The Impact of the Faculty Development on Teaching, Learning, and Research

Rosalie P. Espartero, Maria Cecelia P. Amparado, and Cyril John S. Tubola

University of San Agustin, General Luna St., Iloilo City

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000238

Received: 02 September 2025; Accepted: 09 September 2025; Published: 07 October 2025

ABSTRACT

Faculty development programs—encompassing workshops, mentoring initiatives, research training, and hybrid learning seminars—are vital in higher education for enhancing teaching effectiveness, enriching student learning, and fostering research productivity. This study examined the perceived impact of these programs on faculty performance, specifically investigating whether perceptions differed across demographic and professional factors such as age, sex, educational attainment, years in service, type of seminar attended, and participant roles. Employing a descriptive research design, data were gathered from 120 purposively selected faculty members of the university's Education program using an adapted and modified questionnaire, validated by experts in teacher education and research methods to ensure reliability and relevance. Responses were analyzed through nonparametric tests, namely the Mann-Whitney *U* and Kruskal-Wallis *H* tests, to determine variations in perceptions regarding teaching, learning, and research benefits. The findings revealed that faculty consistently perceived development programs as beneficial across these domains, with no statistically significant differences across most demographic and professional profiles. However, a notable subject-specific variation emerged, as faculty handling pedagogical and methods-oriented courses reported greater perceived improvements in teaching practices compared to colleagues in content-intensive disciplines, suggesting that the benefits of faculty development are shaped in part by instructional context. Despite these differences, the overall trend highlighted a strong acceptance of faculty development as valuable for professional growth, with broad relevance across faculty groups. The study concludes that institutions should continue to invest in comprehensive faculty development initiatives that are adaptable, responsive to subject-specific needs, and aligned with institutional priorities, thereby sustaining long-term academic excellence.

Keywords: faculty development, learning, teaching, research, higher education

INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly evolving landscape of higher education, faculty development has emerged as a crucial mechanism to enhance teaching effectiveness, foster student learning, and advance research outcomes (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013; Rieger, 2009). Faculty in higher education function as central agents of knowledge creation, transmission, and innovation, and institutions worldwide have increasingly invested in professional development programs to strengthen their teaching and research capacity (Golde & Dore, 2001).

Over the years, faculty development has expanded beyond traditional training workshops to include a diverse range of initiatives—such as seminars, mentoring programs, collaborative research projects, and hybrid or technology-driven pedagogical training—that respond to new demands for digital fluency, interdisciplinary collaboration, and innovative classroom practices (Johnson, 2006; Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014). These initiatives are organized at multiple levels, including institutional, regional, and national platforms, to equip educators with essential competencies in instructional design, technology integration, learner-centered approaches, and research advancement. Faculty today face heightened expectations to be both creative and effective teachers while navigating increasingly diverse student populations and balancing the pressures of producing quality research.

As faculty members participate in these development programs, the impact on teaching practices, student learning experiences, and research productivity becomes a critical area of inquiry (Wood, 2003). This study aimed to investigate the multifaceted impact of faculty development on teaching, learning, and research by examining the perceptions and experiences of faculty members who engaged in such initiatives. While previous scholarship has underscored the broad importance of professional development (Weimer, 2013; Wingate, 2007), fewer studies have examined how its perceived benefits vary across demographic factors, professional contexts, and subject specializations. Addressing this gap, the present research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how faculty development supports academic excellence in diverse higher education settings.

Statement of the Problem

Faculty development programs are widely recognized as mechanisms to enhance professional growth, particularly in strengthening teaching practices, advancing student learning outcomes, and supporting research productivity. Yet, much of the existing literature focuses on general benefits, often assuming that participation inherently translates into effectiveness. This creates a gap between perceived value and demonstrated outcomes, raising questions about whether some initiatives risk functioning as "checkbox" activities rather than catalysts for meaningful professional change. While institutions have increasingly invested in such programs, limited evidence exists on how faculty members' perceptions of impact vary across demographic and professional characteristics, or whether subject-specific contexts require more tailored interventions.

This study addressed that gap by determining the perceived impact of faculty development programs on teaching, learning, and research among university faculty members. Specifically, it examined how these perceptions differ when grouped according to age, sex, educational attainment, number of years in the university, nature of the seminar, and role in the seminar. Furthermore, the study investigated whether statistically significant differences exist in perceptions of impact across these variables, thereby offering insights into whether faculty development initiatives are universally experienced as beneficial or whether their relevance and effectiveness are shaped by specific professional contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Faculty Development Programs

Faculty development programs have become an essential component of higher education institutions worldwide, aiming to improve teaching effectiveness, enrich student learning experiences, and foster faculty research productivity. However, the extent to which these programs achieve sustained and measurable outcomes remains an area of debate.

