Faculty Development Post COVID-19: A Cross-Atlantic Conversation and Call to Action

Vicki L. Baker
Albion College

Christel Lutz
University College Utrecht

Abstract: *Originating from a Fulbright Specialist Partnership, this manuscript features a cross-Atlantic conversation and call to action to envision faculty development in a post-COVID era. Relying on relevant literature and practice, four themes are presented with corresponding recommendations as we introduce a new age of faculty development – The Age of the Global Community. Thus, the aim of this manuscript is to initiate a faculty development agenda motivated by the current global pandemic that serves as a launch point for future scholarship and practice.*

Keywords*: faculty development, global perspective*

Introduction

In spring 2020, higher education institutions globally were faced with the challenge of quickly revamping their educational models to virtual learning as the World Health Organization classified COVID as a global pandemic. Social distancing and other public health protocols were instituted as students, faculty, and staff moved out of their offices and labs to embark on remote work and learning. Students were asked to stay home while their courses and many of their research and internship

Vicki L. Baker is a Professor in the Economics and Management Department at Albion College.

Christel Lutz is an Associate Professor in the Psychology Department at the University College Utrecht

projects had to be reconfigured so they could continue online. Simultaneously, instructional technologists and staff employed in centers for teaching and learning were in overdrive supporting faculty members who were tasked with re-envisioning their courses and with filling in technology voids for students with limited online access, with little time and few resources to do so. For faculty members, this rapid change happened against a backdrop of tending to their student concerns and - not in the last place - managing their own and their families' health and well-being. Higher education was not alone in this shift; all industries spanning government, politics, non-profit, medicine, and k-12 education were left scrambling to devise new models for engaging in their work.

Over a year since the world experienced this upheaval, the long-term implications have begun to surface. News headlines and internal corporate reports including, "Why Remote Working will be the New Normal, even after COVID-19," "The Future of Work Post COVID-19," and "HR Leaders Plan to Embrace Remote Work Post-Pandemic" highlight the new work model that is evolving in real time (E&Y Belgium, 2020; Mayer, 2020; Press, 2020). A recent study titled Global Work from Home Experience Survey revealed that 76% of global office workers want to continue working from home post COVID (Lister & Kamouri, 2020). Global powerhouses including General Motors and Siemens are reporting remote working arrangements through mid-2021 and beyond, noting the need for new leadership and employment models, ones rooted in fostering employee performance, not "time in the office" as a measure of productivity (Kelly, 2020). Such trends caused us to wonder -- Despite the challenges higher education is facing globally because of COVID, are we presented with an opportunity to re-envision our work models and the ways in which we support faculty performance and productivity in higher education?

At the time COVID was taking hold globally, we were in partnership through the Fulbright Specialist Program working collaboratively in the Netherlands on faculty development work in the context of liberal arts colleges specifically, but also thinking through ways of supporting faculty across their careers more broadly. This partnership began pre-COVID based on our mutual interest and passion for innovating faculty development in liberal arts colleges domestically and abroad. As faculty development scholars and practitioners, we are keenly aware of and take

responsibility for ensuring our faculty colleagues have the support they need to manage our changing circumstances in higher education. We each hold faculty appointments in which we teach undergraduate courses in our respective disciplines, while also engaging in formal leadership positions that involve student and faculty development responsibilities. And, even without a global pandemic, we noted similar issues placing strain on faculty members in the US and the Netherlands (Baker, 2019; Matthews, 2019). In the Netherlands, for example, national employment surveys published by the General Education Union (AOB) show that faculty members in higher education are among the most overworked employees alongside others working in education more broadly (AOB, 2020). Exacerbating the issue, performance metrics used for evaluation and promotion at universities are still based almost exclusively in measures of research output ('publish or perish'), confronting faculty members with a diabolic reality -- caring for student learning is systematically undervalued as it competes with time spent on research, and thus with career opportunities.

Even after our time in the Netherlands came to an end, we have continued the work we initiated, realizing that many of the challenges and opportunities associated with faculty development are similar in the US, the Netherlands, and beyond. This reality, coupled with the explicit declarations made by some of the world's most visible business leaders about new work models post-COVID, inspired us to further a cross-Atlantic conversation as we seek to envision a new faculty development moving forward.

The goal of our position paper is to offer a literature and practice-informed perspective for advancing the field of faculty development, one that we argue is critical in a post COVID higher education environment. In the context of COVID, many people have been quoting Winston Churchill, who is credited for saying, "Never ever let a good crisis go to waste" when forming the United Nations following WWII. This quote can also be applied to the academic profession. COVID has placed tremendous pressure on universities across the globe, as well as on the academics, support staff, and students who exist within the university system. As the pandemic continues, we are seeing underlying challenges that were perhaps less apparent before. We must seize this opportunity to acknowledge what is broken, and to think about ways to fix it.

