

Why a Workshop on Evaluating the Effectiveness and Impact of Faculty Development?

Arianna Marci

PhD Student, University of Genoa, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

*Faculty Development,
Workshop,
Evaluation,
Impact,
Effectiveness*

ABSTRACT

This is the proposal for the design of a workshop focused on the evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of Faculty Development (FD). The intended audience primarily includes university faculty members. The workshop draws upon key evaluation models widely cited in the literature. Participants would be guided through interactive, collaborative activities designed to facilitate sharing of experiences, the co-construction of evaluative indicators and tools, and the development of a shared framework around core concepts such as effective teaching, effective learning, and consequently, effective FD. The bottom-up approach should valorize diverse perspectives, while fostering a culture of evaluation that is participatory, systemic, critical, contextualized, and oriented toward continuous improvement. This workshop pursues the dual objective of raising awareness regarding the meanings of evaluation in FD processes and fostering the value of a dedicated Community of Practice. The workshop methodology would incorporate active and participatory learning strategies, and tools to enhance engagement.

1. Introduction

In recent decades, the identification of strategies and actions to promote high-quality higher education systems has been recognized as playing a central role in fostering cultural, economic, and social development (Giovannini & Rosa, 2014; Felisatti, 2020). At the same time, it has become essential for faculty members – faculties, academic institutions and organizations, schools and universities, students, etc. – to develop competences (Felisatti & Perla, 2023; van Dijk et al., 2020) suited to effectively contributing to and adapting to “the ongoing transformations in socio-economic challenges and needs, from the local to the global level, while pursuing high standards of educational and instructional quality” (Marci, 2025, p. 76).

An effective strategy to address these needs is the decision to invest in training programs aimed at faculty members – mostly directed toward faculties – which corresponds to the decision to design, plan, organize, and deliver Faculty Development (FD) programs (Marci, 2025; Marci & Modugno, 2025; Silva, 2022; Sorcinelli, 2020a; Steinert, 2010a; Stes et al., 2010), through actions aimed at developing professional and transversal competences (or soft skills) among participants (Silva, 2022; Steinert, 2010b), with the support of professional centres dedicated

* Corresponding author's E-mail address: arianna.marci@ext.unige.it

Cite this article as:

Marci, A. (2025). Why a Workshop on Evaluating the Effectiveness and Impact of Faculty Development?. *European Journal of Teaching and Education*, 7(4): 179-193. <https://doi.org/10.33422/ejte.v7i4.1675>

© The Author(s). 2025 **Open Access**. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and redistribution in any medium, provided that the original author(s) and source are credited.



to this purpose – the Teaching and Learning Centres (TLCs) or Centres for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) (Lotti et al., 2022) – and the professionals working there, such as faculty or educational developers and instructional designers (Marci, 2025; Masini et al., 2023).

Taking into account the importance and value of FD programs, whose recognition has been increasing over the years, the definition of models and methods for assessing their effectiveness and impact remains, and is becoming increasingly, complex (Stes et al., 2010; 2013; Stes & Hoekstra, 2015). In fact, evaluating or verifying the effectiveness and impact of FD represents a growing need, yet at the same time a complex challenge, still due to the ongoing transformations affecting academic institutions, the heterogeneity of the needs of faculties, students, and the variety of national and international approaches and contexts present worldwide (Giovannini & Rosa, 2014; Marci, 2025; Silva, 2022; Steinert, 2010a; Stes et al., 2010). Consequently, there is an increasingly evident need to adopt an evaluation approach capable of flexibly adapting to the particularities and specificities of each context and training need, as well as to the corresponding organizational and personal requirements that each contextual reality entails (Patton, 2016; Silva, 2022). Therefore, a multi-perspective, multidimensional, holistic, and flexible evaluation is required—one that involves the active and conscious participation not only of those who must assess the effectiveness or impact of FD, but also of its intended recipients (faculties, students, etc.) (Bandiera et al., 2005; Guskey, 2000; Lampugnani, 2020; Patton, 1994; 2011; 2016; Silva, 2022; Tomei, 2016).

For this reason, the usefulness and necessity of the workshop presented here—through the description of its design proposal—may be acknowledged. The proposal of a workshop on the evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of FD (Gomley, 2021; Persellin & Goodrick, 2010), involving not only faculties but also—potentially—all stakeholders who may have an interest in understanding and recognizing the possible “immediate” outcomes and the long-term changes (impacts) that training programs can contribute to generating, appears to be significant. It stems from the intention to bring everyone closer not only to the “evaluation logic,” but above all to the process and meaning of FD evaluation, in order to understand not only its educational importance but also to increase awareness of the value of their active and conscious participation, thereby promoting the multi-perspective vision that is needed (Patton, 2016; Silva, 2022). Therefore, this proposal derives from the experience of certain FD initiatives that lead participants to ask themselves, for example: a) “*what was the real impact of this FD program or activity for me?*”; b) “*what kind of skills or competencies have I developed or acquired?*”; c) “*what kind of impact I had on my students thanks to FD? And how I know I have actually achieved that?*”.

