



Faculty of Business Administration
St Teresa International University
Faculty Development Office

TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT
(TNA)

Undergraduate & Graduate Degree Programs

Academic Year 2025 – 2026

Prepared by: Faculty Development Office

1. PURPOSE & OVERVIEW

This Training Needs Assessment (TNA) is a systematic process for identifying the professional development and competency gaps among business school faculty members across both undergraduate (UG) and graduate (GR) degree programs. The findings inform strategic planning for faculty development interventions, resource allocation, and institutional quality assurance.

1.1 Objectives

- Identify current competency levels versus required competency standards for all faculty
- Distinguish training needs specific to undergraduate versus graduate program delivery
- Prioritize development areas aligned with accreditation standards (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA)
- Design targeted, cost-effective training and professional development plans
- Establish a baseline for tracking faculty development outcomes over time

1.2 Scope of Assessment

Dimension	Undergraduate Programs	Graduate Programs
Programs Covered	BBA, BAB, BAcc, B.Sc.(Aeronautics), B.Sc.(ATC)	MBA, DBA.
Faculty Ranks	Lecturer, Asst. Professor	Lecturer, Asst. / Assoc. / Full Professor
Teaching Focus	Foundational concepts, case studies	Advanced research, applied theory
Assessment Methods	Exams, group projects, internships	Exams, Thesis, seminars, publications
Class Size Norms	30–60 students	5–20 students
Accreditation Focus	Teaching quality, curriculum coverage	Research output, faculty qualifications

2. TNA PROCESS FRAMEWORK

The TNA follows a structured six-phase process based on the ADDIE model (Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, Evaluation), adapted for higher education faculty development.

Phase 1: Initiation & Planning

Step 1.1 – Stakeholder Identification

- Dean's Office: Provide strategic direction and institutional priorities
- Department Chairs: Identify departmental needs and faculty performance insights
- Faculty Development Committee: Oversee TNA design and data quality
- Individual Faculty Members: Primary respondents and participants
- Students (sample): Provide course evaluation and teaching effectiveness data
- External Advisors / Accreditors: Benchmark against external quality standards

Step 1.2 – Project Timeline

Phase	Activity	Timeline	Responsible Party
1	Planning & stakeholder alignment	Week 1–2	Dean / HR
2	Data collection (surveys, interviews)	Week 3–6	TNA Coordinator
3	Data analysis & gap identification	Week 7–8	Analytics Team
4	Report drafting & validation	Week 9–10	FDC Committee
5	Training design & intervention plan	Week 11–12	L&D Specialists
6	Implementation & monitoring	Ongoing	Dept. Chairs / FDC

Phase 2: Data Collection

Step 2.1 – Multi-Method Data Gathering

A triangulated approach is used to ensure reliability and validity of assessment findings:

Method	Description	Target Group
Self-Assessment Survey	Structured questionnaire rating competency across 7 domains on a 1–5 scale	All faculty (UG & GR)
Supervisor Appraisal	Department chair evaluates each faculty on same competency framework	All faculty

Method	Description	Target Group
Student Evaluation	Aggregated course evaluation scores and qualitative comments	UG & GR students
Peer Review	Structured classroom observation and peer feedback form	Sample of 30% of faculty
Portfolio Review	Review of syllabi, research outputs, and publications	All full-time faculty
Focus Group Discussions	Facilitated discussion on emerging skill gaps and challenges	Department representatives
Individual Interviews	In-depth 45-minute structured interviews	Senior faculty and chairs
Benchmarking Review	Compare against peer institutions and accreditation benchmarks	FDC Committee

Step 2.2 – Competency Domains Assessed

Faculty are assessed across seven core competency domains for both UG and GR contexts:

