways. Van Maanen (1979) described it as "an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world" (p. 520). Denzin and Lincoln (2011) contended that qualitative research consists of a series of interpretive and substantive practices that make the world visible. "Basically, qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed; that is, how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015, p. 15).

The role of the researcher within the qualitative research design is unique compared with other research designs. The investigative nature of qualitative inquiry requires researchers to personally immerse themselves, "getting close enough to the people and the circumstances there to capture what is happening" (Patton, 2002, p. 48). Creswell (2007) added that researchers not only immerse themselves in the context but also interact and collaborate with the participants in order to understand the topic being studied. This immersion into the context and interaction with

the participants is why all forms of qualitative research regard the researcher as the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). In qualitative research the role of the researcher requires unique emotional intelligence (Collins & Cooper, 2014), introspection (Petty, 2017), and the ability to separate the biases and emotions of the researcher from the externally observable behaviors and internal states of the participants (O'Sullivan, 2015; Patton, 2002).

Qualitative research is the appropriate methodology for this study because the purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of faculty members. The goal of this research was to achieve a greater understanding of how this specific group of faculty members interpret what they experienced when they completed the reflective portion of their faculty development program and subsequently their assessment of how their teaching had changed after the fact. The data collected in this study came in the form of words from participants and from the researcher, not numbers. Thus, the qualitative approach was the most appropriate approach for the specific study.

Pragmatism is a philosophical tradition which asserts that truth can be understood and applied in terms of its practical or pragmatic outcomes (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). According to Savin-Baden and Major (2013), pragmatic qualitative research stems from the early pragmatists of the 1930's, who believed that an objective reality could be understood, albeit imperfectly. These early researchers sought to observe and understand human behaviors as they occurred in natural settings (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013; Sandelowski, 2000).

Ultimately, the purpose of pragmatic qualitative research is to better understand the practical effects of what is believed by linking theory and practice (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). However, unlike other qualitative research philosophies and approaches, pragmatists reject the

idea that "truth" about the real world can be accessed or uncovered solely through a single scientific method (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013; Mertens, 2005). Instead, pragmatic researchers accomplish their purposes by extracting theory from practice, then applying it back to the practice (Creswell, 2003). They are predominantly guided by the research question, allowing for a myriad of eclectic approaches and designs to assess situations and solve problems.

The pragmatic qualitative research approach was chosen for this study because of its practical nature. This study sought to yield a greater understanding about the role of reflection within a specific faculty development program. To do so, semi-structured interviews were used to capture participants' experiences with reflection within the context of a specific faculty development program. Thus, this pragmatic qualitative research design "marks the meeting point of description and interpretation, in which description involves presentation of facts, feelings, and experience in the everyday language or participants, as interpreted by the researcher" (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013, p. 172).

Introduction to the Setting and Population: South Central University

This study occurred on the campus of a public university in the south-central region of the United States, referred to henceforth pseudonymously as South Central University (SCU). In the fall of 2019, SCU launched a faculty development initiative titled the Excellence in Teaching Program (ETP). The primary aim of the ETP was to initiate a faculty development program where there had been none before; the secondary objective was to create a university-sponsored initiative to augment quality teaching. The program was designed by the Provost, the Associate Provost, and the Director of the Center for Transformative Learning (pseudonym), with the assistance of representatives from faculty senate and the university-sponsored faculty development committee.

The theoretical foundation used to design the ETP was Schön's (1983) reflective practice theory. The designers of the ETP strategically sought to implement opportunities for reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action over the course of the 12-month program. They embedded reflection into the ETP using papers composed by participants in response to guided questions. The reflection questions revolved primarily around different teaching strategies and techniques presented to the participants. No needs assessment was conducted prior to the design or execution of the ETP. In many instances, they were asked to reflect on past behaviors (reflection-on-action). There were few questions aimed at preparing their thinking for future occurrences (reflective conversations).

The population for this study consisted of ten faculty members and administrators who participated in SCU's inaugural class of the ETP. All participants were classified as full-time faculty members, which means they work on a 9-month contract and teach a minimum of 12 hours each semester. Administrators work on 12-month contracts and may or may not teach courses. Within this group, various faculty classifications were represented including instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors. Additionally, these individuals held positions in civic or professional organizations, facilitated organized research efforts, and sponsored a multitude of campus organizations ranging from academic and pre-professional to social and Greek.

Definition of Terms

The following terms refer to pertinent concepts, research terms, institutional nuances, culture, and software that were referenced over the course of the study:

Faculty development refers to efforts at an organizational or departmental level that improve faculty members in their various roles and responsibilities (Sorcinelli, et al., 2006; Torraco, 2005).

Reflection is an investigation of the reasoning that informs one's beliefs, actions, and approaches to problem solving (Mezirow, 1990).

Reflective practice is learning through and from experiences in order to gain new insights of self and professional practice (Finlay, 2008; Osterman, 1994; Schön, 1983).

Reflection-in-action is reflection that occurs while a practitioner is in the midst of professional activity; this form of reflection is often referred to as "on the spot" (Schön, 1983).

Reflection-on-action refers to reflection that revolves around professional action but can occur before, during, or after an activity (Schön, 1983).

Reflective conversations refer to the act of intentionally reframing a situation or problem in order to allow practice to "talk back" (Schön, 1983). This form of reflection can occur internally (private) or externally (shared with colleagues) (Schön, 1983).

Significance of the Study

This study offers greater insight into the role of reflection within the context of faculty development for the purpose of improving teaching practice as perceived by faculty members. Some scholars contend that the strategic inclusion of critical reflection in organized faculty development endeavors enhances the overall effectiveness of faculty development (Branch et al., 2014; Calkins & Harris, 2017; Saric & Steh, 2017).

This research offers a unique insight into the ETP at SCU by providing an analysis of faculty members' perceptions of the reflection component of the inaugural class of the ETP. This study will benefit the instructional designers of the ETP as it may offer greater insight into the

effectiveness of the reflective component of the program as perceived by the faculty participants. It may also yield constructive feedback regarding the ETP program by providing tangible evidence about how faculty members view the impacts of reflection on their practice after the fact.

On a larger scale, this study is compelling, timely, and important as it offers a potential glimpse into specific ways that colleges and universities can cultivate faculty members in order to better meet the demands of higher education in the twenty-first century and beyond. This study seeks to produce a clearer understanding of how to effectively incorporate reflection into faculty development programming by sharing the experiences of faculty members following the completion of their faculty development program. This study shows how faculty perceive their professional development after they have had the opportunity to implement the changes and to act on the ideas that emerged in their initial reflections during the development program.

Innovative Aspects of the Study

There are two dimensions to this study that make it innovative and unique. First, this study examines reflections from the first formal faculty development initiative at the institution in which it was facilitated. Prior to the creation of the ETP, SCU employed a more scattershot approach by offering different events and workshops open to anyone. The model of faculty development used by the ETP had never been used at SCU. For many of the participants, this study was the first time that they were asked to reflect critically on their roles and responsibilities as faculty members.

Secondly, and more broadly, this study contributes important understanding to the body of scholarship that addresses the role of reflection in faculty development and the effects of reflection on practice after the completion of the faculty development program. Prior to this

study, the scholarship in this area centered on program design (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Drummond-Young, et al., 2010), delivery format (Brooks, 2010; Hale & Bessette, 2016), and participant perceptions of the experience (Bali & Caines, 2018). This study sought specifically to explore and discuss the role of reflection within the context of faculty development for the purpose of enhancing teaching practice as perceived by the faculty member.

Limitations of the Study

Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2010) described limitations as facets of the study which are outside of the researcher's control and may restrict the method or influence the conclusions of the analysis. This study posed several limitations including the COVID-19 global pandemic, limited time and resources, and the uniqueness of this faculty development program, which afforded only a small pool of potential participants. These limitations are described more thoroughly below.

1. As with all qualitative research, the investigator served as the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Thus, one potential limitation was any bias or preconceived notion that may have tinted the findings of this study.
2. The design of the ETP made the inclusion of participants from other faculty development initiatives inequivalent and thus incomparable. Therefore, one limitation of this study was the small population from which to recruit participants.
3. Another limitation stemmed from the researcher's limited time and resources. This study could have been conducted over a longer period of time or designed more broadly to allow for more potential participants. However, the researcher

did not have time or access to the resources needed to modify this study in those ways.

4. Because of the researchers limited time and resources, as well as the small population size and the uniqueness of the ETP, the small amount of data available was a limitation. With more time, resources, and participants, the amount of data could yield more robust results that could be applied more broadly.
5. This study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which created some unique limitations. The researcher intended to conduct all of interviews in person, but some interviews were limited to interactions over Zoom software to accommodate those individuals who were working virtually or quarantined at the time of their interviews.

Summary

In order to create faculty development initiatives that are meaningful and effective, previous research demonstrates the importance for the reflective component to be embedded into the development initiative (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Steinert et al., 2012; Taczak & Karas, 2019). This study seeks to offer greater understanding into how one cohort of faculty members perceived the effectiveness of a reflective component within their own faculty development initiative—the ETP—and how that reflection subsequently impacted their teaching practices. This research question guided the study:

> How do faculty members who participated in a faculty development program perceive the effectiveness of the reflective component on developing their teaching effectiveness?

The following chapters will offer a greater review of the literature addressing faculty development and reflection, an overview of the methodology used to collect and interpret data, a summary of the findings of this study, and a discussion of the implications of this research.

CHAPTER 2

The aim of this study is to examine the impact of a faculty development program's reflection component on teaching effectiveness as perceived by the faculty participants. This chapter serves as the literature review and is divided into three sections. The first section of this literature review offers a brief history of faculty development and how the definition has evolved to fit the shifting landscape of higher education. An overview of the benefits and challenges associated with faculty development is also shared. The second section explores the literature addressing the concept of reflection and how scholarship depicts reflection as a vehicle for professional development. Additionally, this section will highlight the literature addressing how reflection has been used to facilitate professional development for faculty members in higher education. Finally, the third section of this literature review presents an overview of Schön's reflective practice and an explanation as to why this theory was chosen as the theoretical framework for this study. A brief history of the theory is shared along with critiques that have been offered by members of the academy.

Faculty Development

Until the 1970s, faculty development initiatives in colleges and universities were largely limited to conference attendance, research sabbaticals, and visiting professorships (Alstete, 2000). However, the 1970s and 1980s saw a major paradigm shift with the publication of seminal works by Gaff (1975) and Bergquist and Philips (1975), each of which called for more comprehensive models of faculty development. These works inaugurated a movement toward more organized faculty development efforts that focus on organizational, professional, and personal betterment (Murray, 2002).

Since that time, various definitions of faculty development have been offered. Nelsen (1983) defined faculty development as "activities designed to improve faculty performance in all aspects of their professional lives—as scholars, advisers, academic leaders, and contributors to institutional decisions" (p. 70). Decades later, this definition is echoed in the work of Gardner et al. (2017), who described faculty development as "all activities professionals pursue to improve their knowledge, skills, and behaviors as teachers and educators, leaders and managers, and researchers and scholars" (p. 77). Other definitions incorporate concepts like creativity (Carpenter et al., 2016), faculty satisfaction (Noah et al., 2018), and civic engagement (Cole et al., 2016). Some of the most recent literature places an especially strong emphasis on the importance of a more holistic approach, urging that faculty developers must be cognizant of growing the whole person rather than focusing merely on the professional or organizational aspects of development (Bartell & Boswell, 2019; Tsoh et al., 2019).

Since the publication of the earliest scholarship promoting faculty development, the field of higher education has seen tremendous change. Thus, the definitions of faculty development and subsequent execution strategies have evolved, too. Over the course of the last decade, faculty developers have acknowledged that the advancement of faculty development requires programming that is adaptable and multi-faceted (Lockhart & Stoop, 2018) and that incorporates introspection and self-awareness on the part of the learner (Kumar & Jha, 2012). Today's faculty development initiatives are implemented differently across contexts (Burbank & Kauchak, 2003; McLean et al., 2008), but the primary aim of faculty development remains simple—to cultivate faculty members in their various roles and responsibilities (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013; Sorcinelli, et al., 2006; Torraco, 2005). In one of the earliest iterations of formal faculty development, Bergquist and Phillips (1975) propose a model which hinges on three primary dimensions—

organizational development, professional development, and personal development. These three primary areas have remained central tenets across the faculty development literature.

Organizational Development

The first area underscored in the faculty development literature is organizational development. Within the context of faculty development, organizational development refers to the macro-level benefits derived by colleges and universities from faculty development initiatives. Some scholars have found that clear organizational development efforts embedded into faculty development promote better teaching and scholarship (Schroeder, 2012; Cook & Kaplan, 2011), which betters the university community as a whole.

The idea that faculty development serves as a mechanism for larger organizational development first appeared in the early faculty development literature (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Gaff, 1975). However, Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) contend that this idea did not gain real traction until the turn of the century. Today, scholars find that faculty development is integral to organizational vitality (Kumar, 2018; Campion, et al., 2016). Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) assert that the future of faculty development will call for even greater attention to organizational development, where faculty development initiatives are more closely aligned with the larger goals and objectives of the institution and where faculty members are developed more strategically for leadership roles.

Professional Development

The second area highlighted across the faculty development literature is the idea of professional development. For faculty, the term professional development encompasses an array of tools and strategies used to develop skills associated with teaching, scholarly activities, service, or administrative responsibilities (Guskey, 2000). However, Schuster (1990)

acknowledged that the vast majority of professional development efforts for faculty members revolve around teaching. Diaz-Maggioli (2003) defined professional development as an ongoing process of learning in which teachers engage voluntarily to learn how to tailor their teaching strategies to the needs of their students. Van Bussel et al. (2018) described professional development more broadly, using it as a collective term for the activities performed by an employee to enhance his or her work, career, and/or personal development.

Personal Development

The third area of emphasis across faculty development literature is personal development. Unlike the concept of professional development, personal development is much harder to define as the parameters around it are far more ambiguous. In fact, scholars note that the notion of personal development remains "obscure" and "poorly articulated" (Hall et al., 1999, p. 99) due to a surprising scarcity of literature (Williams & Irving, 1996). To further obfuscate the idea of personal development, Wilkins (1997) asserted that the boundary between personal and professional development is muddled and shifts constantly. Bergquist and Phillips (1975) maintained:

> In designing a faculty development program, one must be fully aware of the spin-off effects from a successful program, which, by definition, changes people. All too frequently, we compartmentalize our images of change, neglecting the fact that when we change the professional performance of an individual, we have usually touched his family life, his relationship with his colleagues and students, and perhaps even his life goals. (p. 202)

Hunt and Sampson (1998) defined personal development simply as "any process of beneficial self-reflexive change which an individual chooses to undertake" (p. 200). However, Donati and Watts (2005) offered perhaps a more fitting definition of personal development as a component of professional development. They described personal development as "a purposeful, specifiable and structured activity, which seeks to develop discrete skills or qualities, whose

effects can either be ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ or transitory, and whose main focus is to enhance a trainee’s professional effectiveness” (p. 479). Murray (2002) asserted that within the context of professional development, personal development typically entails career management and quality of life issues.

The Goals Driving Faculty Development

In a thorough study of 471 faculty development initiatives, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) found that three primary goals drive faculty development efforts in higher education: creating or sustaining a culture of teaching excellence, responding to individual faculty members’ needs, and advancing new initiatives in teaching and learning (p. 43). These goals represent a shift away from the singular focus on individual needs, which was emphasized in earlier studies (Centra, 1976; Erickson, 1986), and show a recognition on the part of faculty developers that the organization can play a proactive role in supporting teaching and learning efforts (Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

Creating Cultures of Teaching Excellence

The first goal of faculty development, as identified by Sorcinelli et al. (2006), is the idea that institutions of higher education can build and maintain cultures of excellence in teaching through the effective design and implementation of faculty development initiatives. In fact, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) “identified teaching for student-centered learning as *the most important issue* [emphasis in original] to address through services for faculty” (p. 73). Similarly, in a systematic review of 111 faculty development initiatives (occurring between the years of 2002 and 2012), Steinert et. al (2016) found that most faculty development interventions (69%) led to enhanced teaching and educational activities including the development of new undergraduate and graduate courses, cross-departmental research collaborations, and enhanced teaching

practices. While other facets of faculty development have morphed over time, this primary tenet of faculty development remains central to the mission of faculty developers.

There are a variety of ways that institutions promote teaching excellence through faculty development programs. Efforts like modeling specific activities and strategies (Steinert, 2005; Teclehaimanot & Lamb, 2005), communities of practice (Abigail, 2016; Banasik & Dean, 2016; Hatcher et al., 2016; Lenning & Ebbers, 1999; Rands et al., 2017; Steinert, 2010; Watson, 2014), and mentoring (Harnish & Wild, 1994; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007; Thorndyke et al., 2006) all represent faculty development initiatives shown to improve teaching practice. Much of this literature stems from Boyer's scholarship of teaching and learning, which asserts that faculty members must devote themselves to a more rigorous and disciplined study of the learning process, application of effective teaching practices, and regular professional reflection (Beach, 1990; Cox, 2003; D'Andrea & Gosling, 2005).

Responding to Faculty Members' Needs

The second goal highlighted in faculty development literature stems from evidence that faculty development meets faculty members' needs outside of the realm of teaching performance. One of the most prominent outcomes linked to faculty development initiatives is increased collaboration and connectedness (Foo et al., 2019; Van Lankveld et al., 2017). Steinert et. al (2016) found approximately 65% of the faculty development interventions that they studied yielded significant improvements in community building as perceived by participants. These findings are supported by the work of O'Keefe et. al (2009), who found that relationships developed in faculty development initiatives led to reduced feelings of isolation and stress in the academic workplace. This is especially significant considering recent scholarship, which finds

that a majority of newly hired community college faculty members report feeling isolated and disconnected from colleagues and administrators (Bodily, 2021).

Faculty development initiatives are also linked to the formulation and development of faculty members' academic identity (Lieff et al., 2012; Steinert et al., 2019). Lieff et al. (2012) found that participants in faculty development programs often report feeling an enhanced self-confidence in managing their various roles and responsibilities as faculty members. Lown et al. (2009) noticed a similar phenomenon in their study of faculty development participants, a majority of whom described increased self-awareness and sense of academic identity. While faculty development furthers academic identity, academic identity is shown to enhance faculty members' well-being (Lieff et al., 2012; Little et al., 2019), productivity (Taylor et al., 2007), and innovative teaching practices (Flores & Day, 2006; Stone et al., 2002).

Advancing Teaching and Learning

Though the concept of faculty development has evolved over the last fifty years, some tenets of faculty development have remained core emphases. One of those emphases is instructional development, which "focuses on the conditions of learning, particularly courses and curricula, that they foster" (Gaff, 1975, p. 47). A myriad of scholarship has been dedicated to the concept of instructional development (Felder et al., 2011; Gustafson & Branch, 1997; Wehlberg & Chadwick-Blossey, 2004; Wilkerson & Irby, 1998). Changes in technology and instructional delivery mediums have greatly influenced best practices regarding instructional development (Felder et al., 2011; Wilkerson & Irby, 1998). Still, the most effective instructional development strategies are those "in which the objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation of students are consistent with each other" (Gaff, 1975, p. 50).

Faculty Development Models

In his literature review of faculty development in higher education, Allen (1988) sought to synthesize the works of early faculty development scholars like Bergquist, Eble, and Gaff. He offered two models of faculty development, single-focus and comprehensive.

Single-Focus Faculty Development

Allen (1988) asserted that there are two single-focus models of faculty development. The first was the problem-oriented approach to faculty development, which is based on the early work of Pochyly (1977). This approach calls for "a systematic search for problems and issues, and the development of strategies to deal with the area in question" (p. 90). Allen noted that this approach to faculty development often resembles crisis management and is seen frequently at institutions where faculty development is not prioritized.

The second single-focus model offered by Allen (1998) was the collaborative model. He asserted that the collaborative model is driven by a single faculty member who pursues development through collaboration. This collaboration may come from an instructional coach, a colleague, or a professional from one's respective field of study and is the key to success in this model. Thus, effective collaboration hinges on the development of trust over time between the faculty member and the "consultant" collaborator.

Comprehensive Faculty Development

The consultative model was offered as a three-step approach consisting of a needs assessment, in-service training, and educational research (Allen, 1998). According to the consultative model, the needs assessment required self, student, and colleague appraisal from each faculty participant. The faculty developer subsequently created an in-service activity based on the specific strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member. After the faculty development

initiative is completed, faculty members were encouraged to contribute educational research detailing their experiences with each prong of the consultative model.

Interinstitutional Model

The interinstitutional model of faculty development was characterized by Allen (1998) as faculty members who pursue innovative courses and curriculum on an experimental basis while peers from other institutions do the same. These faculty members share notes and observations to refine teaching strategies and curriculum design. This model was shaped by research from Noonan (1973), Bell (1977), and Armstrong (1980), who each offered specific recommendations for universities to incentivize interinstitutional faculty development.

Triad Model

The third and final model offered by Allen (1988) was the triad model, which called for faculty members to form triads. Each triad of faculty members was called to share "teaching goals, methods, and proposed modifications" (Sweeney & Grasha, 1979, p. 53) over the course of a semester, an academic year, or in some instances longer. Allen (1988) asserted that the triad model of faculty development works most effectively when faculty members can engage in honest conversations about teaching and scholarship in ways that are comfortable for all. A willingness to give and receive criticism and praise is essential for the triad model to affect change (Allen, 1988; Sweeney & Grasha, 1979).

While Allen's (1998) models of faculty development were not widely adopted, they pose important context for the growth of the field of faculty development. These models informed the faculty development initiatives that have become hallmarks across faculty development scholarship.

Designing Developmental Initiatives for Faculty

Since the earliest literature highlighted the importance of faculty development in higher education, scholars have sought to name the specific design approaches that have been deemed effective. Across faculty development literature and the span of several decades, three types of developmental activities repeatedly appeared: field-specific initiatives, first-year initiatives, and teaching and learning initiatives.

Field-Specific Faculty Development

One popular design across faculty development literature was the idea of field-specific faculty development initiatives, which called for individuals of the same discipline to gather and discuss research, teaching approaches, curriculum design, and other practical issues (Kezar et al., 2018; Schenkel & Teigland, 2008). These groups are sometimes referred to as communities of practice (CoPs), which Wenger et al. (2002) defined as "groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (p. 4).

Kezar et al. (2018) examined four longstanding CoPs which revolved around science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), including the BioQUEST Curriculum Consortium, Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL), The Process-Oriented Guided Inquiry Learning (POGIL) Project, and Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER). Each of these CoPs offered participants an environment to dive into the specific depths of each respective field represented in the STEM disciplines. Relationships formed organically and led to robust conversations about content and instructional approaches.

Another field-specific faculty development design that appeared frequently across the literature was the professional learning community (PLC). Similar to CoPs, PLCs were defined

as “a group of people sharing and critically interrogating their practice in an ongoing, reflective, collaborative, inclusive, learning-oriented, growth-promoting way” (Stoll et al., 2006, p. 223). The design associated with PLCs was depicted in literature as highly collaborative (Harris & Jones, 2010; Lieberman & Pointer-Mace, 2010). It should be noted that not all CoPs and PLCs were field-specific developmental efforts. However, in many instances, the designs associated with CoPs and PLCs offered faculty developers a meaningful template from which to build their programmatic efforts.

Across the scholarship in this area, the hallmark tenets of faculty development programming designed for specific fields included organic and expedited relationship formation (Kezar et al., 2018; Schenkel & Teigland, 2008), rigorous conversations surrounding research developments (Albion et al., 2014; Luo et al., 2020), and innovative approaches to teaching and assessment (de Carvalho-Filho et al., 2020; Akerson et al., 2009). Thus, faculty development initiatives designed for faculty members in specific fields offered unique benefits for faculty developers considering the most appropriate design for their development efforts.

First-Year Faculty Initiatives

The second design style that was frequently referenced across the scholarship revolved around first-year faculty members. This design emphasis gained great popularity toward the end of the twentieth century when more faculty development scholars called attention to the stresses of life as a new faculty member and the importance of meaningful engagement with the university community (Menges, 1999; Olsen, 1993; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) underscored the fears and uncertainties of new faculty members regarding tenure and promotion processes. Austin (2003) and others stressed new faculty members’ perceived lack of community and connection to the institution (Menges, 1999; Olsen, 1993).

These first-year faculty development initiatives were created to orient new faculty members to the culture of the university (Bhavsar et al., 2018) and to promote standards of teaching excellence (Steinert, 2009). Some of the unique benefits associated with faculty development designed for first-year faculty members include teaching effectiveness and scholarship (Bhavsar et al., 2018) and strategies for balancing the demands of life and work (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989).

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Initiatives

The final design that was referenced most frequently across the faculty development literature was influenced by Boyer's (1990) scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), which called for more systematic and rigorous study of teaching and learning processes. Faculty development that emphasized the SoTL became incredibly popular upon its inception (Atkinson, 2001; Vithal, 2018). In these developmental efforts, faculty members are called to discuss, plan, question, and model knowledge. Boyer (1990) said that teaching is "a dynamic endeavor… that must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught" (pp. 23-24). Faculty developers who designed developmental initiatives for the purpose of promoting SoTL contended that the outcomes of this developmental programming included greater promotion of SoTL in institutional policies (Lanning et al., 2014) and improved quality of student learning (Hutchings et al., 2013).

Faculty Development and Student Performance

Faculty developers have long asserted that their efforts improve student outcomes in addition to other benefits for faculty members, departments, and institutions of higher education (Emery et al., 2019). A myriad of scholars has sought to publish data that demonstrates definitive connections from specific developmental practices to precise student outcomes (Fischer et al.,

2020; Shaha et al., 2016). However, scholarship in this area also showed that questions remain about the best ways to measure the efficacy of developmental efforts and to link them to student performance (Gaytan & McEwen, 2010).

Faculty developers contended that the relationship between faculty development and student outcomes can be demonstrated more broadly (Fischer et al., 2020; Gaytan & McEwen, 2010). For example, Steinert and Mann (2006) showed a clear relationship between faculty development participation and improved student evaluations. However, Patrick (2011) and others found that personality and not perceptions of learning or grades was much more likely to affect the ratings a faculty member receives on evaluations (Tripp et al., 2019; Zabaleta, 2007).

In recent decades, faculty development scholars have called for greater accountability within the field (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013; Hines, 2015). Hines (2015) asserted that one of the primary challenges for faculty developers who seek to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of developmental activities is their diverse backgrounds and disciplines. “When charged with evaluation, one's discipline-specific epistemological and methodological orientation informs their evaluation practices” (p. 5).

Challenges with Faculty Development

Despite the demonstrated value of faculty development, Torraco (2005) asserted that faculty development initiatives are overwhelmingly lacking in institutions of higher education. Similarly, McKee et al. (2013) contended that a significant gap remains between understanding the importance of faculty development and implementing effective faculty development initiatives and programming. Scholarship demonstrated that some of the primary challenges for faculty developers include a lack of faculty participation, little or no linkage to departmental and institutional goals, and poor evaluation tools.

Lack of Faculty Participation

One of the largest challenges facing faculty developers is inconsistent faculty participation (Skeff et al., 1997; Taylor & McQuiggan, 2008). Skeff et al. (1997) contended that there are three attitudes that diminish faculty participation in developmental efforts: "a tendency to underestimate the need for or potential benefits from a program, a lack of belief in the utility of teaching skills as opposed to [professional experience], and a belief that teacher training is unrelated to teaching excellence" (p. 57). Each of these attitudes poses a unique barrier to faculty participation in faculty development.

The first barrier to faculty participation identified by Skeff et al. (1997) is the notion that faculty members do not view faculty development as beneficial or needed. Several studies have found that while balancing many roles and responsibilities, faculty members are unwilling to devote substantial time toward faculty development efforts because they do not see the value (Bell, 2013; Cahn et al., 2013; Judge & O'Bannon, 2008; Seminoff & Wepner, 1997). Additionally, there are a myriad of studies in which faculty members indicate that their faculty development program was more beneficial than they had anticipated prior to its start (Nemko & Simpson, 1991; Skeff et al., 1992; Steinert, 2000). This indicates that perhaps faculty members do not fully understand the usefulness of faculty development until they engage in it. Thus, one barrier that faculty developers must anticipate and seek to overcome is the notion that faculty development is not worthy of the time commitment. A variety of solutions have been offered to remove this barrier for faculty members including a reduced teaching load for participants while engaged in faculty development (Santo et al., 2009; Sorcinelli, 1994), offering financial incentives to participants (Herman, 2013; Rosenbluth et al., 2016; Song, 2008), and offering

tenure and promotion incentives to participants (Justice, 2006; Lowenthal et al., 2012; O'Meara, 2002).

