Evaluating Faculty Development: Looking to the Past to Improve the Future

Susan R. Hines, Ed.D., *Saint Mary's University of Minnesota, Winona, MN, USA*

Introduction

Since the early 1970s, faculty developers have provided a myriad of activities to support college educators. Over 90 percent of institutions of higher learning have some sort of formal faculty development on campus.[1] The need for faculty development is clear; however, there is minimal valid evidence indicating teaching and learning has improved as a result.[2] This is not because faculty developers are disinterested in measuring the impact of their work. Instead, the challenge lies in a general lack of evaluation acumen due to the absence of models and practical examples in contemporary faculty development literature.[3] It is this need that sparked my interest to investigate the evaluation methods used to determine the effectiveness of teacher formation developed by John Baptist de La Salle. As a faculty developer at a Lasallian University[4] who has researched faculty development evaluation for the past seven years, I have found De La Salle's evidence-based approach to teacher development to be an extraordinary example of highly effective faculty development evaluation.

Historical Relevance to Today

One may argue that the evaluation of teacher development at De La Salle's gratuitous schools for the poor in late 17th- and early 18th-century France is neither relevant nor applicable to faculty development in 21st-century higher education. Indeed, there are contextual differences to be considered; both the distinctively different school settings and the historical socio-economic circumstances. Yet, De La Salle was an educator of educators, able to develop untrained, undereducated, ill-mannered tradesmen to be effective educators of boys from poor and working class families. He accomplished this through a systemized, goal-oriented, evidence-based approach where teacher development and evaluation were inter-dependent and provided continual evidence of improvement and efficacy. This unique model makes De La Salle's teacher development and evaluation practices a highly desirable historical example to explore.

Delimitations

The scope of this historical analysis is limited exclusively to the era of the early Christian schools during the time of John Baptist de La Salle's leadership beginning in 1680 and ending with his death in 1719. This historical example focuses on the instructional training of teachers as opposed to their religious training. Although the two are closely intertwined, literature emphasizing pedagogical training is exclusively used for this analysis in order to maintain relevancy and transferability to the question of today's secular faculty development. Additionally, the terms "formation" and "development" are used interchangeably.

Analytical Framework

In order to examine De La Salle's practices in a legitimate manner, three program evaluation models applicable to today's faculty development will be provided as an analytical framework. Stufflebeam's *C*ontext, *I*nput, *P*rocess, *P*roduct (CIPP) evaluation model is chosen to examine evaluations used to inform the design of De La Salle's teacher development practices.[5] Kirkpatrick's training evaluation model is selected to further examine the impact measures used.[6] The *Eight Dimensions of Quality Program Evaluation* is used for criteria to judge the various dimensional qualities of De La Salle's evaluation practices overall.[7] This combination of Stufflebeam's CIPP model, Kirkpatrick's model, and the eight dimensional criteria provides a multi-dimensional theoretical framework that will be used to: 1) explore how De La Salle evaluated the design and impact of his teacher development practices, 2) determine the quality of his evaluation practices, 3) discuss comparisons to current evaluation practices, and 4) provide recommendations for improve;ng today's faculty development evaluation practices.

De La Salle's Teacher Formation and Evaluation Practices

In 1679, when De La Salle first became involved in educating the poor in Rheims, France was under the rule of King Louis XIV. The continual wars, burdensome taxes, and agrarian dependency of this period created great socioeconomic rifts.[8] The poor were plentiful while the rich were becoming richer. Starvation, disease, homelessness, and destitution were common sights in the city streets. During this time, schoolmasters of the Little Schools were expected to accept some schoolchildren gratuitously, though with rags for clothes, poor hygiene and limited language skills, very few attended.[9] Education generally consisted of home tutors and a variety of fee-paying schools, along with high doses of corporal punishment. Given these conditions and the harsh everyday struggles of life, parents saw very little reason to send their children to school.

Late 17th-Century Schoolteachers

Those who entered the teaching profession were limited in number and ability. Teachers were typically retired or part-time uneducated tradesmen with horrific personal habits and inadequate reading and writing skills. A local pamphlet of the time referred to them as "low pot-house keepers, second-hand shop proprietors, and silk-weaver flunkie. . . ."[10] Teacher candidates were, however, required to get authorization from an educational leader by passing a skills performance test and character inquiry. Once hired, there was no organized system for teacher training or supervision. This typically resulted in frustrated teachers and their eventual departure from the teaching profession.[11] Such was initially the case for incoming teachers at De La Salle's newly formed schools.

