

A Plan to Support Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning

Margaret Wilson

1. Abstract:

Imagine being asked to develop a new vision for faculty development within your institution. Which aspects of your current faculty development programs and services would you keep? Would you change your structure in any way? What research would guide your planning and your decision making? What data would you gather from existing faculty and administrators? The following are excerpts from a report that was produced in response to a call for a new vision for faculty development at a small community college in Alberta, Canada. While the full report has been vetted through the various administrative bodies within the College, this abbreviated report is being offered for comments by the Transformational Dialogues community in the spirit of a peer review.

Key Words:

faculty development, planning.

2. Introduction

Faculty development programs and services are thought to strengthen the ability of any post secondary educational institution in Canada to realize its mission and vision, uphold its values and business model principles, enhance student learning, and sustain teaching excellence into the future.

A small community college in Alberta had been investing in faculty development activities for years and had even established a Teaching and Learning Centre, but change was needed. The call for a revised vision for faculty development within the College originated in the Centre for Innovation and Development (CID) in January 2008 in response to student Exit Survey results that placed student satisfaction with the quality of teaching at College below the College's established 85% benchmark.

Within the framework of an applied research project, existing policies, procedures, and practices associated with faculty development at the College and fifteen other post-secondary institutions in Canada were investigated. This environmental scan, coupled with the results of an in-house faculty needs assessment survey, a series of internal interviews and focus groups, a consultation with the Faculty Association, and a review of relevant literature, contributed to a new vision for faculty development at the College.

The proposed plan is evidence-based. In addition to considering the environment for teaching at the College and the complexity of faculty work, the 'storm of change' that is currently bombarding post-secondary education also influenced aspects of this vision for faculty development. Best practices at other post-secondary institutions and aspects of research on faculty development have

been reviewed and, where applicable, incorporated. This plan is strategic and sustainable and will improve the College's competitive advantage and impact the recruitment and retention of faculty and students.

Faculty development is complex and includes professional, instructional, leadership, scholarship, and organizational components. To capture this complexity, a multi-dimensional model that situates faculty as learners at its core was generated (see below). The five areas of educational development that are proposed respect all faculty career stages and foster collaboration and enquiry into effective teaching and learning strategies. Each dimension of the model has an administrative framework, an evaluation strategy, a budget, and a succession



plan.

3. An Overview of Faculty Development

What is Faculty Development?

For the past thirty years an area of work has existed in higher education in Canada that focuses on improving the quality and effectiveness of educational programs within post-secondary institutions (Wilcox, 1997).

The most commonly used terms for these improvement activities and the improvement process are:

- *faculty development* (emphasis on improving teaching skills),
- *instructional development* (focus on student learning by improving courses and curriculum),

- *educational development* (a movement to improve quality through education in many areas, an emerging profession),
- *professional or academic development* (the overlap of instructional and faculty development and scholarly work), and
- *organizational development* (a focus on an institution's structure and the relationship among its units).

Each term indicates an approach or focus and has its own characteristics and potential outcomes (Gillespie et al., 2002, and Wilcox, 1997).

Approaches to faculty development have not remained static over the years. Post-secondary institutions that established faculty development offices over twenty years ago focused primarily on improving teaching effectiveness (e.g. University of British Columbia and the University of Alberta). Technology and its incorporation into the teaching process, the onset of the information age, research on adult learning, and the fragmentation of faculty roles have expanded understanding of teaching and learning resulting in approaches to quality improvements that are combinations of *faculty*, *instructional*, *professional*, and *organizational* development (Wilcox, 1997; Ramsden, 2005; Milne, 2007; Merriam & Cafferella, 1999; and Gappa et al., 2002).

In March 1999, the College produced a number of documents that addressed *faculty*, *organizational*, and *professional development*. The Faculty Growth and Evaluation Policy (2002) emphasized faculty growth as well as evaluation with its focus on the development of performance indicators for faculty and others (e.g. librarians). About the same time, the College also demonstrated its concern for individuals and endeavoured to enhance the teaching skills of faculty members by supporting a Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC). A newsletter was developed and some excellent workshops were offered for faculty and staff but declining enrolments and insufficient resources resulted in the eventual cancellation of many of these learning opportunities.