To support the goal of offering solutions to identified challenges, we offer insights into related conversations and actions that are occurring presently in the US and the Netherlands. We first provide a brief overview of the field of faculty development and its evolution, noting that societal changes have informed that evolution and arguing that COVID is forcing critical and systemic accelerations. While our desire to offer a cross-Atlantic faculty development agenda is motivated by the current global pandemic, our hope is the ideas offered throughout this manuscript serve as a starting point, not a final destination.

Faculty Development: Past, Present, Future

The field of educational development is relatively new in comparison to other areas in higher education. Referred to interchangeably as educational development, faculty development, and professional development, the field has progressed in the US over the more than 50 years since its inception. During that time, scholars and practitioners have studied the evolution of faculty development, the term we use throughout this manuscript, coinciding with changes in higher education globally (Lemoine et al., 2019). Those studies have included institutional examinations (Elliott & Oliver, 2016; McGowan, 2020), disciplinary examinations (Cherrstrom et al., 2017; Shouren, 2017), teaching and delivery methods evaluations (Elliott et al., 2015; Meyer, 2014), career stage considerations (Baker & Manning, 2021; Ricci et al., 2020; Yun et al., 2016), reviews of higher education systems (Hibbert & Semler, 2016), and an assessment of overall effectiveness (Condon et al., 2016; Phuong et al., 2018).

The current global pandemic provides yet a new societal context that has supercharged an overhaul of educational delivery and assessment-methods across all institution types, in a very short timeframe. Faculty members are in a unique position of being both directly impacted by the changes in their roles as teachers and learners while at the same time being tasked with the direct responsibility to support students' management of their new educational environment. In the following section, we provide a brief review of relevant literature that describes the evolution that the field of faculty development has seen. We also include mention of the factors that triggered that evolution and offer reflections on the impact of COVID on specific aspects.

Evolution of Faculty Development

Perhaps Sorcinelli et al. (2006) said it best, "At the heart of the university or college are its faculty members - the men and women who devote their lives to research, teaching, and service missions of higher education institutions" (p xiii). It is these individuals who are on the front lines of the educational delivery process. The most comprehensive examination of faculty development to date is documented in Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present (Sorcinelli et al., 2006) and the companion book, Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence: Current Practices, Future Imperatives (Beach et al., 2016). The authors adeptly provide insights into higher education spanning over five decades and highlight the ways in which faculty development responded to changing higher education contexts within and outside of the academy. Even while their own focus has been on the US context, their reflections are relevant globally and serve to anchor our discussion.

In their first book, Sorcinelli and colleagues (2006) described, in detail, five ages of faculty development. Those ages included the Age of the Scholar (1950s to early 1960s), the Age of the Teacher (1960s through the 1970s), the Age of the Developer (1980s), the Age of the Learner (1990s), and the Age of the Network (2000s). Each age brought with it a new unit of analysis or focal actor which informed the evolution within and across ages.

Faculty development during the Age of the Scholar, for example, focused on fostering scholarly development of faculty members. Sorcinelli and colleagues (2006) noted that relatively few formal faculty development programs were in existence. The Age of the Teacher saw faculty development efforts evolve to include instructional and organizational development with a predominant focus on improving teaching. The academy saw a rise in centers for teaching and learning on college and university campuses during this period. During the Age of the Developer, topic areas in which faculty development expanded included pedagogy and other curricular needs, career stage considerations, and personal growth and well-being of individual faculty members. The Age of the Learner saw a heightened focus on teaching and learning which was accompanied by a continued increase in associated centers. This Age also brought with it a collaborative approach to faculty development, one

rooted in capacity-building as it engaged educational associations, consortia, and professional organizations and societies to support faculty development efforts. The final age presented in their first book, the Age of the Network, the authors noted, "Developers will be called upon to preserve, clarify, and enhance purposes of faculty development and to network with faculty and institutional leaders…" (Sorcinelli et al., 2006, p. 28).

Their follow up book, *Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence* (Beach et al., 2016), sought to provide an update on the field of faculty development a decade after their initial work. Notable changes in higher education during that decade included a diversifying student body, increased reliance on non-tenured and contingent faculty, and increased calls for accountability among higher education institutions (Cleveland-Innes, 2020; Kezar et al., 2015). All of these changes, characterized as "the new normal" required yet another shift in how faculty development was defined, developed, and assessed (Beach, et al., 2016, p. 146). As Beach and colleagues (2016) noted, "The envisioned new normal focused on students, faculty, and faculty developers...it would include shared discourse among faculty and administrators, partnerships with a range of stakeholders, a reward structure that measures and values teaching, and intergenerational mentoring throughout an institution" (p.146). As a field, faculty development must ensure all areas of faculty responsibility (e.g., teaching, advising, mentoring, scholarship, community engagement) are supported and all stakeholders are included in the advancement of the field.

In the Netherlands, for example, this perspective on faculty development is in line with calls for action in a recent position paper published by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), *Room for Everyone's Talent: Towards a New Balance in the Recognition and Rewards for Academics* (VSNU, 2019). Arguing that core tasks of knowledge institutions are in the areas of education, research, and impact and patient care, the authors claim that an urgent change is needed in the way universities recognize and reward faculty members. They argue that metrics which emphasize research output are at odds with changing demands placed on colleges and universities and its faculty members when education and impact are equally, if not more, important. New ways of valuing and rewarding interdisciplinary scientific work on

complex societal issues must be in sync with new ways of collaborating (e.g., Open Access and Open Science) and require an urgent rethink of faculty development models as well.

