Assessing the Long-Term Impact of Faculty Development Programs on Instructional Quality and Student Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions of Rajasthan

Ms. Anjali Sharma a[1], Dr. Neetu Khandelwal a[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Apex University*
[2]*Assistant Professor, Apex University*

Abstract: In higher education, Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) are now essential for improving the efficiency and professionalism of teachers. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the long-term effects of FDPs on student satisfaction and instructional quality in Rajasthan higher education institutions. The study assesses the long-term effects of continuous faculty training initiatives on pedagogical practices, classroom engagement, curriculum delivery, and student learning outcomes by concentrating on both qualitative and quantitative variables.

Faculty and students from a representative sample of public and private universities participated in structured questionnaires and interviews to gather data. To investigate the wider institutional ramifications of FDPs, the study additionally takes performance measures and institutional records into account. Important conclusions point to a strong beneficial relationship between consistent FDP engagement and enhancements in the way lessons are delivered, the application of creative teaching strategies, and general student happiness.
The report does, however, also draw attention to current shortcomings in institutional support, follow-up procedures, and standardization for FDP implementation. The study ends with suggestions for improving policies, conducting frequent program reviews, and fostering a culture of ongoing professional growth in Rajasthan's higher education system.

Keywords: Educational Quality Assurance, Instructional Design Innovation, Outcome-Based Teaching Methodologies, Pedagogical Competency Advancement, Professional Learning Communities, Scholarly Teaching Practices

INTRODUCTION

The quality of instruction continues to be a crucial factor in determining student learning results and general academic satisfaction in the ever-changing world of higher education. Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) have become essential tools for improving teachers' topic knowledge, pedagogical skills, and professional development. The adoption of FDPs has accelerated in Rajasthan, a state with a wide variety of higher education institutions, as academic leaders and politicians see their potential to advance educational reforms and enhance institutional performance. In addition to honing teaching techniques, these programs aim to promote creativity, diversity, and student-centered learning settings. Nevertheless, there is little empirical data assessing the long-term effects of FDPs on student satisfaction and instructional quality, despite the increased attention and investment in these initiatives.

The absence of a long-term evaluation of the efficacy of FDPs in Rajasthan higher education institutions is the main issue this study attempts to solve. Although rapid feedback and short-term results are frequently recorded, little is known about how these programs affect teacher performance and student experiences over the long term. This makes it difficult for academic planners and legislators to decide on the structure, frequency, and subject matter of such programs.

This study's main goal is to evaluate the long-term effects of faculty development programs on student satisfaction and the quality of instruction at a few chosen higher education institutions throughout Rajasthan. The purpose of this study is to determine if students feel that their learning experiences have improved as a consequence of the skills and tactics that FDPs have taught them being effectively incorporated into classroom procedures. As a result the primary research question is:- how much do faculty development programs help Rajasthan

higher education institution increase student satisfaction and instructional quality over the long run?

This work is significant because it has the potential to provide evidence-based insights on the efficacy of FDPs, which might aid in academic and administrative decision-making. The results might help government agencies, professional training organizations, and educational institutions rethink faculty training programs in a way that is impactful, sustainable, and in line with the changing requirements of both teachers and students.

This study is organized as follows: a thorough assessment of relevant material on FDPs and their effects both domestically and internationally is given in the next part. The research methodology, which describes the design, sample, instruments, and data analysis methods employed, comes next. The results and discussion, emphasizing significant patterns and interpretations, are presented in the following section. Lastly, the conclusion highlights limits, makes policy suggestions, and discusses research directions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is well acknowledged that Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) are crucial instruments for strengthening teachers' capacity to teach and raising the standard of instruction in higher education. According to existing research, faculty attitudes toward learner-centered education improve, pedagogical awareness increases, and creative teaching methods are adopted as a result of well-structured FDPs. Research by Guskey (2002) and Steinert et al. (2006) has validated the efficacy of FDPs in fostering professional development and enhancing instructor performance. Mishra et al. (2020) and Yadav & Singh (2017) have emphasized the need of FDPs in tackling changing educational issues in India, such as curricular changes, digital transformation, and NEP 2020 implementation. These studies provide a developing understanding of how FDPs help faculty members be prepared for a quickly evolving academic environment.