In 2002, the College, in a progressive move, announced its investment in *instructional development* and a focus on the student (courses and curriculum) with the creation of the Centre for Innovation and Development (CID). "Through the provision of *professional development* opportunities, high-quality education resources, the use of innovative learning technologies, and the development of new programming" (Learning Resource Services Mission Statement), CID sought to increase faculty and student satisfaction with courses and programs by maximizing resource utilization and incorporating information and educational technologies into designed courses and curricula.

4. Why is Faculty Development Necessary?

Much has been written on the changing context for faculty work. Gappa et al. (2007) highlighted four of the most significant forces creating challenges for higher education institutions that included fiscal constraints and increased competition; calls for accountability and shifts in control; increased diversity of

students; and the rise of the Information Age along with expanded use of new technologies to facilitate learning (pg. 7).

In their book, Light and Cox (2001) suggest that the key challenge for faculty is riding a 'storm' of change that includes changing academic roles, the changing nature of the student body, changing institutional demands, and the changing external agency demands including professional accreditation demands (pg. 12).

The Centre for Educational Development and Assessment in the United States, with their meta-professional research project, has been studying the complexity and variety of higher education faculty work (CEDA, 2008). Faculty are expected to be proficient in over twenty different professional skill areas including instructional design, information technology, assessment, learning theory, and more.

The combined effects of changing institutional practices, personal and professional challenges, and greater accountability have the potential to undermine, even fracture the faculty community (Gappa et al., 2007). In order to work creatively, collaboratively, and effectively in a changing environment, faculty must engage in continuous learning. New knowledge, new students, new technology, and new expectations require faculty members to engage in this continuous learning even as they facilitate the learning of their students.

The College is currently facing two critical issues that underscore the need for a new vision of faculty development: student satisfaction with current teaching and the College's move towards the granting of applied degrees.

The results of the 2007-2008 Exit Survey indicate that student satisfaction with the quality of teaching at the College has moved below 85 per cent. This trend downwards has been occurring for the past few years but this year the College is below its own benchmark for the first time. This is not a trend that should be ignored.

At the same time, the College is moving towards the granting of applied degrees. As an institution we must demonstrate, through documentation associated with a self-study, our 'institutional readiness' for offering more to our students. This documentation involves demonstrating faculty capacity, credentials, and growth. The faculty needs assessment administered in March 2008 indicated that many current staff have never developed a teaching dossier that might be required as the College prepares for applied degree granting status.

5. How is Faculty Development Organized?

The origin and placement of faculty development within institutions varies. Some centres were started by the institution's Faculty Association; others with a committee of concerned faculty, while still others originated within Human Resource areas (see Appendix C, Environmental scan).

Regardless of origin, the majority of Canadian post-secondary institutions make some provision for the development and enhancement of teaching and

learning (Wilcox, 1997). Within the college system in Alberta, Lakeland College requires faculty to attend a three-week program before they start teaching within the institution. NAIT requires all new hires to complete their *Becoming a Master Instructor* program (two weeks) prior to commencing their employment. Both of these institutions connect contract starting dates to these educational programs.

Institutions undergoing significant transitions have invested in new models of faculty development. Grant MacEwan College has created a Learning Commons that promotes and supports *instructional development* as well as *faculty/professional development*. The scholarship of teaching and learning is also supported within the Learning Commons. Mount Royal College, in a progressive move, recently situated its faculty development activities within a new Faculty of Teaching and Learning.

Other institutions (Ryerson University, University of Alberta) have taken a critical look at their faculty development practices and are proposing a new direction that addresses the contexts of academic work. The University of Windsor is striving to integrate its well developed technology support area (*instructional development*) with activity around the scholarship of teaching and learning (*academic development*).