And here we are in 2021, a new decade with new challenges facing higher education globally. Perhaps few more pronounced and immediate than the COVID global pandemic which has all but turned higher education on its proverbial head. We believe the global impact of COVID will herald a new age in faculty development, one that we call The Age of the Global Community, one which we believe will be marked by an acceleration of virtual learning and by fundamentally new ways of engaging with – local and distant – communities.

We have both observed the current challenges and the implications of those challenges, which only serve to elevate the role and importance of faculty development, necessitating as they do an institutional focus on individual needs. The pandemic forces us to be together while working at home, alone. Many faculty members face similar challenges and are working quickly to upgrade and enhance existing skill sets to meet the needs of their diversifying students while employing a myriad of pedagogically re-envisioned tools. Yet, we do so in vastly different home circumstances spanning from practical aspects such as internet speed to the profound as some of us are suddenly home-schooling our children, worried about isolated and elderly parents or facing severe economic impact of the pandemic on members of their household. Moreover, teaching tasks are impacted differently depending on what is taught, and how. While some content can be moved relatively easily to a blended environment, this is not true for the training of more practical skills. It is also clear that research programs are impacted to differing degrees. For some the impact is near-disastrous, as laboratory work has come to a halt or research sabbaticals have been cancelled. For others, the pandemic offers new opportunities for collaboration or more flexibility because of significantly less time spent commuting (Kim, 2020).

Those tasked with faculty development responsibilities must find ways to support this sudden evolution, of which they themselves are a part. Across professional domains, COVID has taught us how essential resourcefulness, adaptability, and resilience are. Whether in the front lines of health care or higher education, we need adaptive experts who can balance efficiency and innovation (Smith, 2020). COVID clearly

adds urgency to an already ongoing debate about the hollowing-out of teaching, research and service at higher education institutions in recent decades. Paradoxically, COVID may cause such urgent changes to be delayed rather than accelerated, simply because the human resources required to affect change, already scarce, are being depleted in the current circumstances (Veldhuis, 2020). We argue that it is because of these urgent challenges, not despite them, that the global pandemic has opened the door to a faculty development reassessment, one in which we envision the future of the field.

Envisioning Faculty Development in the Age of the Global Community

As we noted in our prior research and practice (Baker, 2020a; Baker 2020b), faculty members are on the front-lines of the educational re-envisioning process as they weigh the pros and cons of the varied delivery methods available spanning online, in person, hybrid, and hyflex to name a few. As we reflect on lessons learned on our respective campuses and in the field of faculty development more broadly, we have learned how difficult the pandemic has been and continues to be. We also learned how much support we, as faculty members need, and how much we have lost, particularly related to our immediate academic communities given public health protocols. The learning curve is steep for a majority of faculty, particularly early career colleagues and academic mothers, and the available supports to manage are barely keeping up (Flaherty, 2020). As faculty members and faculty developers ourselves in liberal arts colleges, we continue to be keenly aware of the challenges our peers (including ourselves) faced since our doors shut last spring forcing teaching fully online initially and then partially reopened this fall and spring allowing for some face-to-face teaching. The "in real time" learning offers opportunities to envision faculty development moving forward; an approach that squarely situates higher education's most critical resource - the faculty members - at the center of those re-envisioning efforts. Front-line workers and innovators as they are now, faculty members are learning en masse about the possibilities of distance learning, while at the same time recognizing how crucial in-person interactions will remain. Regarding assessment especially, we note an acceleration of a move towards more formative assessments with an

emphasis on higher-level skills and about programmatic assessment (c.f. Bala et al., 2020).

In the following sections, we highlight four themes that undergird our call to action related to faculty development in the Age of the Global Community. Ideally, these areas serve as a foundation from which to build as we seek to innovate faculty development and broaden the notion of community, an expansion of the Age of the Network (Sorcinelli, et al., 2006). To inform our call to action, we rely on lessons learned and insights from our world partners. Each of these areas are salient domestically and abroad, and dominate conversations among faculty, campus leaders, and faculty developers across our campuses and those of our peers across higher education.

We felt it important to note that our themes are situated in an alignment framework (Baker, Lunsford, & Pifer, 2017; Gratton & Truss, 2003) in which truly effective faculty development is positioned at the intersection of institutional priorities and imperatives with individual (e.g., faculty member) needs (Baker, Pifer, & Lunsford, 2016). Alignment draws on three core tenets including vertical alignment (e.g., people strategy must vary based on organizational environment and circumstances), horizontal alignment (e.g., coherent, consistent approach to managing organizational members) and implementation (e.g., action) (Baker, Lunsford, & Pifer, 2017; Gratton & Truss, 2003). An important assumption underlying this framework, however, is that institutional priorities and strategic imperatives are clearly (and visibly) articulated, and serve as a foundational element in key institutional activities.

