

Original Article

Faculty Development Program as Drivers for Personal, Professional, and Institutional Improvement

Jonie Claire L. Pallayoc

Author Information:

St. Louis College of Bulanao, Tabuk City,
Kalinga, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

2chandlershad23@gmail.com

Article History:

Date received: April 9, 2026
Date revised: April 30, 2026
Date accepted: May 14, 2026

Recommended citation:

Pallayoc, J.C. (2026). Faculty development program as drivers for personal, professional, and institutional improvement. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 4(6), 192-207.
<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2026.027>

Abstract. Faculty development programs (FDPs) play an important role in improving teaching practices, strengthening professional skills, and supporting institutional development in higher education; however, despite their regular implementation, limited empirical evidence exists on how these programs are carried out and how they contribute to faculty growth and institutional improvement within specific contexts. This study examined the implementation of faculty development programs at St. Louis College of Bulanao. It explored their perceived effects on faculty professional development and institutional outcomes using an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. Quantitative data were collected from 40 respondents (33 faculty members and 7 administrators), followed by qualitative interviews to explain the survey results further. Descriptive statistics, particularly weighted means, were used to analyze the quantitative data, while thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative responses. Results indicate that FDPs are generally implemented in the institution, with an overall mean of 2.82 reported by faculty and 3.22 by administrators, and faculty members agreed that FDPs contributed to their personal and professional development ($M = 3.21$), particularly in improving teaching competence and professional skills. In terms of institutional improvement, faculty reported a mean of 3.03, while administrators reported a higher mean of 3.47, suggesting improvements in teaching quality, collaboration, curriculum development, and student learning experiences; however, research support received a moderate rating ($M = 2.82$), indicating the need for stronger research-focused initiatives. Overall, the findings show that faculty development programs contribute positively to teaching effectiveness and institutional improvement, but enhancing research support, improving communication of opportunities, and increasing faculty involvement in program planning may further strengthen their impact and sustainability.

Keywords: Faculty development programs; Higher education; Institutional improvement; Professional development; Teaching quality.

Higher education institutions today operate in a dynamic environment shaped by rapid technological advancement, growing societal expectations, and increasing demands for accountability and demonstrable educational quality. Within this context, faculty development has emerged as a vital mechanism for sustaining institutional effectiveness and promoting academic excellence. Beach et al. (2023) and Steinert et al. (2024) note that faculty development programs (FDPs) have evolved from short-term workshops focused primarily on improving classroom instruction to broader initiatives that strengthen academic

communities and facilitate institutional transformation. As higher education institutions respond to complex educational and societal challenges, faculty development is increasingly recognized as a strategic tool for enhancing both professional competence and institutional performance.

Faculty development broadly encompasses structured professional learning opportunities designed to enhance educators' knowledge, skills, and professional practices in their academic roles. Robertson et al. (2025) define these initiatives as programs that not only refine instructional practices but also support the development of research capacity, leadership skills, and institutional engagement. Espartero et al. (2025) emphasize that sustained participation encourages reflective practice and adaptability, equipping educators to respond effectively to emerging educational challenges and evolving learning environments. In this way, faculty development serves as a crucial link between individual professional growth and institutional advancement.

The design and scope of faculty development initiatives have expanded to meet increasingly complex demands in higher education. Tobar (2020) explains that contemporary programs commonly include workshops, mentoring systems, research training, conferences, and faculty learning communities, fostering collaboration and professional exchange among educators. Catanzano et al. (2022) note that these initiatives cater to faculty at different career stages, with early-career educators requiring support in foundational pedagogical and research competencies, while mid-career and senior faculty engage in leadership development, specialization, and institutional responsibilities. Swadia et al. (2023) report that addressing these varied needs strengthens both individual capability and collective institutional capacity.

Effective faculty development programs are typically characterized by systematic planning and alignment with institutional priorities. Ramos and Codilla (2024) highlight that development initiatives are most effective when grounded in structured frameworks and informed by comprehensive needs assessments that identify areas requiring professional improvement. Competency-based approaches have also gained attention for linking development activities with institutional performance indicators and long-term strategic goals. Kırkıç et al. (2024) further show that flexible program delivery, including face-to-face, online, and hybrid formats, enhances accessibility and accommodates faculty responsibilities, reflecting a broader trend toward evidence-informed and outcomes-oriented professional development systems in higher education.

Faculty participation remains central to the success of these initiatives. Arcega (2023) explains that engagement is influenced by the perceived relevance of the program, institutional encouragement, and the availability of professional support systems. However, practical constraints such as heavy teaching responsibilities, limited time, and financial restrictions can limit participation (Bruggen et al., 2020; Bajaj, 2023; Steinert et al., 2024; Dio, 2025). Kongle et al. (2025) highlight the importance of flexible learning structures, institutional incentives, and leadership support in promoting sustained faculty engagement.

Evidence suggests that the benefits of faculty development extend beyond individual professional growth. Favre et al. (2021) and Farakish et al. (2022) report that faculty who engage in continuous professional learning often demonstrate improvements in instructional practice, research productivity, and professional confidence. Ahmed et al. (2025) further show that these faculty members exhibit stronger commitment to institutional goals and greater adaptability in teaching approaches. At the institutional level, development initiatives foster a culture of collaboration and innovation, supporting organizational growth and academic quality (Babu & G, 2023; Steinert et al., 2024). Ang et al. (2025) emphasize that leadership involvement and institutional investment further strengthen these outcomes by ensuring alignment with faculty needs and institutional priorities.

Within the Philippine higher education system, faculty development is recognized as a critical component of quality assurance and institutional competitiveness. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) underscores the importance of strengthening faculty competencies in teaching, research, and service to improve educational outcomes and sustain institutional performance. Policies such as CHED Memorandum Order No. 46 encourage institutions to align professional development initiatives with national standards and institutional missions. For institutions in the Cordillera Administrative Region, particular attention to the social and cultural contexts of upland communities is necessary, highlighting the need for locally responsive faculty development initiatives.

At St. Louis College of Bulanao (SLCB), faculty development initiatives are closely tied to the institution's mission and guided by its P.E.A.C.E. core values—Peace and Justice Advocacy, Ecological and Cultural Responsiveness,

Academic Excellence, Christ-Centered Discipleship, and Engaged Leadership. Institutional reports indicate that these initiatives, delivered through workshops, training programs, and professional learning opportunities, support faculty in strengthening teaching practices, expanding research engagement, and contributing more effectively to institutional development.

Despite the documented benefits of faculty development programs in higher education, there is limited empirical evidence on how these programs are implemented and experienced in small, private, regional institutions, particularly within the Philippine context. Most existing studies focus on large universities or national-level initiatives, leaving a gap in understanding how FDPs contribute to faculty professional growth and institutional improvement in contexts similar to St. Louis College of Bulanao.