Also, some Canadian institutions are moving away from best practice promotion and one-off workshops to develop more comprehensive certificates of study. The University of British Columbia, for example, has developed a Faculty Certificate Program on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. In the United Kingdom, Norway, and Australia faculty are required to complete a teaching certificate in higher education. NAIT's *Becoming a Master Instructor* program is offered all over the world.

6. Who Should Lead Faculty Development?

Ultimately, faculty are responsible for their continuing development but with the amount of change occurring within post-secondary educational institutions, it is critical that someone be designated to lead the way and evaluate the *faculty development* process.

In larger institutions, faculty members have been seconded to the position to manage *faculty development* on either a part-time or full-time basis. The amount of work and energy required to lead others usually requires a full time commitment if faculty development is to be successful and sustainable. In smaller institutions, a faculty member on release time for a specified period has also worked well (Sorcinelli in Gillespie et al., 2002, and Wilcox, 1997).

Because of the complexity of *educational development* work, recent recruitment ads for faculty developer positions have asked for knowledge of teaching and learning in higher education as well as an understanding of change and change management (personal observation). These expectations differ from those of just over five years ago when being a dedicated teacher with a passion for teaching were the most important criteria.

It is essential to have an individual who has the vision, commitment, time, and energy to take the lead in visioning, developing, maintaining, and evaluating these services.

7. A Plan for Faculty Development at the College

The following new vision for faculty development supports the mission, vision, and values of the College and is guided by the business model principles that the College adopted in April 2007.

The model proposes a centralized office to be responsible for directing activities associated with faculty development and that a faculty member, whose time is dedicated to organizing learning opportunities for faculty, be assigned coordination of these activities.

This model refocuses faculty development to consider it adult education and places faculty at its centre by defining them as learners with choices to make in their learning. Five domains/components of learning are differentiated within the model:

The **foundational programs** are designed to engage those faculty who are new to teaching at the College. The programs could be considered pre-requisites for teaching at the College. These programs promote College standards for learning-centred teaching and teaching with technology.

The **academic growth** aspect of the model promotes learning about pedagogy, learning theory and implications for teaching practice.

The **community engagement** aspect of the model promotes collaborative, service, and group learning.

The **strategic planning** aspect of the model includes learning about leadership in teaching. The development of an incentive system for learning that is based upon the University of Sydney's Scholarship Index and linked to the Canadian Council on Learning's Composite Learning Index (CLI) is an example of the kind of learning that will occur for faculty engaged in this aspect of faculty development.

The **scholarship** aspect of the model includes learning about the scholarship of teaching and learning, and involves the development of a peer mentoring system and involvement with applied research.

The following beliefs guide this vision of faculty development:

- Learning about teaching requires practice and reflection;
- Faculty share responsibility for their learning with their students, peers, and administrators;
- Faculty who are learning have greater potential to be innovative and deal with change;
- Learning about leadership and scholarship in teaching and learning involves education, modeling, and guidance;

- Continuous evaluation of programs and services leads to their improvement; and
- Collaborative and experiential learning leads to greater job satisfaction.

8. Positioning Faculty Development

The positioning of faculty development activities within an institution can impact the success of those activities. The options open to the College administration and faculty who are committed to improving the quality of teaching and enhancing student learning are several, and can range from a number of independent activities to the establishment of an office that is adequately resourced and formally charged with coordinating or directing all major activities that focus on the improvement of teaching.

Learning Resource Services is a Department dedicated to the support of teaching and learning for all of the College. The Centre for Innovation and Development would be a very strategic placement for all aspects of faculty development because of its service orientation. Further, the integration of teaching and technology is achievable when those activities are housed within the same physical space.

Recommendation: That the College locate faculty development programs and services within the current structure of the Centre for Innovation and Development (CID) within the Division of Learning Resource Services.

Recommendation: That the College becomes more strategic and equitable in its faculty development practices by adopting a centralized plan for faculty development and designating a faculty member as the champion of that plan.