Theme 1: Prioritize Work-Life Practices

COVID has all but eviscerated the notion of work-life balance given lines that were once blurred, are now mostly nonexistent. Remote work, online teaching, and advising are being mostly managed off campus, while other faculty peers complete work tasks from the confines of their offices, with little to no in person interaction. For many of our academic peers around the globe, this work is happening while simultaneously managing virtual or hybrid K-12 schedules and other personal responsibilities such as caring for aging parents or elderly neighbors. If ever there was a time that faculty members needed support and resources, regardless of institution type or geographic location, it is now.

News headlines about work life balance during COVID abound, both within and outside of the academy (e.g., Laker, 2020; Yerkes et al., 2020; Taylor, 2020). To better support work-life balance in the academy now and post-COVID, there needs to be a re-prioritization of institutional investments, and we narrow in on faculty development programming and corresponding resources as an important institutional investment and an area ripe for innovation.

Faculty Development Programming. Throughout our scholarship and practice, we have continued to hear campus administrators vent frustrations over lack of faculty participation in expensive programming, while faculty members complain that the programming offered isn't the "right" programming and fails to meet professional (or personal) needs (Baker, Lunsford, & Pifer, 2017). COVID has highlighted an interesting dichotomy by both emphasizing the urgency to formulate faculty development programming, while also highlighting the inability for faculty development programming to be all things to all people (at the individual level). One way to get needed insights is through an institutional re-evaluation of what is essential and viable. At an individual level, existential interrogations ('does what I do have value') seem to us a natural response to a global disaster. We observe many of our friends and colleagues, in response to the COVID pandemic, recalibrating their lives to more or lesser degrees.

In purpose-driven institutions like colleges and universities, all stakeholders need to be engaged in discussions that determine answers to what is essential in their communities at the institutional level in response to the challenges resulting from COVID. Such stakeholder engagement makes clear exactly which dialogues and actions at departmental and individual levels need to be facilitated. Centralizing faculty members means prioritizing and supporting their ability and resources to tend to their own development – whether during COVID or not. The crisis made clear that this is urgently true, and it will not become less true once the urgency of the crisis – hopefully – dissipates.

Our practical advice is to offer faculty development programming that acknowledges and accounts for career stages and work-life issues; creating communities bound less singularly by discipline, institution, or nation but more purposefully and thematically organized in global

communities. For example, in the Netherlands, academics working at Liberal Arts and Sciences Colleges have recently combined efforts to support careers in the liberal arts through a shared professional organization which transcends institutional boundaries. Moreover, whereas (inter)national assemblies would not have been possible just a year ago, online gatherings in Zoom are truly 'the new normal' so that, since COVID-19, these are far more easily organized and more eagerly attended. In addition to a more targeted shift in faculty development programming, we also suggest a pointed focus on specific faculty populations most impacted by the pandemic (e.g., pre-tenure colleagues, women). We focus on women academics.

Women Academics. While all individuals across a range of fields and careers have no doubt felt the strain (and pain) caused by the pandemic, academic mothers in particular have faced unparalleled hardships seeking to advance in their careers. As Scheiber (2020) pointed out, the pandemic is especially challenging for women in careers characterized by an up or out trajectory, such as academia, in which high-stakes promotions are on the line. "The loss of months or more of productivity to additional child care responsibilities, which fall more heavily on women, can reverberate throughout their careers" (Scheiber, 2020, para 4).

One institutional response to this reality is pausing or extending tenure and promotion clocks. And while that provides some relief, researchers are finding that such policies still proportionally benefit men given they are able to take the extra time to focus on research whereas women academics are forced to balance parental responsibilities (Antecol et al., 2018). As Scheiber (2020) noted, the pandemic is having similar effects given women are once again disproportionately managing the parental and virtual schooling responsibilities while trying to manage their careers. Such a model is unsustainable.

Additionally, broadening how development funds can be used, such as to offset childcare costs (if available due to public health protocols), would be perhaps more useful to academic mothers during this global crisis. The reality is the implications from the pandemic will have long-term effects for individuals and the institutions in which they are employed. The lack of productivity will not be a mere blip on the radar and will characterize the lived experiences of a significant portion of women

academics across the globe. Building on the ideas offered here, we turn our attention to our second theme – rethink assessment and promotion metrics.

Theme 2: Rethink Assessment and Promotion Metrics

Given the implications of COVID on work productivity and satisfaction, we urge institutional and departmental leaders to engage in a thoughtful re-examination of disciplinary norms to determine if those norms align with practice and the realities of the current (and future) academy. Such discussion is particularly important for individuals, such as for our pre-tenure colleagues and those seeking advancement through tenure and promotion processes. Flexibility to move beyond disciplinary and institutional norms (especially for early career colleagues) provides room for more creativity and innovation in scholarship, teaching, and practice. As part of our Theme 2 discussion, we focus specifically on tenure and promotion practices as well as what we call a need for more institutional inputs.