In response to this gap, this study examines the implementation of faculty development programs at St. Louis College of Bulanao. It explores their influence on faculty professional growth and institutional improvement. By analyzing how development initiatives are planned, delivered, and experienced, the study aims to generate evidence to guide the design of more responsive and strategically aligned professional development programs. The findings are expected to assist institutional leaders and future Human Resources administrators while contributing to the broader discourse on higher education development by offering a contextualized perspective on how faculty development programs can support both educator advancement and institutional progress within regional higher education institutions.

Methodology

Research Design

The study used an explanatory sequential mixed methods design to examine the implementation of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) and their contribution to the professional growth of faculty members and the institutional development of St. Louis College of Bulanao. First, surveys were administered to faculty members to gather quantitative data on their participation in and views of FDPs. This helped identify general patterns and trends among the respondents. After the survey results were analyzed, interviews were conducted with selected faculty members to better understand their experiences and opinions about the programs. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods enabled the researchers to obtain clearer, more complete information about how FDPs are implemented and how they support faculty and institutional development.

Research Participants

The participants of the study consisted of thirty-three (33) faculty members and seven (7) administrators from St. Louis College of Bulanao. For the quantitative phase, total enumeration was used because the populations of faculty members and administrators were small and manageable. This approach ensured that all accessible members of the population were included in the study, providing a complete representation of faculty development program experiences within the institution without introducing sampling error.

For the qualitative phase, purposive sampling was used to select participants based on the results of the quantitative analysis. Participants were selected for their relevance to the emerging findings and their capacity to provide rich, in-depth information on the implementation and outcomes of faculty development programs. This ensured that the qualitative data complemented and further explained the quantitative results.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire used in the quantitative phase was researcher-developed and guided by established literature on faculty and teacher professional development, particularly the works of Stes, Clement, and Van Petegem (2007), which examined the effectiveness and institutional impact of faculty training programs, and Desimone (2009), which identified key dimensions for evaluating professional development initiatives. The instrument was adapted and contextualized to reflect the faculty development programs implemented at St. Louis College of Bulanao, ensuring alignment with the institutional setting and study objectives.

Content validity was established through expert review by specialists in education and research methodology, who evaluated the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the items with the research constructs, and their recommendations were incorporated to refine the instrument. Reliability was ensured through pilot testing with respondents whose characteristics were similar to those of the target participants but who were not included in the final sample, and the results were used to assess internal consistency and improve item clarity and consistency.

The final questionnaire employed a four-point Likert scale to measure respondents' level of agreement with each statement, while the qualitative phase used semi-structured interview questions developed from the quantitative findings, with purposively selected participants providing in-depth insights into their experiences, perceptions, and challenges related to faculty development programs. Together, these instruments facilitated data triangulation by integrating quantitative and qualitative evidence on the implementation and outcomes of faculty development initiatives.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data were collected sequentially in accordance with the explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. Prior to data collection, permission was obtained from the College administration. In the quantitative phase, survey questionnaires were distributed to all faculty members and administrators, in printed form, with clear instructions to ensure accurate and complete responses. After analyzing the quantitative data, a purposive sample of faculty and administrator participants was selected for the qualitative phase, where interviews were conducted to gain in-depth insights into the experiences, challenges, and perceived outcomes of faculty development programs.

Ethical Considerations

This study adheres to ethical research standards by prioritizing the rights, welfare, and privacy of all participants. In compliance with R.A. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act, the confidentiality of personal information is strictly observed and protected. All information collected is utilized solely for this study and will not be shared or used beyond the scope of educational objectives.

Rigor of Qualitative

To make sure the qualitative findings were trustworthy, several steps were taken. Participants reviewed their interview responses, and detailed records of data collection and analysis were kept. Coding was conducted carefully to reflect participants' experiences rather than the researcher's bias. Rich descriptions of the participants and the college context were provided to help readers see how the findings might apply elsewhere. These steps ensured that the results accurately captured the effects of faculty development programs on professional and institutional growth.

Data Analysis

This study employed quantitative and qualitative approaches in line with an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. Quantitative data from the Likert-scale survey were screened for missing values, outliers, and normality before analysis. Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and weighted means, were used to summarize faculty development program implementation and professional and institutional outcomes. These measures described the level of agreement of respondents with the indicators of faculty development and institutional improvement. The validity and reliability of the quantitative instrument were established through expert validation to ensure content validity, and pilot testing was conducted to assess internal consistency prior to full data collection.

Qualitative data from interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed thematically to identify patterns, meanings, and challenges related to faculty development programs. Trustworthiness was ensured through systematic coding procedures, with credibility supported by consistent coding checks and careful review of emerging themes. Findings from both phases were integrated through narrative discussion and joint displays to provide a comprehensive interpretation of how faculty development programs are implemented and how they influence professional and institutional outcomes at St. Louis College of Bulanao.

Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the respondents' profiles by department, position, and length of service. A total of 40 respondents participated in the study, composed of 33 faculty members and 7 administrators from St. Louis College of Bulanao. Among the faculty respondents, the College of Education (COED) had the highest representation with 14 respondents (42.42%), followed by the College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE) with 8 (24.24%), the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) with 6 (18.18%), and the College of Information and Computing Sciences (CICS) with 5 (15.15%). For administrators, most were Program Chairs (57.14%), followed by Deans (28.57%), and one Executive Officer (14.29%). This distribution indicates that the administrative responses largely represent

academic leaders directly involved in program implementation and oversight.

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents

Faculty			Administrators		
Department	Frequency	Percentage	Position	Frequency	Percentage
COED	14	42.42%	Dean	2	28.57%
CCJE	8	24.24%	EO	1	14.29%
CAS	6	18.18%	Program Chair	4	57.14%
CICS	5	15.15%			
Length of Service			Length of Service		
Less than 1 year	8	24.24%	Less than 1 year	0	0%
1–3 years	15	45.45%	1–3 years	1	14.29%
4–6 years	4	12.12%	4–6 years	1	14.29%
7–10 years	3	9.09%	7–10 years	2	28.57%
10 years and up	3	9.09%	10 years and up	3	42.86%

In terms of length of service, faculty respondents were predominantly early- to mid-career, with 45.45% having 1–3 years of service and 24.24% having less than one year. Smaller proportions had 4–6 years (12.12%), 7–10 years (9.09%), and 10 years and above (9.09%). In contrast, administrators demonstrated more extensive institutional experience, with 42.86% having served for 10 years or more, 28.57% for 7–10 years, and 14.29% each for 1–3 years and 4–6 years. This profile suggests that the study captures both newer faculty perspectives and experienced administrative viewpoints, providing a balanced understanding of faculty development implementation.

Implemented Faculty Development Programs in SLCB

Table 2 presents the faculty development programs (FDPs) implemented at St. Louis College of Bulanao as reported by administrators. The results indicate that most FDP initiatives are consistently implemented across the institution. These include in-service training (INSET), local, national, and international seminars and workshops, conferences and symposia, research capability-building programs, graduate studies or scholarship support, ICT or instructional technology training, curriculum development programs, and extension or community engagement activities, all of which were reported at full implementation frequency.

