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Abstract

The increasing reliance on adjunct faculty in higher education calls for innovative strategies to address their professional development needs and foster a sense of community among educators. This dissertation study focuses on an independent art college, which confronts the unique challenge of a fully adjunct faculty and a fragmented urban campus with limited shared spaces. This situation has led to historically low faculty participation in professional development activities and a reported lack of community among instructors. Professional development research shows that ongoing interaction and collaboration among faculty members is required to improve teachers’ classroom practice. So, the college’s pending mass retirement within its experienced faculty population heightens the urgency of cultivating a community of shared learning. The findings from in-depth interviews with faculty members in a needs assessment study revealed a faculty culture characterized by isolation and a desire for more meaningful interactions with their teaching peers. Drawing from insights gained through synthesizing literature on self-determination theory (SDT) and participatory design research, the proposed treatment is the design and implementation of a virtual faculty common (FC). The treatment process utilizes the participatory design approach to drive iterative development and to promote the FC from an authentic faculty perspective. Principles from SDT are incorporated into the FC design and communication strategy to support sustained use of the FC and to inform the methodology for the subsequent impact study. The faculty common impact study employs a mixed methods research design to assess the effects of increased knowledge sharing and collaboration with basic psychological needs satisfaction as the mediating variable.
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American higher education stands at a crossroads, facing increasing debt and oversight from accreditors (Greenstein, 2019; Leisyte & Dee, 2012; Zemsky et al., 2020), as well as new challenges to meet the evolving expectations of consumers in a global market (Dua et al., 2020; de Alva, 2011; Wessel & Christensen, 2012). As public pressure mounts for higher education to reform longstanding policies and practices (Poutré et al., 2017; Zemsky, 2009), higher education administrators often respond by mandating that faculty adopt new teaching practices and technologies (Leisyte & Dee, 2012). However, faculty require adequate professional development (PD), as many instructors are experts in their fields but are less knowledgeable about research focused on best practices in teaching and learning (Meyer, 2006). The need for PD training has also increased due to the many new technologies, such as learning management systems, that are implemented in school settings to support student success (Law, 2014). Additionally, faculty now welcome students from an array of cultural backgrounds and native languages into their classrooms (Greenstein, 2019). This obliges faculty to adjust their communication and instructional approaches to effectively address different learning needs (Larson et al., 2018). Finally, technological changes continue to impact the expectations of a new global workforce and require constant reskilling in the workplace. Consequently, faculty are challenged with ensuring students are both proficient with skills in current demand by employers and prepared to manage their lifelong learning beyond their postsecondary education (Annunziata & Bourgeois, 2018; Chesborough, 2017; Ryan, 2015). All of these changes put a tremendous burden on faculty and staff working in higher education. However, while institutions of higher education have been scrutinized for failing to innovate curricular and instructional practices (Carey, 2011), they have increasingly hired adjunct faculty members to replace tenured
professorships (Jolley et al., 2014). Adjunct faculty typically have less access to PD training and curricular planning activities, as well as fewer interactions with fellow faculty members to support their professional learning (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Dolan et al., 2013).

**Setting**

The college explored in this dissertation study, the School of Visual Arts (SVA), is an independent art and design college located in a major city in the northeastern United States. SVA is a family-owned, for-profit institution of higher education with twenty graduate and eleven undergraduate degree-granting programs. Since its founding in 1947, SVA has employed a fully adjunct faculty comprised of creative professionals who often have no formal teaching background. The approximately 1,000 adjunct instructors teach roughly 3,900 undergraduate and 700 graduate students. The college campus has few shared spaces for faculty to convene outside of class time and casual encounters are rare given the sprawling urban landscape and the instructors’ busy professional schedules (School of Visual Arts, 2016). Additionally, many of SVA’s most experienced faculty members are nearing retirement and the college must prepare for new visual artists and designers to take their place (School of Visual Arts, 2018). Already, in the 2020-2021 faculty census report, 37% of SVA instructors (N = 992) had four years or less teaching experience.

Like many institutions, SVA faces challenges in adapting to the evolving demands on higher education, but faculty professional development is a particularly challenging issue. For the first time in 2019, the college began requiring new instructors to complete a one-time training to become familiar with the college’s faculty resources and policies, but no other professional development is required of faculty. The college offers ongoing PD support and training opportunities but, with the exception of emergency remote teaching workshops during the
COVID-19 pandemic, faculty participation in SVA-sponsored activities has historically remained low (School of Visual Arts, 2016). SVA’s most recent strategic plan recognized the need to support faculty professional development “as the educational landscape becomes increasingly complex” (School of Visual Arts, 2018, p. 11) and identified key concerns such as creating new opportunities for faculty feedback and participation as well as addressing the pending retirement of a large number of long-serving faculty members. The plan indicated that a key goal for improving faculty professional development is the creation of a faculty common to drive participation and shared learning. However, a new faculty common (FC) cast in the same mold as past professional development initiatives would be unlikely to significantly improve faculty participation. Starting from the premise that faculty would benefit from engaging in learning activities to promote their abilities as visual arts educators, it is important to understand the impediments to faculty participation rates in professional development and knowledge-sharing activities. The current chapter is dedicated to this purpose.

**Statement of Problem**

Institutions of higher education (IHE) face increasing pressure from stakeholders to improve curricula and instructional practices to remain relevant for 21st-century learners and competitive in the expanding education market (Annunziata & Bourgeois, 2018; Chesborough, 2017; Ryan, 2015). Faculty are thus expected to adopt new pedagogical approaches and integrate new technologies into their professional practice (Leisyte & Dee, 2012). While professional development (PD) activities ostensibly support faculty in meeting these challenges, prevalent PD models have little impact on the activities of teachers in the classroom and provide few opportunities for faculty to collaborate on solving classroom-based problems (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Elmore, 2000). The challenge is exacerbated by the rise of adjunct faculty which has
increased nationwide across all sectors of higher education by upwards of 75% (Anthony et al., 2020; Jolley et al., 2014). Adjunct faculty typically have less access to PD training and fewer opportunities for engagement in institution-aligned communities to support their learning than their tenured and tenure-track counterparts (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Dolan et al., 2013). The reduced access to teaching peers and academic administrators further strains institutional efforts to optimize faculty performance (Dee & Leisyte, 2017; Senge, 2000). At the School of Visual Arts, all faculty members are designated as adjuncts, or independent contractors (“Labor and Employment Law”, n.d.), and hired based on their status as creative professionals without a clear expectation of prior teacher training. There are no institutional requirements for ongoing professional development training and despite repeated efforts by the Academic Affairs department to engage faculty members, the optional training activities, college-wide events, and asynchronous PD resources remain vastly underused (School of Visual Arts, 2016).

**Theoretical Framework**

The following literature review explores the factors and underlying causes that contribute to low rates of faculty participation in professional development activities at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). The community of practice (CoP) theory provides a helpful framework for understanding how faculty members learn, share knowledge, and improve their practice as visual arts educators. The community of practice (CoP) approach is rooted in social learning theories, such as social cognitive theory and social constructivism, that developed from cognitive psychology in the mid-twentieth century (Bruning et al., 2011). Cognitive psychology emerged as a dominant paradigm in the mid-20th century as a counter to behaviorism, which strictly regarded mental processes as a response to external stimuli (Bruning et al., 2011). In contrast to behaviorism, cognitive psychology shifted the focus from purely observable behaviors to
understanding the underlying mental processes involved in learning, memory, problem-solving, and decision-making. In the following decades, social learning theories built upon the cognitive framework by integrating the impact of social interactions on an individual’s learning to reveal the inherently social construct of cognition (Bandura, 1986a). For example, an individual’s learning is based on their interpretation of and responses to new information depending on a range of factors, including their environment and prior knowledge (Bandura, 1986a).

Around the same time, the rediscovery of Vygotsky’s (1978) work from the early 20th century contributed to social learning theories, especially those that emphasized the social context of learning (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). Interest in Vygotsky’s work from various disciplines, such as psychology and anthropology, paved the way for interdisciplinary collaborations between researchers from these fields (Spillane & Louis, 2002), but conceptions of learning as situated in specific contexts were varied. The term situated cognition has often been presented differently in research among psychologists compared with anthropologists but generally refers to “a reformulation of learning in which practice is not conceived of as independent of learning and in which meaning is not conceived of as separate from the practices and contexts in which it was negotiated” (Barab & Duffy, 2000, p. 3). While educational research grounded in psychology tends to focus on the needs of individual learners, anthropological research by scholars such as Jean Lave (1988), who coined the term community of practice, focuses on communities engaging in a shared and culturally embedded practice of learning and development (Wenger, 2001). Table 1.1 provides a comparison of the psychological and anthropological perspectives on situated learning.
Table 1.1

Focus of Psychological and Anthropological Views of Situativity Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Psychological Views</th>
<th>Anthropological Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>Individuals’ relations to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Members of CoPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>Situated Activity</td>
<td>Individual in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is produced from</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Meanings, identities, and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning arena</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Everyday world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of learning</td>
<td>Prepare for future tasks</td>
<td>Meet immediate community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical implications</td>
<td>Practice fields</td>
<td>Communities of practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Barab and Duffy (2000).

Grounded in an anthropological perspective, Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger developed the situated learning theory in 1991, from which the concept of *community of practice* grew. The situated learning theory emphasizes that learning is not an isolated mental activity but is embedded in social and cultural environments, or communities of practice. The community of practice (CoP) concept focuses on understanding *how* learning and knowledge creation occur within social contexts over time through the interaction and collaboration of individuals with shared interests, skills, and goals (Lave & Wenger, 1991, 2001; Wenger, 1999; Wenger et al., 2002). In the context of higher education faculty professional development, a community of practice (CoP) can be seen as a group of faculty members who share a common interest in teaching and learning and interact and exchange knowledge, ideas, and experiences related to pedagogy (Lave, 2019). In the current dissertation, the CoP framework is used as a lens to view
the benefits and challenges of uniting SVA faculty in a process of participation and knowledge sharing. Adopting this view places SVA faculty at the center of their professional development journey and recognizes their expertise in solving pedagogical problems through a network of teaching peers. While academic support teams may play ongoing roles in facilitating resources and activities for faculty members, the evolution of a quality visual arts education must emanate from faculty as they collectively change their praxis over time (Brown & Duguid, 1991).

**Organizing Framework**

Lewin’s (1947) change model is employed to organize the following needs assessment literature review into two overall categories related to faculty participation in professional development (PD) activities at the School of Visual Arts (SVA): *driving forces* toward change and *restraining forces* against change. The driving forces toward change reflect the broader cultural and societal context which affects the role of the faculty members as institutions of higher education brace for considerable change (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). The restraining forces against change highlight the various factors and underlying causes contributing to the challenge of engaging adjunct faculty members at SVA. Lewin’s (1947) model uses three phases to manage change called *unfreeze*, *change*, and *refreeze*. The purpose of the initial phase, *unfreeze*, is to gain deeper insight into the forces that are driving or restraining change toward a *desired future state* and then to lessen the restraining forces (Schein, 1996). Before the change phase can be implemented, the driving and restraining forces must be understood and addressed, either by reinforcing or diminishing them. This step is essential to avoid activating or intensifying culture-based resistance to the proposed change. Additionally, Lewin’s (1947) change theory emphasizes stakeholder involvement in the change process. By engaging those affected by the change,
organizations can foster buy-in and ownership which are critical for the successful implementation of related interventions (Rogers, 2003).

Contemporary organizational change research has built upon and expanded Lewin’s (1947) change theory by introducing new insights, such as continuous change and ongoing learning (Kotter, 1995; Senge, 2006), the importance of leadership styles to motivate followers (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Onorato, 2013), and the developments of instruments to diagnose organizational cultural climates (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). However, due to its simplicity and practicality, Lewin’s change theory is still used as a framework in organizational change research and provides a helpful overview of the driving and restraining forces related to low rates of faculty engagement and knowledge sharing at the School of Visual Arts. Figure 1.1 adapts Lewin’s (1947) force field analysis to identify the observable driving forces that support the need for engaging faculty around PD and knowledge-sharing activities, as well as the restraining forces that address potential factors and underlying causes of the low rates of faculty participation.
Literature Review

Grounded in a community of practice (CoP) perspective, the literature review explores factors and underlying causes related to faculty participation in professional development and knowledge-sharing activities at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). The first section of the review represents the major driving forces toward change and underscores the urgency to improve faculty professional development (PD) to support the ongoing success of institutions of higher education. The remaining sections, and the majority of the literature review, discuss restraining forces or barriers against change that exist in higher education and specifically at SVA.
Developing a deeper understanding of both forces will assist in leveraging the driving forces to promote institutional change and mitigate the restraining forces to support the successful implementation of interventions related to faculty PD (Lewin, 1947).

**Driving Forces for Change: Evolving Pedagogies, Technologies, and Learning Cultures**

It is widely accepted that knowledge has become the greatest strategic asset to drive competitive advantage in today’s world (Charband & Navimipour, 2016; Cross et al., 2006; Dee & Leisyte, 2017; Wenger et al., 2002). With virtually limitless information available to anyone with a reliable internet connection, institutions of higher education (IHEs) are becoming less valuable as disseminators of information and the desired role of educators is transforming to facilitators who empower and guide students through structured experimentation and co-creation of new knowledge (Brown, 2006; Noam, 1995; Thomas & Brown, 2011). Beyond reforming educational policies, the last quarter century has amplified calls for innovation in education (Law, 2014; OECD, 2013) and research from the learning sciences has contributed to a deeper understanding of how people learn and recommended strategies for improving student learning outcomes (Bransford et al., Brookfield, 2015; 2000; Sawyer, 2005). For instance, the integration of social-emotional learning (Hoffman, 2009; OECD, 2013; Weissberg et al., 2013) and self-regulation tools and frameworks (Heikkilä & Lonka, 2006; Jansen et al., 2019; Schunk, 2012) into lesson plans is suggested to help students excel in both in-person and online learning (Jansen et al., 2020; van Alten et al., 2020). Additionally, educators are increasingly encouraged or required to integrate lessons about global citizenship (Tassone et al., 2018) and instill 21st-century skills into course activities (Davidson et al., 2009; Dede, 2010). Such improvement efforts are intended to enhance students’ engagement and learning, and draw connections between local actions and global problem-solving efforts (Bransford et al., 2000). However, the
connection between research and practice remains elusive for many educators due to the time and background knowledge required to reflect and integrate new mindsets into their practice (Bayar, 2014; Butler & Schnellert, 2008).

**ICT Integration**

Information and communication technology (ICT) has enabled new models of communication and redefined workflows through complex digital networks (OECD, 2013) and workers are expected to continually re-skill to remain relevant in jobs that frequently change (Annunziata & Bourgeois, 2018; Scarpetta, 2018). Therefore, higher education must ensure students gain proficiency in creative problem-solving, critical thinking, and using technology-based tools to fully participate in society and be competitive in a future job market (Davidson et al., 2009). This requires faculty to not only comprehend and apply new pedagogical practices in their classrooms but also keep up with changes in professional fields to adequately prepare students for the future workforce. Faculty are also frequently required by administrators to integrate new technological tools and workflows into their classroom activities (Coleman et al., 2019; Leisyte & Dee, 2012). While such technologies are promoted to improve student learning, implementation without relevant pedagogical considerations could, in fact, diminish students’ academic success (Anderson, 2009; Bransford et al., 2000; Warschauer et al., 2011). These technological challenges were exacerbated through the COVID-19 pandemic as faculty rapidly shifted to an *emergency remote teaching* practice (Hodges et al., 2020). In the wake of the pandemic, online offerings continue to expand across higher education, and recent research showing that online education has the potential to boost equity in higher education (Barrow et al., 2020) paints this previously scrutinized modality in a friendlier light. Still, the adoption of new technology to facilitate online teaching and learning presents a tremendous learning curve
for many faculty (Polly et al., 2021). Additionally, at the School of Visual Arts, transforming
studio-based art and design courses into online learning experiences has proven challenging for
even the most adept online instructors (Song & Lim, 2022).

**Intercultural Classrooms and Shifting Social Norms**

The increase in international students enrolled in American higher education has transformed classrooms into intercultural spaces that present new instructional challenges (Acuff, 2018; Caldwell & Gregory, 2016). As the number of SVA’s international students more than tripled in the last decade (School of Visual Arts, 2018), there is increased attention on improving intercultural teaching and learning practices. This influx of international students has created challenges across higher education (St. Amour, 2020), but also affects art and design pedagogy in specific ways. For example, American art educators expect active participation in discussions and group critiques — a hallmark of art and design pedagogy (Sawyer, 2017). For faculty unaware that cultural differences may discourage students from speaking out in class, it may seem as if students are unwilling to participate or do not understand the conversation. Even on an unconscious level, instructors’ biases affect how they interpret communication from students, and can spill over into the assessments of students’ work and have detrimental effects on students’ overall learning process (Spillane & Louis, 2002).

In the wake of the *Me Too* and *Black Lives Matter* movements, many IHEs have been held accountable for long-term tolerance of sexist and racist behaviors within their communities. The School of Visual Arts was one of many schools that came under fire from alumni and students for its unresponsiveness to past reports filed about inappropriate faculty behavior (Moynihan, 2018). The college has responded by faculty dismissals, public acknowledgment of its need to improve in these areas, and an announcement of a new Office of Diversity, Equity,
and Inclusion to help guide change. However, a shift in consciousness must also be reflected in
the principles and teaching practices championed by faculty members. Classroom practices that
create inclusive and respectful environments create a safe space for students to co-create
knowledge and also support students’ higher-level thinking (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023). A
student’s sense of psychological safety, “defined as the degree to which people view the
environment as conducive to interpersonally risky behaviors like speaking up or asking for help”
(Edmondson et al., 2016, p. 66) plays a role in their learning and positively correlates with
academic performance (Soares & Lopes, 2020). Research on psychological safety as a moderator
for knowledge sharing has also shown that psychological safety is of greater importance for
individuals who possess less confidence in their knowledge of a topic (Siemsen et al., 2009).
Faculty members who thoughtfully approach intercultural classrooms are more likely to improve
student engagement and learning, and to responsibly and civilly manage their own interactions
(Larson et al., 2018).

With increased awareness of the impact of classroom interactions on student wellness and
classroom performance, faculty have new information to improve teaching practices and support
a more diverse population of learners (Sathy & Hogan, 2019). In learning environments,
changing student demographics requires reassessing curricular decision-making and classroom
activities to ensure an inclusive environment, accommodating different culture-based learning
practices, and providing opportunities to prepare students for success in a global market (Acuff,
2018; Caldwell & Gregory, 2016; Pret et al., 2016). This shift requires faculty to apply lessons
from the learning sciences that support student-centered and discourse-based approaches as well
as reconsider their choices in course content and communication styles (Bransford et al., 2000;
Sawyer, 2005). It is no small task to do the personal work required to recognize one’s own
implicit bias and ingrained communication habits (Mezirow, 1997; Wink, 2005), and this is another important area increasingly integrated into faculty professional development programs.

**Restrainting Forces Against Change: Factors and Underlying Causes**

The following sections discuss potential contributing factors and underlying causes of the historically low rates of faculty participation in professional development activities at the School of Visual Arts. As a community of practice occurs naturally and cannot be forced upon its members (Lave & Wenger, 1991), these factors and causes also reflect the restraining forces or constraints to faculty engagement and knowledge sharing.

**Faculty Exclusion from Institutional Planning**

Influential organizational leaders recognize the value of assessing company culture and identifying opportunities to integrate stakeholder feedback into planning, and the development of new workflows and operational strategies (Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein, 1990). Spreitzer and Cameron (2012) recognized the need to reframe strategic planning for the 21st century to ensure workers possess the shared vision and mental models that enable them to solve problems in real-time and adapt to an ever-changing business landscape. While there will always be a place for top-down decisions (Vroom, 2003), shifting the praxis of employees requires transformative leadership to promote an inclusive community and foster shared vision and self-sustaining growth among employees (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Onorato, 2013; Senge, 2000). In lieu of regulating the performance of employees, a more valuable role of today’s leadership is to understand the values, policies, and workflows that contribute to the organizational culture and align strategic planning to harness the greatest strengths of that culture (Cameron, 1978; Christensen et al., 2011; Christensen & Eyring, 2011).
Similarly, driving institutional improvement in higher education requires taking inventory of existing mental models and shared purpose among stakeholders to determine how enacting policies and practices could further develop or hinder the organization’s talent (Friedlaender, 2019; Senge, 2000). Educational policy scholars argue that sustainable educational reform requires the integration of perspectives from multiple stakeholders to bring about systemic change in learning institutions (Bryk et al., 2017; Coleman et al., 2019; Rittel & Webber, 1973). Tackling wicked problems in education necessitates the development of execution networks for delineating goals, strategies, and measurable outcomes to a wider community of stakeholders. However, the inclusion of the faculty perspective is essential to plan and orchestrate such sweeping changes (Austin, 2011; Bourke et al., 2018; Gomez et al., 2016; Leisyte & Dee, 2016). Some scholars recommend that faculty play a prominent role in driving educational reform such as Austin’s (2011) faculty-led approach. Austin (2011) recognized that educators’ backgrounds and abilities will inform the decisions they make in the classroom and must be fully integrated into the policy reform process.

While faculty perspectives are essential to inform strategic planning in support of institutional improvement, IHEs largely fail to engage faculty in the process (Bhati & Manimala, 2011; Leisyte & Dee, 2016). Instead, the prevailing response in higher education is to mandate new evaluative processes defined by institutional leaders (Bourke et al., 2018). While a greater focus on student outcomes is necessary (Bjorklund-Young, 2016; Carey, 2011), the habits of leadership and conventional bureaucracy often fail to include faculty in the related discourse or provide adequate support for faculty to adopt contemporary pedagogy that addresses the individual learning needs of students (Weeres & Kerchner, 1995). This is consistent with the School of Visual Arts, where there are no faculty committees or working groups to identify and
communicate classroom-based needs, or innovations, to the college’s management. A needs assessment study conducted at SVA in 2012 revealed that while the adjunct faculty were typically grateful not to be burdened with required meetings, they also felt that they had no voice in the institution (School of Visual Arts, 2012).

The siloization of academic departments at SVA also diminishes interdisciplinary collaboration, as well as communications from the administration to faculty. A recent accreditation review suggested that the “institutional bodies charged with oversight of academic affairs could facilitate the SVA’s current managerial model of autonomous departments by providing common standards, more opportunities for resource sharing and other forms of support and communication” (School of Visual Arts, 2016). While the institution’s upper management has begun moving in this direction, there has been no notable change in collecting feedback from faculty or engaging faculty to participate in institutional planning. The delivery of general teaching standards by administrators without receiving input from faculty fails to integrate valuable insight from art education practitioners and misses the opportunity to engage faculty in co-creating and improving upon their pedagogical practices (Austin, 2011; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Providing the space and support for faculty to contribute to academic standards and institutional decision-making processes would benefit the college by promoting a greater exchange of knowledge across different communities of practice (CoPs), or domains, such as between administrative offices and faculty members (Li et al., 2009; Wenger et al., 2002). Wenger and colleagues (2002) described the boundaries of a community of practice as fluid, making space for members to engage as discussions interest them. Boundary spanners, or individuals with participation in multiple CoPs, can transfer valuable information between the
domains (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Fischer, 2009; Wenger, 1998, 1999). Additionally, communities of interest are groups that attract members from different CoPs who come together around shared concerns (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Fischer, 2009). While there is sometimes tension at the intersections of different communities of practice, due to differences in values and objectives, the exchange of unfamiliar information can facilitate greater growth for members (Wenger, 1999). For example, knowledge sharing between faculty members and instructional designers could help bridge the divide between theory and praxis as well as bring faculty perspectives to bear on the integration of new learning technologies. Academic staff members must push their work along the boundaries of the faculty CoP to better align institutional academic priorities and policies with the lived practice of arts educators. However, simply leaning on faculty participation to deliver educational improvement does not change the reality of the adjunct position which typically lacks power in institutional decision-making processes (Dolan et al., 2013; Elliot, 1991). To respect the knowledge and energy faculty contribute toward institutional goals, investment in faculty communities of practice cannot be achieved as a narrowly viewed administrative mandate (Bourke et al., 2018).

**Misaligned Professional Development Strategies**

Faculty who began their careers in the classroom thirty or forty years ago entered a very different environment with less pressure placed on instructor performance and student learning outcomes. By contrast, the creative professionals newly hired to teach at SVA, and often without prior teaching experience, face a steeper learning curve (Senge, 2000). The faculty role has become more challenging and time-consuming, and educators increasingly rely on professional development training to stay abreast of new pathways for driving student success (Bayar, 2014). However, despite good intentions, traditional forms of professional development often present
barriers for instructors to effectively integrate evidence-based findings into their teaching practices (Butler & Schneller, 2008). Professional development (PD) is intended to support faculty in navigating the evolving demands of 21st-century education, typically by introducing relevant research from the learning sciences and providing guidance about institutional education standards (Kennedy, 2016), but the predominant training model often fails to deliver a valuable learning experience. The common delivery of PD as one-off instructive training sessions fails to promote integration into participants’ teaching practices (Ebert-May et al., 2011; Elmore, 2000; Hill, 2009). Additionally, professional development has little impact on the classroom activities of teachers unless it is closely tied to clear institutional goals and assessments (Bayar, 2014; Elmore, 2000; Rosenholtz et al., 1986).

Literature pertaining to best practices in professional development emphasizes the need for faculty to participate in active learning (Bayar, 2014; Dede, 2006; Desimone et al., 2002, Desimone, 2009), e.g., analyzing student work, witnessing colleagues immersed in their teaching practices through classroom observation (Desimone, 2011), or through co-teaching (Beach et al., 2008). Ching and Hursh (2014) demonstrated comparable results in faculty engagement and learning when participants interacted through online courses. Akin to member participation in a community of practice, the professional development literature highlights the need for faculty to have access to ongoing opportunities for collaboration with fellow teachers to resolve shared challenges in their familiar setting (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Elmore, 2000). Ongoing access is key as pedagogical skills do not develop in a linear manner based solely on professional development training; years of experience are typically required to move theory into practice and finesse classroom techniques (Kuster et al., 2015; Postareff et al., 2007). Research in elementary and secondary education similarly stresses the importance of “deprivatizing classroom practice”
and supporting a community approach to teacher training (Spillane & Louis, 2002, p. 92). In both cases, the end goal is to improve student learning outcomes by embracing reflection, discussion, and collaboration between instructors (Brookfield, 2015; Spillane & Louis, 2002).

Table 1.2 organizes the empirically-based recommendations for essential components of faculty professional development by Desimone et al. (2002), Bayar (2014), and Darling-Hammond et al. (2017). Desimone and colleagues (2002) synthesized 10 years of professional development literature and identified six characteristics of quality professional development. Using a qualitative research design, Bayar (2014) interviewed 16 elementary teachers about their professional development activities over the course of a year and identified five key components to drive successful PD. Darling-Hammond and colleagues (2017) conducted an analysis of 35 studies selected through an extensive review of literature across three decades. Their findings revealed seven key drivers of successful professional development that lead to improved student learning outcomes. Despite differences in the methodologies and timeframes of these studies, there is close alignment in their findings and recommendations for delivering high-quality professional development. However, while the literature provides strong agreement among best practices, it is helpful to recognize that more data-driven work is needed to link these recommendations to improved student learning outcomes (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). Desimone and colleagues (2002) noted that their literature review identified few studies linking PD with teachers’ instruction and student achievement. Additionally, Darling-Hammond and colleagues (2017) identified only 35 studies over three decades that linked PD and student learning outcomes.
Table 1.2

*Research Comparison on Essential Components for Faculty Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Content focused</td>
<td>• Match with real needs of teachers</td>
<td>• Content focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coherence with other PD training and school policies</td>
<td>• Match with existing school needs</td>
<td>• Uses models and modeling of effective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collective participation with fellow faculty</td>
<td>• Teacher involvement in the design/planning of PD content and activities</td>
<td>• Supports collaboration, e.g., job-embedded contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporates active learning</td>
<td>• Incorporates active learning</td>
<td>• Incorporates active learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Duration spread over a semester</td>
<td>• Long-term engagement</td>
<td>• Sustained duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High-quality instructors</td>
<td>• Provides coaching/expert support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for feedback and reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Desimone (2011) underscored that the substantive features of professional development programs, rather than their structure, are crucial for “enhancing teachers’ knowledge, skills, and classroom practice” (p.69), certain infrastructures may be particularly effective in promoting these desired features. For instance, well-established online communities of practice and professional learning communities (PLCs) serve as facilitators for faculty engagement, knowledge sharing, and collaboration (Owen, 2016; Stewart, 2014; Trust et al., 2016; Vescio et al., 2008). Online communities of learning gained prominence at the turn of the century as platforms for organizations to encourage employee knowledge sharing and collaboration to meet the demands of new markets and innovation (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005;
Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006; Wenger, 2006). Whether referred to as an online community of practice, professional virtual community, or professional learning community, the concept of establishing a space for colleagues to exchange knowledge and foster comradery has garnered significant attention in education literature (Fishman & Davis, 2006; Mullen & Schunk, 2010; Prenger et al., 2017).

Access to exchanging knowledge with teaching peers creates opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and produce artifacts of knowledge for newcomers in the community (Gee, 2008a; Lave & Wenger, 1991). This process increases the likelihood of obtaining higher-level thinking and fixing new information in a more complex construct that involves long-term memory (Wenger, 1998). Learning in a community provides the space for discourse among diverse perspectives, promoting social creativity through the negotiation of differences (Fischer, 2005, 2009). Learning communities also support faculty by providing clearer goals to facilitate institutional change, building shared vision in a supportive and collaborative environment, and undertaking planning and assessment of the community’s activities (Mullen & Schunk, 2010; Owen, 2016; Prenger et al., 2017; Stewart, 2014; Trust et al., 2016; Vescio et al., 2008). Dufour and Reeves (2016) indicated that in addition to supporting educators, a true PLC should also undertake the assessment of student learning outcomes to inform instructional and curricular changes and provide evidence to guide interventions.

Using technology-mediated communication enables member interaction to be driven by “shared concerns rather than shared location” (Fischer, 2009, p. 12), which would be useful at SVA given the barriers faculty face in physically accessing one another. Additionally, the digital documentation of faculty discussions, debates, and shared concerns provides a mechanism for overcoming temporal distance and allows newcomers to benefit from the prior collective
knowledge of the community (Fischer, 2005, 2009). While the School of Visual Arts maintains a robust archive of art and design artifacts, there has been no intentional collection of the faculty perspective on visual arts pedagogy. In recent years, the college’s academic support teams have begun interviewing faculty, including Department Chairs nearing retirement. However, this archival process fails to incorporate community discussion around salient topics related to faculty challenges in a visual arts environment.

**Challenges for Adjunct Faculty Members**

Over the past three decades, there has been a significant trend toward employing adjunct faculty to replace tenured professor roles in higher education (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Jolley et al., 2014). As more faculty join the *gig economy*, the change of their status to independent workers creates new barriers to full participation in a faculty community of practice. As social enterprises, IHEs tend to retain their workforce at below-market wages or with a mix of part-time and full-time employees (Bhati & Manimala, 2011). Faculty who are unable to rely on careers as full-time educators at one institution are more likely to patch together multiple adjunct teaching positions or split their time between teaching and a different career path (Kagan, 2019). Due to competing schedules, less time spent on campus, and no faculty office space, adjunct faculty have diminished access to professional development resources and are less involved in institutional practices (Dolan et al., 2013; Jolley et al., 2014). This lack of access further reduces opportunities for faculty to interact with members of their teaching community or access professional development activities.

Social enterprises frequently rely on a *partnership paradigm* as a common human resources management strategy to ameliorate the lack of financial incentives for workers (Bhati & Manimala, 2011). This approach employs a strong institutional brand, a sense of shared vision
among employees, professional development opportunities, as well as workers’ sense of ownership “through participation in equity as well as decision-making” (Bhati & Manimala, 2011). When these benefits are not effectively administered, the outsider role experienced by many adjunct instructors can create feelings of isolation and a sense of disconnection from teaching peers (Fuller et al., 2023; Jolley et al., 2014). The challenge of connecting with teaching peers and accessing PD activities is exacerbated for SVA faculty, as the sprawling urban campus has few spaces for casual interaction and no faculty offices or lounges (Caldwell & Gregory, 2016). Additionally, due to the college’s location in a major city, faculty who are interested in attending PD activities (typically scheduled during office hours) could easily spend two hours in commute, taking time away from their careers as visual arts professionals.

The School of Visual Arts has relied on adjunct instructors since its founding in 1947 to provide a faculty roster of creative professionals while keeping its faculty salary expenditures low. In exchange for dedicating time away from busy professional careers, faculty were not expected to participate in institutional activities beyond their time in the classroom. As expectations of faculty members have increased in recent years, the long-term culture persists and there remain few new attempts to promote faculty participation in the SVA community. Recommendations for increasing faculty engagement have been raised internally by academic departments and support teams. However, an understandable tension persists around asking contract-based workers to attend PD activities without receiving additional hourly compensation and the college has been hesitant about investing in paid programs. Unfortunately, pay-for-performance models, like the hourly work of adjunct faculty members, typically have a negative impact on individuals’ motivation to participate (Weibel et al., 2014) which diminishes the likelihood that faculty spend time attending professional development workshops.
While hourly wages and exclusion from institutional practices can have negative consequences for faculty motivation and dedication to an organization (Mukherjee & Sujatha, 2020), there are also positive aspects to contract-based work. Scholars have explored ways that freelance workers use *third spaces*, such as work collectives, to earn social capital (e.g., professional contacts), exchange knowledge, and gain opportunities for collaboration (Avdikos & Kalogeresis, 2017; Pret et al., 2016). Some workers place as much value on the cultural, social, and symbolic capital they gain through freelance employment than on the financial compensation (Pret et al., 2016). Similarly, research has shown that adjunct faculty are less attached to a particular institutional identity than to a sense of purpose or membership in a community (Mukherjee & Sujatha, 2020). Recognizing alternative forms of value does not address the need for employers to adequately compensate workers for their time and contributions. However, it suggests that adjunct faculty may be more motivated to participate in unpaid PD activities if the experiences provide value that extends beyond their role as educators. As faculty members identify opportunities to exchange social capital with one another it is then the prerogative of institutional management to identify “ways in which such capital can be isolated from individuals and captured more collectively” (Sparrow & Makram, 2015, p. 11).

SVA’s adjunct faculty are selected based on their status as successful artists and designers rather than prior experience in education. Some research suggests that taking classes from adjunct faculty positively impacts students’ interest in the subject matter as most *adjuncts* are also working professionals who share inspiring real-world perspectives (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Pret et al., 2016). This positive influence can be especially important in settings such as SVA, where faculty introduce students to networks of creative professionals and practices that help them navigate the work-for-hire economy prevalent in art and design industries (Pret et al.,
However, while instructors’ industry expertise may bring meaningful insight to classroom activities, their lack of educator training may negatively impact their self-efficacy in the classroom (Bandura, 1986b; Bandura & Freeman, 1997; Schunk, 1995a; Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2016). During past internal faculty interviews at SVA, even some seasoned SVA faculty reported low self-efficacy based on their lack of formal teacher training and conveyed a sense of disconnection from the institution, with one instructor commenting that he felt like he did not have a voice at SVA (School of Visual Arts, 2012). This was a troubling discovery, as an individual’s self-efficacy is influenced by personal factors, but also their prior experience, and the quality of social support they receive (Bandura, 1986b; Schunk, 1995a).