De La Salle's Educational Development

De La Salle became involved in education with no practitioner experience; therefore, he turned to the more experienced educational practitioners of the time. He formed a close alliance with Father Nicolas Barré, an educational leader known for his involvement with teaching Sisters. Barré's writings included the *Statutes and Regulations* (rules to teach and live by in community)

and *Maximes* (a collection of reflections for women teachers).[12] De La Salle also associated with Father Charles Démia, an exceptional educational reformer, whose writings included *Remonstrances* (a manifesto petitioning for education for the poor) and *Reglements* (a book of rules for male teachers).[13] He knew of the work of Father Jacques de Batencourt, a priest who taught for 18 years and published *The Parish School* (the official manual for over 300 primary school teachers in Paris).[14] These partnerships and resources, and his close association with his adviser Father Nicolas Roland and his educational partner Adrien Nyel, informed De La Salle's training and development of the early Christian schoolteachers who worked in association with him. The creation of the *Conduct* (a manual of prescribed pedagogical practices), the *Meditations* (a book of reflections), a teacher-training institute, writings on theological and moral values, an approach where teachers lived together in community, an education that was practical, and the simultaneous method of teaching are just some of the products resulting from these many collaborations and influences.

Teacher Development Strategies

The aforementioned products are the foundational elements of De La Salle's teacher formation process. The *Conduct* was a manual used to train new teachers with highly prescribed step-by-step details outlining exact procedures to be followed from the moment of opening the school door in the morning to its closing at the end of the day.[15] Nothing was left out. Classroom organization, management, daily schedules, lessons, student disciplinary techniques, educational recordkeeping, teaching materials, and dispositional expectations were described with great attention to detail. The *Conduct* was edited many times from the perspective of an arduous teacher-led research process of examination, discussion, and classroom trials. Teachers were expected, without exception, to read and be devout followers of the *Conduct*.[16]

This uniform manner of teaching was reinforced by the Brother-teacher's community lifestyle, which also allowed for a frugal living arrangement that was especially important given the economic conditions and consequence of tuition-free education.[17] The Director of the community house maintained a schedule of morning readings of the *Conduct*, and midday and evening "recreations" consisting of pedagogical discussions with peers and older teachers. Weekly activities included an "advertisement of defects" where a Brother would request to have a personal external defect identified by his peers to help him see his behavioral improvement needs. Once a week the Director would hold a conference with his community. It took the form either of a discussion or a reading followed by an exchange of views. One-on-one meetings were also held between the Director and teachers to discuss the trials and tribulations of the week. Thursdays, a weekly holiday, were reserved for devotion to studying one's subjects.[18]

Annual personal and professional development included a month-long holiday in September and quiet reflection during the last three days of December.[19] During the September month-long holiday, eight full days were dedicated to the annual retreat. The following three weeks were reserved to deepen one's knowledge as a teacher and Christian educator through reflection and study. Significant time was spent increasing subject matter knowledge, discussing the *Conduct*, and participating in daily recreations. The entire experience was designed to contribute to their overall sacred and secular development. Additionally, the final three days of December were devoted to a second retreat where the Brothers reflected upon their profession and relationship

with God; to ask for God's assistance and reflect upon one's conduct as a teacher over the past year.

Mentorship of New Teachers

All new teachers were mentored by an experienced teacher, one who was called the formator and who was typically the Director of the community house.[20] The formator would shape the teacher through a gradual introduction to the classroom by assisting with and monitoring performance before eventually teaching. The formator would shape the teacher's behavior and instruction through frequent classroom visits and feedback interspersed throughout the day. Observations and corrections were provided in a noninvasive, minimalistic, and facilitative manner. Focal areas included: 1) self-management and interactions with students, 2) the instructional process, and 3) classroom management techniques. The *Conduct* provided clear standards and methods for both teaching and formation practices, including methods of evaluation.[21]

Evaluation of Teacher Development

Evaluation was frequent and regular in the student's, teacher's, and Director's lives, as outlined in the *Conduct.* Detailed records of student behavior and academic progression, teacher performance, and enrollment and absenteeism were routinely kept. Teachers carefully tracked student records, including academic performance, character behaviors, and family interview data gathered at admission, all of which would be passed on to the next year's teacher.[22]