The second barrier identified by Skeff et al. (1997) pertaining to faculty participation in faculty development initiatives is the idea that professional experience negates the need for instructional development. For decades, scholars have sought to address the myth that subject knowledge equates to effective teaching (Dath & Lobst, 2010; Richlin & Cox, 2004; Shulman, 1987; Skeff et al., 1997). Shulman (1987) advocated for pedagogical subject knowledge, which "represents the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (p. 8). For faculty developers, this barrier to faculty participation poses an especially unique challenge because it occurs largely outside of their control. Some have asserted that this unique barrier can be overcome by giving special attention to strategically branding high-caliber programs and to advertising the benefits of faculty development (Hong, 2018; Lawrence, 2013).

The third and final barrier identified by Skeff et al. (1997) is the perception by some faculty members that there is little or no relationship between teacher training and teaching excellence. Several studies designed to gauge faculty members' perceptions of developmental efforts show that many do not believe that there is a relationship between training and teaching excellence (Boice, 1984; Frost & Teodorescu, 2001; Kreber, 2002). However, Guerra (2012) examined the relationship between student assessments and teacher preparedness in higher education. He found no relationship between years of professional experience on the part of the educator and positive student assessments. Instead, he noted a positive correlation between the amount of professional development completed by a faculty member and students' perceptions

of their preparedness and teaching excellence. These results are echoed in a collection of studies (Chalmers & Gardiner, 2015; Flores et al., 2007).

Linking Faculty Development to Strategic Goals

A second challenge for faculty developers is to strategically link faculty development efforts with the goals of the institution at which they occur. In recent decades, there has been a growing call for literature that clearly demonstrates the relationship between faculty development with larger organizational goals and initiatives (Irby et al., 2015; Jolly, 2014; Wilkerson & Irby, 1998). Jolly (2014) insisted that "faculty development needs to be forward looking and directly linked to, or at least cognizant of and responsive to, organizational goals if it is to assist in promoting organizational change" (p. 128).

Irby et al. (2015) contended that faculty development is a powerful vehicle for not only individuals but also organizational betterment and change. Bodgewic et al. (1997) maintained that this barrier is addressed when faculty developers tailor programs that incorporate individual skill development and organizational deficiencies. Faculty development can also further organizational development by affording participants opportunities to define benchmarks for measuring, incentivizing, and rewarding teaching excellence (Steinert & Mann, 2006). Scholarship clearly demonstrates how clear linkages between faculty development and organizational development lead to greater organizational support for developmental efforts (Bland & Simpson, 1997; Irby et al., 2015; Steinert & Mann, 2006; Wilkerson & Irby, 1998).

Evaluation Mechanisms

The third challenge identified for faculty developers is the lack of consensus regarding tools and measurements used to evaluate the effects of faculty development initiatives. Some have explored faculty members' perceptions before, during, and after participating in

development initiatives (Bandiera et al., 2005; Behar-Horenstein et al., 2008; Bennett et al., 2011). Others have sought to link faculty development efforts to specific outcomes such as students' improved academic performance (Sehgal et al., 2011; Sorinola et al., 2017), teaching excellence (Chalmers & Gardiner, 2015; Guerra, 2012), or faculty satisfaction (deNoyelles et al., 2012; Thorndyke et al., 2006). There remain a myriad of diverse perspectives on how to evaluate faculty development efforts (Sorinola et al., 2015; Steinert et al., 2016).

The Future of Faculty Development

As the field of higher education continues to evolve, it will be incumbent on faculty developers to adapt content and delivery methods to meet the changing needs of faculty members. Across recent research, two areas are consistently emphasized as ones that will impact the future of faculty development in higher education: social media and evidence-based assessment.

Social Media

For the last two decades, faculty developers have explored ways to maximize effectiveness using technology (Diaz et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2012; Kuhlenschmidt, 2010; Sprague et al., 1998; Yilmaz & Keser, 2016). Now, there is a growing call for faculty developers to incorporate social media into faculty development initiatives (Luo et al., 2020; Yilmaz et al., 2020). Yilmaz et al. (2020) contended that social media offers an accessible space for communities of practice (CoPs) to form, collaborate, and problem-solve. These virtual CoPs, often referred to as "hives," are commonly seen in WhatsApp, GroupMe, and Facebook groups and pages (Yilmaz & Keser, 2016; Yilmaz et al., 2020). There are also looser associations, such as hashtags or open forums, where participants can enter and exit more casually (Bedford, 2019; Yilmaz et al., 2020).

Luo et al. (2020) asserted that the strategic inclusion of social media can enhance faculty members' engagement during development efforts. "Continued use of 'the same boring methods' certainly limits the level of learner engagement" within the context of faculty development (Yilmaz et al., 2020, p. 1787). This finding aligns with scholarship from Niehaus and O'Meara (2015), who found that there is a positive correlation between faculty retention and engagement with interactive social media discussions (i.e., twitter conversations).

However, Luo et al. (2020) also offered a word of caution for faculty developers seeking to incorporate more social media into development efforts. Much of the literature addressing social media in professional development has occurred in an informal context in which faculty members initiated or volunteered the incorporation of their social media (Greenhow et al., 2019; Luo et al., 2020; Trust et al., 2017; Xie & Luo, 2019). Additionally, there is a well-documented comfort-gap across generational lines pertaining to social media and technology in general (Brock et al., 2014; Cater et al., 2013). Thus, social media is and should be a focus for faculty developers as they prepare future developmental efforts. However, it should also be noted that more research is needed in this area as to how to best incorporate social media without leaving any faculty members behind.

Evidence-Based Assessment

Since its earliest iterations, faculty development scholars have called for programming that enhances the effectiveness of the organization (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Gaff, 1975). Since that time, many have sought to examine the organizational implications of effective faculty development (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013; Campion, et al., 2016; Erickson, 1986; Kumar, 2012; Schroeder, 2012). However, there remains confusion about the best ways to measure the impacts and value of specific developmental initiatives (Sorcinelli et al., 2017). In fact, one critique of

the field of faculty development is the use of superficial and inconsistent measurements to determine the impact of developmental programs (Chism & Szabó, 1998; Hines, 2015). Most faculty developers are faithful to track participation and satisfaction with developmental efforts (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013; Sorcinelli et al., 2006), but most programs are "challenged in assessing their impact on instructional practice, student learning outcomes, and culture change" (Sorcinelli et al., 2017, p. 10). Thus, there is a growing call for evidence-based faculty development (Beach et al., 2016; Matthias, 2019; Sorcinelli et al., 2017). "Faculty developers have to be intentional, driven by evidence-based practices, and continuous in their assessment of the impact of their services to have a meaningful and lasting impact on the quality of teaching and learning" (Sorcinelli et al., 2017, p. 6).

Reflection

The role of reflection in the learning process is one that has been explored by educational scholars for nearly a century (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Brookfield, 1995). John Dewey (1933) was among the first to suggest that *how* learners think is critically important to the learning process. Later, scholars like Freire (1970), Mezirow (1991), and Brookfield (1995) highlighted the transformative and personal nature of education by encouraging teachers and learners to engage in reflection before, during, and after learning experiences.

Freire: Reflection Liberates Us

Paulo Freire was a professor of history and philosophy of education in the 1960's in Brazil. His work addressing illiteracy across the country grew into a life of activism in which Freire authored numerous publications about oppressive power structures, liberation, and reflection.

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970) described a "banking" model of education, equating students to repositories. In this model, the teacher holds the power and the responsibility to "deposit" knowledge into the minds of learners, while the role of students is largely limited to receiving and filing information (Freire, 1970; Schugurensky, 1998; Schugurensky, 2014). Freire (1970) reflected on his own experience as an educator noting that "it was as if my word, my theme, my reading of the world, in themselves, were to be their compass" (p. 5). In contrast to "banking education," Freire (1970, 1973) offered an emancipatory model of education, in which the teacher and students are liberated when they recognize and combat the political nature and power inequalities in antiquated education structures. In this model, lectures are replaced with more problem-based learning and content-centered exchanges between the teacher and students (Elbaz, 1988; Schugurensky, 1998). Freire calls on educators and learners to engage in critical thinking and reflection (Rodgers, 2002).

Across Freire's work, reflection plays an integral role. In fact, Freire (1970, 1973) discussed his own development and changing views over time as well as the impact of his experiences on his understanding of the world and shaping his actions. "Praxis implies no dichotomy by which praxis could be divided into a prior stage of reflection and a subsequent stage of action. Action and reflection occur simultaneously" (Freire, 1970, p. 123). Critics have argued that Freire wrongly highlighted reflection over action (Rodgers, 2002; Schugurensky, 1998). However, Freire (1970) contended that those who neglect to act, after engaging in critical reflection, cannot be accused of inaction because "critical reflection *is* [emphasis added] action" (p. 124).

Mezirow: Reflection Transforms Us

Jack Mezirow was an American sociologist who developed the transformative learning theory after studying adult women who had returned to higher education. He described the transformative learning theory as "an orientation which holds that the way learners interpret and reinterpret their sense experience is central to making meaning and hence learning" (Mezirow, 1994, p. 222). Today, Mezirow's transformative learning theory is regarded as a prominent theoretical framework within the field of adult education.

Mezirow highlighted the role of reflection in the learning process across his work (1978, 1990, 1991, 1994, 1998, 2003), defining reflection as "the process of critically assessing the content, process and premise(s) of our efforts to interpret and give meaning to an experience" (Mezirow, 1991, p. 104). He added that "reflection is the central dynamic in intentional learning, problem solving, and validity testing through rational discourse" (Mezirow, 1991, p. 99).

Mezirow's transformative learning theory has had a profound impact on the field of faculty development (Balmer & Richards, 2012; Brooks, 2004; Lips-Wiersma, 2002; McQuiggan, 2007; Sukhera et al., 2020; Wlodarsky, 2018). His work has framed developmental programming that has helped faculty members to recognize their own assumptions and biases (Sukhera et al., 2020), to question the assumptions that shape their teaching practice (McQuiggan, 2007; Wlodarsky, 2018), and to create new meaning schemes leading to professional and personal growth (Balmer & Richards, 2012).

Brookfield: Reflection Equalizes Us

Stephen Brookfield is a distinguished professor who has authored several books on adult education and training for teachers. Much of his work addresses the importance of critical

reflection for faculty members. In *Become a Critically Reflective Teacher*, Brookfield (1995) is clear to differentiate critical reflection from mere reflection, noting this:

> "To put it briefly, reflection becomes critical when it has two distinctive purposes. The first is to understand how considerations of power undergird, frame, and distort educational processes and interactions. The second is to question assumptions and practices that seem to make our teaching lives easier but actually work against our own best long-term interests." (p. 8)

He went on to identify six reasons why critical reflection is important for educators: It helps us take informed actions; it helps us develop a rationale for practice; it helps us avoid self-laceration; it grounds us emotionally; it enlivens our classrooms; and it increases democratic trust (pp. 22-26). Across his writing, Brookfield (1995) notes that trust is the thread that ties all these recommended practices together. "Since it is difficult to show love to others when we are divided, suspicious, and scrambling for advantage, critical reflection urges us to create conditions under which each person is respected, valued, and heard" (p. 27).

One tool that Brookfield (1995) offered as a mechanism for facilitating critical reflection is the concept of critical conversations, which was similar to Mezirow's (1990, 1991, 1998, 2003) notion of rational discourse. Critical conversations invite participants into a conversation with peers about assumptions, anxieties, goals, and feelings (Brookfield, 1995). Of educators, he wrote, "As they describe their own experiences dealing with the same dilemmas and crises we face, we are able to check, reframe, and broaden our own theories of practice" (p. 35). He further argued that discussing the experiences of colleagues can help faculty members to make sense of their own experiences, while encouraging all engaged in the critically reflective conversation that education is a collective endeavor.

Theoretical Framework: Schön's Reflective Practice

In the 1980's, Donald Schön authored two books—*The Reflective Practitioner* and *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*—which have greatly influenced the fields of nursing, social sciences, and education. Schön's work encourages professionals to engage in reflective practice, which he defines as a process of assessing one's professional abilities via a dialectical exchange with a situation. He contends that this reflective practice augments professionals' ability to understand, evaluate, and interpret their experiences for the purpose of continuous learning. Over time, this approach to learning becomes more fluid and automatic. The goal of reflective practice is to propel professionals from the technical rationality position of development and practice, which is based more in scientific-method and textbook-learning, into the reflection-in-action position, which is more intuitive and application-centered. Schön's work asserted that without engaging professionals in a robust reflective process, learning becomes shallow and detached from real-world application (Hoban & Erickson, 2004; Schön, 1987, 1983).

Technical Rationality

When Schön penned *The Reflective Practitioner* (1983) and *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* (1987), he juxtaposed the idea of reflective practice against the more widely held concept of technical rationality. "Technical rationality holds that practitioners are instrumental problem solvers who select technical means best suited to particular purposes. Rigorous professional practitioners solve well-formed instrumental problems by applying theory and technique derived from systematic preferably scientific knowledge" (Schön, 1987, pp. 3–4). Technical rationality stems from the Cartesian scientific paradigm, which asserts that knowledge originates outside oneself. This perspective holds that one can truly learn only when detached

from one's environment to objectively observe and interpret "reality" (Berman, 1981). Technical rationality considers scientific inquiry to be the only means to discover true knowledge (Imre, 1984; Kinsella, 2007).

Reflective practice emerged in a time when people were growing disenchanted with the tenets and implications of technical rationality (Kinsella, 2007), which was viewed as the standard approach to decision-making in most Western contexts (Polkinghorne, 2004). Schön asserted that the instrumental analyses of technical rationality are insufficient in contexts marked by complexity, unpredictability, and ambiguity (Kinsella, 2007; Sadler-Smith & Smith, 2006). Of technical rationality, Schön (1983) wrote,

> "If the model of technical rationality is incomplete in that it fails to account for practical competence in 'divergent' situations, so much the worse for the model. Let us search instead for an epistemology of practice implicit in the artistic, intuitive processes which some practitioners do bring to situations of uncertainty, instability, uniqueness and value conflict." (p. 49)

His perspectives on professional knowledge and learning encouraged professionals in many fields to embrace indeterminacy and complexity through reflective practice.

Reflective Practice

Schön (1983) offered reflective practice as a paradigm to understand professional knowledge in situations where outcomes and decision-making hinge not on formulaic outcomes. Technical rationality was rooted in quantitative, scientific, analytical decision-making; reflective practice was proposed as an iterative process that involves reflection during and after decision-making and problem-solving.

While no one definition of reflective practice has been elevated, reflective practice was explained in detail across Schön's works (1983, 1987). The act of reflective practice often begins with problem setting. "Problem setting is a process in which, interactively, we *name* the things to

which we will attend and *frame* the context in which we will attend to them" (Schön, 1983, p. 40). This nontechnical process of problem setting helps the professional to both organize and clarify the desired ends and a way to achieve them (Schön, 1983).

Practitioners often flow spontaneously into the act of assessing their own formal education and understanding as well as how its application should be modified to achieve the ends identified in the "naming and framing." Schön (1983) identified three distinct, but interrelated constructs—reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversation—to explain the facets of reflective practice. Each of these three constructs models important dimensions of reflection on professional knowledge and professional growth over time. Reflection-in-action occurs while engaging in professional action. Reflection-on-action is performed posteriori. Finally, reflective conversation occurs after action is a deeper reflective action, calling practitioners to examine relationships, and name new knowledge. These constructs are outlined in Table 2 as applied to professional educators.

Reflection-in-Action. Schön (1987) posited that as professionals engage in the activities of everyday life, they develop a special, specific, and unique understanding of their field. Examples may include the physician who can intuit the disease based on his or her keen experience with the associated symptoms or the builder who, without intentional thought, has learned to navigate the idiosyncrasies of a particular type of construction site. Over time, those connections inform understanding which manifests as implicit, instinctual responses to frequently encountered scenarios. Often, these professionals try to communicate this understanding to peers or mentees but find it difficult to adequately define or explain; some have referred to this phenomenon as "knowing more than you can say" (Barnard, 1968; Polyani,

1966). This unique professional understanding is knowing-in-action which takes shape over time through a process Schön (1987) defined as reflection-in-action.

Table 2
Dimensions of a Reflective Practitioner as Applied by Schön to Professional Educators (Schön, 1987, 1983)

Dimension	Description
Reflection-in-Action	Occurs while the instructor in engaged in instruction. Manifest as the instructor alters teaching methods on the spot.
Reflection-on-Action	Occurs primarily after action but can also occur before. Manifest as the instructor alters teaching methods after reflecting on completed class.
Reflective Conversation	Engaging in the act of reframing a situation or problem to allow practice to "talk back." Can be internal (private) or external (shared with colleagues).

The concept of reflection-in-action stemmed from Schön's (1983) assertion that professionals can think about something while doing it. Phrases like "thinking on your feet" and "learning by doing" are often used to describe this very idea. Schön (1983) referenced the big-league pitchers "finding their groove" and the jazz musicians improvising together. They are combining their knowing-in-action (of the game, chord progressions, and technique) with reflection-in-action. "When intuitive, spontaneous performance yields nothing more than the results expected for it, then we tend not to think about it" (Schön, 1983, p. 56). Later, he noted "when intuitive performance leads to surprises, pleasing and promising or unwanted, we may respond by reflecting-in-action" (Schön, 1983, p. 56).

Reflection-on-action. When practitioners think about completed actions, evaluate possible actions that could have improved an event after the fact, or consider improvements for

similar subsequent events, this form of reflection is referred to by Schön (1983) as reflection-on-action. Reflection-on-action calls practitioners into a retrospective examination of completed actions to expose, name, and explore the development of one's professional knowledge (Cattaneo et al., 2015).

While engaging in reflection-in-action is more instinctual and automatic, reflection-on-action requires a more intentional contemplation (Schön, 1983). Within the context of professional development, Cattaneo and Mottta (2021) found that effective reflection-on-action is promoted "through instructional activities based on prompts regarding declarative knowledge acquisition, metacognitive skills development, and attitude towards reflection" (p. 186). Others have linked reflection-on-action to activities like weblogs (Wopereis et al., 2010), reflexive journaling (Edelen & Bell, 2011), social media (Pérez Garcias, 2020), and COPs (Garcia, 2009; Jiang & Zheng, 2021).

Reflective conversation. The third and final dimension of reflective practice is "reflective conversation" which represents the conscious search for new meaning, relationships, and connections. The notion of reflective conversation became the focus of much of Schön's later work, where he applied reflective conversation as a script for re-framing former understanding and action in professional contexts. Schön (1983) referred to this time as opportunity for practitioners to allow practice to "talk back."

Schön (1983) asserted that reflective practitioners (consciously or unconsciously) begin the act of reflection with problem setting or framing. This helps to categorize and code the challenge at hand against previous formal education and experience. Reflective conversations call practitioners to "enter into a 'frame-experiment'—a dialogue of question and answer with the specific materials of the case in which the case 'speaks back,' compelling them to modify

their initial frames or replace them with new ones" (Waks, 2007, p. 86). Schön and others claimed that the reflective conversation dimension was where the practitioner or practitioners assigned new language and meaning to designs, processes, materials, and actions (Bamberger & Schön, 1983; Holmberg, 2014; Schön, 1992). "The notion of 'conversation' becomes important and productive as it encourages us, as researchers, to make our own action experiments in search of the emergence of new meaning, new features, new structures" (Bamberger & Schön, 1983, p. 70).

Conceptual Confusion: A Critique

Despite its popularity in fields like nursing and education, scholars have offered major critiques of Schön's reflective practice. The primary critique in recent decades, was the conceptual confusion expressed across the body of literature in this area (Bleakley, 1999; Kinsella, 2010; Marshal et al., 2021; Watts, 2019). Some contended that Schön's reflective practice can be easily contorted to fit a myriad of approaches and epistemologies because it is poorly defined (Clark et al., 1996; Ixer, 1999; Mackintosh, 1998; McLaughlin, 1999; Watts, 2019). Newman (1999) wrote, "Schön's work is often used uncritically to support a wide variety of apparently contradictory positions" (p. 146). Other scholars expressed concern over the fear that the idea of reflective practice will lose all meaning as its tenets are misappropriated in scholarship (Mackintosh, 1998; Watts, 2019). Eraut (1995) stressed a lack of connection to "real-world professional practice" stemming from the lack of clarity around reflective practice (p. 12).

Summary

This chapter offered a literature review addressing the major components of this study. First, an overview of faculty development was presented starting with the history of the field of faculty development, followed by the evolution of faculty development since its earliest

iterations were presented by scholars like Gaff, Eble, and McKeachie in the 1970's. This chapter highlighted various models (i.e., single-focus, comprehensive, interinstitutional, and triad models) and designs (i.e., field-specific, first-year faculty, and scholarship of teaching and learning designs) that faculty developers have proposed over the last five decades.

Trends that have been identified for the future of faculty development were offered along with supporting literature. One of the trends identified in this literature review was the call to faculty developers to incorporate stronger technological components such as social media and digital interactions to keep the engagement of learners (Bedford, 2019; Niehaus & O'Meara, 2015; Yilmaz et al., 2020). The second trend identified in the literature for the future of faculty development was evidence-based assessments. Faculty development scholars have long called for greater demonstrable correlations between specific developmental outcomes and student success, organizational vitality, and job satisfaction of faculty members (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013; Campion, et al., 2016; Erickson, 1986). "Faculty developers have to be intentional, driven by evidence-based practices, and continuous in their assessment of the impact of their services to have a meaningful and lasting impact on the quality of teaching and learning" (Sorcinelli et al., 2017, p. 6).

As this study sought to examine faculty members perceptions of the reflective component embedded into faculty development initiative in which they participated, the concept of reflection was also discussed. This literature review examined the perspectives of three scholars who each offer a unique interpretation and application of reflection. Paulo Freire, a historian and philosopher, elevated reflection and action as the keys to liberate learners from oppressive power structures. Jack Mezirow, a sociologist, asserted that reflection transforms us as it helps "to interpret and give meaning to an experience" (Mezirow, 1991, p. 104). Finally, Stephen

Brookfield focused much of his work on reflection to educators and the power dynamics that often color learning environments. Brookfield contended that reflection is different from critical reflection, which helps to recognize how power influences educational processes and interactions and to questions assumptions and biases.

The final section of this literature review addressed Donald Schön's reflective practice, which served as the theoretical framework for this study. Reflective practice was defined by Schön as a method of assessing one's professional knowledge and abilities via a dialectical exchange with a situation. Schön juxtaposed the ideas of technical rationality, which is systematic, quantitative, and detached, and reflective practice, which is more contextual and intuitive. To describe the process of reflective practice, Schön offered three unique constructs including reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversations. Reflection-in-action refers to the connections that are formed over time as a professional develops instinctual responses to frequently encountered scenarios. Reflection-on-action refers to reflection that occurs after a professional activity which leads to the modification of subsequent professional practice. Finally, reflective conversations are intentional searches for new meaning and understanding. These reflective conversations were offered by Schön as a time to invite practice to "talk back." This study was designed to facilitate reflective conversations with faculty members in an effort to allow the practice of reflection within the context of faculty development to "talk back."

CHAPTER 3

Introduction to the Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members' perceptions of the reflection component that was embedded into a faculty development initiative in which they all participated. The researcher sought to gain a clearer understanding of how faculty members felt the reflection component influenced their teaching effectiveness. This study employed a pragmatic qualitative methodology to answer the following research question:

> How do faculty members who participated in a faculty development program perceive the effectiveness of the reflective component on developing their teaching effectiveness?

This chapter will offer an in-depth overview of the pragmatic qualitative methodological design and why it was chosen for this research as well as an explanation of the relationship between this methodology and the theoretical framework. Additionally, this chapter will describe the processes used to select participants and to collect, organize, display, and interpret data.

Qualitative Research

The term *qualitative research* has been defined differently over several decades. Van Maanen (1979) described it as "an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world" (p. 520). Denzin and Lincoln (2011) asserted that qualitative research consists of a series of interpretive and substantive practices that make the world visible. "Basically, qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed; that is, how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015, p. 15). In

all its iterations, qualitative research is applied research, which is performed to discover meaning, enhance understanding, and augment the quality of practice within a particular discipline (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). Social science practitioners and scholars have long relied on qualitative research to guide systematic inquiry about people, processes, and practices (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013).

There are several distinct traits that differentiate the qualitative approach to research from the quantitative approach, including the types of data used, the purpose of the research, and the role of the researcher. Quantitative research uses numbers, numerical calculations, and quantifiably measurable outcomes to ascertain trends and make predictions. This type of research seeks to generate findings which can be generalized to a larger population. Conversely, qualitative research seeks to uncover meaning in experiences, relationships, and processes using words (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Qualitative researchers are not concerned with generalizing their findings, but rather with capturing the true essence of a lived experience (Patton, 2002) and gaining understanding about how people make meanings and interpretations of their experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). Another critical difference between the quantitative and qualitative approaches is that qualitative research places researchers as observers inside the world they are investigating (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). “Qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). The intimate role of researchers as observers in qualitive research is why many choose to convey their work using the first person (Given, 2008; O’Sullivan, 2015).

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher in qualitative research is unique compared with other research designs. The investigative nature of qualitative inquiry requires researchers to personally

immerse themselves, “getting close enough to the people and the circumstances there to capture what is happening” (Patton, 2002, p. 48). Creswell (2009) added that researchers not only immerse themselves in the context but also interact and collaborate with the participants to understand the topic being studied. Therefore, all forms of qualitative research regard researchers as the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). This requires unique emotional intelligence (Collins & Cooper, 2014), introspection (Petty, 2017), and the ability to separate the biases and emotions of researchers from the externally observable behaviors and internal states of the participants (O’Sullivan, 2015; Patton, 2002).

The qualitative approach to research was selected for this study because the quantitative approach would have been insufficient to investigate such complex topics as development, reflection, and perception. In this study, the “world” into which the researcher was immersed was faculty development. The explored events were faculty members’ experiences with the reflection component of their faculty development program. Ultimately, the objective of this study was to gain a greater understanding of the role of reflection in improving faculty members’ teaching effectiveness (as perceived by faculty) so that those findings could be used to adapt and improve future faculty development initiatives. Thus, a qualitative approach was the most appropriate approach for this study because it afforded the researcher the opportunity to ask “open-ended questions of people and observe matters of interest in real-world settings in order to … improve programs” (Patton, 2002, p. 136).

Pragmatic Qualitative Research

Pragmatism is a philosophical tradition which asserts that truth can be understood and applied in terms of its practical or pragmatic outcomes (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). According to Savin-Baden and Major (2013), pragmatic qualitative research stems from the early

pragmatists of the 1930's, who believed that an objective reality could be understood, albeit imperfectly. These early researchers sought to observe and understand human behaviors as they occurred in natural settings (Sandelowski, 2000; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013).

Ultimately, the purpose of pragmatic qualitative research is to better understand the practical effects of what is believed by linking theory and practice (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). However, unlike other qualitative research philosophies and approaches, pragmatists reject the idea that "truth" about the real world can be accessed or uncovered solely through a single scientific method (Mertens, 2005; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Instead, pragmatic researchers accomplish their purposes by extracting theory from practice, then applying it back to the practice (Creswell, 2003). They are predominantly guided by the research question, allowing for a myriad of eclectic approaches and designs to assess situations and solve problems.

The pragmatic qualitative research approach was chosen for this study because of its practical nature. This study sought to yield a greater understanding about the role of reflection within a specific faculty development program. To do so, personal interviews were used to capture participants' experiences around reflection within the context of a specific faculty development program. Thus, this pragmatic qualitative research design "marks the meeting point of description and interpretation, in which description involves presentation of facts, feelings, and experience in the everyday language or participants, as interpreted by the researcher" (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013, p. 172).

Pragmatic Qualitative Research and Schön's Reflective Practitioner

The relationship between pragmatic qualitative research and Schön's reflective practice is rooted in the emphasis placed on practicality by both. Schön (1983) called professionals to move from the technical rationality position of development and practice (theoretical and detached) to

the reflection-in-action position (practical and applicable). He contended that this movement occurs by focusing on reflection in the forms of reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversations. Pragmatic qualitative research fosters reflection in its various forms by examining the "real world" to identify commonalities, dualities, and differences in representations of truth (Creswell, 2014). When participants share their understanding of a particular experience, those commonalities, dualities, and differences emerge to depict versions of shared truth. Pragmatists seek to interpret that truth through the lens of those experiences ultimately to inform future practice (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Similarly, Schön's reflective practice revolves around using reflection to inform thinking, training, and development (Schön 1987; 1983). Thus, the natural marriage of pragmatic qualitative research and Schön's theory of reflective practice was appropriate and fitting for this study.

Setting

This study was conducted at South Central University (SCU), which is a public regional university. The institution is highly regarded in the state and region as a place where academic rigor and faculty-student relationships are both prioritized. The student population of SCU comprises approximately 5,000 undergraduate and graduate students. In that student population, the majority of students qualify for federal financial aid and work at least part-time throughout the duration of their college careers.

SCU offers a variety of degree programs including Bachelor degrees, Master degrees, and doctorates. Professional undergraduate programs are more popular at SCU than liberal arts programs. The largest degree programs at SCU include nursing, education, and business. SCU has a lower turnover rate for employees and faculty than similar institutions. However, faculty

turnover is higher than that for staff. Overall, the culture of SCU is relational. Students report high satisfaction with faculty members and advisement.