Bandura (1986b) described self-efficacy as, “People’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p. 391). When focused on the effects of self-efficacy in instructional settings, Bandura and Freeman (1997) stated that low instructional efficacy impacts an individual’s “general orientation toward the educational process as well as their specific instructional activities” (p. 241). Faculty with low instructional efficacy experience diminished motivation and their classroom performance is adversely affected (Bandura, 1986b; Bandura & Freeman, 1997; Schunk, 1995a). For example, because instructors with low perceived efficacy do not believe in their ability to provide a meaningful learning experience, they exert little effort to guide students through the learning process. Lacking confidence in their ability to help struggling students, they tend to criticize students who don’t quickly understand course content (Bandura & Freeman, 1997). Such behavior from the authority figure in a classroom creates a stressful learning environment for students and diminishes their learning experience (Bandura & Freeman, 1997; Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2016). Additionally, research has shown that students enrolled in courses taught by
teachers with low self-efficacy tend to experience diminished motivation and performance in their studies (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012).

Faculty with low self-efficacy are also likely to experience diminished motivation to participate in professional development activities or engage with their teaching peers (Bandura, 1986b; Bandura & Freeman, 1997). Additionally, low instructional efficacy negatively impacts instructors’ willingness to adopt new technologies and skills required to support student learning or to access teaching resources (Bandura & Freeman, 1997). This creates a vicious cycle as these individuals may not receive the support needed to improve their teaching practice, and persistent low instructional efficacy has been shown to cause burnout in instructors (Bandura & Freeman, 1997; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). While individuals with low self-efficacy tend to be more reluctant to participate in new tasks or events, this reluctance can be mitigated or exacerbated by the circumstances (both personal and situational) that surround the activity (Schunk, 1995b). Self-efficacy can be improved when individuals have access to observe someone competently performing related activities (Bandura, 1986b; Schunk, 1995b). Additionally, the more one has in common with the competent model, the greater the impact on improved self-efficacy (Schunk, 1995b).

Based on their adjunct status, the college’s faculty face an array of barriers to participating in professional development activities. Offering online PD events removes significant barriers by providing access to a shared space and reducing the time required for participation. Still, a lack of motivation to participate may persist due to feelings of disconnection from the school and the hourly pay model that only compensates faculty for time in the classroom. However, truly re-envisioning professional development through the CoP lens would place faculty voices at the center of determining the needs of their community (Wenger,
While the college may not compensate faculty for PD activities, opportunities may yet exist for faculty to exploit their role at SVA to generate other types of value. If the administration is willing to honor the boundaries of the faculty CoP and listen to faculty needs and recommendations, then great things could be achieved within a broader community of interest (Fischer, 2005, 2009). Working across community boundaries, academic support teams could better fulfill their roles by facilitating knowledge exchange around institutional goals and assessments (Bayar, 2014; Bryk et al., 2015; Elmore, 2000; Rosenholtz et al., 1986). Faculty members would have access to a platform for voicing their concerns and recommendations to the administration, as well as facilitating communication and interaction with fellow faculty members. To improve the quality of professional development programming, the community of interest could facilitate collaboration between academic support teams and faculty around the development of PD goals and activities (Bayar, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002). Additionally, work within the community of interest could support faculty with low instructional efficacy by creating new channels to feature adept faculty modeling their practice (Schunk, 1995b).

**Tension Between Faculty Identities as Creative Professionals and Educators**

The theme of creative professionals in the classroom is at the core of SVA’s identity. The college’s most recent strategic plan (School of Visual Arts, 2018) mentions professions, professional, professionals, or professionalism 23 times in the 16-page document and includes “maintaining and sustaining a faculty of working professionals active in their fields” as one of its strategic priorities (p. 11). When addressing new faculty via a recorded video interview in 2019, SVA’s executive vice president described the college’s approach as a simple model that has worked for years, and allows faculty to “bring in your professional practice to the classroom with
your high standards to be able to teach these students who want to enter all the diverse fields of the visual arts” (School of Visual Arts, 2019). The creative professional as an autonomous educator is a persistent fixture in the institutional identity and strongly impacts the *organizational culture*, or what “is valued, the dominant leadership styles, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that make an organization unique” (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 17).

Although faculty are expected to excel in dual roles, a *dominant identity* is supported by the institution. SVA faculty also recognize a sense of isolation in navigating their role in the classroom. When discussing how faculty gain basic teaching skills at SVA, one instructor commented that a “cult of personality and, sort of, general understanding of your own practice has informed everything” (G. Russomagno, personal communication, June 14, 2021). In a similar setting, Hökkä and colleagues (2012) found that the construction of participants’ secondary identity was “subjugated, complex and characterised by a lack of resources” (p. 96). The authors emphasized the need to develop ways to build connections between the two identities to enhance “the quality and attractiveness” of the secondary identity (Hökkä et al., 2012, p. 97). Identity is not a static state but a construct that changes over time as we learn through new experiences (Wenger, 2010). In addition to providing institutional content related to teaching and learning, facilitating knowledge sharing about instructors’ art and design practices may better acknowledge their dual identities as practitioners and educators.

The trope of the artist has historically been situated in communities defined quite differently from institutional settings and that reflected a *culturally patterned self* that resists external constraints (Wilf, 2013). For faculty who primarily identify as creative professionals, belonging and participating in different communities may create a *negotiation of identities*, or the
internal process of defining who we are in the contexts of different groups that may represent incongruent aspects of ourselves (Wenger, 2010). In addition to constructing our identities through membership in various communities, we may also build a sense of self through non-participation in communities in which we choose not to become members. Therefore, professional artists working as part-time educators may experience disparate identities as they step into an institutional setting. This may be especially true at SVA, where instructors are lauded as creative professionals and invited to step into the classroom relatively free from administrative oversight while facing barriers to accessing a faculty community of practice.

**Art Education Research and Shared Language.** While education scholars now advocate for teaching creativity across all disciplines (Sawyer, 2015), the empirically explored concept of creativity is still relatively new (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010; Plucker et al., 2004). Historically, creativity was often associated with mental illness, and more broadly the misconception was held that creativity is unteachable (Becker, 2014; Sternberg & Kaufman, 2018; Wilf, E., 2013). Visual arts pedagogy, which is directly related to the concept and goal of creativity, has largely failed to attract attention from the learning sciences (Bae, 2014; Milbrandt et al., 2018; Sawyer, 2017). When Salazar (2013) worked with instructors at SVA and Maryland Institute College of Art, she found that most of them had previously worked intuitively without a vocabulary to explore their own teaching styles or to recognize ways in which their personal observations fit into a broader pedagogical framework. The faculty reported feeling empowered by discussing their teaching practices with the researcher (Salazar, 2013).

Without interacting in a community, faculty miss opportunities to reinforce the language they use to describe their practice and to identify a shared vocabulary that in turn
helps define their identity as art educators (Gee, 2008a). The dearth of explicit knowledge about art education and minimal opportunities for faculty to share tacit knowledge with other instructors creates another barrier for faculty members to strengthen their identities as educators. Reframing traditional PD activities as conversations for faculty to share their observations and experiences with teaching peers provides an opportunity to improve faculty participation and knowledge sharing in a community of practice. Additionally, if orchestrated to coincide with institutional studies, the experiences of SVA faculty could provide rich data to deepen the collective understanding of visual arts pedagogy. Instead of asking faculty to situate their teaching experiences in a framework based on scant arts education research, alternative PD formats could include drawing on faculty members’ experience through a reflective and collaborative process (Dee & Leisyte, 2017). Kinchin and Wiley (2018) describe a remedy to the “pedagogic frailty” in visual arts education as employing tactics to lead faculty through an autoethnographic exploration that serves their own professional development and contributes to pedagogical discourse.

Academic support teams at the School of Visual Arts began to initiate such activities prior to the COVID-19 shutdown by developing a Teachers on Teaching video series in which SVA faculty were interviewed about their practice. While the pre-selected instructors were generally eager to participate, the format is difficult to scale across the faculty. More importantly, the videos produced one-way communication similar to a workshop lecture. In terms of successful professional development tactics, the quality of the instructor (Bayar, 2014), or expert support (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017) was improved. However, the format fails to provide ongoing opportunities for faculty to explore concepts through collaboration and discussion with other instructors, an essential element for overcoming the disconnect between
theory and praxis (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). When considering opportunities to learn as a community or as a set of communities networked together, it is essential to share a common language to identify goals and resources and to measure outcomes (Bryk et al., 2015).

**Summary**

Chapter One explored the problem of historically low rates of faculty participation in professional development (PD) activities at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). The literature review first broadly identified pedagogy-related areas in need of improvement in higher education (*driving forces for change*) that underscored the importance of improving faculty engagement and knowledge sharing at SVA. Subsequent sections of the review focused on potential factors and underlying causes (*restraining forces against change*) for the college’s low faculty participation rates. Synthesis of organizational leadership texts, from within and outside the field of education, highlighted the need for greater inclusion of SVA faculty in discussions and planning related to institutional improvement (Bryk et al., 2015; Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Spreitzer and Cameron, 2012). Research on faculty professional development revealed the failing of traditional forms of professional development in providing opportunities for faculty to integrate improved teaching methods into their classroom practice (Ebert-May et al., 2011; Elmore, 2000; Hill, 2009; Resnick et al., 2010). Additionally, the literature review examined the challenges adjunct faculty face in accessing institutional resources and connecting with teaching peers (Dolan et al., 2013; Fuller et al., 2023; Jolley et al., 2014), and how characteristics of the college’s adjunct faculty may negatively impact their self-efficacy in the classroom (Bandura, 1986b; Bandura & Freeman, 1997; Schunk, 1995a). Specific to visual arts education, the review addressed potential tension between faculty members’ identities as creative professionals and educators (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010; Hökkä et al., 2012), as well as the lack of a faculty
community to reify the experience of visual arts education through a shared language (Gee, 2008a; Sawyer, 2017). Grounded in the concept of community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), the literature also provided opportunities to reflect on pathways to improving faculty engagement and knowledge sharing at SVA, and ultimately increasing faculty participation in a re-envisioned model for professional development.

Institutions of higher education must sufficiently embrace a 21st-century ethos for faculty to model new communication practices and apply new technologies and pedagogical approaches expected by accreditors and consumers alike. However, broad organizational change requires vision and support from upper management that values the inclusion of stakeholders’ feedback to inform new policies and practices (Spreitzer and Cameron, 2012). While institutional policy and leadership development are outside the scope of this dissertation, the literature reviewed in Chapter One points to areas that can be leveraged by academic support teams to create environments more accessible and engaging to the college’s faculty. Shifting professional development resources from the one-off and one-way delivery of traditional PD may lay the groundwork for faculty to feel a sense of ownership and personal investment in the faculty community of practice. Explicitly recognizing the dual identity of artist-educators may support faculty motivation to participate in exchanging knowledge with their teaching peers and build a shared language around their practice. Increasing opportunities for faculty to share feedback with academic support teams could create conduits for faculty perspectives to flow more freely to upper management. As a next step toward bringing the faculty perspective into focus, the following needs assessment study engages a group of demonstrated faculty leaders to better understand the faculty community of practice from an insider perspective.
Chapter Two: Exploring Faculty Members’ Perspectives on Community and Participation

In Chapter One, the literature review provided a foundation for understanding the underlying causes and factors contributing to low rates of faculty participation in professional development (PD) activities at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). Lewin’s (1947) force field analysis was adapted to organize the literature around the driving forces for changing faculty participation rates and the restraining forces against such change. The driving forces for change included the increasing demands for faculty members to implement new teaching practices and technologies to meet the evolving needs of students, as well as the impact of the college’s pending mass retirement of experienced faculty members. The restraining forces against change included faculty exclusion from institutional planning, misaligned approaches to professional development training, challenges for adjunct faculty members, and tensions that faculty experience based on their dual identities as artists and educators.

Purpose of the Study

The following needs assessment study engages SVA faculty members via an online questionnaire and semi-structured interviews to explore their perceptions of the faculty community of practice at SVA and how the college’s organization and culture influence their teaching practice. For the purpose of the study, a community of practice is a group of faculty members who share common practices, beliefs, and interact to develop themselves toward master practitioners (visual arts educators) within the community (Barab & Duffy, 1998; Wenger, 2009). The study creates a space for faculty members to discuss their views on the value of the community, potential barriers to access, their sense of belonging and engagement, the support they receive from the college’s administration, and how they perceive their identities as artists and educators.
A deeper understanding of the faculty perspective will influence future professional development (PD) programming provided by academic support teams and guide recommendations for the college’s upper management. The study will also deepen my understanding of faculty beliefs about the challenges of delivering quality art education. Additionally, by surveying and interviewing faculty, the researcher intends to communicate to faculty the value of co-creating knowledge as part of a community of practice at SVA. Drawn from Lewin’s (1947) change theory, Schein (1996) discussed the concept of diagnosis as an initial intervention. Schein argued that gathering information to assess a problem is, in fact, a part of the intervention process. In recognizing that every interaction between study facilitators and participants will affect their perceptions, facilitators can use process consultation to manage change by adjusting their interactions to help move participants toward the desired change (Schein, 1996).

**Research Questions**

The needs assessment study posed four open-ended questions to gain a deeper sense of the faculty perspective about their community of practice (CoP) at the School of Visual Arts (SVA).

1. What value do faculty gain from participating in the CoP?
2. How do faculty judge the availability and coordination of activities in the CoP?
3. How do faculty perceive institutional support and ICT support for the CoP?
4. What value and challenges do faculty believe are present in delivering a quality arts education?

Analysis of data collected for these questions illuminates the value that SVA faculty assign to their community of practice and their perspectives about the community support received by the college’s administration. Additionally, the data analysis reveals how faculty
perceive barriers to participation in the CoP, and provides recommendations for academic improvement at the School of Visual Arts.

Method

This study employs a convergent mixed methods design in which quantitative and qualitative data are separately collected and analyzed, and then integrated to provide a deeper understanding of the faculty experience at the School of Visual Arts (Lochmiller & Lester, 2015). Due to the small sample size, the design is designated quan:QUAL to indicate the primary role the qualitative data plays in the study (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). Two valid instruments were adapted to develop the online questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, used for collecting the quantitative and qualitative data, respectively. Participants’ responses to the questionnaire also influenced the questions asked in the interviews to provide context for their questionnaire responses.

Participants

The School of Visual Arts (SVA) is a private, family-owned visual arts college with a fully adjunct faculty. The target population for the needs assessment study is approximately 1,000 adjunct art and design educators at SVA. Using a purposive sampling approach, faculty members were pre-selected to participate in the study, and contacted directly by the researcher (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011; Etikan et al., 2016). Pre-selection criteria included having multiple roles within the institution, e.g., acting as both an instructor and staff member, or having experience collaborating with the administration on special projects. Additionally, to provide greater variation (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011), faculty were invited from various studio-based departments across the college, e.g., design, illustration, and animation. Convenience bias is a potential limitation in using purposive sampling as the individuals selected may not accurately
reflect the most common experiences of faculty at SVA (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). Another potential bias is confirmation bias, or the researcher’s tendency to seek out participants who confirm their preconceived beliefs (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). However, the selected participants were faculty with whom the research had never previously discussed professional development at the SVA.

Four faculty members completed the questionnaire, and three of these participants also completed the semi-structured interviews. Table 2.1 provides a demographic overview of the study participants. A limitation of the quantitative data collection is that the sample size was insufficient to represent the overall gender and ethnicity breakdown of the SVA faculty. Additionally, the sample size provides insufficient sample validity to support a rigorous quantitative study (Lochmiller & Lester, 2018), but the descriptive data gleaned from questionnaire responses helped formulate productive interview questions. All participants listed in Table 2.1 completed the questionnaire, and participants 1, 2, and 3 also completed the semi-structured interviews.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>% of studio courses</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Department(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>BFA Cartooning/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BFA Illustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>MFA Visual Narrative/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BFA Illustration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

Two instruments, an online questionnaire and an interview, were used in the needs assessment study, and both were adapted from existing validated instruments, discussed below. Both instruments collected descriptive data about the participants’ views on their roles as educators at the School of Visual Arts. The questionnaire employed mostly Likert-type questions about the participants’ perceptions of the faculty community of practice (CoP). The interviews were used to draw out more details or personal stories related to the participants’ responses to the questionnaire. The interviews also include open-ended questions about the participants’ views on delivering quality arts education.

Although richer data surfaced from the interviews, the questionnaires provided detailed responses about participants’ views of the faculty community of practice at SVA. Using the questionnaire responses to guide open-ended questions in the interviews helped ensure the interviews stayed grounded in the same topics (Turner & Hagstrom-Schmidt, 2022). Additionally, because faculty completed the questionnaires in advance, they had an opportunity to reflect on the SVA faculty CoP, which may have contributed to more thoughtful discussion during the interview process. Finally, with demographic data collected in advance, the interviews moved more quickly toward personal examples to support participants’ questionnaire responses and provide a space to hear action-oriented recommendations for improving the faculty experience (Turner & Hagstrom-Schmidt, 2022).
Having worked alongside faculty in the college for over a decade, the process of reviewing participants’ questionnaire responses in advance of the interviews provided an alternative to using the “bracketing interview” (Lochmiller & Lester, 2015, p. 110). Bracketing interviews are sometimes used by practitioner-scholars before they conduct interviews with study participants as a way to identify their personal biases (Lochmiller & Lester, 2015). Similarly, reviewing faculty members’ questionnaire responses before conducting the interviews allowed me to recognize if any of the information surprised me as a way to identify my own biases and assumptions (Chenail, 2011). This process helped ensure I was prepared to “suspend judgment in order to be more open to how others experience the phenomenon of interest” (Lochmiller & Lester, 2015, p. 110).

**Questionnaire**

A literature review was conducted to determine if an appropriate and previously validated questionnaire existed for use in this needs assessment study. Verburg and Andriessen's (2006) Community Assessment Toolkit (CAT) was selected and subscales were adapted for use in the questionnaire. Using sub-scales from the Community Assessment Toolkit was an appropriate choice because it was grounded in CoP theory and had been previously tested among members of seven communities of practice (N=271) (Verburg & Andriessen, 2006). The Toolkit was also designed to be used for comparisons of CoPs both within and between organizations, or in the case of SVA, among CoPs within siloed departments that often are managed like their own organization. Additionally, the systematic approach of the CAT provides a breadth of data to address various aspects of the community, such as members’ perception of its value and their desire for changes in the community, the members’ assessment of the community coordination by administrators, the different types of activities through which members access the community
(e.g., technology-based versus in-person), and the support members receive in community activities (see Appendix A to review the needs assessment questionnaire).

I conducted a cognitive review to consider the extent of changes to the original validated instrument and noted that changes to the CAT fell into three categories. First, some of the words used in items were adapted for appropriateness to the audience of faculty members in a higher education setting. For example, an item in the Goals subscale (p. 22) was changed from “Making the company more attractive for customers” to “Making the college more attractive for students.” Second, items that were not appropriate for this study were eliminated. For example, Verburg and Andriessen (2006) used an initial question “What is your role in the community?” (p. 22). This question could be eliminated because all participants were pre-selected based on their role as a faculty member at SVA. Removing poorly suited items helped streamline the questionnaire and reduced the time participants contributed to the independent study. Finally, three questions were added at the beginning of the questionnaire to establish that the participants fit the requirements for participation in the research and to match the responses to follow-up interviews.

**Questionnaire Alignment with Research Questions.** The Verburg and Andriessen (2006) subscales selected for the questionnaire address the first three research questions (RQ). The alignment of selected subscales with each of the first three research questions is discussed below.

**RQ1: Faculty Perceived Value of Participating in CoP.** The Goals, Value, and Results subscales (Verburg & Andriessen, 2006) address the first research question. The Goals items ask participants to evaluate the importance of personal goals for teaching at the college and use a 5-point scale (very important, important, moderately important, a little important, not important). A sample item is “Hearing about new knowledge from other faculty.” The Value section includes
two questions, asking participants to indicate all the ways they find information about solving problems related to teaching, and asking participants to indicate their agreement with six items related to the value of the community of practice. The Results section uses five questions that asks participants: to evaluate their faculty community members; to evaluate the community overall; to evaluate faculty motivation to participate; to identify the value they have gained as a faculty member; and to indicate all the areas in which the CoP needs improvement.

**RQ2: Availability and Coordination of Activities in CoP.** The Activities and Community Coordination subscales (Verburg & Andriessen, 2006) address the second research question. The Activities section includes two questions related to CoP activities, inquiring about the frequency at which they occur. The second question uses the same seven items but asks participants to indicate their preference about a change in frequency in the activities, e.g., prefer a lot more, prefer a little more, no change preferred, prefer a little less, or prefer a lot less. The Community Coordination section uses two questions to evaluate the coordination of faculty community events by SVA’s administration. The first question includes five items that use a 5-point scale to assess the activity of administrative staff, e.g., very active, active, moderately active, a little active, or inactive. The second question asks participants about their satisfaction with the coordination of the faculty community.

**RQ3: Faculty Perception of Support for the CoP.** The Support from Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and Institutional Support subscales (Verburg & Andriessen, 2006) address the third research question. The Support from ICT items ask participants to evaluate the importance of six different means of communication, e.g., instant messaging, using a 5-point scale (very useful, useful, moderately useful, a little useful, not useful). The Institutional Support section uses three questions. The first asks participants to evaluate the time
allocated by the college for participation in the community, and the second asks participants to evaluate how encouraged they feel to participate in the CoP, (both use 5-point scales). The final question asks faculty if they would like more time available for activities concerning their community.

**Interviews**

After completing the online questionnaire, participants were invited via email to schedule a semi-structured interview that was conducted via videoconference (see Appendix B to review the interview script). Most interview questions were based on each participant’s responses to the online questionnaire and intended to draw out richer data to help answer the first three research questions discussed above. Participants were asked to provide more details about their questionnaire responses and to share any new insights or examples they may have thought about after completing the questionnaire. Additionally, the interviews helped illuminate instructors’ predominant views about delivering quality visual arts education at the School of Visual Arts.

**RQ4: Value and Challenges in Delivering a Quality Arts Education.** The fourth research question was addressed using open-ended questions adapted from Seidel and colleagues’ (2009) study *The qualities of quality: Understanding excellence in arts education*. A sample question from Seidel et al. (2009) is “With your ideas about quality arts learning and teaching as a backdrop, what do you think is especially important to keep in mind about assessing arts learning, and assessing arts teaching?”

**Procedure**

Pre-selected participants received an invitation to participate in the study via a direct email from the student researcher that described the purpose of the research and defined participation in the study as the completion of an online questionnaire (approximately 15
minutes) and a follow-up interview (60 minutes). The email included a link to an informed consent form to review before beginning the questionnaire. The email informed participants they would receive an email to schedule the follow-up interview after completing the questionnaire. The email communications included informed consent language and stated that the interviews would be conducted and recorded via videoconference. Additionally, the communications confirmed that faculty responses would not be shared beyond the student researcher and explained the methods for de-identifying data and destroying personally identifiable information upon final analysis. The communication also stated that faculty could decide to participate in the study and still have the option to decide not to participate at a later date.

**Data Collection**

Using a convergent mixed methods design, the quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed separately and then integrated in the findings below. Quantitative feedback collected from the questionnaires was also used to guide the interview questions, so questionnaires were completed before the respective interviews were scheduled.

**Quantitative Data Collection**

Faculty participants received an email from the student researcher with a description of the study and an invitation to participate. Participants were encouraged to reserve twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire and asked to complete the questionnaire within one week to ensure sufficient time to schedule their follow-up interview. Faculty who did not submit their questionnaires within five days received a reminder email. The process was repeated one time with an added note that they would not be contacted again about participation in the study. The questionnaire was hosted by SurveyMonkey software, and submitted questionnaires were
downloaded from SurveyMonkey into a Google Drive account that was accessed via a password-protected device in the researcher’s private office.

**Qualitative Data Collection**

After faculty responded to the online questionnaire, they received a direct email from the student researcher inviting them to schedule their interview. In preparation for each interview, the student researcher reviewed and annotated the scheduled participant’s responses to the questionnaire. Participants were informed that if they do not complete the second phase of the study, their questionnaire responses may still be used without including any personally identifiable information, although they can request complete withdrawal from the study. All interviews were held via Zoom video-conference and recorded for later transcription to facilitate coding. After the participant indicated consent, questions were asked using a standardized open-ended interview approach (Turner & Hagstrom-Schmidt, 2022). Although questions related to participants’ questionnaire responses differed, the questions were framed in a consistent wording, such as “You responded that [an item] is very likely. Can you describe why you feel that way or give some examples of related experiences that influence your thinking on this question?”

All video recordings were saved in a password-protected Google Drive account and viewed once before being transcribed to capture notes on any relevant non-verbal gestures made by the participant during the interview. Then, the videos were transcribed using a web-based, third-party software called Descript.com. Descript.com provides a user confidentiality agreement within its Terms of Service. Next, a master file was created to manage all non-personal identifiers, dates of interviews, and document and video file names. After the videos were
transcribed, the transcriptions and researcher notes were merged into a single document and de-
de-identified, and the video recordings were deleted.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis for the needs assessment study explores quantitative data in the form of questionnaire responses (N=4) and qualitative data from three interview transcripts. Using a convergent parallel design, the quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately and then combined to triangulate results and build a clearer picture of the experience of adjunct faculty members at the School of Visual Arts (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011; Lochmiller & Lester, 2018).

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

Recognizing that the small sample size provides insufficient sample validity to represent the SVA faculty population (Lochmiller & Lester, 2018), the quantitative data primarily provided descriptive data such as subscale means to identify trends in the participants’ responses about their experience of the SVA faculty CoP (see all quantitative tables in Appendix C). While small sample sizes can be helpful in identifying trends among participants, the data must be interpreted with caution as it lacks statistical power and cannot be used to generalize findings (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). However, the quantitative data was useful in preparing both the interviewer and the participants for a productive interview and served to reinforce qualitative findings through triangulating the findings (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011).

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The qualitative data consists of transcriptions of three semi-structured interviews that were conducted to learn about the faculty experience at the School of Visual Arts. The interviews were compiled into a single document for convenience and a digital app (Notability) was used to
facilitate manually annotating the document and color-coding variables. For First Cycle coding, the researcher used provisional and descriptive coding and selectively used in vivo coding to help ensure the voices of participants were authentically represented (Saldaña, 2011). The First Cycle coding resulted in a start list to address the driving research questions listed above. In addition to annotating the transcripts, I used jotting and analytic memoing to capture impressions of common phrases and ideas that participants communicated (Miles et al., 2020).

The second cycle utilized emergent pattern coding to identify and capture patterns across the interviews. Through the iterative process of reviewing the transcripts, the codes were refined, consolidated, and organized. The final 35 codes were added to the Code Book and organized by five categories: 1) Faculty Challenges and Barriers to CoP, 2) Faculty Reflections on Students and Teaching, 3) Faculty Observations and Impressions of the CoP and Institutional Structure, 4) Support Received, Opportunities for Improved CoP and/or Greater Empowerment, and 5) Faculty Desire and Institutional Recommendations (see Appendix D to review the Code Book).

A conceptually clustered matrix was employed to organize categories, relevant codes, and select quotes from faculty (see Appendix E). The matrix provides a visual representation of the data to both strengthen the credibility of the analysis and to check my personal bias (Saldaña, 2011). Saldaña (2011) cautioned against “using qualitative research as a forum for working out your own personal demons” (p. 67). Having worked closely with faculty for over fifteen years, it has become part of my role at SVA to seek opportunities to amplify the voices and decision-making power of the college’s adjunct faculty members. The direct quotes included in the matrix helped ensure the authentic voices of faculty supported the study’s findings (Saldaña, 2011).

**Findings**
Findings from the surveys and interviews revealed that faculty at the School of Visual Arts (SVA) place value in the concept of an active community of practice. However, faculty also face physical, financial, and cultural barriers to participation in the community. The data highlighted participants’ perspectives on a predominant SVA faculty culture of greater isolation than collaboration. The participants’ comments made the case that this faculty culture is a result of the underlying organizational structure and other factors discussed in the Challenges for Adjunct Faculty Members section in Chapter One. Additionally, participants raised concerns that the lack of a healthy community of practice (CoP) among SVA faculty adversely affects students’ learning experience and the college’s standing against its competitors. Faculty participants shared a considerable number of recommendations for institutional improvement during the interviews, such as annual faculty curricular planning meetings, the development of new faculty roles to manage faculty committees and community activities, and new online and/or certificate programs to increase access to prospective students.

Due to the sample size, the quantitative data cannot be extrapolated to the SVA faculty population for statistical purposes (Newcomer et al., 2015). However, the survey responses were effective in guiding and focusing the semi-structured interviews and allowed some integration of the quantitative data into the interview process. Additionally, the quantitative findings clarified how varied the faculty experience is between different academic departments. For example, question 6 asked participants to indicate the frequency in which faculty community activities took place and all four participants provided different responses, ranging from Never to Frequently (See Appendix C to review all quantitative data tables discussed in the current section). To fully integrate the data, the quantitative findings were compared to the qualitative
findings and are presented in the current section through a narrative discussion (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011).

**Faculty Perceived Value of Participating in a Community of Practice**

Research question one asks what value faculty members gain from participating in the community of practice. Responses to questions 5, 16, and 18 – 22 in the *Goals, Value, and Results* sections of the questionnaire were used to assess participants’ overall perceived value of the community and provide a framework for deeper discussion in the interview process.

**Goals for the Community**

In question 5, participants were asked to indicate how important different goals were to them, as members of the faculty community. Some examples of goals are *making the college more attractive for students, making useful contacts/networking, helping newcomers in the community*, etc. (see Table C-1 in Appendix C for details). Three of the four respondents rated all activities *very important* and the fourth respondent rated six out of seven of the activities as *important* and one activity (*developing together new ideas for the college*) as *moderately important*.

All three interviewees’ questionnaire responses indicated that these CoP goals are all very important, but the interviews painted a somewhat different picture. The interviewees all communicated a strong belief that CoP goals related to student success were of the utmost importance and expressed a desire to have a more active community, but they dismissed the goal of utilizing the CoP for professional networking. Instead, participants discussed communicating with fellow faculty members to work through teaching challenges, to check on the academic and emotional well-being of students, and the importance of discussing course learning outcomes and topics with fellow faculty to ensure continuity throughout their programs. Participant 3
commented that “the need to rely on each other is really always there. And we would be an amazing institution if we did that regularly.” However, only P2 discussed how an active CoP provides personal gratification and this was when he was talking about an institution where he previously taught: “It’s such a community there … you know. You just see people on campus walking around. Everyone’s very friendly, SVA by comparison, I think it’s very different than that. My department doesn’t feel different, but I don’t know anyone in any other department.” While the goals of the CoP are expected to primarily focus on supporting members in sharing knowledge and improving their practice, the structure of a healthy community relies on social interaction and the flow of information between members (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 2009). However, for various reasons (discussed in the Availability and Coordination of Activities in CoP section below), participants did not identify with the goal of using their faculty CoP for personal support or even professional networking.

Value of the Community

Question 16 addressed the question of faculty members’ perceived value of the CoP by inquiring about the ways in which faculty find new information to keep up to date and solve problems related to their teaching practice (see Table C-2 in Appendix C for details). All four respondents indicated using self-guided research, three of the four indicated using student feedback and discussions with other faculty members, two indicated using formal training, and only one indicated using the college’s knowledge base or other institutional information. Overall, the comments shared in the faculty interviews corresponded to these survey responses. For example, two of the interviewees discussed their processes for reviewing course evaluations written by their students. Additionally, the interviews provided some clarity on survey responses. Participant 1 explained that “when it comes to self-guided research, that means sitting and
thinking a lot and evaluating what seems to have worked in the classroom and what seems to not work.” Comments about discussions with other faculty members were also present but the frequency of the discussions and the related support received by the administration varied depending on the faculty member’s academic department.

**Results of the Community**

Questions 18-22 also address research question one (what value faculty gain from the CoP), but from a different angle. Instead of directly inquiring about faculty members’ goals for the CoP or the direct benefit gained from the CoP, this subscale examines faculty members’ perspectives on the results of the community. For example, question 18 asks about characteristics of the community such as the trust, sense of community loyalty, common understanding, and sense of belonging that the participants perceive in their fellow faculty members (see Table C-3 in Appendix C for details). While one participant scored faculty members as having a little common understanding, the other respondents indicated moderately or a lot for all four categories (trust, loyalty, understanding, and belonging). These questionnaire responses generally align with the comments given in the interviews. However, while faculty members shared comments in the interviews about positive interactions with fellow faculty members, they also addressed the need for more opportunities for collaboration, knowledge sharing, and community building for faculty at SVA. Moreover, the positive comments faculty shared about faculty communities seemed to be about an idealized form of the faculty community rather than what they experienced at SVA.

Question 19 asks participants to assess to what degree the faculty community has contributed to the institution in ways such as increasing organizational effectiveness, developing new methods, and documenting information such as best practices (see Table C-4 in Appendix C
for details). Question 19 also asks participants to rate the degree to which the faculty community has a good reputation within the organization and includes one reverse-scored item asking about the community’s reluctance to share their knowledge with other faculty members. The mean scores of participants’ assessment of the faculty community’s contributions to the college were 2.6, 4.2, 3.6, and 3.2, and the subscale mean was 3.4 (3=a moderate amount). This seemed somewhat low considering SVA is a global art college that graduates many successful alumni and actively promotes its impressive faculty of creative professionals as a driving factor for student success.

Some remarks by interviewees praised the value of the faculty community, such as “We are boots on the ground and we are, we’re the product, essentially.” However, other comments provide plausible explanations for the relatively low scores for the faculty contribution. For example, P1 discussed their Department Chair’s resistance to faculty collaboration and ideation in group meetings, which is likely to take its toll on employees’ confidence in the value of their own expertise (Rock, 2008). Additionally, P1 described faculty colleagues teaching in the Cartooning Department as “big-hearted people who are in it for the love and are not necessarily very aggressive. And don’t really have very big egos. So, a lot of times I’ll be talking with the teacher and they’ll say, ‘who am I to say what the students should do?’ and I’m like, well, you’re their teachers.” This comment may reflect traits of faculty members working in a specific discipline such as cartooning, but also brought to the researcher’s mind the review of literature in Chapter One related to tensions between faculty members’ identities as creative professionals and educators. Without a fully formed faculty community of practice at the department level, its members may struggle to experience a sense of ownership of their faculty role.
By comparison, Participant 2 described receiving ample support from their department staff, but they still reported a general sense of disconnect from the larger faculty community. Participant 3 shared a very different perspective about the scores assigned to the contribution made by the faculty community, put simply that they were an honest assessment of the current faculty. Participant 3 stated that “around issues of moving a culture … it’s often a personnel issue. And most people don’t like to think of it that way, but it is a personnel issue. And by that, I mean, the world changes, education changes, systems change, and it may be that the new people that you bring on are the people who more share most of the mindsets, habits of mind, and potentialities” that are necessary for ongoing success.