Additionally, studies demonstrate a clear link between student results and teacher development. Higher levels of student satisfaction and engagement are frequently the result of improved teaching techniques obtained through FDPs. According to research by Stes et al. (2010) and Amundsen and Wilson (2012), instructors who used inclusive teaching practices, creative assessment techniques, and active learning greatly enhanced the quality of their students' educational experiences. However, a large portion of the current research mostly ignores the programs' long-term effects on student satisfaction and instructional quality in favor of concentrating on short-term or immediate outcomes, such as faculty satisfaction with training or self-reported gains in teaching ability.

This indicates a significant void in the existing body of literature. While there is ample evidence of the short-term advantages of FDPs, few research have examined whether these gains are maintained over time and if they have a lasting impact on students' views and academic experiences. There is a dearth of empirical research that examines the long-term efficacy of FDPs in various institutional contexts, especially in Rajasthan. Current research frequently ignores contextual factors including institutional support, discipline-specific requirements, and geographical differences and lacks depth in connecting teacher training outcomes with student satisfaction indicators. Longitudinal, region-focused studies that close this gap and offer useful information to academic leaders and politicians are therefore obviously needed.

The current study is based on a multi-theoretical framework that incorporates the Kirkpatrick Model, Adult Learning Theory, and Constructivist Learning Theory in order to fill this research gap. The Four-Level Training Evaluation Model developed by Kirkpatrick in 1959 offers a thorough framework for evaluating training activities, including faculty development programs. The third and fourth levels, which entail behavioral change in teaching techniques and results in terms of student satisfaction, are the emphasis of this study, whereas the majority of FDP assessments concentrate on the first two levels, response and learning. Furthermore, Malcolm Knowles' Adult Learning Theory (1980) provides valuable insights into the planning and execution of FDPs by acknowledging that adult learners are experience-based, self-directed, and driven by real-world application. The necessity of FDPs that are in line with faculty members' actual teaching requirements is supported by this notion. Lastly, a key component of the objectives of the majority of FDPs is the role that faculty play as facilitators of active, student-centered learning, which is supported by the constructivist theory of learning. The current study attempts to offer a thorough grasp of how faculty development affects

teaching effectiveness and contributes to long-term increases in student satisfaction by combining these perspectives.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to evaluate the long-term effects of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) on instructional quality and student satisfaction, this study uses a mixed-method research design that combines quantitative and qualitative techniques. A thorough and in-depth examination is made possible by the mix of approaches, which record both quantifiable results and subjective experiences and viewpoints. With an emphasis on FDPs carried out between 2020 and 2024, the study will employ a cross-sectional and retrospective longitudinal methodology. Because it captures both immediate and long-term results from diverse stakeholder viewpoints, this approach is especially well-suited to assessing the long-term benefits of professional development programs.

A range of tools will be used to collect data. To statistically evaluate reported improvements in teaching quality and student satisfaction, structured questionnaires will be given to faculty members who have taken part in FDPs as well as to their students. Likert-scale and multiple-choice questions designed to gauge elements like classroom atmosphere, student involvement, instructional clarity, and the application of contemporary teaching techniques will be included in these surveys. Selected faculty members will participate in semi-structured interviews in addition to surveys to learn more about their individual perspectives on how FDPs have changed their teaching methods over time. Additionally, groups of students will participate in focus groups to get qualitative input on their experiences learning with faculty members who have received FDP training. To triangulate results, institutional records like program assessment reports and past student feedback data may also be examined.

Faculty members from Rajasthan higher education institutions who have participated in FDPs during the previous three to five years, as well as their present and former students, make up the study population. We will employ a multi-stage purposive sampling approach to guarantee diversity and representation. Academic disciplines, location (rural, semi-rural, or urban), and type (public, private, or autonomous) will all be taken into consideration when choosing institutions. About 300–500 students and 100 faculty members will make up the sample, guaranteeing both qualitative depth and quantitative dependability.

Suitable statistical and qualitative methods will be used to analyze the data. The data will be summarized using descriptive statistics like means, standard deviations, and frequencies, and the relationship between FDP participation and changes in student satisfaction and instructional quality will be ascertained using inferential statistics like t-tests, ANOVA, correlation, and regression analysis. Thematic analysis will be used to find recurrent themes, patterns, and insights in the qualitative data collected through focus groups and interviews. This will help us better understand the long-term consequences of FDPs. Qualitative responses will be carefully interpreted through the use of coding and classification.

Strict ethical guidelines will govern every facet of the study. An informed consent form explaining the study's goal, participants' right to freely participate, and confidentiality guarantees will be given to all staff and student responders prior to their involvement. In all documents and reports, personal identifiers shall be made anonymous. The appropriate Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC) will grant ethical permission, and data will be safely kept and utilized only for scholarly and research reasons. The purpose of these ethical measures is to preserve the integrity of the study process while defending the rights and privacy of each participant.