Tenure & Promotion Practices. As stated previously, many institutions are managing COVID by pausing or extending tenure and promotion clocks. While we applaud these efforts, more can and should be done, given women and underrepresented faculty colleagues are disproportionately impacted during promotion and tenure processes in non-pandemic times. Institutions can use this time to assess their current tenure and promotion practices as they apply to all, regardless of pandemic. That assessment needs to extend beyond overall satisfaction measures to instead include an in-depth examination of all facets of career advancement, including policies and practices.

We recommend conducting an evaluation of tenure and promotion processes (pre, during, post). That evaluation, for example, could involve a process mapping of the various touch points faculty members encounter along with corresponding policies and practices. This could involve input from a diversity of faculty who recently completed the process, paying close attention to the experiences of women and faculty of color in order to compare their experiences against majority faculty. Gaining clarity on how expectations are communicated, about where and how candidates gather relevant information, and how and with whom

candidates engage with the process is important. Determining how, and the extent to which, women and other underrepresented faculty fare in this process is essential. What messages are communicated to these populations of faculty about what is, and is not valued by the academy, particularly during times of crisis? The evaluation should engage with and represent the voices of those who have successfully, and unsuccessfully traversed this process. Now is the time to re-evaluate and decolonize career advancement practices and related policies that are steeped in inherent biases. Opportunities abound to draw on the most innovative career development practices and adapt them for the purposes of higher education.

Focus on Institutional Inputs. We agree with the authors of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA, 2019), who state that "Outputs other than research articles will grow in importance in assessing research effectiveness in the future" (para 1) in their call to raise awareness of the need for new tools and processes to assess scholarly output. Their recommendations focus primarily on practices relating to research articles and other research-related outputs (e.g., datasets). Our recommendations can be seen as a natural extension of these, as we call for the recognition of other types of scholarly output, such as work that results from active societal engagement (see Theme 3) or from collaborations with students. However, to facilitate progress in this direction, institutions need to take a close look at current tenure, promotion, and other career advancement policies and practices including a review of corresponding messaging to see how aligned (or not) that infrastructure is towards achieving this aim.

We once again emphasize the importance of an alignment framework which we described earlier (Baker, Lunsford, & Pifer, 2017; Gratton & Truss, 2003) to support these efforts. Institutional priorities and faculty needs cannot operate in parallel to each other, and the current pandemic underscores this point. Faculty developers, institutional leaders, and faculty members must gain clarity about institutional priorities and faculty members' needs, and use this knowledge to work creatively to develop evolved career advancement assessment and promotion procedures. Rather than institutional metrics (which can create a false sense of transparency and fairness), we need procedures which allow for meaningful evaluation of individual career trajectories. Guiding questions may include: What are the strategic imperatives of the

institution, short and long-term? Are individual faculty members recognized and rewarded for their contributions to the institutional imperatives? Such alignment is critical at all times, but particularly during times of crisis when resources are dwindling. The pandemic is a good reminder about the importance of investing strategically in the human resources of an organization, including the surrounding or global community which is the focus of our third theme – academic community engagement and community-based learning.

Theme 3: Leverage Academic Community Engagement and Community-Based Learning

The academic profession is inherently social and this aspect of the professoriate is but one of the many reasons why we, and our colleagues, pursued a career in this field. The ability to engage in thoughtful dialogue, debate, and action with our peers, students, and community partners fuels our own scholarly learning in and out of the classroom (Baker et al., 2017). We agree with a recent statement made by Christen Aragoni, editor of Liberal Education, in which she highlighted the impact of COVID on higher education: "It is merely emphasizing with many exclamation points the importance of higher education's mission to be on the forefront of protecting democracy and ensuring students are prepared to become engaged citizens" (Aragoni, 2020). However, the ability to support this mission is greatly altered because of the pandemic. Students and faculty alike as well as community partners rely on support from and engagement with their home colleges or universities. We highlight the connection between community-based engagement and professional growth and offer community-based learning examples as important to our Theme 3 discussion.

Community-Based Engagement and Professional Growth. Scholars have revealed the connection between the professional lives and work of faculty who participate in community engagement and how such engagement enhances professional and personal growth (O'Meara et al., 2011; Welch & Plaxton-Moore, 2017). However, others have revealed the disconnect between campus administrators' desire to increase faculty engagement in this high-impact practice and the limited time and lack of institutional support available to faculty to facilitate this engagement, notwithstanding the little (to no) value it holds in tenure and promotion

decisions (Gorski, & Mehta, 2016; Holland, 2016). As faculty development scholars and practitioners, we have experienced firsthand these realities and disconnects through stories shared by our colleagues across a range of institution types, an issue that is present in the US and the Netherlands.