Question 20 asks faculty to what extent they think faculty are generally very enthusiastic and motivated to participate. The four respondents were equally divided, with half indicating a moderate amount and half indicating a lot (see Table C-5 in Appendix C for details). These responses are somewhat misleading without triangulating the qualitative data to provide clearer interpretation of the scores. For example, P2 described a helpful and engaged group of peer faculty members in their small department but recognized the department size likely affected the level of faculty engagement. Participant 3 explained that they perceived low faculty engagement and this was not a result of administrative decisions, but “actually what happens among the faculty themselves.” However, they went on to provide a number of factors related to the organizational structure of the college that negatively impact faculty engagement. Participant 1 described talking with fellow faculty members about their level of engagement, “and people were like, we don’t collaborate. There are no faculty meetings, what’s a faculty meeting?”

To gather additional data about the results of the faculty CoP, question 21 asks participants to rate the degree to which they have gained new skills or resources through being a
faculty member at SVA (see Table C-6 in Appendix C for details). For example, it asks if faculty have learned about their subject area, made useful new contacts, been able to solve problems in their teaching practice, etc. Participants’ responses ranged from 3.5 to 4.5 and the subscale mean was 3.83 (4=a lot). This is fairly consistent with findings from the qualitative data. While the interviewees' descriptions of community interaction and administrative support varied by their department and length of service, all three faculty members provided glowing comments about some area of support they receive in addressing classroom problems — either from fellow faculty, department chairs, staff members, or occasionally, the upper administration.

Question 22 of the questionnaire asked about areas in which the faculty community of practice needs improvement. Three of the four respondents indicated that the *overall organization of the faculty community* needs improvement. Two indicated that *community support by the college* as well as the *coordination of the community* needs improvement. Additionally, one respondent indicated that the *tools supporting community activities* need improvement (see Table C-7 in Appendix C for more details). The qualitative data collected in the interviews aligns with these findings and participants provided detailed descriptions of ways the college could improve the faculty community of practice. As illustrated in Table 2.2, the majority of coded comments were organized under the categories of *challenges and barriers to the CoP* and *CoP and institutional observations*, 46 and 48 counts, respectively. (To view definitions of the codes and more details on the code distribution across the five categories, see the Code Book in Appendix D and the Conceptually Clustered Matrix in Appendix E.)

Based on the Chapter One literature review, the researcher expected faculty to discuss the challenges of the adjunct instructor (code ADJ-Z) and barriers to faculty participation such as time, finances, and the lack of shared physical space on campus (codes FAC-B-TIM, FAC-B-
FIN, and FAC-B-SPC, respectively). However, faculty also frequently raised the idea of different categories of faculty within the college. The faculty-categories comments (code FAC-CAT) directly support and help explain the quantitative findings related to improvement needed in the overall organization of the faculty community.

Table 2.2

Application of Qualitative Analysis Codes Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and Barriers</th>
<th>Students and Teaching</th>
<th>CoP and Institutional Observations</th>
<th>CoP Supportive and Empowering Interaction</th>
<th>Faculty Desire / Recommendation for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ-Z (6)</td>
<td>FAC-CARE (4)</td>
<td>ADMIN (3)</td>
<td>DEPT-POS (5)</td>
<td>COP-DX-DPT (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-NEG (5)</td>
<td>FAC-TCH (10)</td>
<td>ALT-TCH-COMP (7)</td>
<td>FAC-S (2)</td>
<td>COP-DX-ALT (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT-Z (8)</td>
<td>LOS-FX (1)</td>
<td>COP-B (10)</td>
<td>FAC-EMP-OP (2)</td>
<td>FAC-EMP-DX (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-B-CULT (7)</td>
<td>PROF-EXP (7)</td>
<td>DIF-DEPT-COMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-PD-DX (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-B-FIN (7)</td>
<td>REF (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-REC (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-B-SPC (7)</td>
<td>STU (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-B-TIM (4)</td>
<td>STU-FBK (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-EMP-NEG (2)</td>
<td>STU-TUI-CON (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 46</td>
<td>Total: 35</td>
<td>Total: 48</td>
<td>Total: 9</td>
<td>Total: 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviewees discussed the concept of faculty categories in multiple dimensions. First, they discussed what they believe to be the origin of existing faculty categories at SVA, such as how instructors’ length of service and/or desire to make a full-time career out of teaching impacts if they “are interested in starting a new initiative and are willing to put in time to, to develop it”. Secondly, they discussed the advantages that such faculty categories could provide if formally defined by the administration, such as with faculty leader or ambassador roles.
interviewees also elaborated on the detriment of not having such defined faculty categories. For example, Participant 2 compared a prior teaching community to SVA:

“Once you get a full-time position there, … you just get this sense of, and this, that you belong to a larger institution and that you’re much happier to work towards improving the institution itself and going a little bit further. And I think part of it’s because you, you know, you feel like that’s your career suddenly. And most people that teach at SVA don’t feel like it’s their career. You know, they feel like it is an aspect of their career. And that alongside all the other things they do, they do teach. And I think there’s benefits to that because I think SVA has the largest population of professionally working teachers in, probably in the country. And you have access to, through that… What the benefit of that is, is that students have a much better direct contact between teacher and professional. And I think, as a result, SVA has a much higher job placement within the fields that the students study. So, I don’t mean to demean that. No, no, no, but, but it is … a balance, that’s a trade-off.”

Participant 3 commented that “the question is the structure of expectation. I would just say the structure of expectations around faculty as they currently exist, that structure would have to change for the expectations to be able to change.” More concretely, P2 stated, “I think a major solution for that, but I don’t think it’ll happen, is full-time faculty positions, tenure track faculty positions. I’m not like, I don’t feel like I need that personally, but I think the effect, the psychological effect of that, like if that enters into the picture, you suddenly have a group of, of teachers more invested in the community automatically.” Participant 3 offered a solution that did not require implementing a full-time faculty position. Instead, she described a team of faculty who would be tasked with developing a research and planning agenda for the course of the term.
This would involve “participating in that cluster of meetings for which you’ll get an add onto your payment structure.”

The survey questions and interview discussions related to participants’ perception of the value of the faculty community of practice were consistently positive about the value a CoP delivers for meeting classroom challenges and exploring opportunities for institutional improvement. Additionally, faculty identified the areas in which they get the greatest support for their own classroom improvements as direct interactions with either academic staff, fellow instructors, or the students themselves, while the traditional faculty resources delivered through workshops and the college’s faculty knowledge base were less helpful. The participants also raised the need for a team of dedicated instructors to help facilitate faculty learning and academic improvements and addressed some of the barriers to faculty participation that will be discussed more in the following sections.

**Availability and Coordination of Community Activities**

The second research question asks how faculty judge the availability and coordination of activities in the community of practice and was addressed by survey questions 6, 7, 10, and 11 in the Activities and Community Coordination sections. Responses conveyed very different experiences of faculty members in different academic departments. While three out of four participants’ survey responses were neutral or positive about the availability and coordination of faculty CoP activities, the qualitative findings made it clear that their survey responses were evaluations of their individual departments, not the college overall. The participant who responded negatively to the survey (P1), provided ample examples of their department chair standing in the way of faculty members’ interactions with one another.
The other two interviewees shared positive comments about their departments’ staff members with one indicating that in their small department, it is “just easy to get everyone together and kind of talk about what’s working, what not working right” and instructors are easily accessible “through email or social media.” However, this same instructor (P2) seemed to accept that there was no greater community experience at SVA and said, “I’ve always had a sense at, at SVA that we’re a bit more on our own, you know?” Participant 3 indicated deep appreciation for the communications received from SVA’s upper management and assistance from the academic support offices. When asked to explain why she shared such positive feedback but indicated in the survey that the faculty activities do not occur frequently, P3 replied that as a relatively new instructor, her encounters with more experienced faculty members “were an opportunity for them to mostly complain about having to do this at all, complain about the fact that they weren’t being paid for it.” She clarified the different meaning she imposed on the availability of faculty activities and faculty interaction by stating, “When I say it happens rarely, it’s a little bit because of proximity. We’re not all in the same space at the same time, and there’s not a lot of opportunities for connection. So, there’s like a, there’s a timing problem. There’s a physical distance problem. And there’s also maybe a real estate problem.”

**Coordination of Community Activities**

When discussing how active the college’s staff members were in the coordination of activities in support of the faculty CoP, faculty responses again indicated disparity between different academic departments (see Table C-9 in Appendix C for more details). Three of the four respondents’ overall scores for the coordination efforts fall within the *moderately active* to *active* range, and one respondent’s overall score falls in the *inactive* to *a little active* range. The quantitative data helped clarify faculty perspectives on the efficacy of academic staff members in
facilitating community activities. For example, participant 1 gave the lowest survey scores about their department’s efforts to facilitate a CoP and then, in the interview, described their Department Chair refusing to include discussions or collaborative activities in the faculty group meetings. The two other interviewees made positive and appreciative comments about the activities orchestrated through their academic departments.

In addition to faculty members having dramatically different experiences within their departments, it is noteworthy that their feedback about CoP activities primarily focused on department-specific activities, as opposed to professional development (PD) training offered from centralized administrative offices. In fact, all interviewees seemed to think about their CoP in terms of their specific department. One of the interviewees teaches for multiple departments and described each department very differently and indicated that the size of the departments likely impacted their sense of community. When asked specifically about the overall faculty CoP at SVA, P2 commented, “I don’t think SVA is great on the whole big picture of SVA … I don’t think it’s great at facilitating communities.” Participant 2 added that “SVA is a cluster of small organizations that are comfortable within their own groups” but lack an overall “goal or a model or a vision” for faculty to identify.

This section of the survey also asked faculty to indicate their preferred change in the frequency of activities. Three of the four respondents indicated that they preferred no change or a little more activity in the examples provided, e.g., presentations by faculty members and doing special projects for the college. These responses fit with the qualitative findings, as the desire for more CoP activities or additional professional development activities was only mentioned by the three interviewees a total of five times. Participants agreed that the routine faculty experience at SVA is to simply show up for your class without a lot of interaction with the faculty community.
When discussing this reality for faculty, Participant 2 commented, “I have always gotten that sense that they do feel a little broken apart.” However, the idea of additional faculty meetings was not seen as a winning strategy. “I think it would be a mistake to ask for too much of a teacher’s time. And I think I answered one of my questions that way. It’s like, do you, do we need more of like meetings and things? And I think my answer in regards to like full-time teaching is also, you know, I think unless you’re doing that, it’s it, it is wrong and difficult to ask teachers to spend more of their time, right, becoming more involved. You’ll get a lot of push-back there. So, it’s maybe not as simple as saying let’s have more faculty meetings because I think it’ll piss a lot of people off if you start doing that… asking for more but not giving more.”

In other words, while the faculty participants recognized the value of CoP activities and thought the concept of a vibrant community was generally desirable, they did not specifically desire the availability of more community activities.

**Faculty Perception of Support for the CoP**

Closely tied to the second research question, the third research question asks how faculty perceive institutional support and ICT support for the community of practice and is addressed in survey questions 12-15. Faculty responses about the college’s allocation of time for faculty to participate in their community (question 13) were mixed, with both the median and the average score being 3, a moderate amount. When asked how encouraged faculty felt to participate in the community by the college (question 14), faculty responses were equally split between a little and a moderate amount. Similar to the findings discussed above, the qualitative data revealed the mixed responses were somewhat due to different experiences within the participants' respective departments. Additionally, P3 commented, “I understand the pay structure at SVA is very interesting. If you ask someone to do something, you have to pay them for exactly the amount of
All four questionnaire respondents reported that they would like to have more time available for activities concerning the community (question 15; see Table C-11 in Appendix C for details on responses to questions 13-15). However, as previously noted, there was tension in the faculty interviews between the comments shared to address a sort of idealized faculty community of practice and one that they saw as a current reality at SVA. For example, P1 remarked that many faculty members’ “lives are busy with a lot of freelance work or a lot of outside work and they just don’t have time to attend meetings. And they, the idea of spending time to revise their curriculum is more trouble than it’s worth because given the amount of time that they spend teaching … it’s easier if someone is just on salary and is getting paid an annual salary instead of an hourly rate.”

P2 compared their position at a different private art college to highlight the physical barriers to interaction faced by SVA faculty. He said about SVA, “I think we’re always working against the physical space, you know, because it’s so scattered, but I think you, you sort of have to work against that and create things that, that are deliberately meant to, to integrate more departments.” He also noted that in addition to adjunct faculty, his prior college had “a core group that, that takes on a larger responsibility. They chair committees, they go through all of the, everything we’re talking about now, are all the things that are sort of discussed amongst that group … They’re more willing to put in time and it’s required of them, you know, to be fair, to, to do things to kind of facilitate the sort of interactions and sharing of information … Adjunct is just never gonna be as, as involved in extracurricular, anything outside of their class, and adjunct, usually when the class is over, it's, you're done, you know, you go back, you do your freelance work, you do other things … And I think SVA would just have a larger [community], if they had even a limited amount of more full-time faculty in every department.”
Participant 3 described such boundaries as *friction*, whereas friction could mean “you’re paying me so little that I need to do all of this other work; friction could be I’m coming in from Connecticut one day a week to work and I can’t come in four days a week to work, you know?” The participant suggested one way to overcome the friction may be “to spend a little money on social things” and for the leadership to engage with faculty “person by person or tiny small group by tiny small group.” Recognizing administrators’ challenge of scaling this personal engagement, P3 recommended the college create a group of “sort of ambassadors to build community and give them maybe a structure and an opportunity to do it, then you see it’s like training trainers”.

**ICT Support for the Community**

When asked about the usefulness of different types of communication channels to facilitate faculty interaction, respondents reported *moderately useful, useful, or very useful* for all six items (schedule meetings, informal encounters, digital messaging, community newsgroup, written memos, and knowledge bases). The subscale mean was 4.04 for all items (4=A lot). *Scheduled Meetings* was the only item scored *very useful* by all participants and *Informal Encounters* was scored *very useful* or *useful* by all participants (see Table C-12 in Appendix C for more details). Discussions in the interviews did not directly address the ICT support provided by the college although comments were raised about the increased access to and interaction of faculty members during the COVID-19 pandemic shutdown. Additionally, P3 commented that the increased sense of community engagement and knowledge sharing ended as abruptly after school returned to in-person classes. She believed this was due to the barriers of adjunct faculty members’ schedules, time spent on campus, “and the sort of real estate issue of this, you know, diaspora of buildings across the campus … I think it’s all of that. I also think that most people
have habituated relationships with work and the way you’ve always engaged is the way you always engage socially, pragmatically, pedagogically, we’re creatures of habit.”

Overall, the qualitative findings about the participants’ judgment of institutional support for the CoP did not conflict with the survey results but provided more depth and nuance to those quantitative findings. As previously noted, faculty recognized the value of a vibrant community of practice and even provided examples of personal experiences at other institutions as positive examples of a CoP that was not available at SVA. However, participants did not advocate for more faculty community activities within the current institutional structure. Similarly, aside from one specific Department Chair, the faculty comments were not critical of the overall support received from the college regarding CoP-related activities or the ICT-related tools. However, the faculty responded unanimously that they would like more time for community-related activities. The repeated tension communicated by all three interviewees was about a desire for greater activity and/or community but not within the current structure that included the barriers of time, space, and financial compensation for faculty.

Value and Challenges in Delivering a Quality Arts Education

The fourth research question asks what value and challenges faculty believe are present in delivering a quality arts education. Related interview questions were adapted from Seidel and colleagues’ (2009) study (view the interview scripts in Appendix B). No related questions were included in the questionnaire so the following findings are all drawn from qualitative data collected in the faculty interviews. Interviewees provided rich descriptions of their teaching philosophies and approaches to practices such as assessment and grading. Additionally, participants raised concerns about the current state of students’ interdisciplinary knowledge and
the impact of tuition on their learning experience. Faculty also shared comments related to the dual identity of the artist-educator that was raised in Chapter One.

When asked to discuss their approaches to delivering a quality art education, all three interviewees discussed the importance of meeting students where they are to help them shape their goals and/or achieve their unique visions. One participant stated, “I’m always just trying to communicate with my students to see what their demands are because what they’re looking forward to is the thing that I should be sort of like getting them ready for. And they’re maybe more aware of that sometimes than I am, new technologies, new approaches, styles, things that they’ve seen, that they want to learn. I’m always sort of gauging what is on the horizon and what they’re looking out to, to do. And, and that, then forces me to kind of update what I’m teaching and pull in new, new tools, new tricks, new pieces of technology. So, that’s one way, just a better dialogue with the students.” Participant 2 discussed their goals for teaching as assisting students in “developing a, a real, tangible skillset and then also developing a frame of mind to be able to analyze and talk about artwork. And not even just like art in a museum but just visual culture in the world at large, you know, that we live in, whether it’s through advertising or street art or illustration or fine art or whatever, but understanding the context in which it exists and being able to talk about it intelligently.” Further comments were given about student assessment as a means to evaluate student work based on a basic level of professionalism as well as based on the students’ personal growth throughout the course.

The discussion about delivering a quality arts education also led two of the interviewees to comment on the state of students’ general knowledge about culture and politics. Participant 1 discussed that today’s students have less general awareness and tend to stay in narrow boxes within their departmental focus. He added, “So I would love the opportunity to coordinate more
with humanities teachers and be able to count on more, more literacy on the part of our students.” Participant 2 recommended using college-wide events such as exhibitions to improve both faculty and student access to interdepartmental learning. Additionally, two of the interviewees addressed tuition inflation, both as a situation that influences their feelings about teaching and that directly impacts student learning. Participant 1 remarked that “our highest priority is improving the student experience, so we’re very conscious of how much the tuition bill is.” Participant 2 discussed his belief that the increase in tuition has impacted what is taught in schools, stating:

“There’s less risk I think at, at its core, you, you have a shift towards less challenging material, less risky material because people are sort of thinking, well, what am I actually going to do with this? How is this gonna work when I get out of here? And so, art schools are changing from places where you did learn a craft, but you also got to spend a lot of time and being critical of it and thinking about it, you know, not critical in the sense of, of, you know, criticizing, but critical minded thinking in art. As a skill, I think it’s diminishing. And because I, I think people are looking for things that are purely functional because they have to get work when they get out because they have so much debt and they put a demand on the way that schools prioritize their curriculums around the demands of students.”

Other comments provided during this portion of the interviews ranged from the need for giving a lot of interim grades to ensure students don’t “get slammed with an unexpected letter grade at the end of the semester” to providing faculty with “more guidance in how to perform demos.” Additionally, the transition to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic was discussed by multiple participants. Participant 3 commented, “I think particularly SVA is, just
figured out how to build a revenue stream online, where you can essentially have a brick-and-mortar institution and an entire online curriculum and double up your monies… I think that’s like the big win of COVID. Everybody knows how to teach online. At least they know all the technology and they’re more familiar with it, right?” Participant 2 commented that after teaching a continuing education course in-person for 10 years, it is now online and the course “teaches well online, like, it functions… I have students from all over the country in my class now… students that are getting access to it that are really excited to have access to it, that simply can’t afford to be in New York, or they just, any number of reasons they are not here.” Overall, the faculty participants shared a wealth of recommendations for strengthening the college’s faculty community and improving curricular planning and teaching practices, as highlighted by Faculty-Recommendations (coded FAC-REC) being the most frequently represented code in the conceptually clustered matrix (see Appendix E).

While many of the teaching concepts raised by SVA faculty are readily discussed in educational research, far less information is available about applying these strategies directly in studio-based classrooms. As discussed in Chapter One, the dearth of arts education-specific research may contribute to a lack of shared language and shared identity among arts educators. Additionally, historically ingrained concepts of the artist may present barriers for creative professionals to integrate an identity or sense of shared experience with other educators. When asked to consider the unique challenges of delivering a quality arts education, P3 replied, “It’s kind of tricky because in the world of art education, even the people with PhDs in art education, they’re not really practicing artists and there’s always been, there’s always been a bit of a tribal mentality about studying how people make art.” When asked to expand on this statement, she added, “I know a lot of art educators, I’ve worked with a lot with them. And I have to say they’re
so focused on rubrics and Excel spreadsheets that they don’t understand that the actual magic of teaching art is a deeply psychological and emotional connection wherein you are empathetic for the struggle of mastering craft and intellectually engaged in the psychology of how you motivate people to be their best selves … No, you could get me someone with impeccable credentials who can’t motivate a student or engage them from here to the corner. And you can get me someone who has extraordinarily high, intuitive, social, emotional IQ, and they will be the best teacher that student ever had.”

**Conclusion**

While the quantitative findings proved informative in shaping the semi-structured interviews, the lion’s share of invaluable data was collected through in-depth discussions with faculty members. The interviews provided a clear picture of the members’ perceptions about both their department’s efforts to build communities of practice (CoP) and the concept of a broader faculty community at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). While only one participant discussed a disconnect between the identity of artist and educator, all respondents furnished a multitude of comments describing characteristics of the SVA faculty — defined by their departments and length of service, but most significantly by their propensity and capacity to devote time and energy toward academic improvements at SVA. Moreover, the interviews yielded a wealth of recommendations and insights aimed at advancing institutional improvement. These insights underscore the invaluable contribution of the faculty perspective to institutional planning and problem-solving endeavors.

Faculty provided positive quantitative feedback about the value they gain from participating in the CoP (research question 1), but the qualitative findings highlighted a difference between the scores provided about an idealized faculty community of practice and the
reality of the community they experience at SVA. Both the quantitative and qualitative findings highlighted a disconcerting perception held by participants that faculty members contribute only a moderate amount to the college. While faculty members judged the availability and coordination of community activities to be adequate (research question 2), they also discussed barriers to faculty participation that existed at the organizational level, such as the fully adjunct faculty who face the physical constraints of too little time, money, and shared space to actively participate in the community. Additionally, all participants viewed their faculty community of practice within the domain of their specific academic department. Overall, the faculty reported feeling only a little or moderately encouraged by the college to participate in the faculty community of practice. Faculty participants also rated scheduled and impromptu meetings as the most valuable forms of communication with other community members while the lower-rated form of communication was the faculty knowledge base provided by the college administration (research question 3). When discussing the value and challenges of delivering a quality arts education (research question 4), the participants’ comments highlighted their deep concern for students and dedication to improving their practice in spite of previously discussing that they receive little personal value from their faculty role (e.g., added compensation or professional networking opportunities).

In addition to the care and concern faculty expressed for their students, another emerging theme was faculty members’ desire to share feedback around institutional improvement, but lack of a platform or community presence to raise their recommendations to upper management. At the end of the first interview, the faculty member added, “If I could just make a statement with the hope that it will end up in, being heard by the ears of the higher ups, I feel like our highest, like my highest priority, and the, my fellow faculty are interested in improving a curriculum.”
Similar comments were made by all participants. Additionally, participants confirmed that SVA faculty members face barriers to accessing and interacting in the community of practice based on their adjunct status and more specifically, a lack of time, shared space, and financial compensation to incentivize the activity. All participants discussed the need to have select faculty project leaders (contract-based) or full-time faculty members to help unite their voices and improve knowledge sharing among SVA faculty. Participants also highlighted the disparity of the faculty experience across different academic departments, with some instructors feeling as if they did not have the authority to make recommendations for their own courses while others actively collaborated with their Department Chairs. Finally, participants provided examples of ways in which their lack of community collaboration on curricular improvement impacts student learning at the college and expressed the need for greater communication among faculty and students across different academic departments.

The feedback from participants regarding the research questions and other emerging themes was largely consistent with contemporary higher education norms. However, the recommendation for the introduction of new faculty roles at SVA, to enhance information flow and elevate teaching practices, necessitates collaborative efforts from various leadership positions within the college. Notably, the endorsement of such an initiative at SVA requires a clear mandate from the President. Exploring alternative opportunities, what avenues exist to establish a platform that empowers adjunct faculty to contribute to positive change in higher education? Furthermore, if such a platform were available, what factors would motivate adjunct faculty to participate? The needs assessment study not only affirmed that barriers to faculty participation are closely linked to their status as adjunct instructors, but also revealed a deep interest among faculty to share insights and recommendations with teaching peers, given
adequate access and reasonable time (and/or compensation). If effectively designed to foster engagement, a faculty common might serve as a catalyst, enhancing both access and motivation for faculty members to partake in a vibrant community of practice. The establishment of a system for continuous faculty communication and collaboration offers an opportunity to reimagine faculty professional development at the School of Visual Arts. This shift involves transitioning from isolated workshops struggling to attract participants to a discourse- and activity-oriented environment where faculty collectively contribute to advancing visual arts education for the subsequent generation of students. The following chapter presents a literature review to underpin an intervention aimed at transforming institutionalized faculty professional development resources into an online faculty common. This envisioned space prioritizes faculty access, engagement, and the incorporation of faculty voices to guide academic improvements at the School of Visual Arts.
Chapter Three: Exploring Pathways to Faculty Engagement and Knowledge Sharing

The School of Visual Arts (SVA) is a private art and design college that faces ongoing challenges around engaging its adjunct faculty members in professional development activities. The literature review in Chapter One first highlighted reasons why participation in professional development is important for today’s faculty and then explored potential barriers to participation faced by adjunct faculty in general, and also specifically in a visual arts education setting such as SVA. Engaging faculty members in ongoing and collaborative knowledge-sharing activities was identified as a pathway to improve SVA’s overall approach to professional development. Additionally, the literature supported using an online community of practice (CoP) model to overcome some of the physical barriers SVA faculty face around accessing professional development activities (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 2006). The concept of an online CoP aligns with existing institutional plans to develop a faculty common at SVA (School of Visual Arts, 2018). Findings from the needs assessment study in Chapter Two confirmed the barriers that faculty face around accessing professional development activities and opportunities to interact with one another. These barriers include a sprawling urban campus that diminishes opportunities for faculty to experience the benefits of casual interactions within a community of practice, professional development training schedules that compete with instructors’ busy professional schedules, and a campus culture that excludes faculty from institutional decision-making processes. However, faculty participants in the study also indicated that they value the idea of interacting and collaborating with fellow instructors and would prefer more opportunities to do so in support of their professional development. Additionally, faculty reported that the COVID-19 pandemic presented opportunities to engage with their teaching peers in ways that were never previously explored, such as faculty meetups via Zoom videoconferencing.
From an entrepreneurial perspective, observed trends in the external environment provide insight to redefine an institution’s strategic approach and transform its capacity to weather future disruptions (Brown & Cornwall, 2000). “Change and competition are seen as sources of opportunities for new initiatives, programs, facilities, and services” (Brown & Cornwall, 2000, p. 21). Through this lens, the increased online interaction of SVA faculty during the COVID-19 pandemic supports re-envisioning faculty professional development through a virtual learning community. However, outside the urgency created by the pandemic, the threat of low faculty participation remains if the online learning community delivers no added value to motivate faculty participation (Ebert-May et al., 2011). With this in mind, the following intervention literature review explores opportunities to conceptualize, design, and implement a virtual learning community, or online faculty common, that employs motivation strategies to engage SVA’s faculty around knowledge sharing and professional development activities.

**Conceptual Framework**

The following intervention literature review employs a conceptual framework built upon the self-determination theory, participatory design approach, and community of practice literature (see Figure 3.1). Self-determination theory guides the overall approach for promoting faculty motivation to engage in knowledge sharing and professional development activities. The participatory design approach supports the processes necessary for developing an online faculty common that integrates the authentic voices and perspectives of faculty members at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). Finally, the community of practice literature provides a framework for understanding knowledge sharing among faculty and provides boundaries to define the ultimate goal for facilitating change within this community. Altogether, this conceptual framework supports the development of a comprehensive strategy for enhancing faculty knowledge sharing.
and participation in professional development activities at SVA. Each concept and its application to this problem of practice are discussed below.

**Figure 3.1**

*Conceptual Framework Guiding the Intervention Literature Review*

---

**Self-Determination Theory**

The self-determination theory is a prominent motivation theory with a wealth of empirical evidence supporting the theory’s application in an array of domains such as organizational management and educational settings. Developed by Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci, self-determination theory (SDT) is concerned with three *basic psychological*
needs that when fulfilled lead to increased motivation and wellness (Deci & Flaste, 1996; Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008; Deci et al., 2017; Peters et al., 2018). As early as the 1980s, SDT was lauded as a new management paradigm, prioritizing human needs fulfillment in the workplace (Rarick, 1987). Enthusiasm around SDT coincided with a shift away from classical management theory and toward a more humanistic management approach (Rarick, 1987). Peters, Calvo, and Ryan (2018) argued that SDT is not intended “to reduce the totality of human psychological experience to three constructs” (p. 3), but they focus on the three psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness because they are supported by over 40 years of research.

- Autonomy means a sense of volition to act with intention from one’s own values.
- Competence means a sense of self-efficacy, similar to the concept proposed by Bandura (1986).
- Relatedness means a sense of belonging, such as the sense of connection to others that is central in most theories of well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Leary & Baumeister, 1995).

SDT postulates that humans are born with intrinsic motivation, defined by Ryan and Deci (2017) as “the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one’s capacities, to explore, and to learn” (p. 70). This natural state of intrinsic motivation is nurtured when these three basic psychological needs are met (Deci & Ryan, 2000). However, if these needs are not met or are diminished, the results can include lethargy, defensiveness, the use of alternative means to fulfill needs, as well as an array of psychopathy (“Meta-Theory,” 2023). Over the past four decades, SDT has been applied in industries as diverse as sports, healthcare, and video game development and “addressed the links between motivation and the dual concerns of performance and wellness in organizations” (Deci et al., 2017, p. 20). These three basic
psychological needs have been employed to explain causal relationships between independent variables, such as design features, and dependent variables, such as motivation and engagement measures, in an array of empirical studies (Peters et al., 2018). Self-determination theory is utilized in the following literature review to substantiate opportunities for improving SVA faculty members’ motivation to participation in professional development and knowledge-sharing activities.

Self-determination theory is a meta-theory comprised of six mini-theories that were developed from the mid-1970s (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). The mini-theories are concerned with different aspects of intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation in relation to the fulfillment of human psychological needs. The mini-theories apply different lenses to the fulfillment of psychological needs, from social, environmental, and individual perspectives. Additionally, the mini-theories may focus on specific needs (Deci et al., 2017; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Two of the mini-theories that are discussed in the following literature review are described here, organismic integration theory and basic psychological needs theory.

Organismic Integration Theory

Research in the early 1980s led to Ryan and Deci’s second mini-theory, the organismic integration theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2002). The organismic integration theory (OIT) was developed to “detail the different forms of extrinsic motivation and the contextual factors that either promote or hinder internalization and integration of the regulation for these behaviors” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 72). In Deci and Ryan’s (2000) OIT taxonomy of motivational types, amotivation aligns with an absence of self-determination and feelings of incompetence or a lack of control. As one moves across the continuum, four types of extrinsic motivation illustrated a progression that moves closer to intrinsic motivation on the far right.
Deci and Ryan’s organismic integration theory explains the experience one has when completing tasks or following rules that fail to ignite the deeply satisfying intrinsic motivation. If through one’s regulatory processes, they are able to identify the value or importance of a task, then the experience feels more autonomous than if completing the task strictly to gain a reward or avoid punishment (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The most autonomous form of extrinsic motivation, integrated regulation, “occurs when identified regulations are fully assimilated to the self, which means they have been evaluated and brought into congruence with one’s other values and needs” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 72). Studies designed within OIT typically rely on self-report questionnaires as opposed to experimental methodologies (Vansteenskiste et al., 2010).

**Basic Psychological Needs Theory**

Deci and Ryan’s fourth mini-theory expanded upon the concept of satisfying basic psychological needs and the correlation between needs fulfillment and well-being. From the authors’ perspectives, “well-being is not simply a subjective experience of affect positivity but is also an organismic function in which the person detects the presence or absence of vitality, psychological flexibility, and a deep inner sense of wellness” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 243). The theory postulates that all three needs must be fulfilled for optimal well-being and the diminished fulfillment of any of the needs has adverse consequences on well-being (“Meta-Theory,” 2023).

**Participatory Design**

Participatory design, also referred to as co-design, places a strong emphasis on collaboration between end-users and designers, with the aim of empowering individuals to actively contribute to the design and development of systems, processes, or interventions that directly affect them. Participatory design (PD) is defined as a “process of investigating, understanding, reflecting upon, establishing, developing, and supporting mutual learning
between multiple participants in collective ‘reflection-in-action’” (Simonsen & Robertson, 2012, p. 2). In the context of faculty engagement and knowledge sharing, the participatory design approach provides valuable insights into creating solutions that resonate with SVA faculty and promote the active involvement of community members.

History and Relevance of Participatory Design

Participatory design has its roots in Scandinavia in the 1970s and grew out of the recognition that technology designed without the input of end-users is more difficult to use and often fails to meet the needs of those expected to use it. Participatory design was influenced by the Scandinavian approach to systems design which supported workers' unions and strove to extend “greater human flexibility in the use of systems” (Bannon & Ehn, 2012, p. 43) as well as action research projects that addressed socio-technical systems, or the need to find a healthy balance between social and technical systems (Mumford, 2000). Additionally, it is worth noting that both Scandinavian systems design and the socio-technical approach were informed by the work of Kurt Lewin (discussed in Chapter One), who pioneered action research as “a comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action and research leading to social action” (Lewin, 1946, p. 35). Similar to the concept of facilitating communication across different communities of practice, the processes in participatory research and design facilitated knowledge exchange and collaboration across traditional boundaries of employers, such as engineers, managers, and end-users. However, participatory design also quickly adopted dominant ideas from Bauhaus and modern design, such as functional and value-driven objects of design, the integration of art and technology, and a social, collaborative process (Bannon & Ehn, 2012). Early participatory design researchers like Pelle Ehn and Yrjö Engeström advocated for a more democratic and collaborative approach to technology
development. Susanne Bødker, another prominent figure in participatory design, emphasized the importance of context in design and contributed to the understanding of how technology is embedded in social practices. Over the years, participatory design has been applied in various contexts such as healthcare, education, and urban planning, and the foundational design principles from the Bauhaus have also shaped new fields such as human-computer interaction and architecture (Smith et al., 2017).

Participatory design provides a framework for involving stakeholders in the design process as well as related research. For example, researchers have leveraged PD principles to develop more user-friendly software, collaborative teaching and learning environments, and strategies for engaging faculty in the co-creation of knowledge-sharing platforms. As participatory design has evolved, greater attention has been paid to value-based strategies for engagement, which allow “meaning- and decision-making to emerge in often contentious private and public contexts” (Smith et al., 2017, p. 66). This greater focus on context to inform processes and desired outcomes is reflective of the improvement science perspective that “all change takes place in the context of a dynamic and adaptive system” (Lemire et al., 2017), and researchers (and designers) must identify opportunities to effect positive change in specific settings by integrating an array of stakeholder perspectives.