Indeed, in many FD programs, it often happens that participants are administered only an end-of-program satisfaction or appreciation questionnaire (Stes et al., 2010), without adequately explaining its purpose and value (Steinert et al., 2012), thereby making the quality of the evaluation less effective, authentic, or understood (Silva, 2022). Furthermore, it is well known that, in order to understand the effectiveness—and, even more importantly, the impacts—of FD, the sole administration of a questionnaire investigating the immediate reaction (Kirkpatrick, 1979) to the program is not sufficient, as there are different “levels” and instruments available (Guskey, 2002; Patton, 2016; Silva, 2022; Steinert et al., 2012). Consequently, the design of this workshop aims to help participants (maybe, predominantly faculties) reflect upon and attempt to answer questions such as: a) “*what really changes after a FD program?*”; b) “*how is it possible to evaluate this change?*”; and c) “*why it is important to evaluate what changes?*”.

Thus, beyond contributing to the theoretical debate on FD evaluation, the proposed workshop is intended to generate concrete strategies and transferable tools that participants could implement within their institutions, courses or institutional TCLs (or CTLs).

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Faculty Development

Eble and McKeachie (1985), as cited in Sorcinelli (2020b), argue that Faculty Development is a term that refers to “a wide range of activities designed to support faculty performance in all aspects of their professional lives – as teachers, scholars, advisors, academic leaders, and institutional citizens.” As suggested by the various denominations and different meanings that this term encompasses—e.g., “Academic Development,” “Educational Development” (Sorcinelli, 2020a), or “Professional Development” (Guskey, 2000; 2002)—the recipients of these training initiatives should not be considered as exclusively limited to faculties, although they are the primary direct beneficiaries; rather, as previously mentioned, they potentially address all faculty members (Silva, 2022).

As highlighted by Sorcinelli and colleagues (2006), Faculty Development – originating in the early ‘60s of the previous century– has gone through “six ages”:

1. “Age of Scholar”, at the start of ‘60s, where FD “referred primarily to practices for improving and advancing scholarly competence in one’s discipline. Content mastery was seen as key to good teaching, the benefits of professional development were assumed and not measured, and few universities had formal programs” (Sorcinelli, 2020b, p. 20);
2. “Age of Teacher”, in the ‘70s, when emerged that “faculties should not only be prepared in their disciplines, but also better able to teach” (Sorcinelli, 2020b, p. 20). For this reason, the first Teaching and Learning Centres began to be established;
3. “Age of Developer”, in the ‘80s, when training programs began to be valued and recognized also through the allocation of funds by institutions, and interest grew in measuring and assessing the learning outcomes and changes that these programs brought to participants both directly and indirectly (e.g. for their students) (Sorcinelli et al. 2006; 2020b);
4. “Age of the Learner”, in the ‘90s, when a true paradigm shift occurred, whereby teaching needed to be student-centred in order to be effective (Sorcinelli, 2020b). Thanks also to the advent of educational technologies, FD programs began to diversify and to address the need for “holistic” training. Interest in effective teaching practices was increasing (Sorcinelli, 2020b);
5. “Age of the Network”, in 2000s, when we saw the “expansion of instructional technologies, interest in assessment, and diversity and inclusion. There also was renewed interest in how Faculty Development fits with institutional priorities, resource allocations, and reward structures” (Sorcinelli, 2020b, p. 21). In addition, the importance emerged of creating an international network to share and enhance good practices and effective FD programs (Sorcinelli, 2020b);
6. In the end, Sorcinelli and colleagues (2020a) attribute to the 2010s and beyond the “Age of Evidence,” in which the aim is to provide FD programs capable of addressing institutional and academic challenges, as well as those of the labour market, which require faculty members to possess increasingly solid and specific

competences suited to meeting the heterogeneous needs arising from political, academic, and social contexts (Sorcinelli, 2020b). This era foresees and requires the expansion of “online learning (MOOCs), data/learning analytics, skill-based learning [...] and alternative providers of education [...] and pressure for access and metrics impact” (Sorcinelli, 2020b, p. 21).

From what has been stated, it can therefore be assumed that Faculty Development refers to

all actions—formal and informal, individual and collective—designed and implemented to have a beneficial impact on each university, fostering the development of competences not only of a disciplinary nature, but also relevant to every aspect of the personal and professional life of faculty members and of the stakeholders who directly or indirectly benefit from their outcomes (Marci, 2025, p. 76)

In this sense, thanks to the development of Teaching and Learning Centres (or Centres for Teaching and Learning), over time there has been an increase in the variety of types of programs, actions, formats, and forms of Faculty Development (Marci, 2025; Silva, 2022), for which Steinert (2010a) outlines a framework of approaches according to the context or type of learning and program (individual or group) and according to the formal or informal nature of the proposed activities (Steinert, 2010a). As the author (2010), as cited in Lampugnani (2020), points out, it is possible to classify such programs into: a) formal-individual activities (e.g., online learning, Peer Coaching, Peer and student feedback); b) formal-group activities (e.g., workshop and seminars, fellowships and longitudinal programs); c) informal-individual activities (e.g., Reflective on Experience, Learning by observing and by doing); d) informal-group activities (e.g., Work-Based Learning and Community of Practice). In the end, there is Mentorship, which can be individual, group-based, formal, or informal (Lampugnani, 2020; Steinert, 2010a).

