

Attitude of Faculty Members towards Faculty Development Programs and their Perceived Outcomes

Devkant Kala

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management
& Business Studies Uttarakhand University,
Dehradun

D.S. Chaubey

Professor, Department of
Management, Uttarakhand
University, Dehradun

Abstract

A confluence of social, economic and global forces in the knowledge-driven economy pose new challenges to the nation's vitality and make clear the need for higher education institutions (HEIs) to assume new responsibilities. In view of this, faculty development is considered as an enduring process that enhances the productivity of academics for helping faculty to play their instructional, professional, and organizational roles effectively. It promotes academic excellence and innovation, sharpens conceptual, human, and technical skills of faculty and enables academic institutions to produce employable graduates. Faculty development programs (FDPs) are a means to expose the faculty in higher education to review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching; and by which they acquire and develop their knowledge, skills and attitudes. The present study investigated the attitude of 124 faculty members, working in professional institutes of Dehradun, the state capital of Uttarakhand, towards FDPs and their perceived outcomes. Using factor analysis methods, researchers identify five important factors related to faculty attitude for such development programs. Researchers also attempt to examine possible outcomes and obstacles in attending such programs.

Key Words:

Higher Education Institutions, Faculty Development Programs, Attitude, Perceived Outcomes

Introduction

Higher education is becoming a major driver of economic competitiveness in an increasingly knowledge-driven global economy. Contemporary society world-wide has high expectations of the contribution that HEIs can make in helping people learn to live with change, to lead change, to manage change and to support improvement in all spheres of life. As higher education systems grow and diversify, society is increasingly concerned about the quality of programs and seeks 'excellence' across all higher education roles such as community engagement and leadership, research and innovation, and teaching and learning (Jaiswal, 2015). However, higher education has undergone a great deal of changes in terms of growing diversity of students, pedagogical advances, changes in expectations about the quality and

assessment of education, rapid changes in information and technology and their impacts on teaching and learning, corporate style management, nature and value of assessment and paradigms about teaching and learning. These challenges put extra pressure and responsibility on the shoulder of policy makers and have made academic institutions and faculty members to reconsider not only the importance of the content they are teaching, but also the effectiveness of their teaching methods based on students' learning (Millis, 1994; Malik, 2009; Mugimu and Ezati, 2010). The basic model of teaching changed from teaching as transmission of content to teaching as the facilitation of learning and faculty development initiatives have emerged in response to these challenges (Chism, Lees and Evenbeck, 2002).

In order to achieve meaningful educational reform, faculty development initiatives emerged as a key factor which helps faculty members to fulfill their multiple roles effectively. Faculty development programs (FDPs) encompass all those activities and strategies that educational institutions use to renew or assist faculty in their roles, and include initiatives designed to improve professional and pedagogical competence of faculty members in teaching and learning, curriculum design and delivery, student assessment and program evaluation, research, leadership administration and career management (Wilkerson and Irby, 1998). It is a tool for improving educational vitality of academic institutions through attention to competencies needed by individual faculty and to institutional policies required to promote academic excellence. These activities include workshops, seminars, short courses, quality improvement programs, fellowships and other longitudinal programs. Many of these activities have been designed to improve teacher effectiveness across various disciplines at local, regional and national levels. It promotes improvement in the institution in large part through helping individuals to evolve, unfold, mature, grow, cultivate, produce and develop themselves as individuals and as contributors to the institution's mission. Faculty members are the most important factor for enhancing and maintaining academic excellence and innovation in HEIs. These programs enhance necessary skills of faculty members and enable them to work more effectively (Prachyapruit, 2001).

Given the unprecedented growth occurring in higher education, attention to the topic of faculty development is not only timely, but warranted. With this article we attempt to examine the attitude of faculty members towards faculty development activities, factors influencing their active participation and their perceived outcomes in academic and administrative performance. The present study adds in the area of quality improvement initiatives in Indian HEIs by providing empirical evidence of faculty attitude towards ongoing FDPs. The

remainder of this study is organized as follows. First, literature review was discussed. The description of research methodology, questionnaire development, and data collection process are discussed in the next section followed by empirical results, discussion and conclusion. The findings this study would provide valuable information from the perspectives of the faculty with respect to FDPs as well as other factors that have contributed to or hindered their professional success in academia.