Table 2. Implemented Faculty Development Programs in SLCB

Faculty Development Programs	Administrators (Frequency)
• In-Service Training (INSET) / Institutional Trainings	7
• Local Seminars / Workshops / Trainings	7
• National Seminars / Workshops / Trainings	7
• International Seminars / Workshops / Trainings	7
• Conferences, Forums, and Symposia	7
• Research Capability-Building Programs	7
• Graduate Studies / Scholarship Programs	7
• Mentoring and Coaching Programs	2
• ICT / Instructional Technology Training	7
• Curriculum Development Programs	7
• Extension and Community Engagement Programs	7
• Echo Seminars / Knowledge-Sharing Activities	4

In contrast, mentoring and coaching programs ($f = 2$) and echo seminars or knowledge-sharing activities ($f = 4$) were less frequently implemented. This suggests that while the institution demonstrates strong engagement in formal capacity-building activities, structured mentoring and systematic knowledge dissemination mechanisms may require further strengthening to maximize faculty learning transfer and collaboration. Beyond these core programs, additional initiatives such as benchmarking activities, wellness programs, recollections, and opportunities for faculty to serve as resource speakers further reflect the institution's broader commitment to holistic faculty development. Overall, these findings indicate that SLCB prioritizes comprehensive faculty development aligned with both professional and institutional goals. This is consistent with literature emphasizing FDPs as multidimensional mechanisms that extend beyond instructional improvement to include research capacity, leadership development, and institutional engagement (Robertson et al., 2025; Steinert et al., 2024). The stronger implementation of formal training programs compared to mentoring-based initiatives also aligns with patterns noted in prior studies, in which structured programs are more consistently delivered than sustained developmental support systems (Ang et al., 2025).

Faculty Development Programs in SLCB that the Faculty Attended

Table 3 presents the faculty development programs attended by the faculty respondents at St. Louis College of Bulanao. The results show that the highest faculty participation was in in-service training ($n = 33$), followed by ICT or instructional technology training ($n = 28$) and curriculum development programs ($n = 27$), indicating strong engagement in activities directly related to teaching effectiveness, instructional enhancement, and curriculum improvement. In contrast, the lowest participation was observed in international seminars ($n = 3$), mentoring and coaching programs ($n = 5$), and echo seminars or knowledge-sharing activities ($n = 5$), suggesting limited engagement in external exposure opportunities and sustained developmental support mechanisms such as mentoring and structured knowledge dissemination.

Table 3. *Faculty Development Programs Attended by the Faculty*

Faculty Development Programs	Faculty (Frequency)
• In-Service Training (INSET) / Institutional Trainings	33
• Local Seminars / Workshops / Trainings	20
• National Seminars / Workshops / Trainings	12
• International Seminars / Workshops / Trainings	3
• Conferences, Forums, and Symposia	12
• Research Capability-Building Programs	12
• Graduate Studies / Scholarship Programs	7
• Mentoring and Coaching Programs	5
• ICT / Instructional Technology Training	28
• Curriculum Development Programs	27
• Extension and Community Engagement Programs	13
• Echo Seminars / Knowledge-Sharing Activities	5

Moderate participation was observed in local seminars and workshops ($n = 20$), extension and community engagement programs ($n = 13$), national seminars and conferences ($n = 12$), and research capability-building programs ($n = 12$), reflecting a balanced but uneven distribution of faculty engagement across professional development areas. Overall, this pattern indicates that faculty development participation at St. Louis College of Bulanao is primarily concentrated on structured, institution-based programs that directly support instructional delivery. At the same time, less emphasis is placed on mentoring systems and international exposure. This aligns with studies emphasizing that faculty development programs are most accessible and frequently attended when they are structured, locally available, and aligned with immediate teaching responsibilities (Beach et al., 2023; Tobar, 2020; Espartero et al., 2025). It also reflects findings that institutional priorities often shape participation patterns, particularly in contexts where faculty workloads and resource constraints limit sustained engagement in longer-term developmental initiatives such as mentoring and global academic exposure (Babu & G, 2023; Li & Liu, 2024).

Implementation of Faculty Development Programs in SLCB

Table 4 presents faculty and administrator perceptions regarding the implementation of faculty development programs (FDPs) within the institution. Overall, both groups indicated that FDPs are implemented, with a mean of 2.82 for faculty and 3.22 for administrators, suggesting that the programs are operational and contribute to institutional functions, although with varying levels of perceived effectiveness. From the faculty perspective, the highest-rated indicators include alignment of FDPs with institutional goals ($M = 3.30$), relevance of FDP topics ($M = 3.30$), and competence of resource persons ($M = 3.27$), all interpreted as *Strongly Agree*. These results suggest that faculty recognize FDPs as well-structured and aligned with institutional priorities, and that qualified facilitators support program delivery. This reflects a competency-based approach consistent with institutional objectives (Robertson et al., 2025).

In contrast, the lowest-rated indicators are feedback utilization ($M = 2.36$), communication of scholarship opportunities ($M = 2.42$), and faculty consultation in planning ($M = 2.48$), all interpreted as *Disagree*. These findings indicate that participatory elements of FDP implementation, particularly feedback integration and inclusive planning, are less evident to faculty. Other indicators fall within a moderate range, suggesting that aspects such as organization, participation support, and monitoring are present but not consistently experienced. Overall, faculty responses indicate that FDPs are effectively delivered in terms of structure and content, but less developed in terms of engagement and communication processes.

Table 4. Implementation of Faculty Development Program in SLCB

	Indicator	Faculty Mean	Interpretation	Admin Mean	Interpretation
1.	FDPs are aligned with the institution's goals and priorities.	3.30	Strongly Agree	3.67	Strongly Agree
2.	FDP topics are relevant to faculty professional needs.	3.30	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
3.	Faculty members are consulted in the planning of FDP activities	2.48	Disagree	2.67	Agree
4.	FDPs are well-organized and properly scheduled	2.70	Agree	3.17	Agree
5.	Resource persons/trainers are competent and knowledgeable	3.27	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
6.	FDP sessions are delivered using appropriate methods and strategies	3.18	Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
7.	Faculty participation in FDPs is encouraged and supported by the institution.	2.70	Agree	3.33	Strongly Agree
8.	FDP activities are regularly monitored and evaluated.	2.52	Agree	3.00	Agree
9.	Feedback from participants is used to improve future FDP.	2.36	Disagree	2.83	Agree
10.	Scholarship opportunities are clearly communicated and fairly implemented	2.42	Disagree	3.00	Agree
	Average Mean	2.82	Agree	3.22	Agree

Legend: Strongly Disagree=1.00-1.74, Disagree=1.75-2.49, Agree=2.50-3.24, Strongly Agree=3.25-4.00

Administrators reported the highest ratings in alignment with institutional goals ($M = 3.67$), curriculum relevance ($M = 3.50$), and competence of resource persons ($M = 3.50$), indicating strong agreement that FDPs are strategically aligned and effectively implemented. These findings suggest that administrators view FDPs as contributing directly to institutional priorities and program quality. The lowest-rated indicators among administrators include feedback utilization ($M = 2.83$), faculty consultation ($M = 2.67$), and scholarship communication ($M = 3.00$), although all remain within the *Agree* range. This suggests that while administrators recognize these processes as present, they may not be fully optimized or consistently implemented. Administrators consistently reported higher ratings across indicators, reflecting a broader institutional perspective on program implementation and effectiveness.