Selection of Participants

Jones et al. (2006) contended that a sample should consist of individuals "who may shed light on a particular phenomenon" (p. 72). This study explored a specific group of people—the faculty members who comprised the inaugural class of the Excellence in Teaching Program (ETP). Since all the participants from the inaugural class of the ETP were invited to participate, total population sampling was used to populate the sample for this study. In this case, total population sampling is most appropriate because the only individuals who could shed light on the research question were those who had completed the faculty development program and could speak to the impact of the reflection component on their teaching after the fact.

After receiving approval from the dissertation committee and the Institutional Research Board (IRB) (see Appendix A), the researcher sent an invitation to participate in the study by email to the faculty members who had participated in the ETP (Appendix B). This number of faculty invited to participate totaled ten individuals. Of those ten, eight faculty members expressed interest in participating in the study, which equates to an 80% return rate. After receiving feedback to the initial contact email, the researcher provided each interested participant with a personal explanation of the nature of the study, the time commitment, and each element of the consent form (see Appendix C). For six of the participants, the preliminary information was communicated in a face-to-face meeting; for the other two participants, information was conveyed during a private Zoom call. Afterwards, each participant agreed to participate by signing the consent form.

The sample for this study consisted of individuals from several different disciplines including business and technology, education, humanities, science, and social sciences. Sharing the genders represented in the population would likely compromise the anonymity of participants, but men and women are both represented in the sample. These individuals bring a range of professional and academic experience to the study. Five of the eight participants held terminal degrees within their respective fields; four participants were tenured. Each had self-selected to participate in the ETP.

Data Collection

The purpose of qualitative inquiry is to gain clearer understanding of the world by exploring topics and phenomena that are difficult to capture with quantitative research (Mack et al., 2005). Thus, there are several methods that qualitative researchers can use to obtain richer, more nuanced, and specific data including observations, interviews, focus groups, artifact analysis, and document analysis (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). This study used semi-structured interviews and document analysis because both methods yielded important data needed to better understand the perceived role of reflection in a faculty development program for the purpose of improving teaching effectiveness. The semi-structured interviews provided insight into each participant's perceptions of the reflection component of the ETP, and the document analysis yielded evidence that triangulated all participants' experiences. The following sections address the ways in which data was collected from semi-structured interviews and documents that were later analyzed and interpreted.

Semi-Structured Interviews

The first stage in data collection consisted of semi-structured interviews with each participant. The semi-structured interview format is one that consists of open-ended questions

that can be used somewhat flexibly (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). These interviews typically require some specific data from each participant while allowing significant leeway for the researcher to chase ideas and topics as they emerge in real time (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). The researcher conducted two interviews with each participant, each lasting approximately 45 minutes, over the course of one month. The first interview (see Appendix D) was dedicated to establishing rapport, obtaining some biographical information from each participant, gauging their initial reactions to the reflection component of the ETP, and hearing how their teaching practices had changed since their participation in the ETP. The second interview with each participant called for clarification of earlier sentiments and additional introspection.

In each interview, the researcher began the conversation with questions about each participant. Questions like "Are you traveling this summer?" or "What courses do you teach?" helped to create a conversational, comfortable atmosphere for each participant. As an insider-researcher, the researcher had the benefit of an existing rapport with each of the individuals that were interviewed (Costley et al., 2010). As a result, the relationship-building phase of qualitative research was expedited. Another way that the researcher worked to facilitate and maintain a conversation attitude was through the usage of strategically crafted probes. The researcher intentionally employed confirmation probes, clarification probes, and elaboration probes, while deliberately avoiding the use of evidence probes and slant probes because these credibility probes can become confrontational (Rubin & Rubin, 2012) and were not necessary for the nature of this study.

Interview Locations

Data was collected for this study in a time when Covid-19 posed a unique challenge. Two of the eight participants were not able or preferred not to meet in public spaces. Therefore, some interviews occurred in face-to-face settings like an office or a coffee shop. Others were relegated to Zoom conversations. Of the sixteen interviews, twelve took place in a face-to-face location. Most occurred in participants' offices. These interviews offered a unique insight into the personality and priorities of each faculty member. Walls were lined with family photos, inspirational quotes, fishing trophies, international flags, and mementos from their respective alma maters. The researcher noticed that some participants seemed more comfortable in a space that was "their own." Additionally, she found it was easier to build rapport by commenting on a picture or knick-knack.

The interviews that occurred in public spaces took longer to develop into raw and honest conversation. Some participants spoke quietly at first or looked over their shoulders to confirm that no one would hear their answers. Over time, each participant warmed to sharing the good and the bad of their perceptions regarding reflection within faculty development for the purpose of bolstering teaching effectiveness. Even their hesitations, which were manifested through nonverbals (tone, tenor, etc.) and body language, gave the researcher additional information about their experiences with the ETP.

Finally, the zoom interviews afforded the researcher glimpses into the lives of two participants. Each of the four Zoom interviews (an initial interview and a follow-up interview with two different participants) occurred with participants in their respective homes. One participant Zoomed from an office that had been curated over many years. In the distant background were framed awards and news clippings highlighting a long and storied career.

The other participant who was interviewed twice via Zoom was far less composed. Multiple technical difficulties, interruptions from children, barking animals, and packages being delivered made these interviews choppy and inconsistent. Questions and comments like, “Okay, where were we?” or “So sorry about that.” were frequent. This participant’s camera seemed to move over the course of the interviews. Backgrounds included a sink full of dirty dishes, a back patio, and a child’s bedroom.

These interview locations yielded richer interactions than written communication or telephone conversations. However, the Zoom interviews generated a chaotic and unpredictable environment. Certain elements of body language were invisible to the researcher because they occurred outside of the frame.

Transcription Method

The researcher recorded each of the interviews using a portable recorder and my computer because Savin-Baden & Major (2013) suggested that qualitative researchers always need to make a backup recording device. The zoom interviews were recorded using the “record” feature on zoom as well as on my portable recorder. The researcher transcribed the audio recordings into a verbatim Microsoft Word document for later data analysis; transcription refers to the process of converting audio (in real-time or at a later time using a recording) into written text (Patton, 2002). This transcript contained details such as the participant’s name (pseudonyms were used to protect the identities of participants), date, location of the meeting, and time stamps throughout the document so that I could easily navigate to specific points in the audio recordings. The researcher divided each transcript document into smaller pieces, starting each section with the question asked and the subsequent answers and discussion and then inserted line numbers for my own reference.

Data Preparation

On each transcript, the researcher crafted a simple coding system for organization and quick reference. Interviews were referenced as “IN1,” “IN2,” or “IN3” and interview questions were referenced as “Q1,” “Q2,” etc. Finally, each line of the transcript is referenced as “L1,” “L2,” etc. While this rudimentary coding is not necessary for qualitative research, it assisted the researcher greatly in examining the data collectively (i.e., Engagement is mentioned frequently IN1Q4L3, IN2Q2L6-9, IN3Q1L9).

After each interview meeting and subsequent transcription, the researcher read and reread the transcript and made notes in the margins. These notes included her ideas, follow-up questions, and observations. These field notes captured quotes and themes from the interview, as well as informal interactions between the participant and the researcher, body language, and physical reactions. Additionally, the researcher used her field notes to record and reflect on her own feelings and reactions. This proved extremely helpful for undergirding her memory of the interviews and for prompting follow-up questions and connections between content. Additionally, the field notes assisted in determining where the researcher’s own thoughts, experiences, and biases may have influenced the lens through which she observed and interpreted each exchange with participants.

The transcripts of the interviews and the researcher’s field notes served as the primary source of data collected. Secondary data came from participants, who provided access to their reflections and other pertinent documents such as instructor evaluations and communications between peers and students. These documents helped to triangulate the data and enhanced the accuracy of this study.

The digital data (transcripts, audio recordings, field notes, electronic communications, etc.) was stored on the researcher's personal computer, which is password protected. Backup copies were also stored on a portable hard drive. The portable hard drive and the non-digital data (printed papers) were stored in a cabinet in the researcher's office, which remained locked when not in use. The researcher made every effort to secure the data that she collected and to protect the participants in this study.

Document Analysis

The second way that the researcher collected data was through document analysis. Document analysis is a valuable tool for collecting qualitative data because it serves a variety of functions for qualitative researchers. First, document analysis can help to provide important context into the research problem (Goussinsky et al., 2011; Savenye & Robinson, 2005). It can also provide background information about participants and experiences (Owen, 2014). In this phase of the data collection process, the researcher was granted access to the institution's learning management system (LMS)—Canvas. She was able to view only the reflections submitted by the participants who had given consent. The reflections submitted bore important context for the development that occurred during each participant's formal membership and participation in the ETP. Additionally, these questions and answers helped to shape the follow-up questions that were asked in the researcher's second interview with each participant.

Field Notes

Over the course of data collection, the researcher maintained detailed field notes. In each interview, these field notes included comments about the physical location of the interview such as things hanging on the walls, smells in the room, or the "feel" of the place. The researcher also made notes about body language, attire the participant was wearing, time of day, etc. Typically,

the researcher noted especially important and timebound observations in the margins of her notes. Immediately following the interview, she read over her notes while listening to the recording of the interview, adding more context and detail to her field notes. These field notes assisted the researcher in remembering the details of the conversation. The field notes also assisted the researcher in keeping thorough and authentic entries in her reflexivity journal. The careful attention to detail in the researcher's field notes helped her to bring the more nuanced and non-verbal elements of the data into her data analysis.

Data Analysis

There are a myriad of data analysis strategies from which to choose (Patton, 2007), yet Savin-Baden and Major (2013) asserted that there are very few resources which describe one specific approach that is recommended for data analysis in pragmatic qualitative research. This study followed an approach to data analysis that was developed by Miles and Huberman (1984), who suggested that data analysis consists of three concurrent flows of activity:

1. Data reduction;
2. Data display; and
3. Conclusion drawing and verification (interpretation).

Miles and Huberman (1984) asserted that this model is a thorough and consistent approach to data analysis that yields trustworthy findings (Miles & Huberman, 1984; 1994).

Data Reduction

According to Miles and Huberman (1984), "Data reduction refers to the process of focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data in written-up field notes or transcriptions" (p. 10) and occurs continuously throughout the life of the qualitative research project. The act of data reduction, also referred to as data condensation (Tesch, 1990) or

bracketing (Patton, 2002), begins even before data is collected. Instead, Miles and Huberman (1994) contended that data reduction begins when the researcher makes decisions (often without complete awareness) about research questions, conceptual frameworks, theoretical frameworks, and data collection procedures. Reduction continues as the researcher performs fieldwork, drafts field notes, develops coding schemas, and identifies themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These decisions form an important aspect of data analysis as they help to sort, organize, sharpen, and clarify the research.

In this study, data reduction began in the earliest days of this project with the formulation and refining of the research question and with the selection of a research methodology. Those decisions influenced the theoretical framework undergirding the study and the choice of participants from whom to collect data. Over the course of the project, the process of data reduction continued as follow-up questions were crafted and documents were analyzed. After that, the researcher determined which data chunks to pull out and how to code them based on which chunks helped to answer the research question. These analytical choices shaped the nature of this project.

Data Display

A second way that data is analyzed is through data display, which is "an organized, compressed, assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 11). This idea is similar to Patton's (2002) assertion that data be "horizontalized," which consists of examining all elements of the data as though they hold equal weight. Creswell (2007) contended that this process of systematically equating and analyzing the data can occur as data is collected. This idea is echoed by Merriam (1998), who contended that

"the right way to analyze data in a qualitative study is to do it simultaneously with data collection" (p. 162).

In this study, the researcher displayed data by developing a coding schema with which to sort and organize the data. As the data was coded, she used visual tools to identify emergent themes. This process occurred across the life of the data collection period.

Coding the Data

Codes are merely labels assigned to data chunks. For this research project, the researcher created descriptions and developed codes based on key words, phrases, concepts, and ideas (Creswell, 2003). Most of the codes drawn from the data in this study came verbatim from words and phrases used by participants during semi-structured interviews or in reflection submissions. To determine the codes, the researcher relied heavily on the audio recordings, complementary transcripts, and field notes. She revisited each of those recordings, transcripts, and field notes several times, which afforded her the opportunity to review not only the content of the participants' answers, but also more nuanced content such as pauses, changes in tone of voice, and body language.

The researcher chose not to utilize CAQDAS software and instead employed a more traditional method of sorting and coding. She made notes by writing in the margins of the transcripts. In some instances, she added additional pages to the transcripts or attached sticky notes. Those notes informed the creation of labels, which were later used to sort the data. A master list of the labels or codes was stored on a tab in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. That same spreadsheet also contained a tab with the pseudonyms of the participants. All pseudonymous participants were assigned a tab within the spreadsheet on which all of their transcribed comments were recorded. The spreadsheet allowed for easy searching, sorting, and color coding

as each transcript went through multiple iterations of coding. In this project, the data yielded approximately 80 codes.

As shared by Patton (2002), each source of data (recordings, transcripts, and field notes) was handled multiple times before it was sufficiently and completely indexed and coded. Many passages fit multiple codes. Thus, several quotes were cross-coded. Participants' comments were color-coded (i.e. Sally's comments were all written in green) and then copied and pasted into the tabbed page(s) for all pertinent codes. One Microsoft Excel spreadsheet housed the master list of pseudonyms, the master list of codes, the tabbed pages of participants' comments, and the tabbed pages of coded content.

Developing Categories and Themes

Coding the data took a substantial amount of time because it required the researcher to engage with the data multiple times. Codes were examined and reexamined independently and in conjunction with the other codes. The researcher sought to identify synonymous words and ideas as well as words that could potentially represent differences to identify potential alternative understandings (Snyder, 2012). These similarities and dissimilarities helped the researcher to group codes into categories. Each code represented a single idea. The codes were arranged into categories, which represented a group of codes. After a similar process of engaging with the data, the researcher grouped categories into themes. The themes that emerged from the data describe broader, predominant ideas. These codes, categories, and themes were used to help clarify the "what" and "how" of the concepts being examined (Creswell, 2003; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

The line numbers made it easy to cross-reference themes across the transcripts. Additionally, the use of a spreadsheet enabled the researcher to easily navigate across codes and the comments of participants. The researcher created a tab in the Excel spreadsheet for each

theme that emerged from the data. Those themes informed her understanding of the participants' experiences with and perspectives of the phenomenon investigated in this study (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 2009).

Creswell (2007) contended that describing "what" a participant experienced is a textural description, and "how" a participant experienced something is a structural description. Researchers capture the "essence" of an experience when they are able to portray "a composite description of the phenomenon incorporating both the textural and structural descriptions" (Creswell, 2007, p. 159). Displaying the data through codes, categories, and emergent themes, helped to "sharpen, sort, focus, discard, and organize data in such a way that final conclusions can be drawn and verified" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 11).

Coding Cycles

Saldaña (2015) divided coding methods into two main sections, the first cycle and the second cycle. In the first cycle, there are seven subcategories: grammatical, elemental, affective, literary and language, exploratory, procedural, and theming the data. This first cycle is the appropriate time for *holistic coding*, which Saldaña (2015) described as a grand tour overview of all data. Additionally, the first cycle calls for researchers to begin *in vivo coding*, in which the researcher develops codes based on verbatim responses and direct quotes, and *process coding*, which incorporates gerunds ("ing" words) to demonstrate action in the data. Both holistic coding and process coding help researchers to attune themselves "to participant perspectives and actions" using interview transcripts (Saldaña, 2015, p. 73).

The second cycle is more analytical in nature and requires researchers to engage in classifying, prioritizing, and integrating. In this cycle, researchers engage in *eclectic coding*, where researchers refine choices made within the first cycle. The second cycle is also the

appropriate time to perform *pattern coding* and *focused coding*, both of which guide the researcher's "categorization of coded data as an initial analytic strategy" (Saldaña, 2015, p. 74).

Throughout these coding cycles, the researcher was intentionally mindful to prevent two common coding errors. The first common coding error is choosing descriptive coding as a default method. Therefore, the researcher used descriptive coding sparingly and only when necessary. As Saldaña (2015) reinforced, "Topic-based nouns do not tell you as much about the human condition as verbs, gerunds, and the participant's own words" (p. 78). The second coding error is what Saldaña (2015) referred to as *code proliferation*. Avoiding code proliferation was especially important in this study as the researcher chose to code manually rather than to use CAQDAS software. Thus, she intentionally worked to "lump" data and use select codes repeatedly (Saldaña, 2015).

Interpretation

Miles and Huberman (1984) argued, "From the start of data collection, the qualitative analyst is beginning to decide what things mean—noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows, and propositions" (p. 11). At first, these relationships seem vague and incoherent; over the course of the study, they grow more explicit and grounded (Glazer & Strauss, 1967). Miles and Huberman (1984) insisted that this conclusion-drawing and verification, also referred to as interpretation, occurs across the life of qualitatively oriented research project and serves as the third and final stream of analysis activity.

Validating Findings

Lincoln and Guba (1985) asserted that the value of a study is linked to its trustworthiness. Thus, the researcher used Lincoln and Guba's (1985) evaluative criteria to validate her findings. Those evaluative criteria examines credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

The first evaluative criterion offered by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is credibility, which refers to a confidence in the "truth" of a study's findings. There are a myriad of techniques for establishing credibility. In this study, the researcher primarily relied on member checking and triangulation to demonstrate credibility. Member checking is just what its name implies—providing participants with opportunities to check and verify that the interpretation of the data that they provided is accurate (Doyle, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Curtin and Fossey (2007) described member checking as a "way of finding out whether the data analysis is congruent with the participants' experiences" (p. 92). The researcher incorporated member checking by allowing participants to read drafts of the study prior to its submission to the dissertation committee. Following the participant interviews, a summary of results was sent by email to each participant. Member feedback was invited to be provided by email, mail, or phone.

The researcher also used triangulation to ensure the credibility of this study. Triangulation refers to examining information from different data sources "to build a coherent justification for themes" (Creswell, 2014, p. 196). In this study, the researcher performed triangulation by reviewing interviews, observations, and participants' responses to the reflections embedded into the ETP. It should be noted that triangulation was not used to demonstrate that different data sources all yielded the same results but rather to test for such consistency. Where inconsistencies were noted, they did not weaken the credibility of the results, but rather illuminated opportunities for deeper understanding (Patton, 2002).

The second evaluative criterion offered by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is transferability, which they defined as "how one determines the extent to which the findings of a particular inquiry have applicability in other contexts or with other subjects/participants" (p. 290). One technique that researchers use to ensure transferability is thick description. Denzin (1989)

contended that thick description extends beyond merely describing one's actions. "It establishes the significance of an experience, or the sequence of events, for the person or persons in question" (Denzin, 1989, p. 83). This definition is reinforced by the work of Schwandt (2001), who claimed "…to thickly describe social action is actually to begin to interpret it by recording the circumstances, meanings, intentions, strategies, motivations, and so on…" (p. 255), and by the writings of Holloway (1997), who emphasized that thick description "deals not only with the meaning and interpretations of people in a culture but also with their intentions" (p. 154). In this study, sought to incorporate thick description as described by Denzin (1989), Holloway (1997), and Schwandt (2001).

The final evaluative criteria offered by Lincoln and Guba (1985) are dependability and confirmability. Dependability refers to the consistency of the findings whereas confirmability speaks to the degree to which a study's findings are a product of participants' responses rather than the researcher's biases and assumptions. There are several tools and strategies that researchers can incorporate to uphold dependability and confirmability. One of those tools is triangulation, which I have described in detail. Another tool recommended by Lincoln and Guba is the use of a reflexivity journal. A reflexivity journal is a type of diary that researchers maintain over the course of their research. The researcher used a reflexivity journal over the course of this study to record things like her emotions and reflections, logistical challenges and surprises, and questions that emerged throughout the process. This journal afforded the researcher the opportunity to release her thoughts, feelings, ideas, and questions to clearly see where participants' responses and her own ideas diverged.

Ethical Considerations

Many ethical considerations were taken by the researcher throughout the course of this study. The first pertains to the ways in which the research protected the identities of the participants and the information that they shared. The second ethical consideration revolves around researcher positionality. This includes how the researcher prevented her own biases and opinions from creeping into data collection and analysis. Since the researcher is an insider researcher, these considerations were paramount.

Maintaining Confidentiality

Following the models proposed by Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2010) and by Krueger and Casey (2009), the researcher performed each of the following actions with each of the participants: (a) informed participants of the rewards and risks associated with the study, (b) assured participants that their participation was voluntary and confidential, (c) explained that participants may withdraw from the study at any time, and (d) provided a written statement of consent, which each participant signed before taking part in the study (see Appendix C).

From the earliest phases of the study, participants were assured that confidentiality would be prioritized across the life of the study. Participants were informed that they would be recorded for validity purposes but that those recordings would be held in secure storage and destroyed immediately following the completion of the study. The consent document also explained the anticipated benefits for the designers of faculty development and the academic community at large. Names of participants, names of any others mentioned, and the names of places referenced in interviews or in reflection submissions were changed to protect participant identity and to maintain confidentiality. Transcripts were created using codes that were used to link the two interviews and other documents. Following the interviews, documentation connecting the codes

to each participant was destroyed. Original documents were stored on the researcher's computer and external hard drive, both of which are password protected. After the transfer of files to the computer hard drive, original documents were stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's office, which remains locked when not in use.

In addition to obtaining IRB approval (see Appendix A) and written consent from participants (see Appendix C), the researcher made every effort to honor the individuals involved in this study, to fairly communicate their stories, and to highlight their diverse perspectives. One way that she sought to honor her participants was through many clarification questions. She sought to understand both the order of events and the emotions felt in those experiences. The researcher repeated stories back to participants, echoing their language to confirm that her reception of the message was as closely related to its original intent as possible without sharing any details that may compromise the identities of participants. Additionally, the researcher used pseudonyms to reference both the institution and the participants for the sake of protecting the identities of the individual participants and the institution. The researcher clearly communicated to each participant in each interview that no person inside their shared organization or outside of the organization would have access to their identity. Costley et al. (2010) referred to this special attention on the part of insider-researchers as an *ethic of care*.

Performing Insider Research

Insider research refers to research performed in an organization, group, or community in which the researcher is also a member (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007; Hanson, 2013; Hockey, 1993; Mercer, 2007; Ross, 2017). Raelin (2008) insisted that there is ample evidence to suggest that insider research supports the long-term success of organizations. Costley et al. (2010) asserted that another benefit of insider research is the researcher's knowledge and understanding

of nuanced organization-specific language. However, Fleming (2018) asserted that there is a myriad of ethical challenges that insider researchers must address: "The potential for implicit coercion of the participants, acknowledging the desire for positive outcomes, ensuring tacit patterns and regularities were not taken for granted, and awareness of the potential conflicts of being an academic and researcher within the same context" (p. 311).

Coercion of Participants

It is true that "colleagues often welcome the opportunity to discuss issues around their work and expound upon them" (Costley et al., 2010, p. 34). However, the researcher in this study went to great lengths to disclose to each prospective participant the details of the study to avoid coercing or pressuring any individual to participate. She communicated the types of information that would be shared in the study (i.e., approval letters from the IRB committee from the researcher's institution and the institution where the ETP occurred). She also stressed in each semi-structured interview that participation was strictly voluntary and that participants could leave the study at any time.

During the recruitment of participants, the researcher emphasized that participation in the study would have zero impact on the professional interactions or the relationship (if applicable) between the researcher and the prospective participant. The researcher insisted that none of the participants would be contacted about the study or spoken to about the study in the presence of others. She underscored frequently that participants should not feel any pressure to participate in the study. While these actions would have been taken with prospective participants at any location, the nature of the established relationships as colleagues at SCU required even more attention to the freedom of participants to choose whether to participate.

Desire for Positive Outcomes

Fleming (2018) suggested that the second challenge posed to insider researchers is the desire for positive outcomes. Any researcher can fall into premature deductions based on biases and preconceived notions regarding the outcome of a study, but "there is more potential for this to occur when the researcher is closely linked through the nature of the insider position" (p. 316). In this study, the researcher relied heavily on Miles and Huberman's (1984) model for simultaneous data collection and analysis. Each line of transcript and each document was balanced as an equal part. The researcher intentionally and frequently oriented the study around the body of data that had been collected, not the outcome she thought was coming.

Ensuring Patterns and Regularities were Not Overlooked

A unique challenge for insider researchers is the ability to see patterns and regularities that are taken for granted by other insiders. Mercer (2007) wrote of this familiarity between the researcher and the organization as a "double-edged sword" (p. 7). While it affords unique benefits and the ability to go deeper faster, Mercer (2007) asserted that insider researchers struggle to "make the familiar strange" (p. 7).

The researcher relied on probes and questions to seek out these patterns and to name them as they were experienced by the participants. This required intentional and disciplined bracketing on the part of the researcher. She was forced to suspend her experiences and understandings of occurrences that were familiar to see them through the participants' eyes. The follow-up interviews offered an important opportunity to revisit assumptions that were made in earlier conversations about patterns and regularities. The researcher found that some assumptions she held were based on a lack of understanding about the patterns and regularities in which she had been immersed as an insider.

Potential Conflict Stemming from Dual Roles

Concerns have long surrounded the idea "role-duality" for insider researchers. Morse (1998) asserted:

> It is not wise for an investigator to conduct a qualitative study in a setting where he or she is already employed and has a work role. The dual roles of investigator and employee are incompatible, and they may place the researcher in an untenable position. (p. 60)

Brannick and Coughlin (2007) agreed that when members of an organization or group perform insider research, they "are likely to encounter role conflict and find themselves caught between loyalty tugs, behavioral claims, and identification dilemmas" (p. 70).

While the researcher was aware of these potential conflicts of interest and identity, the nature of this study did not elicit controversial responses or illuminate ideas that could be personally or professionally damaging. Thus, the strong language used by Morse (1998) regarding the lack of wisdom for researchers to study their own organizations seemed incongruous with the objectives of this study. However, the researcher was deliberate in the way that she approached the data collection and analysis in this study. She constructed and employed the metaphor of hats: "Now, I am taking off my faculty-member-hat. I am putting on my researcher-hat. All that I know about these phenomena stem from the questions I ask and the answers that are given."

Positionality Statement of the Researcher

It is important that "researchers recognize that their own background shapes their interpretation, and they 'position themselves' in the research to acknowledge how their interpretation flows from their own personal, cultural and historical experiences" (Creswell, 2007, p. 21). As someone who works within the field of higher education as a faculty member, the researcher in this study acknowledged that she has experiences, biases, and personal opinions

about the phenomenon which she was studying. Thus, she stepped into this study consciously and intentionally suspending, or bracketing, her prior experiences and beliefs to interpret the data using only the interviews, observations, and documents collected over the course of this study (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 2009). As much as possible, the researcher avoided presupposition, and instead sought to remain present in each phase of the study. Her reflexivity journal assisted with this, too.

Conclusion

The methodology described in these pages was chosen and followed to capture the lived experiences of the participants in this study to better illuminate the role of reflection within a faculty development initiative for the purpose of augmenting teaching effectiveness. The researcher sought to examine the data in ways that were valid and reliable without injecting or tainting any piece of this study with her own experiences and perceptions. She let the data speak, just as Schön insisted that practitioners allow practice to "talk back" to gain clearer answers to the research question.

In the subsequent chapters, the results of the data collection and analysis will be shared, along with a discussion about the implications for practice and calls for future research in faculty development.

CHAPTER 4

Research Findings

The purpose of this pragmatic qualitative study was to explore faculty members' perceptions of the reflection component that was embedded in a faculty development initiative in which they participated as it pertains to teaching effectiveness. To investigate those perceptions, the researcher employed semi-structured interviews and document analysis to better understand faculty members' opinions of reflection. She compiled the data yielded from the interviews and document analyses to identify the emergent themes that helped to answer the following research question:

> How do faculty members who participated in a faculty development program perceive the effectiveness of the reflective component on developing their teaching effectiveness?

This chapter presents the findings of this research. The first part of this chapter will describe the participants for this study. The second part will identify the themes that emerged over the course of the study and provide evidence to support those themes.

Participants

In every phase of this study, from participant recruitment to reporting results, the participants in this study were assured that measures would be taken to ensure their anonymity and confidentiality. Thus, pseudonyms are used throughout this chapter when referring to participants. Information like gender and teaching discipline were intentionally referenced in the broadest and most ambiguous terms possible. Table 3 provides basic biographical information for each of the eight participants. Given the size of SCU, the researcher has omitted the specific departments represented and the ages of each participant.

Table 3
Participant Information

Pseudonym	Discipline
Alex	Business, Tech, and Education
Billie	Arts & Sciences
Dede	Business, Tech, and Education
Jesse	Business, Tech, and Education
Mac	Arts & Sciences
Olive	Arts & Sciences
Shae	Arts & Sciences
Taylor	Arts & Sciences

The professional experience of the participants ranges from 4 years to 19 years. All of them had some tangible experience from which to draw conclusions and apply concepts. Additionally, five of the eight participants have professional experience in their respective disciplines outside the realm of academia.