Schools were visited each day by the Director to ensure that teachers (and therefore the students) were diligently following the rules and regulations. He would scrutinize the tiniest details and provide corrective feedback when needed. Student placement and lesson assignments were determined by the Director, using records of student behavior and monthly exams.[23] The Director was required, periodically, to submit a report to De La Salle regarding observations of the teachers, himself, and his management plans. In addition, he would make a formal annual report.[24] As the number of schools increased, the position of a Brother Visitor was inaugurated to attend the school communities in a designated region. The Brother Visitor would inquire into the teacher and Director needs as well as conduct an evaluation of student work and teacher preparations.[25]

As time progressed, the success of the educational and organizational development of the Christian schools of De La Salle could be seen on multiple levels. Parents would testify publicly, in great detail, about how the Brothers had transformed their childrens' minds and behavior.[26] Other parents in the city who were once reluctant to have their children go to school eagerly enrolled their sons after seeing the good it was doing for the other local boys.

The students were also pleased as was evidenced by their willingness to quickly and easily accept the Brothers' rules and regulations. Boys throughout the network of schools submitted with relatively little resistance; quite the feat given their rowdy, unruly, unschooled behavior prior to their enrollment in the schools.[27] In time, students would eagerly volunteer to compete in public contests to show off their academic skills and give public proof of the Brothers' good work.[28] As the Brothers' reputation steadily grew, so did the student enrollment.

As the schools' reputation spread, Bishops, pastors, and other influential people requested the opening of more and more schools.[29] De La Salle gained such a reputation that by 1685 (just six years after the first Christian school) regional parish priests began requesting services to train their teachers; so he opened a teacher-training institute for country schoolmasters. The schools' popularity was so strong that by the time of De La Salle's death in 1719 the number of schools grew to 20. By 1750, there were 90; and by 1790, there were 120 schools established throughout France.[30]

The success of the Christian schools of De La Salle has been duly credited to their founder's dedication to the diligent preparation of consistently effective teachers. His highly systemized, goal-oriented, evidence-based approach to teacher formation was so effective that it continued for years beyond his death. Evaluation-laden formation, enhanced through community living and devotion, resulted in an extremely successful community of teachers able to educate the hearts and minds of all the young students in their care.

Theoretical Analysis

De La Salle's evaluation of teacher development is evident at multiple levels. In order to gain insight into the various elements and nuances of his rigorous evaluation practices, three theoretical lenses will be used. Stufflebeam's CIPP model will shed light on the evaluation process used to inform the design of the teacher development process.[31] Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Model will highlight how the various levels of impact were measured.[32] The *Eight Dimensional Qualities of Program Evaluation*[33] will be used to review the qualities of De La Salle's evaluation practices.

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model

Context evaluation gathers data to define existing problems, contributing factors, and stakeholder needs in order to answer the question, "What can be done?" De La Salle's formation practices were the result of time spent immersed in the study of the existing socioeconomic conditions and educational practices of the time. The Brothers' community house and schools intentionally resided in the city where poverty and destitution were prevalent. De La Salle made himself aware of the significant educational initiatives of his time, networked with educational and community leaders, and partnered with his experienced colleague Adrian Nyel to gain insight into common practices and issues in education and formation. The educational needs of teachers and students were continually monitored through ongoing conversation with Brothers, family interviews, school visitations, and examinations of student performance. Through this context evaluation process, De La Salle developed and refined his vision of how the Christian schools and its teachers could best address the needs of society's young boys from poor and working-class families.

Input evaluation assesses like-program practices and resources to answer the question, "How should it be done?" De La Salle spent time, in the early beginnings, communicating with experienced school leaders of the poor such as Barré and Démia. It is through these kinds of relationships that De La Salle gained the knowledge to create an extensive and detailed pedagogical manual (the *Conduct*), a set of meditations (*Meditations*), and the vision of a

Lasallian teacher characterized by a list of virtues or characteristics of good teachers. De La Salle provided such a list in the 1706 edition of the *Conduct*. However, it was his successor, Brother Agathon, who further developed this vision at the end of the eighteenth century in the document entitled *The Twelve Virtues of a Good Teacher*. These precursor schools of the poor also influenced the implementation of simultaneous instruction, regimented classroom management, and teacher community living. None of these borrowed practices, however, were implemented without undergoing modification to meet the needs and purposes of De La Salle's educational vision. The *Conduct* underwent multiple revisions based on input from the Brothers' pedagogical conferences, classroom experimentations, and on-going discussions. No instructional strategy was modified without undergoing strict evidence-based validation through the Brothers' classroom teachings and critical dialogues.