Literature Review

Faculty development represents an investment in human capital in which the return on investment will be received in the form of an improved institution over time (Daigle and Jarmon, 1997). Faculty development is justified because it is expected to result in improved teaching performance and better learning outcomes for students by developing of innovative teaching skills or assessment techniques, adopting better ways of designing curricula, new ways of thinking about the student–faculty relationship, enhancing faculty commitment and providing professional growth of faculty members. These programs create a climate where recognition, institutional support and professional development can be addressed and are believed as useful instrument in building harmony, generating support and enthusiasm, implementing change initiatives and enhancing organizational capabilities (Rodgers, Christie and Wideman, 2014). Faculty development activities can be categorized into four clusters namely; professional, instructional, curricular, and organizational development (Millis, 1994; Wilkerson and Irby, 1998). Professional development promotes the expertise of faculty members within their discipline-oriented activities. Instructional development improves the faculty's ability to teach more effectively. Curriculum development is aimed at evaluating or revising the curriculum. Finally, organizational development engages faculty members in improving their institution and its environment for teaching and decision-making.

Latchem et al. (2006) observed with the exponential expansion of higher education, faculty members are expected to embrace new forms of educational delivery such as open, distance, blended and work-based learning and master the latest tools and methodologies of information and communication technology to teach students from non-traditional backgrounds with a wide range of motivations and abilities. They found that there is little in the way of systematic professional development to prepare faculty members for contemporary pedagogical challenges in universities. Researchers including Postareff et al. (2007), Stes et al. (2007), Tynan and Garbett, (2007), Ahlberg, (2008),

Hussain et al (2010) and Henard and Roseveare (2012) highlighted the trend that is becoming widespread around the world of training university teachers in order to improve their pedagogical thinking and skills. Goody (2007) confirms that nearly 75 percent of Australian universities offer teaching preparation activities which require staff to participate in them. He identified foundation programs as formal programs that induct and develop university teachers with the aim of fostering and supporting the quality of teaching and learning in the university. **Hussain et al. (2010) and Nandan et al., (2010)** supported the relevance of development programs for enhancing the effectiveness of faculty members of HEIs. They revealed that such enhancement activities improve classroom teaching, researching abilities, networking and administrative abilities of faculty members required to discharge their responsibilities more perfectly.

Mestry, Hendricks and Bisschoff (2009) concluded that professional development, as an aspect of integrated quality management system, can be a powerful strategy to improve knowledge and skills of faculty members in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Faculty members need to develop themselves professionally in their knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to improve their overall performance. Steinert et al. (2006) found that faculty members report a positive change in attitudes towards teaching as well as knowledge about educational principles and specific teaching behaviors at McGill University, Canada. They advocated that such programs increase personal interest and enthusiasm, improve self-confidence, enhance the greater sense of belonging to a community, and educational leadership and innovation. Hess (2006) found that FDPs increase the awareness of teaching philosophy and behavior, impart the knowledge of teaching and learning principles, develop enthusiasm and passion for teaching, build confidence in teaching and share information about new teaching methodologies. Organizing such activities in regular interval and with the help of experts in order to enhance their effectiveness and perceived outcomes was also suggested. Komba and Nkumbi (2008) found that faculty members and educational institutions perceive importance of such programs in improving the performance of faculty members professionally, academically and technically.