9. Funding Faculty Development

Investing in people requires time, energy, and adequate resources. Currently, there is increased competition for educational dollars within post-secondary institutions. The College, like other growing and changing post-secondary institutions, must make choices in the name of efficiency, progress, and innovation.

The College has a number of independent activities happening that are related to faculty development that result in funding that is de-centralized. While a de-centralized method of investing in the people of the College has some advantages, it can result in inequities and it could be more strategic.

Several Colleges in Alberta (Lethbridge College, Grant MacEwan College, and Red Deer College) have adopted a formula to determine the number of dollars that are invested back into the development and education of faculty and staff. This allows these institutions to be more strategic with their faculty development and is often used as a marker of institutional commitment to its people.

Recommendation: That the College set aside a certain amount of its budget for the development of faculty. Further, that this amount be a percentage based upon the total amount allocated to faculty salaries.

Recommendation: That a multi-disciplinary, multi-levelled task force be formed to make recommendations with respect to centralized funding of faculty development.

10. The Scope of Faculty Development

Choosing an approach to faculty development is more complicated now than it was even five years ago. If faculty development focuses only on faculty teaching, then there are fewer resources to address student learning issues around curriculum, or to focus on the institutional structure and the climate for learning, or to grow educational leaders. During a period of rapid growth and change, such as the one that the College is currently experiencing, there is a need to approach faculty development so that the diversity of our teachers and their wide range of learning needs are respected.

Recommendation: That the College adopt a multi-dimensional plan for faculty development that promotes learning for faculty at all stages of their career.

Details of the components of this multi-dimensional plan are found in the next section of this report. The goals, activities, timelines, evaluation strategies, budget considerations, and succession plans are explained for each of five domains/components of faculty learning.

11. Building a Learning Community within the College

Changes are occurring in faculty appointments in post-secondary institutions. Some institutions (e.g. Grant MacEwan College, AB.) are reporting that the largest growth in their teaching workforce is the part-time or casual instructor. Indeed, some institutions have more part-time than full-time faculty (e.g. Kwantlen University Polytechnic in B.C. and Mount Royal College and Grant MacEwan College in Alberta).

The College currently experiences a 13% turnover rate of faculty. Within the next five years that figure is expected to rise dramatically as more faculty reach retirement age (Environmental Scan 2008, Strategic Planning Office).

To better prepare new faculty for their diverse roles in teaching, several institutions offer substantive orientations for their new teachers (e.g. Lakeland College, NAIT). All other institutions engage their newly hired faculty in some way with events ranging from two to five days and follow-up occurring for as long as three years (e.g. Mount Royal College). Some of these institutions require or make such 'teacher-training' a condition of employment.

To attract and retain its greatest resource, the College needs to engage faculty (permanent, term and casual) when they are first hired and promote teaching ethics and standards for teaching that are consistent with its policy documents and evaluation practices. As well, by having faculty more familiar with

technology, the College could assume a greater role in eCampus Alberta Consortia.

Suggestion: That the Foundational Programs aspect of the multi-dimensional plan for faculty development, target all newly hired faculty (permanent, term, and casual) during their first year of employment by financially supporting and requiring their participation in one of three foundational programs on teaching, learning, and teaching with technology.

Recommendation: That the College work to build a learning organization by aligning its policy documents with its evaluation practices. Further, that existing evaluation policy documents be modified to encourage excellence in teaching.

While faculty development offices share the common theme of improving the quality of education, the programs and services that they offer vary greatly. Studies have shown that faculty have different needs and responsibilities at different stages of their careers (CEDA, 2008). The College faculty who responded to the needs assessment survey in March 2008 clearly identified the wide range of programs and services they wanted.

Recommendation: That the College regularly conduct needs assessment surveys to determine the learning needs of its faculty.

Recommendation: That the College continuously evaluate the effectiveness of the faculty development programs and services that it offers.

In November 2007, an email went out on the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education's Educational Developers Listserv with the subject heading of "Are faculty coming to your workshops?" Responses to that query came from across Canada with an emphatic "NO!" The College has offered faculty development opportunities in the past. Poor attendance prompted the cancellation of many of these workshops. Focus group and interview discussions with faculty in April 2008 indicate that the College has a teaching culture but not a learning culture.