Process evaluation entails monitoring, documenting, and assessing program activities to answer the question, "Is it being done?" Process evaluation was the cornerstone of De La Salle's teacher development practices. Classroom teachers were routinely and frequently observed and evaluated by the Director. Classroom teaching, student records, and teaching plans were monitored at various times and by various levels of administration including the Director, Brother Visitor, De La Salle, and peers. Summative annual reports were written and submitted to De La Salle regarding student outcomes and teacher performance. Informal evaluation within the community house occurred, in part, during the weekly "advertisements of defects," "recreations" with peers and older Brothers, and weekly one-on-one meetings with the Director. All evaluation activity, formal and informal, was scheduled, strictly followed, and ongoing. Process evaluation data was used to monitor formation practices, improve instructional performance, and evolve one's character development.

Product evaluation determines the impact, effectiveness, sustainability, and transportability of the program to answer the question, "Did it succeed?" Product data emanated from a variety of sources and provided a range of evidence that demonstrated success. Methods included the aforementioned instructional monitoring methods, discussions with parents, observations of student behavior and performance records, public contests of student academic skills, reports of public reputation, and external requests for services by public officials and regional priests. This gathering of far-reaching impact data was not always formally done, yet it was noted by De La Salle's biographers. [34]

As the number of schools expanded, the evaluation process was instituted at all of De La Salle's Christian schools to maintain uniformity and produce consistent results. Formation practices held up to the competition and withstood the test of time throughout the eighteenth century and up to the French Revolution. Furthermore, it served as a point of reference during the establishment of state and private teacher training colleges after 1830.[35]

Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Impact Evaluation

This evaluation model provides a deeper and more detailed exploration of product evaluation by examining measures used to identify four levels of impact resulting from the teacher development process. The four levels of impact in Kirkpatrick's model are the 1) participant's

reaction, 2) participant's learning, 3) participant behavioral changes, and 4) organizational results attributed to training.[36]

Participant Reaction was determined mostly by beneficiaries of the teachers' training not the teachers themselves. Beneficiaries including parents, local priests, public officials, and even students showed high levels of satisfaction through public testimonials, requests for De La Salle's teacher training and schools, and parental and student cooperation; a stark contrast to the early beginnings when the early Brothers were quite poorly regarded. The aforementioned satisfaction data was not formally gathered; however, these contrasting reactions spoke loudly to far-reaching satisfaction with the teacher training, and provided much greater evidence than participant satisfaction surveys.

Participant Learning was routinely evaluated throughout the development process. New teachers trained at the teacher center for country schoolmasters underwent an incoming assessment of their basic intelligence and religious dispositions. They were trained in reading, writing, and arithmetic skills to a level of competency measured by formal assessments. All new teachers were closely observed and numerous formative evaluations took place in the form of ability tests, classroom observations, conferences, and dialogues. The entire process was uniform and continued throughout the span of the teacher's employment.

Participant Behavior was continually evaluated by the Director, as he would make frequently scheduled visits to observe the teacher's instruction and lesson plans. Later when more schools were established, outside visitors such as a Brother Visitor and De La Salle would visit on occasion. Any deviation from the teaching, classroom management, or dispositional elements outlined in the *Conduct* would be noted and corrected. Pedagogical uniformity was a must and was continually refined through these observations and community activities.[37]

Organizational Results were measured in student achievement and the overall success of the schools. Student academic performance and behavior were routinely and carefully recorded by the teacher, reviewed by the Director, and used to determine academic progression. Academic abilities were on public display in the form of intellectual contests. As the educational reputation grew, so did the number of financial sponsors, student enrollment, new schools, inquiries for teacher training, requests for more schools, and the overall number of Brothers.

Eight Dimensional Qualities of Program Evaluation

All eight dimensions of quality program evaluation[38] are strongly evident in De La Salle's teacher development evaluation practices.

1. *Systematic*: Systemization was the hallmark of Lasallian program evaluation practices. Evaluation of teaching both in the early training and professional employment was scheduled, routine, frequent, ongoing, mandatory, and embedded for continual professional development.