**Methodology of Participatory Design**

The core themes of participatory design emphasize the need to involve workers in the collaborative development of the information systems that would largely define their workplace existence (Carroll & Rosson, 2007; Greenbaum & Loi, 2012; Gregory, 2003). Overall, participatory design (PD) has both a moral and a practical component, with the first recognizing that users have the right to be included in the process of designing technologies they use, and the
practical consideration that the design will benefit from the input of users. Ideally, participatory design attempts to “to change situations, not simply study them” (Bannon & Ehn, 2012, p. 42). The North American interpretation of this goal, especially within commercial settings, has played out with a greater focus on user-centered design which, while still helpful, tends to collect data related to experiences as more supplemental material for designers to use rather than integrating end users into the design process (Carroll & Rosson, 2007). However, participatory design in North America has also been embraced through community-based work that recognizes the need to elevate the voices of disenfranchised or disadvantaged community members.

**Community of Practice**

The literature review in Chapter One of the current dissertation was grounded in the community of practice theory developed by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger. Communities of practice are naturally-occurring “knowledge-based social structures” (Wenger, 2002, p. 5) that consist of individuals who are connected through their work and the opportunity to learn from one another to improve upon their shared practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As previously stated, one of my key assumptions is that a community of practice (CoP) is necessary to promote knowledge sharing and faculty professional development. However, how a CoP looks and functions in the digital age is full of new possibilities and distinct challenges that relate to the technology of the time. In recent decades, scholars have investigated such online communities to understand why so many have failed due to members’ resistance to sharing information with one another (Li et al., 2009). Refer to Chapter One for information about the history of the community of practice theory.

The following literature review synthesizes research that supports the design and development of an online faculty common at the School of Visual Arts using a process that
emphasizes faculty participation and supports community members’ basic psychological needs. Grounding this process in a strong theory of treatment that is informed by evidence-based research is intended to foster an online community of practice that engages faculty members in ongoing professional development and knowledge sharing. As the college faces the pending mass retirement of its long-term faculty members, the online faculty community space, which will be referred to as the faculty common (FC) from this point, would also welcome newcomers into a virtual community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Ideally, the knowledge sharing would not be limited to faculty members exchanging information with their teaching peers, but also provide opportunities for faculty to increasingly opt into institutional discussions about improving teaching and learning across the institution.

**Synthesis of the Intervention Literature**

The overarching goal for the intervention literature review is to support a comprehensive plan for the development and implementation of the faculty common (FC) at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). The creation of the FC will mark a major step toward supporting the college’s faculty in fostering a vibrant community of practice (CoP) to enhance their ongoing learning and overall experience as visual arts educators. The FC will address the barriers to faculty participation and knowledge sharing that were discussed in the exploratory literature review and the needs assessment study by providing easy access to a shared space for faculty to convene and collaborate with their teaching peers. As this work is intertwined with re-envisioning the college’s approach to faculty professional development, the FC should also incorporate evidence-based best practices for faculty professional development (Bayar, 2014; Desimone et al., 2002; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).
The first section of the literature review explores research to inform strategies to motivate faculty participation in knowledge-sharing activities. Specifically, the research highlights how the fulfillment of basic psychological needs increases knowledge-sharing behaviors and positively impacts the overall wellness of workers. It also addresses the important role that institutional leadership has on creating a motivating environment. The second section synthesizes research from the participatory design, community of practice, and learning sciences literature to inform co-developing a faculty common with optimal interactivity and content to support the engagement and shared learning of faculty members. The third section aligns fundamental elements from the current conceptual framework (self-determination theory, participatory design, and community of practice) to support communication strategies necessary to successfully implement and evaluate the new faculty common at SVA.

**Knowledge Sharing: Motivation Strategies and the Role of Leadership**

The primary challenge in implementing a faculty common at SVA is ensuring faculty members feel motivated to utilize the FC and then have positive experiences in the FC to sustain their participation. While more explicit goals related to professional development learning outcomes will unfold through an iterative co-design process with SVA faculty members (discussed in the following section), the current section of the literature review aims to inform strategies for driving faculty motivation. Knowledge sharing within organizations, including institutions of higher education, is viewed as a priority to sustain workplace performance and the overall success of organizations (discussed in Chapter One). Knowledge sharing (KS) has been described as “a flow activity, a kind of exchange where one party gives some explicit or tacit knowledge to another party, e.g., a person, a group, or a repository” (Coun et al., 2019, p. 482). In KS literature, explicit knowledge refers to the official guidelines or policy and tacit
knowledge refers to “private information and deals with a combination of training, skills, education and experiences” (Thomas & Gupta, 2020, p. 117). Over the past two decades, there has been significant growth in online communities intended to promote both explicit and tacit knowledge-sharing, but few successfully maintain active knowledge-sharing participation among members (Lai & Chen, 2014; Lin et al., 2009).

**Strategies to Motivate Knowledge-Sharing Behavior**

To investigate the effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on knowledge sharing, Nguyen and colleagues (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of 44 studies involving 14,023 participants. The authors found that intrinsic motivation positively impacted knowledge sharing, which corroborated prior research (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Tang et al., 2016). Nguyen and colleagues also found a positive correlation between extrinsic motivation and knowledge sharing, as well as an additive effect between the two types of motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic). This finding does not conflict with the self-determination theory as SDT’s mini-theory, the organismic integration theory, posits that extrinsic rewards can be integrated with personal values, especially when delivered in an autonomy-supportive (i.e., not controlling) manner. Nguyen and colleagues (2019) argued that supporting self-efficacy and self-enjoyment could be utilized to promote intrinsic motivation, while providing “an effective knowledge-sharing environment” (p. 1010) and recognizing knowledge contributors would reinforce extrinsic rewards (Gagné & Deci, 2005). In the SVA context, this could also include using the new faculty common as a space for recognizing faculty expertise and their valuable contribution to the college’s mission, as well as providing enjoyable activities for faculty that provide a sense of connection beyond their role as educators. Additionally, the study suggests that delivering clear
feedback and training options also supported participants’ intrinsic motivation (Nguyen et al., 2019).

Nguyen and colleagues (2019) also found evidence that the moderating role of age and gender was substantial in explaining variance in their results. For practical application of these findings, the authors suggested that organizations consider strengthening bonds with different groups via periodic gatherings that provide space to address their specific needs. In 2020, Nguyen expanded the group’s research to inform a four-dimensional model that explored motivators of online knowledge sharing via the categories of individual, social, technological, and organizational considerations. For example, at the individual level, high self-efficacy correlated with a tendency to share knowledge online, and at the social level, reputation influenced knowledge sharing. In consideration of both individual and social influences, providing positive feedback to SVA faculty about their interactions in the faculty common (e.g., digital posts) could help promote positive self-efficacy and reputation (or sense of competency, per the self-determination theory) and reinforce their motivation for continued participation in the FC.

To address the challenge of maintaining active knowledge-sharing among online community members, Lai and Chen (2014) explored how different forms of motivation (designated as extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, and intra-community factors) affected the knowledge-sharing intention of online community members. Lai and Chen assessed extrinsic motivation through indicators for the desire for improved reputation and the desire to garner reciprocity through their knowledge-sharing behavior; intrinsic motivation through participants’ enjoyment in helping others and a sense of their own knowledge self-efficacy; and the intra-community factors explored included the participants’ perception of the online community
moderator’s enthusiasm, related offline community activities, and the enjoyability (or playfulness) of participating in the online community (Lai & Chen, 2014). Recognizing that online knowledge-sharing communities include participants who consistently play different roles, the study strove to understand the potentially different motivations experienced among the participants who were primary content providers (the *posters*) compared with the participants who read but never or only privately responded to posts (the *lurkers*). Contrary to Nguyen and colleagues’ (2019) results, the study found that neither reputation nor reciprocity positively impacted actual knowledge-sharing behavior, but reciprocity significantly impacted the lurkers’ intentions.

As in any community of practice, stepping into the lurker role (or *newcomer* role, per Lave and Wenger, 1991) is common behavior for new members who may later transition to the *poster* role after gaining comfort and confidence in the community. Considering the CoP perspective, the behavior of lurkers could be interpreted as newcomers wanting to access more information and gain opportunities to exchange knowledge, while not yet committing to the knowledge-sharing behavior. Lai and Chen (2014) also found that knowledge self-efficacy and enjoyment of helping others (intrinsic motivators) were significant for the *posters*, influencing the actual knowledge-sharing behavior within the group. Additionally, the intra-community factors, such as the moderator’s enthusiasm and enjoyment of the knowledge-sharing experience significantly influenced both posters and lurkers. These results highlight the importance of utilizing academic support staff members to play the collective role of enthusiastic moderators through supportive interactions with faculty and/or recognition of their contributions. Lave and Wenger (1991) discuss the importance of exchanging knowledge at the boundaries of communities to bring new knowledge into CoPs. Ensuring an appropriate level of interaction in
the FC by academic support staff could deliver valuable information to faculty and also provide opportunities to increase staff members’ awareness of faculty members’ challenges, preferences, and frustrations around working at SVA. Lai and Chen’s (2014) findings that intrinsic motivation (knowledge self-efficacy and enjoyment of helping others) was significant only to posters is worth considering how the content and training provided within the FC may support the lurker role in gaining greater self-efficacy and moving along the path to becoming a poster.

Chai and Kim (2012) also explored the knowledge-sharing behavior of online community members but grounded their research in a socio-technical approach to assessing factors of both a social and a technical nature. The socio-technical perspective focuses on understanding and striking a balance between the interplay of social and technical factors in the design of systems, organizations, and processes (Bannon & Ehn, 2012; Mumford, 2000). Survey results of 211 university students were analyzed and confirmed positive relationships between participants’ ethical culture, sense of belonging, and social ties to their knowledge contribution behavior (Chai & Kim, 2012). Additionally, results did not support a statistically significant relationship between the structural assurance of service providers or structural assurance of the internet and the participants’ knowledge-sharing behavior. Instead of focusing on online behavior, In de Wal and colleagues (2014) looked more broadly at high school teachers’ motivation to participate in professional development activities. The authors more tightly applied the SDT framework by utilizing the Basic Psychological Needs Scale (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008), along with measures for self-reported engagement and academic self-regulation (Vansteenkiste et al., 2009). Results from their sample of 2,360 teachers corroborated prior SDT research by finding a negative correlation between external regulation and basic needs fulfillment.

The Role of Intention
Related research argued that for individuals to feel motivated toward a particular behavior, they must first possess the intention to carry out the behavior — regardless of whether the intention is based on a personal desire (intrinsic) or on the desire to comply with external rules (extrinsic). Fortier and colleagues (2009) explored ways to improve female patients’ adoption of healthy behaviors and their study differentiated the intention to share knowledge and actual knowledge-sharing behavior by integrating the theory of planned behavior (TPB) model with the self-determination theory. The theory of planned behavior identifies intention as the most significant predictor of actual behavior change (Azjen, 1991) and Fortier and colleagues found strong connections between autonomous motivation and intended behavior. The authors identified that “attitudes were most strongly and consistently associated with intentions” (p. 63).

Based on the results of the study, the authors recommended that helping women establish positive attitudes toward healthy behavior could further impact real behavior change. In other words, helping the patients see the value in specific beliefs or behaviors would impact their ultimate behavior choices. The transformation from intention to actual motivation toward a behavior can be explained by SDT’s organismic integration theory (OIT). When applied to the case of SVA faculty members participating in knowledge sharing, if a member recognizes the potential value in sharing knowledge within the CoP, then, they are more likely to internalize or align the value with their personal goals, and will therefore experience greater autonomous motivation to carry out the behavior (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008; Gagné & Ryan, 2005). In a review of OIT’s internalization process, Vansteenkiste and colleagues (2018) stated that “The fullest form of internalization occurs when the reason for doing the activity is not just personally meaningful but is also brought in harmony with broader and more deeply anchored values, commitments, and interests of the person.” (p. 32). Figure 3.2 presents the organismic integration
continuum, highlighting how factors representing extrinsic motivation (e.g., requirements to complete an assignment) can be interpreted by individuals as aligning with their own values and somewhat or completely internalized to promote autonomous motivation.

**Figure 3.2**

*Organismic Integration Continuum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amotivation</th>
<th>Extrinsic Motivation</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-regulation</strong></td>
<td><strong>External Regulation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introjected Regulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Motivation</td>
<td>Autonomous Motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Antecedents**
- Autonomy, competence, relatedness frustration
- Interpersonal controls in work climate or leadership
- Personality, goal-striving & individual differences
- Need supportive work climate or supportive leadership (e.g., autonomy support, transformational leadership)
- Personality, goal-striving, & individual differences

**Consequences**
- Psychological distress; burnout; work stress
- Functioning: Lower self-efficacy, effort, and performance
- Behavior: Controlling behavior and teaching
- Wellness and job attitudes: Well-being, job satisfaction, work engagement, organizational commitment
- Functioning: Teacher self-efficacy, effort, and performance
- Behavior: Autonomy supportive behavior and teaching

*Note: Adapted from Slemp et al. (2020) p. 2.*

Like Fortier’s research team, Gorozidis and Papioannou (2014) found comparable results.
in their study exploring teachers’ intentions to participate in professional development training. The authors used a longitudinal mixed methods study in which qualitative and quantitative data were collected concurrently to support triangulation. Recognizing the robust literature that aligns autonomous motivation with positive outcomes, Gorozidis and Papioannou (2014) assessed teachers’ intention to participate in future PD by collecting quantitative data using an SDT-based instrument (the Work Task Motivation Scale for Teachers) and a two-item scale that was based on the theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1991). The authors collected qualitative data through open-ended questions asking teachers why they were motivated to register for the training course, which was the most important reason for registering for the course, why they were motivated to participate in the training, and which was the most important reason to participate in the training. Findings from the quantitative analysis supported the authors’ hypothesis that participants who were high in autonomous motivation also scored high in behavior regulation (reflected in their intention to attend and actual attendance of PD activities). Qualitative data supported these findings with the intrinsic theme represented in 69% of participant responses. Additionally, roughly 34% of participants provided feedback that was categorized in the identified regulation theme, meaning they recognized the value of the work and were able to somewhat integrate the value, resulting in more autonomous motivation (see Figure 3.2 above).

**Beyond Knowledge Sharing: Supporting the Wellness of SVA Faculty**

The implementation of an online faculty common at SVA is intended to enhance knowledge sharing and work performance, but SDT research also supports a broader intervention to support workplace wellness. Within the realm of self-determination theory (SDT), the basic psychological needs theory (BPNT) asserts that fulfilling three psychological needs (relatedness, autonomy, and competence) contributes to well-being (Deci et al., 2017; Ryan & Deci, 2020).
For example, Gomez-Baya and Lucia-Casademunt (2017) investigated Spanish workers to uncover links between basic psychological needs fulfillment and job satisfaction, psychological well-being, and health. Surveying 2,748 Spanish employees from the sixth European Working Conditions Survey, the authors established associations between needs fulfillment, job satisfaction, and health. Their structural equation modeling revealed interrelations among psychological needs, job satisfaction, well-being, and health problems, supporting SDT principles. Ferrand and colleagues (2014) conducted a study of residents in an elderly care community to assess the correlation between psychological needs satisfaction and wellness indicators. While there was no difference among the participants’ physical constraints and residential characteristics, the participants with high satisfaction of psychological needs also had significantly higher rates of personal growth and life purpose, and no feelings of depression were reported (Ferrand et al., 2014). On the education front, Slemp et al. (2020) explored SDT’s role in mitigating instructor burnout and fostering job satisfaction. A meta-analysis across 102 samples (N=40,253) showcased that autonomously motivated teachers exhibited greater engagement, commitment, self-efficacy, and autonomy-supportive behavior. Strong connections emerged between autonomously motivated teachers and transformational leadership, affirming the role of SDT in education. Similarly, Fernet et al. (2012) delved into teacher burnout, positing that school environments influence autonomous motivation and self-efficacy, affecting burnout symptoms. Canadian teachers (N=806) reported declining self-efficacy and autonomous motivation over the school year, with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and decreased personal accomplishment.

*Improving Interdepartmental Communication*
In addition to supporting individual faculty members in building human connections to facilitate shared learning, the faculty common can provide opportunities to overcome the college’s fractured communication between academic departments (School of Visual Arts, 2018). Faculty members who participated in the current needs assessment study (see Chapter Two) highlighted their lack of access to and interaction with faculty members in other departments. Establishing a structure such as the FC can improve the integration of communication between departments thereby contributing to the flow of expertise throughout the college (Barnes et al., 2014; Lewin et al., 2011). Evidence of inter-organizational links promoting innovation and competitive advantage is well-represented in the literature. Goes and Park (1997) conducted a longitudinal study of over 400 hospitals to identify if there was a connection between various inter-organizational links, such as having an administrative link through financial management contracts, and service innovation, or “changes in the technology, design, or delivery” (p. 674) of services. Findings from the study established a significant correlation between inter-organizational links and service innovations. Within an educational context, Barnes and colleagues (2014) assessed the ways in which state organizations collect and apply knowledge to drive school-based improvements. Recognizing that individuals are “embedded in relational systems that can promote or block the spread and use of resources or new knowledge” (Barnes et al., 2014, p. 100), the authors administered 305 surveys and 65 interviews to understand how these distinct but connected organizations gathered and assimilated both internally- and externally-sourced information to support their work. The authors found that the informal networks used by participants returned the most valuable and applicable information to support school improvements in their respective contexts. Additionally, among the stronger informal networks, participants engaged in collaborative processes to utilize shared resources
(Barnes et al., 2014). The faculty common can provide mechanisms for improving the flow of information between SVA’s siloed departments and help ensure innovative practices are not cordoned off by the college’s communication silos.

**The Role of Leadership in Promoting a Motivational Environment**

Knowledge sharing in academia is not well researched compared to other industries (Al-Kurdi et al., 2017), but a systematic review of the literature identified individual factors (e.g., attitudes and intentions) as the greatest determinants for KS, followed by organizational factors and technology factors. The attitudes of academics around knowledge sharing may be influenced by a faculty culture that values academic freedom and autonomy. Organizational factors that influence knowledge sharing include the trust felt by employees, but the research shows that “positive organizational culture alone might not facilitate KS among academics” (Al-Kurdi et al., 2017, p. 238). Instead, the authors recommend supplementing positive organizational culture with behavioral strategies to promote motivation and effective and user-friendly technologies. In a follow-up study, Al-Kurdi and colleagues (2020) focused on the role of the organizational climate and operationalized organizational leadership and trust in KS in higher education. Of the 257 surveyed academics, the authors found a strong positive correlation between knowledge-sharing behavior and both trust and organizational leadership.

While changing institutional culture takes time, leaders can take an important step by improving the expected (or accepted) habits of giving and receiving feedback. Effective leadership and institutional support play a pivotal role in fostering a motivating environment that encourages faculty participation, engagement, and knowledge sharing within the online community. By aligning leadership practices with motivation-driven strategies and participatory design principles, institutions can create a culture that values and prioritizes community
involvement. When analyzing successful professional communities of practice, Zboralski (2009) identified three factors (members’ motivation, community leadership, and management support) “as important antecedents of community interaction” (p. 92). Therefore, organizational leaders can support environmental changes to support workers’ well-being and performance, such as authorizing the development of a faculty common, but their active support is also necessary to promote faculty interaction in the space. Eyal and Roth (2010) found that leadership styles also play a direct role in the autonomous motivation of employees through their analysis of a questionnaire completed by 122 teachers. The authors combined the full range model of leadership, to identify the school principals’ leadership style, and self-determination theory, to identify the participants’ quality of motivation, from amotivation to internalized motivation. The authors found that transformational leadership styles significantly and positively affected teachers’ autonomous motivation and wellbeing while transactional leadership produced controlled motivation and teacher self-reported burnout. Transformation leaders are described by Bass and Avolio (1994) as providing the four i’s: individual consideration to workers, promotion of intellectual stimulation in the organization, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence or vision.

Coun and colleagues (2018) integrated social exchange and self-determination theory to explore how leadership styles directly impacted workers’ perceptions of knowledge sharing. The authors investigated the effects that both shared and transformational leadership would have on workers’ perception of knowledge sharing with peers by developing an instrument that integrated perceptions of knowledge sharing, transformational leadership, and shared leadership in their setting, as well as psychological needs satisfaction. Analysis of questionnaires completed by 163 respondents revealed a strong positive correlation between shared leadership and workers’
perceptions of knowledge sharing. Transformational leadership only indirectly impacted workers’ perceptions of knowledge sharing by encouraging shared leadership. Additionally, a positive correlation was identified between both shared and transformational leadership and the psychological need satisfaction of autonomy. The authors did not find a mediation effect of psychological need satisfaction of competency or relatedness on workers’ knowledge-sharing perceptions, but there was a positive connection between both shared and transformational leadership toward the satisfaction of workers’ sense of relatedness.

Slemp et al. (2018) characterized leadership autonomy supportive behavior (LAS) as “leaders who take interest in the perspectives of their employees, provide opportunities for choice and input, encourage self-initiation, and avoid the use of external rewards or sanctions to motivate behavior” (p. 706). While one could argue that this is just good leadership, a considerable value of the body of SDT research is that it provides specific and well-tested constructs (autonomy, competency, and relatedness) to add clarity to the fuzzy business of human interaction. Baard, Deci, and Ryan (2004) argue that the SDT focus on human needs in management research and organizational studies has been so appealing because “it has substantial heuristic utility for delineating dimensions of the environment that would be expected, a priori, to lead to positive versus negative work-related outcomes” (p. 2045). In other words, if need fulfillment is predictive of positive outcomes among workers, and social or environmental conditions have been identified that support need fulfillment, then managers possess the opportunity to apply theory to effect positive changes in organizational environments.

Silva and colleagues (2014) investigated the application of self-determination theory in healthcare and recognized the paradox of thinking about the satisfaction of psychological needs
as the primary outcome. If, for instance, a patient received treatment that supported their psychological needs and they still chose not to enact the recommended behavior change, then viewing this circumstance through self-determination theory, the patient’s decision was an autonomously motivated decision made about their own life. SDT is deeply rooted in psychology and addresses “human harmonic development and (eudaimonic) well-being” (Silva et al., 2014, p. 175). The authors considered if there is greater value in making the satisfaction of BPNs the primary objective of SDT-related interventions although the desired behavioral change is not guaranteed to follow. Applying this philosophical query to organizational leadership, SDT-based interventions may also require a lessening of perceived control from management and investment in articulating a shared organizational vision, delivering resources to support shared leadership (Coun et al., 2018), and empowering workers to use their skills and personal volition to achieve relevant outcomes. This recommendation is consistent with systems thinking approaches that advocate for leaders to empower and support workers with the necessary resources to both experiment and learn from failures (Hamel and Zanini, 2020). It also aligns with the argument made by prolific organizational scholar Peter Drucker (1998) that the knowledge economy has disrupted the traditional balance of power between workers and management.

A Participatory Process to Define Interactions and Create Content

The prior section reviewed literature that supports the satisfaction of basic psychological needs (BPN) as a way to foster employee knowledge sharing, job satisfaction, and overall wellness. The current section synthesizes literature to inform a process for embedding BPN fulfillment into the fabric of the faculty common by utilizing a participatory design framework for developing online interactions and creating FC content. In other words, the online mechanisms for interaction and digital assets aim to support faculty engagement and knowledge
sharing, but the development process itself establishes initial activities to support faculty members’ sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Developing a faculty common without the input of the faculty is simply an administrative tactic that would be perceived as controlling (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and fail to stimulate a key aspect of faculty professional development — the ongoing communication and collaboration of instructors. Additionally, the longer-term goal of integrating self-determination theory, the community of practice theory, and participatory design is to engage faculty in decision-making processes as a precursor to “enable other principles, such as a design practice based on equalizing power relations” (van der Velden & Mörtberg, 2014). This section introduces participatory design principles to apply in the SVA setting, recognizes complementary frameworks to address potential faculty barriers to accessing an online CoP, explores mechanisms for knowledge sharing to address the time constraints that SVA faculty reported in the needs assessment study (see Chapter Two), and finally surveys current technology options available for the FC. However, as a first step, it is helpful to explore some of the consistent problems that have plagued online CoPs for decades.

Schwen & Hara (2003) assessed cases in which online CoPs were developed in four different contexts. The authors introduced details of each case and the levels of success achieved. Additionally, Schwen and Hara discussed specific ways in which the design of the CoPs failed to align with the underlying (community of practice) theory of treatment and offered recommendations for an improved design approach. While the technology used for the 2003 online CoPs is dated, the primary issues that the organizations faced, such as struggling with member participation, are still relevant. Ironically, of the four cases examined by Schwen and Hara (2003), the online CoP that used collaborative technologies the least actually saw the highest level of participation among users. Therefore, instead of throwing technology at a
community-building problem, the authors emphasized the need to stay grounded in the essential elements required for CoPs to succeed. Schwen and Hara (2003) provided cautionary notes to online CoP developers based on the analysis of the four cases (see Table 3.1). The authors underscored that it is *inappropriate or untested* to conflate situated learning theory, a social theory, with learning theory intended to support knowledge acquisition in instructional contexts. Instead, one must recognize that the learning outcomes of a community of practice are established through dialogue among its members and not the directive of an external source. However, the community of practice literature also recognizes that great learning opportunities occur along the boundaries of communities when information, both explicit and tacit, is exchanged to inform the perspectives and practices of different groups (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Therefore, building effective mechanisms for knowledge sharing in the faculty common can support learning in multiple SVA communities — bridging the knowledge gap between experienced visual arts educators and new faculty, as well as informing the college’s administration about how to better support classroom learning through institutional policy.

### Table 3.1

*Cautionary Notes and Descriptions for Online CoPs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cautionary Note</th>
<th>Description of Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive vs. descriptive distinction</td>
<td>The foundational social theory is not a warrant for designing or nurturing a CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready-made vs. communities in the making</td>
<td>Situated learning theory has more to offer the <em>formed</em> community. Little is known about the early life cycle of CoPs. The best opportunity for online design is with a formed CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of possession vs.</td>
<td>CoPs are rarely centered around declarative knowledge acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schwen and Hara (2003) also emphasized the need for designers to understand CoPs as they currently exist and cautioned against coercing participation from community members. While the needs assessment study provided useful information about SVA faculty members’ general impressions of the value and barriers associated with their faculty CoP (see Chapter Two), more information from faculty members is necessary to understand “those social structures that currently serve the population and engage the population in determining its social learning needs” (Schwen & Hara, 2003, p. 24). While Schwen and Hara (2003) did not discuss the participatory design approach, they stated that “It is our assertion that design in this genre does not occur without the intention of the learners and designers fully participating in the process” (p. 24) and their recommendations reflected the driving principles of PD practice. For example, the authors encouraged integrating the perspectives of community members into the online CoP through an iterative design approach (see Table 3.2). Additionally, coercing the participation of community members is in direct opposition to the principles of self-determination theory, which encourages promoting a sense of autonomy among individuals to increase their motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008, 2017). However, more recent research on delivering effective professional development training (see Chapter One) argues that increasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>knowing in practice</th>
<th>Rather CoPs support knowledge in action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level social theory vs. micro-learning theory</td>
<td>Situated learning theory is a <em>mid-level</em> social theory; mixing learning theory and related pedagogy is either an inappropriate or untested mixing of levels of theory and methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated members vs. unwilling subjects</td>
<td>The intentions of the community members are often subverted in the <em>designs of CoP</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Adapted from Schwen & Hara (2003)*
opportunities for knowledge sharing among faculty is essential to promote active learning and collaborative problem-solving to address classroom-based challenges. Therefore, in an era in which organizations see clear value in fostering an active CoP, Schwen and Hara’s (2003) cautionary notes reinforce the need to carefully manage communication around the expectations and opportunities available through such online communities. Just as it is ineffective to throw technology at a learning problem without understanding how the technology will be optimally used to support learning and what barriers users face in using the technology, it is similarly ineffective to develop an online CoP without a clear understanding of mechanisms that will support optimal member engagement. Additionally, the authors highlight the need to identify the existing community routines, visible practices, and Reflecting on the current study, the author is compelled to underscore that the CoP literature provides the overarching goal for SVA’s faculty common and is not intended, or sufficient, to address the process of designing, developing, and implementing the FC.

**Table 3.2**

*Phases and Strategies for Designing Online CoPs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Possible design interventions</td>
<td>Identify an existing community and evaluate whether design intervention is possible/useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analysis</td>
<td>What are the social patterns of learning and identity formation? What are the untapped possibilities for achieving the goals of the population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design</td>
<td>The design process could incorporate iterative strategies such as socio-technical design, rapid prototyping, or user-centered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Evaluation and Revision

The issue of intention is central to goal setting and evaluation. Participatory decision-making is the only ethical stance in the social theory context.

*Note:* Adapted from Schwen & Hara (2003)

**Applying Participatory Design Principles**

From its origin, supporting workers in Scandinavia in the 1970s, the driving principles of participatory design included a deep commitment to democracy, the prevalence of value-based decision-making in design to support improved futures, and the belief that “conflict and contradictions are regarded as resources in design” (Gregory, 2003, p. 62). Participatory design creates opportunities to elevate the voices and visions of stakeholders around issues situated in their community or work environments, to increase understanding of existing technologies and tools related to participants’ daily practice, and to identify opportunities to positively impact stakeholders’ representation in existing systems (Bannon & Ehn, 2012; Greenbaum & Loi, 2012; Smith et al., 2017). Employing a participatory design approach to developing SVA’s faculty common provides a powerful framework for engaging faculty members in knowledge sharing and re-envisioning professional development topics and activities to meet their authentic needs (Bayar, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002). Additionally, ensuring that interactions with participants are guided by principles of the self-determination theory will reinforce faculty members’ autonomous motivation for sustained participation. Power and Goodnough (2019) conducted a qualitative case study that used the SDT lens to investigate the effects of fostering teachers’ autonomous motivation during professional development activities.
To support participants’ needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competency, the program facilitators provided “choice, encouragement, and constructive feedback” (p. 278).

Participatory design provides considerable leeway in the tools and techniques one employs but requires consistently checking awareness of how decisions impact, and are impacted by, the context, purpose, and form of the work at hand (Brandt et al., 2012; van der Velden & Mörtberg, 2015). Recognizing that the production of knowledge and objects employs a process of social cognition, Brandt and colleagues (2012) argue that in a “particular design project, participatory tools and techniques can be seen as the scaffolding for the temporary community of practice in the making” (p. 148). Many of the methods used to facilitate participatory design processes, such as mock-ups, storyboards, and collaborative prototyping (van der Velden & Mörtberg, 2015) are familiar to visual arts educators who employ similar approaches in their teaching practices and professional roles outside of the college. Another example is scenario-based design, a technique used to provide constraints for the designers and opportunities to explore how end users would realistically make use of a design product. Instead of focusing on the possibilities available through designing with technology, and potentially being biased by the newest capabilities, designers develop scenarios or narratives based on the routines and preferences of the end users for whom they are designing (Rosson & Carroll, 2002). Employing scenario-based design promotes knowledge sharing as “collaboration must be embedded in routine structures” (Mullen & Schunk, 2010, p. 196) for learning communities to sustain the interaction among members.

While a participatory design-based process can be applied to facilitate stakeholder participation at any stage of the project, Broadley and Dixon’s (2022) case study provided a helpful phase-based research design in which to employ participatory design practices. The
authors explored new processes to support policy implementation and raise community awareness in Scotland. While their context shares little in common with developing an online community of practice at the School of Visual Arts (SVA), the study used a qualitative and iterative participatory action research methodology that designated three distinct phases for data collection (Broadley & Dixon, 2022). Phase one, *contextual immersion*, was focused on gathering information from community members to better understand their views about the public policy in question using virtual interviews. This phase assisted the researchers in clarifying factors contributing to the problem and articulating criteria for potential solutions. The second phase involved developing virtual workshops that involved community members in the iterative process of co-designing and evaluating solutions, or tools. Finally, the third research phase focused on evaluating the new tools with select community members as well as reflecting on the research process and identifying core insights (Broadley & Dixon, 2022).

**Technology Considerations**

Faculty feedback collected at SVA about the COVID-19 pandemic pivoting to fully online teaching and learning served as an informal proof of concept for using online video-based environments to overcome the longstanding physical barriers that the college’s faculty face around accessing their teaching peers. Still, it is important to consider a range of viable technologies to meet current and future objectives for the faculty common. Fischer and Ostwald (2005) argued that choosing the right technology for the job involves considering how clearly future tasks are defined. When future tasks are yet unknown, such as with the faculty common, scholars recommend that ill-defined tasks are optimally matched to rich media that provides face-to-face communication options for the end users (Fischer & Ostwald, 2005). Kitson et al. (2018) advised that technology choices should be based on the desired outcome, so this brief
section discusses studies involving technology innovations that have garnered attention from education scholars, involve the use of rich media, and provide features and functionality that support the FC objectives of faculty interaction.

The surge of enthusiasm for emerging technologies in education since the 1990s has prompted research in diverse virtual environments. Ketelhut et al. (2010) investigated student engagement and inquiry skills in a homegrown multi-user virtual environment (MUVE), using different designs informed by learning theory. Results revealed complex patterns but no significant cognitive gains. In contrast, McKeelrich and Anderson (2007) applied the community of inquiry (CoI) model to a commercial MUVE (Second Life), demonstrating its effectiveness as well as the need to carefully align a theory of treatment with the opportunities and challenges available through specific technologies. Virtual reality (VR) has also garnered the attention of education scholars, with studies indicating enhanced engagement but limited evidence for learning. While select VR studies have demonstrated improved learning outcomes (Bailenson et al., 2008), the expense and bulkiness of VR hardware remain a barrier to widespread deployment and would introduce barriers to scaling among SVA faculty members. Videoconferencing is another technology that supports virtual engagement and face-to-face connections. Bojinov et al. (2021) found that synchronous videoconferencing improved employee performance and career advancement, emphasizing the value of face-to-face interaction. Similarly, Maher and Prescott (2016) enhanced workplace performance using videoconferencing for professional development, although disruptions and limited interaction were noted. Still, videoconferencing lacks organic one-to-one conversations and can lead to Zoom fatigue (Bailenson, 2021).

