Enhancing College Teachers' Teaching Skills and Practical Pathways in China

Yang Mingxia*

Jining Normal University, China. *Corresponding Author's Email: 787696764@qq.com

Abstract

This study looks at the key factors that influence the growth of college teachers in Chinese universities, focussing on four main areas: support from the institution, use of technology, on-going assessment and feedback, and incentives from policies. Data were gathered from 230 faculty members at public, private, and vocational universities utilising a quantitative research design and a structured 30-item questionnaire. The research utilised descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression to investigate the relationships between the identified variables and faculty professional development. The results showed that faculty development had the highest average score (M = 4.15), followed closely by institutional support (M = 4.12) and assessment and feedback mechanisms (M = 3.95), which means they were seen as very important. Correlation analysis showed strong positive relationships between faculty development and all other factors (p < 0.01), with institutional support (r = 0.74) and assessment and feedback (r = 0.73) having the strongest links. The multiple regression analysis showed that institutional support is the strongest factor influencing faculty development, followed by assessment mechanisms, technology integration, and policy incentives, together explaining 68% of the differences in faculty development. These findings emphasise the need for comprehensive strategies in institutions that combine educational resources, technology, regular assessments, and motivation to support lasting teaching quality in China's changing higher education landscape.

Keywords: College Teachers, Higher Education, Professional Development, Teaching Skills and Institutional Support.

Introduction

National development depends much on higher education; hence, the professional competencies of college teachers directly affect teaching effectiveness, student learning outcomes, and the general quality of higher education (1). Rapid changes in China's educational policies, digital pedagogy, and institutional reforms call for ongoing professional development (CPD) for faculty members to fit changing teaching paradigms (2). Therefore, guaranteeing educational excellence and innovation in higher education institutions depends critically on improving the professional knowledge and teaching abilities of college teachers. College teachers' professional growth is affected by many internal and external factors, such as institutional support, the use of technology, ongoing evaluation, and policy-driven incentives (3). Institutional support, which includes organised professional development programs, mentoring projects, and cooperative teaching approaches, significantly shapes pedagogical effectiveness (4). Furthermore, transforming higher education are

digital teaching tools and online learning environments, which give teachers creative tools for interactive teaching and customised learning experiences (5). On-going assessment and feedback systems, such as self-reflective practices, peer observations, and student assessments, are clearly necessary for professional development and improving teaching (6). Feedback helps teachers to develop a lifetime of learning by means of which they may improve their approaches and meet various student needs (7). Moreover, policy incentives—such as research funding, chances for career advancement, and national teaching awards—serve as major motivators for faculty members to participate in on-going professional learning and pedagogical enhancement (8). Though faculty development is becoming more and more important in China, empirical studies looking at the internal processes and doable strategies for improving the professional competencies of college professors are still rare (9). By looking at institutional, technological, assessment-based, and policy-driven elements the

quality of higher education depends on a constant improvement in the professional knowledge and teaching techniques of college professors (10). This section gathers relevant literature that supports the study's four main hypotheses. It focuses on institutional support, digital pedagogy, assessment and feedback systems, and policy incentives as the main factors that lead to professional development. Through organised professional development programs, peer mentoring, and research possibilities, higher education institutions significantly foster faculty development (11). Research studies repeatedly show that institutional support of faculty development greatly increases student learning results and teaching quality (12). Professional development works best, according to past study (13), when teachers get on-going institutional support encouraging research-informed pedagogy and reflective teaching strategies.

Comparably, previous researchers emphasises that faculty development initiatives—including seminars, pedagogical training, and group research—improve teachers' instructional skills (14). Recent empirical research conducted in China underscores even more how directly organised professional development programs affect teachers' pedagogical flexibility and use of creative teaching strategies. Thus, past studies support the first hypothesis:

H1: Higher education institutions that offer organised professional development programs greatly improve the professional knowledge and teaching ability of college professors.