Teaching

Bligh (2005) explored the impact of faculty development programs (FDPs) on instructors' teaching performance, noting improvements in teaching skills, assessment techniques, curriculum design, and perspectives on student–teacher relationships. Steinert et al. later summarized anticipated outcomes, including increased faculty satisfaction, reflective practice, and observable changes in teaching behaviors. While these studies demonstrate the transformative potential of FDPs, they also reveal limitations. Faculty often report high levels of satisfaction with training (Steinert et al.), but questions remain as to whether satisfaction consistently translates into long-term pedagogical improvements or measurable student learning outcomes. Moreover, most findings are based on self-reported data, underscoring the need for empirical evidence that directly links participation in FDPs to sustained teaching excellence.

Learning

Doyle (2008) emphasized that inclusive classrooms promote active participation, critical thinking, and collaboration, arguing that FDPs play a role in training faculty to recognize and accommodate diverse learning needs. Gappa et al. (2007) similarly highlighted the growing diversity of student populations in terms of age,

aspirations, and cultural background, calling for faculty preparation that responds to such complexity. Together, these works suggest that faculty development contributes to inclusive pedagogy both at the classroom level (Doyle) and the institutional level (Gappa). Yet challenges persist: while FDPs expose faculty to strategies for inclusivity, little evidence shows how these strategies are consistently enacted in practice or how they influence measurable learning outcomes. This gap underscores the importance of investigating whether inclusivity-focused FDPs genuinely equip educators to address heterogeneity in student populations.

Research

Faculty development has also been linked to research productivity. Cillers and Herman (2010) argued that well-designed programs improve the quality of teaching and assessment, while Trower and Gallagher (2010), in a large-scale study of tenure-track faculty, found that access to development resources correlated with greater career satisfaction and success. Ortlieb, Biddix, and Doepker (2010) emphasized the value of research communities, and Amin et al. (2009) highlighted FDPs as vital to sustaining academic vitality in medical education. Kamel (2016) noted that pressures such as curriculum changes, healthcare competition, and scarce research resources heighten the need for FDP support. While these studies point to the positive role of faculty development in enhancing research skills and collaboration, unresolved questions remain regarding the sustainability of such gains. Specifically, it is unclear whether FDPs foster long-term research productivity or primarily serve as short-term interventions.

Synthesis

Taken together, prior studies affirm the promise of faculty development programs across teaching, learning, and research. Yet they also expose critical gaps: satisfaction and short-term outcomes are often emphasized over sustained behavioral change, inclusivity strategies are discussed more than systematically evaluated, and evidence linking FDPs to lasting research productivity remains limited. These gaps highlight the need for more nuanced investigations into how FDPs influence faculty performance across contexts, disciplines, and time.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employs a descriptive research design within a quantitative approach to systematically capture faculty members' perceptions of the impact of development programs on teaching, learning, and research. A descriptive design is most appropriate because the study seeks to document existing conditions rather than establish causal relationships or manipulate variables. Faculty development programs are already implemented within the institution, and the research aims to provide an objective account of how faculty members experience and evaluate their effectiveness. Through this approach, the study generates a comprehensive profile of perceptions across various demographic and professional characteristics, offering a snapshot of the current state of faculty development within the university. As Wiseman (1999) underscores, the credibility of descriptive research lies in the rigor of its data collection instruments, making the use of adapted and modified questionnaires—validated to ensure relevance and accuracy—particularly well suited to the study's objectives.

The descriptive-quantitative approach also enables the systematic analysis of patterns, similarities, and differences in responses among purposively selected participants. By employing statistical tools, the study examines whether perceptions of faculty development programs vary according to age, sex, educational attainment, years in service, type of seminar, and role in the seminar. Unlike qualitative or experimental designs, which focus on subjective interpretation or controlled intervention, this design provides measurable, generalizable data that can inform institutional decision-making. It is therefore especially valuable in educational research contexts where administrators and policymakers require evidence-based insights into faculty experiences to refine professional development initiatives. In this way, the chosen research design aligns directly with the study's goals of assessing the perceived impact of faculty development programs and identifying whether such impacts are consistent across groups or shaped by specific professional contexts.

Subject and Respondents of the Study

Table 1 Profile of the Respondents

Faculty Members Demographics		***f***	***%***
Sex			
	Male	14	40
	Female	21	60
Age			
	25-35	7	20
	36-45	7	20
	46-55	13	37
	56-65	8	23
Educational Attainment			
	Masteral	26	74
	Doctoral	9	26
Number of Years of Teaching Experiences			
	1-10	11	31
	11-20	8	23
	21-30	8	23
	31 & more	8	23
Subjects Taught			
	General Education	17	49
	Professional	7	20
	Major	11	31
Role in the Faculty Development			
	Participant	32	91
	Facilitator	2	6
	Speaker	1	3
Type or Level of Faculty Development			
	Local	25	71
	National	9	26
	International	1	3
Entire Group		**35**	**100**

The respondents of this study were 35 faculty members from the Education program of the College of Liberal Arts, Sciences, and Education at the University of San Agustin. Purposive sampling was used to select participants who had engaged in at least one faculty development program within the past two years. This ensured that all respondents had relevant and recent experiences with professional development initiatives, making their perceptions directly aligned with the study's objectives.