We agree with Welch's and Plaxton-Moore's (2017) observation, "...There is an emerging pedagogical and ethical incentive to identify and implement continued professional education to faculty that effectively serves not only the instructors and scholars using engaged pedagogy in the courses, but students, community partners, and those they serve as indirect beneficiaries as well" (p. 132). As Baker (2020a) argued in a recent opinion piece published in Inside HigherEd: now is not the time to cut faculty development budgets, but rather reallocate and re-envision how those funds can be used. We believe community engagement is a fruitful area in which re-envisioning and innovation can occur.

Community-Based Learning Examples. As a result of COVID, new (online) communities are being forged, locally and at a distance. For example, two international internship and community-based learning programs supported at University College Utrecht, one to Aruba and one to East-Africa, are no longer seeing the travel of participating students to these distant locations. However, the programs do not cease to exist, but are instead partially re-configured online. Baker relies on community-based learning as fundamental to delivering a management education at Albion College. COVID means that the in-person engagement is limited, however such a reality should not be a deterrent to incorporating such high-impact practices in the classroom. The current (and future) needs of community partners highlights the importance of intense engagement, given these individuals are also suffering from COVID related challenges. While serving in a consultative capacity, students are able to see first-hand the opportunities and challenges COVID presents to community organizations, which facilitates a collaborative approach to solving these problems while also contributing in meaningful ways to the community.

Aspects of the partnerships with stakeholders and other educational programs have been made easy by the very fact that the pandemic has reached every corner of the world. As everyone is seated behind their computer screen at home, the main distance left to travel is not spatial,

but rather temporal – and as long as some are willing to get up early while others work late, global connections and shared classrooms have come into existence that we would not have conceived of without the global crisis. While clearly adding to the time management challenges of academics engaged in this type of work in combination with a full workday, we also believe that such connections may well bring new empowerment and energy to these projects. We regard our own research in faculty development as a form of community-engaged research itself. As we study how we can support one another in this crisis, we are uncovering unrealized potential in our work, and in each other.

The implications of community-based learning for faculty as a professional development tool are immense. We recommend faculty developers and those tasked with faculty development responsibilities facilitate cross campus dialogue. Find out who is currently engaged in this work and who wants to be engaged. Include community partners in these conversations. Seek to find out how community-based learning can be in service to faculty members' career advancement goals and community partners' needs and wants. In sum, we agree with Unger (2020) who said, "High-impact civic learning is not only how our colleges and universities can survive and thrive, it is how they can justify their purpose to their own stakeholders and the broader public. Let's be on the better side of history and engage our students more fully and consistently with the worlds beyond their classrooms" (para 11). Our emphasis here is on collaborations and leveraging avenues that broaden collaborations, which we expand on as part of our final theme discussion – Accelerate the Open Science Agenda.

Theme 4: Accelerate the Open Science Agenda.

As the world responds to the pandemic, examples of the ways in which knowledge sharing has been beneficial and lacking, abound. While some countries have pursued a national approach, others have relied on state and local authorities to guide response efforts. An important lesson for higher education has surfaced – the need for resources that facilitate collaboration, information sharing, dissemination, open channels for communication, and opportunities for affirming validity and reliability of scholarly findings are needed. Thus, the focus of the final theme presented in our call to action is the need to accelerate the Open Science

agenda through considerations about faculty development in the Age of the Global Community.

The COVID crisis brings added urgency to a growing need to embrace new ways of organizing higher education. As faculty developers we see a crucial role for Open Science, and we agree with the call for a change in culture described in the advice paper published by the League of European Universities (LERU, 2018). Open Science offers new ways to do research and disseminate findings, offering pathways for collaborations across universities and with societal partners. Embracing Open Science crucially includes opportunities for Open Education and Innovation, making it possible to negotiate the changes necessary to support, recognize, and reward the type of community-engaged research described under Theme 3. It invites diverse types of scholarship – but this is possible only if faculty development programs are aligned with these aims. Rather than metrics which focus merely on the number of articles published or grants awarded, Open Science/Education/Innovation highlights the importance of open conversations with students and societal partners, providing a natural platform for public engagement – both in terms of thinking about why we engage the public in our research and teaching, as well as having conversations with multiple publics about what science is and why science matters.

No doubt, there are benefits and challenges to Open Science, which are well documented. For example, research by Allen and Mehler (2019) illustrated the reputational gains, increased chances for publication, and broader increase in reliability of study findings as strong benefits to advancing an Open Science agenda. However, they also acknowledged the associated costs in terms of flexibility, time, and current incentive structures. Open Science will affect the way science is viewed in society; how it is regarded, taught, and used. We envision direct impacts on teaching, specifically in infusing global perspectives in the classroom and by fostering global teaching teams. While these opportunities are exciting, of course this uncharted territory is bound to bring challenges to faculty developers and others tasked with supporting faculty development offerings that prepare faculty members to engage in Open Science pathways.

Despite likely challenges, we see Open Science and Open Education as opening exciting new avenues and opportunities that add value and

facilitate community building and cross-country collaborations that benefit a variety of stakeholders in local, national, and global communities. We believe COVID is speeding up the need for such efforts. The adoption of open practices requires a change in attitude and productivity expectations, which need to be considered by academics at all levels, as well as funders. Yet, taken together, we think that "capitalizing on the benefits is a good investment" (Allen & Mehler, 2019, para 30).