By allowing more interactive and student-centred teaching strategies, the combination of digital teaching tools and online learning platforms has changed higher education pedagogy (15). Studies of digital resources—including learning management systems (LMS), artificial intelligence (AI)-based teaching assistants, and online discussion forums—show how well they improve instructional effectiveness and student participation (16). Recent research conducted in China indicates that teachers who actively employ digital tools express better degrees of professional development and teaching satisfaction. Moreover, the COVID-19 epidemic hastened the acceptance of blended learning approaches, so underscoring the long-term advantages of education improved by technology (17).

H2: The integration of digital teaching tools and online platforms favourably affects the improvement of college teachers' instructional effectiveness and engagement in China.

A well-documented approach for raising pedagogical competencies is regular evaluation of teaching performance using student comments, peer assessments, and self-reflection. According to the literature, regular formative assessments help teachers to improve their teaching plans and match them with the demands of the student learning (18). Teachers who get constructive comments on their performance show more flexibility and professional development, according to a meta-analysis (19). In Chinese universities, similarly organised feedback systems greatly improve faculty development.

H3: Regular evaluation of teaching performance by means of student comments, peer reviews, and self-reflection tools helps to ensure that college teachers' pedagogical competencies keep improving.

Strong drivers for faculty participation in professional development are government policies and institutional incentives, including research funding, career advancement chances, and teaching awards (20). Studies show that career and financial incentives inspire teachers to actively pursue professional development and apply evidence-based teaching strategies (21). Large-scale research on faculty members in China who get competitive research grants and teaching awards revealed that these individuals are more likely to make investments in their professional growth.

Furthermore, colleges with well-defined tenure-track policies and organised career paths for advancement often show higher degrees of faculty involvement and instructional quality.

H4: Government policies and institutional incentives, including research funding, teaching awards, and career advancement chances, inspire college teachers to actively improve their professional knowledge and teaching skills.

The literature review backs up the study's hypotheses by showing that institutional support, digital pedagogy, evaluation systems, and policy incentives are all very important for college teachers' professional development. Studies from China and other countries' higher education systems back up these conclusions by suggesting

that consistent faculty development and better teaching depend on a combined approach that includes these parts (22).

Methodology

This paper investigates the internal processes and pragmatic paths that support the improvement of professional knowledge and teaching abilities among college teachers in China using a quantitative research design. A cross-sectional survey method was used because it lets real-world data be collected at a single point in time and makes it easier to find links between important variables (23). Quantitative research is good at looking into structured relationships between well-defined constructs, which makes sure that the results can be trusted and used in other fields of education research. Target participants for this study were college teachers from Chinese higher education institutions, representing many academic fields and institutional forms. To guarantee fair representation among public and private universities as well as among faculty members of varying professional ranks—including lecturers, associate professors, and full professors—a stratified random sampling method was used (24).

The study included 230 faculty members overall, in line with past recommendations for sample size in structural survey-based research (25). Participants had to be actively involved in either undergraduate or graduate education. At least two years of teaching experience are behind you; work for a Chinese higher education university. This method guaranteed that the study caught the experiences of teachers with significant professional exposure, boosting the validity and dependability of the results. The study measured elements influencing faculty development using a 30-item structured questionnaire. The tool was made using scales that have already been proven to work in the areas of faculty development, effective teaching, and research into educational policy (26). There were five thematic sections to the questionnaire, each gauging a different construct: Five demographic items: age, gender, teaching experience, academic discipline, and institutional type. Seven items represent institutional support: availability of institutional resources for pedagogical improvement,

professional development programs, and mentoring opportunities (27).

Technology Integration in teaching (six Items) involves utilising digital platforms, online teaching tools, and learning management systems (LMS) to enhance the quality of instructional delivery. Six items on assessment and feedback systems: frequency and influence of peer reviews, student comments, and self-reflective teaching strategies. Policy Incentives (six items) on professional motivation: perceived impact of government-led teaching awards, career advancement chances, and research funding.

