

# Tracing the Evolution of Educational Development Through the POD Network's Institute for New Faculty Developers

*Michele DiPietro*

DR. MICHELE DIPIETRO IS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF STATISTICS AT KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY. HE IS A FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE POD NETWORK. HE CO AUTHORED "HOW LEARNING WORKS: 7 RESEARCH BASED PRINCIPLES FOR SMART TEACHING." HIS SCHOLARLY INTERESTS INCLUDE LEARNING SCIENCES, ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION, THE MILLENNIAL GENERATION, STATISTICS EDUCATION, THE CONSULTATION PROCESS IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, AND TEACHING IN TIMES OF TRAGEDY. HIS SCHOLARSHIP HAS BEEN TRANSLATED INTO CHINESE, ITALIAN, KOREAN, HEBREW, AND JAPANESE. HE CAN BE REACHED AT MDIPIETR@KENNESAW.EDU.

Volume 33, Issue 2, 2014

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0033.202> [<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0033.202>]

 [<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>]

## Abstract

Educational development is a unique professional field in that it is not defined by content taught in a single degree that qualifies individuals to be in it. The resulting heterogeneity in newcomers' knowledge and skills is addressed in different ways by different national networks. Since 1997, the POD Network has held a biennial Institute for New Faculty Developers, geared toward socializing new professionals into the field. An analysis of the evolution of the Institute, therefore, focused on understanding how educational development has represented itself to newcomers, can chronicle the trajectory of the field and generate conversations about its future.

**Keywords:** new developers, history, professionalization of educational development

The POD network is going through momentous changes. A new strategic plan, a new website, a new format for our flagship journals—all these changes are sure to have a tremendous impact on the field of educational development. Because of these changes, and in consideration of the fact that educational development recently reached its 50th anniversary in the US, it is a good time to take stock of the current state of the field. Others have written histories of the field (Tiberius, 2001, Sorcinelli, et al. 2006, Ouellett, 2010); therefore, I will take a different approach here.

My point of departure will be the familiar challenge in trying to describe our profession to strangers. From the cringe inducing "teach the teachers" to the vague "change agent," we all run into the challenge of representing our field and its permeable boundaries. Even very elegant definitions, such as "a profession dedicated to helping colleges and universities function effectively as teaching and learning communities" (Felten et al., 2007) could equally apply to student affairs professionals and other realms in higher education. Part of the challenge is that our field does not have an official qualification for it, like a degree or a certification, therefore there is no agreed upon body of knowledge or expertise that defines it. This creates tremendous (and valuable) heterogeneity at the outset for those entering the field (McDonald & Stockley, 2011). A possible answer to the question of where educational development is going can be gleaned by looking at how the field socializes newcomers into it and how it represents itself to them. Separate national networks answer this question differently. For instance, the UK network, SEDA, offers a certification program (see [http://www.seda.ac.uk/pdf.html?p=3\\_1\\_10](http://www.seda.ac.uk/pdf.html?p=3_1_10) [[https://www.seda.ac.uk/pdf.html?p=3\\_1\\_10](https://www.seda.ac.uk/pdf.html?p=3_1_10)]). Japan, on the other hand, has made faculty development mandatory in every university in 2008, but has left universities free to decide how they will carry out the mandate, resulting in certain challenges of identity and socialization of young professionals into the field (Sato, 2013).

The POD Network socializes and professionalizes newcomers into the field through the Institute for New Faculty Developers (INFD). The Institute hosts must follow the guidelines set forth in the call for proposals, but have considerable latitude in achieving the goals of the Institute. This has resulted in an

event that has evolved significantly since its inception. There has been interest in adopting several features of the Institute by networks from other countries, such as Japan (Fink, 2013) and Australia (Goody, 2014). I will attempt to chart the evolving frontier of educational development by looking at the evolution of INFD through the years.

This article is not a longitudinal study or metaanalysis of INFD. The Institute has changed so much in so many dimensions that direct comparisons are not possible. Furthermore, the availability of data varies across the years. For instance, some of the organizations that hosted INFD (i.e., the Institute for the Advancement of Teaching in Higher Education [IATHE] and the Collaboration for the Advancement of College Teaching and Learning [Collaboration]) are now defunct, creating difficulties in accessing some of the data for those Institutes. Given these constraints, this paper is structured more as a reflective essay from the perspective of a former president of POD and director of two Institutes, who served two terms on the Core committee at a time when key conversations about future directions of INFD were happening. The essay will rely on the data made available by the POD network and former directors, past POD newsletters, and other documents identified through Internet searches.