The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with each participant via physical meetings or Zoom based on the availability and preferences of the participants. Each participant was interviewed twice. The initial interview with each participant was dedicated to rapport-building and the semi-structured interview questions listed in Appendix D. The second interview with each participant was set aside for clarification and follow-up. Following each interview, the researcher transcribed the interview and noted observations that were not captured on the audio recording of the interview (i.e. facial expressions, nonverbal cues, etc.). To analyze the data, the researcher followed an approach developed by Miles and Huberman (1984), which consists of three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and interpretation (also referred to as conclusion drawing).

Data Reduction

Data reduction is defined by Miles and Huberman (1984) as “the process of focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data in written-up field notes or transcriptions” (p.

10). Tesch (1990) writes of data reduction as a way of condensing the data. In this study, the researcher compressed strings of text into shorter and more manageable representations called codes. Mezmir (2020) described codes as "descriptive constructs designed by the researcher to capture the primary content or essence of the data" (p. 18). The majority of the codes used to reduce the data were emic codes, or in-vivo codes. Saldaña (2015) explained in-vivo coding as a foundational approach to coding, which incorporates the specific language used by the participants. Thus, in this study, many of the codes which were used to develop categories and themes were based on verbatim words used by participants. These codes were identified on physical transcripts, then moved to an Excel spreadsheet to be organized. The spreadsheet assisted the researcher in tracking the relationship among the codes, categories, and themes.

The second way that data was reduced in this study was through creating a map of the concepts and codes and physically annotating the relationships and frequency. To create the code map, the researcher used a long roll of paper and drew the codes. Dotted lines, arrows, and questions marks assisted the researcher in identifying the early emergent themes represented in the data. Different shapes were used to identify commonalities and discrepancies. The code map offered a visual representation with which the researcher could interact with the data.

An unforeseen challenge emerged when coding the data. The researcher had trouble capturing the complex "essence" described by participants while also avoiding code proliferation. She found that she was insentiently sub-coding the data, reducing it reflexively. This challenge forced the researcher to revisit the coding schema multiple times. Despite the many iterations of coding, the primary tenets of the emergent themes remained the same.

Data Display

The code map also provided the researcher with a meaningful way to display the data in this study. Miles and Huberman (1994) described data display as "an organized, compressed, assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action" (p. 11). After each interview or document analysis, the researcher pulled pertinent quotes and codes and added them to the code map. She identified new relationships, grouped similar concepts, and made note of instances where data disagreed with previously displayed data.

Additionally, participants' comments were displayed in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Quotes were color-coded and then copied and pasted into the tabbed page(s) for each participant. One spreadsheet contained the master list of codes, the tabbed pages of participants' comments, and the tabbed pages of coded content. The spreadsheet afforded the researcher the tools needed to count the uses of specific language used by different participants.

Interpretation

As the researcher converted data chunks to codes and codes to categories, themes began to emerge across the data. Overlapping data and incongruities became clearer. As Miles and Huberman (1984) recommended, the researcher engaged in interpretation across the life of the study. At all times throughout the study, the researcher used the research question as the guide for identifying which pieces of information were most useful.

Emergent Themes

This study produced approximately 80 codes based on key words, phrases, concepts, and ideas (Creswell, 2003). Codes were grouped into 11 categories, and those 11 categories were grouped into four themes. The four themes that emerged over the course of this research are these:

1. Violated expectations curb motivation.
2. Perceived meaningfulness influences engagement.
3. Feedback promotes reflection.
4. Learners will learn.

The following sections of this chapter describe in detail the quotes, codes, and categories that informed these themes. Figure 4 demonstrates these relationships.

Setting the Stage: They Stopped Smiling

When the data collection phase of this study began, the researcher was surprised by the enthusiastic response rate of the participants. Of the ten faculty members who were invited to interview, eight agreed to participate almost immediately. Two faculty members declined to participate in the study. One prospective participant elected not to participate due to the time commitment and concerns about being identified. The other prospective participant did not respond to any of the researcher's requests. Thus, the sample used for this study represents 80% of the population who was invited to participate.

Interviews were scheduled, and data collection began. As is common in semi-structured interviews, each conversation began with introductions and brief, rapport-building small talk. Preface questions like "How did you end up at South Central University?" and "Are you teaching any summer classes?" helped to create a warm and inviting atmosphere where the participants seemed comfortable and excited to share their experiences.

The early questions in each interview pertained to the roles and responsibilities of faculty members, what they are good at, and what they enjoy about teaching. In each of the initial interviews with participants, the researcher noted nonverbal behaviors like enthusiastic nodding,

CODE		CATEGORY	THEME
BEG	Beginning	Time Commitment	Violated expectations curb motivation.
END	End		
FIN	Finish		
KG	Keep Going		
NOMO	No Motivation		
TIM	Time		
ASGN	Assignments	Course Content	
DISA	Disappointed		
EXP	Expectations		
NMAT	New Material		
REP	Repetition		
TER	Terminology		
TEX	Teaching Excellence		
VID	Videos		
CHO	Chosen	Recognition	
EXC	Excited		
MOT	Motivation		
OPP	Opportunity to Help		
PTG	Prestige		
PRI	Pride		
REC	Recognition		
COLL	Collaborate	Collaboration	Perceived meaningfulness influences engagement.
CON	Conversation		
IDEA	Idea Sharing		
ISO	Isolated		
LKMN	Like-Minded		
ONL	Online		
TALK	Talk		
CHA	Change	Engagement	
CHG	Challenge		
CON	Connect		
ENG	Engagement		
INT	Interaction		
FNOT	For Nothing	Meaningfulness	
IMP	Impact		
REL	Relational		
RET	Retention		
SS	Student Success		
WoT	Waste of Time		
WRLD	Change the World		

Figure 4. This figure shows the codes, categories, and themes that emerged in this study.

CODE		CATEGORY	THEME
BHO	Black Hole	Experiences with Reflection	Feedback promotes reflection.
FEE	Feelings		
PTN	Pertinent		
QUE	Questions		
REFL	Reflection		
WHAT	What is it?		
BUND	Build Understanding	Purpose of Reflection	
CRTH	Critical Thinking		
EMO	Emotional		
HWRK	Hard Work		
PER	Personal		
SELF	Understanding Self		
BCH	Batch	Feedback	
CBOX	Checkbox		
DCRG	Discouraging		
FB	Feedback		
GOJO	"Good Job"		
INC	Inconsistent		
LTE	Late		
REG	Regurgitation		
APP	Apply	Application	Learners will learn.
ASS	Assessment		
CAR	Career		
DESP	Despite		
LEAR	Learned		
N2D	Not To Do		
NO	Wouldn't Do It Again		
NOEN	Enjoyment (No)		
NORE	Not Recommend		
QUIT	Quit		
REAL	Real World		
REM	Remember		
TECH	Technology		
UND	Understanding		
GOTE	Good Teacher	Lifelong Learners	
LAN	Language		
LLL	Lifelong Learner		
LOV	Love Teaching		
PAS	Passion		
STU	Student		

Figure 4 (continued). This figure shows the codes, categories, and themes that emerged in this study.

smiling, and exaggerated hand motions to convey excitement. Answers were long and detailed, rife with examples of meaningful engagements with students and ways they are improving their classes, departments, and communities. Multiple participants shared that they feel like what they are doing professionally is "making a difference in the world."

The first minutes of each interview were marked by smiles, laughter, and a friendly conversational cadence. However, as the interview questions turned from more general questions about their roles and responsibilities as faculty members and toward the ETP, each participant's countenance, tone of voice, and body language changed. If only for a moment, they stopped smiling. This shift in the conversations is important to note because it occurred in each of the initial interviews. It also shows the marked difference between how faculty members perceive the work they do in their professional roles (fulfilling and fun) and the professional development they received in the ETP.

It is important to note that these faculty members volunteered to participate in the ETP. Thus, many in this group described themselves using phrases like "lifelong learner," "a teacher's teacher," or "an overachiever." These participants have attended conferences, webinars, and other professional development efforts aimed at improving teaching effectiveness. The impetus behind their involvement with the ETP was not punitive but rather stemmed from a genuine interest in the topics presented and an eagerness to improve their teaching.

Theme 1: Violated Expectations Curb Motivation

The first theme that emerged over the course of this study pertains to the expectations of faculty members who participated in the ETP faculty development initiative and how those expectations were violated by the structure of the program. Several of the participants communicated their early excitement about the opportunity to be a part of the ETP. Olive

remarked, “I was just really excited to meet some new people and hear what they’re doing in their classes.” Others mentioned an eagerness to discuss problems they experience in the profession with others who may have solutions. “I am so bad at rubrics… I just don’t get them,” said Shae, “but, surely, someone on this campus is good at them and can help me… That’s the kind of stuff that I thought we would do [in the ETP].”

All of the participants spoke about their experience with the ETP as one where their expectations of the program’s activities and assignments were violated shortly after entering the program. There are three primary places where participants felt their expectations were violated: the time commitment, the nature of the content, and the recognition they would receive for completing the faculty development program.

The Time Commitment

Many of the participants made references to the amount of time that was asked of the participants in the ETP. Mac conveyed his disappointment in the time commitment required to complete the ETP by calling it “burdensome.” He felt the course designers did not consider the workloads of faculty members when designing the course:

> They told us that the time commitment would be minimal. I know because I specifically asked about that before I signed up. But, when I got into the class, I saw what they meant by “minimal” (air quotes used by participant). I probably spent 200 hours watching all the videos and doing the assignments. It was crazy.

Those sentiments were echoed by Shae:

> It’s incredibly poor practice to design a course with no respect for your students’ time. From the beginning, it was evident that the [ETP] was going to be so much more work than what I had anticipated when I applied.

Dede said this:

> I was so pumped that I got in [to the ETP]. I was all excited. I had my new notebook. It felt like I was going back to school. But after [the ETP] started, I lost all motivation to keep going. It took way too long. I learned nothing… I thought, you know what, I’m

> done with this. The demands of the class were too much, and I got stuff I need to do… So I quit.

Some of the participants communicated explicit links between their expectations of the time requirements and the content in the course. For example, Alex's unmet expectations of the course content affected the way she perceived the violation of her expectations surrounding time: "It turned out to be a lot more work, I think, than I anticipated, which would have been fine if the content was worth it." Shae remarked, "I think that you need to be realistic about the amount of time that people can put into this. Anything that looks even remotely like busy work should be dropped out." These participants seemed to communicate that a heavier time commitment than what they had originally expected may have been mediated by exceptional content. However, with the ETP, the course content also failed to meet their expectations.

Course Content

The second category that emerged from the data addressed the nature of the course content. Participants reiterated their unmet expectations with the content presented in the course and the ways in which it was delivered. Billie shared this:

> I was really concerned about new faculty who might see this as an example of what an online class should be developed as. That like, "Oh, okay. We'll go find a bunch of videos and assign them assignments about those videos." … It just wasn't excellence in teaching, you know?

Shae commented as follows:

> Maybe a week or two after the [ETP] started, I spent an afternoon just looking at stuff in the course. I remember thinking, this is it? These are the best practices in higher education? I was incredibly frustrated. And, after that, it was hard to make myself do the assignments and stuff.

Other participants echoed Shae's remarks about between course content and motivation. Dede said, "If you keep people too busy, they lose the desire to actually learn things." Jesse concurred that by the end of the course, her motivation to engage with material was completely gone:

> I thought, why am I spending so much time on [the ETP]? No one even looks at these submissions. It was like… I gave myself permission to quit. You have to understand… I'm an overachiever. I don't quit things. But, I just… I just didn't care anymore.

In the conversations that addressed how the course content violated their expectations, the demeanor of several participants revealed disappointment or apathy. Many of their answers were thoughtful, not rushed. Their body language included downcast eyes, and the tenor of their words communicated either disenchantment or complete disregard. Taylor emphasized her frustration with the course content in this way:

> Like, I really wanted to learn, you know? I was totally willing to do the work. But, when I saw what the work actually was, I was so disappointed. Like, this is it? YouTube videos from 2002 and journal articles on basic classroom management techniques? I was actually offended. I wanted to go deeper. I wanted to have real conversations about struggles in the classroom and high-impact practices. The [ETP] was ridiculous.

Recognition

The third area where participants expressed unmet expectations was the lack of recognition given to participants. For example, Alex said:

> So from a vanity point of view… we worked hard for this. Those of us who actually did it. And we were told that we were going to get a certificate and we can like be part of this fellowship and all this kind of stuff. And it was… we didn't get any kind of recognition at all for finishing. I'm embarrassed to even put a fellow on my signature line because what does that even mean? It has no meaning.

Mac agreed:

> I'm nearing the end of my career, so I imagined [the ETP] might… I don't know, give me a chance to share what I've learned and to hear what more junior faculty members are doing. I'm not looking for a platform or anything, I just wish a part of [the ETP] would've been a chance to say, "[Participant's Name], you've had a great career in education. Tell us what has made you successful." It's just… at least acknowledge us.

Dede added this:

> And that's not fair, because that's not how it was sold. It was sold that were going to become a resource and an asset to our campus. If you go back and look at the marketing that came out with this, it wasn't, "Endure this horrible thing, and then we're all going to

> be so embarrassed of how horrible this program was that we're not even going to say that you completed it."

Just as participants communicated that excellent course content may have justified a larger time commitment than was expected, they also conveyed that appropriate recognition at the end of the program may have negated an overall poor impression of the program.

This theme is validated in the document analysis as well. Over time, participants' reflection entries decreased in word count, thoroughness, and completion. Early ETP reflection activities (i.e., the first five) averaged approximately 294 words each. However, the last reflections (i.e., the last five) were completed by only three of the eight participants included in this study. Their entries in the final reflection activity averaged approximately 32 words. When participants were asked about this stunning change over time, several echoed the theme: violated expectations curb motivation.

Theme 2: Perceived Meaningfulness Promotes Engagement

The second theme that emerged over the course of this study stemmed from the concept of perceived meaningfulness. Several participants referenced the importance of seeing professional and personal value in the tasks and assignments given through the ETP. In fact, this language came directly from Alex who shared that "the ETP ended up being so much worse than what I was, what I expected… I just… It was stupid. I lost any motivation I had to engage with the material." The three categories that informed this theme are collaboration, engagement, and meaningfulness.

Collaboration

Many of the participants expressed a desire for more collaboration in the ETP. For example, Dede said of the meaningfulness of the ETP, "I think it could have been [meaningful]. I think partly in order for it to be is that it needs to be more of a conversation. I felt very isolated in

my reflecting." Alex remarked, "I think I would find it more meaningful if I had some face-to-face things. I like being there and talking and interacting with other professors and seeing their teaching style and learning what I can take from them." Olive remembers "We did a few like get-together things, where we all came and talked about some different topics. Honestly, I got way more out of those meetings than all the other YouTube videos and TED Talks we had to watch."

Taylor commented this:

> You don't know what you don't know, right? So, we have all of these brilliant minds on our campus. If we have a place to talk about what we're doing, what's working, what's not… I don't know. I think that's where actual, genuine reflection comes into play… thinking "how can I extrapolate what so-and-so is doing and use that in my context? How can I use these ideas to help my students learn better?"

Several of the participants in this study clearly linked the idea of reflection with collaboration, idea-sharing, and discussion. Many referenced face-to-face collaborations, while a couple expressed a desire for interaction via online discussion boards (Dede and Olive).

Jesse said this:

> I mean, come on, I have a Ph.D. in [discipline], so I understand the importance of talking to other people to like to grow and learn. It would have been so easy to bring us all into a room and just… facilitate a conversation. Like, how cool would it be to get to do that?

Several of the participants connected the idea of collaboration with meaningfulness in the learning process. As time progressed and opportunities for collaboration did not come, ETP participants lost the desire to engage fully with the course content and reflection assignments.

Engagement

Other participants shared comments about the type of engagement that they had hoped would arise from participation in the ETP. Alex commented that the invitation to participate in the ETP came at a "perfect time." "I had started to feel a little stale in my career. I love to teach,

I really do. But I was struggling. I needed something to kinda jumpstart my enthusiasm around [discipline] and teaching." Later, Alex commented that "the [ETP] was not what I needed. I needed to be connected… and, like, feel involved… or, like, drawn in" and "I wonder if anyone even knows I'm here."

Jesse added the following:

> I love nerding out about teaching. I think it's fun to sit with other faculty and talk about what we're doing. For me, those conversations are so life-giving. I leave feeling refreshed and ready to get back out there. But, [the ETP] was not that… if anything, it was a soul-suck.

Mac shared a similar sentiment:

> I don't know what I was expecting, honestly. I suppose that I have this romanticized view of teaching and learning. I envisioned stepping into the [ETP] and being engaged and challenged… and perhaps respected. A place where I could impart my hard-earned wisdom with younger or less-experiences academicians… and also where I could receive training to improve my classes.

Billie echoed Mac's words in a simpler way. "It was so boring," he laughed. "I know we've all got a lot to learn… But I can guarantee you none of my students would have sat through that."

Taylor disliked the rigidity of the ETP's design, which was evident in the following statement:

> I think I would have maybe dialed in a little better if there were some places where we could tailor the content to our unique disciplines… or even asked questions about specific situations we've been in. It's hard to get excited about something that's just so blah… it's like one-size-fits-all, but in reality, it fits no one.

This category demonstrates how the faculty who participated in the ETP did not feel engaged in the program. They expressed a desire for more connection, interaction, and challenge. When the faculty members perceived that the ETP would not engage them in those ways, they deemed the initiative to be meaningless.

Meaningfulness

Several of the participants who were interviewed touched on the idea of meaningfulness. They communicated that they found the ETP to be meaningless and how that perception discouraged more active participation. Alex noted, “I could say anything and it didn't really matter. I was doing the work, but by the time I got the reflection, I was tired, and it didn't really mean anything to me.” Olive and Jesse both used the phrase “waste of time” when referring to the ETP. Mac shared something similar: “The whole program was just trivial and irrelevant…”

When asked what might have made the ETP feel more meaningful, faculty members shared diverse perspectives on the areas where they perceived to need development. Shae addressed some non-academic metrics:

> My department is not growing. We have to be realistic about the fact that students are not enrolling in [discipline]. I could have so appreciated talking with others about how they are retaining their students.

Dede said this:

> I haven’t been teaching that long, you know? So, I’m out here trying to figure out how all of this stuff works. I know my stuff… but, how do I build a class in Canvas? How should I deal with plagiarism? That’s stuff we didn’t talk about in grad school.

Participants repeatedly communicated their hope and expectation to be drawn into a developmental initiative that they enjoyed and that they found to be meaningful. Some communicated this “meaningfulness” to be practical, applicable content and strategies (i.e., Shae and Dede). Others communicated a desire to collaborate with colleagues and to explore more philosophical ideas pertaining to the roles and responsibilities of faculty members (Mac). Yet, their answers consistently pointed to the fact that the ETP did not engage them in meaningful ways. Therefore, the participants stopped engaging in reflection component of the ETP initiative over time.

Theme 3: Feedback Promotes Reflection

The third theme that emerged from this study was the idea that feedback promotes reflection. Seven of the eight participants explicitly connected the lack of feedback received in the ETP to their waning motivation to reflect. For several of the participants, the ETP was their first experience engaging in reflection for the purpose of professional development. The categories that informed these themes include experiences with reflection, participants' perceptions of the purpose of reflection, and the role of feedback.

Experiences with Reflection

For many of the participants in this study, the ETP represented their first formal engagement with the concept of reflection. Most understood the idea of reflection and its function within the context of the ETP. However, when asked about their definition of reflection in this context, the participants presented a myriad of answers. Mac joked "reflection is a bit of a junk-drawer-word, isn't it?" He went on to define reflection in the following way:

> I would say reflection needs to be an introspective process. One that you can start and put away, then pull out again as you learn and grow and change. It feels like knowledge, experience, and emotions should each play a part in how we reflect… what did you do? What emotions were triggered by that act and so on and so forth… I do not think that I can rightly describe the steps one must take to reflect.

Olive commented that she has a colleague who is constantly incorporating reflection assignments into her classes. "I don't know how she does it. She poses questions for students that really are not hard… you know in the scientific way." She added that her colleague "is able to draw out responses that are thoughtful, and she can actually assess their understanding of certain topics. I don't know how to do that."

Alex stated, "Yeah, I feel like reflection is some big buzzword in education right now. But, it's kinda a black hole. Like, what are the boundaries around the concept of reflection?"

Later, she asked, “Can you reflect wrong? That doesn’t feel right. But does that mean any thinking is reflection? That seems wrong, too.” Billie shared a parallel comment: “I don’t know. I don’t know what quote-unquote reflection is… (laughter) but I feel pretty confident saying that what we had to write [in the ETP] was not what reflection is supposed to look like.” Taylor lowered her voice as she said the following:

> Okay, this is kind of embarrassing on this side of [the ETP], but I had no idea what they meant when they used words like reflect or reflection. I still don’t. But the assignments or the reflections I should say weren’t like that… it was more like… I don’t know. It was just like “tell me what the video said.”

When cross-referenced with the participants’ reflection submissions in the ETP, the researcher found that the answers to the reflection assignments were primarily content regurgitation. A few personal stories, comments, questions, or examples of application were offered by any participant within the ETP; all were written within the first five reflection assignments. Instead, the questions labeled “personal reflections” were framed more to gauge whether each participant watched the assigned video and remembered specific bits of content.

Purpose of Reflection

Since the ETP was many participants’ first time being asked to reflect, several acknowledged their confusion about the definition of reflection and the purpose. Many were asked, “Why do you think the developers of the ETP incorporated reflections?” in follow-up interviews or clarification questions.

Dede said this:

> There’s value in that, right? Like understanding yourself? [Laughs] I know that sounds like cliché or whatever. But, the act of teaching and the act of learning too really is about something deeper than just gaining knowledge, you know. It’s about understanding. That’s deep, right?

Shae referred to the personal nature of reflection. “I’ve read a little bit about reflection in educational contexts before. I think to do it right, whatever that means, it takes some hard work and real self-searching.” Later in the interview, she asked to revisit the question about why the language of reflection was used in the ETP. She said, “I think reflection can be sorta personal. Like you’re really getting in there. Talking about motivations and biases and fears. I don’t know.”

When asked which aspects of the ETP stood out as beneficial, several participants acknowledged that they “liked the idea” of reflection. Billie and Shae both shared a willingness to incorporate reflection into their classes. Olive said that she had tried to do something similar without using the word “reflection.” However, each of these participants strongly asserted that any inclusion of reflection into their courses would look very different from what they had experienced in the ETP.

Feedback

The third factor that influenced participants’ motivation to engage in reflection was feedback. Several mentioned that their engagement with the course and specifically the reflection activities wavered after little or no feedback was received. Alex recalled:

> But by the time you got to the reflections, there was just so much else that you'd already done. And I think in the beginning I spent a lot of time and energy responding and not having any kind of feedback at all as we went, just really played into the fact that I didn't really care at that point.

Shae joked, “I thought about submitting something crazy like ‘Hello, is anyone out there?’ just to see if someone would respond.” She continued, “Do you know how frustrating it is to spend hours working on an assignment that no one reads? After about a month, I was totally disenchanted with the whole thing.”

Dede expressed a desire for more collaborative feedback:

> If it was collaborative… where the participants gave feedback to each other, that would have been incredible. Like, if they said, "Bring your lessons and let's peer discuss this. Let's share what it is that we each came up with." That would have been awesome.

Mac shared frustration about the lack of feedback:

> They actually graded our reflections, which I find laughable. We were given numerical grades for our work. But whether you got eight out of ten or ten out of ten, there was no feedback offered as a justification for the grade. Can you imagine what our students would do if we just arbitrarily assigned grades with no comments or critiques? There would be blood in the streets, my friend.

Others commented on the delays in receiving feedback. Taylor noted, "Every month or two, someone would go in and write something stupid… like 'good job' or something." Billie said, "It was like someone had a checklist and had to go in and just make sure everyone got a little comment and grade." Alex joking shared, "I don't think I'll ever write 'good job' on an assignment again. It's like more of a slap in the face than anything. The point of feedback is to get better. Writing 'good job' just doesn't cut it."

The connection between perceived meaningfulness and motivation was prevalent across the interviews with participants. It was also manifest in the actual reflections that ETP participants completed while in the ETP. As alluded to in their comments, their initial reflection submissions were lengthy and detailed. Participants shared some personal information about fears of inadequacy, future professional aspirations, and challenges they were facing in their roles and responsibilities. However, by the end of the ETP, responses were brief and vague. Answers sounded less like reflection and more like regurgitated course content.

Theme 4: Learners will Learn

The fourth and final theme that emerged from this study is the idea that individuals with an affinity for the learning process will seek to uncover new meanings and understandings even in poorly constructed learning environments. Despite largely negative experiences with the ETP,

participants explained how their experiences in the ETP helped shape their approach to teaching and course design. This theme was comprised of two categories: application and lifelong learners. Discuss sub themes here!!!

Application

The application category stemmed from participants' comments addressing specific, future behaviors that they will change based on their experience in the ETP. Those answers were given in response to questions about what each participant will take from the ETP and seek to incorporate into their roles as faculty members. Several shared answers regarding feedback first. They left the ETP with a renewed dedication to give their students strong and prompt feedback. For example, Dede commented, "I now hold myself to a higher standard on feedback than I did before. So yes, [the ETP] accidentally taught me something." Alex shared something similar, "I don't think I'll ever write 'good job' on an assignment again. It's like more of a slap in the face than anything. The point of feedback is to get better. Writing 'good job' just doesn't cut it."

Taylor connected feedback and content, noting:

> I get it. I know what it's like to have a bunch of students and the time that it takes to sit and grade for hours on end. But you know who assigned that work? I did. I was the one. Theoretically, there is a reason why I've assigned it to them. So, I need to be willing to do the work. If I'm not, then I need to remove some of [the assignments].

Mac shared:

> It has been a very long time since I've entered an educational space as a student. I forgot what it feels like to have time constraints set on my work, what it feels like to be measured against my peers. The lack of student-centeredness in [the ETP] has forced me to reconsider how I build my classes. When I look through their eyes, what do I see?

Other participants identified other areas of the ETP that have influenced their teaching. Olive shared, "One of my biggest takeaways [from the ETP] is how important community is for online students. That whole experience was kinda… I don't know… lonely? I've gotta make sure

that my classes aren't like that." Jesse said this, "I am more determined than ever to make sure that my students think my classes matter. No busy work just to say they did something." These participants vocalized clearly that they do not want to copy in their classes the behaviors of the facilitators of the ETP.

Each of the participants was asked if he/she would elect to participate in the ETP again knowing what he/she know now, and almost all the participants emphatically said that they would not participate again. However, when asked if they learned from the experience, all answered in the affirmative.

Of the reflection components, Billie commented:

> And it was actually… some of these reflective pieces of I don't do certain things that I could. And mostly it was little steps that were just like, "Huh, I need to make critical thinking a priority" Which I've always been very big that I ask questions that require critical thinking but now I'm like asking about application… maybe that's why students hate my exams… Yeah, [the ETP] kinda showed me what not to do.

Olive described something similar: "This sounds terrible, but [participating in the ETP] was actually very beneficial… just not in the way it was intended. It was like a really good picture of what not to do." Mac echoed Olive's words almost verbatim: "The ETP is like the perfect model of what not to do." Even as the participants detailed the negative aspects of their experiences in the ETP, most were clear that they drew something from the ETP that enhanced their perceptions of their teaching effectiveness.

Lifelong Learners

The group of people who were recruited to participate in the ETP represent diverse fields of study but share a common passion for teaching and learning. Olive shared, "I've always been a nerd, and I'm good with that. Learning is so fun for me." Later, she expounded on this idea by saying:

> I guess I'm just not surprised that I can stand on this side [of the ETP] and say I learned a lot. Maybe it sounds selfish, but I think that has very little to do with them. I think that's more about me.

This sentiment is also visible in the various reflections that participants submitted as part of the ETP. For example, in one of their last reflection submissions responding to a recording of a TED Talk, Taylor wrote, "I went into [the video] with a bad attitude but as I listened, I actually learned about a teaching technique I wasn't familiar with." When I sought clarification from Taylor about why she went into the video with a bad attitude, Taylor noted:

> I dreaded every stupid assignment in that damn class. I don't know… I kinda forgot I wrote that. [Laughter] I guess I had a bad attitude because I felt like an idiot for doing the work… ya' know the assignments and stuff… when no one was even reading what I wrote. It wasn't for a grade. I wasn't getting paid. It sounds cliché but I actually really enjoy learning new stuff.

When asked her thoughts of her experience in the ETP, Jesse paused before saying:

> We're teachers. We are the overachievers. We like school. [Laughter] So, despite [the ETP] asking stupid questions and making us watch five thousand YouTube videos… I don't know. I still feel like I gained a greater understanding of the field of teaching. Maybe the best thing to come out of the ETP… for me, anyways… is a better understanding of myself as a learner. I am constantly watching for new patterns and relationships. Even in a setting that is not designed well, with topics that don't matter, and teachers who don't teach… I learned.