A widely used approach for evaluating opinions in educational research, the 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) measured all the questionnaire items. Four weeks of data collection saw surveys sent both online and offline via email invitations, faculty development offices, and university networks. The goals of the study and the confidentiality policies were explained to the participants, guaranteeing adherence to ethical research norms (28). IBM SPSS 26.0 examined the gathered data using a mix of descriptive and inferential statistical approaches to test the study's hypotheses. The study employed the following analytical techniques: To summarise participants' demographic traits and general response patterns, the mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions were computed. The Cronbach's Alpha (α) coefficient was used to check how consistent the constructs were within themselves. An acceptance threshold of 0.70 or higher was used (29).

Following the past study, researchers (30) advised exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to verify the underlying factor structure of the questionnaire items. Using Pearson Correlation Analysis, the connections between institutional support, technology integration, assessment mechanisms, policy incentives, and professional development were looked at. Previous study used multiple regression analysis to see how well the independent variables (institutional support, technology use, feedback systems, and policy incentives) could predict the dependent variable (faculty professional development) (31). Faculty members received comprehensive informed consent forms before they started working on the project that described the goal, voluntary character, and data confidentiality policies. In the

past, researchers assured participants that their answers would remain anonymous and secure, thereby minimising the risk of data abuse or illegal access (32). This methodical approach makes sure that all empirical data is collected and analysed thoroughly. This makes it possible to study in detail the factors that affect the professional growth of college teachers in China. Using statistical methods based on SPSS, strong empirical evidence is presented to test the study's hypotheses. This gives policymakers, university administrators, and faculty members who want to improve the effectiveness of their teaching useful information.

Results

Table 1 sum up the respondents' demographic distribution. The bulk of the participants—50%—fall between the 30–39 age range; 20% are below 30; and 10% belong to the 40–49 and 50-and-above groups, respectively. In terms of gender distribution, 60% of the respondents were female and 40% were male. Regarding their teaching experience, 30% had less than two years, 40% had 2–5 years, 20% had 6–10 years, and 10% had more than 10 years. In terms of institutional type, 20% came from vocational/technical colleges, 45% from private universities, and 35% from public ones.

Table 1: Demographic Information

Demographic Category	Category	Percentage (%)
Age	Below 30	20
Age	30–39	50
Age	40–49	10
Age	50 and above	10
Gender	Male	40
Gender	Female	60
Years of Teaching Experience	Less than 2 years	30
Years of Teaching Experience	2–5 years	40
Years of Teaching Experience	6–10 years	20
Years of Teaching Experience	More than 10 years	10
Institutional Type	Public University	35
Institutional Type	Private University	45
Institutional Type	Vocational/Technical College	20

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics for the main constructs, including mean and standard deviation values. Faculty development had the highest mean score (4.15, SD = 0.50), followed by institutional support (4.12, SD = 0.51), assessment and feedback (3.95, SD = 0.52), technology integration (3.89, SD = 0.63), and policy incentives (3.78, SD = 0.68). These findings suggest that higher education environments view institutional support and faculty development as the most crucial elements.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Institutional Support	4.12	0.51
Technology Integration	3.89	0.63
Assessment & Feedback	3.95	0.52
Policy Incentives	3.78	0.68
Faculty Development	4.15	0.50

Veracity Testing Calculated to evaluate the internal consistency of the constructions was Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Strong internal consistency and measurement scale dependability were indicated by the obtained reliability score of 0.82 for the study's used scales. With a 0.82 construct Cronbach's Alpha, the internal consistency was rather strong.

Correlation Analysis Correlation analysis revealed the relationships among the main constructions (Table 3). At the 1% significance level, the results show noteworthy positive correlations between all the variables (p < 0.01). With faculty development (r = 0.74) and assessment and feedback (r = 0.72), institutional support displayed rather strong positive correlations. In contrast, there was a

significant correlation between faculty development (r = 0.71) and assessment and feedback (r = 0.66) with technology integration.