This article is divided in six sections. The first section offers a brief history of INFD and its incarnations. The second section reviews INFD goals to look at enduring and emerging concerns in the field. The third section looks at specific session titles and content in order to track trends. The fourth section examines how criteria for the selection of INFD faculty have evolved. The fifth section examines INFD participant profiles. The sixth section concludes the paper contextualizing the themes from the previous sections in the current higher education context.

## INFD: History and Evolution

The first National Institute for New Faculty Developers was held in 1997 at University of Delaware. The Institute was denoted “National” to underscore the reach and to denote prestige for the individuals and institutions selected to run it in partnership with the POD Network. From its inception, it was conceived as a weeklong event (four and a half days in the summer to be precise), with a mix of faculty from the host institution and nationally recognized developers in the field. Faculty receive no honorarium for their participation. Originally, it was an event repeated every three years, back at the University of Delaware in 2000, and at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) in 2003, but in 2005, again hosted by IUPUI, it became a biennial event. In 2007, the Institute was hosted in Canada, in a partnership between the University of Ottawa, the University of Waterloo, and the IATHE. Because of the change in nation, the institute was renamed International Institute for New Faculty Developers, and it had a mix of faculty from Canada and from the US. In 2009, the Institute was held in Indianapolis, hosted by the Collaboration. Because of the Collaboration’s emphasis on minority serving institutions (HBCUs, HIS and Tribal Colleges) the institute was renamed back to National Institute for New Faculty Developers, and co sponsored by the HBCU Faculty Development Network. In 2011, Kennesaw State University (KSU) hosted the Institute in Atlanta. KSU emphasizes “global learning” in its Quality Enhancement Plan, therefore the organizers decided to emphasize comparative practices in faculty development worldwide, and again renamed it International Institute for New Faculty Developers. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia provided a generous scholarship for 21 developers in Georgia to attend the Institute. During the following year, POD’s Professional Development Committee and the Core Committee decided to review the goals and vision for the institute in order to settle on a permanent name and model for the institute. The Professional Development Committee noted that the reputation of the event was sufficiently established by its longevity and it no longer needed to be qualified as either National or International. It also recommended that the 2011 model be used for future iterations of the Institute and that pertinent documents from 2011 (proposal, budget, assessments) be made available in future calls to host. In 2013, the institute was accordingly renamed “Institute for New Faculty Developers” and again hosted by Kennesaw State University, co sponsored by Wiley Learning Institute. By this year, what were natural emphases in previous Institutes diversity in 2009, international practices in 2011 crystallized in an official theme, “*Theory•Research•Praxis*,” underscoring the research base of the field.

## INFD: Goals and Learning Outcomes

The major goal of the Institute is to socialize newcomers into the ethos of the field, and to endow them with the knowledge and skills they need to be successful. Through the years, a clarification and a detailing of what this means has gradually happened, and additional goals have been added on. The stated goals of the first Institute were as follows:

- Answer the questions asked by new faculty developers
- Place faculty developers at ease in their positions
- Get them started effectively in conducting instructional development activities on their campuses.

These goals were operationalized in the following learning outcomes:

- Acquire the conceptual framework and basic skills needed to establish and run faculty development programs and activities
- Design and implement instructional development activities that appropriately meet the needs of your home institution.

These goals were established when POD was still a relatively small organization, holding conferences in resorts, and putting a strong emphasis in helping institutions start centers, or perhaps programs run by a faculty development committee if a center was not financially viable. The goals attend to cognitive dimensions (acquiring a knowledge and skill base) as well as affective dimensions (putting new developers at ease in their role). They also reflect a contextual orientation (fitting programs to institutional needs), which has been a hallmark of the field from its inception. The goals/learning outcomes stayed relatively unchanged until 2009, when they were expressed as:

- Gain the conceptual framework and basic knowledge and skills needed to establish, manage, evaluate, and improve successful professional development programs focused on strengthening teaching and learning
- Learn how to build participation, allies, and collaborative partners, to provide meaningful programming with limited resources, and to contribute to institutional priorities and development
- Develop an initial, practical action plan to meet the needs of your home institution
- Discover resources available to help in your work and sustain your own professional development

In this formulation we see the emergence of the need to make participants leave with a plan of action, to consolidate the learning that occurred during the event, and to keep momentum going.