2. *Goal-Directed*: Evaluation was built on De La Salle's formation goals which were clearly stated and outlined in the *Conduct*. There was never a doubt as to the aim of teacher development and the evaluation methods needed to monitor results.

3. *Measurable Objectives*: All objectives or competencies were measurable, communicated, shared common knowledge, and foundational for establishing teacher development and evaluation.

4. *Criteria for Success*: A minimal expected level of mastery was established for teachers to begin their employment. After employment had begun, the expected performance was uniform behavior as outlined the *Conduct*. There was no room for straying from the established norm.

5. *Appropriate Means of Measurement*: The various methods used to evaluate the expected teacher behaviors and practices were appropriate and provided valid data to inform pedagogical and formation improvements.

6. *Multiple Measures*: A variety of measures were used to determine the effectiveness of teacher formation including routine classroom observations, daily pedagogical discussions, weekly one-on-one conferences with the Director, school visitations, parent feedback, and reviews of student records.

7. *Formative and Summative Feedback*: Opportunities to gather formative and summative data were numerous with a strong emphasis on formative evaluation. The evaluation methods provided opportunities to see early growth, end-of-training mastery, ongoing professional improvement, and annual benchmarks.

8. *Clear Evidence of a Causal Relationship*: Evidence of causal relationships can be seen from teacher development, to instructional practices, to student's behaviors and academic outcomes, to the school's reputation, increased enrollment, and the expansion of schools. A chain of evidence clearly extends from the point of training to the impact point of organizational growth.

Discussion

De La Salle's teacher development evaluation practices were exemplary. Examining his work through a three-model theoretical framework demonstrates his systematic and rigorous evidence-based approach to teacher development. It is evident that the evaluation process played a key role in the creation of quality teachers, strong student outcomes, and organizational growth. The same cannot be said for faculty development today. Faculty developers find it extremely difficult to gather valid evidence demonstrating that their efforts result in improved teaching, much less learning and organizational growth. Why was this possible for De La Salle and so difficult for today's faculty developers? A comparison of past and present contextual factors, teacher development practices, and evaluation methods shed light on some significant differences to consider (see Table 1).

Table 1: Comparison of Context, Development Practices & Evaluation Methods

	1680 to 1719 Christian Schools Teacher Development	21st Century Faculty Development[39]
Contextual Factors	a. Incoming students were uniformly academically unprepared, poor, socially ill-formed b. Teacher candidates were uniformly under-educated, undisciplined, underprepared c. Society was extremely socio-politico-economically divisive	a. Incoming students have a variety of educational preparation and various socio-economic backgrounds b. Teachers are college-educated content experts with varied teaching preparation c. Society is relatively socio-economically stable
Development Practices	a. Practices are directly tied to a clear institutional vision and mission b. Informed by clearly defined teacher competencies c. Highly prescribed and standardized d. Participation is mandatory with vocational commitment e. Built on an all-inclusive community approach f. A continual process	a. Practices have fuzzy goals yet tie to institutional mission b. Informed by ill-defined teacher competencies c. Structure defined by faculty and institutional needs d. Participation is voluntary e. Built on a teacher-directed approach f. An ad hoc process
Evaluation Methods	a. Product-oriented b. Highly systematic and rigorous c. Multiple built-in feedback loops d. Foundational for development e. Cultural norm	a. Process-oriented b. Routinely superficial c. Simplistic and occasional feedback d. Tacked on to development e. Low priority

Contextual Factors

The early Christian schools of De La Salle were developed in direct response to the socially divisive and poverty-stricken conditions of 17th-century France. The schools served as a catalyst for social change by transforming young impoverished boys into productive citizens through a holistic Catholic education. The extremely low baseline conditions of teachers and students necessitated a highly prescribed, systemized, all-inclusive, evaluation-laden approach to transformational teacher development. Evaluation-driven development was essential to provide the continual feedback necessary to properly shape the Lasallian teachers into unified change agents in the classroom.

Today's U.S. universities are significantly different. Education is provided in response to student needs in a much more economically and politically stable society compared to the extreme poverty of so many seen in Louis XIV's France. Today's newly recruited professors enter university classrooms with various pedagogical preparations and equipped with substantial, yet varied, educational backgrounds and content expertise. Incoming university freshmen have a wide range of academic abilities and come from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds. Today's university educational conditions are at a comparably higher level than those at the time of De La Salle, reducing the need for highly prescribed development of faculty and students. This initial variability obscures pedagogical and academic baseline skill levels and make it difficult to establish baselines and benchmarks for measurable improvement.