In these answers, the body language of some participants changed. With raised eyebrows and tilted heads, they seemed almost surprised by the realization that they left the ETP with a greater understanding of teaching and learning. Others reluctantly conceded that they learned through their experience in the ETP. Several of the participants contended that they perceived the reflection component of the ETP initiative to be advantageous in unexpected ways. They communicated that they will be more effective teachers because of their poor design and execution of the ETP.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty members' perceptions of the reflection component that was embedded into a faculty development initiative in which they participated as it pertains to teaching effectiveness. To borrow a phrase from Schön (1983), the purpose of this study was to allow practice, specifically the practice of reflection, to "talk back." This is the research question that guided this analysis:

> How do faculty members who participated in a faculty development program perceive the effectiveness of the reflective component on their teaching effectiveness?

Thus, it was important to gauge participants' perceptions of the faculty development program and more specifically of the reflection component. Additionally, it was essential to explore the connections, if any, between the reflection component and teaching effectiveness as perceived by the participants.

The results of this study yielded four distinct themes: violated expectations curb motivation, perceived meaningfulness influences engagement, feedback promotes reflection, and learners will learn. The first theme that emerged in this study demonstrates how the expectations of the participants in the ETP were not fulfilled with the course design and content of the ETP. The time that they were asked to devote to the ETP exceeded what they were verbally promised prior to starting the program. Additionally, participants in this study found both the content of the course and the recognition they received after completing the course to be lacking. These violated expectations hindered their motivation to engage with the material and the ETP.

A second theme that emerged in this study revolved around the relationship between perceived meaningfulness and engagement. Participants communicated a reluctance to engage in authentic and consequential ways because of the poor course design. Additionally, participants

were given very little feedback and opportunity for collaboration. Thus, over time, participants stopped engaging with the material.

The third theme addressed the idea that feedback promotes reflection. Several of the participants in this study communicated a confusion about the act of reflection in educational settings. Guidance from instructors and probes calling students to dig deeper would have benefitted students in taking surface-level conversations into a more personalized and reflective space.

The final theme that emerged over the course of this study was the idea that learners can experience new meanings and understanding even in a learning environment that is not ideal. The faculty members in this study were highly critical of the design of the ETP and the "reflection" questions that were posed. However, they were also self-proclaimed "life-long learners" who desired to improve their teaching. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the faculty participants were nearly unanimous in asserting that the ETP helped them to better understand the roles of teacher and student. In the next chapter, I will discuss the results of this study in conjunction with pertinent literature and will offer suggestions for future research in the area of faculty development.

CHAPTER 5

The purpose of this pragmatic qualitative study was to explore faculty members' perceptions of the reflection component embedded into their faculty development initiative and how that reflection component influenced their teaching effectiveness. The following research question guided this study:

> How do faculty members who participated in a faculty development program perceive the effectiveness of the reflective component on developing their teaching effectiveness?

This chapter opens with an overview of the answer to the research question, followed by a review and summary of the findings in the context of relevant literature. Afterwards, the findings are discussed through the lens of the theoretical framework. The final sections of this chapter explore the implications for higher education administrators and faculty developers, and also provides recommendations for future practice and research.

Answering the Research Question

Analysis of the data collected across this study showed that the faculty members who participated in the inaugural class of the ETP perceived the reflective component to be meaningless, unengaging, and ineffective. However, the data also revealed that the participants perceived their experiences with the reflection component of the ETP to be effective in producing changes in their professional actions. Most communicated this idea with some variation of this phrase: "The ETP showed me what not to do."

The four themes that emerged over the course of this study offered important insight into the answer to this question. Participants from the inaugural class of the ETP communicated unanimously negative perceptions of the reflection component that was embedded into the ETP.

They attributed their negative perceptions of the reflection component to violated expectations surrounding the time commitment, the content presented, and the recognition received during and after the program. Additionally, they conveyed that very few, if any, of the reflection components offered meaningful questions or prompts to elicit authentic reflection. Despite these negative perceptions, ETP participants did feel as though they emerged from the ETP as stronger teachers. Therefore, the answer to this study's research question can be summarized as follows: The faculty members who participated in the inaugural class of the ETP perceived the reflection component to be fruitless in developing their teaching effectiveness, yet it did offer important examples of poor teaching practice and ultimately led to the participants' altering subsequent professional activity.

Review of Findings

To explore faculty members perceptions of the reflection component of their faculty development initiative and its potential impact on their teaching effectiveness, the researcher performed sixteen semi-structured interviews and analyzed 436 documents. While the interviews yielded rich details about the participants' lived experiences, the documents that were analyzed were far less informative. Outside of affirming the assertions made by participants, the researcher gained few novel insights into the perceptions of the faculty members who participated in the ETP.

Using Miles and Huberman's (1984) model of data analysis, the researcher repeated multiple iterations of coding, categorizing, and drawing out emergent themes. As the analysis phases continued, four prominent themes consistently emerged across the data:

1. Violated expectations curb motivation.
2. Perceived meaningfulness influences engagement.

3. Feedback promotes reflection.

4. Learners will learn.

When examined in the context of relevant literature, these themes provide a clearer understanding of the impact of reflection within faculty development on teaching effectiveness as perceived by faculty participants. These themes help to answer the research question that guided this study. Thus, the next section of this chapter considers each of the emergent themes identified in this study alongside the literature in these areas.

Theme 1: Violated Expectations Curb Motivation

The first theme that emerged from this study is the idea that violated expectations curb motivation. The relationship between expectations and motivation is one that scholars have acknowledged for several decades. Weitz (1956) was the first to address job expectancy and its impact on professional performance and satisfaction. He linked unmet expectations to specific adverse impacts in the workplace by proposing that "job expectancy" is a critical factor in understanding one's motivation. Later, Vroom (1964) expanded the concept of job expectancy with his Expectancy Theory. Porter and Steers (1973) demonstrated a clear relationship between unmet expectations in the workplace and an employee's propensity to leave the organization. Taris et al. (2006) linked several adverse outcomes to unmet expectations including motivation, learning, effort, and turnover. Thus, the idea that violated or unmet expectations curb motivation in professional contexts is not new.

Within the context of faculty development, many have examined what motivates faculty members to participate in faculty development. There is wide agreement that the prevalent reason for self-selecting to participate in faculty development is to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., Berman & Skeff, 1988; Lowenthal et al., 2013; Padgett & Conceição-Runlee,

2000; Phuong et al., 2018; Sloan, 1989; Stupnisky et al., 2017). This literature aligns with the findings of this study, which overwhelmingly demonstrated that faculty members self-selected to participate in the ETP to develop their teaching effectiveness. Shae expressed an enthusiasm to learn more about using rubrics effectively, while Dede disclosed discomfort around concepts like building an effective online course within the institution's LMS and handling plagiarism in his classes. The individuals entered the ETP with specific areas that they recognize to be weaknesses and areas in which they aspire to grow. However, the ETP violated their expectations of what they had hoped to gain from participating in this faculty development initiative.

Some faculty development scholars have explored the relationship between unmet expectations and motivation to participate in or to complete faculty development programs (e.g., Barksdale et al., 2011; Rud & Trevisan, 2014). In this study, faculty members communicated enthusiasm at the opportunity to participate in the ETP. Dede shared, "I was so pumped that I got in [to the ETP]. I was all excited. I had my new notebook. It felt like I was going back to school." Later, Dede's level of enthusiasm shifted when he recounted, "The demands of the class were too much, and I got stuff I need to do… So I quit." Dede discussed how his motivation to enter the program was high, but that his motivation waned over time when the program violated his expectations of what the program would entail.

While scholars have explored the relationship between expectation and motivation in faculty development, very few have named the explicit mitigating effects of unmet expectations on motivation to engage in reflection activities in meaningful ways (e.g., Calkins et al., 2021). This study offers important insight into specific ways that unmet expectations influenced faculty members' perceptions of reflection within the context of a faculty development program. This

study demonstrated three explicit expectations that were unmet by the ETP and ultimately hampered faculty members' motivation to reflect.

Violated Expectations of Time Commitment

Over the course of this study, one of the chief ways that participants felt their expectations were unmet was the substantial time commitment required to participate in the reflections embedded into the ETP. They communicated that their understanding of time that would need to be allocated to the ETP was "minimal" as remembered by Mac. However, participants communicated that the reflection assignments required substantially more time than what was originally communicated. They asserted that those violated expectations hampered their motivation to engage meaningfully with the reflection component. These sentiments align with other scholarship from the field of faculty development, which articulates the influence of expectations on the motivation of faculty development participants (Burks et al., 2009; Rud & Trevisan, 2014).

Burks et al. (2009) found that when faculty members are given too many assignments or when expectations of the faculty developers are not clearly communicated to faculty participants, the motivation to persist, and ultimately to complete the program, waned. Similarly, Lowenthal et al. (2013) discovered that the primary factor motivating faculty members to elect to participate in faculty development is to improve teaching. When participants do not perceive that their teaching is being influenced, the engagement in the program deteriorates. In this study, Dede shared that the time commitment required for the ETP was more than he could give. Ultimately, this violated expectation regarding the time commitment led Dede to quit.

Stupinsky et al. (2017, 2019) examined the explicit relationship between clear expectations and motivation within the context of faculty development. They found that clear

expectations, coupled with balance and collegiality, positively impact intrinsic motivation. They contended that in contexts where clear expectations, balance, and collegiality are present, research and teaching "success" followed.

These studies align with the findings of this study in two important ways. First, the individuals who comprised the inaugural class of the ETP self-selected to participate for a number of reasons, foremost to improve their teaching effectiveness. The second way that this study aligns with research in this area is that their motivation waned when their expectations went unmet as the ETP continued. Thus, this study affirms the research of others (Burks et al., 2009; Lowenthal et al., 2013; Phuong et al., 2018; Stupnisky et al., 2017; Stupnisky, 2019) that violated expectations curb motivation to participate in meaningful ways with faculty development initiatives. More research is needed to confirm the relationships between unmet expectations and the motivation to reflect within the context of faculty development.

Violated Expectations of Content

The second way that participants felt their expectations of the reflection component of the ETP were unmet was with the content of the assignments in which participants were asked to reflect. When examined as a whole, the participants perceptions of the ETP were primarily negative. Most participants communicated an eagerness and an excitement to participate in the ETP prior to the start of the program. However, that excitement soon gave way to frustration. Participants summarized their experience with the reflection questions using words and phrases like "waste of time" and "pointless." Others described the experience as "lackluster" and "the opposite of effective teaching."

Of the various expectations that were unmet in the delivery and design of the ETP, the faculty participants' perceptions of the poor content of the course drew the most passionate

comments. While a large body of scholarship exists to clarify which faculty development designs and approaches are most effective and which are most ineffective, some faculty developers continue to offer programming that is of poor quality (Muret-Wagstaff & Simon, 2012; Stockley & Forbes, 2014). Puri et al. (2012) interviewed several new faculty members at teaching institutions. They demonstrated that the vast majority expressed disappointment in the caliber of faculty development initiatives offered at their respective institutions. Thornlow and McGuinn (2010) shared a similar sentiment among nursing faculty, who declared that the practices in faculty development for nursing faculty members were woefully inadequate.

Over the last decade, faculty development literature has had numerous scholars calling for higher quality developmental programming and content that is more interesting, practical, creative, and inspiring. Therefore, the fact that the participants in this study were disappointed in the quality of the content presented in the reflection assignments and in the ETP as a whole is very much in line with other studies of similar programs, institutions, and faculty members.

The comments from the ETP participants draw attention to an interesting relationship between the perception of the quality of developmental content and participants' motivation to reflect and ultimately to persist to program completion. Dede and Shae both offered several comments about the content of the ETP and their motivation to engage in the act of reflection. This is one place where the existing faculty development literature has not made explicit connections to date. More research is needed to determine if there is a consistent correlation between the participants' perceptions of the course content and their motivation to participate in reflection activities for the purpose of professional development.

Violated Expectations of Recognition

The third and final way that participants felt their expectations of the reflection component of the ETP were unmet was with the recognition or lack thereof that was offered to them during and after the program. The role of recognition within the context of faculty development was highlighted in some of the earliest faculty development literature by scholars like Chait and Gueths (1981), Francis (1985), Tymitz-Wolf (1984), and Friedman and Stomper (1983). Recognition remains a critical element in enticing faculty members to participate in faculty development and in motivating them to complete the developmental program in which they participate (Campbell, 2020; Payumo et al., 2019).

The participants in this study repeatedly indicated that the recognition component was not their primary motivation for participating in the ETP. Rather, they indicated that it was one *additional* way that the ETP designers incentivized participation. Participants entered the ETP with the understanding that they would be given certain tokens of recognition—a customized name plate for their office door indicating that they were one of few to be invited to participate in the ETP or an email signature badge indicating the same. Over the course of the program, those tokens became unkept promises from the ETP facilitators.. These tokens were never awarded to the ETP participants. As participants continued to complete the reflection assignments, which Shae referred to as “hard work,” they grew even more disenchanted with the ETP. One participant referred to the lack of recognition as “one last stab in the back.” Several participants indicated that this “last straw” was the reason they did not complete the ETP or did not complete it on time.

This study provided ample evidence to defend the assertion that violated expectations (i.e. time commitment, program content, and recognition received) lead to negative outcomes.

However, there are scholars who contend that unmet expectations can lead to learning, development, and growth (Olmstead et al., 2020; Scott, 2013). Scott (2013) asserted that "critical unmet expectations can usefully stimulate dialogue and collaboration" (p. 573). Olmstead et al. (2020) insisted that some positive results stem from unmet expectations for teachers in developmental contexts.

It should be noted that the design of the ETP did not offer much traditional space for dialogue or collaboration, much to the dismay of some participants. Therefore, additional research could be used to indicate if the negative effects of unmet expectations can be mitigated by opportunities to work through those expectations with colleagues and peers.

Theme 2: Perceived Meaningfulness Promotes Engagement

The second theme that emerged over the course of this study is the idea that perceived meaningfulness promotes engagement within the context of faculty development. This theme is one that has been echoed in recent scholarship (Bryson et al., 2020; Copridge et al., 2021; Hendrix, 2021). Bryson et al. (2020) contended that strategic faculty development requires participants to identify broader, more meaningful goals before stepping into the practical implications of faculty development. "During the course of our conversations, we begin to collectively acknowledge the diminishing value of a course goal focused on content coverage and the recall of facts, and instead, turn our attention to articulating more significant and meaningful values" (p. 4). This was echoed strongly across the data that was collected in this study.

Participants used words and phrases to describe the meaninglessness of the ETP including "blah" and "disappointed." Ultimately, this theme stemmed from a comment made by Alex, who said, "The ETP ended up being so much worse than what I was, what I expected… I

just… It was stupid. I lost any motivation I had to engage with the material." Over the course of this study, participants communicated this theme through three missing components: lack of collaboration, lack of engagement, and lack of meaningfulness.

Lack of Collaboration

Many faculty development scholars have highlighted the importance of collaboration in faculty development initiatives (Bartell & Boswell, 2019; Sorcinelli, 1994; Steinert et al., 2016). Korstage et al. (2019) demonstrated the significance of robust conversations in developing faculty members. Morrison and Gleddie (2019) showed how collaboration addressing inclusivity in faculty development led to more meaningful outcomes for faculty participants and students. This concept is most clearly seen in the work Bartell and Boswell (2019), who insisted that the key to faculty development is developing the whole person, which occurs only through "collaborative engagement."

Taylor echoed those words with this comment, "So, we have all of these brilliant minds on our campus. If we have a place to talk about what we're doing, what's working, what's not… I don't know." These statements align unmistakably with the literature in this area. Whether through conversations (Boyd & Glazier, 2017; Korstange et al., 2019) or online interactions (Moore, 2018; Yoon et al., 2019), collaboration has been elevated throughout the literature in this area as integral to effective faculty development endeavors. Goh (2019) calls faculty members to engage in collective reflective practice.

Some scholars have shown how collaboration in faculty development creates a greater sense of engagement and meaning for the participants. Slavit and McDuffie (2013) demonstrated how conversations "increased teachers' engagement and led to improved awareness of ways to

improve their practices" in the context of faculty development" (p. 104). Similarly, Quinlan and Åkerlind (2000) offered peer collaboration as a highly effective vehicle for "focusing on the meaningful application of knowledge to real world problems" (p. 31). Taguchi et al. (2012) connected meaningfulness with inter-departmental collaboration in faculty development. While the ETP consisted of faculty members of various career-stages and disciplines, the collaboration component was missing. Thus, this lack of collaboration with colleagues influenced the meaningfulness that the participants ascribed to the ETP.

Lack of Engagement

The second place where participants' perceived the reflection component of the ETP to be meaningless was the lack of engagement. Participants expressed a desire to engage and be engaged with a wide range of unique words and phrases. Alex communicated her hope that the reflection component of the ETP might "jump-start" her enthusiasm for teaching. Mac shared a desire to impart lessons he has learned over the course of his career with less experienced faculty members. Others used words like "drawn in," "involved," and "connected." Participants told the researcher that they expected the reflection component to be challenging and engaging. Instead, they perceived it to be shallow and boring.

These perceptions contrasted starkly with the existing research that addresses reflection in faculty development. Messmann and Mulder (2015) demonstrated how teachers who engaged in reflection on their professional tasks and performance were significantly more likely to seek out innovative teaching techniques and to experience better student outcomes. They called for a wider adoption of reflection and application in faculty development endeavors. Sorinola et al. (2017) showed how reflection within faculty development leads to greater engagement,

motivation, and professionalism. They linked these outcomes to secondary results including improved confidence, competence, and career progression.

Some faculty development scholars have asserted that without reflective components, faculty developers cannot truly engage faculty members meaningfully (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Lorenzetti, 2009; Saric & Steh, 2017; Taczak & Karas, 2019). Despite the presence of "reflection" within the ETP, this study reveals how the faculty members perception of the reflection component serves to mitigate its effectiveness in eliciting meaningful engagement.

Lack of Meaningfulness

Faculty development scholarship has illustrated how participants are more engaged with activities that are personally meaningful to them (Slavit & McDuffie, 2013). Porter and Freedman (2020) connected engagement and meaningfulness in faculty development when they wrote that participants "had greater motivation, purpose, investment, and engagement in their learning, and their learning activities were more meaningful, when their certification projects were designed to meet immediate personal learning needs" (p. 43).

Faculty development scholars have emphasized that the strategic incorporation of reflection into faculty development programming is widely accepted as a best practice by modern-day scholars in this area (Bartell & Boswell, 2019; Calkins & Harris, 2017; Strawser & Smith, 2020). Taczak and Karas (2019) asserted that strategic reflection enhances the meaningfulness of the learning which occurs within the context of faculty development. However, the participants in this study did not experience the "meaningfulness of the learning" that Taczak and Karas (2019) described. Instead, Mac referred to the reflection component as "irrelevant," while Jesse and Olive both used the phrase "waste of time." The word "stupid" was used nine times by five different participants during the semi-structured interviews.

Theme 3: Feedback Promotes Reflection

The third theme that emerged over the course of this study is the notion that feedback promotes reflection within the context of faculty development. The relationship between feedback and reflection is one that has been examined by faculty developers (Garcia et al., 2017; Gonzalo et al., 2014; Jones & Gallen, 2016), who underscored the role of feedback as an essential component for faculty development. Steinert et al. (2016) listed "the provision of feedback" as a key feature of faculty development (p. 770). In their analysis, they linked feedback and reflection, "which allowed participants to reflect on their teaching and learning practices, values, and beliefs" (p. 777).

In the ETP, feedback was one facet of the reflection component with which every participant expressed frustration. Participants communicated irritation with the caliber and promptness of feedback in the ETP as well as how the lack of feedback deterred their willingness to reflect. Some of their comments stemmed from questions regarding the understanding of and experiences with reflection in a professional context. Others were in response to questions about their understanding of the purpose of reflection in faculty development. Their answers offered important insights into their perceptions of the reflection component of the ETP as well as the potential impacts it had on developing their teaching effectiveness. There were three primary categories that informed this theme including experiences with reflection, the purpose of reflection, and the importance of feedback to promote reflection.

Experiences with Reflection

Adams (2009) asserted that most faculty enter academia with little or no training in the act of thinking reflectively about their teaching. In this study, most participants conveyed a sense of understanding about the role of reflection within the ETP. However, after several follow-up

questions from the researcher, some ETP participants conceded that their idea of reflection was not as detailed as they had previously thought. Thus, Adams' suggestion ultimately proved true for the participants in this study, most of whom relayed little or no familiarity with the concept of reflection embedded specifically for the purpose of professional development.

Some participants quipped about the idea that reflection is an undefinable construct. Alex referred to reflection as a "black hole," and Mac called reflection "a junk-drawer-word." While the participants offered these comments in jest, there is substantial research in the field of faculty development that agrees with the idea that reflection is hard to define and to delineate (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Lorenzetti, 2009; Taczak & Karas, 2019). Others have asserted that the term "reflection" has been used so widely, the idea has become irrelevant and cheap (Kinsella, 2010). Bengtsston (1995) wrote, "The divergent uses of the term 'reflection' indicate that it is fundamentally unclear what reflection really is" (p. 26).

The data collected in this study showed that participants' reactions toward the reflection component were superficial and flat. When asked what one ETP participant remembered of the nearly 60 writing prompts assigned to each participant, she said she did not remember anything specific about the reflection assignments. Another bristled at the word "reflection" and insisted that what they did in the ETP was not reflection. The participants in this study were nearly unanimous in agreement that the reflection portion of the ETP was not reflective but rather rote regurgitation of buzzwords and "the bare minimum." The broadness of the participants' answers indicates that more clarity is needed to help faculty members, and others, to better understand their own experiences with reflection for the purpose of development.

Purpose of Reflection

In an effort to better understand participants' perceptions of the reflection component, the researcher spent significant time in each interview following up with participants and probing into their understanding of the purpose of reflection. It is interesting to acknowledge that participants communicated some confusion around the definition of reflection, but they brought more specific opinions of the purpose for reflecting. The comments from the participants in this study illuminated a desire for something more personal than what was offered in the reflective component of the ETP.

These participants gave voice to ideas that are demonstrated throughout faculty development scholarship. Mac used the phrase "introspective process" when he referred to his idea of the purpose of reflection. That same phrase was employed by Rocha (2014), who emphasized the importance of reflection as an introspective process for developmental efforts designed for new teachers. Tokumaru and Shimizu (2018) studied the "introspective process" of an experienced teacher reflecting on her career. The products of this reflection were used to develop less experienced educators. Chen et al. (2009) proposed a tool to guide new educators through the "introspective process" of identifying and combating biases.

The comment made by Dede suggesting that the purpose of reflection is "like understanding yourself" also aligns with faculty development research. There is ample scholarship to defend the notion that faculty development enhances professional knowledge. However, over the last two decades, faculty developers have acknowledged the importance of developing educators holistically, which requires guiding faculty members to a deeper and more personal understanding of their own motivations and biases in their professional contexts (Barden et al., 2019; Hubbard et al., 1998; Lockhart & Stoop, 2018; Zahorski, 2002).

Feedback

The idea that feedback promotes reflection within faculty development has been highlighted prominently by faculty development scholars (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Gonzalo et al., 2014; Jones & Gallen, 2016). In their systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness, Steinert et al. (2016) offered "the incorporation of reflection with feedback" as one of the "key features of effective faculty development" (p. 780).

Other participants acknowledged the presence of feedback but expressed dissatisfaction with the content and frequency with which it was given. Billie said, "It was like someone had a checklist and had to go in and just make sure everyone got a little comment and grade." Taylor commented, "Every month or two, someone would go in and write something stupid… like 'good job' or something."

Ash and Clayton (2009) contended faculty developers must be cognizant to ask the right questions of their students in order to stimulate genuine reflection on their teaching. Similarly, the work of Copridge et al. (2021) and Campbell et al. (2019) highlighted the importance of reflection in faculty development but also noted that meaningful questions play an important role in eliciting genuine reflection.

In the ETP, participants' reflections deteriorated over time after insignificant feedback (or no feedback at all) was offered. Shae said, "Do you know how frustrating it is to spend hours working on an assignment that no one reads? After about a month, I was totally disenchanted with the whole thing." The contrast between the faculty participants' negative perceptions of feedback and reflection revealed in this study and the literature's boasting of reflection's impact in faculty development poses an interesting clash. Additional research is needed to delineate

what makes reflection activities truly reflective for faculty participants and furthermore, how faculty developers can elicit deeper reflection with strategically developed questions.

Theme 4: Learners Will Learn

The fourth and final theme that emerged over the course of this study is the idea that teachers who are motivated to learn will. This is one place where the findings of this study diverge from much of the published scholarship in the field of faculty development. Most faculty development literature focuses on high-impact practices that result in increased perceptions of teaching effectiveness (Brinkley-Etzkorn, 2018; Donnelli-Sallee & Autry, 2018; Jones et al., 2019). The findings in this study pointed to a different reality for the participants from the inaugural class of the ETP at SCU. Several participants communicated a dissatisfaction with the content of the course, referring to it as "useless" and a "waste of time." However, despite these negative comments from participants, each communicated an increased perception of their teaching effectiveness after seeing in the ETP "what not to do."

Application

Faculty developmental scholars have long stressed the importance of application-based developmental initiatives (Bond & Blevins, 2020; Fanghanel, 2013; Rathbun et al., 2017). Bond and Blevins (2020) called for a more practical model of faculty development. "Linking accepted theory and practical application… may have implications on the way we design and develop meaningful professional development" (Bond & Blevins, 2020, p. 231). Though the ETP was designed to provide content which can be applied, participants contended that the ETP provided a sure model of poor teaching.

In this study, ETP participants clearly communicated negative perceptions of the reflection component. However, several also acknowledged that the experience of participating

in the ETP changed the way that they perform certain professional tasks. Alex and Dede both referenced renewed dedication to providing students with meaningful feedback. Dede commented, "…yes, [the ETP] accidentally taught me something."

There is substantial scholarship to defend the idea that without a clear linkage to impact on teaching, reflection loses its importance in the minds of participants. For example, Lehner (2016) contended that this is especially true for faculty members who are new to the field of teaching:

> For teacher-centered participants, opportunities to practice teaching is of high importance in order to see the relevance of the theoretic reflections on how a good teacher should act. Without possibilities of gaining teaching experience, the investigated trainee teachers lost the motivation to reflect on their conceptions of teaching and on the potential outcomes in their practice. (p. 138)

Others have shown how the practical application of concepts presented in faculty development efforts shape the participants' engagement with the material and motivation to reflect (Akuma & Callaghan, 2019; Branch, 2014; Voon et al., 2019).

Lifelong Learners

Research shows that the people who self-select to participate in faculty development efforts are often the highest performing teachers (Emery et al., 2019; Martin & Dowson, 2009). Thus, it was not surprising that the individuals chosen to participate in the inaugural class of the ETP described themselves using the phrase "lifelong learner." Faculty development literature shows the unique draw of lifelong learners to developmental efforts (Ayvaz-Tuncel, 2018; DeWitt, 2001). However, this study demonstrated that the members of the inaugural class of the ETP felt that the learning the resulted from the ETP was solely a product of their own efforts and abilities. This juxtaposition of outcomes poses a unique incongruity.

One significant outcome that this study revealed is the overall negative impression of the reflective component embedded into the ETP. The second outcome showed how faculty participants left the ETP with new understanding about their roles and responsibilities as teachers. Though these ideas seem contradictory, both align with scholarship in the field of faculty development. It is, however, uncommon to see both represented in the same sample.

Negative Perceptions. The first outcome exposed in this study was an overall negative perception regarding the reflection component of the ETP. Participants used words like "burdensome" and "trivial" to describe the types of prompts that were given in an effort to generate reflection. For some participants, this negative perception started early in the ETP. Shae remembered, "From the beginning, it was evident that the [ETP] was going to be so much more work than what I had anticipated when I applied." Dede commented, "I lost all motivation to keep going. It took way too long. I learned nothing…" Billie said, "…It just wasn't excellence in teaching, you know?"

Negative experiences with faculty development are not new (Deswal et al., 2017; Furr, 2018). Many scholars have demonstrated negative perceptions with reflection components of faculty development. In their analysis of business programs, Raymond and Kannan (2014) found that in the eyes of participants, most developmental efforts lack strategic focus and structure. Yoon et al. (2016) asserted that poorly perceived faculty development "has been found to be a major obstacle to improvements in health professions education" (p. 382).

New Knowledge. The second outcome revealed how the ETP participants gained new knowledge from the reflection component of the ETP, despite their negative perceptions of it. The concept that participants gained new knowledge from reflective activities in faculty development is seen frequently in literature (Camburn & Han, 2015; Christofilos et al., 2015;

Jones, 2010; Krutka et al., 2017). In their review of faculty development efforts, Steinert et al. (2006) reported high levels of satisfaction with developmental efforts and participant's perceptions of relevance on their teaching and research. However, Steinert et al. (2006) do not draw a clear correlation between the two. Additional research is needed to show if there is significant statistical data with which to generalize a key finding from this study—while participants perceived the reflective component to be ineffective, learning occurred.