The participants reflected diversity across demographic variables. In terms of sex, both male and female faculty members were represented. They also came from varied age groups, ranging from younger, early-career faculty in their twenties and thirties to mid-career and senior faculty members who had already accumulated decades of teaching experience. Their years in service likewise varied, with some teaching at the university for fewer than five years and others having more than twenty years of professional experience. Educational attainment ranged from bachelor's degree holders who were pursuing advanced studies to those who had completed master's and doctoral degrees.

Professional characteristics also differed among the respondents. Faculty members handled a range of subjects, including pedagogy- and methods-oriented courses as well as content-heavy or discipline-specific courses. Their participation in faculty development initiatives also varied: while most joined as participants, a number assumed roles as facilitators, trainers, or organizers. They were engaged in diverse types of programs such as workshops, seminars, mentoring sessions, and research-focused training. This variety in demographic and professional backgrounds provided a comprehensive perspective on how faculty development programs are perceived and experienced within the Education program.

Data Gathering Procedure and Instrumentation

This study employed a quantitative mode of data collection through the use of an adapted and modified questionnaire originally based on established instruments assessing the perceived impact of faculty development programs. The original instrument was reviewed and adjusted to align with the specific objectives of this study, particularly in capturing the impact of faculty development on teaching, learning, and research. Modifications included rephrasing items for clarity, contextualizing examples to the Education program, and adding response options relevant to local practices in seminars and workshops.

The questionnaire consisted of two main parts. The first part focused on the respondents' demographic and professional profile, including sex, age, number of years of teaching experience, educational attainment, and subject taught. The second part assessed the perceived impact of faculty development programs on teaching, learning, and research. Respondents were asked to rate items using a five-point Likert Scale, where each response option was assigned a numerical weight and descriptive interpretation, allowing for quantitative analysis of perceived impact levels. To ensure instrument quality, the revised questionnaire underwent expert validation by specialists in teacher education and research methodology. Reliability testing was also conducted, yielding a Cronbach's alpha of 0.976, which indicates very high internal consistency.

Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were assured that their involvement was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without consequence. Measures were taken to guarantee confidentiality: no identifying information was included in the dataset, and responses were coded for analysis. The data were handled securely and used exclusively for research purposes. These procedures ensured compliance with ethical standards and the credibility of the study's findings.

Each response was assigned with a numerical weight and described using the Likert Scale below:

Numerical Weight/Scaling	Description
4.21-5.00 (Very High Impact)	The respondent experiences very influential impact. A score of 5 was indicated.
3.41-4.20 (High Impact)	The respondent experiences influential impact. A score of 4 was indicated.
2.61-3.40 (Average Impact)	The respondent experiences neutral impact. A score of 3 was indicated.
1.81-2.60 (Low Impact)	The respondent experiences uninfluential impact. A score of 2 was indicated.

1.00-1.80 (Very Low Impact)	The respondent experiences very uninfluential impact. A score of 1 was indicated.

Data and Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics are used to describe distributions between variables (Best and Kahn, 1998). The data gathered from the accomplished questionnaires were examined, classified, and analyzed according to the objectives of the study. Responses were tabulated, tallied, and interpreted using the following statistical tools: frequency count, percentage, mean, and standard deviation.

Inferential statistics is concerned with inferring or drawing conclusions about the population based from the pre-selected elements of that population (Altares et al., 2003). Responses were tabulated, tallied, and interpreted using Mann Whitney *U* test and Kruskal Wallis *H* test.

Ethical Considerations

This study was granted ethical clearance by the University of San Agustin Research Ethics Review Committee (USA-RERC), which issued an official Ethics Review Certificate bearing the assigned RERC Protocol Code 2024-208-PROFESSIONAL. The approval signifies that the research protocol, including its objectives, methodology, data collection instruments, and treatment of participants, was thoroughly reviewed and found to adhere to established ethical standards. This ensures that the study upholds the principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, and that the rights, safety, and well-being of all participants are adequately protected throughout the research process. The ethical clearance also reflects the commitment of the researcher and the institution to conduct responsible and ethically sound academic research in accordance with institutional and national guidelines.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Faculty development plays a vital role in strengthening the core functions of higher education—teaching, learning, and research. As universities face growing demands for academic excellence and innovation, professional development programs have become essential tools in equipping faculty members with updated knowledge, effective teaching strategies, and advanced research skills. Through seminars, workshops, training sessions, and collaborative initiatives, educators are given opportunities to enhance their competencies and adapt to evolving educational trends. Understanding the impact of these programs is crucial in ensuring that they truly support faculty growth and contribute to improved academic outcomes. This study investigates how faculty development influences teaching practices, learning experiences, and research productivity from the perspectives of university faculty members.