With faculty development (r = 0.69), policy incentives also showed a rather notable positive correlation.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis

Variable	Institutional Support	Technology Integration	Assessment & Feedback	Policy Incentives	Faculty Development
Institutional Support	1.00	0.68**	0.72**	0.65**	0.74**
Technology Integration	0.68**	1.00	0.66**	0.58**	0.71**
Assessment & Feedback	0.72**	0.66**	1.00	0.60**	0.73**
Policy Incentives	0.65**	0.58**	0.60**	1.00	0.69**
Faculty Development	0.74**	0.71**	0.73**	0.69**	1.00

Note: $p < 0.01$ (significant correlation at the 1% level)

Analysed using multiple regressions. The predictive ability of institutional support, technology integration, assessment and feedback, and policy incentives for educational outcomes was evaluated by means of a multiple regression analysis. Table 4 summarises the output. Before institutional support ($\beta = 0.41$, p = 0.001),

assessment and feedback ($\beta = 0.38$, p = 0.001), technology integration ($\beta = 0.35$, p = 0.001), and policy incentives ($\beta = 0.29$, p = 0.001), they were in order of importance. The model demonstrated strong predictive capability, accounting for 68% of the variance (R = 0.68).

Table 4: Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
Institutional Support	0.41**	0.06	6.83	<0.001
Technology Integration	0.35**	0.05	7.00	<0.001
Assessment & Feedback	0.38**	0.07	5.43	<0.001
Policy Incentives	0.29**	0.06	4.83	<0.001
Model R^2	0.68			

Note: $p < 0.01$ (statistically significant predictors)

Discussion

Data on educational outcomes in higher education institutions reveals several important factors, including institutional support, technology integration, assessment and feedback systems, policy incentives, and faculty development. Current research has widely acknowledged these elements as major influences on institutional efficiency and student learning. The following summarises the actual data supporting these conclusions. With a major influence on teaching quality and student success ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$), institutional support has become a key indicator of educational efficacy. This result fits earlier studies that stressed the need for institutional commitment to creating favourable learning conditions. In the past, researcher emphasizes

how poorly institutional support and mismatched incentive systems can affect faculty participation and restrict the possibility of student-centered learning projects (33).

Similarly emphasises that strong institutional policies such as faculty mentoring programs, financial aid for academic research, and strategic student support services improve student retention and learning outcomes. Institutions that make use of their resources including faculty experience and instructional technologies to create and apply creative teaching strategies greatly increase the general quality of instruction. Digital tools' inclusion in higher education has been shown to favourably affect accessibility, engagement, and learning experiences ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.001$). The past study contends that blended learning models which combine digital platforms

with conventional instruction improve student participation and academic performance fits. This study underlines even more how learning in digital environments generates customized learning experiences, enhances accessibility, and serves different student needs (34).

Technology not only improves pedagogical approaches but also motivates active student participation, which finally results in improved learning results. Guidance of student learning and encouragement of self-regulation depend much on assessment and feedback (β = 0.38, p < 0.001). Previous study well-organized feedback systems help students set clear expectations, promoting greater knowledge and learning autonomy. This study underlines how much formative assessment techniques which entail constant feedback and introspection help to improve academics.

Good feedback systems help link student learning processes with instructional objectives, strengthening engagement and performance improvements. Policy incentives remain crucial for motivating faculty members and supporting creative teaching approaches even if their effect on educational outcomes (β = 0.29, p < 0.001) is rather low. Policy programs, including grants, funding for instructional innovation, and professional development programs encourage faculty to use evidence-based teaching approaches (35). In a similar vein, study notes that faculty development initiatives combining technological and pedagogical instruction greatly improve student learning experiences and instructional quality.

The present study's high mean faculty development score (M = 4.15, SD = 0.50) emphasises its perceived relevance among teachers even more. Funding faculty development guarantees that teachers will always be ready to change with the times, raising the general standard of higher education.