Development Practices

De La Salle's teacher development practices were aimed specifically at achieving the vision he had of what the Christian schools were to be. His ideal image of a Lasallian teacher was clearly communicated through highly defined instructional, behavioral, and classroom management competencies in the *Conduct*. Regimented reading, practice, evaluation, feedback, and modification allowed for formation and continual refinement toward becoming the ideal Lasallian teacher. Living together in community provided an additional advantage as well as solidarity and 100% commitment to teaching and to the practices outlined in the *Conduct*. This commitment to teaching and the evaluation-laden development process was foundational.

Today's faculty development practices lack well-defined visionary goals and direct ties to institutional mission. Goals tend to be non-existent or aimed towards non-specific targets such as creating a culture of teaching excellence, responding to faculty needs, or advancing new academic initiatives.[40] Non-descript goals such as these provide fuzzy targets unable to clearly inform educational goals, pedagogical competencies, and faculty development practices.

Additionally, the image of today's ideal college teacher is minimally defined beyond competencies outlined in end-of-course evaluations. Commitment to teaching and instructional improvement is faculty-governed and highly variable.[41] Participation in faculty development activities is voluntary with limited instances of mandatory attendance.[42] Faculty development programs are oftentimes designed to service faculty needs identified through instructional needs assessment.[43] These ambiguously aimed, uncontrollable, service-driven conditions contribute significantly to the challenges faculty developers face in implementing and measuring institution-wide instructional improvement.

Evaluation Practices

De La Salle's teacher development evaluation practices were highly product-oriented. His systemized evaluation approach was scheduled, detailed, frequent, continual, and diligently administered to shape the whole teacher. Evaluation existed in many forms including personal reflective practices, peer conversations, one-on-one conferences, classroom observations, school visitations, student academic records, parent feedback, and enrollment records. Continual formative evaluation on a daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly basis provided feedback for continual and progressive growth to refine the teachers' character, instruction, and classroom management. Summative evaluation, involving various administrative levels, was scheduled periodically throughout the year. Evaluation was so embedded and intertwined into the Brothers' lives and development process that the success of formation was dependent upon it.

Today's faculty development evaluation practices are superficial and process-oriented where ongoing evaluation and annual reports are comprised of participation, satisfaction, and activity data for reasons of accountability and determinations of program improvements.[44] Self-reports of changes in teaching are commonly gathered by means of post-event confirmations through simple online or paper surveys. Survey responses are typically anonymous, limited in detail, and representatively low. Overall, evaluation is a low priority and a tacked-on afterthought due to perceived notions that quality evaluation is too complex and labor intensive. High participation

numbers and self-reports of teaching improvements by satisfied faculty determine program success today. There is limited, if any, evidence that faculty development directly results in quality teaching and learning in our colleges and universities.[45]

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this examination of De La Salle's teacher development practices and comparative analysis between past and present practices, the following recommendations are suggested for improving today's faculty development evaluation practices.

Shift from Process-Oriented to Product-Oriented Evaluation

From the beginning, De La Salle's formation practices were geared towards producing the image he had of the ideal teacher capable of a wholistic Catholic education for the poor. The end product dictated the process. Therefore, first and foremost, faculty developers need to examine their institutional mission to develop and articulate a vision of the ideal teacher capable of achieving such an institutional mission. This image can then be expressed through the construction of clearly articulated teacher competencies. These competencies can be used as criteria or outcomes for guiding program design and evaluation. Involving the entire university community in the competency-defining process can help ensure a shared vision and university-wide buy-in. In doing this, faculty developers can move from a heavy reliance on evaluating process (i.e., satisfaction) to evaluating the product (i.e., impact on teaching) resulting from their work.