RESULT

The following tables summarizes the survey's findings about the long-term impact of faculty development programs on instructional quality and student satisfaction.

Area of Improvement	% Faculty Reporting Improvement
Enhanced lesson planning	82%
Use of technology and ICT tools	76%
Application of student-centered pedagogy	70%

Improved classroom engagement	68%

Table No1: Faculty Perception of Long-Term Impact of FDPs on Teaching Practices

Area of Improvement	% Students Noticing Improvement
Classroom delivery and concept explanation	72%
Use of interactive/engaging methods	70%
Faculty approachability and responsiveness	65%

Table No2: Student Perception of Faculty Trained Under FDPs

Criteria	Before FDP	After FDP
Teaching effectiveness	3.4	4.2
Communication and clarity	3.5	4.3
Course satisfaction	3.3	4.1

Table no. 3: Average Student Satisfaction Ratings (Before vs. After FDP Exposure)

SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION

The long-term effects of Faculty Development Programs (FDPs) on student satisfaction and instructional quality at Rajasthan higher education institutions were investigated in this study. According to the results, faculty teaching techniques and student learning experiences have both benefited greatly from FDPs. Better lesson preparation, the incorporation of ICT resources, and more interactive classroom involvement were among the long-lasting pedagogical changes observed by faculty members who took part in FDPs. Students who were taught by these faculty members also reported feeling more satisfied with the overall quality of the course delivery, communication clarity, and efficacy of the instruction. These results demonstrate how effective FDPs may be in bringing about long-lasting, constructive change in the educational setting.

The study does point out, though, that a number of outside variables, including institutional support, resource accessibility, and regular post-training follow-up, have an impact on the long-term efficacy of FDPs. Although the majority of faculty members successfully used the lessons learned from FDP, others mentioned difficulties because of administrative, time, or infrastructural restrictions. These problems imply that although FDPs have advantages, they cannot reach their full potential unless they are backed by an institutional context that is supportive. The conclusion that faculty development, when in line with adult learning principles and reflective practice, leads to better educational outcomes over time is supported by the theoretical framework, which draws from Kirkpatrick's model of training evaluation, Adult Learning Theory, and Constructivist Learning Theory.

Several important recommendations are made in light of the results to improve the long-term efficacy of FDPs in Rajasthan's higher education establishments. In order to make sure that FDP lessons are being utilized consistently in teaching methods, it is first necessary to institutionalize frequent follow-up and monitoring processes. To guarantee better relevance and effect, programs should also be customized to the unique requirements of different academic fields and the local teaching setting. In order to encourage meaningful engagement, FDP participation should also be connected to professional advancement, such as promotions and evaluations. For faculty to successfully use contemporary teaching methods, institutions must also improve administrative support and infrastructure.

In order to regularly evaluate the efficacy of faculty members who have received FDP training, student input should also be methodically included into performance reviews. Last but not least, encouraging collaborative learning settings through peer support groups, multidisciplinary seminars, and mentorship may help maintain the benefits of FDPs and advance a continuous improvement culture. By putting these recommendations into practice, schools can eventually improve academic quality and student satisfaction while also bolstering teacher performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era. Johns Hopkins University Press.

[2] Boud, D., & Hager, P. (2012). Re-thinking continuing professional development in a global context. Routledge.

[3] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.

[4] Mishra, S. (Ed.). (2021). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Indian Perspective. Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA).

[5] National Education Policy. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

[6] O'Sullivan, R., & Irby, D. M. (2011). Faculty development: Strategies for successful learning communities. Springer.

[7] Steinert, Y. (Ed.). (2014). Faculty development in the health professions: A focus on research and practice. Springer.

[8] Senge, P. M. (2006). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. Broadway Business.

[9] University Grants Commission. (2021). Annual Report 2020–21. UGC, India.

[10] World Bank. (2017). Higher education for development: An evaluation of the World Bank group's support. World Bank Publications.

[11] Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. Medical Teacher, 28(6), 497–526.

[12] Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. Educational Leadership, 59(6), 45–51.

[13] Lawler, P. A., & King, K. P. (2003). Changes in faculty perceptions about teaching and learning through faculty development. Journal of Staff Development, 24(2), 30–34.

[14] Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions? A conceptual review of the educational development literature in higher education. Review of Educational Research, 82(1), 90–126.