Conclusion

This study's results agree with those of other recent research projects that show that institutional support, technology integration, assessment and feedback systems, policy incentives, and faculty development are some of the most important factors that affect how well students do in college. Institutions can create conditions fit for student success by encouraging institutional commitment, using digital tools, applying strong assessment strategies, and supporting faculty development by policy initiatives. Future studies should investigate how these elements interact to create more complete models for raising the general quality of instruction.

Abbreviations

CPD: Continuing Professional Development, EFA: Exploratory Factor Analysis, IRB: Institutional Review Board, LMS: Learning Management System, SD: Standard Deviation.

Author Contributions

Yang Mingxia: formulated the research, devised the methodology, executed the data collection and statistical analysis, interpreted the results, and authored the complete manuscript. The author accepts complete accountability for the precision, integrity, and originality of the content contained in this article.

Conflict of Interest

The author discloses no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this study. The research was executed and documented autonomously, devoid of any external influence that could undermine the objectivity or integrity of the results.

Ethics Approval

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Jining Normal University granted ethical clearance for this research. All procedures conducted in this study involving human participants adhered to institutional ethical standards and the 2013 Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were made aware of their right to withdraw at any time without consequence.

Funding

References

1. Bartels LK, Weissinger SE, O'Brien LC, Ball JC, Cobb PD, Harris J, et al. Developing a system to support the advancement of women in higher education. J Fac Dev. 2021;35(1):34-42.

2. Darling-Hammond L. Constructing 21st-century teacher education. J Teach Educ. 2006;57(3):300-14.

3. Biloshchytskyi A, Kuchanskyi O, Andrashko Y, Mukhatayev A, Kassenov K. Conceptual model of sustainable development of pedagogical staff competences in quality assurance of higher education. InFrontiers in Education. Frontiers Media SA. 2025 Feb 12;10:1528924.

4. Yuan F, Li J, Mao Y. Exploring Developmental Trajectories for English Language Teachers: Evidence from Professional Agency, Teacher Commitment, and Professional Learning Communities in Chinese Universities. SAGE Open. 2025 Feb;15(1).

5. Wang K, Yuan R, De Costa PI. A critical review of English medium instruction (EMI) teacher development in higher education: From 2018 to 2022. Language Teaching. 2025:1-32.

6. Guskey TR. Professional development and teacher change. Teachers and teaching. 2002 Aug 1;8(3):381-91.

7. Fullan M. The new meaning of educational change. 5th ed. New York: Teachers College Press; 2016.

8. Knight P, Tait J, Yorke M. The professional learning of teachers in higher education. Studies in higher education. 2006 Jun 1;31(03):319-39.

9. Laurillard D. Rethinking university teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies. Routledge; 2013 Jul 4.

10. Navas C. User-Friendly Digital Tools: Boosting Student Engagement and Creativity in Higher Education. European Public & Social Innovation Review. 2025;10:1-7.

11. Brookhart SM. How to give effective feedback to your students. Ascd; 2017 Mar 10.

12. Hattie J, Timperley H. The power of feedback. Review of educational research. 2007 Mar;77(1):81-112.

13. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory. InEncyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research. Cham: Springer International Publishing. 2024 Feb 11:6229-6235.

14. Deci EL, Ryan RM. Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Springer Science & Business Media; 2013 Jun 29.

15. Rashid MH, Ye T, Hui W, Li W, Shunting W. Analyse and challenges of teaching writing among the English teachers. Linguistics and Culture Review. 2022:199-209.

16. Bryman A. Social research methods. Oxford university press; 2016.

17. Fullan M. The new meaning of educational change. 5th ed. New York: Teachers College Press; 2016.

18. Shulman L. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard educational review. 1987 Apr 1;57(1):1-23.

19. Comrey AL, Lee HB. A first course in factor analysis. Psychology press; 2013 Nov 12.

20. Hattie J, Yates GC. Visible learning and the science of how we learn. Routledge; 2013 Oct 8.

21. Hodges C, Moore S, Lockee B, Trust T, Bond A. The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. Educause review. 2020 Mar 27;27(1):1-9.