Kabakçi and Odabaşı (2008) and Ngala and Odebero (2010) revealed that these programs improve job performance skills, extend experience of faculty for career development or promotion purposes, develop professional knowledge and understanding of faculty in order to fulfill his responsibilities more effectively, promote job satisfaction, develop enhanced view of their job, enable them to anticipate and prepare for change, and

make them feel willing and competent to contribute positively to the development of institution. Boyden (2000), Lindbeck and Darnell (2008) and Murray (2008) advocated that FDPs provide opportunity to new faculty to interact with experienced and peer faculty members and consequently reduces time required for new faculty to develop as fully functioning members of the academic team. Henard and Roseveare (2012) examined twenty nine HEIs of ten countries and revealed that mandatory faculty development activities for enhancing skills, knowledge and research assignment are organized internally for improving quality of teaching and research, and uses as criteria for promotion at various academic levels. MacKinnon (2003) investigated attitudes of pharmacy educators towards FDPs and found that major motivating factors for attending programs are to improve teaching, research skills, and quality of work. However, faculty members were not positive toward the level of mentoring, ongoing institutional support and financial aspects involved in attending such activities. Kabakçi and Odabaşı (2008), Lindbeck and Darnell (2008), Murray (2008) and Ngala and Odebero (2010) recommended that institutions also encourage faculty members to attend such programs by granting paid study leave and providing adequate time and financial support.

Olatunji (2013) investigated the availability systematic pedagogical competences programs for lecturers in the universities of ten countries in Africa namely: Botswana, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia, Namibia, Tanzania, Cameroon, South Africa, Nigeria and Ghana. He found that only 20% Universities have such programs in place for improvement of teaching competency and cover areas such as e-teaching, e-learning, ethics and code of teaching, general teaching methods, research supervision skills and students' support. Unfortunately, these programs are not given weightage while recruiting faculty members for Universities. Puri et al. (2012) attempted to examine the perception of faculty members towards faculty development initiatives at small teaching institutions of USA using motivation-hygiene theory. They found that lack of comprehensive faculty development opportunities, time conflicts, work pressure and lack of institutional support influence the faculty participation in such programs. The study of Seyoum (2014) in Ethiopia found that organizational and personal factors such as leadership support, provision of time and resource, work load, professional experiences of faculty members and their academic rank influence faculty members to participate in faculty professional competence development programs. Komba and Nkumbi (2008), Hussain et al. (2010) and Nandan et al., (2010) also identified inadequate weightage of FDPs in promotion, insufficient support and motivation, poor coordination and lack of budgets for poor faculty

preference for participating in such quality improvement activities.

Objectives of the Study

In order to analyze attitudes of faculty members towards FDPs, their perceived outcomes and factors leading to failure of such programs, this study is carried out with following objectives:

- ▶ To examine the attitude of faculty members towards various dimensions of FDPs.
- ▶ To examine the level of improvement as perceived by faculty members in their teaching, research and administrative skills through participating in FDPs.
- ▶ To examine the factors which lead to the failure of FDPs.

Research Methodology

The population for this study was Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and various other academic staffs, working in professional institutes of Dehradun, the state capital of Uttarakhand. The survey was based on the visit to professional institutes for interaction with randomly chosen academic staff members with judgmental sampling. As a result, 124 teaching professionals of well-known professional institutions were identified and the survey instrument was distributed to them. A structured questionnaire was developed to collect data on the variables in this study. The questionnaire included over 40 items that were related to the attitude of faculty members towards various dimensions of faculty development initiatives. Questionnaire was divided into two parts (Part A and B). Part A deals with demographical and professional characteristics of faculty members such as age, gender, present position in the institution, educational qualification, years of experience, and status of FDPs attended in nominal and ratio scale. Part B consists of various statements regarding attitude of faculty members towards development programs, their perceived outcomes and reason for not participating in such

programs in five-point Likert scale, where 5 represents strongly agree and 1 represents strongly disagree. Pilot study was further carried out to ensure reliability and validity of the instrument and data to be collected. In order to ensure validity, the initial questionnaire was given to a group of referees - a panel of Professors - to judge its validity according to its contents, clarity of items meaning, suitability to avoid any misunderstanding and to assure its linkage with main study objectives. In order to validate the reliability, questionnaire was pilot tested using 20 faculty members, representing 16% of the total sample size, who were considered the representative of the study population. Value of Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.804 indicating acceptable level of reliability of research instrument. Data thus received was systematically arranged, tabulated and analyzed. Analysis of data was performed using IBM SPSS version 20.