Many documents and studies (ESG, 2015; EUA, 2015; EHEA, 2018; Felisatti & Perla, 2023; van Dijk et al., 2020) acknowledge the need for effective FD programs, aimed at the holistic development of the competences of faculties, and which indirectly also have significant effects on the development of students’ competences and learning, as well as on the academic institution in its broadest sense (Silva, 2022). Among the competences promoted by FD are those more specifically related to teaching, design, and evaluation; management and leadership; digital and communication skills; reflective competences (Schön, 1983); social and problem-solving skills, with the aim of fostering personal and professional empowerment (Marci, 2025; Silva, 2022) and of embracing change (Kunnari, 2018) that accompanies the ongoing evolution of Higher Education (Marci, 2025).

2.2. Evaluation of Faculty Development

As previously mentioned, FD programs and activities aim to improve university teaching quality by developing both teaching and soft skills, and thus enhance students’ learning experiences, making them active and meaningful (Stes et al., 2010; 2013). For this reason, the evaluation of impact and effectiveness of FD is necessary for understanding the real effects and changes in teaching and learning (Silva, 2022; Stes et al., 2010; 2013; 2015). In accordance with Illie and colleagues (2020), the evaluation of FD is useful for measuring its effectiveness, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, guiding universities’ future strategic decisions, and ensuring that investments in training are productive. Thanks to this and other studies (Bandiera et al., 2005; Guskey, 2000; Kreber & Brook, 2001; Steinert, 2010a; Stes et al., 2010), regarding the outcomes of FD, we know that they concern the increase in the perception of teaching effectiveness, the positive change in teaching practices, the increase in

student engagement, and the resulting institutional impact, which improves the quality of higher education organizations. Factors contributing to the effectiveness of FD (Illie et al., 2020) include, for example: medium- to long-term pathways with ongoing support, interdisciplinary training, the use of active and participatory teaching and training methods, and formative evaluation using feedback.

When speaking about FD evaluation, it is necessary to clarify that when referring to “effectiveness” one generally means the achievement of FD objectives and the identification of strengths and weaknesses (Tomei, 2016) in order to achieve continuous improvement and innovation, and to redesign activities in an equally effective way (Patton, 2011; 2016). When referring to “impact,” instead, the intention is to investigate and evaluate the long-term effects and changes (Tomei, 2016) that FD can contribute to generating on direct recipients (faculties) and indirect recipients (students) (Patton, 2011; 2016; Stes et al., 2010).

Among the main reference models for FD evaluation, that of D.L. Kirkpatrick (1979) is the most widely adopted for the analysis of impact and effectiveness, and is structured in four levels: a) reaction, i.e., the immediate satisfaction or appreciation by participants; b) learning, i.e., participants’ learning, which entails changes in their knowledge, abilities, and skills; c) behaviour change, i.e., the transformation and application of what has been learned into competences, thus a genuine transfer of learning; and d) results, i.e., the impact on the organization’s broader objectives and on students’ learning outcomes. An interesting adaptation of Kirkpatrick’s (1979) model is that developed by Stes and colleagues (2010), that identify the following levels, omitting participants’ reaction: a) “Change within teachers,” which broadens the concept of “teachers’ learning” to include attitudes, conceptions, knowledge, teaching philosophy statements, and skills; b) “Behavioural change,” which covers all aspects of the transfer of learning in terms of the development and acquisition of competences; c) “Institutional impact,” which refers also to the increase in networking, and thus the development of Communities of Practice (Wenger, 1998), as well as the expansion of the educational offer of the TLCs; and d) “Change within students,” which includes students’ perception of teaching, the quality of their learning, their approach to study, and their learning outcomes. Among the possible tools to assess these levels, there are various types (quantitative and qualitative): e.g., questionnaires, interviews, focus group, reflective journals, reflective practices, peer observation, etc., aimed at both direct and indirect participants (Stes et al., 2010; 2013; 2015).

However, despite further and ongoing adaptations and developments of the model by various authors—e.g., Guskey (2000; 2002), who adds a level dedicated to the support provided by the institution and by the institutional or professional context in which FD takes place, as well as the study by Kreber & Brook (2001)—difficulties in reconstructing causal links between training, teaching change, and learning outcomes remain significant (Giovannini & Rosa, 2014). This reveals the need for systemic, multidimensional, multi-perspective, contextualized, and transformative evaluation approaches, capable of capturing the complexity of training programs and the realities in which they are embedded. In this direction lies the rationale of development evaluation (Silva, 2022), with essential elements of the Developmental Evaluation (DE) approach (Patton, 1994; 2016), understood as a critical-reflective and transformative approach to evaluation, whose purpose is to foster continuous learning and innovation applicable in educational contexts (Patton, 2011; Silva, 2022). DE is characterized by its methodological flexibility, the integration of quantitative and qualitative tools and data, and the adoption of a cyclical model that combines shared design and evaluation, experimentation, data analysis, and redesign of interventions, with a view to continuous improvement and innovation (Patton, 2011; Silva, 2022). This approach assigns a central role to the co-participation of actors (faculties, trainers, evaluators, and, if possible, students) and

values the role of the evaluator as a facilitator of change and promoter of reflective processes, rather than as a judge (Silva, 2022). The rationale is that of generative learning, based on recurring evaluative questions (“*What?*”, “*So what?*”, “*Now what?*”) that guide evaluation over time. In this sense, DE operates at the intersection of two transformative dynamics: the “top-down” transfer of good practices and the “bottom-up” generation of contextual knowledge and innovation (Tomei, 2016). These dynamics are understood as mechanisms of change that evaluation must accompany and nurture (Patton, 2011). The key principles of the approach include: development purpose, methodological rigour, utilization and process orientation, attention to complexity, systems thinking, co-creation, and timely feedback (Patton, 1994; 2016).