Conclusion

All areas of higher education are feeling the strain imposed by the COVID crisis, yet we see this crisis as an opportunity to recalibrate and push the field of faculty development into the future. We have heard, and experienced, the challenges in the academy. Yet, we see so much potential to contribute to the needed solutions. Our time together in the Netherlands through our Fulbright Specialist partnership was profoundly inspirational for us and highlighted the responsibility we have as scholars and practitioners to contribute in meaningful ways to the experiences of our faculty peers around the globe. The pandemic has highlighted the value of education and science; new work models are becoming apparent and urgently necessary. Documenting the cross-Atlantic conversation and call to action is just one way for us to help guide those efforts recognizing that at the core of all of this opportunity are the faculty members who are deserving of support. Our hope is to propel us strongly into the Age of the Global Community.

References

Antecol, H., Bedard, K., & Stearns, J. (2018). Equal but inequitable: who benefits from gender-neutral tenure clock stopping policies? *American Economic Review*, *108*(9), 2420-41.

Allen, C., & Mehler, D. M. (2019). Open science challenges, benefits and tips in early career and beyond. *PLoS biology*, *17*(5), e3000246.

AOB (September 2020). More Burnout Complaints in Education.
        https://www.aob.nl/en/nieuws/weer-meer-burn-outklachten-in-
        het-onderwijs/.

Aragoni, C. (2020). From the editor: Democracy in action. *Liberal
        Education, 106*(1/2).
        https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2020/winter-spring/editor

Baker, V. L. (September 8, 2020a). Now's not the time to cut faculty
        development funds. *Inside HigherEd*.
        https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/09/08/four-ways-
        investing-professional-development-now-can-benefit-both-
        faculty-and

Baker, V. L. (March 25, 2020b). How colleges can better help faculty
        during the pandemic. *Inside HigherEd*.
        https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/03/25/recommenda
        tions-how-colleges-can-better-support-their-faculty-during-
        covid-19

Baker, V. L. (January 30, 2019). Academe needs to take a cue from
        industry. *Inside HigherEd*.
        https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2019/01/30/midcareer-
        faculty-members-need-more-training-and-development-opinion

Baker, V. L., & Manning, C. E. (2021). A Mid-Career Faculty Agenda:
        A Review of Four Decades of Research and Practice. *Higher
        Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 36*, 1-66.

Baker, V. L., Lunsford, L. G., & Pifer, M. J. (2017). *Developing faculty
        in liberal arts colleges: Aligning individual needs and
        organizational goals*. Rutgers University Press: New Brunswich,
        NJ.

Baker, V. L., Pifer, M. J., & Lunsford, L. G. (2016). Faculty challenges
        across rank in liberal arts colleges: A human resources
        perspective. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(1), 23-30.

Bala L, van der Vleuten C, Freeman A, Torre D, Heeneman S, Sam AH. COVID-19 and programmatic assessment. Clin Teach. 2020 Jun 26:10.1111/tct.13207. doi: 10.1111/tct.13207. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 32588965; PMCID: PMC7361442.

Beach, A.L., Sorcinelli, M.D., Austin, A.E., & Rivard, J.K. (2016). *Faculty development in the age of evidence: Current practices, future imperatives*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Cherrstrom, C. A., Richardson, R. S., Fowler, D., Autenrieth, R., & Zoran, M. J. (2017). Creating Teaching Opportunities for STEM Future Faculty Development. *Journal of STEM Teacher Education*, *52*(1), 7.

Cleveland-Innes, M. (2020). Student demographic change and pedagogical issues in Higher Education. In *Inequality, Innovation and Reform in Higher Education* (pp. 159-173). Springer, Cham.

Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Indiana University Press.

DORA (2019). Improving how research is assessed. https://sfdora.org/

Elliott, R. W., & Oliver, D. E. (2016). Linking faculty development to community college student achievement: A mixed methods approach. *Community college journal of research and practice*, *40*(2), 85-99.

Elliott, M., Rhoades, N., Jackson, C. M., & Mandernach, B. J. (2015). Professional development: Designing initiatives to meet the needs of online faculty. *Journal of Educators Online*, *12*(1), n1.

EY Belgium (September 7, 2020). Why remote working will be the new normal, even after COVID-19. https://www.ey.com/en_be/covid-19/why-remote-working-will-be-the-new-normal-even-after-covid-19

Flaherty, C. (November 19, 2020). Faculty pandemic stress is now chronic. *Inside HigherEd*. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/11/19/faculty-pandemic-stress-now-chronic

Gorski, I., & Mehta, K. (2016). Engaging Faculty across the Community Engagement Continuum. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, *6*, 108-123.

Gratton, L., & Truss, C. (2003). The three-dimensional people strategy: Putting human resources policies into action. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *17*(3), 74-86.

Hibbert, P., & Semler, M. (2016). Faculty development in teaching and learning: the UK framework and current debates. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *53*(6), 581-591.