Recommendation: That the College encourage, recognize, and reward faculty learning through the implementation of a learning index that connects learning to the evaluation system within the College. Further, that this learning index be designed in consideration of the Canadian Council on Learning's Composite Learning Index (CLI) and the University of Sydney's Scholarship Index.

Recommendation: That a multi-disciplinary, multi-levelled task force be formed to make recommendations with respect to an incentive system for life-long learning within the College.

Recommendation: That a multi-disciplinary, multi-levelled advisory committee of faculty (that includes Faculty Association representation) be formed to guide future faculty development work within the College. To ensure appropriate disciplinary and functional representation, the Deans will be asked to appoint members to the committee.

The next sections of the report detail the goals, activities, time lines, evaluation strategies, budgets, and succession planning approaches for each of the five learning components of the faculty development plan. The complete report is available upon request.

Your comments and questions are welcomed.

Author's contact Information

*Margaret Wilson
Faculty Development Coordinator
Centre for Innovation and Development
NorQuest College
10215 108 Street, Room A622A
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 1L6
Phone: 780-644-6053
Email: margaret.wilson@norquest.ca*

References

- American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). (1987). *Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education*. Washington DC: The American Association for Higher Education.
- American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). (1996) *Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever*. Washington DC: The American Association for Higher Education. Located at:
<http://www.tltgroup.org/programs/seven.html>
- Anderson, T., & Elloumi, F. (Eds.). (2004). *Theory and practice of online learning*. Athabasca, AB: Athabasca University. (ISBN 0-919737-59-5)
- Asmar, C. (2002). *Strategies to enhance learning and teaching in a research-extensive University*. The International Journal for Academic Development, 7(1), 18-30. doi:10.1080/13601440210156448
- Barr, R.B., and Tag, J. (1995). *From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education*. Change, Nov. / Dec. 13-25.
- Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (2nd Ed). UK: Open University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Centre for Educational Development and Assessment. (2008). *The Meta-profession project*. Available from Centre for Educational Development and Assessment web site: <http://www.cedanet.com/meta/>
- Collins, J. (2005). *Why business thinking is not the answer* [Monograph]. Good to Great and the Social Sectors. ISBN: 13:978-0-9773264-0-2.
- Cross, K. P. and Gardner, D.P. (1997). *Teaching and learning in the next century*. National Teaching and Learning Forum. Retrieved May 16, 2008 from <http://www.nrlf.com.html/teaching.htm>
- Cunsolo, J.M., Elrick, M., Middleton, A.L.A., and Roy, D. (1996). *The scholarship of teaching: A Canadian perspective*. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 26, p. 35-56.
- Elvidge, Liz (2005) *Exploring academic development in higher education: Issues of engagement*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge
- Ewell, P.T. (1997) *Organizing for learning: A new imperative*. AAHE Bulletin, December 1997.
- Faris, R. (2008) What are learning communities? *SPARC BC News*, winter p.3-7.
- Fink, L.D. (2003). *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Foley, G. (2001). *Strategic learning: Understanding and facilitating organizational change*. Sydney, Australia: Centre for Popular Education.