Results

Data summarized in Table 1 indicate demographical and professional characteristics of sample respondents. 38.7 % respondents were from age group of 20 – 30 years, 50 % were from 31 – 40 years and 11.3 % were from age group of 41 – 50 years. Out of 124 respondents, 80 (64.5 %) were male whereas 44 (35.5 %) were female. According to educational qualifications, almost 13% were graduate, 58% were post-graduate and 29% respondents were having Doctorate degree. Graduate refers to faculty members having only Bachelor Degree in Engineering. 14 respondents were Professor, 28 were Associate Professor and 68 were Assistant Professor and 14 were others designations which includes senior lecturers and lecturers. 32 respondents were having work experience of less than 5 years, 62 were having work experience of 6-10 years and 20 respondents were having academic experience of 11-15 years. Only 10 respondents were having more than 15 years of academic experience. This shows that representative sample covers responses of faculty members of diverse demographical and professional characteristics, so that perception towards FDPs can be evaluated effectively across the different dimensions.

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

| Variables | Frequency | Percent | Variables | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------------|------------|---------|
| Age | | | Position | | |
| 20-30 Years | 48 | 38.7% | Professor | 14 | 11.3% |
| 31-40 Years | 62 | 50% | Associate Professor | 28 | 22.6% |
| 41-50 Years | 14 | 11.3% | Assistant Professor | 68 | 54.8% |
| Gender | | | Others | 14 | 11.3% |
| Male | 80 | 64.5% | Years of Experience | | |
| Female | 44 | 35.5% | Less than 5 Years | 32 | 25.8% |
| Qualification | | | 6-10 Years | 62 | 50% |
| Graduation | 16 | 12.9% | 11-15 Years | 20 | 16.1% |
| Post Graduation | 72 | 58.1% | More than 15 Years | 10 | 8.1% |
| Doctorate | 36 | 29% | Total No. of Respondents | 124 | |

Table 2: Faculty Development Programs Attended

| FDPs Attended | Frequency | | Duration of FDPs | Frequency | |
|---------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------|---------|
| | Frequency | Percent | | Frequency | Percent |
| Less than 2 | 48 | 38.7% | 1 Day | 28 | 22.6% |
| 3-5 | 48 | 38.7% | Upto 3 Days | 70 | 56.5% |
| 6-10 | 23 | 18.6% | 1 week | 20 | 16.1% |
| More than 10 | 5 | 4.03% | More than 1 Week | 6 | 4.8% |

Data presented in table 2 indicate that 48 respondents have attended less than 2 FDPs, 48 have attended 3-5, 23 have attended 6-10 and only 5 have attended more than 10 FDPs. It seems that faculty members are aware about the importance of FDPs for their academic and personal growth. With respect to duration of FDPs, 28 respondents have attended FDPs of one day, 70 have attended FDPs of upto 3 days, 20 have attended FDPs of one week and only

6 respondents have attended FDPs of more than 1 week. In order to know the areas of development programs attended by faculty, analysis of data presented in table 3 shows that research methodology (75.8%) was the prime focus area for majority of faculty, followed by teaching skills and methodology (51.6%), general management (21%) and leadership and communication (17.7%).

Table 3: Areas of Faculty Development Programs Attended

| Faculty Development Program | Responses | | Percent of Cases |
|---------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|
| | N | Percent | |
| Research Methodology | 94 | 38.2% | 75.8% |
| General Management | 26 | 10.6% | 21.0% |
| Leadership and Communication | 22 | 8.9% | 17.7% |
| Teaching skills and Methodology | 64 | 26.0% | 51.6% |
| Curriculum Development | 14 | 5.7% | 11.3% |
| New Educational Strategies | 20 | 8.1% | 16.1% |
| Others | 6 | 2.4% | 4.8% |
| Total | 246 | 100% | 198.4% |

Factor Analysis

The exploratory factor analysis was used in order to identify various issues related to faculty members' attitude towards FDPs and their perceived outcomes. KMO test of sample adequacy was also carried out. The value of KMO was found 0.753 which seems appropriate

to perform factor analysis. Principal Component analysis for extracting factors and rotation with Varimax was employed. As latent root criterion was used for extraction of factors, only factors having latent roots or Eigen values greater than one were considered significant. The factors have been given appropriate names on the basis of variables represented in each case.