#	Competency Domain	Undergraduate Indicators	Graduate Indicators
1	Teaching & Pedagogy	Lecture delivery, active learning, student engagement	Seminar facilitation, Socratic method, research-led teaching
2	Curriculum Design	Learning outcomes alignment, syllabus construction	Graduate-level course rigor, interdisciplinary integration
3	Assessment & Grading	Rubric development, formative & summative balance	Dissertation/thesis supervision, viva examination
4	Research & Scholarship	Engagement with current literature, applied cases	Publication record, grant acquisition, conference presentations
5	Digital & EdTech Literacy	LMS proficiency, online/hybrid delivery	Research tools, data analytics platforms, AI literacy
6	Industry & Professional Links	Guest speakers, internship coordination	Industry partnerships, consulting, executive education
7	Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	Inclusive classroom practices, accessibility	Global perspectives, cross-cultural competency

3. REQUIRED TOOLS & INSTRUMENTS

3.1 Self-Assessment Survey Instrument

Distributed digitally via institutional survey platform. Faculty rate themselves on each competency indicator using the following rating scale:

Rating	Level	Description
1	Novice	Little to no exposure; significant training required
2	Developing	Basic awareness; emerging skills, guided practice needed
3	Competent	Adequate performance with occasional support
4	Proficient	Consistent high performance with minimal guidance
5	Expert	Recognized leader; able to mentor and train others

3.2 Tools & Platforms

Tool / Platform	Category	Purpose & Usage
Microsoft Forms / Qualtrics	Survey Platform	Distribute and collect self-assessment and supervisor appraisal questionnaires
Microsoft Excel / SPSS	Data Analysis	Analyze survey results, compute mean scores, identify gap scores per domain
Power BI / Tableau	Data Visualization	Create dashboards showing competency gap heatmaps and departmental comparisons
LMS (Canvas / Moodle)	Teaching Portfolio	Review syllabi, uploaded materials, and course analytics (completion, engagement rates)
SCOPUS / Web of Science	Research Benchmarking	Verify faculty publication record, citation impact, and h-index for GR programs
HR Information System	Personnel Data	Retrieve faculty rank, years of service, prior training history, and contract type
Zoom / MS Teams	Virtual Interviews & FGDs	Conduct focus groups and individual interviews for remote or distributed faculty
Classroom Observation Form	Peer Review Tool	Structured rubric used during live class observation (provided in Appendix A)
Turnitin / iThenticate	Academic Integrity	Evaluate faculty awareness and enforcement of academic integrity in assessments
Institutional Repository	Portfolio Review	Access faculty-submitted research, case studies, and course development outputs

4. TNA ANALYSIS FORMAT

4.1 Individual Faculty TNA Form

Completed by each faculty member and reviewed by the department chair. One form per faculty member per academic year.

SECTION A: FACULTY IDENTIFICATION

Full Name:	
Employee ID:	
Academic Rank:	☐ Lecturer ☐ Asst. Prof ☐ Assoc. Prof ☐ Professor
Department:	
Programs Teaching:	☐ Undergraduate ☐ Graduate ☐ Both
Years at Institution:	
Assessment Date:	

SECTION B: COMPETENCY SELF-RATING MATRIX (1 = Novice ... 5 = Expert)

Competency Domain / Indicator	Sub-Indicator	Self-Rating (1-5)	Supervisor Rating (1-5)	Gap Score (S-Self)
1. Teaching & Pedagogy	Lesson planning & delivery			
	Student engagement techniques			
	Use of active learning strategies			
	Feedback quality and timeliness			
2. Curriculum Design	Learning outcome alignment			
	Syllabus construction			
	Course material currency			
3. Assessment & Grading	Assessment design and rubrics			

	Formative vs. summative balance			
	Thesis/dissertation supervision (GR)			
4. Research & Scholarship	Publication record (journals/books)			
	Research methodology proficiency			
	Grant writing & funding acquisition			
5. Digital & EdTech Literacy	LMS proficiency (Canvas/Moodle)			
	Hybrid/online teaching delivery			
	AI tools & data analytics use			
6. Industry & Professional Links	Real-world case integration			
	Industry advisory engagement			
	Internship / placement coordination			
7. Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	Inclusive classroom practices			
	Cross-cultural communication			
	Accessible course design (ADA/WCAG)			
TOTAL / AVERAGE SCORE		/5.0	/5.0	

SECTION C: PRIORITY TRAINING NEEDS & INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Competency Area	Gap Score	Priority (H/M/L)	Training Mode	Target Date	Budget Est.