Starting in 2011, and continuing in 2013, new goals have accrued onto the original set. The most recent articulation is as follows:

- Give participants access to relevant bodies of literature
- Help participants develop basic skills (about conducting instructional consultations, SGIDS etc.)
- Develop a sense of cohort among new developers
- Plug newcomers into the field by intense networking with established practitioners
- Provide resources and tools to develop, run, and evaluate programs
- Establish a research orientation to faculty and organizational development
- Raise awareness about institutional dynamics and the importance of strategic thinking and planning in positioning the center for long term viability on campus

The goals were operationalized in the following learning outcomes:

- Discuss the broad strokes of several theories (learning theory, assessment, organizational development, etc.)
- Articulate the importance of taking a research oriented approach to faculty development
- Conduct consultations, classroom observations, SGIDS, etc.
- Gain confidence in their ability to do so

- List several people (participants and faculty) who would be good resources for specific issues
- Set and achieve individual goals for themselves
- Develop a personal action plan for the first year, including initiatives and opportunities for further development

We see the persistence of both the cognitive dimensions and affective dimensions. In addition, we see a metacognitive emphasis, that of strategic thinking, reflecting the concerns of the field following the shuttering of several centers. Part of the strategic dimension is the emphasis on research based principles. This new articulation is grounded in POD's current strategic plan, particularly goal #4: Advancing evidence based practice among our members. Establishing a strong research orientation, and a practice grounded in empirically gathered evidence is part of the ongoing professionalization of the field and it is also needed to maintain relevance.

### INFD: The Sessions

How have these goals/outcomes been achieved? From the beginning, the Institute has relied on formal and informal opportunities for learning and networking in workshops, one on one mentoring opportunities, and communal meals. In addition, INFD 2007 relied on a keynote speaker and INFD 2009 employed permanent process groups through the week. Through the years, participants have also received common resources, such as "POD: A Handbook for New Practitioners (Wadsworth, 1988) in the initial Institutes, or "Creating the Future of Faculty Development" (Sorcinelli et al., 2006), "A Guide to Faculty Development" (Gillespie, Robertson, & Associates, 2010), "How Learning Works: 7 Research Based Principles for Smart Teaching" (Ambrose et al., 2010) and "Theory •Research•Praxis" *Institute for New Faculty Developers Resource Book*" (DiPietro, 2013).

Of course, it is interesting to compare the structured sessions to see how those have evolved. The first Institute was organized around 11 sessions/topics, represented in Table 1. Represented in the program, we see the usual fare of services and programs, such as consultations, as well as a commitment to listen to students' experiences through SGIDs, focus groups etc. The session on graduate student programs reflects the national movement to prepare graduate students to teach, expressed by programs such as Preparing Future Faculty. Notice that the seed of using research on teaching and learning to design our programs is there from the very beginning of INFD. And finally, the session about reflecting on our practice embodies the ethos of the field as progressive refinement.

**Table 1. Session titles for INFD 1997**

Sessions/Topics for INFD 1997
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploring the roles and impact of faculty development</li> <li>• Establishing programs</li> <li>• Designing instructional development activities</li> <li>• Forming partnerships with faculty, administrators, and staff</li> <li>• Consulting with faculty</li> <li>• Integrating research on teaching and learning</li> <li>• Learning from students' perceptions</li> <li>• Reflecting on our practice</li> <li>• Preparing graduate students to teach</li> <li>• Exploring the relationship with teaching, learning, and technology</li> <li>• Utilizing faculty development resources</li> </ul>

In addition to the previous sessions, and to the cognitive and affective dimensions, the year 2000 sees the emergence of the moral dimension with a session on the ethical dimensions of faculty development. The networking aspect of INFD becomes formalized in a session. Signature pedagogies such as active,

collaborative, and problem based learning get a dedicated session. Running workshops, another staple of the field, gets its own session. A session on evaluating teaching is introduced, at a time when institutions were pioneering moves to online student evaluations or generally redefining their faculty evaluation plans. It is also important to note that, while sessions on integrating technology were ahead of the curve in the early years (as a comparison, Blackboard was founded in 1997), they focused more on making a case for integrating technology, and were met with skepticism by several participants (Garrison, 2000). And finally, a session on creating an individualized professional development plan that each participant will take back to campus is introduced, realizing several POD values. It promotes reflection. It creates the synthesis and integration of a week's worth of material, attending to both cognitive and motivational considerations about the learning accrued and the value added through the week. It puts participants in control of the consequences of their learning. And it models active engagement, our foremost recommendation to the instructors we work with.