Table 4: Rotated Component Matrix

| Statements | Component | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| FDP that facilitate continuous improvement can, over time, have significant benefits for teachers, students and institute as a whole. | .866 | | | | |
| Faculty development has a positive influence on performance of faculty members. | .803 | | | | |
| FDP improves teaching skills of faculty members. | .643 | | | | |
| FDP enhances a faculty member's ability to fulfill his/her academic and administrative responsibilities more effectively. | .448 | | | | |
| FDP promotes interpersonal relationships of faculty members. | .445 | | | | |

| | |
|---|------|
| I am looking to attend FDPs of reputed organization like IIMs, IITs and so on as it give more mileages. | .839 |
| Faculty members should be provided with recognition and incentives for their participation in FDPs. | .740 |
| Such programs should be an ongoing process, not a one-time event. | .679 |
| To be effective, motivation of attending FDPs must come from faculty. | .486 |
| I attend FDP for achieving required API scores. | .825 |
| The ultimate goal of FDP is to enhance overall personality and sharpen knowledge of faculty members. | .688 |
| I attend FDP because it provides opportunity to break the monotony of job. | .665 |
| I attend FDP as it is a mandatory requirement for my promotion. | .655 |
| FDP enhances confidence level and analytical skills of faculty members. | .604 |
| Management encourages development programs at our Institute. | .840 |
| FDP in my Institute are included in the yearly academic plan. | .792 |
| At our Institute, FDPs are considered to be important. | .771 |
| Institute should make compulsory participation in FDP for faculty. | .634 |
| Mounting program fees restrain me for attending such programs. | .885 |
| Poor participation of faculty in FDP is due to its short nature program as it is not beneficial gaining knowledge as well as API score. | .626 |

The results of factor analysis identified five factors in faculty members' attitude towards such programs and their perceived outcomes. These factors are then named as 'academic and personal improvement', 'motivation to

participate in FDPs', 'job-oriented objectives of FDPs', 'management attitude towards FDPs', 'obstacles in attending FDPs'. Variables in these factors are shown in the table below:

Table 5: Factors related to Faculty members' attitude towards FDPs

| | |
|--|---|
| Academic and personal Improvement | FDP that facilitate continuous improvement can, over time, have significant benefits for teachers, students and institute as a whole. |
| | Faculty development has a positive influence on performance of faculty members. |
| | FDP improves teaching skills of Faculty members. |
| | FDP enhances a faculty member's ability to fulfill his/her academic and administrative responsibilities more effectively. |
| | FDP promotes the interpersonal relationships of faculty members. |
| Motivation to participate in FDPs | I am looking to attend FDPs of reputed organization like IIMs, IITs and so on as it give more mileages. |
| | Faculty members should be provided with recognition and incentives for their participation in FDPs. |
| | Such programs should be an ongoing process, not a one-time event. |
| | To be effective, motivation of attending FDPs must come from faculty. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Job-oriented objectives of FDPs | I attend FDP for achieving required API scores. |
| | The ultimate goal of FDP is to enhance overall personality and sharpen knowledge of faculty members. |
| | I attend FDP because it provides opportunity to break the monotony of job. |
| | I attend FDP as it is a mandatory requirement for my promotion. FDP enhances confidence level and analytical skills of faculty members. |
| Management attitude towards FDPs | Management encourages development programs at our Institute. |
| | FDP in my Institute are included in the yearly academic plan. |
| | At our Institute, FDPs are considered to be important. |
| | Institute should make compulsory participation in FDP for its faculty. |
| Obstacles in Attending FDPs | Mounting program fees restrain me for attending such programs. |
| | Poor participation of faculty in FDP is due to its short nature program as it is not beneficial gaining knowledge as well as API score. |