The findings indicate that FDP implementation at SLCB is strongest in structural and content-related dimensions, particularly in alignment, relevance, and delivery by competent resource persons. However, participatory mechanisms such as faculty consultation, feedback utilization, and transparent communication remain comparatively weaker, especially from the faculty perspective. This suggests a gap between program design and faculty experience, where FDPs are operational but not fully participatory. This pattern aligns with literature emphasizing that effective faculty development requires not only structured delivery but also inclusive planning and responsive feedback systems to enhance engagement and program relevance (Ramos & Codilla, 2024; Kongle et al., 2025; Arcega, 2023). At the same time, the presence of structured implementation reflects institutional commitment to organized and outcomes-oriented professional development (Beach et al., 2023; Tobar, 2020; Kırkıç et al., 2024). Strengthening participatory processes and communication mechanisms would further improve FDP effectiveness and align implementation more closely with faculty needs and institutional goals.

To further examine the implementation of the faculty development program (FDP), qualitative interviews were conducted with selected faculty and administrators. The results are presented in a joint display, as shown in Table 5, integrating quantitative and qualitative data. Overall, the joint display integrates quantitative and qualitative findings to provide a comprehensive understanding of FDP implementation and its associated areas of concern.

Table 5. Explanatory Phase on Program Implementation

Key Areas	Respondents	Quantitative Results	Qualitative Findings	Integration
Faculty Consultation in Planning FDPs	Faculty	Low mean score on consultation in the planning of faculty development program activities. $M = 2.48$ (Disagree)	Theme 1: Selective Faculty Consultation T1: "Faculty involvement in FDP planning varies. Only selected group, especially those with administrative roles or specific expertise, are regularly consulted, while others feel less involved."	The interview responses support the low rating on consultation of faculty in FDP planning. It shows that only selected faculty, usually those with administrative roles or specific expertise, are involved, while others are not consulted. Some also shared that they were not part of the planning process, with only recent and limited involvement, such as being asked to suggest INSET themes. This suggests

Scholarship and Study Grant Opportunities	Administrators	Moderately low mean score on consultation in the planning of faculty development program activities. M = 2.67 (Agree)	Theme 2: Lack of Faculty Participation in Planning T3: "Faculty members were not involved in the planning of faculty development programs." Theme 3: Limited Involvement T2: "In the past, faculty members were not involved in planning, but recently were asked to suggest themes for the next INSET."	that faculty participation is still restricted and not fully inclusive, pointing to the need to widen involvement in FDP planning. This aligns with literature emphasizing participatory planning to improve program relevance (Ramos & Codilla, 2024)
			Theme 1: Consultation Limited to Administrative Channels A1: "Deans or program chairs are consulted when planning training, depending on specialization." Theme 2: Minimal Direct Faculty Involvement in FDP Planning A3: "Program heads gather inputs from faculty members."	The low rating can be linked to the faculty's limited awareness of scholarship and study grant opportunities. Many of them are not informed, which suggests that these opportunities are not clearly or regularly shared. This shows the need to improve how information is communicated so that more faculty can access and benefit from these programs.
	Faculty	Low mean score on communication and implementation of scholarship and study grant opportunities. M = 2.42 (Disagree)	Theme: Low Awareness of Opportunities T1: "I wouldn't say that I am fully aware of all the various scholarship and study grant opportunities available." Theme 2: Weak communication and information Dissemination T2: "No, I am not aware that the institution offers scholarship or study grants. I just knew that there is because of this study." Theme 3: Limited Visibility of Institutional Programs T3: "No, I am not aware of the scholarship or study grant opportunities offered by the institution."	The low rating can be linked to the faculty's limited awareness of scholarship and study grant opportunities. Many of them are not informed, which suggests that these opportunities are not clearly or regularly shared. This shows the need to improve how information is communicated so that more faculty can access and benefit from these programs.
	Administrators	Moderately low mean score on communication and implementation of scholarship and study grant opportunities. M = 3.00 (Agree)	Theme: Existing but Informal Communication of Opportunities A1: "Usually, faculty members ask for scholarships, or it is communicated to possible takers." Theme 2: Targeted or Selective Information Sharing A2: "Opportunities are personally communicated by the administration to interested or selected teachers."	The responses in the qualitative phase show that information is shared, but it is often informal and sometimes depends on faculty inquiries or is given only to selected or interested teachers. This suggests that communication is not fully systematic or widespread, which explains why the rating is only moderate despite the presence of these opportunities.

Personal/Professional Development Outcomes (Faculty Members' Perspective)

Table 6 presents the personal and professional development outcomes of faculty development programs (FDPs) as perceived by faculty members, with an overall mean of 3.21, interpreted as *Agree*. The highest-rated outcomes include enhancement of professional skills ($M = 3.36$), increased confidence in performing academic tasks ($M = 3.33$), and improved teaching competence ($M = 3.30$), all interpreted as *Strongly Agree*. These results indicate that FDPs are particularly effective in strengthening instructional capability, skill development, and faculty confidence in academic roles. In contrast, the lowest-rated outcome is the enhancement of research capacity ($M = 2.82$), although it is still interpreted as *Agree*. This suggests that while FDPs contribute to research development, the level of support is comparatively limited. Other outcomes, such as motivation for professional growth ($M = 3.21$), alignment of professional goals with institutional expectations ($M = 3.21$), communication and collaboration skills ($M = 3.18$), and job satisfaction ($M = 3.12$), fall within the moderate range. These results indicate generally positive but less pronounced effects in areas related to long-term professional engagement and collaborative practice.