Reapplying Theory: Allowing the ETP's Reflective Component to "Talk Back"

From the beginning, this study was framed using Schön's reflective practice, which invites reflective conversations for the purpose of allowing practice to "talk back." The researcher sought to examine faculty participants' perceptions of the reflection component embedded into their faculty development program. The impetus behind this study was to investigate how each participant perceived the impact of the reflection component of the ETP on developing their teaching effectiveness.

Across the reflective conversations, the researcher listened to ETP participants recount their experiences with the reflective component of the program. Some were passionate about their disappointment. Others were apathetic. All were negative about the impact they perceived the reflective component to have on developing their teaching effectiveness. Despite their negative perceptions of the feedback component, nearly all participants left the ETP with a new perspective on reflection, feedback, and teaching. Some completed the program while others quit, but all articulated something (or several things) that the experience taught them.

Schön's reflective practice called professionals to engage in a process of assessing their professional abilities via a dialectical exchange with a situation. He contended that this reflective practice augments professionals' ability to name and frame their experiences for the purpose of

continuous learning. Schön emphasized the importance of a robust reflective process (Schön, 1987, 1983) which helped learners to apply the understanding that emerged from the reflective process (Hoban & Erickson, 2004). To explain reflective practice, Schön offered three unique constructs which include reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversations.

This study sought to capture new meanings, relationships, and connections around the reflective component of the ETP as perceived by faculty participants after the fact. In the language of Schön, the exchanges that informed this study are reflective conversations. Schön contended that reflective conversations offered professionals a chance to reframe former understanding and action. He famously referred to reflective conversations as an opportunity for practice to "talk back."

Over the course of this study, participants were asked to reflect on their experience with the reflection component of the ETP. They were given opportunities to identify and assign new language. In this study, participants were quick to describe the ineffectiveness of the reflection component of the ETP. However, several participants also acknowledged lessons that were learned as a result of their experience with the ETP's reflection component. In one instance, the researcher asked, "So, it sounds like you did learn something. Is that what I'm hearing you say?" The participant laughed and then paused before she replied, "Well, yeah. I mean I guess I did."

As these conversations continued, participants more readily shared ways that they learned despite their perceptions that the reflective component of the ETP was poorly designed and executed. They became more comfortable with that reframing, but several were quick to offer a related caveat: "…I think that has very little to do with them. I think that's more about me."

The pragmatic nature of Schön's reflective practice was echoed in the words of several participants. Their expectations were to gain from the ETP clearer understanding of how to

perform certain professional tasks (i.e., build a course in Canvas, address plagiarism), to receive a "jumpstart" during a season of apathy, to collaborate with colleagues, and to impart the things that they've learned to other faculty members. When they failed to see the pertinence of the content addressed in the reflective component of the ETP, many lost the desire to participate.

Implications

This study offers several implications for higher education administrators and faculty developers. For higher education administrators, those implications include prioritizing recognition for those who complete developmental initiatives. For faculty developers, those implications include crafting faculty development endeavors that address professional and personal needs via reflection. Additionally, faculty developers need to be trained in meaningful and frequent feedback.

Higher Education Administrators

The findings of this study highlight the importance of recognition for faculty members who participate in developmental efforts. Higher education administrators play a key role in offering that support. Pastore (2019) found that faculty development participants view recognition from administrators as reinforcement and encouragement to continue. She also found that recognition offered to faculty participants should be personalized (Pastore, 2019). Hammer et al. (2010) demonstrated how rewarding faculty development participants reinforces to all members of the university community their dedication to teaching excellence.

In a context like SCU, there are a number of specific ways that administrators can acknowledge individuals who participate in faculty development. Studies show how some university leaders have designed and awarded digital badges based on the completion of rigorous developmental initiatives (Risquez et al., 2020; Wolfenden et al., 2020). Drawing on Andrade's

(2011) four-step approach, Elliott (2014) emphasized the importance of symbolic strategies that administrators can use to celebrate successes of faculty members including "award ceremonies, transition rituals, showcase events…" (p. 39). Personalized individual recognition is also incredibly important within the realm of higher education (Thorton et al., 2014; Childs et al., 2021).

The implication for higher education administrators is that faculty members who participate in developmental efforts desire to be recognized in ways that are both personalized and public. According to the participants in this study, that recognition communicates to faculty that they are valued and that their hard work is recognized. Additionally, participants asserted that public recognition shows the university community that continuous quality improvement is rewarded in tangible ways.

Faculty Developers

The second group for whom this study offers important implications is faculty developers. The first implication for faculty developers is the notion that faculty developers should be mindful of the practical and tangible results that flow from reflective activities embedded into faculty development. The second implication revolves around the quality and timing of feedback provided to participants.

Pragmatic Reflection. As Schön (1983) encourages practitioners to allow practice to "talk back," effective faculty development should include pragmatic application-based elements so that participants perceive it to be personally valuable. Research suggests that when faculty members perceive reflection to be meaningful to their professional practice, they are more likely to engage (Akuma & Callaghan, 2019; Lehner, 2016).

Meaningful faculty development that feels somewhat personalized to the participants poses unique challenges for faculty developers. Faculty developers must think about the unique goals of the participants and the different contexts in which they teach. This kind of faculty development may not fit within the neat parameters of an academic year and it might entail revisiting participants after they have had time to apply the changes and ideas that emerged from reflection. As reflective activities "talk back," the ways in which reflection is stimulated may need to be altered. Faculty developers must seek to design programs and craft reflection prompts in order to elicit thoughtful, practical responses.

This implication also calls faculty developers to build meaningful reflection opportunities that call participants to pragmatically assess and reflect on all of their responsibilities as faculty. Incorporating questions about things like advisement, research, and service offer faculty members a more holistic development. In this study, participants expressed a desire to grow in each of these areas. Scholarship defends the idea that holistic faculty development offers lasting change in faculty members attitudes and professional behaviors (Harwood et al., 2005; Kumar & Jha, 2012; Lockhart & Stoop, 2018; Zahorski, 2002). Therefore, it is important for faculty developers to strategically and intentionally incorporate reflection questions about pragmatic outcomes of all areas of faculty life.

Quality Feedback. The second implication for faculty developers revolves around the magnitude of strong feedback given in a timely manner. There is a significant body of literature that highlights the poor feedback culture within faculty development (McLean et al., 2008; Steinert et al., 2016, 2018; Thomas et al., 2014).

Faculty developers need additional training in best practices for providing quality feedback within the context of faculty development. Without the feedback component, reflection

and discussion are nothing more than opinion-sharing. This feedback can be offered in a number of ways to the participants. The ETP occurred within the institution's LMS. Thus, comments and direct messages could easily be employed to deepen the conversation and hone reflection skills. In face-to-face contexts, developers can build an environment where feedback from developers, peers, and students is all incorporated in meaningful ways.

Faculty developers must continue to explore how best to elicit meaningful reflection for faculty members in programming that is high-quality and available to all who desire to participate. Only then can scholars begin to connect specific reflective activities with specific teaching outcomes. As the world changes and technologies evolve, faculty developers will be required to adapt developmental efforts for faculty. The results of this study show how reflective conversations afford faculty developers new insights on how best to cultivate teaching effectiveness in faculty members. These reflective conversations allow faculty participants to reflect on their learning journey and the practice of reflection to "talk back."

Recommendations

This study yields important recommendations for future faculty developers, university administrators, and scholars in this field. Those recommendations can be divided into two categories: recommendations for practice and recommendations for future research.

Recommendations for Practice

The recommendations for practice that emerged from this study include calls to define reflection for the context in which it is offered and to make feedback more meaningful for the participants. Clearer understanding of these areas will help to shape the field of faculty development, namely in designing reflection activities, eliciting meaningful responses, and bolstering teaching effectiveness as perceived by faculty members. The first recommendation for

future practice is to clearly define reflection for the context in which participants are reflecting. The second recommendation is to set appropriate expectations for participants early in the program.

Define Reflection for the Context

The popularity of reflection in faculty development programming is a clear indication of its impact on the field. Yet, this study is one of many in which the participants could not clearly define reflection in their developmental program. Thus, the first recommendation for future practice addresses how reflection is defined, modeled, and explained to faculty participants within the context of faculty development.

As highlighted in the literature review, the role of reflection in the learning process is one that has been investigated by scholars for many decades (Calkins & Harris, 2017; Brookfield, 1995). More specifically, the importance of reflection in the adult learning process has been emphasized by researchers like Mezirow (1991; 1995), Brookfield (1995), and Freire (1970). Despite wide acceptance by modern-day faculty development scholars that reflection opportunities are a best practice in faculty development design, there remain many questions about the boundaries of reflection within the field of faculty development (Calkins & Harris, 2017).

This study showed that the act of reflection is contextual. The researcher contends that one reason why no single definition of reflection has been widely adopted by faculty developers is the shifting contexts in which reflection in used. In one time and place, certain reflective activities may elicit meaningful, genuine responses. In a different environment, or with different participants, those same reflective activities may be shallow and unproductive. Faculty

developers should place clearer parameters and provide clearer instructions on how to reflect for the purpose of professional development.

In this study, participants' motivation to engage with the ETP material waned after a clash between the expectations with which they entered the program and the reality of the course design and content. Faculty developers have the opportunity to increase the likelihood of faculty participating in more meaningful ways by shaping more clearly what reflection is and how it will be used in the developmental initiative. When participants have a clearer understanding why they need firmer boundaries around the idea of reflection, faculty developers can explore how to best communicate those boundaries to participants. The participants need to understand what exactly faculty developers are asking of them when they are encouraged to "reflect."

The data collected in this study signifies those clearer expectations from the outset will give participants an opportunity to adjust their expectations accordingly. This adjustment may mitigate the negative impacts of violated expectations such as reduced motivations and negative perceptions.

Set Appropriate Expectations

The second recommendation for future practice calls faculty members to set appropriate expectations for participants early in the faculty development initiative. In this study, the ETP program facilitators did not clearly communicate what should have been expected from the program. When the expectations of those faculty participants were violated, several negative outcomes followed. Thus, faculty developers need to set clear expectations about the time commitment, the content of the initiative, and the recognition or rewards that will be given to members after the conclusion of the program.

The findings of this study align with other research from the field that shows how unclear or unmet expectations can hamper one's motivation to participate in faculty development programs (e.g., Barksdale et al., 2011; Rud & Trevisan, 2014). By setting those expectations early in the program, faculty members can adjust their own expectations.

Faculty developers should consider quantifying the approximate time that is needed each week, month, etc. to complete the activities included in the development effort. While each participant's time commitment will vary, this approximation gives faculty developers and participants a clear expectation regarding time. Ideally, this should be shared with participants during the recruitment phase of the initiative. Faculty members should be able to take this factor into consideration before committing to the program.

Faculty developers should also spend time identifying the goals of the effort and what specific content helps participants to reach those goals. While the field of faculty development seeks to broaden its scope by addressing more roles and responsibilities of faculty members, each faculty development program cannot address all areas encompassed in the job duties of a faculty member. Thus, developers should be specific with the objectives of each program and clearly communicate the content that should be expected to faculty members who are considering participating.

Finally, faculty developers should be very clear about the recognition that each participant will receive and at what stage of the development program will participants be recognized. Some programming offers recognition for every faculty member who completes any piece of the development effort. Others recognize only those who complete the program. In those instances, faculty developers must quantify and communicate to potential participants what it

means to “complete” the initiative. When clear expectations are not set, participants’ motivation to participate ebbs.

Recommendations for Future Research

The researcher offers three recommendations for future research in this area including a call for faculty development scholars to link reflection activities to specific outcomes, a call for faculty developers to explore the role of feedback in eliciting reflection within the context of faculty development, and a call for clearer assessment tools that are rooted in pragmatism.

Link Reflection Activities to Specific Outcomes

The first recommendation for future research calls faculty development scholars to link reflection activities with specific outcomes. The act of reflecting on specific elements of one’s profession is something that faculty developers have embraced over the last decade or so (Boerboom et al., 2011; Breen et al., 2014; Steinert et al., 2016). Damp et al. (2017) developed a series of faculty development workshops that resulted in many faculty participants reporting higher levels of confidence in targeted teaching behaviors. However, they also concede that they are not able to show a clear relationship between specific activities within the workshops and any single teaching behavior (Damp et al., 2017).

Steinert (2008, 2010, 2012, 2018) has been one of the most vocal faculty development scholars to call for more targeted research identifying and promoting the relationship between faculty development initiatives that bolster teaching effectiveness and reflection activities. She attributes this need for research linked developmental efforts and outcomes to the fact that much scholarship focuses primarily on how reflection helps the learner to better understand their identity or their experiences. While those exercises are immensely impactful and professionally developmental, the researcher contends that more research is needed to understand the value of

reflection within faculty development for the purpose of achieving specific outcomes. The researcher asserts that when faculty development scholars have a clearer understanding of the outcomes that flow from specific reflective activities, then faculty development practitioners can begin to craft developmental programming that targets institution-specific weaknesses with a level of confidence that predicted outcomes will follow.

Examine Feedback to Elicit Reflection in Faculty Development

Some scholars have examined feedback as a mechanism to elicit reflection within the context of faculty development (Ash & Clayton, 2009; Kopechek et al., 2017; Standal & Moe, 2013). However, questions remain about the best ways to train faculty developers to use feedback in this way. In this study, participants indicated that feedback from the ETP facilitators may have altered their perception of the reflection component.

Campbell et al. (2019) and Steinert et al. (2016) both identified the need for more research highlighting how reflection can be maximized to elicit authentic reflection. Some have contended that the follow-up questions posed for reflectors stimulate deeper thought (Jaramillo-Cherrez & Jin, 2020; Laverick, 2017). Others have suggested that peer feedback is most effective in generating reflection (Garcia et al., 2017; Ruessler et al., 2014). Additionally, research is needed to examine the various mediums through which feedback is given (i.e., private feedback vs. public feedback, face-to-face feedback vs. digital feedback, etc.). When faculty development scholars have a clearer understanding of the role of feedback in provoking reflection, faculty development practitioners can be trained to give better feedback.

Develop Clearer Assessment Tools that are Rooted in Pragmatism

The final recommendation for future research is for faculty development scholars to examine the way that reflection is used to assess understanding and application with assessment

tools that are rooted in pragmatism. Scholars who have examined reflection in any context have long struggled to communicate how and why to assess reflection (Taczak & Karas, 2019). Some, like Brookfield (1995), assert that the purpose of reflection is to better understand one's self. He offers four lenses through which an educator can reflect on an experience to ultimately gain deeper insight into their professional identity (1995; 1998). Steinert (2018) would contend that reflection for the purpose of professional development should be viewed as a "journey, not a destination."

Schön's reflective practice calls for reflection that yields pragmatic and tangible results (Musolino & Mostrom, 2005). He acknowledges experience is a fertile ground for learning, but suggests that the act of reflection-in-action is to become a researcher of practice (Schön, 1983). Schön (1983) refused to divorce reflection from results and outcomes, contending that true reflection occurs in "a reflective conversation with the situation" (p. 76). Thus, more research is needed to develop high-impact practices for assessing reflection in terms of outcomes and results.

Summary

Faculty development has been broadly defined and implemented differently in multiple contexts. Most developmental efforts address organizational development, professional development, and personal development with the goals of augmenting teaching effectiveness, addressing faculty members' needs, and advancing teaching and learning. The designs most frequently employed by faculty developers include field-specific faculty development, first-year faculty development, or scholarship of teaching and learning initiatives.

Over the last two decades, faculty developers have highlighted reflection and introspection as keys to effective developmental efforts. This study examined the influence of

Freire, Mezirow, and Brookfield as primary influences on the modern understanding and application of reflection in faculty development. Ultimately, this study was conducted using Schön's reflective practice as the theoretical framework, which calls professionals out of quantitative scientific inquiry and into reflective practice. Reflective practice consists of three unique constructs—reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflective conversations. This study primarily focused on facilitating reflective conversations with participants in order to uncover new understanding around their perceptions of the reflective component of the ETP, a faculty development initiative in which they all participated.

This pragmatic, qualitative study consisted of semi-structured interviews and document analysis. Over the course of the study, participants identified four primary themes regarding their perceptions of the reflection component:

1. Violated expectations curb motivation.
2. Perceived meaningfulness promotes engagement.
3. Feedback promotes reflection.
4. Learners will learn.

Each of these themes revealed important data that helped to answer the research question that guided this study.

There were several places where the data that was collected and analyzed in this study aligned with other scholarship from the field of faculty development. Participants were excited to participate in the ETP, but were later discouraged by the time commitment and poor content of the program. They were dissatisfied with the lack of collaboration and perceived meaningfulness. Those concepts agree with other research on faculty development initiatives.

There were also places where the data analyzed in this study disagreed with scholarship. The most significant disparity came from the idea that participants' perceptions of the reflection component of the ETP were largely negative. However, they were also able to communicate specific lessons learned from the ETP and how their subsequent professional behaviors changed.

Across this study and through these reflective conversations, participants gave voice to the practice of reflection for the purpose of developing teaching effectiveness. As practice was able to "talk back," one sentiment emerged as the principal finding: Sometimes it takes reflective conversations to recognize that despite negative perceptions, learning happened and teaching effectiveness grew.

REFERENCES

Abigail, L. K. M. (2016). Do communities of practice enhance faculty development? *Health Professions Education, 2*(2), 61-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpe.2016.08.004

Adams, P. (2009). The role of scholarship of teaching in faculty development: Exploring an inquiry-based model. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2009.030106

Akerson, V. L., Cullen, T. A., & Hanson, D. L. (2009). Fostering a community of practice through a professional development program to improve elementary teachers' views of nature of science and teaching practice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46*(10), 1090-1113. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20303

Akuma, F. V., & Callaghan, R. (2019). Teaching practices linked to the implementation of inquiry-based practical work in certain science classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56*(1), 64-90. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21469

Albion, P. R., Tondeur, J., Forkosh-Baruch, A., & Peeraer, J. (2015). Teachers' professional development for ICT integration: Towards a reciprocal relationship between research and practice. *Education and Information Technologies, 20*(4), 655-673. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-015-9401-9

Alstete, J. W. (2000). *Posttenure faculty development: Building a system for faculty improvement and appreciation* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions? A conceptual review of the educational development literature in higher education. *Review of Educational Research, 82*(1), 90-126. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312438409

Andrade, M. S. (2010;2011;). Managing Change—Engaging faculty in assessment opportunities. *Innovative Higher Education, 36*(4), 217-233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9169-1

Ardi, R., Hidayatno, A., & Yuri M. Zagloel, T. (2012). Investigating relationships among quality dimensions in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 20*(4), 408-428. https://doi.org/10.1108/09684881211264028

Armour, K. M., & Duncombe, R. (2004). Teachers' continuing professional development in primary physical education: Lessons from present and past to inform the future. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 9*(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/1740898042000208098

Atkinson, M. P. (2001). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Reconceptualizing scholarship and transforming the academy. *Social Forces, 79*(4), 1217-1229. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2001.0029

Austin, A. E. (2003). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. The Review of Higher Education, 26(2), 119-144.

Austin, A. E., & Rice, R. E. (1998). Making tenure viable: Listening to early career faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(5), 736-754.

Austin, A. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2013). The future of faculty development: Where are we going? *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 133,* 85-97. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20048

Ayvaz-Tuncel, Z. (2018). Factors supporting and preventing academics from becoming lifelong learners. *International Journal of Higher Education, 7*(4), 55-62.

Bali, M., & Caines, A. (2018). A call for promoting ownership, equity, and agency in faculty development via connected learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0128-8

Balmer, D. F., & Richards, B. F. (2012). Faculty development as transformation: Lessons learned from a process-oriented program. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, *24*(3), 242-247.

Bamberger, J., & Schön, D. A. (1983). Learning as reflective conversation with materials: Notes from work in progress. *Art Education*, *36*(2), 68-73.

Banasik, M. D., & Dean, J. L. (2016). Non-tenure track faculty and learning communities: Bridging the divide to enhance teaching quality. *Innovative Higher Education, 41*, 333-342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9351-6

Bandiera, G., Lee, S., & Foote, J. (2005). Faculty perceptions and practice impact of a faculty development workshop on emergency medicine teaching. *Canadian Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *7*(5), 321-327. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1481803500014512

Barden, A., Giammarinaro, N., Fornari, A., & Cerise, J. E. (2019). Impact of a faculty development course on relationship-centered communication skills. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare, 12*(3-4), 154-159. https://doi.org/10.1080/17538068.2019.1673621

Barksdale, D. J., Woodley, L., Page, J. B., Bernhardt, J., Kowlowitz, V., & Oermann, M. H. (2011). Faculty development: Doing more with less. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, *42*(12), 537-544. https://doi.org/10.3928/00220124-20110301-01

Barnard, C. I. (1968). *The functions of the executive*. Harvard University Press.

Bartell, D. S., & Boswell, C. (2019). Developing the whole teacher: Collaborative engagement as faculty development within a first-year experience program. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 33*(3), 25-32.

Baruch, Y. (2013). Careers in academe: The academic labor market as an eco-system. *Career Development International, 18*(2), 196-210. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2012-0092

Bassot, B. (2016). *The reflective practice guide: An interdisciplinary approach to critical reflection*. Routledge.

Beach, A. L. (1990). Boyer's impact on faculty development in E. L. Boyer (Ed.), *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate* (pp. 31-37). Jossey-Bass.

Beach, A. L., Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., & Rivard, J. K. (2016). *Faculty development in the age of evidence: Current practices, future imperatives*. Stylus Publishing.

Bedford, L. (2019). Using social media as a platform for a virtual professional learning community. *Online Learning*, *23*(3), 120-136.

Behar-Horenstein, L. S., Schneider-Mitchell, G., & Graff, R. (2008). Faculty perceptions of a professional development seminar. *Journal of Dental Education*, *72*(4), 472-483. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.0022-0337.2008.72.4.tb04512.x

Bell, C. E. (2013). Faculty development in veterinary education: Are we doing enough (or publishing enough about it), and do we value it? *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *40*(2), 96-101.

Bendermacher, G. W. G. (2017). Unravelling quality culture in higher education: A realist review. *Higher Education, 73*(1), 39-60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9979-2

Bengtsson, J. (1995). What is reflection? On reflection in the teaching profession and teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, *1*(1), 23-32.

Bennett, P. N., Gum, L., Lindeman, I., Lawn, S., McAllister, S., Richards, J., & Ward, H. (2011). Faculty perceptions of interprofessional education. *Nurse Education Today*, *31*(6), 571-576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2010.09.008

Bergquist, W. H., & Philips, S. R. (1975). Components of an effective faculty development program. *Journal of Higher Education, 46*(2), 177 – 211. https://doi.org/10.2307/1980880

Berk, R. A. (2010). Why are faculty development workshops a waste of time? *The Journal of Faculty Development, 24*(2), 49-52.

Berman, M. (1981). *The reenchantment of the world.* Cornell University Press.

Berman, J., & Skeff, K. M. (1988). Developing the motivation for improving university teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, *12*(2), 114-125.

Bhavsar, G. P., Grote, K., Galvan, M. C., Tyutina, S. V., Guan, S. A., Stapleton, L. D., & Knotts, G. (2018). Evaluation of first-year faculty learning communities on teaching effectiveness and scholarship: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 32*(2), 23-29.

Blackwell, S., Miller, A. J., & Lawrance, S. E. (2016). Getting beyond the happiness factor in evaluating faculty development programming. *Assessment Update*, *28*(5), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/au.30068

Bland. C. J.. & Schmitz. C. C. (1990). A guide to the literature on faculty development. In J. H. Schuster, D. W. Wheeler, & Associates (Eds.), *Enhancing faculty careers* (pp. 298-328). Jossey-Bass.

Bland, C. J., & Simpson, D. (1997). Future faculty development in family medicine. *Family Medicine*, *29*(4), 290-293.

Bleakley, A. (1999). From reflective practice to holistic reflexivity. *Studies in Higher Education, 24*(3), 315-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079912331379925

Bogdewic, S. P, Baxley, E. G., & Jamison, P. K. (1997). Leadership and organizational skills in academic medicine. *Family Medicine, 29*(4), 262–265.

Bodily, B. H. (2021). Playing in the Sandbox: A Narrative Approach to Faculty Development. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *45*(5), 309-323.

Boerboom, T. B. B., Jaarsma, D., Dolmans, Diana H. J. M, Scherpbier, Albert J. J. A, Mastenbroek, Nicole J. J. M, & Van Beukelen, P. (2011). Peer group reflection helps clinical teachers to critically reflect on their teaching. *Medical Teacher, 33*(11), 615-623. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2011.610840

Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Support and fostering professional development.* Jossey-Bass.

Bond, M. A., & Blevins, S. J. (2020). Using faculty professional development to foster organizational change: A social learning framework. *Techtrends, 64*(2), 229-237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00459-2

Boyd, A. S., & Glazier, J. A. (2017). The choreography of conversation: An exploration of collaboration and difficult discussions in cross disciplinary teacher discourse communities. *The High School Journal, 100*(2), 130-145. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2017.0003

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Jossey-Bass.

Branch, W. T. (2014). Teaching professional and humanistic values: Suggestion for a practical and theoretical model. *Patient Education and Counseling, 98*(2), 162-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.10.022

Branch Jr, W. T., Chou, C. L., Farber, N. J., Hatem, D., Keenan, C., Makoul, G., Quinn, M., Salazar, W., Sillman, J., Stuber, M., Wilkerson, L., Mathew, G., & Fost, M. (2014). Faculty development to enhance humanistic teaching and role modeling: A collaborative study at eight institutions. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 29*(9), 1250-1255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-014-2927-5

Brannick, T., & Coghlan, D. (2007). In defense of being native: The case for insider academic research. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(1), 59-74. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106289253

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). S*uccessful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners.* Sage.

Breen, S., McCluskey, A., Meehan, M., O'Donovan, J., & O'Shea, A. (2014). A year of engaging with the discipline of noticing: Five mathematics lecturers' reflections. *Teaching in Higher Education, 19*(3), 289-300. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.860107

Brinkley-Etzkorn, K. E. (2018). Learning to teach online: Measuring the influence of faculty development training on teaching effectiveness through a TPACK lens. *The Internet and Higher Education, 38*, 28-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2018.04.004

Brock, T. P., Assemi, M., Corelli, R. L., El-Ibiary, S. Y., Kavookjian, J., Martin, B. A., & Hudmon, K. S. (2014). A nontraditional faculty development initiative using a social media platform. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *78*(5), 1-5. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe785105

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1998). Critically reflective practice. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, *18*(4), 197-205. https://doi.org/10.1002/chp.1340180402

Brooks, A. K. (2004). Transformational learning theory and implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *6*(2), 211-225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422304263454

Brooks, C. F. (2010). Toward “hybridized” faculty development for the twenty-first century: Blending online communities of practice and face-to-face meetings in instructional and professional support programmes. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 47*(3), 261-270. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2010.498177

Brooks, H. (1967). Dilemmas of engineering education. *IEEE Spectrum*, *4*(2), 89-91.

Bryson, B. S., Masland, L., & Colby, S. (2020). Strategic faculty development: Fostering buy-in for inclusive excellence in teaching. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 34*(3), 1-10.

Burbank, M. D., & Kauchak, D. (2003). An alternative model for professional development: Investigations into effective collaboration. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(5), 499-514. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(03)00048-9

Burks, R., Heidenberg, A., Leoni, D., & Ratliff, T. (2009). Supporting the motivators: A faculty development issue. *Primus*, *19*(2), 127-145. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970802409115

Cahn, P. S., Benjamin, E. J., & Shanahan, C. W. (2013). "Uncrunching" time: Medical schools' use of social media for faculty development. *Medical Education Online*, *18*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.3402/meo.v18i0.20995

Calkins, S., Diehl, J., Getis, V., Guittar, M., Lee, R. A., & Stachowiak, J. (2021). Transparent by design: Collaborating to build a reflective faculty development program to enhance online teaching. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, *35*(2), 78-87.

Calkins, S., & Harris, M. (2017). Promoting critical reflection: An evaluation of the longer-term impact of a substantial faculty development program. *Journal of Faculty Development, 21*(2), 29-36.

Camburn, E. M., & Han, S. W. (2015). Infrastructure for teacher reflection and instructional change: An exploratory study. *Journal of Educational Change, 16*(4), 511-533. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-015-9252-6

Campbell, C. M. (2020). A well in the desert: Regional public universities as teaching-supportive institutions. *New Directions for Higher Education, 190*, 89-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20369

Campbell, N., Wozniak, H., Philip, R. L., & Damarell, R. A. (2019). Peer-supported faculty development and workplace teaching: An integrative review. *Medical Education, 53*(10), 978-988. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13896

Campion, M. W., Bhasin, R. M., Beaudette, D. J., Shann, M. H., & Benjamin, E. J. (2016). Mid-career faculty development in academic medicine: How does it impact faculty and institutional vitality? *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(3), 49-63.

Carpenter, R., Sweet, C., & Blythe, H. (2016). The future of faculty development. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(2), 5-8.