Table 2 Faculty Development Impact Level by Sex

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Sex**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***U***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	Male	14	0.76	4.16	High	110.000	0.206	Not Significant
	Female	21	0.59	4.45	Very High			
Learning	Male	14	0.73	4.19	High	112.000	0.236	Not Significant
	Female	21	0.58	4.42	Very High			
Research	Male	14	0.68	4.06	High	129.000	0.554	Not Significant
	Female	21	0.79	3.92	High			

The data in Table 2 shows the impact level of faculty development programs on teaching, learning, and research when grouped by sex. Female faculty members reported a "Very High" impact on both teaching (*M*=4.45) and learning (*M*=4.42), while male faculty members rated the impact as "High" in the same areas (*M*=4.16 for teaching and *M*=4.19 for learning). In terms of research, both male (*M*=4.06) and female (*M*=3.92) faculty members described the impact as "High". Despite the observed differences in mean scores, the Mann-Whitney U test results indicate that these differences are not statistically significant across all three domains: teaching (*U*=110.000, *p*=0.206), learning (*U*=112.000, *p*=0.236), and research (*U*=129.000, *p*=0.554). Therefore, sex does not significantly influence the perceived impact of faculty development programs on teaching, learning, and research.

The finding that ***sex*** does not significantly influence the perceived impact of faculty development programs, despite observed differences in mean scores, carries several implications. An advantage of this result is that it underscores the equitable accessibility and potential benefit of faculty development initiatives for both male and female educators, suggesting that program design does not need to be tailored explicitly along gender lines to be effective in Iloilo City. This aligns with the broader aim of faculty development to enhance teaching, learning, and research capabilities across the entire faculty, as highlighted by Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) and Johnson (2006), without inherent gender bias in its reception. However, a disadvantage could be the missed opportunity to explore nuanced, qualitative differences in how male and female faculty members might experience or prioritize certain aspects of development, even if the overall perceived impact is statistically similar. For instance, while both sexes rated research impact as "High", understanding subtle gender-based preferences in research support could further optimize programs for different faculty groups, potentially leading to even higher engagement and outcomes, consistent with the ideas of enhancing faculty vitality (Magno & Bolatito, 2017) and overall academic performance. This also suggests that while the current programs are generally effective, a deeper dive into gender-specific experiences, though not statistically significant in this quantitative analysis, could reveal avenues for more targeted and potentially more impactful support.

Table 3 Faculty Development Impact Level by Age

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Age**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***H***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	25-35	7	0.54	4.50	Very High	0.546	0.659	Not Significant
	36-45	7	0.99	3.97	High			
	46-55	13	0.50	4.45	Very High			
	56-65	8	0.68	4.31	Very High			
Learning	25-35	7	0.46	4.40	Very High	0.948	0.443	Not Significant
	36-45	7	0.87	3.93	High			
	46-55	13	0.56	4.54	Very High			
	56-65	8	0.63	4.29	Very High			
Research	25-35	7	0.78	4.03	High	1.198	0.345	Not Significant
	36-45	7	0.70	3.99	High			
	46-55	13	0.69	4.21	Very High			
	56-65	8	0.77	3.55	High			

Table 3 illustrates the perceived impact level of faculty development programs on teaching, learning, and research across different age groups. Across all domains, the impact is generally rated as "Very High", particularly among the 25–35, 46–55, and 56–65 age groups, with mean scores ranging from 4.21 to 4.54. Notably, the 36–45 age group consistently reported slightly lower mean scores, with a "High" description in all

three areas. Despite these variations, the Kruskal-Wallis H test results show no statistically significant differences in perceived impact based on age in teaching (H=0.546, p=0.659), learning (H=0.948, p=0.443), or research (H=1.198, p=0.345). These findings indicate that age does not significantly influence how faculty members perceive the impact of development programs on their professional roles.

The finding that ***age*** does not significantly influence the perceived impact of faculty development programs, despite variations in mean scores across age groups, presents several implications. An advantage is that faculty development initiatives can be designed with a universal approach, as their perceived effectiveness is likely to transcend age-related differences, aligning with the idea that ongoing professional development is crucial for all faculty members to enhance teaching and learning, as supported by Austin & Sorcinelli (2013) and Doyle (2008). This consistency implies that resources can be efficiently allocated to broad programs rather than age-specific ones, potentially maximizing reach and impact across the institution, which is vital for institutional effectiveness as highlighted by Johnson (2006). However, a disadvantage could be the missed opportunity to tailor programs that specifically address the unique needs or career stages of different age cohorts, even if the overall perceived impact isn't statistically different. For instance, while all age groups may find programs impactful, younger faculty might benefit more from foundational teaching skills (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014) and research methodologies (Wiseman, 1999), while more experienced faculty might seek advanced pedagogical strategies (Weimer, 2013) or leadership development. Overlooking these nuanced needs, even without statistical significance in overall perception, could limit the depth of impact for specific groups. Nonetheless, the overarching implication remains positive: faculty development holds broad relevance across all age demographics, contributing to faculty vitality and improved academic performance (Magno & Bolatito, 2017) and ultimately fostering student learning (Rieger, 2009).