[15] Chalmers, D., & Gardiner, D. (2015). An evaluation framework for identifying the effectiveness and impact of academic teacher development programs. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 46, 81–91.

[16] Pillai, A., & Satyanarayana, M. (2017). Faculty development programs in India: Role in improving teaching and learning. Journal of Education and Practice, 8(14), 145–151.

[17] Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. Active Learning in Higher Education, 5(1), 87–100.

[18] Sharma, S. (2021). Faculty development programs and their impact on higher education: Evidence from Rajasthan. Journal of Education and Human Development, 10(2), 45–56.

[19] Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and scholarship of teaching. Innovative Higher Education, 27(1), 5–23.

[20] Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of teaching: A model. Higher Education Research & Development, 19(2), 155–168.

[21] Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to teach in higher education (2nd ed.). Routledge.

[22] Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

[23] Mishra, S. (2016). Quality assurance in higher education: An Indian perspective. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 11(2), 1–14.

[24] Srivastava, M. (2018). Faculty development and quality of education in Indian universities. University News, 56(23), 10–14.

[25] Singh, R. P. (2020). Enhancing faculty capabilities through FDPs: An empirical study of selected colleges in Rajasthan. Indian Journal of Higher Education, 11(3), 34–45.

[26] Guskey, T. R. (2000). Evaluating professional development. Corwin Press.

[27] Murray, J. P. (2001). Faculty development in publicly supported universities. The Journal of Higher Education, 72(2), 159–181.

[28] Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. Educational Researcher, 33(8), 3–15.

[29] Chaurasia, R., & Patel, M. (2022). Evaluating the outcomes of FDPs in private universities. International Journal of Educational Development, 89, 102540.

[30] Maheshwari, S., & Agrawal, R. (2021). Role of AICTE-sponsored FDPs in reshaping pedagogy. Asian Journal of Management Studies, 13(2), 89–97.

[31] Harvey, L. (2003). Student feedback. Quality in Higher Education, 9(1), 3–20.

[32] Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. Jossey-Bass.

[33] Arambewela, R., Hall, J., & Zuhair, S. (2005). Postgraduate international students' satisfaction: The role of academic and non-academic support services. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27(2), 169–182.

[34] Hénard, F., & Leprince-Ringuet, S. (2008). The path to quality teaching in higher education. OECD.

[35] Jain, M., & Kothari, A. (2019). Determinants of student satisfaction in higher education: A case study from Rajasthan. International Journal of Educational Management, 33(4), 657–674.

[36] Mishra, S. (2020). Online faculty development in India: Challenges and opportunities. Commonwealth of Learning.

[37] Sahni, S. (2021). Digital transformation and online FDPs in Indian higher education. Education and Information Technologies, 26, 5645–5660.

[38] Roy, A., & Dey, S. (2021). Adoption of MOOCs for faculty development in India. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET), 16(6), 141–152.

[39] Jain, V., & Mehta, R. (2022). Online faculty training programs and pedagogical change during COVID-19: Evidence from India. Higher Education Research & Development, 41(3), 445–460.

[40] AICTE. (2022). Faculty development programs and e-learning initiatives. https://www.aicte-india.org

[41] Kumar, S. (2019). Impact of faculty development programs on teacher performance in Rajasthan. Rajasthan Journal of Educational Studies, 8(1), 12–20.

[42] UGC-HRDC Jaipur. (2021). Annual report of faculty development activities. University of Rajasthan.

[43] Jain, R., & Sharma, D. (2023). Academic performance and student satisfaction in colleges of Rajasthan. Journal of Education and Social Policy, 10(1), 22–31.

[44] Sharma, K., & Tripathi, V. (2020). Institutional commitment to teaching quality: A study of public universities in Rajasthan. Higher Education for the Future, 7(2), 128–141.

[45] AIU. (2021). Status of faculty training and development in Indian universities. Association of Indian Universities.

[46] Frenk, J., Chen, L., Bhutta, Z. A., Cohen, J., Crisp, N., Evans, T., & Zurayk, H. (2010). Health professionals for a new century: Transforming education to strengthen health systems. The Lancet, 376(9756), 1923–1958.

[47] Knight, P. T. (2002). Being a teacher in higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, 73(2), 206–226.

[48] Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress. Jossey-Bass.

[49] Collinson, V., & Cook, T. F. (2007). Organizational learning: Improving learning, teaching, and leading in school systems. Sage Publications.

[50] Feldman, K. A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. Research in Higher Education, 30(6), 583–645.