2.3. The Workshop as Faculty Development Tool

The workshop falls within the category of formal-group FD activities (Steinert, 2010a) and is identified as one of the most effective methodologies, as it enables participants not only to acquire knowledge and competences from trainers or peers (Steinert et al., 2008b), but also to actively construct new knowledge and develop concrete tools or artefacts, following a laboratory-based approach (Lotti, 2023; Steinert, 2010b). Therefore, as Steinert (2010b) states, “workshops are popular because of their inherent flexibility and promotion of active learning. Of varying duration, they are commonly used to promote skill acquisition or help teachers to prepare for curricular change. Although transfer to the workplace is sometimes challenging, they can also help to develop expertise in curricular design and innovation” (p. 75).

It is a method that favours Cooperative Learning (Lotti, 2023; Steinert, 2010a) and involves several phases, some of which may be repeated depending on the objectives: mutual introduction among participants and the trainer; presentation of the learning objectives; creation of an inclusive, well-organized, and collaborative learning environment with a setting adapted to the training and organizational needs; encouragement of active participation, critical reflection, and learning from experience; and, finally, the possibility to give and request feedback (Lotti, 2023).

The workshop is considered a methodological tool suitable for addressing various topics related to FD (Steinert et al., 2008a); indeed, it is used in many training activities and programs (Bandiera et al., 2005; Lotti, 2023; Persellin & Goodrick, 2010; Rust, 1998; Steinert et al., 2003; 2008a; 2008b; Tricio et al., 2018; Zenni et al., 2021), covering different themes such as instructional design, learning assessment, teaching skills, feedback, participatory teaching, public speaking, teaching methodologies and pedagogical strategies, inclusion, well-being, etc. (Silva, 2022).

Regarding typology, in their research, Sufi and colleagues (2018) distinguish different types of workshop depending on their specific use and objectives: a) “Exploratory workshops,” where “ideas are analysed to better understand a topic and its associated problems, current solutions and future challenges, [...] identifying what actions are needed to move a particular topic forward or getting expert advice from and into different communities” (p. 2); b) “Learning workshops,” where “a particular set, application, or technique is taught. The expected outcome is increased knowledge, competence, or confidence in a particular area. [...] they typically include practical exercises to apply knowledge gained” (p. 2); and c) “Creating workshops,” that “bring together individuals with a common interest to solve particular problems by collectively building something. They can include multidisciplinary teams in which problem holders guide the creative process” (p. 2).

3. A Workshop on Evaluating the Effectiveness and Impact of FD

In accordance with the theoretical framework outlined above, the rationale for proposing a learning, exploring, and creating workshop (Sufi et al., 2018) on the impact and effectiveness evaluation of FD should be evident from a methodological standpoint. The choice of this specific topic responds to the challenges related to FD evaluation described in the previous paragraphs, although, at a deeper level, the overall aim would be to transform FD evaluation from a “challenge” into a real “learning opportunity” for every faculty members. This through the promotion of a participatory and reflective culture of evaluation (Patton, 2011; Schön, 1983; Silva, 2022).

Therefore, the main objectives – but also, in some way, the learning outcomes – of this kind of workshop should be:

1. exploring and comparing key models for evaluating FD impact and effectiveness;
2. reflecting critically on the concepts of FD effectiveness and impact in relation to teaching and learning;
3. identifying effective tools, methods and approaches for FD evaluation;
4. understanding the value of one’s own participation in FD evaluation;
5. co-designing evaluation indicators and tools suited to the context and goals, and building a shared framework on them;
6. developing a Community of Practice (Wenger, 1998) as a real Faculty Learning Community (Lotti, 2021b).

Regarding the objectives and the timing when it could be proposed, it can be offered both as a pre-FD activity, to prepare participants for a specific FD program focused on the evaluation of effectiveness and impact that may be required by the trainers; as well as a post-FD activity, to reflect on a certain FD experience; but also as a stand-alone FD activity.

With reference to the target audience, this workshop can be proposed to faculties, but potentially also to faculty developers and instructional designers, TLCs (or CTLs) coordinators, students, etc. The ideal number would be approximately 16–20 participants, so as to make the planned activities more effective, less dispersive, or not sufficiently productive. It is necessary that the workshop be set up in a suitable setting for the objectives and planned activities (e.g., spacious room, round tables, movable chairs) (Lotti, 2023; Steinert, 2010a). The use of handouts, posters, markers, and pens or pencils, instant polling tools (e.g., Wooclap or Mentimeter), digital boards, Metaplan (e.g., post-it) (Bonaiuti, 2014), personal or workshop-provided laptops (e.g., trainers expert in the topic), and a video projector for slides is foreseen.