Table 6. *Personal/ Professional Development Outcomes (Faculty Members' Perspective)*

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	FDPs have improved my teaching competence.	3.30	Strongly Agree
2.	FDPs have enhanced my professional skills (e.g., research, curriculum design, and classroom management).	3.36	Strongly Agree
3.	FDPs have increased my confidence in performing academic tasks.	3.33	Strongly Agree
4.	FDPs have improved my use of instructional technologies.	3.27	Strongly Agree
5.	FDPs have motivated me to pursue further professional growth	3.21	Agree
6.	FDPs have improved my ability to manage my teaching workload effectively.	3.27	Strongly Agree
7.	FDPs have enhanced by capacity to engage in scholarly research activities.	2.82	Agree
8.	FDPs have improved communication and collaboration skills with colleagues.	3.18	Agree
9.	FDPs have helped me align my professional goals with institutional expectations.	3.21	Agree
10.	FDPs have contributed to my overall job satisfaction	3.12	Agree
Average Mean		3.21	Agree

Legend: Strongly Disagree=1.00-1.74, Disagree=1.75-2.49, Agree=2.50-3.24, Strongly Agree=3.25-4.00

Overall, the findings suggest that FDPs at SLCB are most effective in enhancing teaching-related competencies and immediate professional skills, particularly those directly applied in classroom practice. This aligns with the existing literature, which indicates that faculty development initiatives commonly produce stronger outcomes in instructional improvement and skill acquisition due to their structured, practice-oriented nature (Ramos & Codilla, 2024; Espartero et al., 2025). However, the relatively lower rating in research capacity highlights a gap in sustained, research-focused development. This suggests that while FDPs support general professional growth, they may lack sufficient emphasis on research training, mentorship, and scholarly engagement. Previous studies emphasize that research productivity requires continuous support, access to resources, and targeted training to translate development initiatives into measurable scholarly output (Ahmed et al., 2025; Gautam et al., 2025).

These findings indicate that strengthening research-oriented programs and collaborative initiatives could enhance the long-term impact of FDPs, complementing the institution's strong focus on teaching effectiveness and professional competence. To further explain the quantitative findings, follow-up interviews were conducted with selected faculty members focusing on research capacity, teaching competence, and professional skills, as shown in Table 7. The joint display synthesizes quantitative and qualitative findings, highlighting key strengths in FDP outcomes and areas requiring further development. It suggests further strengthening the research-related components of faculty development programs to support more balanced professional growth.

Table 7. *Explanatory Phase on Personal and Professional Development Outcomes*

Key Areas	Respondents	Quantitative Results	Qualitative Findings
Research Capacity	Low mean score on capacity to engage in scholarly research activities. $M = 2.82$ (Agree)	Theme 1: Limited Alignment of FDPs with Research Activities T3: "The FDPs I attended did not support my research activities." Theme 2: Limited Exposure to research-oriented FDPs T1: "There were no seminars related to research that I have attended." Theme 3: Need for Accessible Research Training T2: "There should be seminars on research and workshops for all faculty."	The low rating reflects a limited capacity of FDPs to support faculty research activities. Responses show that some FDPs do not fully match the needs of faculty research work, and several participants reported little to no exposure to research-related seminars. There is also a clear call for more accessible training, such as workshops for all faculty and sharing of sessions for those who are unable to attend. This is supported by studies highlighting the need for targeted research-focused training for faculty (Ahmed et al., 2024; Ramos & Codilla, 2024).

Professional Skills	High mean score on enhanced professional skills. M = 3.36 (Strongly Agree)	T1: "Echoing of research seminars would help those who cannot attend." Theme 1: Improved Teaching Strategies and Approaches T4: "I shifted from traditional lecturing to scenario-based learning." T5: "I learned to make my lessons more interactive and student-centered." T6: "FDPs helped me integrate technology in my teaching."	Faculty experiences show better teaching methods and technology use, supporting the high rating. This confirms FDPs' help in improving classroom practices, consistent with studies on active and experiential learning (Tobar, 2020; Nair et al., 2024).
		Theme 2: Development of Curriculum and Classroom Management Skills T4: "It improved my skills in curriculum design and syllabus alignment." T5: "I learned to create structured lesson plans aligned with learning outcomes."	It clearly shows that professional skills, such as curriculum design and classroom organization, were also enhanced, aligning with the college's mission to provide relevant instruction and to develop faculty competence (Ramos & Codilla, 2024).

Institutional Improvement Outcomes

Table 8 presents faculty and administrators' perceptions of the impact of faculty development programs (FDPs) on institutional outcomes. The overall mean of 3.03 (*Agree*) for faculty and 3.47 (*Strongly Agree*) for administrators indicates that FDPs are generally perceived as contributing positively to institutional development, with administrators expressing stronger agreement.

Table 8. Institutional Improvement Outcomes

	Indicators	Faculty Mean	Interpretation	Admin Mean	Interpretation
1.	FDPs contributed to improved teaching quality in the institution	3.30	Strongly Agree	3.67	Strongly Agree
2.	FDPs have strengthened collaboration and teamwork among faculty.	3.09	Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
3.	FDPs have fostered a culture of continuous professional learning.	3.12	Agree	3.33	Strongly Agree
4.	FDPs have supported the institution in achieving its academic goals.	3.09	Agree	3.33	Strongly Agree
5.	Faculty scholarships and study grants have contributed to improving faculty qualifications and strengthening the institution's academic capacity.	2.73	Agree	3.33	Strongly Agree
6.	FDPs have supported improvements in curriculum quality and relevance.	3.09	Agree	3.67	Strongly Agree
7.	FDPs have contributed to better student learning experiences.	3.12	Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
8.	FDPs have strengthened the institution's research and scholarly output.	2.82	Agree	3.17	Agree
9.	FDPs have helped improve the institution's reputation and academic standing.	3.03	Agree	3.67	Strongly Agree
10.	FDPs have positively influenced institutional performance and effectiveness.	2.94	Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
Average Mean		3.03	Agree	3.47	Strongly Agree

Legend: Strongly Disagree=1.00-1.74, Disagree=1.75-2.49, Agree=2.50-3.24, Strongly Agree=3.25-4.00

Among faculty respondents, the highest-rated outcome is the contribution of FDPs to improved teaching quality (M = 3.30), indicating that faculty perceive FDPs as most effective in enhancing instructional practices. This supports existing studies showing that professional development strengthens teaching competence and promotes reflective practice (Favre et al., 2021; Robertson et al., 2025). In contrast, the lowest-rated indicator is faculty scholarships and study grants (M = 2.73), followed by research and scholarly output (M = 2.82). These results suggest that institutional support mechanisms for research and advanced professional development are less visible or experienced by faculty. This aligns with literature emphasizing that access to funding, resources, and structured support is essential to fully realize the benefits of faculty development programs (Cauilan; Bajaj, 2023). Other indicators fall within a moderate range, suggesting that FDPs contribute to collaboration, curriculum improvement, and student learning, but with a less pronounced impact than teaching-related outcomes. Overall, the results indicate that faculty primarily experience FDP benefits at the instructional level, while broader institutional support systems, particularly in research and scholarships, remain areas for improvement.