The next two iterations of INFD, both held at IUPUI, take two major themes of the field that have threaded through the program so far, and elevate them as stand alone sessions. One is diversity and inclusion in faculty development, both as a topic and a process. The other is assessment, as a theory and as a practice, which developers need to understand to support their own faculty, as well as to document their own impact.

In 2007, INFD becomes international in Canada, with faculty from Canada, the US, and the United Kingdom (see next section). This means that even enduring topics might be addressed by faculty from a different educational development tradition, thus adding additional perspectives. This Institute is structured more like a conference, with a keynote and a combination of plenary and concurrent sessions, to allow participants to customize their experience. In addition, INFD starts going “meta” and reflecting on itself, with a session addressing pathways to the profession (McDonald & Stockley, 2011).

Back in the US in 2009, INFD retains the plenary and concurrent session combination, but adds base groups in order to promote networking and mentoring. Base groups stay together for the whole week and have frequent dedicated time on the program, in the form of six reflective pauses to consolidate learning. A major emphasis of this institute is cohort programming, reflecting an understanding that faculty respond well to programs tailored to their needs. Sessions about understanding our clients and their needs, designing and conducting needs assessments, designing and managing learning communities, working with new faculty, working with mid career and senior faculty, stem from that understanding and are grounded in influential contemporary studies (Baldwin, 2008). Similarly, the well established student motivation session gets a mirror session in 2009, that of faculty motivation and engagement in learning. Another thread of this institute is that of offering some organizational development sessions, such as one on the role of educational development leaders in building learning centered institutions, and one on creating institutional culture of teaching and learning. Early discussions on the Core committee identified INFD as addressing the professional development aspect, leaving the organizational development aspect for a future event to be planned in the off year from the institute. This has recently materialized with the POD Leadership Development Institute, started in 2012, which addresses one specific area of organizational development beyond instructional development (and separately with the Organizational Development Institute held in collaboration with AAC&U at their conference). At the same time, INFD has crystallized the notion that most developers attend to both aspects most of the time (Schroeder, 2011), and that the distinction between the two areas blurs, and it has evolved accordingly.

In 2011, we see the emergence of new topical issues: Undergraduate Research and other high impact practices, following the release of the LEAP report (Kuh, 2008), and a session on Millennial students and generational theory. A session on maximizing the impact of the teaching center website acknowledges the new delivery format for the “Age of the Network” (Sorcinelli et al., 2006). Other sessions embrace the expansion of TLC roles beyond pure teaching and learning, such as Supporting faculty through the promotion and tenure process, and Leadership development for department chairs. A subset of concurred sessions is aimed at specific participant subgroups, such as those doing educational development at small colleges, or center directors, (fundraising and a panel of experienced directors). Finally, sessions about

developing one's own philosophy and identity in faculty development, and staying up to date with the field make a case for the ongoing professionalization of developers.

The most recent iteration in 2013 was organized around 10 plenary sessions and 30 concurrent sessions (see Table 2). Sessions on new formats continue to be incorporated, such as hybrid or online workshops, multi day institutes, and using Faculty Fellows in addition to full time staff. Also in terms of format, some of the sessions were offered as “walking workshops,” a format that won the POD innovation award for its ability to incorporate concerns about sustainability, work/life balance and holistic approaches (Ross, 2011). The track for new directors continues to expand, with a session on strategic planning. A session on supporting fixed term faculty addresses the national exploding growth of contingent faculty. Another session on publishing in the field, run by editors of national and international educational development journal, is aimed at making participants feel like contributors to the field from the beginning of their career, not just passive consumers. It also reinforces a conception of educational development as a scholarly field with a strong theoretical and empirical basis, setting the standards for what good scholarship in it entails, in accordance with POD's strategic plan.