About the specific timing, the workshop should be organized in two parts, held in two different days (e.g. first in a week and the second one in the week after). The first session should last 6/7 hours (depending on group size); the second session should last 4 hours.

Regarding the general methodology, that is, the characteristics and individual activities with which the workshop should be conducted, there are specific design, training, and pedagogical-didactic elements chosen in particular. Specifically, first of all, a bottom-up approach (e.g., using Brainstorming) (Bonaiuti, 2014) should be employed, alternating with a top-down approach (Patton, 2011; Tomei, 2016), so as to give participants the opportunity to explore their own beliefs or knowledge about the different aspects of FD evaluation and to integrate or “correct” them through mini-lectures that will be provided by the trainers following each participatory activity (Lotti, 2021a; Lotti, 2023). These “mini-lectures” should, however, be supported by multimedia and multimodal tools, so as not to “fall into the risk” of conducting a

purely frontal lecture and to avoid hindering active learning by the participants (Bonaiuti, 2014; Lotti, 2023). Indeed, another essential element is the recursive presence of guided discussion moments (Bonaiuti, 2014) and reflective moments at individual, pair, and small group levels, so as to stimulate reflection not only after the experience but also during the experience itself (Bonaiuti, 2014; Lotti, 2023; Schön, 1983; Steinert, 2010b). As can be deduced, the didactic and training architecture (Bonaiuti, 2014) most commonly used in this workshop should be the “cooperative” one, that is, privileging activities and strategies of Cooperative Learning (Bonaiuti, 2014), as will be seen in the methodological choices made to propose this type of workshop.

In the end, as will be illustrated, participants should be given the opportunity to analyze scenarios or case studies and to experience “Backward Design or Planning” (Lotti, 2021a, pp. 39–41).

3.1. First and Second Session of the Workshop

The objective of the next two paragraphs is to explicate the specific didactic and training methodologies and strategies, active and participatory, considered potentially effective for a workshop on this specific topic, along with their respective purposes. The activities will be divided into first and second session of the workshop, as follows.

The first session, should consist of:

1. a reciprocal introduction, activation and ice-breaking strategies. Specifically, it should be used PAMOR methodology (Casula, 1997; Lotti, 2023), that consists in the sharing of personal and professional Presentation of each participant and instructors, the sharing of the Expectations, the Method, the Objectives and Rules of the workshop. Afterwards, using comparison of images or stimulating questions through instant polling tools or in plenary, questions are asked to explore the conceptions, beliefs, experiences on the topic: e.g. “*what does impact mean to you in a FD program?*” or “*what change do you expect from your participation in FD?*” or “*If I say ‘impact’ or ‘effectiveness’ in teaching and learning fields, what comes to your mind?*”. What emerges is collected, categorized, and discuss together;
2. Think-Pair-Share (Bonaiuti, 2014). This strategy is used to explore more deeply the conceptions of effectiveness, first individually (Think), then in pair (Pair) and in plenary (Share), through questions such as: “*what are the main characteristics of an effective teaching, an effective learning and so of an effective FD program?*”. What emerges is collected, categorized, and discussed again, and the “bottom-up framework” of the topic progresses. After this activity, a mini-lecture is scheduled;
3. Jigsaw (Bonaiuti, 2014). This Cooperative Learning strategy involves the creation of mixed groups (home group) and then the creation of expert groups, which should have the task of identifying the characteristics (levels, tools, etc.) of the main FD evaluation models (Guskey, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 1979; Kreber & Brook, 2001; Patton, 2011; Stes et al., 2010), through the support e.g. of short papers and summary sheets, integrable through research and discussion moments among expert groups. Then, participants should report their “discoverings” back to their home-group, so that everyone has a general knowledge of selected models. A group reflection should take place on the

contexts in which that models can be applied. After that, the small-group work is shared with others. At the end of this activity, a mini-lecture on evaluation models is scheduled;

4. World Café (Brown, 2002; Dawson et al., 2010; Rania et al., 2025). The aim is reflecting on the FD evaluative models and on how to apply them to design impact indicators. Through this cooperative technique, participants are involved divided into small groups sitting at different tables, each assigned a different level of impact evaluation (e.g. reaction, change in faculties, behaviour change, institutional change and change in students), starting from guiding questions. Each member of groups should discuss and write/draw on a large sheet drafts of observable indicator, possible evaluative tools to use, and examples. At each round, participants (except one who summarizes contents and ideas) change table and thus a process of “cross-pollination” of ideas is possible (Brown, 2002; Rania et al., 2025) and each level is enriched by everyone’s contribution. At the end of the last round, one member of each group presents the large sheets that should have been created. Discussion follows and essential elements continue to be “mapped”;
5. Think-Aloud-Pair Problem Solving (Bonaiuti, 2014). The aim is reflecting in pair on real problems related to FD evaluation (e.g. very short scenarios describing a FD activity with certain objectives) and identifying possible solutions. In pair, alternately, the first should read a scenario, analyse it, and think out loud about the task, sharing his or her reflections and possible solutions. Meanwhile, the other participant should take some notes and stimulates reflection through questions. Then, the two participants should switch their roles and in the end they should identify a common solution. At the end of this activity, each pair explains the solutions identified and receives feedback from instructors and other pairs.