From the administrators' perspective, the highest-rated outcomes include improved teaching quality, curriculum relevance, and institutional reputation (all M = 3.67), indicating a strong perception that FDPs contribute to both

academic and strategic institutional goals. These findings support studies showing that well-implemented faculty development programs enhance institutional performance, innovation, and competitiveness (Steinert et al., 2024; Ang et al., 2025). The lowest-rated indicator among administrators is research and scholarly output (M = 3.17), although it is still interpreted as *Agree*. This suggests that while administrators recognize ongoing efforts in research development, they also acknowledge that this area is not as strongly developed as other institutional outcomes. Administrators consistently reported higher ratings across indicators, reflecting their broader view of institutional performance and long-term impact. This difference suggests a perception gap, where administrators recognize strategic gains from FDPs, while faculty experience more immediate, practice-based benefits.

The findings indicate that FDPs at SLCB contribute most to teaching quality and instructional improvement, both of which faculty and administrators consistently recognize. However, research development and scholarship support remain comparatively weaker areas. This pattern suggests that FDP implementation is more concentrated on teaching enhancement than on sustained academic and research development. Strengthening research-focused initiatives and improving access to scholarship opportunities could enhance the overall institutional impact of FDPs, aligning both faculty experiences and administrative expectations.

To further explain the moderate ratings in research and scholarly output, follow-up interviews were conducted with selected faculty and administrators, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. *Explanatory Phase on Institutional Improvement Outcomes*

Key Areas	Respondents	Quantitative Results	Qualitative Findings	Integration
Institution's Research Output	Faculty	Moderately low mean score on institution's research and scholarly output. M = 2.82 (Agree)	Theme 1: Limited Research Support T1: "FDPs did not support my research activities since I have not attended any seminars about research." T2: "FDPs that I attended did not support my research activity since the FDP seminars or activities." T3: "The FDPs I have attended did not support my research activities."	Faculty responses indicate that research-related FDPs are limited or unavailable, which explains the moderate quantitative rating. This indicates a need for structured research programs, mentoring, and institutional support (Ahmed et al., 2024; Ramos & Codilla, 2024).
	Administrators	Moderately low mean score on institution's research and scholarly output. M = 3.17 (Agree)	Theme 1: Limited but developing Institutional Support A1: "Seminars/conferences... are communicated... financial capacity is always taken into consideration..." A3: "Assignment of a research director is expected to improve support; incentives can motivate research output." Theme 2: Research driven by an individual rather than an institutional push A2: "Most research is initiated by faculty themselves for professional growth."	The result shows that the institution's research output is only moderate. Participants' responses can explain this. Some support is already given by the institution, such as sharing information about seminars and providing possible incentives, but these are still limited. Because of this, many faculty members rely on their own effort and motivation to do research. Overall, the findings suggest that while there are existing supports, they are not yet strong enough to greatly improve research productivity.

The joint display synthesizes the quantitative and qualitative findings on institutional research and scholarly output. It indicates that research development is supported to some extent through existing initiatives, but access and participation remain limited among faculty. This suggests that research support is not yet fully institutionalized, highlighting the need to strengthen structured research programs, mentoring, and communication strategies to enhance the impact of FDPs.

Proposed Enhancement on Faculty Development Programs (Faculty Members' Perspective)

Table 10 presents proposed enhancements to Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) from the perspective of

faculty members. The table summarizes their views on areas that may improve the implementation and effectiveness of these programs, including institutional support, funding, scholarship opportunities, program alignment, and scheduling. It shows an overall average mean of 3.84, interpreted as Strongly Agree.

Table 10. *Proposed Enhancement on Faculty Development Programs (Faculty Members' Perspective)*

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	I would recommend the continuous or expanded implementation of FDPs.	3.61	Strongly Agree
2.	There is a need for increased institutional support for faculty participation in FDPs.	3.85	Strongly Agree
3.	There is a need to expand scholarships and advanced study opportunities for faculty.	3.91	Strongly Agree
4.	FDP offerings should be better aligned with faculty and institutional priorities	3.85	Strongly Agree
5.	FDP schedules should be made more flexible to accommodate faculty workloads.	3.85	Strongly Agree
6.	There is a need for more needs-based faculty development programs.	3.85	Strongly Agree
7.	Results of FDP evaluations should be shared with faculty members.	3.88	Strongly Agree
8.	There is a need to increase overall funding for faculty development programs.	3.94	Strongly Agree
Average Mean		3.84	Strongly Agree

Legend: Strongly Disagree=1.00-1.74, Disagree=1.75-2.49, Agree=2.50-3.24, Strongly Agree=3.25-4.00

The results show that faculty members recognize FDPs as essential mechanisms for improving their professional competencies and contributing to institutional growth. The strong support for the continued implementation and expansion of FDPs indicates that faculty perceive these programs as critical tools for advancing teaching, research, and leadership capacities within the institution.

Faculty members emphasized the need for increased funding and expanded scholarship opportunities, underscoring the importance of institutional investment for meaningful professional development. This aligns with the literature, which identifies FDPs as essential mechanisms for enhancing both individual competencies and institutional performance in higher education (Robertson et al., 2025; Steinert et al., 2024). Adequate institutional support, including funding and resources, enables faculty to pursue advanced studies, participate in scholarly activities, and acquire specialized expertise that strengthens teaching, research, and leadership functions (Ang et al., 2025).

The strong faculty agreement on aligning FDP offerings with faculty and institutional priorities underscores the importance of strategic, needs-based program planning. The literature notes that institutions are expected to provide structured, evidence-based, and outcomes-oriented development programs aligned with institutional goals (Beach et al., 2023). Needs assessment is crucial in planning, as programs must be customized and goal-oriented to address specific faculty needs (Ramos & Codilla, 2024; Crispino & Moyani, 2023). Similarly, competency mapping and mentoring systems have been identified as approaches that align faculty capabilities with institutional objectives (Nashrullah et al., 2025). These perspectives reflect the faculty's desire for development programs that are both relevant and responsive to professional requirements.

The strong support for flexible FDP schedules also highlights faculty awareness of workload challenges and the practical demands of academic work. The delivery of FDPs has evolved to include flexible modalities such as face-to-face, online, and hybrid approaches, which allow institutions to adapt to changing educational contexts and faculty preferences (Beach et al., 2023). Faculty engagement in FDPs is influenced by motivation, institutional support, and perceived relevance of the programs (Kongle et al., 2025; Arcega, 2023), indicating that flexible scheduling is a critical factor in facilitating participation and maximizing program impact.

Furthermore, faculty members strongly agreed that evaluation results should be shared with participants. Monitoring and evaluation ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of FDPs, and structured evaluation frameworks, such as the Kirkpatrick Model, assess outcomes at multiple levels, including learning, behavior, and institutional impact (Alhassan, 2022; Humphry, 2022; Ahmed et al., 2024). Sharing evaluation results promotes a culture of reflection and continuous improvement, allowing faculty to understand the contribution of FDPs to both personal and institutional development.