Training Mode Key: WS = Workshop | OC = Online Course | CP = Conference/Publication | CR = Coaching/Mentoring | SR = Self-Directed Research | CT = Cross-Training

SECTION D: NARRATIVE & COMMENTS

Faculty Self-Reflection (key achievements, professional goals, perceived support needs):

Supervisor/Chair Observations and Recommended Actions:

Faculty Member Signature & Date

Department Chair Signature & Date

5. GAP ANALYSIS & PRIORITY SCORING

5.1 Gap Identification Formula

The Training Priority Index (TPI) is calculated for each competency domain:

TPI = (Required Level – Average Actual Level) × Strategic Weight
Higher TPI = Higher Training Priority | TPI ≥ 2.0 = Immediate Action Required

5.2 Priority Classification

Priority Level	TPI Range	Required Action
HIGH (Critical)	TPI ≥ 2.0	Immediate intervention: mandatory training within 30 days
MEDIUM (Important)	TPI 1.0 – 1.9	Scheduled training within the current semester
LOW (Developmental)	TPI 0.5 – 0.9	Elective or self-directed development within the year
MONITOR	TPI < 0.5	No immediate action; reassess at next annual cycle

5.3 Departmental Summary Matrix

Aggregated data is compiled into a department-level summary to inform collective training plans and resource planning:

Competency Domain	Finance	Marketing	Management	HRM	Accountin g	Avg. Gap
1. Teaching & Pedagogy						
2. Curriculum Design						
3. Assessment & Grading						
4. Research & Scholarship						
5. Digital & EdTech Literacy						
6. Industry & Prof. Links						

Competency Domain	Finance	Marketing	Management	HRM	Accounting	Avg. Gap
7. Diversity, Equity & Inclusion						

6. TRAINING INTERVENTION MENU

The following training modalities are available to faculty based on priority level and program context:

6.1 Undergraduate Program Faculty

Training Type	Description	Duration	Provider / Platform
Active Learning Workshop	Hands-on workshop on flipped classroom, case-based, and team-based learning methods	1 day	Internal FDO / External Trainer
Course Redesign Bootcamp	Guided redesign of one course using backward design and UDL principles	3 days	Instructional Design Team
Assessment Design Lab	Workshop on creating valid, reliable, and fair assessments and rubrics	1 day	FDO / Assessment Specialist
EdTech Proficiency Training	Hands-on LMS training, digital tools for hybrid/online delivery	2 days	IT Department / Vendor
DEI in the Classroom	Workshop on inclusive pedagogy, bias awareness, and accessible design	Half-day	DEI Office / External Expert
Industry Immersion Program	Faculty spend time at partner companies; briefed on industry needs	1–2 weeks	Industry Partners / Dean's Office

6.2 Graduate Program Faculty

Training Type	Description	Duration	Provider / Platform
Research Methodology Seminar	Advanced training in qualitative and quantitative research methods	2–3 days	Research Centre / Visiting Scholar
Publication Strategy Workshop	Guidance on targeting journals, manuscript preparation, peer review process	1 day	Senior Faculty / Research Dean
Dissertation Supervision Training	Best practices for graduate student supervision and examination	1 day	Graduate School / FDO

Training Type	Description	Duration	Provider / Platform
Grant Writing Intensive	Hands-on support for preparing funding proposals (national and international)	2 days	Research Office
Executive Education Design	Designing and delivering programs for corporate executives and professionals	2 days	ExEd Unit / External Partner
Leadership & Mentoring	Building mentoring and academic leadership capabilities	Ongoing	Senior Academic Mentors
International Conference Grant	Financial and logistical support to present research at global conferences	Varies	Research Office / Dean's Office