At the end of the first session of workshop, each group is assigned a level of impact evaluation and a concrete tool (e.g. rubric, questionnaire, observation grid, reflective practice, etc.) to design as draft, taking into account the “framework” designed during the day and the indicators participants should have worked on during the activities. The results of their work should be presented the week after, in the second session of the workshop.

The second session, should consist of:

1. a starting presentation of groups’ work and a plenary discussion with feedback from trainers;
2. another shorter World Café session, in which the aim should be providing feedback between participants for improving tools they should have developed and presented before in plenary;
3. Backward Design/Planning activity (Lotti, 2021a). Through this designing methodology, participants should have the opportunity to simulate the design of a draft of FD program or activity, starting from the desired impacts that they should select. Guiding questions should be e.g. “*what change do we want to see in six months? What evidence would demonstrate it? How do we get there?*”. The FD designs should be shared in plenary and discussed together.

At the end of the second session of the workshop, participants should be able to “take away” the shared framework of the topic and also tools they should have developed. Furthermore, for “reflecting in”, “reflecting on” and “reflecting for” the experience (Schön, 1983), they should be asked what they could “take home” and what they could try to bring into their own contexts. The creation of Community of Practice (Wenger, 1998) in the format of a Faculty Learning Community (Lotti, 2021b) on the topic should be proposed.

4. Discussion and Expected Outcomes

As this is a project proposal for a workshop on the impact and effectiveness evaluation of FD, the following expected outcomes can be listed:

1. the achieving the objectives and learning outcomes of the workshop previously mentioned, with the using of different kind of evaluative tools adapted e.g. pre-post test questionnaires, interviews, analysis of tools and indicators generated by participants (Sufi et al., 2018; Tricio et al., 2017);
2. specifically, in addition, the FD evaluation that could be seen less as “challenge” and more as an opportunity for a “shared learning” for each one of the faculty members;
3. the fostering of foundations for a systemic, multidimensional, multiperspectival and participatory FD evaluation culture;
4. the increasing of participants awareness of the impacts of FD and their role in this process;
5. providing more conscious and contextualized opportunity of self- and hetero-evaluation tools;
6. the design of a workshop that could be flexible and implementable in different contexts;
7. furthermore, in terms of “concrete outputs”, this workshop should be able to provide co-designed, original and contextual evaluative tools for FD that could be proposed by participants in their own institutions and/or in the TLCs or CTLs of their university of afference. Regarding this, one of the output should be related to the enhancement of institutional capacity to embed evaluation practices into strategic planning and quality assurance process. In addition, participants should be generate a shared and “specific” evaluation framewrok of FD, maybe renewing in different and original ways the impact and effectiveness learning, teaching and FD’s meanings. Therefore, about this last output, the empowerment of faculties to act as change agents in promoting a reflective and evidence-informed teaching culture should be expected.

Although the benefits may vary, there is a possibility that some risks may occur, which must be taken into account: e.g., heterogeneous participation in the workshop, some proposed activities may be time-consuming, and preparation by the trainers is required, which should be verified as available (Silva, 2022). Additionally, a limitation may correspond to varying availability of resources across different institutions or contexts. However, the proposed strategies and methodologies are considered particularly flexible to accommodate diverse needs, availability, and requirements, and therefore can be adapted (Bonaiuti, 2014; Rania et al., 2025).

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, it is possible to say that the core message of the need of this kind of workshop could be the importance to make faculty members understand that evaluation is not only what happens at the end of a process, but the moment when we can all understand why it is worth continuing to grow together as members of the same big “teaching and learning community”. Therefore, in relation to the potential practical implications, this workshop should aim not only to raise awareness but also to provide participants with usable frameworks and tools that could be adapted to diverse Higher Education contexts, thus reinforcing the link between evaluation, professional growth and development, and institutional quality.