Table 4 Faculty Development Impact Level by Educational Attainment

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Educational Attainment**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***U***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	Masteral	26	0.65	4.31	Very High	102.500	0.592	Not Significant
	Doctoral	9	0.75	4.40	Very High			
Learning	Masteral	26	0.61	4.28	Very High	85.000	0.232	Not Significant
	Doctoral	9	0.75	4.47	Very High			
Research	Masteral	26	0.72	4.03	High	103.500	0.622	Not Significant
	Doctoral	9	0.82	3.83	High			

Table 4 presents the impact level of faculty development programs on teaching, learning, and research when grouped according to educational attainment. Both master's and doctoral degree holders rated the impact on teaching and learning as "Very High", with slightly higher mean scores for those with doctoral degrees (M=4.40 for teaching and M=4.47 for learning) compared to those with master's degrees (M=4.31 and M=4.28, respectively). In the area of research, both groups rated the impact as "High", with master's degree holders reporting a higher mean (M=4.03) than doctoral degree holders (M=3.83). Despite these variations in mean scores, the Mann-Whitney U test revealed that the differences in perceived impact between the two groups are not statistically significant in teaching (U=102.500, p=0.592), learning (U=85.000, p=0.232), or research (U=103.500, p=0.622). This indicates that educational attainment does not significantly affect the perceived impact of faculty development programs.

The finding that **educational attainment** does not significantly influence the perceived impact of faculty development programs carries several implications. On one hand, this suggests an advantage in that faculty development initiatives, as described by Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) regarding their future directions, appear to be broadly effective and inclusive, catering well to both master's and doctoral degree holders without needing highly specialized approaches based on academic background for general teaching and learning

enhancements (Johnson, 2006; Rieger, 2009). This consistency simplifies program design and resource allocation, ensuring that foundational pedagogical strategies (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014) are perceived as beneficial across diverse academic qualifications. However, a potential disadvantage lies in the possibility that current faculty development might not be adequately leveraging or addressing the distinct, advanced scholarly needs and research expertise that doctoral training, as discussed by Golde and Dore (2001), is designed to cultivate, particularly given that both groups only rated research impact as "High" (Wiseman, 1999). This lack of differentiation, despite variations in mean scores, implies a missed opportunity to provide more targeted interventions that could potentially elevate the perceived impact on research for faculty with higher degrees, suggesting that while current programs offer universal benefits, there might be room for more nuanced, advanced development catering to specialized academic profiles.

Table 5 Faculty Development Impact Level by Number of Years of Teaching Experiences

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Number of Years of Teaching Experiences**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***H***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	1-10	11	0.57	4.51	Very High	1.210	0.337	Not Significant
	11-20	8	0.54	4.22	Very High			
	21-30	8	0.96	3.96	High			
	31 & more	8	0.46	4.56	Very High			
Learning	1-10	11	0.54	4.40	Very High	0.714	0.558	Not Significant
	11-20	8	0.57	4.21	Very High			
	21-30	8	1.00	4.15	High			
	31 & more	8	0.40	4.54	Very High			
Research	1-10	11	0.78	4.18	High	0.416	0.744	Not Significant
	11-20	8	0.46	3.89	High			
	21-30	8	0.82	3.96	High			
	31 & more	8	0.89	3.80	High			

Table 5 presents the faculty development impact level across different years of teaching experience, categorized by its impact on teaching, learning, and research. For "Teaching", faculty with 1-10, 11-20, and 31 & more years of experience show a "Very High" impact level (*M*=4.51, 4.22, and 4.56 respectively), while those with 21-30 years report a "High" impact (*M*=3.96). Similarly, for "Learning", all experience groups except 21-30 years (*M*=4.15, "High") indicate a "Very High" impact level (*M*=4.40, 4.21, and 4.54 respectively for 1-10, 11-20, and 31 & more years). In contrast, the impact on "Research" consistently remains "High" across all experience groups, with mean scores ranging from 3.80 to 4.18. Results for all the three areas (Teaching, Learning, and Research) suggest that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived faculty development impact level based on the number of years of teaching experience.