Table 6: Perceived Outcomes of FDPs

| Perceived outcomes | Mean | SD |
|---|------|------|
| Improving the teacher professionally, academically and technically. | 4.03 | 0.70 |
| Improved administrative effectiveness | 3.24 | 0.57 |
| Encouragement to participate in Conferences | 3.31 | 0.69 |
| National and International Publications | 3.87 | 0.78 |
| Project Grant preparation | 3.31 | 0.72 |
| Enhance ability to fulfill responsibilities more effectively | 3.82 | 0.90 |
| Developing learning resources | 4.16 | 0.79 |
| Achieving personal development | 4.27 | 0.63 |
| Updating faculty members in line with changes in curriculum | 3.90 | 0.67 |
| Improved Managerial and communication skills | 3.63 | 0.77 |

Sample respondents were also asked to indicate perceived outcomes of such programs on their academic and professional assignments. Data summarized in table 6 indicate that personal development (4.27) is the prime outcome of FDPs as perceived by faculty members. It is followed by developing learning resources (4.16),

improving them professionally, academically and technically (4.03), updating faculty members in line with changes in curriculum (3.90), helpful in publishing articles in national and international (3.87) and improving managerial and communication skills (3.63).

Table 7: Reasons of Failure of FDPs

| Reasons | Mean | SD |
|---|------|------|
| Inadequate incentive & weightage | 3.90 | .844 |
| Low internal motivation of faculty to participate | 3.34 | .974 |
| Lack of trained facilitators | 3.48 | .844 |
| Time consuming | 2.56 | .802 |
| Mounting program fees | 4.18 | .820 |
| Insufficient institutional commitment | 3.86 | .743 |
| Uninteresting/ irrelevant topics covered | 3.24 | .824 |

In the review of relevant literature regarding perception of faculty members for participating in faculty development activities, it was found that there are several factors such as institutional support, work pressure, lack of internal motivation, financial constraints which hinder faculty members to participate in such activities. In view of this, we also attempted to identify various factors which discourage faculty members to attend such programs. Data presented in table 7 shows that mounting program fees of such programs (4.18) is the most important reason for failure of such programs. Inadequate incentive & weightage of participation in such programs (3.90), insufficient institutional commitment (3.86), lack of trained facilitators for FDPs (3.49) and low internal motivation of faculty members to participate (3.34) were some of the factors hold back faculty members to participate in these professional development initiatives.

Discussion

Today's industry leaders have recognized that confronting the phenomenon of rapid change in a global economy must be of paramount importance for faculty members of HEIs who are primarily responsible for preparing employable workforce. Therefore, HEIs have been urged to pay more attention to uncovering and disseminating relevant new knowledge and practices. Faculty members must be afforded on-going opportunities to stay abreast of the critical knowledge, skills, and practices necessary to properly train future workforce. FDPs are considered as an investment of time, energy, and resources needed to facilitate development and support of faculty members in their roles as educators. These programs are initiated as a result of the apparent need to enhance instructional quality and in recognition of the vital need for faculty to remain competent and innovative to compete in today's ever-changing scenario of higher education. In order to create an environment that optimally cultivates and nurtures acquisition of important new knowledge, skills, and understandings by faculty, the present study determined how faculty members view FDPs programs available to them. The study found that faculty members show positive attitude towards FDPs and their possible outcomes. They believed that such programs help them to review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to moral purposes of teaching, and acquire and develop their knowledge, skills and attitudes. Findings of the study revealed that research methodology, teaching skills and methodology, general management and leadership and communication are desired areas for FDPs among faculty members. Research methodology is the most preferred area of FDPs because of having its significance in helping them to conduct research work and publish quality papers for journals. Faculty members also believed that short term FDPs would not achieve overall objective of such activities. They generally

preferred programs of at least three days for understanding concepts, knowledge and skills thoroughly and effectively.