- Galbraith, M. W. (Ed), (1991). *Facilitating adult learning: A transactional process*. Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E. and Trice, A.G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibbs, G. (2000). *Institutional learning and teaching strategies in English higher education*. Journal of Higher Education, 40 (3), 351-372.
- Gibbs, G. and Coffey, M. (2004). *The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students*. The Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education and SAGE Publications, 5(1), 87-100. doi: 10.1177/1469787404040463
- Gillespie, K.H., Hilsen, L.R., and Wadsworth, E.C. (Eds). *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources*. San Francisco, CA: Anker Publishing.
- Gross Davis, B. (1993). *Tools for Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass ISBN 1-55542- 568-2
- Hagedorn, L.S. (2000). *Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes*. New Directions for Institutional Research, 105(spring), 5-20.
- Hannan, A. and Silver, H. (1992). *Innovating in higher education: Teaching, learning, and institutional cultures*. UK: Open University Press.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (5th Ed.). Woburn: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Kreber, C. and Brook, P. (2001). *Impact evaluation of educational development programmes*. International Journal for Academic Development, 6(2), 96-108. doi: 10.1080/13601440110090749
- Lawler, P.A., & King, K.P. (2000). *Refocusing faculty development: The view from an adult learning perspective*. Retrieved August 29, 2008 from <http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/2000/lawlerp&kingk-web.htm>
- Light, G. and Cox, R. (2001). *Learning and teaching in higher education: The reflective professional*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- McKeachie, W. J. (2002). *McKeachie's teaching Tips*. (11th Ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin. ISBN 0-618-11649-4
- McKeachie, W.J. (1997). *Critical elements in training university teachers*. The International Journal for Academic Development, 2(1), 67-74.
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimension of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Mitchell, C. and Sackney, L. (2000). *Profound improvement: Building capacity for a learning community*. The Netherlands: GPB Gorter BV, Steenwijk.
- Milne, A.J. (2007). *Entering the interaction age: Implementing a future vision for campus learning spaces*. EDUCAUSE, Jan/Feb, p. 13-31.
- O'Banion, T. (1997). *A Learning College for the 21st Century*. Phoenix, Arizona: The Oryx Press.
- Paul, R. and Elder, L. (2006). *How to improve student learning: 30 Practical ideas*. California: Foundation for Critical Thinking.
- Payne, T. (2002). *Community college faculty rewards: Expectations and incentives*. Community College Enterprise, (Spring). Retrieved from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4057/is_200204/ai_n9065321/print
- Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J. and Boydell, T. (1997). *The Learning Company: A strategy for sustainable development* (2nd Ed.). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Ramsden, P. (2005) *Learning to Teach in Higher Education* (2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Rust, C. (1998). *The impact of educational development workshops on teachers' practice*. The International Journal for Academic Development, 3(1), 72-80.
- Saroyan, A. and Amundsen, C. (Eds). (2004). *Rethinking teaching in higher education: From a course design workshop to a faculty development framework*. Virginia: Stylus.
- Scott, V. and Miner, C. (2008). *Peer coaching: Implication for teaching and program improvement*. Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal, 1(3). Retrieved from: <http://www.kwantlen.ca/TD/issue1-3.html>
- Sowak, G. (2007). *Organizational culture at NorQuest College: A case study analysis*. Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Sparks, D. (1994). *A paradigm shift in staff development*. Journal of Staff Development, 15(4), 26-29.
- Watkins, K.E. and Marsick, V.J. (1993). *Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systemic change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weimer, M.E. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilcox, S. (1997). *Learning from our past: The history of educational development in Canadian Universities*. Centre for Higher Education Research and Development. Eric #ED443309.
- Winfrey, E.C. (1999). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation*. In B. Hoffman (Ed), *Encyclopedia of Educational Technology*. Retrieved July 23, 2008, from <http://coe.sdsu.edu/eet/articles/k4levels/start.htm>
- Wright, W.A. and Associates (1998). *Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies for higher education*. Anker Publishing Company.

Appendix A

Web Resources

Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Centre for Academic Growth
Lakeland College, Professional Development
MacEwan College, Faculty Development
Monash University, Australia, Learning and Teaching Plan 2003-2005
Mount Royal College, Academic Development Centre
NorQuest College, Quest City
Simon Fraser University, Learning and Instructional Development Centre
University of Alberta, University Teaching Services
University of Arizona, Center for Learning & Teaching Excellence
University of British Columbia, Centre for Teaching & Academic Growth (TAG)
University of Guelph, Teaching Support Services
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, Center for Teaching and Learning
University of Regina, Tips for New Faculty
University of Southern Australia, Flexible Learning Centre
University of Toronto, Office of Teaching Advancement
University of Victoria, Learning & Teaching Centre
University of Winnipeg, Centre for Innovation in Teaching & Learning
Online Newsletter, Online Classrooms, Magna Publishing (PDF, March 2004)
Online Newsletter, The Teaching Professor, Magna Publishing (PDF, March 2004)
Carnegie Foundation for Education
Educational Developers Caucus (EDC)
Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE)
Canadian Council on Learning, Composite Learning Index (CLI)

