

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Prepared by the Faculty Development Subcommittee AY 2016/2017

March 2017

Members of the Faculty Development Subcommittee AY 2016/2017

Jay Rajasekera, Professor, Graduate School of International Management (GSIM)

Shinichi Hirose, Professor, Graduate School of International Management (GSIM)

Vida Macikenaite, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of International Relations (GSIR)

Michael Mondejar, Assistant Professor, Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR)

Summary

Faculty development activities at IUJ have been implemented independently in each of the departments (GSIM, GSIR, and CLEAR). In GSIR and CLEAR, Faculty Activity Report systems have been in place to monitor the progress of faculty development in addition to other matters. This has provided the faculty with opportunities to receive feedback and suggestions from the Dean or Program Director, respectively. In addition, across all departments, course evaluations submitted at the end of each term by the students have been used to assess and improve teaching effectiveness. The results of the course evaluations are reviewed at curriculum meetings (GSIM) or during the annual faculty activity report follow-up meetings (GSIR and CLEAR). The Deans or Program Director can review the final evaluation results and offer feedback to the faculty to help improve their teaching. Such review gives guidance to the faculty, identifying the areas that need improvement in terms of teaching and curriculum development.

Program and course coordination within GSIM, GSIR, and CLEAR have been pursued through regular curriculum meetings and program meetings.

Further, there is funding allocated to the faculty attending outside or organizing within IUJ pedagogical development workshops and conferences. Thus, some faculty members have attended relevant conferences or instructor-training workshops both in Japan and abroad.

Faculty development activities in each of the departments are explained in more details in the attachments 1-3.

Suggestions for further improvement of faculty development activities at IUJ

The Faculty Development Subcommittee recommends that, for further improvement of faculty development at IUJ, the following faculty development activities are considered to be developed and introduced across the three departments:

1. *Mandatory peer observations*: At least once an academic year, every full-time faculty member is required to observe a class taught by another instructor in the same program and provide that instructor with feedback regarding their teaching. Furthermore, faculty should be encouraged to observe classes taught by professors in different programs, to promote cross-program understanding and collaboration.
2. *Peer review of the syllabi in a program*: Faculty within each program should discuss the syllabi of other instructors to coordinate the contents of the courses within the program and provide feedback on the overall structure of the course and student work load.
3. *Mid-term evaluations for every program*: Following the example of GSIM, courses in every program should conduct mid-term evaluations to provide instructors with more immediate feedback on their teaching strengths and areas to improve, particularly pertaining to classes that are still ongoing. Such a system would most likely require a quick-turn around time (<1 week) to be effective, and therefore the evaluation forms should be short.
4. *Mentoring of junior faculty members*: Once a member in the early years of their career join IUJ, they could be formally assigned a mentor – senior faculty member from the same program – to assist them in developing their teaching skills and provide academic work-related advice. Some informal practices have been implemented so far, and this could serve as an example for an institutionalized system of incoming junior faculty development.

Attachments

1. Faculty development activities at GSIM.
2. Faculty development activities at GSIR.
3. Faculty development activities at CLEAR.

Attachment 1. Faculty development activities at GSIM.

Course Evaluations

Each term, two student evaluations are done for each GSIM course; the so-called “mid-term” evaluation is basically for the faculty member who teaches the course to receive feedback from students. It is usually reviewed by the respective faculty for his/her own benefit. However, the GSIM Dean also can review it and, if needed, provide feedback to the faculty to help improve their teaching.

The assessment that is often used as a gauge for faculty development is the “final course evaluation”, which measures the value of the course and the teaching skills of the faculty. These final course evaluations are reviewed at GSIM Curriculum Meetings, which are held once every month (except during the summer) and attended by “area faculty” who represent key academic areas or disciplines in GSIM, such as Management, Marketing, or IT/OM. Also, the GSIM Dean is present during the curriculum meetings.

The review of the course evaluations helps the Dean identify areas that need improvement in terms of teaching and curriculum development, two areas that are key for academic faculty. When needed, the Dean or senior area faculty could mentor junior faculty, including monitoring a class, to help them develop their skills.

In a survey conducted by GSIM Professor Hirose, the following results were obtained:

- 80% of GSIM faculty had observed class(es) conducted by other faculty members
- 80% of GSIM faculty had offered or received consultation for class delivery improvements

Program and Course Coordination

GSIM currently has three masters programs: 2-Year MBA, E-Business Management, and 1-Year MBA. The general practice in GSIM is that faculty is recruited not for the program, but for the academic area. Thus, good coordination of courses offered at respective programs must be strategically done for quality assurance and efficiency.

GSIM has a curriculum committee that is in charge of this coordination, and reports changes in the curricula to GSIM faculty meetings. These meetings help individual faculty members develop new

curricula and guidance for course materials.

Conferences and Events

GSIM faculty has plenty of opportunities to improve their knowledge of student expectations by attending events such student recruitment “open day” events, workshops, and interviews. The same survey conducted by Prof. Hirose found out that 80% of GSIM faculty had participated in such events.