The finding that faculty development impact levels on teaching, learning, and research are not statistically significant based on ***years of teaching experience*** implies both advantages and potential disadvantages for institutional practice. On one hand, this suggests that faculty development programs can be designed to offer broad benefits, fostering continuous professional growth across all career stages, from early-career faculty seeking foundational teaching skills (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014) to seasoned educators aiming for renewed vitality and pedagogical refinement (Magno & Bolatito, 2017; Weimer, 2013). This broad applicability means programs can efficiently enhance overall institutional impact on learning (Johnson, 2006; Rieger, 2009) without needing highly differentiated content for each experience cohort. However, a disadvantage could be that a "one-size-fits-all" approach might overlook the nuanced developmental needs that evolve with

experience, potentially missing opportunities to optimize impact. For instance, while all faculty might perceive a general "High" or "Very High" impact, highly experienced faculty might benefit more from advanced sessions on specific research strategies (Wiseman, 1999) or specialized learner-centered methodologies (Doyle, 2008), which might not be adequately addressed if programs aren't tailored. Ultimately, while current programs appear universally beneficial in their perceived impact, future development could explore how to deepen the specific types of impact for faculty at different career stages, as suggested by calls for the future evolution of faculty development (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013).

Table 6 Faculty Development Impact Level by Subjects Taught

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Subjects Taught**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***H***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	General Education	17	0.74	4.38	Very High	4.209*	0.032	Significant
	Professional	7	0.49	4.71	Very High			
	Major	11	0.51	4.01	High			
Learning	General Education	17	0.73	4.42	Very High	1.426	0.265	Not Significant
	Professional	7	0.44	4.49	Very High			
	Major	11	0.59	4.09	High			
Research	General Education	17	0.79	4.10	High	0.757	0.486	Not Significant
	Professional	7	0.85	4.00	High			
	Major	11	0.61	3.77	High			

*p<0.05 is significant.

Table 6 considers the Faculty Development Impact Level based on the subjects taught, specifically focusing on its influence on Teaching, Learning, and Research. For "Teaching", there's a significant difference (H=4.209, p=0.032) among subject categories, with General Education and Professional subjects showing a "Very High" impact (M=4.38 and 4.71 respectively), while Major subjects indicate a "High" impact (M=4.01). Conversely, for "Learning", the impact is not statistically significant (H=1.426, p=0.265), with General Education and Professional subjects both reporting a "Very High" impact (M=4.42 and 4.49) and Major subjects showing a "High" impact (M=4.09). Similarly, for "Research", the impact is also not statistically significant (H=0.757, p=0.486), with all subject categories (General Education, Professional, and Major) consistently reporting a "High" impact (M=4.10, 4.00, and 3.77 respectively).

The finding that faculty development programs have a varied impact depending on the ***subject taught***, with a statistically significant impact on "Teaching" but not on "Learning" or "Research". The advantage here is that faculty development appears to be effectively tailored to enhance teaching skills, particularly for General Education and Professional subjects, which aligns with the emphasis on effective pedagogy highlighted by Svinicki and McKeachie (2014) and the benefits of faculty development on teaching skills noted by Kamel (2016). However, a disadvantage is the lack of a significant impact on "Learning" and "Research" across subject categories, indicating a potential gap in current faculty development approaches. This suggests that while faculty might feel more equipped to teach specific subjects, the broader goals of improving student learning outcomes (Doyle, 2008; Weimer, 2013; Rieger, 2009) and fostering research productivity (Wiseman, 1999) might not be uniformly addressed by existing programs. Future faculty development initiatives, as envisioned by Austin and Sorcinelli (2013), could benefit from more targeted strategies to ensure a consistent and significant impact on learning and research, thereby maximizing the institutional impact of these programs

(Johnson, 2006) and enhancing overall faculty vitality (Magno & Bolatito, 2017), rather than solely focusing on teaching methodologies for specific subject areas.

Table 7 Faculty Development Impact Level by Role in the Faculty Development

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Role in the Faculty Development**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***H***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	Participant	32	0.69	4.35	Very High	0.573	0.751	Not Significant
	Facilitator	2	0.14	4.10	High			
	Speaker	1	a	4.20	High			
Learning	Participant	32	0.66	4.35	Very High	1.962	0.375	Not Significant
	Facilitator	2	0.14	3.90	High			
	Speaker	1	a	4.60	Very High			
Research	Participant	32	0.76	3.95	High	1.342	0.511	Not Significant
	Facilitator	2	0.00	4.00	High			
	Speaker	1	a	4.80	Very High			

a. No computed standard deviation (SD) due to single (1) response.