Develop Evaluation-Dependent Faculty Development Practices

Evaluation was the cornerstone of De La Salle's formation practices. Feedback loops were embedded, as a kind of foundations glue, into the entire teacher development process. All development practices were designed to create a continual self-improvement process by assessing, receiving, practicing, reflecting, extending, and reassessing. This suggests that faculty development needs to be designed in an evaluation-dependent reflective manner. Using competency criteria as a guide, program activities should be designed in a way that induces a continual self-evaluative process for ongoing improvement. Consequently, the first step is to determine the instructional goal and evaluation process, and the second step is to design activities to meet the desired outcome. This could be done by asking the following questions: 1) How can faculty development help faculty assess their current practices; gather, apply, and reflect on new knowledge, and then extend it to their teaching? 2) How can this process be perpetuated? and 3) How can the evaluation process provide evidence of faculty development success? Imagine if all workshops, seminars, brown-bag lunches, and conferences were designed to uncover current practices, learn and apply new skills, and then provide space for follow-up discussion and reflection before and after teachers implement their new skills. In doing so, feedback loops become so deeply embedded into faculty development practices that development and evaluation become interdependent and provide continual evidence of change.

Nurture Faculty Commitment to Continual Improvement

A major reason for De La Salle's successful teacher development was the devotion of his teachers to employment and formation. Today's professors do not take a vocational vow and oftentimes have numerous conflicting academic responsibilities. Faculty developers, therefore, need to invest more energy and resources into programs that promote greater levels of motivation and nurture a commitment on the part of teachers to continual improvement by engagement in activities such as faculty learning communities, grant programs for scholarship of teaching and learning, mentorship programs, and ongoing pedagogical discussions using social media, online discussion boards, and conferencing technology. Not all faculty members will participate, but those who do are already motivated to improve and can deepen their professional growth through high-involvement developmental opportunities.

Systemize, Systemize, Systemize Evaluation

De La Salle's evaluation practices highlight the need for diligent systemization. Embedding evaluation into all faculty development activities is essential. Also essential is the mapping of sources, methods, and timing for gathering formal data. The purpose of gathering data, it should be remembered, is to monitor pedagogical improvement resulting from faculty development. De La Salle's practices suggest that formative data needs to be the mainstay of teacher development activities and that periodically scheduled reviews of instructional practices, including an annual report, are equally important. Embedding evaluation into development practices and periodic instructional reviews and reports transforms faculty development into an evaluation-driven process where gathering feedback becomes the operational norm.

Focus on Reputation, Not Satisfaction

Faculty developers should consider shifting part of their satisfaction evaluation efforts to reputational evaluation. De La Salle's schools and, consequently the teachers of these schools, had a regional reputation for being highly effective. This reputation alone translated into growing enrollment, school expansion, and increased demands for teacher training. This suggests faculty developers should shift the focus of their evaluation efforts from gathering participant satisfaction towards measuring their center's reputation within the university and beyond. Periodically surveying university stakeholders and, perhaps, outside competitors, regarding perceptions of faculty development quality on campus might provide a much more telling story of the program's worth and merit. Although this measure does not provide direct causal evidence of academic quality, it does provide a rich and colorful picture of the presence, profile, and perceived value of the program, which is more informative than participant satisfaction.

Conclusion

Measuring the impact of faculty development on teaching and learning is inherently complex given the dynamic variables present within the teachers, students, and organizational structures. De La Salle's teacher development practices suggest it is essential to reduce this complexity by: 1) developing a unified direction; 2) establishing a shared vision and common understanding of good teaching; 3) designing faculty development to promote a dedication to improvement; and 4)

measuring perpetual growth through continual feedback loops using communities of practice. It is through this shared commitment and dedication to the continual pursuit of a common goal that faculty developers can discover multiple opportunities to measure real change.

De La Salle's 300-year-old approach is surprisingly relevant to today's faculty development evaluation practices. His evaluation practices align with today's evaluation models better than much of our own work today. Perhaps it is best not to overlook our educational founders from centuries ago when searching for examples to enhance today's efforts. Those looking to John Baptist de La Salle will find a rich source of indispensable information that can transform our educational work today.

Notes

1. Joanne Kurfiss and Robert Boice. "Current and desired faculty development practices among POD members," in: *To Improve the Academy Volume 9*, edited by Linda Hilsen, (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1990): 73-82.

2. John V. Kucsera and Marilla Svinicki. "Rigorous Evaluations of Faculty Development Programs," *Journal of Faculty Development* 24:2 (2010): 5-18.

3. Susan Hines. "Investigating Faculty Development Program Assessment Practices: What's Being Done and How Can It Be Improved?" *Journal of Faculty Development* 23:3 (2009): 5-19; Susan Hines, "How Mature Teaching and Learning Centers Evaluate Their Services" in: *To Improve the Academy,* Volume 30, edited by Judith Miller and Jim Groccia, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (2011): 277-289; Nancy Van Note Chism and Borbala Szabo, "How Faculty Development Programs Evaluate Their Services" *Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development* 15:2 (1997): 55-62.