Spatial videoconferencing, or videoconferencing that is held in a space resembling a video game environment, offers agency and interactivity without special hardware. James Paul
Gee’s (2008b) insights into game players’ agency, competence, and connection align with the self-determination theory’s basic psychological needs, making spatial videoconferencing suitable for promoting community engagement. However, careful design and implementation are essential as spatial videoconferencing provides a learning curve for users who are unfamiliar with such screen-based environments. While spatially-based videoconferencing applications were difficult to customize in the past due to the technical expertise and expense required, many new solutions have emerged in recent years. For example, Kim and Kim (2023) conducted a study using a spatial videoconferencing platform called GatherTown to evaluate students’ learning experiences. Kim and Kim (2023) utilized the community of inquiry (CoI) framework in a single-group pretest-posttest study with 48 university students who were enrolled in the same online course. The authors used a validated CoI instrument that employed three subscales to assess teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence. The participants were asked to complete the questionnaire before participating in GatherTown and again after six weeks of participation (the instructor was the same for both versions of the online course). The analysis of questionnaire responses revealed significant positive improvements in all three subscales in the post-test compared to pre-test responses. Additionally, participants reported that the experience in the spatial videoconferencing environment, or *metaverse*, felt like interacting with classmates in a physical classroom. Participants also reported greater freedom to interact with others and to express themselves (e.g., using avatars).

A study by Lee and colleagues (2023) similarly focused on student interactions in GatherTown but used a comparative mixed methods design to gain deeper insight into how the spatial videoconference interactions affected students’ *teamwork* experience compared to interacting via Zoom. The quantitative data indicated that in all items (e.g., team interactions,
recognition of others’ emotions, sense of belonging), the mean difference was significant and GatherTown was the preferred tool (Lee et al., 2023). The authors’ qualitative findings supported the questionnaire results with participants highlighting their elevated sense of presence, exchange of emotions, sense of belonging, and ability to interact in multiple directions in GatherTown (Lee et al., 2023). Such positive preliminary findings, and the inexpensive of these products, support a good argument for using spatial videoconferencing for the FC. However, faculty feedback should ultimately inform the technology selection as participatory design research stresses an ethical orientation toward including end users in the decisions about how and when to implement technology (van der Velden & Mörtberg, 2015).

**Addressing Barriers to Online Participation**

Participatory design research provides guidance on incorporating the perspectives of faculty members into the conceptualization and development of the FC, and self-determination theory literature provides high-level parameters for designing for need fulfillment such as ensuring controls are comprehensible to users to support a sense of competency (Peters et al., 2018). However, complementary frameworks such as multimedia theory and universal design for learning can also support the development of the faculty common by improving the ease of access for all members. Research on multimedia theory provides decades of empirical evidence to support digital design choices that minimize user distractions and support optimal learning (Mayer, 2005; 2014). For example, a multimedia instructional message, or “a communication containing words and pictures intended to foster learning” (Mayer, 2005, p. 32), can be utilized to provide simple navigation information or instructions for more complex learning activities. Using design principles grounded in the cognitive theory of multimedia learning will help filter out distractions and make optimal communication design choices for effective reception and
processing by the human mind (Mayer, 2005; 2014). Additionally, employing clear design choices supports the end users’ sense of competence as they navigate through a system without unnecessary cognitive strain (Ryan et al., 2006). Similarly, when multimedia theory was applied in interactive game environments, Mayer and Johnson (2010) found that using direct guidance as well as prompts to promote user reflection were effective approaches to enhancing learning in an educational game. Additionally, the universal design for learning is an educational framework that aims to make learning accessible and effective for all learners and is often used to improve the accessibility of content in online systems (Rogers-Shaw et al., 2018). UDL principles emphasize providing multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression to accommodate a diverse range of learners and involve designing instructional materials, methods, and assessments that are flexible and inclusive (Rogers-Shaw et al., 2018).

**Balancing Time Constraints and Interaction with Meaningful Content**

As discussed in the exploratory literature review (refer to Chapter One), evidence-based recommendations for professional development training include content that authentically addresses the needs of educators while also aligning with broader institutional policies and practices (Ebert-May et al., 2011; Elmore, 2000). Creating content for the FC must ensure that faculty members have the ability to prioritize and contribute to the development of content that is most relevant to their learning needs, incorporates active learning principles, and involves ongoing collaboration among faculty (Bayar, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002). However, while user-driven content and providing faculty members with greater access to one another is essential, respecting the time constraints of faculty members is also a primary concern. Therefore, other strategies must be utilized to develop meaningful FC content that will engage faculty without further burdening their busy schedules. For example, options for
flexible participation would provide both asynchronous and synchronous activities within the same space. Curating relevant media with summaries and readily accessible feedback forums would enable micro-interactions. Facilitating automated reminders that faculty can opt into and ensuring mobile access to the FC content are also options to support faculty access. Nonetheless, optimal convenience is not sufficient to drive sustained faculty participation in the FC.

To establish nascent online communities that reflect the current practices of the end users and provide opportunities for further development, participatory design scholars recommend using boundary objects that “represent the domain concepts and ontologies that both define and reflect the shared practice” (Fischer & Ostwald, 2005, p. 10). Boundary objects can be easily interpreted across different communities to help maintain coherence among a diverse collection of stakeholders who ultimately weigh in on a design project (Star & Greismer, 1989). For example, in a higher education setting, boundary objects may include “research papers, dissertations, and a conceptual framework that encompasses the individuals and work done within the community” (Fischer & Ostwald, 2005, p. 10). However, in a visual arts college like SVA, boundary objects may also include examples of artwork, video-based demonstrations of art practice techniques, or even a materials swap exchange. Boundary objects are used to facilitate a shared understanding among participants across the spatial and temporal gap of online communication and support a connection to one’s identity. While implementing boundary objects early in the design process supports the structure for a future community of practice (CoP) by creating a common language, the objects will take on new meanings through the continued interaction of community members.

Another content strategy for motivating faculty participation is to integrate work-adjacent topics of interest into both synchronous and asynchronous activities. Tiwari and Garg (2019)
highlighted opportunities for human resources management to reevaluate traditional approaches to driving workplace performance by introducing mindfulness training. The study sought to identify the effect of the mindfulness variable on job performance and the mediating role of basic needs fulfillment (Tiwari & Garg, 2019). Middle managers were surveyed with an instrument that measured mindfulness, needs fulfillment, and job performance. Analysis of the 327 responses indicated a significant correlation between all the variables, indicating that mindfulness supports workplace performance and is mediated by the fulfillment of the basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Tiwari & Greg, 2019). Determining topics of interest to faculty for non-traditional workshops, as well as other synchronous and asynchronous activities, can be discovered through the participatory design process and through surveying the broader SVA faculty community. However, McDermott (1999) cautions against including too many topics in the CoP as this will likely lead to information overload instead of an environment that enables faculty to access and contribute information with ease.

Gruber’s (2018) mixed-method research suggested ways in which participatory design can guide the placement of academic-related content in the FC. Gruber used a participatory approach to transform the development of course curricula from an individual undertaking to a collective experience that brings together the voices of multiple stakeholders. In addition to creating a space for faculty collaboration on curriculum redesign, Gruber’s work involved collecting feedback from external experts on the specific program content as well as interviewing current and past students. This raises the question of how broadly participatory activities should extend to collect sufficient data for FC development. While student and alumni perspectives are irrelevant to the nontraditional content described above, they could provide deep insight into the
areas in which SVA needs to improve its curriculum and classroom practices. However, participatory design scholars, Bratteteig and Wagner (2014) argue that while utilizing Cohen’s (1972) garbage can model in decision-making making may be tempting, an orderly design-based approach is preferable. Additionally, one must remain cognizant that decisions made within a complex network of other issues can have unforeseen consequences that may even define “the context for all other choices” (Bratteteig & Wagner, 2014, p. 58). In the context of SVA, unnecessary complications related to developing the FC are unlikely to garner the administrative support that is necessary for a successful implementation. Additionally, analysis of college-wide course evaluations would provide better data to target improvement topics for the FC. Being transparent with faculty members about how the improvement topics were selected could add weight to the importance of interacting with the topics. At present, little academic data is shared with faculty members and the college largely fails to use data to guide decisions about program development or improvement. The development of the FC could serve as a catalyst to nudge faculty (and administrators) toward using data to drive curricular decision-making.

Gruber’s (2018) study also offered suggestions for developing FC content to preempt faculty tension around knowledge sharing as well as opportunities for academic support teams to support the development process. Gruber described how instructors experienced tension as they moved from sharing data about their course designs to actively participating in the interpretation of the data to collaboratively develop a better-integrated program curriculum. This tension was overcome by establishing boundaries and rules to ensure that all participating faculty members had “equal input on what learning outcomes would be included in each course” (p. 429) and ensuring that faculty could modify the courses they taught as long as the assigned learning outcomes were met. Including an activity in SVA’s PD process for faculty members to develop a
community contract could preempt tension around faculty sharing information about their course designs or teaching practices. Additionally, Gruber (2018) recognized that within the context of her work, faculty knowledge exchange would not have been possible without “institutional support structures, effective ways of managing the distribution and adaptation of knowledge by the members of the community” (p. 425). Similarly, at SVA, utilizing the participatory design approach will ensure faculty members co-design the content and activities in the FC, but a well-conceived plan or prototype would respect the time of SVA faculty by enabling facilitators to quickly initiate the iterative design process. Additionally, to extend the prior example of using scenario-based elements within the FC to prompt faculty responses, academic support teams could use select clips from SVA’s Teachers on Teaching video series to provide models for faculty members to adapt and improve upon.

**Mechanisms for Knowledge Sharing**

In the early years of using ICT tools to support communities of practice, McDermott (1999) suggested that there are three key questions that inform the type of community connections that need to be built. These questions address the type of knowledge that is being exchanged, the strength of the community identity, and “how closely integrated sharing knowledge is with people’s everyday work” (McDermott, 1999, p. 2) (see Figure 3.3). The purpose of outlining these questions was to provide a framework for better understanding the dimensions of an existing CoP and how to most effectively facilitate communication among its members. Knowledge sharing via web-based systems can take many forms, from in-depth conversations to exchanging brief comments, or the knowledge could be transmitted in a fully impersonal manner through the exchange of digital files. However, as previously discussed, knowledge sharing (KS) typically refers to the exchange of either *explicit* or *tacit* knowledge.
The FC is intended to provide a shared space for exchanging both explicit and tacit knowledge, but the approaches are different for each. McDermott (1999) highlighted that documenting the contributions of community members can be helpful in “translating tacit knowledge into explicit written tips, procedures, case studies, etc.” (p. 3), but it can be *inappropriate* when the authors fail to understand the meaning and context of the practitioner. While academic support offices should provide easy access to explicit knowledge (e.g., policies and procedures) via the FC (Sherer et al., 2003), tacit knowledge sharing must remain in the authentic voice of faculty members. While it is unreasonable to expect SVA instructors to document their visual arts education processes in long form, the FC should include opportunities for faculty to comment on the (explicit) knowledge shared by the administration and contribute recommendations. More than simply *allowing* faculty members to weigh in on the recommended policies and procedures, the institution can support the faculty community by encouraging them to reflect on “general education and coherence on learning across disciplines” (Sherer et al., 2003, p. 192).

Organizing mechanisms for knowledge-sharing activities in ways that correspond to natural categories existing in the workflow of faculty will support instructors' integration of the information into their practice (McDermott, 1999). Additionally, using different media to correspond with the type of knowledge being shared will create a more engaging experience for faculty and can promote the assimilation of the information and a sense of connection, or relatedness, with the community members who are sharing. In the context of SVA, the goal of improving communication between faculty members goes hand-in-hand with the need to drive faculty participation through these channels of communication. Drawing on the participatory design framework, the scenario-based design technique (Rosson & Carroll, 2002) can be used as
a mechanism for facilitating faculty discussions on topics of interest. Narratives embedded within the FC could be powerful mechanisms to evoke relevant experiences from faculty members and help promote participation. As discussed in Chapter One, SVA previously produced a Teachers on Teaching video series to share the thoughts, feelings, and practice-based recommendations of faculty with other members of the community. However, this process of capturing and distributing faculty perspectives fails to provide opportunities for other community members to respond. Facilitating asynchronous discussions is challenging, but using video-based scenarios that highlight the competence and relatedness of fellow faculty members is a path that can be explored to prompt discussions in the FC.

**Figure 3.3**

*Key Dimensions of Communities of Practice*

![Diagram showing dimensions of communities of practice](image)

*Note:* Adapted from McDermott (1999).

When considering ways to design specific mechanisms for knowledge sharing within the SDT framework, the extant literature provides unreliable recommendations. Using a participatory design process to co-design a faculty common that liberally applies the principles...
of self-determination theory would ideally create an environment in which all interactions, both the development and ultimate user experience of the FC, support faculty members’ sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy. However, while a multitude of studies have explored SDT-related outcomes in workplace settings, online communities, and game-based environments, far fewer have operationalized basic psychological needs (BPN) fulfillment through specific design elements. Tyack and Mekler (2020) argued that while self-determination theory has been widely applied to recent human-computer interaction (HCI) research on video games, the majority of those studies failed to consider core SDT concepts and/or incorporate SDT-based measures into their studies. Additionally, few studies have explored the application of SDT to media rich online interfaces outside of gaming. To address this gap, Peters and colleagues (2018) introduced the motivation, engagement, and thriving in the user experience (METUX) model. The METUX model helps to align design choices with the measured outcome of end users’ basic psychological needs satisfaction. The authors posit that increasing autonomy enhances engagement, increasing competence boosts motivation, and increasing relatedness improves well-being (Peters et al., 2018). Design elements can be manipulated based on these constants to amplify engagement, motivation, and well-being. Table 3.3 outlines the authors’ detailed METUX model adapted for the faculty common. To highlight the availability of validated measures for basic needs fulfillment, Table 3.3 includes the measures Peters and colleagues recommended for evaluating each phase of the user experience. While the authors’ model does not identify specific mechanisms for online interaction, it provides a helpful resource to align proposed digital assets and KS mechanisms with psychological needs fulfillment and evaluation measures.
Table 3.3

*Motivation, Engagement, and Thriving in User Experience (METUX) Model in Detail*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere of Experience</th>
<th>Psychological Needs (Mediators) in Context</th>
<th>Evaluation Measures</th>
<th>Desirable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adoption             | • To what extent is FC adoption autonomously motivated?  
   • To what extent does a potential user anticipate they will be competent at using it? | • ACTA (Peters et al., 2018)               | • Adoption                                   |
| Interface            | • To what extent does direct interaction with the FC support BPN satisfaction? | TENS-Interface (Peters et al., 2018)         | • Engagement (with FC)  
   • Usability  
   • User satisfaction |
| Task                 | • To what extent does engagement in FC-specific tasks support BPN satisfaction? | TENS-Task (Peters et al., 2018)              | • Engagement (with FC tasks)  
   • User satisfaction |
| Behavior             | • To what extent does the FC improve BPN satisfaction with respect to the behavior that the FC is intended to support? | • Assessments of BPN satisfaction in relation to behavior, e.g., knowledge-sharing  
   • Assessments of behavior-specific outcomes (e.g., quantity or frequency of KS contributions) | • Engagement (with behavior, e.g., KS)  
   • Satisfaction (with behavior, e.g., KS)  
   • Behavior-specific outcomes (e.g., participation and KS)  
   • Experience of well-being during behavior |
| Life                 | • To what extent does the technology influence the user’s experience of BPN satisfaction in their life overall? | TENS-Life (Peters et al., 2018)  
   • BPNS (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagné, 2003)  
   • Other validated measures of flourishing | • Increased life satisfaction, well-being, thriving/flourishing |
Communication Strategies for Successful Implementation and Evaluation

The current section delves into the relevant literature to inform the development of a communication strategy for implementation and ongoing evaluation of the faculty common. Successful implementation and evaluation are reliant upon a communication strategy that takes into account the social structure of the faculty community at SVA (Rogers, 2003). It is imperative that communications about the new faculty common are disseminated through channels accessible to SVA faculty members, as advocated by Baranowski and Stables (2000). Additionally, it is essential to consider the cultural perspective through which SVA faculty members will receive the message (Rogers, 2003). Equally important is ensuring that the language of these communications aligns with the principles of self-determination theory, as explored in the current intervention literature review. As examined in the first section of this literature review, language and interactions framed to support basic psychological needs serve as precursors to motivation in various workplace and online contexts. Moreover, maintaining ongoing evaluation of the faculty common through a participatory approach requires planning communications to facilitate sustained feedback from faculty.

The phases involved in the successful implementation and evaluation of the faculty common align with networked learning research, which relies on the seamless flow of information to enhance the skills and knowledge of community members, as elucidated by Bessant and colleagues (2012). The authors’ analysis of longitudinal qualitative data from three
differently configured professional learning networks identified the necessary allocation of resources and management approaches needed to develop and sustain such networks. This analysis identified challenges for consideration through three distinct phases: convening the network, operating the network, and sustaining or closing the network (Bessant et al., 2012). In the first phase, the analysis revealed the importance of “securing a critical mass of participants” (Bessant et al., 2012, p. 1100) through the promotion of the network by either a power association or by identifying key players to mobilize support for the network. Key players are referred to in the diffusion of innovation theory as opinion leaders and are characterized by having the ability to “influence other individuals’ attitudes or overt behavior informally in a desired way with relative frequency” (Rogers, 2003, p. 27). Across nearly every diffusion research tradition, the adoption of an innovation by opinion leaders has been identified as a driver of mass adoption (Rogers, 2003).

Employing the participatory design approach with faculty members offers opportunities to infuse SVA’s artist-educator values into college-wide promotions for the faculty common. According to the SDT literature, effectively communicating the goals and opportunities associated with the faculty common in a manner that supports faculty members’ sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness will positively impact their initial acceptance of the FC. Furthermore, framing messages in a motivating manner that emphasizes representative faculty members’ sense of belonging and identity within the SVA community will encourage the reception of these messaging as integrated regulation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). As discussed in this chapter, SDT’s organismic integration theory posits that when an individual recognizes the value of an activity, they are more likely to integrate the activity with their personal values, resulting in a higher level of autonomous motivation in carrying out related tasks (Deci & Ryan, 2000;
Taking a different approach to assessing the motivation of online community members, Lampe and colleagues (2010) conducted a survey of participants (N=599) to compare motivation driven by individual determinants versus a commitment to their organization. The analysis of results from individuals who were motivated by their commitment to their organization overwhelmingly indicated that this commitment was based on a strong sense of belonging, over other measures such as the usability of the site (Lampe et al., 2010).

**Communicating Personalized Incentives**

The effective use of incentives can also be used to foster employee motivation, as well as optimal job performance. Ciarniene and Vienazindiene (2010) conducted a literature review to identify “the most important attributes of compensation and incentives management” (p. 15) and found that developing incentives that align with the institutional vision as well as the vision of individual employees is essential, and programs should therefore be frequently updated to maintain a connection with the vision of employees. From an SDT perspective, incentives should avoid communicating a sense of control or expectation from the employer. The best way to deliver such incentives is through the recognition of past performance delivered as a way to honor the prior effort with no proverbial strings attached (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008; Fall & Roussel, 2014). Furthermore, research by Woolley and Fishbach (2018) suggested that receiving an immediate versus delayed reward for completing a task increased individuals’ intrinsic motivation. The authors’ study was based on prior research conducted by Leppar et al. (1973) that determined the strength of the connection between an activity and its goal affects intrinsic motivation. Leppar and colleagues (1973) demonstrated that adding goals to an activity weakens intrinsic motivation by diluting the link between the activity and its original purpose. This *dilution effect* occurs when an activity serves multiple goals, diminishing its association with...
The proximity between an activity and its goal also matters. For instance, introducing an activity that serves the same goal as another activity reduces intrinsic motivation for the original one (Bélanger et al., 2015; Whoolley & Fishbach, 2018). Overall, the number and closeness of links between an activity and a goal impact their association. In the context of SVA, communicating a clear and focused goal for the FC implementation process will support faculty members’ initial motivation to participate and help avoid the information overload that McDermott (1991) cautioned against. Additionally, aligning incentives with this primary goal, as well as with the vision of faculty members, will further support their motivation.

**Sustaining Faculty Engagement**

In discussing the second phase, or operation of the learning network, Bessant and colleagues (2012) noted that establishing trust among network members is essential and “is only likely to emerge through concrete activities demonstrating the clear benefits of cooperation” (p. 1102). The authors discuss two levels of participant trust, both the initial trust in participating in the community and the later trust that develops when a member recognizes the value gained through community participation. To support trust at both levels, ground rules for participation must be communicated to establish transparency around knowledge sharing and any processes involving the organization and codification of the knowledge captured within the community. Additionally, Bessant et al. identified the challenge of maintaining member motivation for continued participation as a challenge in the operation phase. To support members’ sustained motivation, it is essential that they can identify value in their participation, such as having a secure space for peer-enabled reflection that produces information that is applicable to them in solving their own challenges or having a venue for providing feedback for the college’s
management. Ensuring the tone of the space is inclusive and faculty concerns are addressed in a timely and transparent manner can also support sustained online community interaction (Riverin & Stacey, 2008). Faculty concerns can be addressed through the dedicated support of network coordinators who can validate the problems being worked out by participants and acknowledge successful resolution (Bessant et al., 2012).

Communications about the role of the FC facilitators (academic support teams) should also be thoughtfully constructed. Participatory design research runs the gamut from “viewing users’ perceptions of technology as important” (Halskov & Hansen, 2015, p. 89) to users playing a critical role in the design process. It is important to consider how the framing of the project by administrators can impact the degree of real influence end users actually feel empowered to contribute (Light & Akama, 2012; Sarkkinen, 2004). Light and Akama (2012) argued that understanding the skills and orientation of participatory design facilitators can provide as much information about the PD process as the methods used, although there is little research on the former. Light and Akama (2012) shared data collected in two distinct cases that both used participatory design methods to engage participants in developing new methods of communication and network learning. While the overall goals for each case were similar, the approaches used by PD facilitators varied dramatically and resulted in very different responses from the participants. Additionally, while participatory design offers many methods for participant engagement, they get translated in different contexts, and the levels of participation can also be influenced by the affordances of different technologies that are employed in the process (Halskov & Hansen, 2015; Oostveen & Besselaar, 2004). Therefore, it is also important that the initial promotion of the FC communicates how to effectively use the FC and lessens faculty members’ perceived barriers to engaging in an online environment. Although the
integration of technologies in higher education has grown exponentially in recent decades, research shows that faculty members tend to underutilize or inconsistently use technologies due to an array of perceived barriers (Mercader & Gairín, 2020).

### Ongoing Assessment of the Faculty Common

As the final stage of networked learning, *sustaining or closing the network*, Bessant and colleagues (2012) acknowledged that networks are sometimes developed with specific, even short-term, purposes. Therefore, it is important to gauge if members perceive ongoing benefit to their membership and if not, either make adjustments to improve the experience or disband the network (Bessant et al., 2012). Inherent in the participatory design of the FC is the intention to maintain an ongoing and iterative process of collecting feedback and making adjustments to the FC to meet the evolving needs of SVA stakeholders. The overall evaluation of the success of FC as an online community of practice presents challenges, but self-determination theory provides multiple avenues for evaluating the success of the new platforms. While there is substantial academic literature supporting the value and processes of CoPs, some scholars argue that there is little agreement on how to evaluate their success (McKellar et al., 2014). “As a result, empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of CoPs remains limited, and even fewer analyses investigate the mechanisms that determine effectiveness” (McKellar et al., 2014). Self-determination theory, however, is awash with empirical studies that frequently employ the validated instruments that have become standards for SDT research. Additionally, when evaluating the overall success of the FC, it is worth exploring how instruments, such as Roca and Gagné’s (2008) extended Technology Acceptance Model, could be used to evaluate the quality of the FC from a technology perspective.

While the institutional goal for the FC is to increase faculty participation and knowledge
sharing, this goal is an initial step toward improving professional development outcomes. The participatory design framework presupposes that faculty members will engage in co-developing their own goals for the FC. As more faculty members engage with the KS mechanisms, the data can be parsed to identify learning goals that are either widely held by SVA faculty or fall within specific subgroups of the faculty community. Looking broadly at the evolution of participatory design, the original distinction between the participants and designers has blurred over time with the rise of more user-friendly technologies (Halskov & Hansen, 2015). Such changes can present challenges to researchers who need to define user groups and assess their degree of involvement. Therefore, regression analysis would be helpful to determine how faculty members who closely participated in the development of the FC are differently engaged with the content, or if any other categories of faculty members display notable differences in their interactions in the FC.

**Conclusion**

With the intention of fostering a connected and productive teaching and learning community at the School of Visual Arts (SVA), it is imperative that design, development, and implementation decisions for the faculty common (FC) are grounded in a strong theory of treatment (Moullin et al., 2020). The current intervention literature review examined research grounded in a conceptual framework that employed self-determination theory (SDT) to support the primary challenge of motivating SVA faculty to participate in professional development activities aligned with institutional goals. The framework also utilized the participatory design approach and community of practice (CoP) research, to support the process of developing an online faculty common (FC) that will serve as the CoP hub for SVA faculty. The participatory design process will engage faculty members in setting goals and guiding the development of content available in the faculty common. Design plans for the FC will focus on ease of access
and creating an inclusive environment to support faculty members' sense of belonging. Additionally, visual cues and scaffolded resources will guide users through tasks, from the most basic navigation to fully interacting with objects in the virtual environment. Faculty members' involvement in the FC development process will create opportunities to effectively promote the launch of the FC from the faculty perspective, and ongoing evaluation of the FC will help ensure the online space continues to meet the evolving needs of the college’s educators. Altogether, the intervention literature review, the exploratory literature review (see Chapter One), and the needs assessment research (see Chapter Two) support a comprehensive development plan for the new SVA faculty common.

The ongoing participation of SVA faculty members in the FC will provide opportunities to identify specific faculty learning needs as well as to collect data to inform the college’s planning and policy. I believe that collaborating with SVA faculty members has the potential to return valuable feedback to not only improve the FC, but also contribute to the paucity of research guiding the application of SDT principles in online communities. In 2020, Peters, Ahmadpour, and Calvo collaborated with professional designers to solicit feedback on design tools that the authors hoped would address the gap between research design practices. While 82% of participants agreed to use what they had learned from the experience, only 56% found the tools useful due to insufficient instruction (Peters et al., 2020). While the researchers’ goal was to bridge theory and practice, the study failed to collect designers’ input about integrating SDT principles into the design process. Future work would benefit from emphasizing a collaborative research approach that integrates the diverse insights of designer participants (Barab et al., 2003). Research on prosocial behavior has come a long way, as it was first dismissed as anti-intellectual and morally dogmatic (Cameron, 2023; Harrison et al., 2022).
However, although positive psychology is emerging as a framework to inform technology development and promote well-being (Gaggioli et al., 2017), much of the extant literature focuses on the outcomes of applying the SDT principles instead of articulating and evaluating the mechanisms that drive the outcomes. Applying self-determination theory in the development of the faculty common at SVA provides opportunities for testing the effectiveness of these specific mechanisms. The following chapter provides the faculty common intervention plan which details a process to procure the necessary resources and support, guide the development and promotion, and iteratively collect data supporting ongoing improvements to the virtual faculty common.
Chapter Four: Faculty Common Intervention Plan

The School of Visual Arts (SVA) has contended with low rates of faculty participation in professional development activities since its inaugural teaching and learning center opened in 2012. At the beginning of this dissertation, an exploratory literature review identified factors contributing to low rates of faculty participation in professional development activities and found that adjunct faculty frequently face barriers to accessing institutional resources and communicating with their teaching peers. Additionally, the literature revealed that quality professional development training requires faculty participation in an ongoing and collaborative practice with teaching peers. The subsequent needs assessment study confirmed faculty members’ sense of isolation at SVA and their desire to have greater access to convene with fellow faculty members. Participants in the study contributed their diminished community access to the college’s organizational culture which is influenced by employing an all-adjunct faculty and a sprawling urban campus. The adjunct status of faculty members means they are only compensated for time in the classroom, making it difficult to dedicate additional hours to SVA activities that potentially take time away from other paid work. The college’s disjointed campus makes it difficult for faculty to convene, even for brief encounters, which exacerbates the challenge of connecting as a community. The college now faces the mass retirement of its experienced faculty members and the need to engage the faculty community in professional development and knowledge-sharing activities has become more urgent. Developing a virtual community space for faculty provides proximity to teaching peers, but such an intervention is insufficient without addressing the cultural barriers that SVA faculty face. It has been reported that Peter Drucker once said culture eats strategy for breakfast. While, to my knowledge, this quote has not been confirmed, the literature is replete with discussions about the importance of
organizational culture and how “changing culture is a difficult and long-term effort” (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 101). An intervention to disrupt organizational culture does not fit within the timespan of a doctoral program nor can it be controlled by any individual. However, drawing from the intervention literature review in Chapter Three, I can offer a beginning.

The current chapter presents an intervention plan that utilizes a participatory design approach to engage SVA faculty members in the co-design of a virtual faculty common. Incorporating principles from self-determination theory into participatory design processes will enable the transformation of SVA’s professional development programming at a foundational level and initiate cascading effects to support faculty engagement and empowerment. Finding new and improved methods to promote engagement around shared learning, collaboration, and innovation in the workplace is a challenge faced by organizations large and small, and higher education is no exception. The challenge is not simply about improving how we manage constant reskilling, but empowering workers to contribute to the co-creation of new knowledge as well as to better advocate for their needs. Solving this dilemma in higher education is perhaps doubly important as faculty are encouraged to reexamine didactic approaches and adopt new pedagogies that encourage students’ active learning and cocreation of new knowledge (Thomas & Brown, 2011). For today’s teachers to effectively teach in this way, faculty professional development needs to model what this looks like (Brookfield, 2015).

Only through the authentic voices of community members can a healthy community of practice be established. When attempting to shift organizational culture, adaptive leadership literature highlights the need to activate participation across an entire organization to manage sweeping changes, and cautions individuals against presuming they can solve such challenges in isolation (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). “By trying to solve an adaptive challenge for people, at best
you will reconfigure it as a technical problem and create short-term relief. But the issue will not have gone away” (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p.70). Through this perspective, only by empowering faculty to define and co-develop pathways to their own learning will the challenges of driving engagement and knowledge sharing be resolved. Setting the stage for change involves “a blend of ingenuity in marshalling available economic resources and sensitivity on how opportunities are designed to be made continuously relevant to others” (Holt, 2008, p. 61). Holt (2008) recognized that when doing the work of reorganizing processes and resources, it is necessary to select a path for change that suits the ingrained culture of the people, organization, and available resources.

The participatory design approach provides an apt process to engage the expertise of SVA faculty, as both creative professionals and educators, to develop digital conduits for channeling their collective knowledge to support an active faculty learning community and establish a persistent source of institutional knowledge. Taking a participatory approach also aligns with a greater change happening in the world, a paradigm shift, in which the perspectives of workers are increasingly recognized as the essential glue that keeps the machine running and there is an upswell of readiness to reinvent our working lives. Hamel & Zanini (2014) recognized a mismatch between the pace of change across the business landscape and the structure of organizations to adapt to new demands. The authors argue that three assumptions conspire to diminish institutional change efforts: change is envisioned by leadership, change is administered to stakeholders, and change can be engineered or managed. While many leaders struggle to adapt to what it means to lead in this new era, the authors recommend that to drive organizational change it is better to build a platform than a program (Hamel & Zanini, 2014). In this spirit, the
transformation of professional development programming at SVA will be initiated through utilizing a participatory design process to develop the college’s new virtual faculty common.

**Conceptual Framework**

The following intervention plan utilizes Stufflebeam’s (2003) context, input, process, and product (CIPP) evaluation model. Developed by Daniel Stufflebeam in the 1960s, the CIPP model is widely used for evaluating and assessing programs, project, and policies (Stufflebeam, 2003). The participatory design (PD) approach shares important principles with the evaluation and improvement sciences, as well as other theories that emphasize active involvement, collaboration, and empowerment of individuals or communities in decision-making processes. For example, PD views existing social systems through a lens of inquiry to guide incremental change and ensure stakeholders’ voices inform iterative design and development processes (Bannon & Ehn, 2012; Greenbaum & Loi, 2012; Smith et al., 2017). Similarly, improvement science has been defined as a “data-driven change process that aims to systematically design, test, implement, and scale change toward systemic improvement, as informed and defined by the experience and knowledge of subject matter experts” (Christie et al., 2017, p. 25). To learn as a community, improvement scientists consider it essential to share a common language to identify goals and resources and to measure outcomes (Bryk et al., 2017; Rossi et al., 2019).

Additionally, Zimmerman (2000) argued that taking “An empowerment orientation also suggests that community participants have an active role in the change process, not only for implementing a project, but also in setting the agenda” (p. 45).

Despite the many overlapping themes, participatory design lacks a cogent evaluation framework such is commonly applied in the evaluation and improvement sciences. Alternatively, the CIPP model provides a helpful framework to guide and assess the development of
community-based projects involving multiple stakeholders, as well as to evaluate the worth of the program being tested (Zhang et al., 2011). To ensure a systematic evaluation that supports transparency and accountability, the CIPP model highlights the importance of evaluating four components: the context surrounding an intervention or project, the required input for the project to be undertaken, the process for carrying out the necessary activities in the project, and finally the resulting product itself (Stufflebeam, 2003). Figure 4.1 illustrates Stufflebeam’s framework as a clear structure for evaluating the co-development of SVA’s faculty common as a new initiative to differently engage faculty around institutional professional development.

Figure 4.1

Faculty Common Development Evaluation Model

Note: Adapted from Stufflebeam, 2003, p. 33.
Faculty Common Co-Development and Evaluation Plan

The following sections present an intervention plan that involves initiating and managing a participatory design process through which faculty members from the School of Visual Arts (SVA) collaborate on developing the college’s inaugural faculty common (FC). The objective for implementing the participatory process is twofold. Firstly, initiating the co-development process provides an opportunity to test new ways of engaging with SVA faculty members around professional learning topics. Secondly, collaborating with faculty members will bring their teaching and design expertise to bear on the virtual faculty common, which will not only be an artifact of the co-design process, but the inaugural FC available for the entire faculty community. Utilizing the participatory design (PD) approach for professional development is a major break from the traditional delivery of faculty training at the School of Visual Arts. Moreover, integrating the self-determination theory (SDT) framework into the PD process provides an opportunity to train faculty members on SDT principles and test the application of SDT via an embedded action research agenda. Utilizing the CIPP model provides formative feedback to guide iterative improvements throughout the project and summative feedback to maintain accountability around the program’s return on investment.

The CIPP model’s four evaluation stages are used to outline the participatory development and implementation of the faculty common (Stufflebeam, 2003). The context evaluation in Stufflebeam’s (2003) CIPP model pertains to collecting data before the start of the project to align stakeholders around a shared vision to support the participatory design initiative as an effective path for actualizing the virtual faculty common. The input evaluation focuses on the resources and strategies that are necessary to undertake the project. Stufflebeam describes
input evaluation as helping “prescribe a course of action by which to make needed changes” (p. 44). The third area of the CIPP model is the process evaluation. This phase involves guiding, monitoring, and documenting the collaboration strategies and progress made by the participatory design team (Stufflebeam, 2003). In this stage, the project facilitator supports the integration of the SDT framework into the development process and assists in aligning the faculty vision for the FC with institutional learning goals. The final stage of the CIPP model, the product evaluation, is intended “to measure, interpret, and judge an enterprise’s achievements” (Stufflebeam, 2003, p. 50). This evaluation stage is used to determine the success of utilizing the participatory design process to co-develop SVA’s inaugural faculty common. Additionally, this final section discusses how a transparent evaluation process can be used to promote the launch of the FC and promote a culture of shared learning and action research at SVA.