Casarejos, F., Frota, M. N., & Gustavson, L. M. (2017). Higher education institutions: A strategy towards sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 18*(7), 995-1017. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-08-2016-0159

Cater, M., Davis, D., Leger, B., Machtmes, K., & Arcemont, L. (2013). A study of extension professionals preferences and perceptions of usefulness and level of comfort with blogs as an informal professional development tool. *Journal of Extension*, *51*(4), 1-13.

Cattaneo, A., Motta, E., & Gurtner, J.L. (2015). Evaluating a mobile and online system for apprentices' learning documentation in vocational education: Usability, effectiveness, and satisfaction. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning, 7*(3), 40–58.

Cattaneo, A. A., & Motta, E. (2021). "I reflect, therefore I am… a good professional". On the relationship between reflection-on-action, reflection-in-action and professional performance in vocational education. *Vocations and Learning*, *14*(2), 185-204.

Centra, J. A. (1976). *Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities.* Educational Testing Service.

Chait, R. P., & Gueths, J. (1981). Proposing a framework for faculty development. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *13*(4), 30-33.

Chalmers, D., & Gardiner, D. (2015). The measurement and impact of university teacher development programs. *Educar*, *51*(1), 53-80.

Chan, S. S., & Burton, J. (1995). Faculty vitality in the comprehensive university: Changing context and concerns. *Research in Higher Education*, *36*(2), 219-234. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02207789

Chen, D. W., Nimmo, J., & Fraser, H. (2009). Becoming a culturally responsive early childhood educator: A tool to support reflection by teachers embarking on the anti-bias journey. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *11*(2), 101-106.

Childs, E., Remein, C. D., Bhasin, R. M., Harris, A. C., Day, A., Sullivan, L. M., Coleman, D. L., & Benjamin, E. J. (2021). How to launch and continually enhance an effective medical campus faculty development program: Steps for implementation and lessons learned. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 13*, 147-156. https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S308608

Chism, N. V. N., & Szabó, B. (1998). How faculty development programs evaluate their services. *The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 15*(2), 55–62.

Christofilos, V., DeMatteo, D., & Penciner, R. (2015). Outcomes of commitment to change statements after an interprofessional faculty development program. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 29*(3), 273-275. https://doi.org/10.3109/13561820.2014.950725

Clayton, P., & Ash, S. (2005). Reflection as a key component in faculty development. *On the Horizon, 13*(3), 161-169. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120510618187

Clinton, M. (1998). On reflection in action: Unaddressed issues in refocusing the debate on reflective practice. *International Journal of Nursing Practice, 4*(3), 197-202. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-172X.1998.00088.x

Cole, E. R., Howe, E. C., & Laird, T. F. N. (2016). Responsive and responsible: Faculty encouragement of civic engagement. *Journal of College and Character, 17*(1), 8-22. https://doi.org/library.uark.edu/10.1080/2194587X.2015.1125366

Collins, C. S., & Cooper, J. E. (2014). Emotional intelligence and the qualitative researcher. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 13*(1), 88-103. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691401300134

Cook, C., & Kaplan, M. (2011). *Advancing the culture of teaching on campus: How a teaching center can make a difference*. Stylus Publishing.

Copridge, K. W., Uttamchandani, S., & Birdwell, T. (2021). Faculty reflections of pedagogical transformation in active learning classrooms. *Innovative Higher Education, 46*(2), 205-221. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09544-y

Costley, C., Elliott, G. C., & Gibbs, P. (2010). *Doing work-based research: Approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*. Sage.

Cordie, L. A., & Adelino, L. (2020). Authentic professional learning: Creating faculty development experiences through an assessment institute. *Journal of Transformative Learning*, *7*(2), 19-33.

Cox, M. D. (2003). Fostering the scholarship of teaching through faculty learning communities. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 14*(2/3), 161-198.

Cranton, P. (2001). Becoming an authentic teacher in higher education. Krieger Publishing Company.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Sage Publications.

Crone, W. C. (2010). *Survive and thrive: A guide for untenured faculty*. Morgan & Claypool.

Curtin, M., & Fossey, E. (2007). Appraising the trustworthiness of qualitative studies: Guidelines for occupational therapists. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 54*, 88-94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1630.2007.00661.x

D'Andrea, V., & Gosling, D. (2005). *Improving Teaching and Learning: A Whole Institution Approach.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Damp, J. B., Dewey, C. M., Wells, Q., Horn, L., Kroop, S. F., & Mendes, L. (2017). Faculty development on clinical teaching skills: An effective model for the busy clinician. *Journal of Medical Education and Curricular Development, 3*, 187-191. https://doi.org/10.4137/JMECD.S40798

Dath, D., & Lobst, W. (2010). The importance of faculty development in the transition to competency-based medical education. *Medical Teacher*, *32*(8), 683-686. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2010.500710

de Carvalho-Filho, M. A., Tio, R. A., & Steinert, Y. (2020). Twelve tips for implementing a community of practice for faculty development. *Medical Teacher, 42*(2), 143-149. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2018.1552782

Dean, K. L. (2018). Academic gerrymandering? Expansion and expressions of academic work. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 27*(4), 405-410. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492618774849

deNoyelles, A., Cobb, C., & Lowe, D. (2012). Influence of reduced seat time on satisfaction and perception of course development goals: A case study in faculty development. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *16*(2), 85-98.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism.* Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.

Deswal, B. S., Sharma, M., Girdhar, S., & Aggarwal, N. (2017). Challenges of Medical Education in India. *Indian Journal of Health Sciences and Care*, *4*(2), 62-65.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* DC Heath.

DeWitt, T. (2001). Can we train a lifelong learner? *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 155*(6), 637-650.

Diaz, V., Garrett, P. B., Kinley, E. R., Moore, J. F., Schwartz, C. M., & Kohrman, P. (2009). Faculty development for the 21st century. *Educause Review*, *44*(3), 46-55.

Diaz-Maggioli, G. (2003). Professional development for language teachers. *ERIC Digest, 3*(3). 1-4.

Dodge, A. M., Copp, S. B., & Stevens, A. (2018). Insights from a reflective conversation among two professors and a student: Instructional approaches, accountability, and building community in online courses. *Distance Learning, 15*(3), 29-39.

Donati, M., & Watts, M. (2005). Personal development in counsellor training: Towards a clarification of inter-related concepts. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 33*(4), 475-484. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880500327553

Donnelli-Sallee, E., & Autry, D. (2018). Supporting online teaching effectiveness at scale: Achieving efficiency and effectiveness through peer review. *The Journal of Educators Online, 15*(3), 1-17.

Downey, C. A., & Clandinin, D. J. (2010). Narrative inquiry as reflective practice: Tensions and possibilities. In *Handbook of reflection and reflective inquiry* (pp. 383-397). Springer.

Doyle, S. (2007). Member checking with older women: A framework for negotiating meaning. *Health Care for Women International, 8*(10), 888-908. https://doi.org/10.1080/07399330701615325

Drummond-Young, M., Brown, B., Noesgaard, C., Lunyk-Child, O., Maich, N. M., Mines, C., & Linton, J. (2010). A comprehensive faculty development model for nursing education. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 26*(3), 152-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2009.04.004

Eble, K. E. (1972). *Professors as teachers.* Jossey-Bass.

Edelen, B. G., & Bell, A. A. (2011). The role of analogy-guided learning experiences in enhancing students' clinical decision-making skills. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *50*(8), 453-460.

Elbaz, F. (1988). Critical reflection on teaching: Insights from Freire. *Journal of education for teaching*, *14*(2), 171-181.

Elliott, R. W. (2014). Faculty development curriculum: What informs it? *The Journal of Faculty Development, 28*(3), 35-45.

Emery, N., Maher, J. M., & Ebert-May, D. (2019). Studying professional development as part of the complex ecosystem of STEM higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 44*(6), 469-479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-019-09475-9

Eraut, M. (1995). Schön shock: A case for refraining reflection-in-action. *Teachers and teaching*, *1*(1), 9-22.

Erickson, G. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. In M. Svinicki, J. Kurfiss, & J. Stone (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 5 Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 182-196). New Forums Press.

Fanghanel, J. (2013). Going public with pedagogical inquiries: SoTL as a methodology for faculty professional development. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 59-70. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.59

Felder, R. M., Brent, R., & Prince, M. J. (2011). Engineering instructional development: Programs, best practices, and recommendations. *Journal of Engineering Education, 100*(1), 89-122. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2011.tb00005.x

Fernandez, G., Lowenstein, S., & Crane, L. (2005). 282 medical school faculty discontent: Predictors of intent to leave academic careers. *Journal of Investigative Medicine, 53*(1), 127-128. https://doi.org/10.2310/6650.2005.00005.281

Finlay, L. (2008). Reflecting on "reflective practice." The Open University.

Fischer, C., Foster, B., McCoy, A., Lawrenz, F., Dede, C., Eisenkraft, A., Fishman, B. J., Frumin, K., & Levy, A. J. (2020). Identifying levers related to student performance on high-stakes science exams: Examining school, teaching, teacher, and professional development characteristics. *Teachers College Record, 122*(2), 1-64.

Fleming, J. (2018). Recognizing and resolving the challenges of being an insider researcher in work-integrated learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 19*(3), 311-320.

Flores, B. B., Clark, E. R., Claeys, L., & Villarreal, A. (2007). Academy for teacher excellence: Recruiting, preparing, and retaining Latino teachers through learning communities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *34*(4), 53-69.

Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*(2), 219-232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.09.002

Foo, Y. Y., Moody, J., & Cook, S. (2019). Visualizing faculty development impact: A social network analysis. *Perspectives on Medical Education, 8*(3), 191-196. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-0510-9

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* McGraw Hill.

Francis, J. B. (1975). How do we get there from here? Program design for faculty development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *46*(6), 719-732. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1975.11778671

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Herter and Herter.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness.* Continuum.

Friedman, M., & Stomper, C. (1983). The effectiveness of a faculty development program: A process-product experimental study. *Review of Higher Education, 7*(1), 49-65. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1983.0003

Frost, S. H., & Teodorescu, D. (2001). Teaching excellence: How faculty guided change at a research university. *The Review of Higher Education*, *24*(4), 397-415. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2001.0007

Furr, M. (2018). Factors associated with veterinary clinical faculty attrition. *Journal of veterinary medical education*, *45*(1), 16-26.

Gaff, J. G. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal.* Jossey Bass.

Garcia, I., James, R. W., Bischof, P., & Baroffio, A. (2017). Self-observation and peer feedback as a faculty development approach for problem-based learning tutors: A program evaluation. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine, 29*(3), 313-325.

Gardner, A. K., Waters, V. M., & McLaughlin, R. J. (2017). What do faculty in health professions need to be competent educators? Results from a school-wide needs assessment. *Journal of Allied Health, 46*(4), 77-80.

Gartner, A. (1976). *The preparation of human service professionals*. Human Sciences Press.

Gaytan, J. A., & McEwen, B. C. (2010). Instructional technology professional development evaluation: Developing a high-quality model. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 52*(2), 77-89.

Ghanizadeh, A. (2017). The interplay between reflective thinking, critical thinking, self-monitoring, and academic achievement in higher education. *Higher Education, 74*(1), 101-114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0031-y

Gibson, S. K. (2006). Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organizational politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*(1), 63-79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-006-9007-7

Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Sage.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Aldine.

Goh, A. Y. S. (2019). Rethinking reflective practice in professional lifelong learning using learning metaphors. *Studies in Continuing Education, 41*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2018.1474867

Gonzalo, J. D., Heist, B. S., Duffy, B. L., Dyrbye, L., Fagan, M. J., Ferenchick, G., Harrell, H., Hemmer, P. A., Kernan, W. N., Kogan, J. R., Rafferty, C., Wong, R., & Elnicki, M. D. (2014). Content and timing of feedback and reflection: A multi-center qualitative study of experienced bedside teachers. *BMC Medical Education, 14*(1), 212-245. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-14-212

Goussinsky, R., Reshef, A., Yanay-Ventura, G., & Yassour-Borochowitz, D. (2011). Teaching qualitative research for human services students: A three-phase model. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(1), 126-146. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2011.1042

Gowdy, E. A. (1994). From technical rationality to participating consciousness. *Social Work, 39*(4), 362-370. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/39.4.362

Guerra, J. (2012). Career technical education adjunct faculty teacher readiness: An investigation of teacher excellence and variables of preparedness. Florida International University. https://doi.org/10.25148/etd.fi12112804

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development.* Corwin Press, Inc.

Greenhow, C., Galvin, S. M., & Staudt Willet, K. B. (2019). What should be the role of social media in education? *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 6*(2), 178–185. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732219865290

Gustafson, K. L., & Branch, R. M. (1997). Revisioning models of instructional development. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *45*(3), 73-89. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02299731

Hale, E., & Bessette, L. S. (2016). New frontiers: Exploring the power and possibilities of the unconference as a transformative approach to faculty development. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(2), 9-12.

Hall, E., Hall, C., Harris, B., Hay, D., Biddulph, M. & Duffy, T. (1999). An evaluation of the long-term outcomes of small-group work for counsellor development. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 27*(1), 99-112. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069889908259718

Hammer, D., Piascik, P., Medina, M., Pittenger, A., Rose, R., Creekmore, F., Soltis, R., Bouldin, A., Schwarz, L., & Scott, S. (2010). Recognition of teaching excellence. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 74*(9), 164-164. https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7409164

Hammond, H. G., & Waltemeyer, S. (2021). Policies and Procedures That May Hinder Morale, Motivation, and Engagement. In A. Dailey-Hebert, B. J. Mandernach, & E. Donnelli-Sallee (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Inclusive Development for Remote Adjunct Faculty in Higher Education* (pp. 233-252). IGI Global.

Hanson, J. (2013). Educational developers as researchers: The contribution of insider research to enhancing understanding of role, identity, and practice. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 50*(4), 388-398. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.806220

Harnish, D., & Wild, L. A. (1994). Mentoring strategies for faculty development. *Studies in Higher Education*, *19*(2), 191-201. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079412331382037

Harris, A., Jones, M. (2010). Professional learning communities and system improvement. *Improving Schools, 13*(2), 172-181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480210376487

Harwood, A. M., Ochs, L., Currier, D., Duke, S., Hammond, J., Moulds, L., Stout, K., & Werder, C. (2005). Communities for growth: Cultivating and sustaining service-learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(1), 41-51.

Hatcher, J. A., Shaker, G. G., & Freeman, T. M. (2016). Faculty learning communities: Taking collective action to improve teaching and learning in nonprofit and philanthropic studies. *The Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, 6*(3), 254-272. https://doi.org/10.18666/JNEL-2016-V6-I3-7584

Hendrix, G. K. (2021). Disrupting institutional erasure: Organizational exit, remembrance, value, and the need to matter. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 28*(4), 1323-1336. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12609

Herman, J. H. (2013). Faculty incentives for online course design, delivery, and professional development. *Innovative Higher Education*, *38*(5), 397-410. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-012-9248-6

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2010). *The practice of qualitative research*. Sage.

Hines, S. R. (2015). Setting the groundwork for quality faculty development evaluation: A five-step approach. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 29*(1), 5-12.

Hoban, G. F., & Erickson, G. (2004). Dimensions of learning for long-term professional development: comparing approaches from education, business and medical contexts. *Journal of In-Service Education*, *30*(2), 301-324.

Hockey, J. (1993). Research methods: Researching peers and familiar settings. *Research Papers in Education*, *8*(2), 199–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152930080205

Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research.* Blackwell Science.

Holmberg, J. (2014). Studying the process of educational design–revisiting Schön and making a case for reflective design-based research on teachers 'conversations with situations.' *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *23*(3), 293-310.

Hong, R. (2018). Faculty assessment fellows: Shifting from a culture of compliance to a culture of assessment advocacy. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *177,* 105-119. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20259

Houston, T. K., Ferenchick, G. S., Clark, J. M., Bowen, J. L., Branch, W. T., Alguire, P., Esham, R. H., Clayton, C. P., & Kern, D. E. (2004). Faculty development needs: Comparing community-based and hospital-based internal medicine teachers. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 19*(4), 375-379. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30619.x

Hubball, H., Collins, J., & Pratt, D. (2005). Enhancing reflective teaching practices: Implications for faculty development programs. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 35*(3), 57-81.

Hubbard, G. T., Atkins, S. S., & Brinko, K. T. (1998). Holistic faculty development: Supporting personal, professional, and organizational well-being. *To Improve the Academy*, *17*(1), 35-49.

Hunt, C., & Sampson, F. (1998). *The self on the page: Theory and practice of writing in professional development.* Jessica Kingsley.

Hutchings, P., Borin, P., Keesing-Styles, L., Martin, L., Michael, R., Scharff, L., Simkins, S., & Ismail, A. (2013). The scholarship of teaching and learning in an age of accountability: Building bridges. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 1*(2), 35-47. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.2.35

Imre, R. W. (1984). The nature of knowledge in social work. *Social Work, 29*(1)*,* 41-44. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/29.1.41

Irby, D. M., O'Sullivan, P. S., & Steinert, Y. (2015). Is it time to recognize excellence in faculty development programs? *Medical Teacher, 37*(8), 705-706.

Ixer, G. (1999). There's no such thing as reflection. *British Journal of Social Work, 29*(4), 513–527. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/29.4.513

Ixer, G. (2011). "There's no such thing as reflection" ten years on. *Journal of Practice Teaching & Learning, 10*(1), 75–93. https://doi.org/10.1921/146066910X570285

Jaramillo Cherrez, N., & Jin, Y. (2020). Cultivating instructor's reflection: Leveraging partnerships and team efforts. *College Teaching, 68*(2), 62-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2020.1723474

Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(1), 73-85. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8

Jiang, Y., & Zheng, C. (2021). New methods to support effective collaborative reflection among kindergarten teachers: An action research approach. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 49*(2), 247-258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01064-2

Johnson, T., Wisniewski, M. A., Kuhlemeyer, G., Isaacs, G., & Krzykowski, J. (2012). Technology adoption in higher education: Overcoming anxiety through faculty bootcamp. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *16*(2), 63-72.

Jolly, B. (2014). Faculty development for organizational change. In Y. Steinert (Ed.), *Faculty Development in the Health Professions* (pp. 119-137). Springer.

Jones, C. A., Watkins, F. S., Williams, J., Lambros, A., Callahan, K. E., Lawlor, J., Williamson, J. D., High, K. P., & Atkinson, H. H. (2019). A 360-degree assessment of teaching effectiveness using a structured-videorecorded observed teaching exercise for faculty development. *Medical Education Online, 24*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2019.1596708

Jones, E. (2010). Personal theory and reflection in a professional practice portfolio. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(6), 699-710. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930902977731

Jones, M. H., & Gallen, A. (2016). Peer observation, feedback, and reflection for development of practice in synchronous online teaching. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 53*(6), 616-626. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2015.1025808

Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education. Routledge.

Judge, S., & O'Bannon, B. (2008). Faculty integration of technology in teacher preparation: Outcomes of a development model. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *17*(1), 17-28.

Justice, G. W. (2006). Motivating university faculty participation in the training and professional development of P-12 teachers. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 11*(3), 3-20.

Kezar, A., Gehrke, S., & Bernstein-Sierra, S. (2018). Communities of transformation: Creating changes to deeply entrenched issues. *The Journal of Higher Education, 89*(6), 832-864. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2018.1441108

Kinsella, E. A. (2007). Technical rationality in Schön's reflective practice: Dichotomous or non-dualistic epistemological position. *Nursing Philosophy, 8*(2), 102-113. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-769X.2007.00304.x

Kinsella, E. A. (2010). Professional knowledge and the epistemology of reflective practice. *Nursing Philosophy, 11*(1), 3-14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-769X.2009.00428.x

Kleinhans, K. A., Chakradhar, K., Muller, S., & Waddill, P. (2015). Multigenerational perceptions of the academic work environment in higher education in the United States. *Higher Education, 70*(1), 89-103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9825-y

Knight, B. (1996). Reflecting on "reflective practice." *Studies in the Education of Adults, 28*(2), 162-184. https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.1996.11730638

Kopansky-Giles, D., Peranson, J., Ghavam-Rassoul, A., & Slater, M. (2017). Teaching teams to teach: Program evaluation results from an interprofessional faculty development program in academic family medicine. *International Journal of Integrated Care, 17*(5), 329-337. https://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.3646

Kopechek, J., Bardales, C., Lash, A. T., Walker, J., Curtis, Pfeil, S., & Ledford, C. H. (2017). Coaching the coach: A program for development of faculty portfolio coaches. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine, 29*(3), 326.

Korstange, R., Rust, D. Z., & Brinthaupt, T. (2019). Kickstarting FYE faculty development. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 33*(2), 37-42.

Krutka, D. G., Carpenter, J. P., & Trust, T. (2017). Enriching professional learning networks: A framework for identification, reflection, and intention. *Techtrends, 61*(3), 246-252. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0141-5

Kuhlenschmidt, S. (2010). Issues in technology and faculty development. *A Guide to Faculty Development*, *2*, 259-274.

Kumar, D. (2018). Discussing the undiscussed: What ingredients are missing in faculty development programs? *Research and Development in Medical Education, 7*(2), 64-67. https://doi.org/10.15171/rdme.2018.014

Kumar, M., & Jha, S. (2012). Revitalizing management education in India: A strategic approach. *Journal of Management and Public Policy, 3*(2), 5-17.

Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, *27*(1), 5-23. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020464222360

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (4th ed.). Sage.

Lanning, S. K., McGregor, M., Crain, G., Van Ness, C. J., Keselyak, N. T., & Killip, J. W. (2014). The status of the scholarship of teaching and learning in dental education. *Journal of Dental Education, 78*(10), 1353-1363. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.0022-0337.2014.78.10.tb05808.x

Laverick, V. T. (2017). Secondary teachers' understanding and use of reflection: An exploratory study. *American Secondary Education, 45*(2), 56-68.

Lawrence, S. M. (2013). Teaching and learning in digital contexts: Undergraduates' perceptions of themselves and their professors collaborating in a "participatory culture." *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education*, *1*(10), 3-18.

Lehner, M. (2016). Visualizing individual conceptual development paths in faculty development. *Journal for University Development, 11,* 125-143. https://doi.org/10.3217/zfhe-11-05/08.

Lenning, O. T., & Ebbers, L. H. (1999). The powerful potential of learning communities: Improving education for the future. *Studies in Higher Education*, *25*(3), 363-374.

Lieberman, A., Pointer-Mace, D. (2010). Making practice public: Teacher learning in the 21st century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 77-88. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347319

Lieff, S., Baker, L., Mori, B., Egan-Lee, E., Chin, K., & Reeves, S. (2012). Who am I? Key influences on the formation of academic identity within a faculty development program. *Medical Teacher*, *34*(3), 208-215.

Light, G., Cox, R. & Calkins, S. (2009). *Learning and teaching in higher education: The reflective professional* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Sage.

Lips-Wiersma, M. (2002). The influence of spiritual "meaning-making" on career behavior. *Journal of Management Development, 21*(7), 497-520. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710210434638

Little, D., Green, D. A., & Felten, P. (2019). Identity, intersectionality, and educational development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *158,* 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20335

Lockhart, M. S., & Stoop, C. (2018). Assessing a faculty development program in a changing environment. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 32*(2), 13-21.

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

Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(1), 33-43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001004

Lowenthal, P. R., Wray, M. L., Bates, B., Switzer, T., & Stevens, E. (2012). Examining faculty motivation to participate in faculty development. *International Journal of University Teaching and Faculty Development, 3*(3), 149-164.

Lown, B. A., Newman, L. R., & Hatem, C. J. (2009). The personal and professional impact of a fellowship in medical education. *Academic Medicine*, *84*(8), 1089-1097.

Lumpkin, A. (2011). A model for mentoring university faculty. *The Educational Forum, 75*(4), 357-368. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2011.602466

Luo, T., Freeman, C., & Stefaniak, J. (2020). "Like, comment, and share"—professional development through social media in higher education: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 68*(4), 1659-1683. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09790-5

Mandernach, B. J., Greenberger, S., & McNaughton, M. (2021). Support for adjunct faculty scholarship in online graduate programs: Fostering knowledge, motivation, and engagement. In A. Dailey-Hebert, B. J. Mandernach, & E. Donnelli-Sallee (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Inclusive Development for Remote Adjunct Faculty in Higher Education* (pp. 115-138). IGI Global.

Marshall, T., Keville, S., Cain, A., & Adler, J. R. (2021). On being open-minded, wholehearted, and responsible: A review and synthesis exploring factors enabling practitioner development in reflective practice. *Reflective Practice, 3*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2021.1976131

Martin, A. J., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and educational practice. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1), 327-365. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325583

Masoumi, D., Hatami, J., & Pourkaremi, J. (2019). Continuing professional development: Policies, practices and future directions. *International Journal of Educational Management, 33*(1), 98-111. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2018-0109

Matthias, L. R. (2019). Faculty development: A review of the (relatively recent) literature and implications for Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, *18*(4), 260-275. https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2018.1517618

McKeachie, W. J. (1974). The decline and fall of the laws of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *3*(3), 7-11. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X003003007

McKee, C. W., Johnson, M., Ritchie, W. F., & Tew, W. M. (2013). *The breadth of current faculty development: Practioners' perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

McLean, M., Cilliers, F., & Van Wyk, J. M. (2008). Faculty development: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Medical Teacher, 30*(6), 555-584. https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590802109834

McQuiggan, C. A. (2007). The role of faculty development in online teaching's potential to question teaching beliefs and assumptions. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *10*(3), 1-13.

Menges, R. J. (1999). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support.* Jossey-Bass.

Meotti, M. P. (2016). The states and higher education: An evolving relationship at a pivotal moment. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 48*(1), 39-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2016.1121085

Mercer, J. (2007). The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: Wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980601094651

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Quality criteria in qualitative research.* Sage.

Messmann, G., & Mulder, R. H. (2015). Reflection as a facilitator of teachers' innovative work behavior. *International Journal of Training and Development, 19*(2), 125-137. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12052

Mezirow, J. (1978). *Education for perspective transformation: Women's re-entry programs in community colleges.* Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Mezirow, J. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformational and emancipatory practice.* Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1994). Understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly, 44*(4), 222-232.

Mezirow, J. (1998). On critical reflection. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48*(3), 185-198.

Mezirow, J. (2003). Transformative learning as discourse. *Journal of Transformative Education, 1*(1), 58-63.

Mezmir, E. A. (2020). Qualitative data analysis: An overview of data reduction, data display, and interpretation. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, *10*(21), 15-27.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher*, *13*(5), 20-30. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X013005020

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Millis, B. J. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*(5), 454-464. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00974.x

Moore, J. A. (2018). Exploring five online collaboration tools to facilitate a professional learning community. *Techtrends, 62*(6), 612-617. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0288-3

Moore, W. E. (1970) *The professions: Rules and roles.* Russell Sage Foundation.

Morrison, H. J., & Gleddie, D. (2019). Playing on the same team: Collaboration between teachers and educational assistants for inclusive physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 90*(8), 34-41. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2019.1644257

Morse, J. M. (1998). Designing funded qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 56-85). Sage.

Muret-Wagstaff, S., & Simon, B. A. (2012). Faculty Hour: A model for interdisciplinary quality improvement in the perioperative setting. In D. S. Tichansky (Ed.), *The sages manual of quality, outcomes, and patient safety* (pp. 85-92). Springer.

Murray, J. P. (2002). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118,* 89-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.67

Murray, J. P. (2008). New faculty members perceptions of the academic work life. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 17*(1-2), 107-128. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911350802168886

Musolino, G. M., & Mostrom, E. (2005). Reflection and the scholarship of teaching, learning, and assessment. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education, 19*(3), 52-66. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001416-200510000-00008

Nelsen, W. C. (1983). Faculty who stay: Renewing our most important resource. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 40,* 67–83.

Nemko, M., & Simpson, R. D. (1991). Nine keys to enhancing campus wide influence of faculty development centers. *To Improve the Academy, 223,* 83-87. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/223

Newman S. (1999). Constructing and critiquing reflective practice. *Educational Action Research Journal*, *7*(1*),* 145–166.

Niehaus, E., & O'Meara, K. (2015). Invisible but essential: The role of professional networks in promoting faculty agency in career advancement. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(2), 159–171. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9302-7

Noah, T. L., Tolleson-Rinehart, S., Meltzer-Brody, S., Jordan, J. M., Kelly, K. J., Eimers, K. M., & Burks, A. W. (2018). Application of assessment metrics for an academic department faculty development program. *The Journal of Pediatrics, 195*, 5-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.01.009

Norton, L., Richardson, T. E., Hartley, J., Newstead, S., & Mayes, J. (2005). Teachers' beliefs and intentions concerning teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, *50*(4), 537-571. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6363-z

Olmstead, K., Ashton, J. R., & Wilkens, C. P. (2020). Do you really want to do this?: Teacher candidate perspectives on imperfect placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly), 47*(4), 56-77.

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *Journal of Higher Education 64*(4), 453-471.