References

- 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>
- Bonaiuti, G. (2014). *Le strategie didattiche* [Teaching strategies]. Carocci.
- Brown, J. (2002). *The world café: A resource guide for hosting conversations that matter*. Whole Systems Associates.
- Casula, C. (1997). *I porcospini di Schopenhauer: Come progettare e condurre un gruppo di formazione di adulti* [The porcupines of Schopenhauer: How to design and lead an adult training group]. Franco Angeli.
- Dawson, D., Britnell, J., & Hitchcock, A. (2010). Developing competency models of faculty developers. *To Improve the Academy*, 28(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2334-4822.2010.tb00593.x>
- Eble K., & McKeachie, W. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development*. Jossey-Bass.
- Felisatti, E. (2020). Verso la costruzione di una “via italiana” alla qualificazione didattica della docenza universitaria [Towards the construction of an ‘italian path’ to the educational qualification of university teaching]. In A. Lotti & P.A. Lampugnani (Eds.), *Faculty development in Italia: valorizzazione delle competenze didattiche dei docenti universitari* (pp. 69-79). Genova University Press. https://gup.unige.it/sites/gup.unige.it/files/pagine/Faculty_Development_in_Italia_ebook_indicizzato.pdf
- Felisatti, E., & Perla, L. (2023). *Documento linee guida per il riconoscimento e valorizzazione docenza universitaria*. ANVUR [Guidelines document for the recognition and enhancement of university teaching. ANVUR]. https://www.anvur.it/sites/default/files/2025-02/Linee-Guida-riconoscimento-e-valorizzazione-docenza-universitaria_Final.pdf
- Giovannini, M. L., & Rosa, A. (2014). La valutazione di impatto dei progetti di formazione all’insegnamento dei docenti universitari: quali indicazioni dalle rassegne delle ricerche empiriche? [The impact of university teacher training programs: What insights emerge from reviews of empirical research?]. *Giornale Italiano della Ricerca Educativa*, 8, 93-104. <https://ojs.pensamultimedia.it/index.php/sird/article/view/226>
- Gormley, C. (2021). Edin impact analysis tool. *National Resource Hub*. <https://hub.teachingandlearning.ie/resource/edin-impact-analysis-tool/>
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Corwin Press.

- Guskey, T. R. (2002). *Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development*. Corwin Press.
- Illie, M. D., Maricuțoiu, L. P., Iancu, D. E., Smarandache, I. G., Mladenovici, V., Stoia, D. C. M., & Toth, S. A. (2020). Reviewing the research on instructional development programs for academics: Trying to tell a different story: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 30, Article e100331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100331>
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1979). Techniques for evaluation training programs. *Training and Development Journal*, 13, 78-92. <https://assets.td.org/m/4a306d561507658e/original/TECHNIQUES-FOR-EVALUATING-TRAINING-PROGRAMS.pdf>
- Kreber, C., Brook, P., & Policy, E. (2001). Impact evaluation of educational development programmes. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(2), 96-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13601440110090749>
- Kunnari, I. (2018). *Teachers changing higher education: From coping with change to embracing change*. Helsinki Studies in Education.
- Lampugnani, P. A. (2020). Faculty development: Origini, framework teorico, evoluzioni, traiettorie [Faculty development: Origins, theoretical framework, evolutions, trajectories]. In A. Lotti & P. A. Lampugnani (Eds.), *Faculty development in Italia: Valorizzazione delle competenze didattiche dei docenti universitari* (pp. 27-40). Genova University Press. https://gup.unige.it/sites/gup.unige.it/files/pagine/Faculty_Development_in_Italia_ebook_indicizzato.pdf
- Lotti, A. (2021a). *Il team based learning per le università italiane* [Team based learning for italian universities]. QuiEdit.
- Lotti, A. (2021b). Faculty learning communities e comunità di pratica per lo sviluppo professionale del docente: L'esperienza dell'università di Genova [Faculty learning communities and communities of practice for teacher professional development]. *Excellence and innovation in learning and teaching*, 6, 149-163. <https://doi.org/10.3280/exioa0-2021oa11133>
- Lotti, A. (2023). Il workshop degli studenti: Una strategia per rendere attiva, costruttiva e interattiva anche la didattica a distanza nei corsi di laurea [The student workshop: A strategy to make teaching in degree programs active, constructive, and interactive even in distance learning]. *Quaderni del GLIA*, 1(1), 78-94. <https://riviste.unige.it/index.php/glia/article/view/2165/2947>
- Lotti, A., Bosco, A., Dipace, A., & Limone, P. (2022). Valutazione di un intervento online di faculty development: Il modello del progetto TILD dell'università di Foggia [Evaluation of an online faculty development initiative: The TILD project model at the university of Foggia]. In A. Dipace, A. Fornasari & M. De Angelis (Eds.), *Il post digitale: Società, cultura, didattica* (pp. 235-249). Franco Angeli. <https://iris.unimore.it/retrieve/3e9a66af-1c61-4755-ac65-7c02abf4e861/IL%20POST%20DIGITALE%20LOTTI.pdf>
- Marci, A (2025). Competenza, competenze: Trasformare per andare oltre [Competence, competencies: Transforming to go beyond]. *Pedagogia e Vita*, 1, 72-78. <https://www.edizionistudium.it/riviste/pedagogia-e-vita-12025-sezione-online>
- Marci, A., & Modugno, A. (2025). Start come progetto di orientamento in itinere al Disfor di Genova: Un esempio di integrazione organica tra didattica e tutorato [Start as an ongoing orientation project at Disfor of Genoa: An example of organic integration between teaching