Setting the Stage with Context Evaluation

The initial context evaluation phase explores to what extent implementing a participatory process for developing the virtual faculty common is relevant and achievable at SVA, and gathers the appropriate information to build a strong argument for initiating this new approach. The primary goal for context evaluation is identifying the needs of the target group to “thereby provide the criteria for setting goals and judging outcomes” (Stufflebeam, 2003, p. 39). Reviewing extant institutional documents such as self-studies and strategic plans is helpful in assessing the vitality and needs of the faculty community in broad brushstrokes. The context-related documentation can also be used to identify risks related to the FC implementation plan. For example, the risk of faculty non-participation in the faculty common is recognized based on the past participation rates of faculty members in SVA-hosted events. Institutional documents provide a comprehensive view of historical trends that may have been affected by the
governance, financial, and/or communication structures within the institution. However, administering internal surveys and interviewing faculty members is a better way to understand the lived experiences of faculty members. Additionally, conducting surveys and interviews helps administrators to check their own assumptions about where faculty needs lie, and provides the opportunity to identify faculty members who are interested in participating in institutional change efforts or have other characteristics that make them good candidates for the participatory design project. In relation to the faculty common project, the context evaluation was completed through the needs assessment study described in Chapter Two and the subsequent intervention literature review in Chapter Three. However, in hindsight, the questionnaire employed in the needs assessment study would have benefited from incorporating a scale to assess the basic psychological needs (BPN) fulfillment of SVA faculty members. This data would provide a BPN baseline for the college’s faculty population that could be used for longitudinal comparison. Finally, during the context phase, it is important to consider existing resources within the institution that could be utilized or adapted to support faculty engagement and knowledge sharing. Altogether, the context evaluation supports a persuasive vision for the FC that can be used to elicit the necessary support from upper management.

**Identifying Institutional Allies**

The context evaluation phase is used to raise stakeholders’ awareness and align thinking on how to address organizational challenges (Stufflebeam, 2003). Context evaluation, like the participatory design process, prioritizes collecting data from an array of stakeholders to identify issues that need to be addressed throughout the shared system (Gregory, 2003; Stufflebeam, 2003). Informal data collection with work colleagues can support the essential step of garnering support for the project, but must be initiated with caution. Listening to colleagues’ perspectives
about the problem being addressed can provide new insights and also reveal allies with similar goals, who may be willing to contribute institutional resources and talent for the project. Garnering support from academic department chairs and other relevant administrative offices can be helpful to compel institutional leaders to approve the project proposal. However, listening to a diverse array of perspectives can also reveal institutional players who are likely to stand in the way of the planned intervention, even if only to defend the institutional status quo (Battilana et al., 2009). It is helpful to identify risks that were not apparent through the review of institutional documents, but also important to control the amount of information shared about the intervention before approval is received from the respective authority.

**Establishing a Shared Vision with Institutional Leaders**

Securing support from institutional leaders is pivotal for ensuring access to the essential resources needed for the project, effectively promoting the faculty common from a position of influence, and fostering active engagement from various departments and offices. As illustrated in Chapter Three, the conduct of institutional leaders significantly shapes employees’ perceptions of shared leadership in their professional context and influences their own knowledge sharing behavior (Coun et al., 2018; Eyal & Roth, 2010; Zboralski, 2009). Messages that endorse faculty visits to the new FC are received differently when conveyed by college leadership compared to academic support offices, a point articulated by Levin (2013), who emphasized that it is possible to initiate changes without such support, “but not to sustain them or for them to be effective” (p. 7). Acknowledging the existing power dynamics and political agendas within the administration is crucial before aligning the project’s vision with the college’s strategic plan (Smith et al., 2012). Battilana and colleagues (2009) posited that a persuasive vision should include a clear description of the problem being addressed, articulate why it is superior over existing
arrangements, and present compelling reasons driving the proposal. In addition, it is essential to provide pertinent data to substantiate these reasons, as it is not uncommon for upper management to make decisions without recognizing “valuable information about trends and opportunities observed by others in the organization” (Brown & Cornwall, 2000, p. 17).

SVA’s upper management places a strong emphasis on the enhancement of the student learning experience and the engagement of faculty as rationales for the faculty common project. Therefore, it is imperative to articulate a compelling case that underscores the necessity of revamping the college’s outdated approach to faculty training as an initial step toward achieving these objectives. As previously discussed, empirical research highlights the need for faculty to have access to collaborative and action-based professional development opportunities in order to effect change in classroom practices (Bayar, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2009, 2011). Consequently, driving faculty engagement and participation in professional development activities is the interim goal for supporting student learning. To this end, the combination of the participatory design approach and self-determination theory to engage and motivate faculty is strategically grounded and supported by extensive research. Furthermore, empirical research substantiates the argument that training educators in SDT principles fosters a student learning experience characterized by increased engagement, autonomous motivation, and improved test scores (Reeve, 2023; Reeve & Cheon, 2021). Participation of faculty members in the co-development of strategies and activities to inform online learning serves multiple purposes. It equips them to improve the delivery of online education for their own students, augments the instructional design team’s understanding of nuances specific to visual arts education in online courses, and contributes to the team’s collective intelligence for pushing the boundaries of online learning beyond the confines of the traditional learning management system.
Moreover, the FC plan aligns with institutional improvement endeavors by introducing new mechanisms for SVA to embrace data-driven decision-making processes. Establishing avenues within FC to collect academic-related data will provide critical support to institutional leaders as they navigate the ongoing transformations in higher education. Finally, the creation of a repository for faculty feedback on teaching strategies and methods for addressing classroom challenges will further enrich the college’s onboarding resources for the anticipated influx of new faculty members.

Convening the Faculty Common Development Team

Stufflebeam’s (2003) second phase, the input evaluation, focuses on the resources and strategies necessary “to help prescribe a course of action by which to make needed changes” (Stufflebeam, 2003, p. 44). Stufflebeam suggested utilizing sources such as relevant literature, expert consultation, and web searches to inform the input evaluation. For the FC development project, the input evaluation addresses participant recruitment and the expectations for participation. Additionally, the input evaluation establishes a budget and time frame for the project. While most FC decisions will be made through a participatory process, it is necessary for the facilitator to anticipate the needs of the group, plan for the procurement of resources, and prepare options to present to the co-development team. Furthermore, in this stage, it is crucial to consider the facilitator’s role and their methods of engagement and communication with team members. The input evaluation draws upon insights from the intervention literature review (refer to Chapter Three), in conjunction with internal records at SVA.

Participant Recruitment

To revolutionize traditional professional development at SVA and position faculty members at the forefront of this transformation, an intervention must reshape the allocation of
faculty time dedicated to professional development. The college’s financial model, coupled with its strong brand identity linked to employing creative professionals, has historically hindered broadscale changes in this regard. However, the FC project offers an innovative approach—engaging a select group of faculty members, as SVA’s inaugural faculty advisory committee, to collaboratively develop the college’s new faculty common. As revealed in the needs assessment interviews (see Chapter Two), SVA faculty are primarily visual artists, many of whom prefer not to assume full-time or permanent roles as educators. Therefore, a rotating membership model will be adopted to prevent faculty overload and to address budgetary constraints. With a small, annually or biannually rotating committee, the FC project ensures a diversity of voices while avoiding undue burden on faculty members. While the initial committee is contracted for the specific purpose of co-developing the SVA faculty common, subsequent teams will choose different projects to tackle based on a growing collection of faculty feedback. The core objective is to define a fresh role for SVA faculty and utilize the inaugural FC project to create mechanisms for facilitating knowledge sharing among faculty, all the while gathering faculty feedback to inform institutional planning.

Faculty members should be purposefully selected for the inaugural participatory design (PD) committee to bring together an array of SVA faculty perspectives, while also obtaining the requisite skills for the initial project. Backup committee members should also be selected as participant turnover should be expected (Bryson & Patton, 2010). Synthesizing research on evaluation use, Bryson and Patton (2010) emphasized the importance of evaluators developing facilitation skills, including relationship-building, conflict resolution, and effective communication. It is equally valuable to identify stakeholders with genuine interest in using evaluation results and to ensure that the necessary training for participants is embedded within
the program design (Bryson & Patton, 2010). When Farooq and colleagues (2009) discussed their long-running, online community of practice for educators, they recognized that action research was integrated into their participatory design approach. The authors stated, “We assume that the end users who are scrutinized in our research and are potentially affected by our research can be, or can be qualified to become, co-researchers” (Farooq et al., 2009, p. 116). While relatively few SVA faculty members are trained in academic research, many frequently conduct research for professional assignments that run the gamut from background research to consumer behavior analysis. Identifying faculty members with these skills will be a boon to the inaugural faculty advisory committee and can help clarify training needs for future committee members. Also important in the initial committee selection process is identifying faculty members who are influential within the college and/or are known through their work as creative professionals. These individuals can aid in garnering support from upper management and serve as opinion leaders (Rogers, 2003) influencing faculty adoption of the new faculty common. In addition to faculty members, select administrative staff members (e.g., instructional designers and media specialists) will be recruited to co-develop the FC, guided by the vision of faculty members.

**Budget and Timeline**

When considering faculty participants through the input evaluation, it is important to plan for their compensation as well as any other benefits that may be received through their role in co-developing the FC. Many institutions of higher education have tightened their budgets as the post-pandemic recovery continues and SVA is no exception. Nevertheless, creative solutions can be explored to ensure the inclusion of at least five faculty members in the inaugural PD team, who will receive compensation at the base hourly rate for instructional work. For example, in my office, the operating budget that was previously allocated for catering in-person faculty
workshops is no longer needed as all faculty training has remained online since 2020. Additionally, reaching out to institutional allies identified in the context evaluation phase can provide leads for reallocating resources in support of the intervention project. Depending on the final budget available, five or more faculty members will receive contracts for 50 hours of co-design work to be conducted primarily through biweekly meetings over the course of one year. Other projected costs will be included in the preliminary budget, such as technology licenses.

**Facilitator Approach**

Throughout the participatory design process, the approach taken by the team facilitator is of the utmost importance. As discussed in Chapter Three of the current dissertation, the tone with which a participatory design facilitator addresses the working group can have a dramatic impact on participants’ receptiveness to the co-development process (Light and Akama, 2012). While a few clear expectations will be established with participants regarding the desired capabilities for the FC, the role of the facilitator is not to prescribe the final outcome. Instead, the facilitator’s objective is to model autonomy-supportive behavior, shepherd the process by tracking the evolving plans and evaluation milestones, and occasionally bridge ideas. A major goal of the FC project is to create new pathways through which SVA faculty members have greater latitude in bringing their ideas to bear on institutional planning. Therefore, for their purpose in the FC project, any additional influence the facilitator has in shaping institutional change must align with promoting the ideas generated by the college’s faculty members. If the facilitator feels the need to redirect any goals generated by the faculty PD team members, it should relate to a) recommending the group collect more data to ensure their ideas reflect the broader faculty community, or b) offering feedback about challenges the group’s ideas may face from the administration and how best to work around or compromise to achieve their goals.
Implementing the Participatory Design Process

This section aligns with Stufflebeam’s (2003) process evaluation, which provides “an ongoing check on a plan’s implementation plus documentation of the process” (p. 47). For the FC project, implementation involves initiating a participatory process to define shared goals, select technologies for the FC platform, and co-design the FC content, knowledge sharing mechanisms, and evaluation processes. It is also necessary to introduce team members to the self-determination theory early in the process and to address their comfort with incorporating SDT-aligned decisions into the FC development process. Additionally, throughout the year, team members will have opportunities to share recommendations from their classroom experiences, professional expertise, as well as any resources they have found helpful in guiding their practices. Guided by the participatory design approach, team meetings will involve developing and testing prototypes for the FC, and identifying SDT-related design elements to ensure the final product successfully meets goals for supporting users’ sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy.

Self-Determination Theory as a Call to Action

Prior to joining the participatory design (PD) team, it is crucial for participants to understand the project’s parameters and requirements. Two key elements are the integration of self-determination theory (SDT) into the design of the faculty common and the project’s timeline for its launch. However, it is important to note that the PD team maintains significant control over the final product. For instance, team members will decide how to effectively implement SDT principles into the FC design and to what extent SDT considerations will influence final design decisions. Similarly, as the project timeline may be non-negotiable, team members will discuss what deliverables are feasible within the given timeframe and prioritize essential design
elements to be in place before the FC’s launch. Nevertheless, it is essential that team members receive a clear introduction to self-determination theory and the evidence supporting SDT as a valuable driver of human wellness, performance, and motivation before diving into the planning and development of the faculty common.

Introducing faculty to the self-determination theory should happen within the initial PD team sessions. The objective of introducing SDT is not to immediately tackle the challenge of implementing the theory into a design process, but to instill a sense of its value in guiding teaching practices. This is because presenting faculty with the novel task of integrating SDT concepts into design practices may feel foreign, but sharing seemingly obvious (and well-researched) examples of integrating SDT in teaching practices will feel more relatable. Focusing on the value of incorporating SDT to promote students’ learning will support PD team members’ integrated regulation. While a multitude of studies could be discussed, taking a more conversational approach to describe the three basic psychological needs associated with SDT is likely to be more well-received by participants. At the 2023 SDT Conference, Dr. Johnmarshall Reeve discussed his decades of experience conducting longitudinal research using random control trials that tested SDT interventions in school settings. Reeve argued that to help students, teachers are the key locus for intervention as they represent the social context, the relationships where students can receive support. The scholar noted that training teachers on SDT does not take considerable time and teachers generally benefit by receiving clear examples of how the concepts can be translated into course materials and specific activities that support students’ sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy. Similarly, for PD team members, it is sufficient to recognize the evidence amassed by SDT research and disclose some of the main points drawn from SDT literature, such as the value of providing learners with opportunities to contribute to
the direction of class activities and ensuring instructor feedback identifies specific improvement strategies (Ahmadi et al., 2022). It is also helpful for SVA faculty to know that multiple studies have identified how one’s sense of autonomous motivation plays a significant role in predicting their creative output (Hon, 2012; Liu et al., 2013). Additionally, a team of scholars recently convened an international expert panel (N=34) in 2022 to develop a classification system for teacher behaviors that align with SDT principles (Ahmadi et al., 2022). The scholars argued that such classifications exist for health interventions “with detailed descriptions of SDT intervention components” (p. 11) and developing a similar classification for education would improve the implementation and replication of research studies. Table 4.1 provides a shortlist from the 57 need-supportive and need-thwarting teacher behaviors that were classified.

Table 4.1

Shortlist of Need Supportive and Need Thwarting Teacher Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Need</th>
<th>Conceptual Definition</th>
<th>Emblematic Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need Supportive Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support autonomy</td>
<td>Create an environment in which student feel volition, ownership, and self-endorsement of their learning</td>
<td>• Allow student input or choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach in students’ preferred ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support competence</td>
<td>Create an environment in which students feel capable of achieving their goals</td>
<td>• Provide optimal challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide specific feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Praise improvement or effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support relatedness</td>
<td>Create an environment in which students feel accepted, understood, and worthy of attention</td>
<td>• Show unconditional positive regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ask about students’ progress, welfare, and/or feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expressing affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controlling Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Thwart autonomy | Create an environment in which students feel pressured to conform to the teachers’ agenda | • Use pressuring language  
• Set up activities that exclude some students  
• Set pressuring deadlines |
| Thwart competence | Create an environment in which students feel incapable of achieving their goals and unsure what is expected | • Publicly present critical feedback  
• Criticize a fixed quality  
• Chaotic or absent teaching |
| Thwart relatedness | Create an environment in which students feel demeaned, rejected, ignored, or judged | • Ignore students  
• Use abusive language  
• Provide punishments or rewards unfairly  
• Yell or use a harsh tone  
• Be sarcastic |

*Note:* The table was adapted from Ahmadi et al., 2022, p. 38. The research team developed this shortlist by selecting behaviors based on mean effect ratings (greater than +2 or less than -2), plus two additional behaviors (*) to provide a clearer description of autonomy thwarting.

The final part of the SDT introduction emphasizes that, despite digital communication’s pervasive presence in various aspects of human life and its recognized impact on human wellness, efforts to design for human wellness are still in their early stages. Although SDT has seen increased usage in videogame research in recent years, literature reviews indicate that its effective implementation in research measures remains limited. Lastly, the motivation, engagement, and thriving in the user experience (METUX) model will be introduced to participants (Peters et al., 2018). The METUX model, as framed by Peters and colleagues (2018), aims “to enable technology designers to evaluate their technologies for wellbeing impact, and allow HCI researchers tools and theory upon which to improve. In this way, as a community we may iterate collectively toward a future in which all technologies are better designed to support psychological wellbeing and human potential” (p. 12). At this point, the facilitator may pause to provide space for the PD team members to respond or ask questions such as, “Do these
SDT concepts resonate with any of the work you do in the classroom or in your roles as creative professionals?” This approach to introducing SDT is deliberate, intended to guide the emerging team toward a collaborative and communal perspective, and also highlight the SDT framework as an opportunity apply their professional expertise. For instance, even though the college’s administration may have pre-approved the use of SDT in the FC design, the introduction to PD members is conveyed in an autonomy-supportive manner. Ample context is provided, controlling language is avoided, the instructors’ expertise is recognized, and perspective taking occurs (Reeve & Cheon, 2021). Moreover, presenting theory to instructors in regard to designing professional development activities can be perceived as threatening if the theory is poorly conveyed as a way to correct the practice of educators (Elliot, 1991).

**Participatory Design Meetings**

The flow and activities in the participatory design meetings draw upon insights from the intervention literature review in Chapter Three. An initial step is to set the space by using perspective taking to establish shared goals for the yearlong intervention and build consensus on the group’s approach to collaborating on the FC development (Carroll & Rosson, 2007; Greenbaum & Loi, 2012). For instance, the group critique process is common in visual arts education, so instructors likely have their own similar but nuanced approaches to conducting group critiques. Through discussion, the PD team can collectively define the approach the group will use to work collaboratively (Light & Akama, 2012). Research on evaluation use emphasizes that high-quality interactions are more important than the quantity of interactions, and specific criteria should be established for group interactions and regularly evaluated (Bryson & Patton, 2010). By employing reflection, discussion, and activities to gain participant buy-in during the early stages, the benefits of group cooperation become clearer, fostering trust among team
members (Bessant et al., 2012; Elliot, 1991). Research suggests that allocating time for team members to explore goals for the FC and shape a shared vision for the development process strengthens their commitment to the group (O’Connell et al., 2010).

The participatory design literature encourages collecting data from the broader community to inform goals and visions. Similarly, evaluation research recommends that facilitators nurture participants’ interest in using evaluation, focusing on issues relevant to those involved (Bryson & Patton, 2010). In the educational context, participants can employ surveys and contextual inquiries (e.g., classroom observations) to gather input from other SVA faculty members. Engaging the broader faculty community in the FC development process allows the faculty advisory committee to establish a presence within the community and heralds a new era of faculty leadership at SVA. These early interactions between PD team members and the broader faculty community also serve to raise awareness about the forthcoming FC (Rogers, 2003). Throughout the process evaluation, to ensure the participants’ vision for the FC aligns with institutional goals and incorporates self-determination principles, evaluation checklists are developed to maintain consistent quality assurance. Similar to the previous evaluation stages, the facilitator is responsible for documenting the group’s ongoing progress. Additionally, the facilitator plays a pivotal role in guiding discussions and presenting relevant literature to elucidate best practices for developing and sustaining online learning communities (Faroq et al., 2009). Facilitating group discussions about applying and adapting literature related to improving teacher professional development creates a forum for reflection on professional development practices. Planning discussions focused on the development of the faculty common will also require participants to reflect on their own challenges as instructors and articulate their visions for supporting the visual arts education community.
Documenting the Process

Documentation of the participatory design process will be used to identify opportunities for improvement throughout the project and for the final assessment of the project (Stufflebeam, 2003). Documentation will also serve to keep the group on track as meetings may be scheduled weeks apart. The intervention documentation process involves the collection of feedback from PD team members — faculty members, academic support staff, and the group facilitator. Figure 4.2 provides an overview of the data collection timeline.

Figure 4.2
Participatory Design Intervention: Data Collection Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating PD Intervention</th>
<th>FC Development Process</th>
<th>FC Launch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following All Team Meetings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Intervention Questionnaire</td>
<td>Critical Incident Questionnaire</td>
<td>Post-Intervention Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Self-Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitator Report and Self-Reflection. Following each team meeting the group facilitator will prepare a report that includes notes on discussion topics, comments given in group critiques, the next steps or new directions planned for the FC, as well as questions that require follow-up. The report will be circulated to all group members to check for accuracy and add comments as needed. Separate from the shared document, the group facilitator will also write a
reflection on their performance as facilitator, feedback that came up during the live meetings about the group’s process, as well as any moments of tension that arose in the group and how these were navigated. Light and Akama (2012) argued that PD research would benefit from having a clearer understanding of the practices of design facilitators and this self-reflection piece will be valuable in the final data analysis conducted at the end of the year.

**Pre- and Post-Questionnaire.** To align assessment data with the intervention goals, all participants will receive a questionnaire to complete before the first group meeting and at the end of their year-long appointment to the faculty advisory committee. The questionnaire will assess participants’ basic psychological needs (BPN) satisfaction in their work domain and their knowledge sharing behavior. Ryan’s (2006) Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Scale for the work domain (BPNSS-WORK) is used to assess team members’ BPN satisfaction (review the BPNSS-Work scale in Appendix F). Yi’s (2009) Knowledge Sharing Behavior Scale (KSBS) is used to assess knowledge sharing behavior (review the KSBS in Appendix G). Additionally, two open-ended questions (described in the Product Evaluation section below) are included in the pre- and post-questionnaires to assess team members’ expectations for participating in the Faculty Advisory Committee and FC development process.

**Critical Incident Questionnaire.** At the end of each meeting, participants will complete an adapted version of Brookfield’s (1998) critical incident questionnaire (CIQ) (review the Intervention Critical Incident Questionnaire in Appendix H). The CIQ is used to engage “practitioners in trying to discover, and research, the assumptions that frame how they work” (Brookfield, 1998, p. 197). CIQ responses, submitted anonymously, will inform improvements to the facilitator’s approach, collaboration methods, and workflows developed with the team. The facilitator reviews CIQ responses between meetings and shares them with the group at the
beginning of the following meeting for collective process improvement. Regular use of the CIQs guides ongoing evaluation of the group interactions and provides the facilitator some direction to prepare resources before each group gathering. The CIQ is widely used in education and, as with other aspects of the participatory design process, provides an opportunity for the intervention activities to model instructional practices that can feel relevant and useful to visual arts educators. As noted above, PD team members will have opportunities to share their teaching practices throughout their yearlong appointment to the faculty advisory committee. As well, the group may develop new ways to document progress. However, the facilitator reports, pre- and post-questionnaires, and regular use of CIQs will provide a solid foundation of quantitative and qualitative data to inform improvements to the FC development process and to document the intervention. Additionally, as extensive meeting notes are collected throughout the project, the qualitative data will surface the expert perspectives of faculty members and improve the college’s institutional knowledge around delivering excellence in visual arts education.

**Faculty Common Launch and Product Evaluation**

The final steps in implementing the faculty common involve developing a communication plan for college-wide promotion of the new virtual FC. Additionally, the close of the yearlong development process marks the end of the inaugural faculty advisory committee. As previously noted, the CIPP model is intended for both formative evaluations to support incremental improvements and summative evaluations that provide a retrospective view of progress made throughout the project (Stufflebeam, 2003). The current section discusses ways to incorporate the team’s learning experience into the FC’s launch promotions. Additionally, this section provides recommendations for sustaining coherence across the faculty participatory design teams as the initial group rotates out. Finally, the *product evaluation*, assesses the overall
achievements of utilizing the participatory design approach to develop SVA’s virtual faculty common.

**FC Launch Communication Strategy**

In preparation for the FC launch, the PD team will engage in the development of a comprehensive communication plan to promote the new virtual space. One notable method for members of the college’s inaugural faculty advisory committee to contribute to promotional content is by participating in recorded interviews, sharing their experiences while working on the committee. These video interviews will be featured in promotional sizzle reels to emphasize the goals of the FC launch from the faculty perspective. The adoption of new innovations is greatly influenced by the visibility of their adoption by one’s peers (Rogers, 2003). Since faculty participation in the FC is voluntary, it is vital to create promotional materials that showcase faculty members actively using and endorsing the faculty common. The overall FC communication plan will employ messaging that seeks to establish a deep emotional connection with SVA faculty members, highlighting the substantial benefits they will derive from engaging with the faculty common. The language used in promotions and incentives should be carefully crafted to support faculty members’ sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Such environmental cues play a crucial role in helping the recipients of the message integrate the requested response (e.g., visit the FC) with their personal values, resulting in more autonomous motivation to carry out the action (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Figure 4.3 illustrates the mediating role of autonomy supportive or autonomy thwarting (i.e., controlling) messages and incentives in prompting faculty members’ responses.
Sustaining Coherence Across Teams’ Visions.

Rotating memberships in the faculty advisory committee are intended to prevent overburdening faculty members and also provide more faculty members with the opportunity to step into an advisory role at the college. The transition between participant groups will involve overlapping meetings, ensuring a smooth handover between members. At the conclusion of their membership term, departing members will take part in a post-mortem session where they will share their impressions of the experience, identify successful activities, and discuss any challenges they encountered during their tenure. Furthermore, they will reflect on their initial vision and how it may have evolved throughout the process. These post-mortem sessions will be documented and shared with incoming committee members, as well as archived within the SVA Archives. With participants’ consent, selected video clips may be used in faculty training materials or to promote the faculty advisory committee and other faculty initiatives.

Product Evaluation
The product evaluation phase involves collecting and analyzing participant perspectives on the outcomes of the intervention project, both intended and unintended. Data collected for the product evaluation and the final analysis methods are described below. The main objective is to determine to what extent the product “met the needs of all the rightful beneficiaries” (Stufflebeam, 2003, p. 50). While the PD team members were the direct beneficiaries of the product as the participatory design intervention, the PD plan includes multiple points where team members interact with and potentially impact the broader SVA faculty community. Therefore, including feedback from faculty beyond the PD team is also desirable. For this purpose, the following chapter describes a faculty common impact study to assess the impact of the FC on the broader SVA faculty community. The current intervention product evaluation supports components of the process evaluation used in the subsequent impact study.

**Quantitative.** A questionnaire is administered at the beginning and end of the participatory design intervention to all faculty members in the PD team. The questionnaire includes a scale to assess respondents’ basic psychological needs satisfaction in the work context (Ryan, 2016) and respondents’ knowledge sharing behavior (Yi, 2009). The questionnaires are analyzed using descriptive statistics.

**Qualitative.** Qualitative data is collected from the PD team to supply rich descriptions of the yearlong participatory design process and avoid taking a narrow view of the process that can occur by solely collecting quantitative data (Johnson & Christensen, 2010).

**Questionnaire—Open-Ended Questions.** The pre- and post-questionnaires distributed to PD team members contain two open-ended questions inquiring about their expectations for the participatory design process and, in the post-questionnaire, to what extent their expectations were fulfilled. The following qualitative questions are analyzed using emergent coding.
Pre-Q1. What are your personal goals and expectations for joining SVA’s faculty advisory committee and participating in the co-development of the college’s new faculty common.

Pre-Q2. What are some examples of how these goals and expectations will be fulfilled through this yearlong process?

Post-Q1. Looking back on your participation in the faculty advisory committee, in what ways were your initial goals and expectations fulfilled? Please provide examples.

Post-Q2. In what ways did your goals and expectations related to the faculty advisory committee and faculty common development evolve over the past year?

**Critical Incident Questionnaire (CIQ).** The CIQs are collected from all PD team members following each team meeting. Upon conclusion of the yearlong participatory design intervention, all CIQs are analyzed using thematic coding to assess how participant engagement changed throughout the program.

**Facilitator Self-Reflection.** Following each team meeting, the facilitator writes a self-reflection about their performance as facilitator, and includes any moments of tension during the meeting that required their attention. Upon conclusion of the participatory design intervention, all facilitator reflections are analyzed using emergent coding.

**Conclusion**

The School of Visual Arts (SVA) has contended with low levels of communication between faculty members for decades but has continued to maintain its status as a successful international visual arts college. However, the college faces a mass retirement of faculty members and has virtually no documentation to reflect its collective 76 years of institutional knowledge. When the college’s master visual arts educators are gone, much of their decades of
experience will be gone as well. Therefore, the intervention plan described in Chapter Four re-
envision faculty professional development practices by bringing faculty members together as
collaborators to develop an inaugural faculty common. Using the participatory design (PD)
intervention to initiate a new faculty advisory committee is an important step to ensure that
faculty members begin to have clear pathways for delivering their feedback to the administration.
Additionally, through close collaboration with academic support teams in the administration, the
committee can improve institutional communication to faculty members to develop greater
transparency around academic data and improve pedagogical practices. Using the CIPP
evaluation model, the intervention plan outlines data collection through each of the four phases:
context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, and product evaluation (Stufflebeam,
2003). Each phase of data collection informs iterative improvements to the intervention and
supports a comprehensive retrospective evaluation to maintain accountability to upper
management and help ensure future support for the faculty advisory committee.

While engaging in a participatory design process is expected to have a positive impact on
the direct participants and set the stage for future committees to benefit from similar processes,
the number of faculty participants is quite small compared to the overall SVA faculty population.
Therefore, the design mission of the inaugural committee’s yearlong appointment is to
collaboratively produce a virtual faculty common (FC) to support sustained interaction across the
faculty community. The development and promotion of the FC from the faculty perspective
provides opportunities to drive engagement by using faculty opinion leaders to enhance the FC’s
initial attraction for the broader faculty population. Additionally, incorporating principles from
the self-determination theory (SDT) ensures that the content and activities embedded in the FC
provide positive representations of visual arts educators, opportunities for faculty members to
engage in reflection and discussion about their roles as artists and educators, and enables faculty participants to choose how to engage with an array of activities. The goal of integrating SDT in the design of the FC is twofold. Firstly, to promote faculty engagement and long-term motivation by fostering integrated regulation, where users feel a deep sense of connection between their values and the activities they perform on the platform. Secondly, to inform the methodology for evaluating the impact of the FC on the broader faculty community. The ultimate goal discussed throughout this dissertation is driving faculty knowledge sharing to support a healthy community of practice (CoP). A thriving CoP is marked by members’ sense of belonging and fulfilment in exchanging knowledge around their shared practice (Lave & Wenger, 1999). Through the SDT lens, the degree to which community members thrive is mediated by the satisfaction of their basic psychological needs (i.e., sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy) (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The following chapter presents a research design to test this hypothesis.
Chapter Five: Assessing the Impact of the Faculty Common

Drawing from the foundational insights presented in the intervention literature review, Chapter Four detailed an intervention plan grounded in the participatory design approach and self-determination theory. The intervention plan outlined the development process for a virtual faculty common (FC) at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). Expressly designing roles for key faculty members and utilizing the participatory design (PD) approach in the development process ensures the platform is created through the authentic vision of faculty members. Through the PD process, faculty members participate in collecting and reviewing institutional data, articulating a vision for the FC, and contributing to the content and interactions embedded in the FC, as well as the promotional material. While SVA faculty members have been compensated for one-off college projects in the past, the intervention plan is different in that the faculty perspective directly informs a product, the FC, that serves as a platform for ongoing engagement of faculty members in discussion and decision making about institutional professional development. Finally, utilizing the self-determination theory (SDT) to inform the FC development process integrates autonomy, competence, and relatedness supportive messaging throughout the experience. The ensuing FC product establishes a community-driven model for professional development that is oriented towards bolstering faculty motivation, fostering a heightened sense of inclusion, and increasing instructional self-efficacy among the faculty community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The present chapter presents the research design for a faculty common impact study to test this hypothesis.

While research suggests that well-developed faculty learning communities positively affect both teaching practices and student learning outcomes, Vescio and colleagues (2008) found “few studies move beyond self-reports of positive impact” (p. 80) and the empirical
studies available are predominantly qualitative. While the largely qualitative data is helpful to elucidate the experiences of individual participants, it fails to deliver compelling generalizable evidence (Creswell et al., 2011; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Teddlie & Tasakkori, 2003, 2009). To address this gap in the literature, there is a need for more quantitative data to “document changes in teachers’ perceptions of the professional culture of the school” (Vescio et al., 2009, p. 90). The literature reviewed in Chapter Three provided evidence suggesting that the satisfaction of basic psychological needs will impact faculty members’ knowledge sharing behavior, engagement, and overall performance. Therefore, the following FC impact study assesses how access to the FC impacts faculty members’ basic psychological needs satisfaction, perceptions of the SVA community of practice, and their knowledge sharing behavior. The study design is informed by SDT’s motivation, engagement, and thriving in the user experience (METUX) model to align the intervention with the methodology used to measure its impact.

The faculty common impact study addresses the following research questions (See the data collection and analysis matrix in Appendix I).

RQ1. Reach: To what extent did the college’s faculty receive communications and resources necessary for accessing the faculty common?

RQ2. Adherence: To what extent does the implementation of products and activities adhere to the faculty common design plan?

RQ3. Fidelity of Implementation (Participant Responsiveness): To what extent are faculty engaged in the faculty common?

RQ4. To what extent are faculty autonomously motivated to initially access the faculty common?
RQ5. To what extent does initial interaction in the FC support basic psychological needs satisfaction (BPNS)?

RQ6. To what extent does engaging in knowledge-sharing tasks in the FC support BPNS?

RQ7. To what extent does engaging in the FC improve faculty members’ BPNS and knowledge sharing behavior in their work environment?

**Research Design**

The study uses a convergent mixed methods design to determine how access to the faculty common (FC), a virtual professional learning community, improves faculty members’ basic psychological needs satisfaction and promotes knowledge sharing and participation in professional development activities. The mixed methods approach collects and analyzes qualitative and quantitative data separately and then compares and interprets areas of convergence and/or divergence in the findings (Creswell & Clark, 2018). The value of mixed methods is “that integration of quantitative and qualitative data maximizes the strengths and minimizes the weaknesses of each type of data” (Creswell et al., 2011, p. 5). For example, while qualitative data will elucidate the experiences of faculty interaction in the FC, the quantitative data will yield numeric data describing faculty participation trends, psychological needs satisfaction, and comparing relationships among variables, such as gender and ethnic background, as well as teaching experience in specific academic departments (Creswell et al., 2011). Using a mixed methods approach also tends to improve validity of the study design by creating opportunities to triangulate findings from multiple sources (Smith et al., 2016). This mixed methods approach reflects the pragmatic research paradigm which employs “the combination of methods and ideas that helps one best frame, address, and provide tentative answers to one’s research question[s]” (Johnson et al., 2007, p. 112).
Theory of Treatment

The theory of treatment guides the overall approach to addressing the low rates of faculty engagement and knowledge sharing at SVA. Rossi and colleagues (2019) described program theories developed in the early planning stages of a new program as being formed from a researcher’s prior practice as well as drawn from research in the social sciences. Grounding research methods in a program theory, or theory of treatment, improves causal inferences and supports both the internal and external validity of the study (Cronbach, 1982; Leviton & Lipsey, 2007; Rossi et al., 2019). Additionally, Leviton and Lipsey (2007) discussed the importance of researchers considering an array of theories to base their “research design on relevant constructs and variables” (Leviton & Lipsey, 2007, p. 27), thereby improving the program’s effectiveness.