**Table 2. Session titles for INFD 2013**

Plenary sessions for INFD 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational Development Programs</li> <li>• Introduction to Learning Theory</li> <li>• Consultation Basics I &amp; II</li> <li>• Course Design for the Faculty Developer</li> <li>• Planning and Facilitating Memorable Workshops</li> <li>• Introduction to Assessment for New Faculty Developers</li> <li>• Assessing Our Programs and Centers</li> <li>• Organizational Development Theory: Institutional Change</li> <li>• Developing an Individualized Professional Development Plan</li> </ul>
Concurrent Sessions for INFD 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to Motivation Theory</li> <li>• Addressing the Needs of Different Faculty Audiences</li> <li>• Intentional Technology Decisions: Choosing Tools Wisely</li> <li>• Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</li> <li>• Starting &amp; Sustaining Teaching &amp; Learning Programs at Small Colleges</li> <li>• Graduate Student Professional Development Programs</li> <li>• Using Small Group Instructional Diagnosis</li> <li>• Programming for Incoming Faculty: Orientation &amp; Beyond</li> <li>• Faculty Learning Communities</li> <li>• Riding the Wave of Institutional Initiatives and Trends in Higher Education</li> <li>• Supporting Faculty through the Promotion and Tenure Process with the Academic Portfolio and more</li> <li>• Understanding and Appropriately Using Student Evaluations of Teaching</li> <li>• Supporting Fixed Term Faculty</li> <li>• Effective Teaching Strategies: A Workshop Toolkit</li> <li>• Working Strategically with Your Institution</li> <li>• Intro to Generational and Millennial Students</li> <li>• Utilizing Faculty Fellows</li> </ul>

- Multi day Institutes
- Diversity in Faculty Development
- Introduction to Student Development Theory
- Staying up to date with the field/Publishing in the Field
- Maximizing the Impact of the Teaching Center Website
- Leadership Development for Department Chairs
- Conducting Classroom Observations
- Raising and Managing Funds for your Center
- Alternative Delivery Formats for Faculty Development Sessions
- Model for Developing a Reflective Philosophy of Practice
- Introduction to Strategic Planning
- Panel: Directing and Starting Centers
- Panel: Insights from New Developers

A side by side comparison of Tables 1 and 2 visually demonstrates the growth in the program in 16 years, reflecting both the evolution of the field, and the maturation of the organization in understanding the needs of its members and addressing them.

### INFD: The Faculty

Connected to the growth in content, INFD has experienced a growth in the number of faculty involved. Starting with eight faculty members in 1997, the most recent one included 20 faculty, with a peak of 22 faculty in 2011. Typically, faculty come from the host institution as well as from POD. From the beginning, the faculty featured in the Institute have been prominent figures in the field, both as experts and as mentors, but in 2011 the Institute articulated a set of criteria for the selection of the faculty, as shown in Table 3. Not all criteria will be represented in each faculty, but the goal is to build a portfolio of faculty who collectively represent the criteria, which are informed by the values in POD's strategic plan (especially visibility, evidence based practice, and commitment to diversity). Having INFD faculty who have moved up in leadership positions on campus (such as associate provosts) is important for two reasons. These roles are involved in campus wide change initiatives, and thus have experience with organizational development. Additionally, they provide participants with models of career development in a field that does not have a predetermined path.

**Table 3. Criteria for selection of Institute faculty in 2011 13**

The portfolio of INFD faculty represents developers who:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serve or have served on Core</li> <li>• Serve or have served as President of POD (or President Elect)</li> <li>• Are steeped in the learning sciences and ground their educational development work in research and evidence</li> <li>• Have shaped the field through their publications and scholarly work</li> <li>• Are editors of faculty development journals and can encourage participants to write in the field</li> <li>• Have moved up in leadership positions on campus and thus can speak to working with the administration strategically and to organizational development</li> <li>• Have international experience and can speak to a potentially international audience of new developers</li> <li>• Have experience founding a center and embedding it in the institutional culture</li> <li>• Have a strong commitment to diversity issues</li> </ul>

Some of the faculty in recent years have been international, thus providing a broader perspective. In 2007, INFD invited faculty from Canada, the US and the UK. In 2011, INFD faculty came from the US, Canada, Australia and Israel (the latter two being former presidents of those national networks). Unfortunately, the international travel expenses are not sustainable and go against the goal of minimizing cost for participants.