- and tutoring]. *Quaderni del GLIA*, 4(4), 201-221. <https://riviste.unige.it/index.php/glia/article/view/2624/3269>
- Masini, M., Piccinno, T., Picasso, F., Botto, M., Garbarino, S., & Lampugnani, P. A. (2023). La professionalità dell'instructional designer per l'innovazione didattica: Un'esperienza di faculty development presso l'università di Genova [The professionalism of the instructional designer for educational innovation: A faculty development experience at the university of Genova]. *Quaderni del GLIA*, 1(1), 13-33. <https://riviste.unige.it/index.php/glia/article/view/2161/2954>
- Patton, M. Q. (1994). Developmental evaluation. *Evaluation Practice*, 15(3), 311-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821409401500312>
- Patton, M. Q. (2011) *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. Guilford.
- Patton, M. Q. (2016). What is essential in developmental evaluation: On integrity, fidelity, adultery, abstinence, impotence, long-term commitment, integrity, and sensitivity in implementing evaluation models. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37(2), 250–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214015626295>
- Persellin, D. C., & Goodrick, T. (2010). Faculty development in higher education: Long-Term impact of a summer teaching and learning workshop. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10(1), 1-13. https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/music_faculty/5/
- Rania, N., Marci, A., & Coppola, I. (2025). World café between research and teaching: Individual and community empowerment. *Encyclopaideia*, 29(71), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1825-8670/20125>
- Rust, C. (1998). The impact of educational development workshops on teachers' practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 3(1), 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144980030110>
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books.
- Silva, R. (2022). *Faculty development: Il docente universitario tra ricerca, didattica e management* [Faculty development: The university teacher between research, teaching, and management]. Carocci.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2016). *Faculty development in the age of evidence: Current practices, future imperatives*. Stylus.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2020a). Evaluation of faculty development programs in the United States: A fifty-year retrospective (1970s2020). *Excellence and innovation in Learning and Teaching*, 2, 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.3280/exioa2-2020oa10801>
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2020b). Fostering 21st century teaching and learning: New models for faculty professional development. In A. Lotti & P. A. Lampugnani (Eds.), *Faculty development in Italia. Valorizzazione delle competenze didattiche dei docenti universitari* (pp. 19-26). Genova University Press. https://gup.unige.it/sites/gup.unige.it/files/pagine/Faculty_Development_in_Italia_ebook_indicizzato.pdf
- Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A., Eddy, P., & Beach, A. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development*. Jossey-Bass.

- Steinert, Y. (2010a). Faculty development: From workshops to communities of practice. *Medical Teacher*, 32(5), 425–428. <https://doi.org/10.3109/01421591003677897>
- Steinert, Y. (2010b). Making it all happen: Faculty development for busy teachers. In P. Cantillon & D. Wood (Eds.), *ABC of learning and teaching in medicine* (2nd ed., pp. 73-77). Blackwell Publishing.
- Steinert, Y., Nasmith, L., & Daigle, N. (2003). Executive skills for medical faculty: A workshop description and evaluation. *Medical Teacher*, 25(6), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159032000150485>
- Steinert, Y., Boillat, M., Meterissian, S., Liben, S., & McLeod, P. J. (2008a). Developing successful workshops: A workshop for educators. *Medical Teacher*, 30(3), 328–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590801948059>
- Steinert, Y., McLeod, P. J., Liben, S., & Snell, L. (2008b). Writing for publication in medical education: The benefits of a faculty development workshop and peer writing group. *Medical Teacher*, 30(8), 280–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590802337120>
- Steinert, Y., Nasmith, L., & Mann, K. (2012). Faculty development initiatives designed to promote leadership in medical education: A BEME systematic review. *Medical Teacher*, 34(6), 483-503. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.680937>
- Stes, A., Min-Leliveld, M., Gijbels, D., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). The impact of instructional development in higher education: The state-of-the-art of the research. *Educational Research Review*, 5, 25–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2009.07.001>
- Stes, A., Coertjens, L., & Van Petegem, P. (2013). Instructional development in higher education: Impact on teachers' teaching behaviour as perceived by students. *Instructional Science*, 41(6), 1103-1126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9267-4>
- Stes, A., & Hoekstra, A. (2015). Convergence in diversity: Evaluating faculty development across the globe. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 46, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.04.001>
- Sufi, S., Nenadic, A., Silva, R., Duckles, B., Simera, I., De Beyer, J. A., Struthers, C., Nurmikko-Fuller, T., Bellis, L., Miah, W., Wilde, A., Emsley, I., Philippe, O., Balzano, M., Coelho, S., Ford, H., Jones, C., & Higgins, V. (2018). Ten simple rules for measuring the impact of workshops. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 14(8), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006191>
- Tomei, G. (2016). *Valutare gli outcome dei programmi complessi: Approcci, metodologie, tecniche* [Evaluating the outcomes of complex programs: Approaches, methodologies, techniques]. Franco Angeli.
- Tricio, J. A., Montt, J. E., Ormeño, A. P., Del Real, A. J., & Naranjo, C. A. (2017). Impact of faculty development workshops in student-centered teaching methodologies on faculty members' teaching and their students' perceptions. *Journal of dental education*, 81(6), 675–684. <https://doi.org/10.21815/JDE.017.014>

- van Dijk, E. E., van Tartwijk, J., van Der Schaaf, M. F., & Kluijtmans, M. (2020). What makes an expert university teacher: A systematic review and synthesis of frameworks for teacher expertise in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 31(11), Article e100365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100365>
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zenni, E. A., & Turner, T. L. (2021). Planning and presenting workshops that work: A faculty development workshop. *MedEdPORTAL: the journal of teaching and learning resources*, 17, Article e11158. https://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.11158