The theory of treatment for the current dissertation draws from the community of practice literature, the participatory design approach, and self-determination theory. Throughout this dissertation, the two literature reviews and the needs assessment study were guided by the end goal of supporting a healthy faculty community of practice (CoP), in which SVA faculty members participate in knowledge-sharing activities around improving their practice as educators (Lave & Wenger, 1999). Findings from literature reviews and needs assessment study informed the intervention plan detailed in Chapter Four. The intervention plan utilizes the participatory design framework and self-determination theory for the development and implementation of a faculty common as a faculty hub designed to enhance and sustain faculty motivation and engagement in the community. Table 5.1 outlines the necessary inputs, activities, products, and outputs required for the FC development intervention.
Table 5.1

**Required Components of the Intervention Development Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitator/staff members coordinate PD process and FC updates</td>
<td>• Early adopter and influencer faculty participate in FC promotions</td>
<td>• An array of embedded activities and resources</td>
<td>• Community hub to facilitate faculty interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SVA finances maintenance of FC, promotion costs, and stipends for PD team</td>
<td>• Incentive activities to draw faculty into FC on launch date</td>
<td>• Mechanisms for knowledge sharing</td>
<td>• Faculty-led PD activities embedded in FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FC events for synchronous interaction</td>
<td>• Feedback forums</td>
<td>• Faculty feedback collected to improve institutional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Embedded media representing excellence in visual arts education</td>
<td>• Faculty familiarity using interactive/spatial learning environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final treatment plan is developed based on an *articulated program theory* to illustrate causal relationships between the FC intervention and the outcomes measured in the current impact study (Weiss, 1997). Delineating the required inputs (e.g., participants and resources) and aligning the development processes to the desired intervention (FC) outcomes is a necessary step before planning appropriate evaluative measures (Holliday, 2014). The logic model, illustrated in Figure 5.1, aligns the required components of the intervention development process with the desired outcomes measured through the impact study (Weiss, 1997). Additionally, the logic model supports the research design as the specified activities provide apt points in the treatment for data collection to evaluate both the intervention processes and eventual outcomes.
Figure 5.1

Logic Model Aligning the Participatory Design Intervention and Faculty Common Impact Study

[Diagram showing various stages of the logic model, including Total start-up costs, Total operational costs, Resources, Implementation of PD process, Quality of implementation fidelity, Participatory design approach, SDT integration, Alignment of faculty vision and institutional goals, Production of SVA Faculty Common Development (platform, content, activities), PD team data collection processes/word of mouth, Promotions produced by PD team/administration, Reach (community awareness incl. faculty, institutional leaders, academic support staff), For all program elements, and How do contextual factors such as the college/faculty culture and leadership approaches affect implementation, reach, outcomes?]
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Figure 5.1

Logic Model Aligning the Participatory Design Intervention and Faculty Common Impact Study (cont’d)

- Changes in faculty members?
  - Recognition that faculty feedback is value by the institution?
  - Increased exposure to teaching peers & media portraying visual arts educators?
  - Familiarity with a range of choices for interacting in FC?
  - Greater awareness of visual arts educators’ practice and needs?

- Changes in academic support staff, e.g., instructional designers?

- Changes in institutional leaders?

- Changes in students?

**Short-Term**

- Supported sense of competence?
- Supported sense of relatedness?
- Supported sense of autonomy?

**Intermediate**

- Increased interaction/contributions to discussions about teaching practices?
- Increased collaboration with fellow faculty?
- Increased feedback given to guide institutional improvements?

**Distal**

- Increased instructional self-efficacy
- Increased sense of belonging in SVA CoP
- Increased curiosity/motivation to contribute to shared learning and professional development

Future opportunities to investigate connections between faculty behaviors and changes in students' learning experiences
Research Questions

The research questions address both the process and outcome evaluations. The process evaluation focuses on three evaluation components (reach, implementation adherence, and participant responsiveness) that are addressed in research questions 1 through 3. The outcome evaluation is closely aligned with the theory of treatment, and specifically self-determination theory, to not only gauge the effectiveness of the faculty common, but also gain insight into the persistent barriers to participation that faculty experience. Answering these questions will help inform “the characteristics of the online community that serve to retain and sustain faculty membership” (Luo et al., 2020, p. 1678).

Process Evaluation

The following process evaluation questions focus on three evaluation components: reach, adherence to the treatment implementation plan, and fidelity of implementation via participants’ responsiveness. The process evaluation is performed by analyzing concrete observations of faculty behavior (e.g., opening an email message) as well as direct participant feedback (e.g., faculty entries in discussion forums). The direct participant feedback (quantitative and qualitative data) ensures that faculty voices are integrated into the ongoing process evaluation and will provide greater context for the evaluation (Creswell et al., 2011; Rossi et al., 2019). The Process Evaluation Data Collection Matrix (Table 5.2) provides an overview of the process evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, data collection tools, and frequency of data collection. Each process evaluation question and its corresponding indicator is addressed below.

RQ1. Reach: To what extent did faculty receive communications and resources necessary for accessing the faculty common?
RQ2. Adherence: To what extent does the implementation of products and activities adhere to the faculty common design plan?

RQ3. Participant Responsiveness: To what extent are faculty engaged in the faculty common?

**RQ1. Reach**

The primary goal of the FC is to improve faculty engagement within a community of practice, and the first step is to ensure access. One of the documented barriers for SVA faculty to access the faculty CoP is related to the limited attention and availability of fully adjunct faculty who often work full-time in roles outside of formal education (School of Visual Arts, 2016). Therefore, evaluating *reach* will be valuable to determine if faculty are receiving messages from the college that promote the new faculty common as a resource and opportunity for engagement. Baranowski and Stables (2000) described *reach* as the extent to which programs contact the target group or communication was received by the targeted group. In the current study, faculty access will be measured by collecting and analyzing quantitative data collected from the email delivery system, myEmma. The indicators for reach are the extent to which faculty opened communications announcing the launch of the faculty common and then clicked links to access the FC.

**RQ2. Implementation Adherence to Project Design**

Thoughtful promotion is critical to motivate faculty to initially access the faculty common, but the careful design and development of the FC is intended to drive ongoing faculty engagement (Shaw et al., 2018). Dusenbury and colleagues’ (2003) discussed measuring the *fidelity of implementation adherence* by the extent to which a program is implemented as intended by the program developers. Data collected in the process evaluation stage of the
intervention study (see Chapter Four) similarly used Stufflebeam’s (2003) CIPP model to assess the degree to which the faculty common and related promotional communications were developed to a) meet the shared goals of faculty members, b) address alignment with institutional goals, and c) integrate principles from self-determination theory. These prior findings are important to include in framing the process evaluation for the faculty common impact study. To address adherence to the project design, the question is posed: To what extent does the implementation of FC-based products, activities, and communications adhere to the faculty common design plan? Adherence to the project design is measured quantitatively by the PD team using checklists and a Likert scale-based evaluation form to assess the degree to which the products and activities within the FC were designed and implemented as planned.

**RQ3. Participant Responsiveness**

To assess participant responsiveness as a dimension of the fidelity of the project implementation, the question is posed: To what extent are faculty engaged in the faculty common? Dusenbury and colleagues (2003) defined participant responsiveness as “ratings of the extent to which participants are engaged by and involved in the activities and content of the program” (p. 244). For the FC impact study, faculty engagement will be assessed via quantitative analysis of faculty feedback collected through interactive elements embedded in the faculty common and related to the products and activities outlined in the logic model. In this way, the logic model informs the research methodology and facilitates mapping data to specific products or activities in the logic model (Holliday, 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Process Evaluation Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool(s) / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach: Did the college’s faculty receive promotional communications and resources necessary to access the faculty common?</td>
<td>Extent to which faculty received essential communications leading up to and announcing the launch of the faculty common, and their ability to access the FC.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>myEmma data analysis dashboard / Automated continuous collection from the initial email announcing the FC launch to the FC launch date (approximately 6 weeks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Adherence: To what extent does the implementation of FC-based products, activities, and communications adhere to the faculty common design plan?</td>
<td>The degree to which the products and activities within the FC and the promotional messaging and incentives aligned with the faculty vision, institutional goals, and integrated SDT principles.</td>
<td>PD team members (faculty and staff members)</td>
<td>Observations by PD team members supported by checklists and Likert-scale evaluation forms created during the yearlong development phase / Ongoing throughout PD process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Responsiveness: To what extent are faculty engaged in the faculty common?</td>
<td>Faculty members access the FC, submit feedback in the FC, and participate in activities in the FC.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Interactive elements embedded in the FC collect activity/responses from participants, e.g., forms and digital whiteboards / Ongoing throughout impact assessment study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome Evaluation

Using Peters and colleagues’ (2018) motivation, engagement, and thriving in user experience (METUX) model as a guide, the outcome evaluation design collects qualitative and quantitative data from participants via the study enrollment form and submission of weekly questionnaires delivered via web-based forms. To benefit from the mixed methods approach, appropriate timing will be used to collect different data and ensure the integration of data at multiple points throughout the study (Mertens, 2018). For example, the data collected in the enrollment form will obtain consent from participants and collect demographic information, while the data collected during the first week questionnaire focuses on participants’ initial impressions of the user experience, such as how easy or difficult it is to navigate within the FC. Each week of the core four weeks of the study and again at the 15-weeks and 32-weeks points, a questionnaire is shared with participants that includes qualitative question prompts to elicit feedback about their unique experiences and impressions. While the data collected at different stages focuses on different levels of attention to the participant experience, they all investigate how interactions in the FC contribute to the fulfillment or thwarting of basic psychological needs, hypothesized as the mediating variable affecting faculty engagement and knowledge sharing behavior. The outcome evaluation data collection matrix (Table 5.3) provides an overview of the outcome evaluation questions, measures, data sources, data collection tools, and frequency of data collection. The following outcome evaluation questions and their corresponding constructs and measures are outlined in the Outcome Evaluation Matrix (see Table 5.3).

RQ4. To what extent are faculty autonomously motivated to initially access the faculty common?
RQ5. To what extent does initial interaction in the FC support basic psychological needs satisfaction (BPNS)?

RQ6. To what extent does engaging in knowledge-sharing tasks in the FC support BPNS?

RQ7. To what extent does engaging in the FC improve faculty members’ BPNS and knowledge sharing behavior in their work environment?
Table 5.3

Outcome Evaluation Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ4. To what extent are faculty autonomously motivated to initially access the faculty common?</td>
<td>Self-regulation (e.g., identified, introjected) impacts the degree to which faculty feel autonomously motivated to access the FC.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>• ACTA (Peters et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CIQ (Brookfield, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ5. To what extent does initial interaction in the FC support basic psychological needs satisfaction (BPNS)?</td>
<td>BPNS experienced through faculty members’ mastery of the FC interface impacts their levels of engagement and enjoyment.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>• TENS-Interface (Peters et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CIQ (Brookfield, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ6. To what extent does engagement in knowledge-sharing tasks in the FC support BPNS?</td>
<td>BPNS experienced through faculty members’ knowledge-sharing activity in the FC impacts their levels of engagement and enjoyment.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>• TENS-Task (Peters et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CIQ (Brookfield, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ7. To what extent does engaging in the FC improve faculty members’ BPNS and knowledge sharing behavior in their work environment?</td>
<td>BPNS experienced through faculty interactions in the FC impacts their engagement and enjoyment in the work domain</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>• BPNS-Work (Ryan, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• KSBS (Yi, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TENS-Life (Peters et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CIQ (Brookfield, 1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

The following sections describe the participants, measures and instrumentation, procedures, intervention components, data collection and analyses, as well as the limitations and strengths of the study design.

Participants

The population addressed in this study is faculty members at the School of Visual Arts (SVA) and all selected participants are adjunct faculty currently teaching at SVA. Convenience sampling, a form of non-probability sampling, will be used and an invitation to participate in the study shared with all SVA faculty members (approximately 800 per semester). The invitation to participate will include details about the study and explain informed consent language (see the Faculty Common Impact Study Enrollment Form in Appendix J). Completed questionnaires from all faculty who choose to enroll in the study will be included in the quantitative analysis described below. Purposeful sampling, another form of non-probability sampling, will be used to select a subsection of participants based on specific characteristics for inclusion in the qualitative data analysis described below (Lochmiller & Lester, 2015). Based on the demographical information collected in the study enrollment form, purposeful sampling will be used to maximize the representation of participants in alignment with the college’s overall faculty population (e.g., academic department, gender, ethnicity). At least 75 participants are anticipated to enroll in the study. A power analysis will be conducted to determine a sufficient sample size to be able to detect a statistically significant effect if one exists.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in the intervention study are discussed below. Each instrument measures one or more of the following constructs outlined in the outcome evaluation data
collection matrix (see Table 5.3): autonomous motivation, sense of competence, sense of relatedness, sense of autonomy, and knowledge-sharing behavior. The instrumentation follows guidelines developed through the METUX model (Peters et al., 2018), including the use of three Technology-based Experience of Needs Satisfaction (TENS) scales.

**BPNSS-Work Scale**

The quantitative Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Scale was adapted for use in the work domain by Richard Ryan (2016). BPNSS-Work gauges participants’ basic psychological needs satisfaction using 24 items that address respondents’ sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy. An example of an adapted item is, “I have felt initiative and choice in the things I am undertaking in the FC.” BPNSS-Work can be reviewed in Appendix F.

**KSBS.** Yi’s (2009) Knowledge Sharing Behavior Scale (KSBS) collects quantitative data to assess participants’ current knowledge sharing behavior and includes four subscales: Written Contributions (five items), Organizational Communication (eight items), Personal Interactions (seven items), and Communities of Practice (seven items). The scale was adapted for use with SVA faculty and can be reviewed in Appendix G.

**ACTA.** The quantitative Autonomy and Competence in Technology Adoption (ACTA) scale was developed by Peters et al. (2018) to accompany application of the motivation, engagement, and thriving in the user experience (METUX) model. ACTA assesses the degree to which participants’ initial engagement with the faculty common was autonomously motivated. The adapted ACTA scale can be reviewed in Appendix K.

**CIQ.** Brookfield’s (1998) qualitative Critical Incident Questionnaire (CIQ) was adapted for use in the faculty common impact study (review the adapted CIQ in Appendix L). The CIQ asks four questions prompting individuals to reflect on the experiences they found most engaging
or distancing when interacting in the faculty common. The adapted version also incorporates two quantitative questions to assess participants’ self-reported frequency of visits to the FC and the length of time they spend in the FC.

**TENS-Interface.** The TENS-Interface scale was developed by Peters et al. (2018) to accompany application of the METUX model and includes three subscales (competency, relatedness, autonomy) with five questions in each. An example of an adapted item is, “I found the faculty common interface and navigation controls confusing.” The adapted TENS-Interface scale can be reviewed in Appendix M.

**TENS-Task.** The TENS-Task scale was developed by Peters et al. (2018) to accompany application of the METUX model and includes three subscales (competence, autonomy, relatedness) each with four items. An example item is, “I find sharing comments too challenging in the faculty common discussion forums.” The adapted TENS-Task scale can be reviewed in Appendix N.

**TENS-Life.** The TENS-Life scale was developed by Peters et al. (2018) to accompany application of the METUX model and includes three subscales (competence, autonomy, relatedness). The autonomy subscale contains four items, the competence subscale contains three items, and the relatedness subscale contains three items. An example of a reverse-scored item is, “Now that I use the technology, I feel pressured to use it more often than I’d like.” The adapted TENS-Life can be viewed in Appendix O.

**Intervention Study Timeline**

The study timeline is designed to coincide with the semester system at the School of Visual Arts. The majority of interaction with study participants takes place over four weeks, with two additional questionnaires administered at week 15 and 32. Data is collected through a series
of questionnaires and the total number of hours participants are expected to spend on the questionnaires is approximately two hours. Table 5.4 presents a timeline for evaluations delivered through questionnaires. The phased approach of administering the different TENS scales is important as they each address different levels of participant attention to aspects of the FC. While the faculty common may support need-satisfying interaction at the interface level (be satisfying to use), it “may still not necessarily impact need satisfaction in relation to the behavior it’s designated to support” (Peters et al., 2018, p. 10).

Table 5.4

Timeline for Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 15</th>
<th>Week 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>TENS-Interface</td>
<td>TENS-Task</td>
<td>BPNS-Work</td>
<td>BPNS-Work</td>
<td>BPNS-Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSBS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>CIQ</td>
<td>TENS-Life</td>
<td>TENS-Life</td>
<td>TENS-Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>CIQ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA</td>
<td>KSBS</td>
<td>KSBS</td>
<td>KSBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIQ</td>
<td>CIQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures

Leading up to the launch of the faculty common (FC), promotional communications will be sent via electronic mail to all SVA faculty members announcing a synchronous kick-off event hosted in the online space. The promotions will highlight that the new FC was co-designed by SVA faculty members and members of the administration. Additionally, the communications
will describe the faculty-generated goals for the FC and include an invitation for faculty to participate in an institutional study to assess the success of the new platform. The invitation to participate in the study will include a link to a webpage that presents details about the study, explains informed consent language, and presents an online enrollment form for participation (See the Faculty Common Impact Study Enrollment Form in Appendix J). Following enrollment, participants will be contacted prior to the FC kickoff event to clarify the requirements of participation and informed consent language. Requirements of the study are to visit the FC at least once per week during the first four weeks of the study and to complete the weekly questionnaires (weeks 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, and 32). Upon the launch of the FC, the study participants will be contacted via email each week of data collection with a link to the appropriate questionnaire per the previously shared timeline for evaluations (see Table 5.4). Procedures for collecting and analyzing both the qualitative and quantitative data are described below.

Data Collection

Questionnaires are used throughout the study to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. To streamline the data collection process, all questionnaires will be shared with participants via Google Forms. Because SVA uses an institutional Google account, the forms can collect participants’ email addresses automatically to facilitate contact with participants if any questions arise about their responses, etc. However, following all data collection, all personally identifiable information will be removed from the responses and destroyed to ensure anonymity in the data analysis and presentation of findings. Participants will be emailed every week of data collection (weeks 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, and 32), with a link to the appropriate week’s questionnaire form. For example, the week 1 questionnaire contains the BPNS-Work scale, KSBS scale, and ACTA
scale. The following sections discuss data collected prior to the start of the study and during each week of the study and describe how they will be analyzed.

**Impact Study Enrollment Data Collection.** Demographical information will be collected in the study enrollment form, e.g., gender, ethnicity, and academic department (see Appendix J for all items).

**Week 1 Data Collection.** The data collected during week 1 provides the baseline for participants’ basic psychological needs satisfaction (BPNS) in their work environment and their knowledge sharing behavior. Additionally, the data addresses the degree to which participants are autonomously motivated in their initial engagement with the faculty common and the frequency and length of time they spent accessing the FC. The following scales are administered in week 1: BPNS-Work (Ryan, 2016), KSBA (Yi, 2009), ACTA (Peters et al., 2018), CIQ (Brookfield, 1998).

**Week 2 Data Collection.** In week 2 of the study, participants may still be adjusting to basic navigation within the FC. The Technology-based Experience of Needs Satisfaction-Interface (TENS-Interface) scale is introduced to assess the degree to which the user experience in the faculty common either supports or frustrates participants’ sense of competence, relatedness, and/or autonomy. The following scales are administered in week 2: TENS-Interface (Peters et al., 2018), CIQ (Brookfield, 1998).

**Week 3 Data Collection.** In week 3, participants are expected to be more familiar with the FC and the interactivity it provides. The Technology-based Experience of Needs Satisfaction-Task (TENS-Task) scale aims to assess the degree to which the interactions within the FC either support or thwart users’ basic psychological needs. The following scales are administered in week 3: TENS-Task (Peters et al., 2018), CIQ (Brookfield, 1998).
**Week 4 Data Collection.** For the final week of the core 4-week study, the Technology-based Experience of Needs Satisfaction-Life (TENS-Life) scale is introduced. The scale is intended to detect if psychological needs satisfaction experienced through interaction with a technology extends beyond the interface, task, and behavior spheres (Peters et al., 2018). For example, if the experience of seamlessly connecting with fellow instructors (interface), and using embedded tools (task) to regularly exchange information with work colleagues (behavior) could support the satisfaction of basic psychological needs that extends into the sphere of one’s overall life BPNS. The following scales are administered in week 4: TENS-Life (Peters et al., 2018), BPNS-Work (Ryan, 2016), KSBS (Yi, 2009), CIQ (Brookfield, 1998).

**Week 12 Data Collection.** The following scales are administered in week 12: TENS-Life (Peters et al., 2018), BPNS-Work (Ryan, 2016), KSBS (Yi, 2009).

**Week 32 Data Collection.** The following scales are administered in week 12: TENS-Life (Peters et al., 2018), BPNS-Work (Ryan, 2016), KSBS (Yi, 2009).

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

The quantitative data analysis will employ descriptive statistical analysis, correlation analysis, and group comparisons. Each analysis and the relevant data sets are discussed below.

**Descriptive Statistics.** Descriptive statistical analysis will be used to summarize the questionnaire results. Basic descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation will be calculated for each item across the scales. This provides an overview of the central tendency and variability of responses. Histograms will be created to visualize the distribution of responses for each scale item. This helps to see the spread of responses across the scale.

**Correlation Analysis.** Pearson’s correlation coefficients are calculated to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between two continuous variables. Pearson’s
correlation coefficients will be calculated to assess the relationship between the fulfillment of each BPN and the participants’ knowledge sharing behavior. Additionally, correlation analysis will be used to assess the relationship between the fulfillment of BPNs and the frequency of visits to the FC and/or amount of time spent in the FC (Knapp, 2018).

**Group Comparisons.** Group comparisons will be employed to compare means of dependent variables across more than two groups of study participants and determine if there is an association between the group membership and dependent variable, such as frequency of visits to the FC. The demographical data collected in the study enrollment form is essential for this analysis and will enable group comparisons based on age, gender, academic department, and length of service. ANOVA will be utilized for the group comparisons upon confirming that the data is normally distributed via visual inspection. If data is not normally distributed or the variances are not equal, a non-parametric test will be used for the comparison. The group comparisons will enable shifting the unit of analysis from general trends recognized across all faculty participants to the level of academic departments. For example, ANOVA will be performed to determine if there are significant differences in psychological need satisfaction and knowledge sharing behaviors among different academic departments.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The qualitative items included in the adapted critical incident questionnaire (CIQ) provide an opportunity for faculty members to share comments about their unique experiences interacting in the faculty common that positively and negatively contributed to their overall experience. The qualitative data will be analyzed in multiple cycles. The first cycle will employ content analysis to identify specific content or patterns related to the standards that were used to guide the faculty common design and development or (specific content or mechanisms
embedded in the FC that participants may respond to). The second cycle will employ a thematic analysis to identify recurring themes or patterns beyond the initial intentions of the FC. Both cycles involve coding and categorizing the content of the data, similar to the approach used in the prior needs assessment study.

**Strengths and Limitations**

A strength of the study is its alignment of the outcome evaluation research questions with the theory of treatment, specifically the use of the METUX-based model and corresponding scales. Data collected through the TENS scales will provide insight into how the design of the FC interface, its mechanisms for interaction, and the behaviors it promotes to users, affects the fulfillment or thwarting of participants’ basic psychological needs (Peters et al., 2018). The findings can be used to reassess the design of the FC and align adjustments with feedback from a wider collection of faculty voices. However, the predominance of quantitative data in the outcome evaluation may diminish the study’s ability to “understand processes, especially those that emerge over time, provide detailed information about setting or context, and emphasize the voices of participants through quotes” (Creswell et al., 2011, p. 4).

Another challenge that may generally arise in mixed methods studies is the contradiction of findings between the qualitative and quantitative analyses (Creswell et al., 2011). “The analytic challenge for all qualitative researchers is finding coherent descriptions and explanations that still include all of the gaps, inconsistencies, and contradictions inherent in personal and social life” (Miles et al., 2020, p. 6). Additionally, faculty self-reporting on the frequency of visits and amount of time spent weekly in the FC provides essential data to conduct the correlation analysis. It would be an improvement to the study if there were analytics available within the FC to track users’ time spent on the platform and provide more reliable data.
However, I suspect that from the faculty perspective this may feel like a layer of surveillance and could undermine the effort to foster participants’ basic psychological needs. Finally, as discussed in Chapter Three, faculty professional learning communities ideally undertake the difficult work of aligning professional development and knowledge-sharing activities with student learning-related outcomes (Dufour & Reeves, 2016). While the current study draws no direct connections to student learning and changes in faculty teaching practices related to participation in the FC are beyond the scope of this study, it is my belief that establishing a BPN-supportive interface with mechanisms for faculty members’ ongoing interaction is a necessary antecedent.

Summary and Conclusion

As public pressure for innovation in higher education mounts (Law, 2014; OECD, 2013), the demands on faculty members have increased (Bourke et al., 2018) while the number of adjunct faculty members hired to replace tenured professorships has also increased (Jolley et al., 2014; Leisyte & Dee, 2012). This dissertation examined the plight of adjunct faculty in higher education generally and explored opportunities for improving the faculty experience at one specific college, the School of Visual Arts (SVA). Chapters One and Two explored the barriers that adjunct faculty members face to accessing institutional resources, and the negative impact this exclusion has on faculty members, as well as the strategy and planning efforts in their respective institutions (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Dolan et al., 2013; Meyer, 2006). Failure to provide faculty members with access to their teaching peers significantly diminishes institutional professional development efforts as ongoing collaboration with fellow instructors is a hallmark of quality faculty professional development (Bayar, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Dede, 2006; Desimone et al., 2002). The literature reviewed opportunities to improve faculty members’ access to one another through a virtual learning community, but historically low rates of faculty
participation in SVA’s in-person activities suggest the risk of low faculty participation in an online environment. In-depth interviews with SVA faculty members provided evidence that instructors value and desire greater connection with their teaching peers and worry that the lack of access to one another negatively impacts their students’ learning experience. Interviewees noted that the culture of SVA gives them the sense that they’re on their own.

Chapter Three synthesized literature to inform intervention strategies for stimulating faculty engagement and sustaining a culture of knowledge sharing within the institutional and financial framework of SVA. Studies examining antecedents to knowledge sharing utilized the self-determination (SDT), a prominent motivation theory, which posits that the satisfaction of basic psychological needs (competence, relatedness, and autonomy) has a positive effect on individuals’ propensity to share knowledge, their workplace performance, and their overall wellness (Deci et al., 2017; Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008; Gagné & Deci, 2005; Nguyen et al., 2019; Peters et al., 2018). Furthermore, participatory design literature was investigated to inform a process for integrating the perspectives of SVA faculty members into the development of professional development training and resources (Carroll & Rosson, 2007; Greenbaum & Loi, 2012). The fundamental principles of participatory design resonate with SVA’s applied arts orientation and its ethos “to change situations, not simply study them” (Bannon & Ehn, 2012, p. 42) aligns with the objectives of the intervention. Chapter Four delineated a comprehensive intervention plan that combines SDT and participatory design (PD) methodologies to effect concrete progress in the incorporation of SVA faculty voices in professional development processes and to offer valuable insights for institutional planning. The intervention program brings select faculty members together via an inaugural faculty advisory committee, dedicated to the collaborative development and launching of the college’s new faculty common. Guided by
the motivation, engagement, and thriving in the user experience (METUX) model articulated by Peters and colleagues (2018), the design of the faculty common assimilates SDT principles to foster faculty engagement and sustain their use of the space. Ongoing data collection, overseen by the FC design team, serves to both inform the iterative development process and to provide accountability measures to ensure the continuity of the faculty advisory committee.

The current and final chapter aligns the inputs and processes involved in developing the faculty common with the overarching goal of supporting a healthy faculty community of practice in which members exchange resources to improve their shared practice as visual arts educators and gain a sense of belonging and self-efficacy (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This is a bold goal that is not expected to be achieved overnight. However, drawing from the comprehensive body of literature rooted in self-determination theory, the satisfaction of faculty members’ basic psychological needs (BPN) based on their experiences in a BPN-supportive environment (the faculty common) will mediate increased knowledge sharing and collaboration as an intermediate goal (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008). Additionally, the use of the participatory design intervention enables extensive promotion of the FC through the authentic voices of SVA faculty members. But most importantly, the development of professional development content and activities within the FC will speak to the true needs and the expertise of SVA faculty members.

While the current budget constraints in higher education add some difficulty to the initial stage of channeling resources toward the intervention plan, the task is not unsurmountable. Despite the faculty perspectives that surfaced in the needs assessment, I believe the college’s leadership places deep trust in the faculty and, with proper assurances, would support an intervention intended to improve their knowledge and overall wellness at SVA. Providing clear evidence of improvement in the areas of knowledge sharing behavior and participation in
professional development activities is essential to procure continued support for the faculty advisory committee. The process evaluation in the faculty common impact study will be supported by the data collected through the FC development process. The outcome evaluation in the impact study will be supported by the use of validated scales to assess knowledge sharing and the mediating satisfaction of basic psychological needs. The impact study provides a clear assessment of the value that faculty members gain from accessing the FC, but does not address a correlation with student learning outcomes. This should be attended to in future research. However, sustainable organizational change must first move “the hearts and minds of the people within an organization, the culture of the organization, and finally how the organization better meets its mission” (Friedlaender, 2009, p. 7). Faculty members have the greatest impact on student learning and research has shown that supporting the BPN of faculty also has significant, positive effects for student engagement and learning (Ahmadi et al., 2022, Reeve, 2023).
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Appendix A

2021 School of Visual Arts Faculty Needs Assessment Survey

Johns Hopkins University
Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB)
Research Participant Informed Consent Form

Study Title: Faculty Community of Practice Needs Assessment
Application No.: HIRB00013152

Principal Investigator: Dr. Henry Smith, Assistant Professor of Education, 6740 Alexander Bell Drive, Columbia, MD 21046, (410) 516-9774, henry.smith@jhu.edu

You are being asked to join a research study. Participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you decide to join now, you can change your mind later.

1. Research Summary (Key Information):

The information in this section is intended to be an introduction to the study only. Complete details of the study are listed in the sections below. If you are considering participation in the study, the entire document should be discussed with you before you make your final decision. You can ask questions about the study now and at any time in the future.

The goal of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of how faculty perceive their community of practice as it relates to their role as educators, their perceived identity within the community, potential barriers to faculty participation within the community, as well as what activities they believe would support or enhance their faculty community of practice (CoP).

“Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (Wenger et al., 2002, p. 4). For the purpose of this study, the community of
practice explored is the one that includes faculty members as professional educators within this particular institution.

Full participation in this independent study includes the completion of an online questionnaire and a single interview. The questionnaire asks questions about the participant’s experience as a member of the faculty community at this institution. Questions were adapted from Verburg and Andriessen's (2006) Community Assessment Toolkit. Following completion of the questionnaire, a semi-structured, one-time interview will be conducted via videoconference.

The interview will be recorded to facilitate response analysis, but all personally identifiable information will be removed from participant responses and any shared findings. All personally identifiable information will be destroyed upon final data analysis. All participant responses to the questionnaire and the interview questions will be kept confidential. Participants will incur no significant risks or costs from participation in this study.

2. Why is this research being done?

This research is being done to paint a clearer picture of the community of practice of art and design faculty working at a college in a large urban area. Faculty responses will provide insight into the beliefs instructors hold about their participation and role within the institution. This information will be valuable to help strengthen the faculty learning community and improve the alignment between community practices and institutional goals.

People with over ten years of experience teaching at SVA and who predominantly teach studio-based courses may join the study.

3. What will happen if you join this study?

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:

1) Complete an online questionnaire (10-20 minutes).
2) Use the scheduling tool provided to schedule a one-time interview with the principal researcher.

3) Participate in the interview via a recorded videoconference call (60-90 minutes).

**Video recordings:**

As part of this research, we are requesting your permission to create and use video recordings of the interview. Any video recordings or other personally identifiable information will not be used for advertising or non-study-related purposes.

You should know that:

- You may request that the video recording be stopped at any time.
- If you agree to allow the video recording and then change your mind, you may ask us to destroy that imaging/recording. If the imaging/recording has had all identifiers removed, we may not be able to do this.
- We will only use these recordings for the purposes of this research.
- The video recording will be transcribed by an outside company that has agreed to keep all data confidential.

4. **What are the risks or discomforts of the study?**

- You may get tired or bored when I am asking you questions or you are completing questionnaires. You do not have to answer any question you do not want to answer.
- There is the risk that information about you may become known to people outside this study.
- The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life.

5. **Are there benefits to being in the study?**
There is no direct benefit to you from being in this study.

6. **What are your options if you do not want to be in the study?**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate.

7. **Will you be paid if you join this study?**

No.

8. **Can you leave the study early?**

- You can agree to be in the study now and change your mind later, without any penalty or loss of benefits.
- If you wish to stop, please tell me right away.
- If you want to withdraw from the study, please email the principal researcher at jphillips@sva.edu.

9. **Why might we take you out of the study early?**

You may be taken out of the study if:

- The study is canceled.
- There may be other reasons to take you out of the study that we do not know at this time.

10. **How will the confidentiality of your data be protected?**

Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be
available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

Study records and identifiable information will be captured through email exchanges about the study, an online questionnaire, and a recorded video conference-based interview. This data will be saved to a private Google Drive via an SVA institutional account. The account will be accessed on a password-protected device in a private home office. After the initial review of the video recordings, the recordings will be transcribed and all related data (e.g. emails, survey responses, and any other data relevant to the study that may contain personally identifiable information) will be merged into a single document and de-identified. For example, code numbers will be used in lieu of participants’ names in this document to maintain the participants' confidentiality throughout the data analysis and reporting. All personally identifiable information will be destroyed upon final data analysis.

**What should you do if you have questions about the study?**

Call the principal investigator, Dr. Henry Smith at 410-516-9774. If you wish, you may contact the principal investigator by letter. The address is on page one of this consent form. If you cannot reach the principal investigator or wish to talk to someone else, call the IRB office at (410) 516-5680.

You can ask questions about this research study now or at any time during the study, by contacting the researcher working with you, Jennifer Phillips, at (212) 592-2177.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.

**What should you do if you are harmed by taking part in this study?**
If you feel that you have been harmed in any way by participating in this study, please call Dr. Henry Smith, principal investigator, at (410) 516-9774. Please also notify the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.

This study does not have any program for compensating or treating you for harm you may suffer as a result of your participation.