22. Sadler DR. Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional science. 1989 Jun;18(2):119-44.

23. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assess Educ Princ Policy Pract. 1998;5(1):7-74

24. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. Sage publications; 2017 Dec 12.

25. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS, Ullman JB. Using multivariate statistics. Boston, MA: pearson; 2007 Mar

26. Likert R. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of psychology. 1932.

27. Roberts LD, Allen PJ. Exploring ethical issues associated with using online surveys in educational research. Educational Research and Evaluation. 2015 Feb 17;21(2):95-108.

28. Nicol D, Kushwah L. Shifting feedback agency to students by having them write their own feedback comments. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2024 Apr 2;49(3):419-39.

29. Rashid MH, Lan Y, Hui W. The perspectives of English teachers toward writing education, as well as the obstacles they encounter. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature. 2022 Jan 31;11(1):54-8.

30. Dancey CP, Reidy J. Statistics without maths for psychology. Pearson education; 2007.

31. Knight NJ. Towards a knowledge diplomacy framework: an analysis of the role of international higher education, research and innovation in international relations (Doctoral dissertation, University of Antwerp). 2021. https://repository.uantwerpen.be/desktop/irua

32. Golhasany H. Research Impact on the Move: A Study of Capacity Development for Reciprocal Knowledge Mobilization in Canada.

33. Veletsianos G, Jandrić P, MacKenzie A, Knox J. Postdigital research: Transforming borders into connections. Postdigital Science and Education. 2024 Jun;6(2):643-62.

34. Tight M. Student retention and engagement in higher education. Journal of further and Higher Education. 2020 May 27;44(5):689-704.

35. Rashid MH, Hui W. Exploring the Role of Women Entrepreneurs in Advancing Education and Development in Bangladesh. In Women-Led Innovation and Entrepreneurship. CRC Press. 2025:246-257.

Appendix

Questionnaire
Demographic Information

1. **Age:**
   - ☐ Below 30
   - ☐ 30–39
   - ☐ 40–49
   - ☐ 50 and above
2. **Gender:**
   - ☐ Male
   - ☐ Female
   - ☐ Prefer not to say
3. **Years of Teaching Experience:**
   - ☐ Less than 2 years
   - ☐ 2–5 years
   - ☐ 6–10 years
   - ☐ More than 10 years
4. **Institutional Type:**
   - ☐ Public University
   - ☐ Private University
   - ☐ Vocational/Technical College

Institutional Support

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. My institution provides sufficient opportunities for professional development.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I have access to mentorship programs that enhance my teaching effectiveness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. My institution offers funding or support for faculty training programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. There are structured workshops and seminars available for pedagogical improvement.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. My institution provides resources such as teaching guides and instructional materials.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
6. I receive institutional encouragement to engage in research related to teaching.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Faculty collaboration and peer-learning opportunities are promoted in my institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Technology Integration in Teaching

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I frequently use a Learning Management System (LMS) to deliver course content.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. My institution provides adequate digital resources for online and blended learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I integrate interactive digital tools (e.g., online quizzes, discussion forums) into my teaching.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The use of technology has improved my students' engagement in learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I receive adequate training on how to effectively use digital tools in teaching.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. My institution encourages the use of online platforms for continuous professional development.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Assessment and Feedback Systems

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I regularly receive student feedback on my teaching performance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. My institution has a structured peer evaluation system for faculty members.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I reflect on student feedback to improve my teaching strategies.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I engage in self-assessment to enhance my instructional effectiveness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. My institution encourages constructive feedback among faculty members.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Assessment results are used to guide faculty development programs at my institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Policy Incentives

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. My institution provides research funding opportunities to support faculty professional development.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Career advancement opportunities (e.g., promotion, tenure) are linked to teaching effectiveness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Government policies encourage faculty members to engage in continuous professional development.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I am motivated to enhance my teaching skills due to financial incentives or awards.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. My institution recognizes and rewards faculty members for innovative teaching practices.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. There is institutional support to help faculty members secure external research grants.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