Because of the heterogeneity of the faculty, INFD recognized the need to bring everybody on the same page and has incorporated, since 2007, a faculty day, held the day before INFD officially begins. This gives faculty time to meet in person, harmonize with respect to the ethos and culture of the Institute, and finalize the last minute details with their co presenters.

Finally, the three Presidents of POD (elect, current, and past) have been included on the faculty by default since 2011. This practice is meant to connect the new cohort of developers with the leadership, and to encourage participants getting involved with the structures of POD (committees, interest groups, conference) from the very beginning, fostering the POD value of distributed leadership.

### INFD: The Participants

As the field has grown and the Institute has increased in complexity, the size of the event hasn't always kept pace proportionally. Table 4 reports the number of participants for the years in which this information is available. Attendance increased overall in the beginning, to a peak of 107 participants in 2007 in Canada. Unfortunately, it dipped to 32 participants in 2009, probably because of the collapse of the US economy (the POD conference also experienced a contraction in 2008 and 2009). It rose again to 84 in 2011, in part thanks to the scholarship of the State System of Georgia, which sponsored attendance for 21 participants, and it stayed at the same level in 2013 even when that scholarship wasn't renewed. Data about the composition of this group is not available from the beginning, but the final two iterations offer a snapshot of the participants.

**Table 4. Number of INFD participants per year**

Year	Attendance
2000	59
2003	72
2005	70
2007	107
2009	32
2011	84
2013	81

Even at a first glance, the configuration of practitioners in the field is variegated. Recent participants have included faculty developers in a center, faculty members serving on faculty development committees, administrators such as assistant/associate provosts, instructional designers, instructional technologists in technology centers, assessment specialists, and directors of centers. Most participants are either new, or in a new role at an existing center, in contrast from early versions of the Institute that focused on starting new programs and centers. However, about 15% of participants include institutional teams coming to the institute to bring back momentum on campus to start a center. One team in the last Institute came with the intent to learn how to revive a defunct center, but that number is too small to indicate whether this represents a trend reversal in the closing of centers that we have witnessed in the last decade.

Even more interestingly, the last two institutes have seen the flourishing of an international audience. A small number of international participants attended INFD from the very first year, but that percentage grew in 2007, when the Institute was designated as international. The internationalization of INFD has continued in 2011 and persisted even when the International designation was dropped from the name in 2013. To date, we have documented participation of individuals or teams from 15 nations beyond the US and Canada (Australia, Iraq, Japan, Kurdistan, Liberia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of South Africa, Slovakia, South Korea, Switzerland, Turkey, and United Arab Emirates).



Participants from many of these nations come with a unique goal. Educational development is not established in those nations, so in addition to the nuts and bolts of the field, they want to learn to articulate a rationale for the importance of educational development that they can take back home and use to start a national movement.

Experience in the field is another interesting variable to look at. While the institute is nominally geared toward those new to the field, the last two Institutes have identified three distinct subgroups. About 60% of participants are new to the field, from a few weeks to up to two years into. Given that the institute has biennial frequency, this sizable group captures all the new hires since the last institute. A second group is comprised of those who are not technically in the field yet. They might have been hired conditionally on attending the institute, or they are trying to position themselves for a career change. The final group is made up of those with more than two years of experience in the field. Many of those have been promoted to directors and are interested in developing new managerial and strategic skills. But many others are just regular educational developers (with up to 15 years of experience in the field) who still find value in reflecting and exchanging perspectives with faculty and other participants. In fact, a small number of participants are repeat attendees from a previous institute, who, in their final evaluations, articulated a thirst for professional development opportunities for mid career developers.

Participants bring a predictable set of goals and expectations to the Institute. They expect to learn new knowledge and develop practical skills, connect with both faculty and other participants, and learn how to apply general ideas to their institutional context. Interestingly, past needs assessment conducted before the institute revealed the expectation held by some participants that most of the information would be passed on in sessions, and that they would learn by listening. Accordingly, these participants didn't value the one on one mentoring sessions with faculty as much as the structured sessions, especially if they had never been to a POD conference before. This expectation has implications not only for the tone and climate in the institute, but also for how these developers will facilitate workshops on campus, and therefore it must be addressed directly during the institute. Fortunately, final assessments of the institute show that people consistently come around to a more active approach.