The present study identified five factors in faculty members' attitude towards FDPs and their perceived outcomes. These factors are named as academic and personal improvement, motivation to participate in FDPs, job-oriented objectives of FDPs, management attitude towards FDPs, obstacles in attending FDPs. It was found that faculty members perceive that such programs enhance academic performance, improve interpersonal relationship among faculty members of different institutions, helpful in discharging academic and administrative responsibilities more effectively. Faculty members show their inclination towards FDPs of reputed institutions because of their effectiveness and mileages. Faculty members strongly believe that these kinds of development activities enhance subject knowledge, confidence, analytical skills and pedagogical advancement. They suggested that such programs must be organized as an ongoing activity and should be included in the academic plan of the institutions. Further, institutes should make a compulsory provision for faculty members to participate in development activities and support them monetary and non-monetary to encourage their participation. Besides developing interpersonal relationships among faculty members, FDPs are also helpful in meeting the mandatory requirements for academic promotion and discontinuing the monotony from routine assignments.

Although faculty must have internal motivation to attend such programs, they consider that adequate encouragement, recognition and incentives must be provided to attend such professional development programs. Faculty members raise their concerns about mounting programs fees and unproductive and unrewarding short nature programs. Reasons such as inadequate incentive for participating, weightage in promotion, existing work load, lack of trained facilitators in such programs, low internal motivation of faculty for attending FDPs and insufficient institutional commitment **were** also pointed out by residents. These results are consistent with the findings of Komba and Nkumbi (2008), **Hussain et al. (2010) and Nandan et al., (2010)**, Puri et al. (2012), **Olatunji (2013) and Seyoum (2014)**. Faculty members strongly believe that such programs must be included in the yearly academic plan of institutions and provision of attending such programs must be made compulsory considering future of students, faculty members and institution in mind.

FDP is a tool for improving the educational vitality of HEIs through attention to competencies needed by individual faculty member and to the institutional

policies required to promote academic excellence. The purpose of development programs is to enable faculty members to meet their academic and administrative goals, and through their accomplishments to achieve the missions of their departments, colleges and Universities. Faculty avails several benefits by attending these programs namely personal development, developing learning resources, improving faculty professionally, academically and technically, updating faculty members in line with changes in the curriculum and helpful in publishing articles in national and international. Hence, faculty development programs should be designed to foster the growth of faculty to their maximum potential while achieving the mission and goals of their respective educational institution. Institutions of higher education must be held accountable to provide appropriate support to the faculty with respect to their educational and intellectual development. Effective teachers and scholars need to constantly question their educational approaches by assessing not only their students' progress but their own, and examining the outcomes of their scholarly activities.

Conclusion

Faculty is among the most cherished and valuable resource in academic institutions especially HEIs. Creating and sustaining a sense of shared educational purpose and zeal for teaching among the faculty is of paramount importance in times of change and fiscal stringency. In order to promote excellence in academic institutions and provide quality teaching to students, faculty needs to develop themselves professionally in their knowledge, skills, values and attitudes. They need to be self-directed; they should display a willingness to learn when they have a perceived need and they desire immediate application of new skills and knowledge. For professional development to be effective motivation should be intrinsic rather than extrinsic. The present study contributes new knowledge to understanding the perceptions and experiences of faculty members towards FPDs and their perceived outcomes. The study demonstrated that FPDs help faculty in furthering their knowledge and skills to assist them in becoming better administrators, academician and researcher within their respective communities. Since faculty development is considered an essential component in the academic success of faculty as well as academic institution, institutions must encourage faculty to participate in such programs by providing funding, recognitions and similar other incentives. Attending such professional development program will assist faculty members in improving their knowledge, skills, values and attitudes in order for them to become better equipped in the development of their students and society. This study is a significant contribution to the understanding of faculty

professional development in developing countries contexts where general pedagogical knowledge takes precedence over the faculty's knowledge of the subject matter.