11. What does your proceeding with this questionnaire mean?

Your decision to proceed with this questionnaire means that: You understand the information given to you in this online form, you accept the provisions in the form, and you agree to join the study. You will not give up any legal rights by proceeding with this questionnaire.

Needs Assessment Study Questions:

* 1. I understand the information given to me in this online form, accept the provisions in the form, and agree to join the study.

Agree, Disagree

* 2. How many years have you taught at the School of Visual Arts?

(blank field)

* 3. What percentage of the courses you teach are studio-based visual arts courses?

(compared with art history, humanities and sciences etc.)

(Slider: 0%, 50%, 100% indicated)

* 4. Please enter your email address. This will be used to contact you to schedule a follow-up interview. All of your questionnaire and interview responses will remain confidential. After completion of the interview, all responses will be de-identified.

(blank field)
Community of Practice — Goals

5. How important are the following goals for you as a member of the community? That means, for you personally, how important are these as reasons to teach at SVA?

(5-point scale: Very important, Important, Moderately important, A little important, Not important)

- Hearing about new knowledge from other faculty
- Developing together new ideas for the college
- Developing standards, methods and best practices
- Making useful contacts/ networking
- Improving the level of expertise of other faculty
- Making the college more attractive for students
- Helping newcomers in the community

Community of Practice — Goals

6. How often do the following activities happen in your faculty community?

(5-point scale: Frequently, Semi-regularly, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)

- Meetings with discussions
- Presentations by faculty members
- Presentations by non-faculty members
- Workshops
- Collaborating on course plans, reports, or other publications
- Doing special projects for the college
- Brainstorming to find solutions to problems

7. To what extent would you prefer a change in the frequency in these activities?
Meetings with discussions

Presentations by faculty members

Presentations by non-faculty members

Workshops

Collaborating on course plans, reports, or other publications

Doing special projects for the college

Brainstorming to find solutions to problems

Community of Practice — Participation

8. How actively do you participate in the faculty community?

(Slider: Minimal participation, Moderate participation, Active participation indicated)

9. How often do you have contact with other faculty members outside of organized meetings?

(Slider: Never, Occasionally, Frequently indicated)

Community of Practice — Community Coordination

10. How active is the college's staff in the following activities?

(5-point scale: Very active, Active, Moderately active, A little active, Inactive)

Organizing faculty meetings

Stimulating faculty members to participate in the community

Sharing their own expertise with the faculty community

Providing opportunities for faculty leader roles (e.g., leading projects, discussions, curricular development teams, etc.)

Alerting faculty to interesting external activities (e.g., conferences)
11. How satisfied are you with the coordination of your faculty community?  
(Multiple choice: Very satisfied, Satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied)  

**Community of Practice — Information & Communication Technology**  
12. How useful do you think the following means of communication are (or might be) for your faculty community's work?  
(5-point scale: Very useful, Useful, Moderately useful, A little useful, Not useful)  
- Scheduled meetings  
- Informal encounters  
- Instant Messaging/Chat/Shared Whiteboards (application sharing systems)  
- Special discussion list / newsgroup for the community  
- Written memos or reports  
- Database or knowledge sharing tools in which you are expected to fill in your project experiences and relevant knowledge  

**Community of Practice — Institutional Support**  
13. Does the college allocate time for you to participate in the faculty community?  
(Multiple choice: A great deal, A lot, A moderate amount, A little, None at all)  
14. Overall, how encouraged do you feel by the college to participate in the faculty community?  
(Multiple choice: A great deal, A lot, A moderate amount, A little, None at all)  
15. Would you like to have more time available for activities concerning the community?  
Yes, No  

**Community of Practice — Value**
16. Which of the following ways do you find new information about solving problems and keeping up to date in your teaching practice? (Check all that apply.)

- Discussions with other faculty
- Formal training
- Student feedback
- Professional mentors
- Self-guided research
- Through the college's faculty knowledge base or other institutional information
- Other (please specify)

17. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.
(5-point scale: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

- Some knowledge is so valuable to me that I would not share it
- The most important thing that happens in our faculty community is that members find solutions to problems in their teaching
- Thanks to the combination of the different skills and views in our community, many new ideas have been developed
- People in the community are reluctant to talk about things that have gone wrong in their projects / classes
- Newcomers have much to learn before they are at the same level as the existing faculty members
- Knowledge is now so developed in the community that it can be written up for art education research, training courses etc.

**Community of Practice — Results**
18. To what extent do you think faculty members:

(5-point scale: Completely, A lot, Moderately, A little, Not at all)
- Trust each other
- Feel a sense of loyalty to the community
- Have a good common understanding
- Feel a sense of belonging to the community
- 19. To what extent do you think the faculty community has:
- (5-point scale: A great deal, A lot, A moderate amount, A little, Not at all)
- Made a real contribution to the effectiveness of the organization
- Contributed to developing new methods or approaches for the organization
- Contributed to the documentation of information, such as knowledge systems, training guides, or best practices
- A good reputation in the organization
- Reluctance to share their knowledge with other faculty members

20. To what extent do you think faculty are generally very enthusiastic and motivated to participate?

(5-point scale: A great deal, A lot, A moderate amount, A little, Not at all)

21. Through being a faculty member at SVA, to what extent:

(5-point scale: A great deal, A lot, A moderate amount, A little, Not at all)
- Have you learned about your subject area?
- Have you made useful new contacts?
- Have you been able to solve problems in your teaching practice?
- Have you been better able to keep up to date in your field?
• Have you been able to transfer what you heard in the community to your classroom practice?

22. In your opinion, in what areas does the faculty community of practice need improvement? (Check all that apply.)

• In the area of the tools that support community activities

• The overall organization of the faculty community

• The way the community is supported by the college

• The coordination of the community

• Other (please specify)
Appendix B

Interview Script

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate. You should also know that:

- You may request that the video recording be stopped at any time.
- If you agree to allow the video recording and then change your mind, you may ask us to destroy that imaging/recording. If the imaging/recording has had all identifiers removed, we may not be able to do this.
- We will only use these recordings for the purposes of this research.
- The video recording will be transcribed by an outside company that has agreed to keep all data confidential.

Before we begin, I want to thank you again for spending an hour or so with me here today. The goal of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of how SVA faculty perceive their community of practice as it relates to their role as educators, how faculty identity within the community, potential barriers to faculty participation within the community, as well as what activities they believe would support or enhance their faculty community of practice.

To describe what we’re doing here today, I wanted to let you know that results from each completed questionnaire are reviewed prior to the corresponding interview and some responses are flagged for further discussion. We will talk through your responses from the online questionnaire and I will ask you to provide some details about those responses. However, you are free to also share any other ideas or thoughts that you think relate to this topic. Also, after we go through the flagged questionnaire responses, I have a second set of prepared questions I will ask you about your views on delivering quality art education. Do you have any questions for me
before I begin asking you prepared questions? Let’s start with some basic background information.

1. How long have you taught at the School of Visual Arts (enter number of years)?
2. What program(s) have you taught for at the School of Visual Arts (include all undergraduate, graduate, and/or continuing education programs that apply).
3. Do you fulfill other roles other than faculty member at the School of Visual Arts?
4. What was your overall impression of the questions asked in the online questionnaire?
5. Next, we are going to review some of your responses to the questionnaire. [This section of the interview will be personalized for each participant and attempt to draw out rich details related to their responses to the online questionnaire.]
6. The last set of questions will address your beliefs about delivering quality art education. The first question is: What are your big ideas about what counts as high-quality teaching in the arts? What are your big ideas about what counts as high-quality learning in the arts?
7. Given your ideas about quality in arts teaching and learning, what do you think the focus, or purpose of arts education should be?
8. Given your ideas about quality in arts teaching and learning, what are some of the important controversies around what the focus of arts education should be?
9. How have your ideas about quality in arts teaching and learning evolved? Are there ideas, theories and/or experiences that have strongly influenced you?
10. Are there particular art forms and contexts you have in mind when you are responding to these questions? Do your ideas about quality in arts education differ across art forms and/or contexts?
11. With your ideas about quality arts learning and teaching as a backdrop, what do you think is especially important to keep in mind about assessing arts learning, and assessing arts teaching?

12. What are your thoughts or questions about the relationship between high quality learning and teaching in the arts and high-quality learning and teaching in other disciplines?

13. What social, political or cultural factors, if any, do you think it is important to keep in mind when we think about quality in art education?

14. What do program or local level decision makers need to understand about quality in order to make good decisions about where to focus their attention and resources?
Appendix C

Quantitative Data Analysis Tables

Table C-1

Faculty Goals for the Community

Q5. How important are the following goals for you as a member of the community? That means, for you personally, how important are these as reasons to teach at SVA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making the college more attractive for students</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Important (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing together new ideas for the college</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Moderately important (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing standards, methods, and best practices</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Important (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making useful contacts/networking</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Important (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the level of expertise of other faculty</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Important (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing about new knowledge from other faculty</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Important (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping newcomers in the community</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>Important (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3.86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Subscale mean: 4.72

Table C-2

Faculty Problem-Solving and Learning Methods

Q16. Which of the following ways do you find new information about solving problems and keeping up to date in your teaching practice (check all that apply)?
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### Table C-3

**Characteristics of the Faculty Community**

Q18. To what extent do you think faculty members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust each other</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel a sense of loyalty to the community</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a good common understanding</td>
<td>A little (2)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel a sense of belonging to the community</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>Moderately (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale mean: 3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C-4

**Contributions of the Faculty Community**

Q19. To what extent do you think the faculty community has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>A great deal (5)</th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made a real contribution to the effectiveness of the organization</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to developing new methods or approaches for the organization</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to the documentation of information, such as knowledge systems, training guides, or best practices</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good reputation in the organization</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to share their knowledge with other faculty members</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale mean: 3.4

**Table C-5**

*Faculty Enthusiasm to Participate*

Q20. To what extent do you think faculty are generally very enthusiastic and motivated to participate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table C-6**

*Value Gained from the Faculty Community*

Q21. Through being a faculty member at SVA, to what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A great deal (5)</th>
<th>A moderate amount (3)</th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>A great deal (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you learned about your subject area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you made useful new contacts?</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to solve problems in your teaching practice?</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been better able to find all kinds of information?</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td>A great deal (5)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been better able to keep up to date in your field?</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td>A great deal (5)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to transfer what you heard in the community to your classroom practice?</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td>A great deal (5)</td>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subscale mean: 3.83 |

**Table C-7**

*Areas for Improvement in the Faculty Community*

Q22. In your opinion, in what area does the faculty community of practice need improvement (check all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the area of the tools that support community activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall organization of the faculty community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the community is supported by the college</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordination of the community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C-8

*Community Activities Current Frequency and Preferred Change in Frequency*

Q6. How often do the following activities happen in your faculty community? /  
Q7. To what extent do you prefer a change in the frequency of the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with discussions</td>
<td>Occasionally / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>Semi-regularly / No change preferred</td>
<td>Occasionally / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Occasionally / No change preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations by faculty members</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>Occasionally / No change preferred</td>
<td>Occasionally / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a little more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations by non-faculty members</td>
<td>Never / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>Frequently / No change preferred</td>
<td>Occasionally / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Semi-regularly / Prefer a little more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Never / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>Semi-regularly / No change preferred</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Never / Prefer a little more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating on course plans, reports, or other publications</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>– / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Occasionally / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Never / Prefer a little more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing special projects for the college</td>
<td>Never / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>Occasionally / No change preferred</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Never / No change preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming to find solutions to problems</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a lot more</td>
<td>Occasionally / No change preferred</td>
<td>Rarely / Prefer a little more</td>
<td>Never / No change preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-9

*Community Coordination by College Staff*

Q10. How active is the college’s staff in the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing faculty meetings</td>
<td>A little active (2)</td>
<td>A little active (2)</td>
<td>Moderately active (3)</td>
<td>Moderately active (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Stimulating faculty members to participate in the community</td>
<td>Sharing their own expertise with the faculty community</td>
<td>Providing opportunities for faculty leader roles (e.g., leading projects, discussions, curricular development teams, etc.)</td>
<td>Alerting faculty to interesting external activities (e.g., conferences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A little active (2)</td>
<td>Moderately active (3)</td>
<td>Active (4)</td>
<td>Active (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately active (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerely active (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Active (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately active (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerely active (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscale mean:</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table C-10**

*Faculty Satisfaction with Community Coordination*

Q11. How satisfied are you with the coordination of your faculty community?

- Very dissatisfied (1)
- Satisfied (4)
- Satisfied (4)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)

**Table C-11**

*Institutional Support for the Faculty Community*

Q13 Does the college allocate time for you to participate in the faculty community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot (4)</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td>A moderate amount (3)</td>
<td>A little (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 Overall, how encouraged do you feel by the college to participate in the faculty community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little (2)</td>
<td>A moderate</td>
<td>A moderate</td>
<td>A little (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amount (3)</td>
<td>amount (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15 Would you like to have more time available for activities concerning the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table C-12**

*ICT Support for the Faculty Community*

Q12 How useful do you think the following means of communication are (or might be) for your faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled meetings</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Not useful (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal encounters</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant messaging/ chat/ shared whiteboards</td>
<td>Moderately useful (3)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(application sharing systems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special discussion list/ newsgroup for the</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Moderately useful (3)</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written memos or reports</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Moderately useful (3)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
<td>Moderately useful (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database or knowledge sharing tools in which</td>
<td>Moderately useful (3)</td>
<td>Moderately useful (3)</td>
<td>Very useful (5)</td>
<td>Useful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you are expected to fill in your project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences and relevant knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-scale mean: 4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

### Qualitative Data Analysis Code Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Challenges and Barriers to CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct-Challenges</td>
<td>ADJ-Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges for adjunct faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-Negative</td>
<td>COP-NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative faculty experience from lack of CoP opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-Negative</td>
<td>DEPT-Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department-specific challenges faculty face against participating in CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Barrier-Admin</td>
<td>FAC-B-ADM</td>
<td>FAC-B-ADM</td>
<td>Barriers to faculty CoP posed by administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Barrier-Culture</td>
<td>FAC-B-CULT</td>
<td>FAC-B-CULT</td>
<td>Barrier to faculty CoP posed by culture at SVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Barrier-Financial</td>
<td>FAC-B-FIN</td>
<td>FAC-B-FIN</td>
<td>Financial barriers to faculty participation in CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Barrier-Space</td>
<td>FAC-B-SPC</td>
<td>FAC-B-SPC</td>
<td>SVA space barriers to faculty participation in CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Barrier-Time</td>
<td>FAC-B-TIM</td>
<td>FAC-B-TIM</td>
<td>Time barriers to faculty participation in CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Empowerment-Thwarted</td>
<td>FAC-EMP-NEG</td>
<td>FAC-EMP-NEG</td>
<td>Feeling disempowered; no real authority or false role/title given to faculty with additional title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Care-For-Students</td>
<td>FAC-CARE</td>
<td>FAC-CARE</td>
<td>Passion for teaching, and care and concern for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-On-Teaching</td>
<td>FAC-TCH</td>
<td>FAC-TCH</td>
<td>Faculty thoughts about good teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS-Effect</td>
<td>LOS-FX</td>
<td>LOS-FX</td>
<td>Effects or impact to faculty experience based on length of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-Experience-Value</td>
<td>PROF-EXP</td>
<td>PROF-EXP</td>
<td>Faculty expertise informing PD training for students and/or guiding curricular decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Faculty discussion of the value of reflecting on teaching practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>Faculty perspectives on today’s students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students-Feedback-On-Teaching</td>
<td>STU-FBK</td>
<td>Faculty use of direct communication with/observation of students and review of course evaluation to gain feedback on their teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students-Tuition-Concerns</td>
<td>STU-TUI-CON</td>
<td>Faculty consideration of tuition cost, SVA value, and comparing value provided by other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Observations and Impressions of the Cop and Institutional Structure</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>Impressions of college’s upper management (general) and specifically via mass communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate-Teaching-Comparison</td>
<td>ALT-TCH-COMP</td>
<td>Teaching experience at other institutions guiding faculty impressions/comparisons with SVA CoP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-Benefits</td>
<td>COP-B</td>
<td>Perceived benefits of CoP for faculty, e.g., productive collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIF-DEPT-COMP</td>
<td>Faculty with experience in more than one SVA department guiding CoP impressions/comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-CAT</td>
<td>DISTINCT faculty categories related to goals and investment of time and energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-X</td>
<td>Faculty interaction patterns or opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP-STU</td>
<td>Lack of faculty CoP adversely affecting student experience at SVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVA-PL</td>
<td>Faculty interest in discussing/contributing to institutional planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVA-PY</td>
<td>Faculty awareness of institutional policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-S</td>
<td>Support received via interactions with academic support offices/staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT-POS</td>
<td>Department-specific interactions by leaders facilitating faculty CoP at dept. level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-EMP-OP</td>
<td>Valued opportunity received by faculty to step up/gain authority/take a greater role in the college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-DX</td>
<td>Desire for an active faculty CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-DX-DPT</td>
<td>Desire for greater interaction with SVA faculty from other departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-DX-ALT</td>
<td>Desire to connect with faculty and/or teaching networks beyond SVA CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty- Empowerment- Desire</td>
<td>FAC-EMP-DX</td>
<td>Desire for a greater voice in decision-making, and empowerment of the faculty role at SVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-PD- Desire</td>
<td>FAC-PD-DX</td>
<td>Communicated desire for specific faculty PD options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty- Recommendation</td>
<td>FAC-REC</td>
<td>Recommendations for institutional improvement and improved teaching and learning at SVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E

### Conceptually Clustered Matrix of Faculty Perspectives on the Community of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Challenges and Barriers</th>
<th>Students and Teaching</th>
<th>CoP and Institutional Observations</th>
<th>Supportive and Empowering Interaction</th>
<th>Faculty Desire / Recommended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>ADJ-Z (2)</td>
<td>FAC-CARE (3)</td>
<td>ADMIN (1)</td>
<td>FAC-S (1)</td>
<td>COP-DX-DPT (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP-NEG (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPT-Z (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-CULT (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-FIN (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-TIM (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-EMP-NEG (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>ADJ-Z (2)</td>
<td>FAC-CARE (1)</td>
<td>ALT-TCH-COMP (7)</td>
<td>FAC-S (1)</td>
<td>COP-DX-DPT (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP-NEG (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-CULT (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-FIN (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-SPC (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-TIM (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>ADJ-Z (2)</td>
<td>FAC-TCH (3)</td>
<td>ADMIN (2)</td>
<td>DEPT-POS (1)</td>
<td>FAC-REC (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-CULT (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALT-TCH-COMP (2)</td>
<td>FAC-EMP-OP (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-FIN (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-SPC (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-B-TIM (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Codes Applied Per Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and Barriers</th>
<th>Students and Teaching</th>
<th>CoP and Institutional Observations</th>
<th>Supportive and Empowering Interaction</th>
<th>Faculty Desire / Recommended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ-Z (6)</td>
<td>FAC-CARE (4)</td>
<td>ADMIN (3)</td>
<td>DEPT-POS (5)</td>
<td>COP-DX-DPT (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP-NEG (5)</td>
<td>FAC-TCH (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC-S (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT-Z (8)</td>
<td>FAC-B-CULT (7)</td>
<td>LOS-FX (1)</td>
<td>PROF-EXP (7)</td>
<td>ALT-TCH-COMP (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-B-FIN (7)</td>
<td>COB (10)</td>
<td>FAC-B-TIM (4)</td>
<td>STU (3)</td>
<td>STU-FBK (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC-EMP-NEG (2)</td>
<td>FAC-X (7)</td>
<td>IMP-STU (3)</td>
<td>SVA-PL (1)</td>
<td>SVA-PY (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 46  Total: 35  Total: 48  Total: 9  Total: 25
Appendix F

Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Scale in the Work Domain (BPNS-Work)

Ryan’s (2006) Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Scale for use in the work domain (BPNSS-WORK) was adapted for use with faculty at the School of Visual Arts (SVA). It is administered to members of the participatory design intervention team at the beginning and end of their yearlong appointment. The BPNSS-Work is also administered to participants in the Faculty Common Impact Study at weeks 1, 4, 15, and 32.

Instructions

The following questions concern your feelings about your job at SVA during the past four weeks. Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements given your experiences on this job. Please note that no personally identifiable information is collected in this form and your responses will remain anonymous.

Scale

Use the following scale in responding to the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

1. I have felt initiative and choice in the things I am undertaking in my job at SVA.

2. I have sometimes felt excluded from the people I work with.

3. I feel confident that I can do things well on my job.

4. I care about my co-workers and they care about me.

5. Most of the things I do on my job feel like “I have to”.
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6. When I am at work, I have serious doubts about whether I can do things well.
7. I can make the decisions I want about how I do my job.
8. People I work with are often cold and distant towards me.
9. At work I feel capable at what I do.
10. I feel forced to do many things on my job I wouldn’t choose to do.
11. I often feel disappointed with my performance in my job.
12. I feel connected with people at work.
13. I feel my choices on my job express who I really am.
14. When I am at work, I feel competent to achieve my goals.
15. I feel pressured to do too many things on my job.
16. At work, I feel close and connected with other people who are important to me.
17. I feel insecure about my abilities on my job.
18. My daily activities at work feel like a chain of obligations.
19. What I have been doing in my job really interests me.
20. I often have the impression that people I spend time with at work dislike me.
21. In my job, I feel I can successfully complete even difficult tasks.
22. I feel the relationships I have at work are just superficial.
23. When I am working, I feel like a failure because of the mistakes I make.
24. I experience a warm feeling with the people I spend time with at work.
Appendix G

Knowledge Sharing Behavior Scale

Yi’s (2009) Knowledge Sharing Behavior Scale (KSBS) was adapted for use with faculty at the School of Visual Arts (SVA) to assess knowledge sharing behavior. It is administered to members of the participatory design intervention team at the beginning and end of their yearlong appointment. The KSBS is also administered to participants in the Faculty Common Impact Study at weeks 1, 4, 15, and 32.

Participant Instructions

The following questions concern your knowledge sharing behavior in your job at SVA during the past four weeks. Please indicate how often you participate in the following knowledge sharing behaviors on this job. Please note that no personally identifiable information is collected in this form and your responses will remain anonymous. Use the following scale in responding to the items.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Sometimes Always

Questions

The following questions assess four dimensions of knowledge sharing: written contributions, organizational communications, personal interactions, and community of practice (Yi, 2009).

Written Contributions

WC1. Submit documents and reports.

WC2. Publish articles in college journals, newsletters, or other SVA publications.
WC3. Share documentation from personal files related to current work.

WC4. Contribute ideas and thoughts to department databases or information boards.

WC5. Keep others updated with important college information through online discussion boards or email groups.

**Organizational Communications**

OC1. Express ideas and thoughts in meetings.

OC2. Participate fully in brainstorming sessions.


OC4. Answer questions of others in meetings.

OC5. Ask good questions that can elicit others’ thinking and discussion in meetings.

OC6. Share success stories in meetings that may benefit the college.

OC7. Reveal past personal work-related failures or mistakes in meetings to help others avoid repeating these mistakes.

OC8. Make presentations in meetings.

**Personal Interactions**

PI1. Support less-experienced colleagues with time from personal schedule.

PI2. Engage in long-term coaching relationships with junior faculty.

PI3. Spend time in personal conversation (e.g., discussion in hallway, over lunch, through telephone) with others to help them with their work-related problems.

PI4. Keep others updated with important SVA information through personal conversation.

PI5. Share passion and excitement on some specific subjects with others through personal conversation.
PI6. Share experiences that may help others avoid risks and trouble through personal conversation.

PI7. Have online chats with others to help them with their work-related problems.

PI8. Spend time in e-mail communication with others to help them with their work-related problems.

Communities of Practice

CP. Meet with faculty community members to create innovative solutions for problems that occur in work.

CP2. Meet with faculty community members to share your experience on specific topics with common interests.

CP3. Meet with faculty community members to share success and failure stories on specific topics with common interests.

CP4. Meet with faculty community members to work to encourage excellence as educators.

CP5. Support personal development of new faculty members.

CP6. Send related information to community members through faculty e-mail list.

CP7. Share ideas and thoughts on specific topics through college supported online faculty communication tools.
Appendix H

Critical Incident Questionnaire for Participatory Design Intervention

The following questions are intended to collect data about the participatory design (PD) approach utilized in the development of SVA’s virtual faculty common. Please take about five minutes to respond to the questions about today’s PD session. No personally identifiable data is collected in this online form so your responses are anonymous.

If nothing comes to mind for any of the questions just leave the space blank. All of the team’s responses will be shared at the beginning of the next PD session. Thanks for taking the time to do this. What you write will help make the PD sessions more responsive to your concerns.

1. At what moment in the PD session did you feel most engaged with what was happening?

2. At what moment in the PD session were you most distanced from what was happening?

3. What action that anyone (facilitator or other team member) took during the session did you find most affirming or helpful? What action that anyone took during the session did you find most puzzling or confusing?

4. What about this PD session surprised you the most? (This could be about your own reactions to what went on, something that someone did, or anything else that occurs).
## Appendix I

### Faculty Common Impact Study Data Collection and Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Timeline</th>
<th>Indicators/Measures</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>Analysis Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1. To what extent did the college’s faculty receive communications and resources necessary for accessing the faculty common (FC)?</strong></td>
<td>During FC pre-launch promotion (approx 6 weeks)</td>
<td>Indicators: Extent to which faculty received and opened emails about the FC, and clicked links to enter the FC</td>
<td>Quan data collected via email system, myEmma.</td>
<td>Process evaluation Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2. To what extent does the implementation of products and activities adhere to the FC design plan?</strong></td>
<td>During PD intervention’s process and product evaluation</td>
<td>Indicators: Extent to which the FC adhered to design and implementation plan</td>
<td>Quan data via Likert scale checklists</td>
<td>Process evaluation Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3. To what extent are faculty engaged in the FC?</strong></td>
<td>Weeks 1-4, 15, and 32 of the impact study</td>
<td>Indicators: Extent to which faculty contribute comments/interact with elements embedded in the FC</td>
<td>Quan data via interactive elements in FC</td>
<td>Process evaluation Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ4. To what extent are faculty autonomously motivated to initially access the FC?</strong></td>
<td>Week 1 of the impact study</td>
<td>Measures: Type of regulation faculty experience around accessing the FC (e.g., identified, introjected); Baseline measures for sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy, and knowledge sharing behaviors</td>
<td>Quan data via ACTA, BPNS-Work, and KSBS Qual data via CIQ</td>
<td>Outcome evaluation Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and group comparisons*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ5. To what extent does initial interaction in the FC support basic psychological needs satisfaction (BPNS)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Week 2 of the impact study**
Measures: Faculty sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy in relation to initial interactions in the FC
Quan data via TENS-Interface scale; Qual data via CIQ
Outcome evaluation

**RQ6. To what extent does engagement in knowledge-sharing tasks in the FC support BPNS?**

**Week 3 of the impact study**
Measures: Faculty sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy in relation to using the embedded tools/activities for sharing knowledge in the FC
Quan data via TENS-TASK scale; Qual data via CIQ
Outcome evaluation

**RQ7. To what extent does engaging in the FC influence faculty members’ BPNS and knowledge sharing behavior in their work environment?**

**Weeks 4, 15, and 32 of the impact study**
Measures: Faculty sense of competence, relatedness, and autonomy in their SVA work domain; Faculty knowledge sharing behavior in their SVA work domain
Quan data via TENS-Life, BPNS-Work, and KSBS Qual data via CIQ (week 4 only)
Outcome evaluation

*The faculty common impact study enrollment form (see Appendix J) collects quantitative demographical data to support group comparison analyses.*
Appendix J

Faculty Common Impact Study Enrollment Form

You are being asked to join a research study conducted by members of SVA’s Academic Affairs Department in collaboration with the SVA Faculty Advisory Committee. Participation in this study is voluntary, and if you decide to join now, you can change your mind later. Following the final week of data collection, all personally identifiable information is removed from the data and destroyed to ensure anonymity in the data analysis and presentation of findings. If you decide to withdraw from the study after all personally identifiable is removed, your (anonymous) responses will remain in the final data analysis.

Participation In the Study

Full participation in the study includes the following steps.

- Complete the following enrollment questionnaire.
- Visit the college’s new faculty common at least once per week over the next four weeks.
- Complete a questionnaire that will be emailed to you at the end of each week of data collection (weeks 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, and 32). Each questionnaire is expected to take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Full participation in the study includes completing all six questionnaires. The questionnaires are designed to assess your engagement using the faculty common and your general knowledge sharing behavior as an SVA faculty member.

Questions About the Study
You can ask questions about this research study now or at any time during the study, by contacting the primary researcher, Jennifer Phillips, at jphillips@sva.edu or (212) 592-2177.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please contact SVA’s Office of the Provost at provost@sva.edu.

**Enrollment Questionnaire**

Please answer the following questions to enroll in the SVA Faculty Common Impact Study.

1. I understand the information given to me in this online form, accept the provisions in the form, and agree to join the study. (Agree, Disagree)

2. Primary Department (drop-down menu with all SVA departments)

3. Length of time teaching at SVA (multiple choice options: 0-2 yrs, 2-5 yrs, 5-10 yrs, 10 or more yrs)

4. Which most accurately describe(s) you? Check all that apply. (multiple choice options: woman, man, non-binary, let me type, I prefer not to say)

5. Which race or ethnicity best describes you? Please choose only one. (multiple choice options: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black or African American, Hispanic, White/Caucasian, Multiple ethnicity/Other (please specify), I prefer not to say.)
Appendix K

Adapted Autonomy and Competence in Technology Adoption (ACTA) Scale

*Headers and regulation indicators are removed and items are randomized in their order when presented to participants.*

There are a variety of reasons why people choose to start using a technology. Please consider the following and indicate how true each of these reasons is for you in regard to the School of Visual Arts Faculty Common. The scale is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all true</td>
<td>Somewhat true</td>
<td>Very true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-regulation**

I decided to start using the faculty common because:

1. Other people want me to use it. (external)
2. I expected it will be interesting to use. (intrinsic)
3. I believe it could improve my life. (identified)
4. It will help me do something important to me. (identified)
5. I want others to know I use it. (introjected)
6. I will feel bad about myself if I didn't try it. (introjected)
7. I think it would be enjoyable. (intrinsic)
8. I am required to use it by my department. (external)
9. It is going to be of value to me in my life. (identified)
10. It is going to be fun to use. (intrinsic)
11. I feel pressured to use it. (external)

12. It will look good to others if I use it. (introjected)

**Perceived Competence**

1. I feel confident that I’ll be able to use the technology effectively.

2. The technology will be easy for me to use.
Appendix L

Critical Incident Questionnaire for Faculty Common Impact Study

Please take about five minutes to respond to the questions below about your experiences in SVA’s faculty common over the past week. Thank you for taking the time to do this. What you write will help us make SVA’s faculty common more responsive to your concerns.

1. Approximately how many times did you visit the faculty common (FC) in the past week? (multiple choice: 0-1, 2-4, 5 or more)

2. Approximately how much time did you spend in the FC in the past week, meaning the total time for all visits combined? (multiple choice: 0-20 minutes, 21-40 minutes, 40-60 minutes, over 60 minutes)

3. At what moment visiting the FC this week did you feel most engaged with what was happening? (open field)

4. At what moment visiting the FC this week were you most distanced from what was happening? (open field)

5. What action that anyone in the FC took this week did you find most affirming or helpful? What action that anyone took did you find most puzzling or confusing? (open field)

6. What about your visits to the FC this week surprised you the most? This could be about your own reactions to what went on, something that someone did, or anything else that occurred. (open field)
Appendix M

TENS-Interface Scale Adapted for the Faculty Common

Instructions for Administering and Scoring Scale

- Headers and reverse-scored indicators are removed and items are randomized in their order when presented to participants;
- All items are weighted equally in scoring;
- Reverse-scored items are indicated by “(-)”.  

Questions

Reflect on your experience using the faculty common (FC) and rate your agreement with the following statements. The scale is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competence

1. I feel very capable and effective at using the FC.
2. I feel confident in my ability to use the FC.
3. Learning how to use the FC was difficult. (-)
4. I found the FC interface and controls confusing. (-)
5. It wasn’t easy to use the FC. (-)

Autonomy

6. The FC provides me with useful options and choices
7. I can get the FC to do the things I want it to.

8. I feel pressured by the FC. (-)

9. The FC feels intrusive (-)

10. The FC feels controlling. (-)

Relatedness

11. The FC helps me to form or sustain relationships that are fulfilling.

12. The FC helps me to feel part of a larger community.

13. The FC makes me feel connected to other people.

14. I don’t feel close to other users of the FC. (-)

15. The FC doesn’t support meaningful connections to others. (-)
Appendix N

TENS-Task Scale — Related to the Task of Knowledge Sharing

Instructions for Administering and Scoring Scale

- Headers and reverse-scored indicators are removed and items are randomized in their order when presented to participants;
- All items are weighted equally in scoring;
- Reverse-scored items are indicated by “(-)”. 

Questions

Reflect on your experience using the faculty common (FC) to post comments (including questions, recommendations, and ideas), and rate your agreement with the following statements.

The scale is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competence

1. I feel confident in my ability to post comments in the FC.
2. It’s easy to post comments in the FC.
3. I find posting comments in the FC too challenging. (-)
4. I find posting comments in the FC too difficult to do regularly (-)

Autonomy

5. I feel pressured to post comments in the FC. (-)
6. I only do post comments in the FC because I have to. (-)

7. I post comments in the FC because other people want me to (-)

8. I will feel guilty if I don’t post comments in the FC (-)

**Relatedness**

9. Posting comments in the FC helps me to form or sustain relationships that are fulfilling.

10. Posting comments in the FC helps me to feel part of a larger community.

11. I don’t feel close to other users when I post comments in the FC. (-)

12. Posting comments in the FC doesn’t support meaningful connections to others. (-)
Appendix O

TENS-Life

Instructions for Administering and Scoring TENS-Life Scale

• Headers and reverse-scored indicators are removed and items are randomized in their order when presented to participants;
• All items are weighted equally in scoring;
• Reverse-scored items are indicated by “(-)”.

Questions

Below, we are going to ask about how using the faculty common (FC) has or has not affected your actual experiences of certain feelings in your life. Choose from 1 to 5 to rate your agreement with the following statements. The scale is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Not True at All | | | | | Completely True

Autonomy

1. Now that I use the FC, I feel pressured to use it more often than I’d like. (-)

2. I spend more time in the FC than I feel I should. (-)

3. The FC ends up making me do things I don’t want to do. (-)

4. The FC intrudes in my life. (-)

Competence

5. Using the FC has made me feel insecure about my abilities. (-)
6. Using the FC has made me feel less capable in my life. (-)

7. Using the FC has lowered my confidence. (-)

**Relatedness**

8. Using the FC has helped me feel a greater sense of belonging to a larger Community.

9. Using the FC has helped me feel close and connected with other people who are important to me.

10. Because of the FC, I feel closer to some others.