Table 7 examines the Faculty Development Impact Level based on the role played in faculty development activities (Participant, Facilitator, Speaker) across Teaching, Learning, and Research. For “Teaching”, while participants reported a “Very High” impact (*M*=4.35), facilitators and speakers reported a “High” impact (*M*=4.10 and 4.20 respectively); however, the differences were not statistically significant (*H*=0.573, *p*=0.751). Similarly, for “Learning”, participants showed a “Very High” impact (*M*=4.35), facilitators a “High” impact (*M*=3.90), and speakers a “Very High” impact (*M*=4.60), but these differences were also not statistically significant (*H*=1.962, *p*=0.375). In the realm of “Research”, participants and facilitators perceived a “High” impact (*M*=3.95 and 4.00), while speakers perceived a “Very High” impact (*M*=4.80); yet, again, no statistically significant differences were found (*H*=1.342, *p*=0.511). The consistent "Not Significant" interpretation across all three impact areas suggests that the role an individual play in faculty development does not significantly influence their perception of its impact on teaching, learning, or research.

The consistent lack of statistically significant differences in perceived faculty development impact across various ***roles*** (participant, facilitator, speaker) suggests that the benefits of such programs are broadly disseminated, irrespective of the specific engagement level. An advantage of this finding, emphasizing the broad positive effects of faculty development as supported by Austin & Sorcinelli (2013) and Johnson (2006), is that it reinforces the idea that participation in any capacity can contribute to enhanced teaching and learning outcomes. For instance, even as a participant, faculty can acquire new teaching strategies (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014) or improve their understanding of learner-centered approaches (Doyle, 2008; Weimer, 2013), similar to what a facilitator might aim to impart. However, a disadvantage could be a potential missed opportunity for maximizing impact; if the roles do not significantly differentiate perceived benefits, it might indicate that faculty development programs are not fully leveraging the unique expertise and contributions of facilitators and speakers. While speakers may demonstrate "Very High" impact on research, this trend is not statistically significant, suggesting that their specialized contributions might not be universally recognized as having a distinctly higher impact than general participation. This could imply a need to refine program design to ensure that the unique contributions of facilitators and speakers are more explicitly integrated and recognized for their distinct value in fostering academic vitality (Magno & Bolatito, 2017) and ultimately impacting student learning (Rieger, 2009).

Table 8 Faculty Development Impact Level by Type or Level of Faculty Development

Faculty Development Impact Level on:	**Type or Level of Faculty Development**	***f***	***SD***	***M***	**Description**	***H***	***p***	**Interpretation**
Teaching	Local	25	0.60	4.37	Very High	0.674	0.714	Not Significant
	National	9	0.89	4.26	High			
	International	1	a	4.00	High			
Learning	Local	25	0.58	4.33	Very High	1.525	0.466	Not Significant
	National	9	0.85	4.39	High			
	International	1	a	3.90	Very High			
Research	Local	25	0.80	3.96	High	0.382	0.826	Not Significant
	National	9	0.61	4.06	High			
	International	1	a	3.60	Very High			

a. No computed standard deviation (SD) due to single (1) response.

Table 8 examines the Faculty Development Impact Level based on the type or level of faculty development (Local, National, International) across Teaching, Learning, and Research. For "Teaching", local faculty development was perceived to have a "Very High" impact (M=4.37), while national and international levels had a "High" impact (M=4.26 and 4.00 respectively); however, these differences were not statistically significant (H=0.674, p=0.714). In terms of "Learning", local development also showed a "Very High" impact (M=4.33), national development a "High" impact (M=4.39), and international development a "Very High" impact (M=3.90); again, no significant differences were observed (H=1.525, p=0.466). Similarly, for "Research", local and national faculty development indicated a "High" impact (M=3.96 and 4.06 respectively), while international development showed a "Very High" impact (M=3.60); once more, the differences were not statistically significant (H=0.382, p=0.826). Overall, the analysis consistently indicates that the type or level of faculty development does not significantly influence its perceived impact on teaching, learning, or research.

The finding that the perceived impact of faculty development on teaching, learning, and research does not significantly differ across local, national, and international levels (i.e., based on the ***type or level of faculty development***) suggests that the quality and relevance of the program's content and design may be more crucial than its geographical scope. An advantage of this is that institutions can strategically invest in more accessible and potentially cost-effective local faculty development initiatives, confident that they can achieve similar positive outcomes in enhancing teaching skills (Kamel, 2016) and fostering faculty vitality (Magno & Bolatito, 2017), contributing to overall institutional impact (Johnson, 2006). However, a potential disadvantage lies in the risk of overlooking the unique benefits that national or international programs might offer, such as exposure to diverse pedagogical innovations, broader academic networks, and cutting-edge research methodologies crucial for the continuous evolution of faculty development (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013) and the cultivation of advanced academic literacy (Wingate, 2007). Ultimately, this highlights the importance of designing programs that strongly support learner-centered teaching practices (Doyle, 2008; Weimer, 2013) and foster skills that directly improve student learning outcomes (Rieger, 2009; Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014), irrespective of the program's scale, while acknowledging the potential for broader perspectives gained from wider-ranging engagements (Wiseman, 1999).