References

- Ahlberg, A. (2008). Teaching and learning in hard science research environments: views of academics and educational developers. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(2), 133-142.
- Boyden, K.M. (2000). Development of new faculty in higher education. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 16(2), 104-111.
- Chism, N. V., Lees, N. D. and Evenbeck, S. (2002). Faculty development for teaching. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 34-41.
- Daigle, S. L. and Jarmon, C. G. (1997). Building the campus infrastructure that really counts. *Educom Review*, 32 (4), 35.
- Goody, A. (2007). Report on the survey of foundations of university teaching programs. Unpublished: Preparing Academics to Teach in Higher Education (PATHE). A project funded by the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education.
- Hénard, F. and Roseveare, D. (2012). Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development report on Fostering Quality Teaching in Higher Education: Policies and Practices.
- Hess, G.F. (2006). Improving teaching and learning in law school: Faculty development research, principles and programs. *Widener Law Review*, 12 (2), 443-471.
- Hussain, S., Sarwar, M., Khan, M.N. and Khan, M.I. (2010). Faculty Development Program for University Teachers: Trainee's Perception of Success. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 44 (2), 253-257.
- Jaiswal, Vijay (2015). Towards achieving teaching excellence in higher education. *University News*, 53 (15), 13-19.
- Kabakçi, I. and Odabaşı, F.H. (2008). The organization of the faculty development programs for research assistants: The case of education faculties in Turkey. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 7 (3), 56-63.
- Komba L. and Nkumbi, E. (2008). Teachers professional development in Tanzania: Perceptions and Practices. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 11 (3), 67-83.

- Latchema, C., Özkulb, A.E., Aydinb, C.H. and Mutlub, M.E. (2006). The Open Education System, Anadolu University, Turkey: e-transformation in a mega-university. *Open Learning*, 21 (3), 221–235.
- Lindbeck, R. and Darnell, D. (2008). An investigation of new faculty orientation and support among mid-sized colleges and universities. *Academic Leadership*, 6 (3). Retrieved from <http://contentcat.fhsu.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collecti on/p15732coll4/id/261/rec/1> on 21st March, 2015.
- MacKinnon, G.E. (2003). An investigation of pharmacy faculty attitudes toward faculty development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 67 (1), 49-71.
- Mestry, R., Hendricks, I. and Bisschoff, T. (2009). Perceptions of teachers on the benefits of teacher development programmes in one province of South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 29, 475-490.
- Millis, Barbara (1994). Faculty Development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72 (5), 454.
- 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.
- Nandan, S., Samaddar S. G. and Nandan, T. (2010). A dynamic model for evaluation of usefulness of faculty development programmes in the area of business management. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 5 (2), 251 - 259.
- Ngala, F.B. and Odebero, S.O. (2010). Teachers' perceptions of staff development programmes as it relates to teachers' effectiveness: A study of rural primary schools in Kenya. *Educational Research and Review*, 5 (1), 1-9.
- Olatunji, M. O. (2013). Ensuring and promoting the pedagogical competence of University lecturers in Africa. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*. 3 (3), 73-85.
- Postareff, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., and Nevgi, A. (2007). The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5), 557-571.
- Prachyapruit, A. (2001). *Socialization of New Faculty at a Public University in Thailand*. Unpublished dissertation. Michigan State University, Department of Educational Administration.
- Puri, A., Graves, G., Lowenstein, A. and Lily Hsu, L. (2012). New Faculty's Perception of Faculty Development Initiatives at Small Teaching Institutions. *International Scholarly Research Network Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/isrn/2012/72627 0/> on 12th January, 2015.
- Rodgers, R., Christie, J., and Wideman, M. (2014). *The Effects of a Required Faculty Development Program on Novice Faculty Self-Efficacy and Teaching*. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, Canada.
- Seyoum, Yilfashewa (2014). Aspects to Bolster Faculty Members Professional Competencies in Ethiopian HEIs: Haramaya and Adama Science and Technology Universities in Focus. *Journal of Education & Human Development*, 3 (1), 387-419.
- Steinert, Y, Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M. and Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. *Medical Teacher*; 28(6), 497-526.
- Stes, A., Clement, M., and Van Petegem, P. (2007). The effectiveness of a faculty training programme: Long-term and institutional impact. *International Journal of Academic Development*, 12(2), 99-109.
- Tynan, B. R., and Garbett, D. L. (2007). Negotiating the university research culture: collaborative voices of new academics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(4), 411-424.
- Wilkerson L. and Irby, D. M. (1998). Strategies for improving teaching practices: A comprehensive approach to faculty development. *Academic Medicine*, 73 (4), 387.396.