On the emotional side, most participants bring considerable anxiety about their ability to be successful in their new roles. From its inception, INFD has explicitly addressed this anxiety as part of its goals, and anonymous evaluation comments through the week reveal more positive and confident attitudes by the end (e.g., "I learned that I am not alone," or "I learned that I might just be able to do this job!").

## Conclusion

The evolution of INFD chronicles educational development's response to the shifts happening in higher education, such as changes in the student body, pressures for accountability in student learning, and financial concerns and competition by the for profit sector. Higher education has responded by leveraging advances in the learning sciences and new technologies on one hand, and by shifting the roles and structure of the professoriate. Already in 2006, Sorcinelli et al. wisely pointed out that, to thrive in this new landscape, educational developers will increasingly have to "connect, communicate, and collaborate to meet the challenge of how to do more with less while simultaneously maintaining excellence" (p. 158).

This means a) reducing cost by embracing sustainable practices, b) becoming increasingly more self sustaining, and c) making a compelling case for the centrality and value added of educational development. We need to respond with a renewed emphasis on evidence based practice, pedagogical interventions with proven impact, and convincing metrics of our work and results. At the same time, we need to weave ourselves at the core of our institutions, by expanding its offerings beyond instructional support to supporting faculty across the career span—from graduate students to new faculty to the tenure and promotion process, to fixed term faculty and to mid career faculty and chairs and administrators. In addition, educational development needs to expand our scope beyond working with individual instructors and get involved in strategic initiatives around teaching and learning, whether it be accreditation initiatives, quality enhancement plans, general education, or program reviews.

The scale and decentralized nature of the higher education landscape in the US make it unlikely we will develop a certification program like in the UK; therefore we will continue to need mechanisms for the ongoing professionalization and socialization of new developers along these vectors. This analysis proves that INFD has matured over the years and has evolved to a solid model, as evidenced by the desire of other national networks to emulate it, and by the decision of the Professional Development Committee to recommend a specific structure. It is robust, yet flexible and reflexive enough to continue to incorporate emerging concerns and translate them into portable programs.

## Author Note

I wish to thank Hoag Holmgren and the POD Network for making archival INFD documents available.

## References

- Ambrose, S., Bridges, M., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M., and Norman, M. (2010). *How learning works: 7 research based principles for smart teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Baldwin, R., DeZure, D., Shaw, A., and Moretto, K. (2008). Mapping the Terrain of Mid career Faculty at a Research University. *Change*, 40(5), 46–55.
- DiPietro, M. (Ed.) (2013). “Theory•Research•Praxis” Institute for New Faculty Developers Resource Book. Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Kennesaw State University.
- Felten, P. Kalish, A., Pingree, A., and Plank, K. (2007). Toward a scholarship of teaching and learning in educational development. *To Improve the Academy*, 25, 93–108.
- Fink, D. (2013). Personal communication to the Core Committee.
- Garrison, B. (2000). Educators learn all about faculty development, *UpDate*, 19(37). Available online at <http://www.udel.edu/PR/UpDate/00/37/educators.html>  
[<https://www.udel.edu/PR/UpDate/00/37/educators.html>]
- Gillespie, K., Robertson, D. and Associates (2010). *A guide to faculty development (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Goody, A. (2014). Personal communication to the author.
- Kuh, G. (2008). High Impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- McDonald, J., and Stockley, D. (Eds.) (2011). *Pathways to the Profession of Educational Development. New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 122. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ouellett, M. (2010). Overview of Faculty Development: History and Choices. In K. Gillespie and D. Robertson (Eds.) *A guide to faculty development (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ross, C. (2011). Pedometers and Pedagogy. Poster presented at the 36<sup>th</sup> Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education Conference, Atlanta.
- Sato, Machi. (2013). Younger faculty, Identity, and Careers in Japan. In L. Gornall, C. Cook, L. Daunton, J. Salisbury, and B. Thomas, (Eds.) *Academic Working Lives: Experience, Practice and Change*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Schroeder, C. (Ed.) (2011). *Coming in from the margins: Faculty Development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., and Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning From the Past, Understanding the Present*. Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Tiberius, R. (2001). A brief history of faculty development: Implications for teachers and developers. *To Improve the Academy*, 20, 20–37.
- Wadsworth, E. (1988). *POD: A handbook for new practitioners*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