Holland, B. A. (2016). Factors Influencing Faculty Engagement--Then, Now, and Future. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *20*(1), 73-81.

Kelly, J. (July 27, 2020). Siemens says that 140,000 of its employees can work from anywhere. *Forbes online*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2020/07/27/siemens-says-that-140000-of-its-employees-can-work-from-anywhere/#6012362d6a44

Kezar, A. J., Maxey, D., & Holcombe, E. (2015). *The professoriate reconsidered: A study of new faculty models*. Pullias Center for Higher Education, University of Southern California.

Kim, J. (March 16, 2020). Will COVID-19 permanently shift how higher ed thinks about remote work? *Inside HigherEd*. https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/learning-innovation/will-covid-19-permanently-shift-how-higher-ed-thinks-about-remote-work

Laker, B. (April 28, 2020). How to dramatically improve work-life balance. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/benjaminlaker/2020/04/28/how-to-dramatically-improve-work-life-balance-during-coronavirus-crisis/#2512839b5b1e

Lemoine, P. A., Seneca, S., & Richardson, M. D. (2019). Resilience for faculty development in global higher education. In *Handbook of Research on Faculty Development for Digital Teaching and Learning* (pp. 481-504). IGI Global.

LERU (2018). *Open Science and its role in universities: A roadmap for cultural change.* Advice Paper, May. https://www.leru.org/files/LERU-AP24-Open-Science-full-paper.pdf.

Lister, K., & Kamouri, A. (2020). Global work from home experience survey. *Global Workplace Analytics*. https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/brags/news-releases

Matthews, D. (2019). Dutch end 'one-sided" research focus and hope world follows. *Times Higher Education* (online). https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/dutch-end-one-sided-research-focus-and-hope-world-follows

Mayer, K. (July 20, 2020). HR leaders embrace remote work post-pandemic. *Human Resource Executive*. https://hrexecutive.com/hr-leaders-plan-to-embrace-remote-work-post-pandemic/

McGowan, V. (2020). Institution initiatives and support related to faculty development of open educational resources and alternative textbooks. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, *35*(1), 24-45.

Meyer, K. A. (2014). An Analysis of the Cost and Cost-Effectiveness of Faculty Development for Online Teaching. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *18*(1), 1.

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(2), 83-96.

Phuong, T. T., Cole, S. C., & Zarestky, J. (2018). A systematic literature review of faculty development for teacher educators. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(2), 373-389.

Press, G. (July 15, 2020). The future of work post-covid-19. *Forbes online*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/gilpress/2020/07/15/the-future-of-work-post-covid-19/#7bc7dbda4baf

Ricci, L. A., Haras, C., & Kelly, K. (2020). Seeing what sticks: Does professional development shape teaching practice for early-career faculty?. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, *34*(2), 89-94.

Scheiber, N. (September 29, 2020). Pandemic imperials promotions for women in academia. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/29/business/economy/pandemic-women-tenure.html?referringSource=articleShare

Shouren, W. A. N. G. (2017). On ways of facilitating university foreign language faculty development. *Foreign Language Learning Theory and Practice*, (2), 1.

Smith, T.M. (May 11, 2020). How adaptive expertise can make or break the COVID-19 response. *American Medical Association.* https://www.ama-assn.org/education/accelerating-change-medical-education/how-adaptive-expertise-can-make-or-break-covid-19

Sorcinelli, M.D., Austin, A.E., Eddy, P.L., & Beach, A.L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty Development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Taylor, L. A. (April 8, 2020). Ten work-life balance tips for researchers based at home during the pandemic. *Nature* (Career Column). https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-01059-4

Unger, A. (2020). How higher ed survives: Affordable, high-impact civic engagement. *Liberal Education Blog*. https://www.aacu.org/blog/how-higher-ed-survives-affordable-high-impact-civic-engagement

VSNU (November 13, 2019). Room for Everyone's Talent: Towards a new Balance in the Recognition and Rewards of Academics. https://www.vsnu.nl/recognitionandrewards/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Position-paper-Room-for-everyone%E2%80%99s-talent.pdf.

Veldhuis, P. (September 4, 2020) (translated title) Scientist Once Again Bound to Draw the Short end of the Stick. *NRC Handelsblad.* https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2020/09/04/straks-trekken-wetenschappers-weer-aan-het-kortste-eind-a4010846

Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (2017). Faculty development for advancing community engagement in higher education: Current trends and future directions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *21*(2), 131-166.

Yerkes, M. A., André, S., Beckers, D. G. J., Besamusca, J., Kruyen, P. M., Remery, C., van der Zwan, R., & Geurts, S. (2020, July 21). Intelligent lockdown, intelligent effects? The impact of the Dutch COVID-19 'intelligent lockdown' on gendered work and family dynamics among parents. https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/uq2pf

Yun, J. H., Baldi, B., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2016). Mutual mentoring for early-career and underrepresented faculty: Model, research, and practice. *Innovative Higher Education*, *41*(5), 441-451.