These findings are consistent with the vision, mission, and core values of St. Louis College of Bulanao (SLCB). The institution's vision of nurturing excellence and forming competent and compassionate leaders is reflected in the faculty's support for expanded development opportunities, particularly scholarships and advanced studies. Likewise, the mission's emphasis on quality instruction, research, and community engagement highlights the importance of sustained faculty development initiatives (Robertson et al., 2025; Steinert et al., 2024). The

institution’s core values – academic excellence, Christ-centered formation, and engaged leadership are reinforced through FDPs that encourage continuous learning, professional growth, and collaborative engagement among faculty members (Babu & G, 2023; Li & Liu, 2024).

Overall, the findings suggest that faculty perceive FDPs as strategic instruments for strengthening individual professional capacity and institutional effectiveness. Their emphasis on institutional support, program relevance, flexibility, and evaluation reflects a commitment to enhancing FDP implementation in ways that support both professional growth and the institution’s broader goals.

To further understand why faculty identified increased overall funding for faculty development programs as the highest-rated indicator, selected participants were interviewed, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Explanatory Phase for Proposed Enhancement on Faculty Development Programs (Faculty Members’ Perspective)			
Key Areas	Quantitative Results	Qualitative Findings	Integration
Increase Overall Funding for Faculty Development Programs	High mean score on the need to increase overall funding for faculty development programs. M = 3.94 (Strongly Agree)	Theme 1: Increased and Transparent Funding for FDPs T9: “Increase overall funding to accommodate more participants in FDPs outside the province…… T12: “FDP can be strengthened by allocating a fixed and transparent budget for each department every semester to ensure equal opportunities and allow departments to select relevant trainings based on their needs. Transparent funding will motivate faculty to actively seek professional development opportunities.” Theme 2: Funding to Support Faculty Participation in FDPs T3: “Send instructors to seminars, workshops, and trainings funded by the school.”	The faculty responses explain the high quantitative rating, emphasizing the need for increased and transparent funding. Participants highlighted that adequate resources would allow more faculty to attend relevant FDPs, ensure fair allocation across departments, and motivate active engagement in professional development. This shows that faculty view funding as a key factor in effectively enhancing and sustaining FDPs.

The joint display integrates quantitative and qualitative findings, indicating that faculty strongly emphasize the importance of increased and transparent funding for faculty development programs. Adequate financial support is considered essential for expanding access to FDPs and improving participation opportunities across departments.

Proposed Enhancement on Faculty Development Outcomes (Administrators’ Perspective)

Table 12 shows that administrators expressed unanimous support for all proposed enhancements to Faculty Development Programs (FDPs), with each item receiving the maximum mean rating of 4.00 (Strongly Agree).

Table 12. Proposed Enhancement on Faculty Development Programs (Administrators’ Perspective)			
Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	There is a need to increase funding for faculty development activities.	4.00	Strongly Agree
2.	There is a need to expand scholarships and advanced study opportunities for faculty.	4.00	Strongly Agree
3.	FDP planning should be more closely aligned with institutional strategic priorities.	4.00	Strongly Agree
4.	A more systematic needs assessment should be conducted for FDP planning.	4.00	Strongly Agree
5.	FDP monitoring and evaluation systems should be strengthened.	4.00	Strongly Agree
6.	Partnerships with external institutions should be expanded for faculty development.	4.00	Strongly Agree
7.	Long-term planning for faculty development should be institutionalized.	4.00	Strongly Agree
Average Mean		4.00	Strongly Agree

Legend: Strongly Disagree=1.00-1.74, Disagree=1.75-2.49, Agree=2.50-3.24, Strongly Agree=3.25-4.00

The results indicate a shared recognition that FDPs are essential for strengthening faculty competencies, promoting institutional growth, and sustaining academic excellence. Their strong support for increased funding and expanded scholarships suggests that financial resources are crucial for enabling participation, providing equitable opportunities, and supporting advanced skills development, aligning with Robertson et al. (2025) and Steinert et al. (2024).

Administrators also highlighted the need to align FDP planning with institutional strategic priorities and conduct systematic needs assessments. This reflects a focus on evidence-based, outcome-oriented programs that enhance both individual professional growth and organizational performance, aligning with Beach et al. (2023), Ramos & Codilla (2024), and Crispino & Moyani (2023). Strengthening monitoring and evaluation mechanisms was also emphasized to promote accountability, reflection, and continuous improvement, aligning with Alhassan (2022) and Ahmed et al. (2024).

Furthermore, administrators underscored the value of expanding partnerships with external institutions and institutionalizing long-term FDP planning. These strategies demonstrate a proactive approach to capacity building, collaboration, and leadership development, aligning with Ang et al. (2025) and Tobar (2020).

These priorities reflect the vision, mission, and core values of St. Louis College of Bulanao (SLCB). The vision of nurturing excellence and forming competent, compassionate leaders is reinforced through strategic, well-resourced FDP initiatives. The mission’s focus on quality instruction, research, and community engagement is supported by evidence-based planning and faculty capacity building, aligning with Robertson et al. (2025) and Steinert et al. (2024). Likewise, the core values of academic excellence, Christ-centered formation, and engaged leadership are reflected in administrators’ advocacy for equitable opportunities, systematic development, and collaborative practices, as it aligns with Babu & G (2023) and Li & Liu (2024). Overall, administrators’ perspectives emphasize that well-funded, strategically planned, and systematically implemented FDPs are vital for both faculty development and institutional excellence, demonstrating a strong commitment to continuous improvement and alignment with organizational goals.

To further explain the administrators’ unanimous strong agreement, qualitative interviews were conducted to identify key areas of enhancement, as shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Explanatory Phase on Enhancement Proposals (Administrators’ Perspective)			
Key Areas	Quantitative Results	Qualitative Findings	Integration
Comprehensive Enhancements for Faculty Development Programs	M = 4.00 (Strongly Agree)	Theme 1: Strategic Policy and Institutionalization A2: “Institution-wide policy that defines the purpose of FDP.” A4: “Create a formal FDP manual to outline eligibility, criteria of selection, and prioritize areas, and inform all faculty members.” A1: “Succession plan entails FDP.” Theme 2: Sustainable Financial Support A2: “Stable institutional budget.” A2: “Provide direct financial incentives.” A4: “Allocate a fixed percentage of tuition revenue/operational fund separate from the general training fund to support the FDP and make sure these funds are allocated and used properly.” Theme 3: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Career Integration A1: “Faculty development programs must be evaluated.” A3: “Link faculty performance and promotion.” A3: “Measure Institutional impact.” A2: “Structure programs to meet the needs of faculty at different career stages.”	The unanimous strong agreement is explained by administrators’ emphasis on comprehensive enhancements. The three themes reflect the critical policy, financial, and evaluative measures considered essential for effective, sustainable, and career-relevant FDPs.

This joint display highlights administrators’ emphasis on policy, finance, and evaluation mechanisms as key drivers for strengthening faculty development programs. These insights underscore the importance of strategic, well-resourced, and accountable systems to enhance faculty development and institutional impact.