O'Keefe, M., Lecouteur, A., Miller J., & McGowan, U. (2009). The Colleague Development Program: A multi-disciplinary program of peer observation partnerships. *Medical Teacher, 31*(12), 1060–1065.

O'Meara, K. A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure.* Routledge Falmer.

O'Sullivan, D. (2015). Voicing others' voices: Spotlighting the researcher as narrator. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 8*(2), 211-222.

Osterman, K. F. (1990). Reflective practice: A new agenda for education. *Education and Urban Society*, *22*(2), 133-152.

Osterman, P. (1994). How common is workplace transformation and who adopts it? *ILR Review*, *47*(2), 173-188. https://doi.org/10.2307/2524415

Owen, G. T. (2014). Qualitative methods in higher education policy analysis: Using interviews and document analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(26), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1211

Padgett, D. L., & Conceição-Runlee, S. (2000). Designing a faculty development program on technology: If you build it, will they come? *Journal of Social Work Education*, *36*(2), 325-334. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2000.10779011

Pastore, D. L. (2019). Mid-career faculty development model: Sport management faculty perspectives. *The Physical Educator, 76*(4), 1102-1127. https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2019-V76-I4-8874

Patrick, C. L. (2011). Student evaluations of teaching: Effects of the big five personality traits, grades, and the validity hypothesis. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*(2), 239-249. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903308258

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.

Payumo, J., Gerard, A., & Neisler, G. (2019). Mapping the benefits of faculty development to international research partnerships. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 33*(1), 49-63.

Pérez Garcias, A., Tur, G., Darder Mesquida, A., & Marín, V. I. (2020). Reflexive skills in teacher education: A tweet a week. *Sustainability, 12*(8), 31-61. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083161

Petty, J. (2017). Emotion work in qualitative research: Interviewing parents about neonatal care. *Nurse Researcher, 25*(3), 26-30. https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2017.e1532

Phuong, T. T., & McLean, G. N. (2016). The experiences of Vietnamese university faculty in relation to their faculty development. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 17*(4), 599-608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-016-9454-5

Phuong, T. T., Cole, S. C., & Zarestky, J. (2018). A systematic literature review of faculty development for teacher educators. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(2), 373-389.

Polkinghorne D. *(*2004*). Practice and the human sciences: The case for a judgement-based practice of care.* State University of New York Press.

Polanyi, M. (1966). The logic of tacit inference. *Philosophy*, *41*(155), 1-18.

Pope-Ruark, R. (2017). Reimagining paths to faculty vitality in higher education. In R. Pope-Ruark (Ed.) *Agile Faculty* (pp. 1-22). University of Chicago Press.

Porter, B. D., & Freeman, M. K. (2020). Experienced outcomes of a self-directed professional development program. *The Professional Educator, 43*(1), 36-47.

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, *80*(2), 151-176. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034829

Postareff, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Nevgi, A. (2007). The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(5), 557-571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.013

Postareff, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Nevgi, A. (2008). A follow-up study of the effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. *Higher Education, 56*(1), 29-43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-007-9087-z

Premkumar, K., Moshynskyy, A., Sakai, D. H., & Fong, S. F. (2017). Faculty's perception of faculty development. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, *31*(3), 15-24.

Puri, A., Graves, D., Lowenstein, A., & Hsu, L. (2012). New faculty's perception of faculty development initiatives at small teaching institutions. *International Scholarly Research Notices*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/726270

Quinlan, K. M., & Åkerlind, G. S. (2000). Factors affecting departmental peer collaboration for faculty development: Two cases in context. *Higher Education, 40*(1), 23-52. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004096306094

Rands, M. L., Bender, H., Gillette, M. T., & Orgler, L. (2017). The role of faculty learning communities in supporting team-based learning. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 31*(3), 61-78.

Rathbun, G. A., Leatherman, J., & Jensen, R. (2017). Evaluating the impact of an academic teacher development program: Practical realities of an evidence-based study. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(4), 548-563. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1161004

Raymond, B. C., & Kannan, V. R. (2014). A survey of faculty mentoring programs in AACSB schools of business. *Journal of Management Education, 38*(6), 818-829.

Reader, S., Fornari, A., Simon, S., & Townsend, J. (2015). Promoting faculty scholarship: An evaluation of a program for busy clinician-educators. *Canadian Medical Education Journal, 6*(1), 43-60. https://doi.org/10.36834/cmej.36666

Reid, L. F., Sexton, J., & Orsi, R. (2015). Outcomes of a faculty development program promoting scholarly teaching and student engagement at a large research-intensive university. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 29*(3), 23-35.

Richlin, L., & Cox, M. D. (2004). Developing scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning through faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *97,* 127-135. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.139

Risquez, A., Cassidy, D., & O'Suilleabhain, G. (2020). Badge of honour? An exploration of the use of digital badges to support a partnership approach to faculty development. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *36*(5), 18-29.

Roblin, N. P., & Margalef, L. (2013). Learning from dilemmas: Teacher professional development through collaborative action and reflection. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 19,* 18–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.744196

Rocha, K. D. (2014). Europe's got talent: Setting the stage for new teachers by educative mentoring. *CEPS Journal, 4*(4), 99-120.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(4), 842-866.

Rosenbluth, G., Tabas, J. A., & Baron, R. B. (2016). What's in it for me? Maintenance of certification as an incentive for faculty supervision of resident quality improvement projects. *Academic Medicine*, *91*(1), 56-59.

Ross, L. E. (2017). An account from the inside: Examining the emotional impact of qualitative research through the lens of "insider" research. *Qualitative Psychology, 4*(3), 326-337. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000064

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Sage.

Rud, L. G., & Trevisan, M. (2014). Jumpstarting junior faculty motivation and performance with focused writing retreats. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, *28*(1), 33-40.

Ruesseler, M., Kalozoumi-Paizi, F., Schill, A., Knobe, M., Byhahn, C., Müller, M. P., Marzi, I., & Walcher, F. (2014). Impact of peer feedback on the performance of lecturers in emergency medicine: A prospective observational study. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine, 22*(1), 71-79. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13049-014-0071-1

Russell, T. (2018). A teacher educator's lessons learned from reflective practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 4-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1395852

Sadler-Smith, E., & Smith, P.J. (2006). Technical rationality and professional artistry in HRD practice. *Human Resource Development International, 9*(2), 271-281. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678860600616248

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health, 23*(4), 334-340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G

Sandelowski, M. (2010). What's in a name? qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing & Health, 33*(1), 77-84. https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20362

Sanford, R., & Kinch, A. F. (2016). A new take on program planning: A faculty competencies framework. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(2), 79-96.

Santo, S. A., Engstrom, M. E., Reetz, L., Schweinle, W. E., & Reed, K. (2009). Faculty productivity barriers and supports at a school of education. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(2), 117-129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-009-9098-z

Saric, M., & Steh, B. (2017). Critical reflection in the professional development of teachers: Challenges and possibilities. *CEPS Journal, 7*(3), 67-85.

Savenye, W. C., & Robinson, R. S. (2005). Using qualitative research methods in higher education. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 16*(2), 65-95. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02961475

Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2013). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice.* Routledge.

Schein, E. H. (1972). *Professional education: Some new directions*. McGraw-Hill.

Schenkel, A., & Teigland, R. (2008). Improved organizational performance through communities of practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 12*(1), 106-118. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270810852421

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schön, D. A. (1992). Designing as reflective conversation with the materials of a design situation. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, *5*(1), 3-14.

Schroeder, C. (2012). *Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change*. Stylus Publishing.

Schugurensky, D. (1998). The legacy of Paulo Freire: A critical review of his contributions. *Convergence*, *31*(1), 17-29.

Schugurensky, D. (2014). *Paulo Freire*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Schuster, J. H. (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal.* Jossey-Bass.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Scott, K. M. (2013). Does a university teacher need to change e-learning beliefs and practices when using a social networking site? A longitudinal case study. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 44*(4), 571-580. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12072

Sehgal, N. L., Sharpe, B. A., Auerbach, A. A., & Wachter, R. M. (2011). Investing in the future: Building an academic hospitalist faculty development program. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *6*(3), 161-166.

Seminoff, N. E., & Wepner, S. B. (1997). What should we know about technology-based projects for tenure and promotion? *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 30*(1), 67-82. https://doi.org/10.1080/08886504.1997.10782214

Shaha, S. H., Glassett, K. F., Rosenlund, D., Copas, A., & Huddleston, T. L. (2016). From burdens to benefits: The societal impact of PDL-enriched, efficacy-enhanced educators. *Journal of International Education Research, 12*(2), 77-86. https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v12i2.9630

Sheets, J. K. E., Barnhardt, C. L. Phillips, C. W., & Valdés, P. H. (2018). The impact of faculty work-life factors on faculty service morale. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 32*(2), 53-65.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411

Skeff, K. M., Stratos, G. A., Berman, J., & Bergen, M. R. (1992). Improving clinical teaching: Evaluation of a national dissemination program. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *152*(6), 1156-1161.

Skeff, K. M., Stratos, G. A., Mygdal, W., DeWitt, T. A., Manfred, L., Quik, M., Roberts, K., Greenberg, L., & Bland, C. J. (1997). Faculty development a resource for clinical teachers. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 12*(2), 56-63. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.12.s2.8.x

Slavit, D., & Roth McDuffie, A. (2013). Self-directed teacher learning in collaborative contexts. *School Science and Mathematics*, *113*(2), 94-105.

Sloan, E. D. (1989). Extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation in faculty development. *Chemical Engineering Education*, *23*(3), 134-187.

Snyder, C. (2012). A case study of a case study: Analysis of a robust qualitative research methodology. *Qualitative Report, 17*(2), 1-21.

Somekh, B., Altrichter, H., & Posch, P. (1995). *Teachers investigate their work: An introduction to the methods of action research*. Taylor & Francis.

Song, J. (2008). Tenure and asymmetric information: An analysis of an incentive institution for faculty development in research universities. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *3*(2), 310-319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-008-0020-8

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *72*(5), 474-479. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00976.x

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present.* Anker Publishing.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Berg, J. J., Bond, H., & Watson, C. E. (2017). Why now is the time for evidence-based faculty development. In C. Haras, S. C. Taylor, M. D. Sorcinelli, & L. von Hoene (Eds.) *Institutional commitment to teaching excellence: Assessing the impacts and outcomes of faculty development* (pp. 5-16), American Council on Education.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. (1989). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 60*(1), 59-81.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Yun, J. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *39*(6), 58-61. https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.39.6.58-C4

Sorinola, O. O., Thistlethwaite, J., Davies, D., Peile, E. (2015). Faculty development for educators: A realist evaluation. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 20*(2), 385-401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-014-9534-4

Sorinola, O. O., Thistlethwaite, J., Davies, D., & Peile, E. (2017). Realist evaluation of faculty development for medical educators: What works for whom and why in the long-term. *Medical Teacher*, *39*(4), 422-429.

Sprague, D., Kopfman, K., & Levante Dorsey, S. D. (1998). Faculty development in the integration of technology in teacher education courses. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, *14*(2), 24-28.

Squire, K. (2017). Innovation in times of uncertainty. *On the Horizon, 25*(4), 293-308. https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-07-2017-0051

Standal, Ø. F., & Moe, V. F. (2013). Reflective practice in physical education and physical education teacher education: A review of the literature since 1995. *Quest, 65*(2), 220-240. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2013.773530

Steinert, Y. (2000). Faculty development in the new millennium: Key challenges and future directions. *Medical Teacher*, *22*(1), 44-50.

Steinert, Y. (2005). Learning together to teach together: Interprofessional education and faculty development. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *19*(1), 60-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820500081778

Steinert, Y. (2010). Faculty development: From workshops to communities of practice. *Medical Teacher*, *32*(5), 425-428. https://doi.org/10.3109/01421591003677897

Steinert, Y. (2012). Faculty development: On becoming a medical educator. *Medical Teacher*, *34*(1), 74-76. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2011.596588

Steinert, Y. (2010). Developing medical educators: A journey, not a destination. In T. Swanwick (Ed.), (pp. 403-418). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444320282.ch28

Steinert, Y., & Mann, K. V. (2006). Faculty development: Principles and practices. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *33*(3), 317-324.

Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Anderson, B., Barnett, B. M., Centeno, A., Naismith, L., Prideaux, D., Spencer, J., Tullo, E., Viggiano, T., Ward, H., & Dolmans, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update. *Medical Teacher, 38*(8), 769–786. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181851

Steinert, Y., Naismith, L., & Mann, K. (2012). Faculty development initiatives designed to promote leadership in medical education. *Medical Teacher, 34*(6), 483–503. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.680937

Steinert, Y., O'Sullivan, P. S., & Irby, D. M. (2019). Strengthening teachers' professional identities through faculty development. *Academic Medicine*, *94*(7), 963-968.

Stevens, M. (2020). Expertise, complexity, and self-regulated engagement: Lessons from teacher reflection in a blended learning environment. *Journal of Online Learning Research, 6*(3), 177-200.

Stockley, A. J., & Forbes, K. (2014). Medical professionalism in the formal curriculum: 5th year medical students' experiences. *BMC Medical Education, 14*(1), 259-267. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-014-0259-0

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. Journal of Educational Change, 7(4), 221-258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8

Stone, S., Ellers, B., Holmes, D., Orgren, R., Qualters, D., Thompson, J. (2002). Identifying oneself as a teacher: The perceptions of preceptors. *Medical Education, 36*(1),180-185. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2002.01064.x

Stockhausen, L. (2006). Métier artistry: Revealing reflection-in-action in everyday practice. *Nurse Education Today, 26*(1), 54-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2005.07.005

Strage, A. A. (2018). Bringing academic retirement out of the closet. *New Directions for Higher Education, 182,* 29-45. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20278

Strawser, M. G., & Smith, S. (2020). Introduction to the special section: Faculty development for the new professoriate: Onboarding, engaging, and training new faculty. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 34*(2), 44-45.

Stupnisky, R. H., Hall, N. C., & Pekrun, R. (2019). Faculty enjoyment, anxiety, and boredom for teaching and research: instrument development and testing predictors of success. *Studies in Higher Education*, *44*(10), 1712-1722. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1665308

Stupnisky, R. H., Hall, N. C., Daniels, L. M., & Mensah, E. (2017). Testing a model of pretenure faculty members' teaching and research success: Motivation as a mediator of balance, expectations, and collegiality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *88*(3), 376-400. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1272317

Sukhera, J., Watling, C. J., & Gonzalez, C. M. (2020). Implicit bias in health professions: From recognition to transformation. *Academic Medicine*, *95*(5), 717-723.

Taczak, K., & Karas, J. (2019). Disrupting the margins: A case for an intentional reflective framework. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 33*(2), 31-36.

Taguchi, M., Hanzawa, R., Sugihara, M., & Murakami, M. (2012). Work-related anxieties and meaningfulness felt by junior staff engaged in faculty development: Cooperation with other departments and future carrier prospects. *Japan Journal of Educational Technology, 36*(3), 327-337. https://doi.org/10.15077/jjet.KJ00008514509

Taris, T. W., Feij, J. A., & Capel, S. (2006). Great expectations - and what comes of it: The effects of unmet expectations on work motivation and outcomes among newcomers. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*(3), 256-268. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00350.x

Taylor, A., & McQuiggan, C. (2008). Faculty development programming: If we build it, will they come? *Educause Quarterly, 31*(3), 28-37.

Taylor, B. J., & Cantwell, B. (2015). Global competition, US research universities, and international doctoral education: Growth and consolidation of an organizational field. *Research in Higher Education, 56*(5), 411-441. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-014-9355-6

Taylor, E. W., Tisdell, E. J., & Gusic, M. E. (2007). Teaching beliefs of medical educators: perspectives on clinical teaching in pediatrics. *Medical Teacher*, *29*(4), 371-376. https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590701510553

Teclehaimanot, B., & Lamb, A. (2005). Workshops that work! Building an effective, technology-rich faculty development program. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, *21*(3), 109-115.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools.* Palmer.

Thomas, C. M., Bantz, D. L., & McIntosh, C. E. (2019). Nurse faculty burnout and strategies to avoid it. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing, 14*(2), 111-116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2018.12.005

Thomas, S., Chie, Q. T., Abraham, M., Jalarajan Raj, S., & Beh, L. (2014). A qualitative review of literature on peer review of teaching in higher education: An application of the SWOT framework. *Review of Educational Research, 84*(1), 112-159. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313499617

Thorndyke, L. E., Gusic, M. E., George, J. H., Quillen, D. A., & Milner, R. J. (2006). Empowering junior faculty: Penn State's faculty development and mentoring program. *Academic Medicine*, *81*(7), 668-673.

Thornlow, D. K., & McGuinn, K. (2010). A necessary sea change for nurse faculty development: Spotlight on quality and safety. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *26*(2), 71-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2009.10.009

Thornton, T. (2014). Professional recognition: Promoting recognition through the higher education academy in a UK higher education institution. *Tertiary Education and Management, 20*(3), 225-238. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2014.931453

Tokumaru, S., & Shimizu, J. (2018). Visualization of introspective processes by TAE: Reflecting on the teaching practice of a Japanese teacher. *The Bulletin of Kaichi International University, 17*(1), 55-84. https://doi.org/10.24581/kaichi.17.0_55

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Organization development: A question of fit for universities. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *7*(3), 303-310. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422305277171

Tripp, T. M., Jiang, L., Olson, K., & Graso, M. (2019). The fair process effect in the classroom: Reducing the influence of grades on student evaluations of teachers. *Journal of Marketing Education, 41*(3), 173-184. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475318772618

Trust, T., Carpenter, J. P., & Krutka, D. G. (2017). Moving beyond silos: Professional learning networks in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 35*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.06.001

Tsoh, J. Y., Kuo, A. K., Barr, J. W., Whitcanack, L., Merry, I., Alldredge, B. K., & Azzam, A. N. (2019). Developing faculty leadership from 'within': A 12-year reflection from an internal faculty leadership development program of an academic health sciences center. *Medical Education Online, 24*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2019.1567239

Tymitz-Wolf, B. (1984). Faculty development: Concerns and considerations for effective programming. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 7*(3), 119-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840648400700301

Van Bussel, J., Justice, S., Bang, A., & Damirón-Alcántara, A. (2018). Team leaders' beliefs about teachers' learning-path strategies. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *30*(5), 351-363. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-01-2018-0021

Van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Croiset, G., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2017). The role of teaching courses and teacher communities in strengthening the identity and agency of teachers at university medical centers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 399-409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.07.011

Van Maanen, J. (1979). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *24*(4), 520-526. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392358

Vithal, R. (2018). Growing a scholarship of teaching and learning institutionally. *Studies in Higher Education (Dorchester-on-Thames), 43*(3), 468-483. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1180350

Voon, X. P., Wong, L., Chen, W., & Looi, C. (2019). Principled practical knowledge in bridging practical and reflective experiential learning: Case studies of teachers' professional development. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 20*(4), 641-656. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09587-z

Wangenge-Ouma, G., & Langa, P. V. (2010). Universities and the mobilization of claims of excellence for competitive advantage. *Higher Education, 59*(6), 749-764. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9278-x

Wanous, J. P., Poland, T. D., Premack, S. L., & Davis, K. S. (1992). The effects of met expectations on newcomer attitudes and behaviors: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*(3), 288-297. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.77.3.288

Watson, C. (2014). Effective professional learning communities? The possibilities for teachers as agents of change in schools. *British Educational Research Journal, 40*(1), 18-29. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3025

Watts, L. (2019). Reflective practice, reflexivity, and critical reflection in social work education in Australia. *Australian Social Work, 72*(1), 8-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2018.1521856

Wehlburg, C. M., & Chadwick-Blossey, S. (2004). *To Improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development, Vol. 22*. Anker Publishing.

Weisblat, G., & Sell, C. (2012). An exemplar in mentoring and professional development: Teaching graduate students transferable skills beyond the discipline. *Journal of Research Administration, 43*(1), 60-84.

Weitz, J. (1956). Job expectancy and survival. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *40*(4), 245-248. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048082

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge.* Harvard Business School Press.

Wilkerson, L., & Irby, D. M. (1998). Strategies for improving teaching practices: a comprehensive approach to faculty development. *Academic Medicine*, *73*(4), 387-96.

Wilkins, P. (1997). *Personal and professional development for counselors*. Sage.

Williams, D. I., & Irving, J. A. (1996). Personal growth: Rogerian paradoxes. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 24*(2), 165-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069889608260406

Wlodarsky, R. (2018). A structured model for reflective adult learning among university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *18*(5), 98-111. https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v18i5.589

Wolfenden, F., Adinolfi, L., & Cross, S. (2020). Exploring open digital badges in teacher education: A case study from India. *Journal of Learning for Development, 7*(1), 108-116.

Wopereis, I. G., Sloep, P. B., & Poortman, S. H. (2010). Weblogs as instruments for reflection on action in teacher education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *18*(3), 245-261.

Wygal, D. (2011). Teaching, scholarship and sharing: Perspectives on community. *Accounting Education*, *20*(3), 227-237. https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2011.581373

Xie, Q., & Luo, T. (2019). Examining user participation and network structure via an analysis of a twitter-supported conference backchannel. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 57*(5), 1160–1185.

Yilmaz, F. G. K., & Keser, H. (2016). The impact of reflective thinking activities in e-learning: A critical review of the empirical research. *Computers & Education, 95*, 163-173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.006

Yilmaz, Y., Lal, S., Tong, X. C., Howard, M., Bal, S., Bayer, I., Monteiro, S., & Chan, T. M. (2020). Technology-enhanced faculty development: Future trends and possibilities for health sciences education. *Medical Science Educator*, *30*(4), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-020-01100-1

Yoon, S. A., Miller, K., Richman, T., Wendel, D., Schoenfeld, I., Anderson, E., & Shim, J. (2020). Encouraging collaboration and building community in online asynchronous professional development: Designing for social capital. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 15*(3), 351-371. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-020-09326-2

Yoon, H. B., Shin, J. S., Lee, S. H., Kim, D. H., Sung, M., Amgalan, N., & Chinzorig, T. (2016). Transnational collaboration for faculty development in health professions education in Mongolia. *Korean Journal of Medical Education*, *28*(4), 381-390.

Zabaleta, F. (2007). The use and misuse of student evaluations of teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(1), 55-76. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510601102131

Zahorski, K. J. (2002). Nurturing scholarship through holistic faculty development: A synergistic approach. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 90*(2), 29-40. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.53

Zou, T. X. P. (2019). Community-based professional development for academics: A phenomenographic study. *Studies in Higher Education, 44*(11), 1975-1989. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1477129

APPENDICES

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter 1

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

To:	Jonna Lynn Myers
From:	Douglas J Adams, Chair IRB Expedited Review
Date:	05/04/2021
Action:	**Exemption Granted**
Action Date:	05/04/2021
Protocol #:	2103325554
Study Title:	Reflective Conversations: Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness

The above-referenced protocol has been determined to be exempt.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol that may affect the level of risk to your participants, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have any questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact the IRB Coordinator at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

cc: Carsten M Schmidtke, Key Personnel

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter 2

March 12, 2021

Ms. Jonna Myers

Re: "Reflective Conversations: Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Improve Teaching Effectiveness."

Ms. Myers,

The SWOSU Protection of Human Subjects Committee, through expedited review under 45 CFR 46.110, and with submitted revisions, has approved your research entitled: "Reflective Conversations: Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Improve Teaching Effectiveness".

It is the responsibility of the researcher to notify the committee and submit any modifications to the study protocol prior to implementation. It is also the responsibility of the researcher to submit an annual report if the study extends past a year and a final report upon completion of the protocol. IRB FORM # HS-3 is provided on the SWOSU web site for your use in completing annual and final reports. For institutional compliance and auditing purposes, you are required to maintain all records pertaining to your conducted research including any informed consent forms for three years after completion of the research. For funded research, consult the time required for retention of records by the funding agency. (SWOSU disposition policies should be used when disposing of research records.) Annual reports must be received and approved by the PHSC by the anniversary date of the original approval.

The committee wishes you success with your study.

Sincerely,

Anne Pate

Anne Pate, PhD, MPH
Co-Chair, IRB-PHS
Associate Professor, Allied Health Sciences

Cc: Dr. Jared Edwards
Jennifer Cook-Johns

Appendix B: Invitation to Participate

Hello! My name is Jonna Myers and I am pursuing an Ed.D. in Human Resource and Workforce Development from the University of Arkansas.

You are receiving this email because you participated in the inaugural class of the Excellence in Teaching Program (ETP). For my dissertation, I am exploring the role of the reflective component that was embedded into the ETP on enhancing teaching effectiveness. The findings of this study will provide direction for the developers of the ETP, and all faculty developers, on how to best craft reflection activities for faculty development initiatives that enhance collegiate level teaching practice. Thus, your participation in this study would be greatly appreciated.

If you agree to participate in this research, you will be asked to share access to the reflections that you submitted during your participation in the ETP, and to participate in two different interviews, each of which will last approximately 45 minutes. Your participation is voluntary; therefore, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

Over the course of this study, confidentiality will always be held in the highest regard and upheld. Your professional and personal information will be kept anonymous to protect your individual identity and privacy.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the me at jlm033@uark.edu. You may also contact Dr. Carsten Schmidtke, the researcher's advisor, at cswded@uark.edu.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Jonna L. Myers
Human Resource and Workforce Development
Department of Rehabilitation, Human Resources, and Communication Disorders
University of Arkansas

Appendix C: Informed Consent Document

Project Title:

Reflective Conversations: Exploring Faculty's Perceptions of Reflection to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness

Investigators:

Ms. Jonna Myers, Graduate Student
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
100 Campus Drive, Weatherford, OK 73096
Jonna.myers@swosu.edu OR Jlm033@uark.edu

Purpose:

The purpose of this project is to investigate the role of reflection in faculty development as perceived by the inaugural class of a faculty development initiative. Furthermore, this study seeks to gain a greater understanding of how faculty perceive the impact of reflection on teaching effectiveness.

Procedures:

You are invited to participate in two interviews. Questions will cover topics such as specific reflection activities, prompts, application of reflection, your roles and responsibilities as a faculty member, and teaching practices. Your responses will be recorded in writing using paper submissions, Zoom, email, and other electronic mediums for the exchange of written communication. The time commitment anticipated for each participant is approximately 2 hours.

Potential Risks and Benefits of Participation:

There are no known risks associated with this project that are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life. Additionally, no direct benefits are associated with this research. However, the results may have implications on policies, practices, and procedures regarding faculty development in colleges and universities.

Confidentiality:

Names of participants, the names of any persons mentioned in writing or in verbal conversations, and names of places will be changed to protect participant identity and maintain confidentiality. Transcripts will be created using codes that will be used solely to link the two interviews. Following the interviews, documentation connecting codes to participants will be destroyed. Original documents will be stored on Ms. Myers' computer and external hard drive, both of which are password protected.

All data and subsequent analysis will be incorporated into a larger research study that may be shared in faculty meetings, business conferences, and research journals.

Original documents will be kept for a minimum of three years following the completion of this study, as is required by state and federal regulations pertaining to research with human subjects. There are no foreseeable risks in maintaining confidentiality. After the transfer of files to the computer hard drive, original documents will be stored in a locked

file cabinet in Ms. Myers' office, which remains locked when not in use. At the end of the three-year storage period, all original and digital files will be erased and/or shredded.

All documents and other information obtained from participants will be kept confidential to the fullest extent of the law and University policy.

Compensation:

No compensation will be offered for participation in this project.

Contacts:

For questions about this research, you may contact the following person:

Dr. Carsten Schmidtke
School of Leadership and Human Resource Development
Louisiana State University
298 Coates Hall
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
cswded@uark.edu

Participant Rights:

As a participant in this project, you are entitled to know the nature of my research. You are free to decline to participate, and you are free to stop the interviews or withdraw from the project at any time. No penalty or risks are associated with withdrawing your participation. Feel free to ask any questions at any time about the nature of the research activity and the methods I am using.

Please initial next to either "Yes" or "No" to the following:

_____ Yes _____ No I consent to be audio-recorded for the interview portions of this research.

Signatures:

I, the participant, have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy of the form has been given to me.

_____

Printed Name of Participant

_____ _____

Signature of Participant Date

I, the researcher, certify that I have personally explained this document before requesting that the participant sign it.

_____ _____

Signature of Research Date

Appendix D: Semi-Structured Interview #1

1. Please tell me about your role as a faculty member.
2. How do you view your responsibilities as a teacher?
3. What are your greatest strengths as a teacher?
4. Describe your experience with the Excellence in Teaching Program (ETP).
5. There were approximately 59 personal reflection assignments embedded into your class of the ETP. What do you remember about those personal reflections?
6. Can you share specific questions that were asked or topics that were expressly mentioned in the personal reflection assignments?
7. What aspects of the personal reflections stand out as beneficial?
8. What aspects of the personal reflections stand out as unhelpful or useless?
9. Which specific ETP activities, resources, or strategies have you incorporated into your classes or overall pedagogy?
10. How did your participation in the ETP influence your approach to teaching in higher education?
11. How did your participation in the ETP shape the way you view your role as a faculty member?