In addition, GSIM faculty are encouraged to attend academic conferences; IUJ provides financial support to attend such conferences through 1) the individual IUJ research fund, 2) the IUJ Research Institute Travel fund, 3) Kaken-hi (MEXT government research grants)

Faculty Training Workshops

The Super Global University (SGU) status that IUJ received about 3 years ago had enabled various opportunities for IUJ faculty to attend various teacher training workshops. Many such workshops are organized by other large SGU institutions in other parts of Japan.

GSIM has used the SGU opportunity to send several faculty to train at Harvard Business School “Case Method” teaching workshops. Indeed, many courses offered in GSIM are based on this case method; thus, learning how to master it is key for faculty development. In Professor Hirose’s survey, 50% of GSIM faculty indicated that they have participated in such pedagogical improvement workshops.

Attachment 2. Faculty development activities at GSIR.

Faculty Activity Report System

In GSIR, each faculty submits an annual Faculty Activity Report in September. In addition to other matters, the Report includes teaching activities. It monitors course assignments (students' workload) and the results of course evaluations, as well as the faculty's work in curriculum development. The follow-up meeting with the Dean in December has provided opportunities to observe and discuss individual faculty development and progress.

Course evaluations

GSIR collects course evaluations from the students at the end of each term to monitor their satisfaction with teaching quality and course contents. The results, which include evaluations of specific aspects of a course as well as students' individual comments and suggestions, are distributed to the instructors after final submission of the grades. Considering students' feedback, the faculty members are able to revise their future course structure or teaching practices to improve teaching effectiveness. While course evaluations provide guidelines for self-assessment, should it be necessary, course evaluation results can be discussed in detail between the Dean and the faculty at the meeting following submission of the Faculty Activity Report. The Dean may give suggestions to promote faculty development.

The average course evaluation at the GSIR in Fall 2016 increased to 9.04 when compared to 8.78 in Fall 2015. The average course evaluation over winter-spring-fall semesters remained constant at 9.09 in 2015 and 2016.

Program and course coordination

Monthly curriculum meetings have been held between the Dean, Vice Dean, the three program directors (IRP, PMPP, IDP), and OAA members to share information on the practices and policies of curricula at GSIR.

Program meetings in GSIR have been a forum for discussion on ways to improve learning outcomes and teaching effectiveness. In particular, grade structure and the necessity to introduce research methodology-centered course were addressed in the IRP meetings as a means to enhance learning outcomes and the quality of educational activities.

Mentoring and faculty training

There are no formal programs for the mentoring of junior faculty members or faculty training at GSIR at the moment. So far, faculty development activities have taken place informally on an *ad hoc* basis.

Attachment 3. Faculty development activities at CLEAR

Course Evaluations

IUJ administers online course evaluations on behalf of faculty at the end of the every term. The results of these evaluations are distributed to instructors shortly after the conclusion of the term, and the teachers can utilize the feedback to revise their course curricula or teaching practices at their own discretion.

The results of these evaluations, along with other teaching, research, admin, and professional development activities, are tabulated and submitted to the CLEAR Director in the form of an “annual activity report.” The Director then meets with faculty on a one-to-one basis to review the report and provide feedback on each member’s contributions to the program.

CLEAR faculty also designs and administers their own supplementary course evaluations in all courses in order to gauge students’ views on particular teaching techniques, new materials, and other modified aspects of those courses. Such evaluations are meant to provide instructors with more precise feedback for improving course curricula and teaching methodologies.

Program and Course Coordination

The respective departments of CLEAR meet to establish summative goals for each language course at the beginning of the academic year, and review their progress in meeting those goals (using sample student performances) at the end of the year. These goals help inform faculty of necessary curricula improvements, which are further explored in curriculum development meetings that are held at the beginning of the academic year.

CLEAR faculty also meet every other week (in their respective departments) to provide reports on student performance in courses (i.e., attendance, progress, and behavior), make inquiries, and discuss other curricular matters.

Faculty that teach the same classes will regularly meet to discuss course progress and curriculum development, and conduct assessment norming sessions. This is to ensure that students receive “equal levels” of instruction and feedback by all teachers.

Program and course coordination occurs in both the regular term and during the summer intensive

English and Japanese programs.

Conferences

CLEAR faculty regularly attend both Japan-based conferences (e.g., JALT PanSIG Conference, JLEM Conference) and international conferences (e.g., JALT International Conference, Nihongo Kyoiku Gakkai International Conference, TESOL International Convention & English Language Expo) to participate in presentations, workshops, and other types of teacher training.

Teacher Training

CLEAR faculty have participated in both face-to-face and online teacher training classes and workshops to acquire new skills and teaching techniques. These programs are related to instructors' teaching (e.g., Email writing, E-learning material development/instruction) and/or research interests (statistical analysis)

In the Teacher Education Program (TEP), CLEAR faculty invite language-teaching professors and experts from outside of IUJ to the university to conduct teacher training workshops to local/regional language teachers. These workshops are often attended by faculty, who can also learn from the workshop instructors.

CLEAR faculty also conduct their own workshops for local/regional language teachers (some through TEP). These workshops provide faculty with opportunities to share teaching methodologies with these instructors and obtain teacher training experience.

Observations

While we currently do not have any formal teacher mentoring procedures in place, veteran CLEAR faculty will often observe a new faculty member's lessons and provide feedback, and/or invite the new instructor to observe their own classes.