Conclusion

In summary, this study makes several important contributions to understanding the role and effectiveness of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) at St. Louis College of Bulanao. First, it shows that FDPs improve teaching skills and support faculty growth, in line with the institution’s mission and P.E.A.C.E. core values. Second, it identifies areas for improvement, including participation, communication, and research support, highlighting the

need for more inclusive, well-planned programs. Third, the study emphasizes that linking FDPs to career development and institutional goals can strengthen teaching quality, research output, and overall institutional performance. More importantly, this study contributes original insight by identifying a gap between the structured implementation of FDPs and faculty experiences, particularly regarding participation, feedback mechanisms, and access to development opportunities. It also provides a specific contribution to Philippine higher education by offering localized empirical evidence from a private regional institution, an area that remains underrepresented in existing literature on faculty development.

Moving forward, future research could explore why some faculty participate more actively than others and what motivates their engagement in FDPs. Studies could also examine how FDPs influence teaching methods, research work, and professional growth. Tracking faculty experiences over time would help understand the long-term effects of FDPs. Finally, comparing FDPs in different colleges or universities could show what works best in different settings and provide ideas for improving programs across institutions.

Contributions of Authors

The author declares sole authorship of the study.

Funding

This work was solely funded by the author and received no specific funding from any funding agency.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to everyone who contributed to the successful completion of this study. Their invaluable support, expertise, encouragement, and empowerment throughout the process were truly significant, and their contributions are deeply acknowledged.

References

- Ahmed, S., Hegazy, N., Kumar, A.P., Abouzeid, E., Wasfy, N., Atta, K., Wael, D., & Hamdy, H. (2022). A guide to best practice in faculty development for health professions schools: A qualitative analysis. *BMC Medical Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03208-x>
- Ahmed, S., Naudhani, T., & Wazir, S. (2025). The role of faculty development in enhancing teaching quality in higher education in Pakistan. *Social Science Review Archives*, 3(3), 1895–1908. <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i3.1024>
- Alhassan, A.I. (2022). Implementing faculty development programs in medical education utilizing Kirkpatrick's model. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 13, 945–954. <https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S372652>
- Ang, J., Berry, E., Chavez, J., Dela Calzada, K., Polestina, M.A., Asiri, M., Marquina, R., Macabago, J., & Paringit, S., Jr. (2025). How academic leaders induce motivation and productivity among faculty through faculty development management. *Environment & Social Psychology*, 10(8). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3913>
- Arcega, I. (2023). Enabling faculty through engagement: Insights to human resource policy directions. *Journal of Organisational Studies and Innovation*, 9(4), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.51659/josi.22.160>
- Babu, T.S.V., & G. V. (2023). Professional development programs: Their role in shaping organizational culture and boosting teaching effectiveness – A review. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v29i4.7483>
- Bajaj, R. (2023). Challenges and opportunities: Faculty development in private higher education institutions (HEIs). *Journal of Propulsion Technology*, 44(4), 3072–3080. <https://doi.org/10.52783/tjpt.v44.i4.1399>
- Beach, A., Sorcinelli, M.D., Austin, A., & Rivard, J. (2023). *Faculty development in the age of evidence: Current practices, future imperatives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003444787>
- Catanzano, T., Deitte, L., Naeger, D., Morgan, D., Germaine, P., & Slanetz, P. (2022). Meeting faculty development needs: Review of current resources and opportunities for program development. *Academic Radiology*, 29(7), 1116–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2021.08.021>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2012). CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, series of 2012: Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA.
- Crispino, E., & Moyani, G., Jr. (2023). Professional developmental needs of teachers. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends*, 2(4), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.58429/pgjsrt.v2n4a89>
- Dio, E.A. (2025). Transforming graduate school faculty development: Insights from training needs analysis. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(6), 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.207>
- Espartero, R., Amparado, M.C., & Tubola, C.J. (2025). The impact of the faculty development on teaching, learning, and research. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 2772–2785. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.909000238>
- Farakish, N., Cherches, T., & Zou, S. (2022). Faculty success initiative: An innovative approach to professional faculty onboarding and development. *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, 6(2), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-022-00069-x>
- Favre, D., Bach, D., & Wheeler, L. (2021). Measuring institutional transformation: A multifaceted assessment of a new faculty development program. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching*, 14(3), 378–398. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-04-2020-0023>
- Gautam, A., Dahal, N., & Hasan, M. (2025). University faculty perceptions of training transfer and professional growth: A qualitative study. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2024.2371401>
- Humphry, J. (2022). Implementing faculty development programs in medical education utilizing Kirkpatrick's model. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 13, 945–954. <https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S372652>
- Kırık, K.A., Korkmaz, Z.S., Doğan, S., Nalbantoğlu, Ü.Y., & Cengiz, S.G. (2024). Faculty development to design effective online courses: Responding to requirements. *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, 11(2), 163–189. <https://doi.org/10.18543/tjhe.2597>
- Kongle, D., Syeda, U.B., & Saba, S. (2025). Faculty engagement as a strategic driver of institutional performance in higher education. *Involvement International Journal of Business*, 2(4), 230–240. <https://doi.org/10.62569/ijib.v2i4.160>
- Li, Y., & Liu, Y. (2024). Strengthening teacher development programmes in higher education: Best practices and lessons learned. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2024.2371401>
- Nair, B., Bleasel, J., Mwangi, F., & Malau-Aduli, B. (2024). Reimagining faculty development: A paradigm shift from content to transformative learning processes. *Medical Teacher*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159x.2024.2390035>
- Nashrullah, M., Qausya, N., Nursalim, M., Budiyanto, B., & Lestari, G.D. (2025). Innovation in strategies for faculty development and career advancement. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Studies*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.21070/ijins.v26i1.1319>
- Naveen, P. (2025). Weighing faculty research contribution in institutional growth and incentivization. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202503.1733.v2>
- Ramos, L., & Codilla, L. (2024). Nurturing excellence: Exploring the level of professional development strategies for quality assurance in a multi-campus higher education institution. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(5), 1528–1534. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.05.06>
- Robertson, M., Cofrancesco, J., Jr., & Levine, R. (2025). Transforming individuals and institutions through competency-based faculty development. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 12, 1621376.

- <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2025.1621376>
- Steinert, Y., O'Sullivan, P., & Irby, D. (2024). The role of faculty development in advancing change at the organizational level. *Academic Medicine*, 99(7), 716–723. <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000005732>
- Swadia, B., Baskaran, D., Gupta, D., et al. (2023). Faculty professional development in private colleges: Strategies for enhancing teaching and research. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/tjpt.v44.i4.2195>
- Tobar, C. (2020). Towards the advancement of teaching and learning: An innovative approach to faculty development (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University).
- van Bruggen, L., ten Cate, O., & Chen, H.C. (2020). Developing a novel 4-C framework to enhance participation in faculty development. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 32(4), 371–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2020.1742124>
- Yadav, B.K. (2024). Professional development programmes: Practices and impacts. *KMC Journal*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.3126/kmcj.v6i1.62342>