4. International Association of Lasallian Universities (IALU). A network of 70+ Lasallian institutions of higher education.

5. Caroline Kreber and Paula Brook. "Impact Evaluation of Educational Development Programmes," *The International Journal for Academic Development* (2001): 96-107.

6. Donald Kirkpatrick. *A Practical Guide for Supervisory Training and Development.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

7. Hines. "Investigating Faculty Development."

8. George Van Grieken. *Touching the Hearts of Students: Characteristics of Lasallian Schools.* Landover, MD: Christian Brothers Publications, 1999.

9. Luke Salm. *The Work is Yours: The Life of Saint John Baptiste de La Salle,* 2nd edition. Landover, MD: Christian Brothers Publications, 1996.

10. John Baptist de La Salle. *The Conduct of the Christian Schools*, translated by F. de La Fontainerie and Richard Arnandez, Landover, MD: Lasallian Publications, 1996.

11. Lauraire, Léon. *The Conduct of Schools: A Comparative Approach* (Cahiers lasalliens #63). Translation unknown. Rome: Brothers of the Christian Schools, 2011.

12. Lauraire. *The Conduct of Schools: A Comparative Approach*.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Lauraire, Léon. *The Conduct of Schools: A Contextual Approach* (Cahiers lasalliens #61). Translated by Leonard Marsh. Rome: Brothers of the Christian Schools, 2008.

16. De La Salle. *The Conduct of the Christian Schools*.

17. Yves Poutet. *The Origins and Characteristic of Lasallian Pedagogy*. Translated by Julian Watson, Finian Allman, Celsus Clark, and John Walch. Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1997.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Frederick Mueller. *The Formation of New Teachers: A Companion on the Lasallian Journey.* Washington DC: Christian Brother Conference, 2008.

21. Ibid.

22. Van Grieken. *Touching the Hearts of Students.*

23. Mueller. *The Formation of New Teachers*.

24. Saturnino Gallego. *An Introduction to the Writings of John Baptiste de La Salle*. Translated by Arthur Bertling. Rome: Brothers of the Christian Schools, 1993.

25. Poutet. *The Origins and Characteristics of Lasallian Pedagogies.*

26. Jorge Bonilla Sort de Sanz and Alain Houry. "Director" in: *Lasallian Themes* 3, edited by Alain Houry, et al., Rome: Brothers of the Christian Schools (1997): 93-101.

27. Gregory Wright. *St. John Baptist de La Salle: A 17th-Century Educational Innovator*. Manila: De La Salle University Press, 2000.

28. Lauraire, Léon, *The Conduct of Schools: A Pedagogical Approach* (Cahiers lasalliens #62). Translated by Allen Geppert. Rome: Brothers of the Christian Schools, 2006.

29. Sort de Sanz and Houry.

30. Pedro Maria Gil. *Three Centuries of Lasallian Identity: The Relation Between Mission and Spirituality throughout the History of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.* Lasallian Studies 4. Translated by Paul Grass. Rome: Brothers of the Christian Schools, 1998.

31. Stufflebeam, Daniel. "Evaluation Models," *New Directions for Evaluation* 2001:89 (Spring 2001): 7–98.

32. Kirkpatrick. *A Practical Guide.*

33. Hines. "Investigating Faculty Development."

34. Lauraire. *The Conduct of Schools: A Contextual Approach.*

35. Lauraire. *The Conduct of Schools: A Comparative Approach.*

36. Kirkpatrick. *A Practical Guide.*

37. Lauraire. *The Conduct of Schools: A Contextual Approach.*

38. Hines. "Investigating Faculty Development."

39. Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Ann Austin, Pamela Eddy, and Andrea Beach. *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning From the Past, Understanding the Present.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. Hines, Susan. "How Mature Teaching and Learning Centers Evaluate Their Services," in: *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development*, Volume 30, New York: Jossey-Bass (2011): 277-289.

43. Sorcinelli, et al. *Creating the Future of Faculty Development.*

44. Hines. "How Mature Teaching and Learning Centers Evaluate Their Services."

45. Kucsera and Svinicki. "Rigorous Evaluations."