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that faculty development initiatives are positively received across a diverse group of faculty members, reflecting their perceived usefulness in enhancing teaching, learning, and research. Participants consistently acknowledged the value of these programs for professional growth, indicating that such initiatives contribute meaningfully to academic practice. However, while overall

perceptions are favorable, these findings are based on self-reports, which do not directly capture long-term behavioral changes or impacts on student outcomes.

The results suggest that faculty development programs function effectively as broad platforms for growth, yet they also highlight the need for caution against assuming that a single universal approach fits all faculty profiles. Differences in academic disciplines, career stages, and professional responsibilities point to the importance of adaptable structures that can respond to varied needs. Programs designed with both general and specialized components can better accommodate this diversity while maintaining institutional coherence.

Moreover, the study underscores the importance of viewing faculty development not only as a tool for professional enrichment but also as a catalyst for institutional advancement. By aligning faculty development with broader academic goals, universities can create environments that foster teaching innovation, research productivity, and inclusive learning practices. At the same time, further evidence is needed to clarify the extent to which perceived benefits translate into measurable educational outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Institutions should continue supporting faculty development programs but design them in flexible and modular formats. Core training can cover fundamental teaching strategies, assessment approaches, and research skills applicable to all faculty, while optional modules may address subject-specific pedagogy, mentoring needs of early-career academics, or advanced research competencies for senior faculty. This ensures programs remain inclusive while still adaptable to specialized demands.

Regular evaluation and feedback mechanisms must be integrated into the implementation of faculty development initiatives. Institutions should systematically collect input from participants, monitor the application of new practices in classrooms, and assess alignment with institutional objectives. Administrators, in particular, should provide the necessary resources, recognition, and incentives that encourage faculty participation and the sustained integration of professional learning into teaching and research.

Future research should extend beyond perception-based evidence. Longitudinal studies can provide insight into whether participation in development programs leads to lasting changes in pedagogy or student achievement. Comparative analyses of different models—such as workshops, mentoring, and collaborative communities of practice—would clarify which approaches yield the strongest outcomes. Expanding inquiry across multiple institutions or international contexts could also reveal structural and cultural differences that shape faculty development effectiveness, offering broader guidance for policy and practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers hereby extend their deepest gratitude to the University of San Agustin for providing the necessary institutional support and resources that greatly facilitated the successful completion of this educational endeavor. They would like to express their sincere appreciation to all individuals whose assistance, encouragement, and cooperation were instrumental throughout the course of this study. In particular, the researchers wish to acknowledge with profound respect and gratitude Dr. Nenelyn Dela Fuente, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Sciences, and Education, for her unwavering support, guidance, and invaluable contributions. Her leadership and commitment to academic excellence significantly enriched the research process and outcomes. The researchers recognize that the accomplishment and success of this undertaking are shared achievements, owed to the collective efforts and dedication of all those involved. Their support has been indispensable in bringing this study to fruition, and for this, the researchers remain truly thankful.

Statements and Declarations:

Funding: The authors received financial support for research.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Ethics Approval: This study was granted an ethics clearance by the University of San Agustin Research Ethics Review Committee (USA-RERC), General Luna Street, Iloilo City, Philippines, 5000.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, A. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2013). The future of faculty development: Where are we going?. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2013(133), 85-95.
2. Doyle, T. (2008). Helping students learn in a learner-centered environment: A guide to facilitating learning in higher education. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
3. Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education. The Pew Charitable Trusts.
4. Johnson, D. R. (2006). A framework for the institutional impact of faculty development programs. Journal of Faculty Development, 20(3), 5-21.
5. Kamel, A. (2016). Faculty development program: Impact on dental faculty members' teaching skills. Saudi Journal of Oral Sciences, 3(2), 61-68.
6. Magno, C., & Bolatito, A. (2017). Faculty vitality: A key factor for enhancing the academic performance of learners. European Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences, 20(3), 2488-2497.
7. Rieger, G. W. (2009). Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections.
8. Innovative Higher Education, 33(3), 161-173.
9. Rowbotham, M. A. (2015). The impact of faculty development on teacher self-efficacy, skills and retention (IERC FFR 2015-1). Edwardsville, IL: Illinois Education Research Council at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.
10. Svinicki, M. D., & McKeachie, W. J. (2014). McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers. Cengage Learning.
11. Weimer, M. (2013). Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice. John Wiley & Sons.
12. Wingate, U. (2007). Developing academic literacy: An institutional approach. Studies in Higher Education, 32(2), 169-180.
13. Wiseman, C. (1999). Research strategies for education. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
14. Wood, D. F. (2003). ABC of learning and teaching in medicine: Problem-based learning. BMJ, 326(7384), 328-330.