7. EVALUATION & MONITORING FRAMEWORK

7.1 Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation

Level	Evaluation Type	What is Measured	Method / Tool
1	Reaction	Faculty satisfaction with training experience	Post-training feedback survey (digital)
2	Learning	Knowledge and skill acquisition	Pre/post tests; portfolio submissions
3	Behavior	Application in classroom and research practice	Peer observation; student evaluations; 90-day check-in
4	Results	Institutional impact: quality improvement metrics	Course pass rates; research outputs; accreditation scores

7.2 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

KPI	Baseline Target	Annual Target	Measurement Frequency
% Faculty completing TNA annually	≥ 90%	100%	Annual (June)
Average competency score (all domains)	≥ 3.0 / 5.0	≥ 3.5 / 5.0	Biannual
% High-priority gaps closed within 6 months	≥ 70%	≥ 90%	Semester-end
Student course satisfaction score	≥ 3.8 / 5.0	≥ 4.0 / 5.0	End of each semester
# of faculty publications (GR)	≥ 1 per faculty	≥ 2 per faculty	Annual
% Faculty trained in digital/hybrid delivery	≥ 60%	≥ 85%	Annual
Training participation rate	≥ 80%	≥ 95%	Per training event

7.3 Reporting & Review Cycle

- Monthly: Training coordinator tracks participation rates and intervention completion
- Semester-End: Department chairs submit faculty development progress summaries
- Annual: FDC Committee presents consolidated TNA report to Dean's Office
- Biennial: Full external benchmarking review against accreditation standards

8. ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

Role	Key TNA Responsibilities
Dean / Associate Dean	Approve TNA process; set strategic training priorities; allocate budget; receive annual TNA report
Faculty Development Committee (FDC)	Design TNA instruments; oversee data collection and analysis; develop training menu; monitor KPIs
Department Chairs	Conduct supervisor appraisals; validate individual development plans; monitor training completion
TNA Coordinator (HR/FDO)	Administer surveys; manage data; compile analysis; coordinate training scheduling and logistics
Individual Faculty Members	Complete self-assessment honestly; engage in development planning; attend assigned training
IT / Learning Technology Team	Maintain LMS data access; support EdTech training delivery; provide course analytics reports
Research Office	Provide publication and grant data; co-design research capacity training for GR faculty
DEI Office	Advise on inclusive practices training; review DEI competency domain standards

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Classroom Observation Rubric

Observation Criterion	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Work (1)
Learning objectives communicated clearly	Explicit, student-focused outcomes stated	Stated but generic	Implied only	Not stated
Lesson pacing and time management	Optimal pacing; all sections covered	Minor pacing issues	Some content rushed	Poor time management
Student engagement and interaction	Active dialogue; all students included	Good interaction	Mostly one-way	Passive students only
Clarity of explanations and examples	Clear, varied, relatable examples	Mostly clear	Some confusion	Unclear throughout
Use of technology / learning aids	Seamlessly integrated; adds value	Effective but limited	Some use	Absent or distracting
Formative assessment / checking for understanding	Multiple checks; responds to gaps	Some checks	Occasional question	None observed
Inclusive and respectful environment	Actively promotes inclusion	Generally inclusive	Neutral only	Exclusionary behavior

Appendix B: Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
TNA	Training Needs Assessment – systematic process identifying gaps between actual and required competencies
TPI	Training Priority Index – calculated score ranking the urgency of each training gap
FDC	Faculty Development Committee – institutional body overseeing faculty professional development
FDO	Faculty Development Office – administrative unit managing faculty training programs
LMS	Learning Management System (e.g., Canvas, Moodle) – digital platform for course delivery

Term	Definition
UDL	Universal Design for Learning – inclusive curriculum design framework for all learners
UG	Undergraduate – referring to bachelor's degree level programs
GR	Graduate – referring to master's and doctoral degree level programs
AACSB	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – international accreditation body
ADDIE	Instructional design model: Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, Evaluation

— End of Document —

Business School | Faculty Development Office | Academic Year 2024–2025