Appendix B

Needs Assessment Survey

Purpose:

To derive information and perceptions of teaching values, as a guide to make policy and program decisions, a needs assessment survey was sent online to 296 College faculty and 35 others who teach including instructional assistants, librarians, and counsellors (N = 331). The survey ran from March 10 to 20, 2008. A total of 161 surveys were returned for a 46% response rate (95% confidence interval).

| Respondents: | % | N |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|
| Permanent faculty | 52% | 83 |
| Term faculty | 23% | 37 |
| Casual faculty | 11% | 18 |
| Instructional assistants | 9% | 15 |
| Other | 6% | 9 |

[Other includes: coordinator/manager/consultant/contract worker/substitute instructor]

| Key Findings | Implications |
|---|---|
| Respondents clearly defined effective teaching. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The College has a strong culture for teaching. Faculty understanding of teaching excellence could be used as a foundation for Code of Ethics for Teaching at the College and criteria for a teaching award. |
| One third of respondents indicated that their understanding of teaching and learners and learning was not strong. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not a strong culture for learning at the College. There is a great deal of work to do with faculty in building their understanding and confidence around teaching and learning. The curriculum for faculty educational activities could be derived from suggestions within this needs assessment survey. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% of respondents identified a need for workshops and seminars around teaching and learning. 62% identified a need for technology training. | There is significant interest and an identified need to learn. |
| Respondents endorsed multiple methods for measuring the quality of teaching which supports research on faculty evaluation. | More than one indicator is needed to judge teaching effectiveness. |
| Student success motivates faculty and lies at the heart of their satisfaction with their teaching role. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stories of rewarding teaching experiences could be celebrated within the College. Respect and value for teaching needs to be promoted. |

Appendix C

Interviews and Focus Groups

Purpose:

To derive information and perceptions on teaching and learning at the College, and to provide insight into the needs assessment survey data, focus groups and interviews were conducted from March through May, 2008. A random sample of faculty and others who teach were invited to share in this way while some interviews were directed at key administrators (President, Deans, Strategic Planner, etc). In total, 27 interviews and 11 focus groups have been conducted to date.

| Respondents: | Interviews | Focus Groups |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Academic Enrolment Planning | 1 | 2 |
| Academics for Careers & Employment | 3 | 2 |
| Business & Industry Careers | 4 | 1 |
| Health & Human Service Careers | 6 | 1 |
| Language Training & Adult Literacy | 4 | 1 |
| Learning Resource Services | 3 | 3 |
| Administrators | 5 | 0 |
| Student Groups | 1 | 1 |

| Key Findings | Implications |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teaching responsibilities of faculty (and others who teach) at the College are diverse. Those who teach keep refreshed/current in diverse ways and most self-identify as experiential learners who are intrinsically motivated. | Any educational interventions planned for faculty must be strategic, embrace the diversity of learning needs, and must be designed with the busy experiential learner in mind. |
| TIME and SPACE were identified as the biggest challenges faculty face when working with students and one another. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timing and location of educational interventions must be given careful consideration. Faculty need flexibility within their work day to accommodate their learning needs. |
| Excellent faculty development activities, including ISW workshops, newsletter publications, and technology training, have been offered in the past but discontinued due to lack of faculty participation (release time issue). | To successfully change the current culture at the College, incentives for faculty to participate in faculty development activities need to be developed and linked to annual performance reviews. |
| The allotment of \$300 per faculty member for professional development is insufficient to support learning in a meaningful or strategic way. | Professional development allotments should be reconsidered in light of evidence of their failing effectiveness. |

| Key Findings | Implications |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few instructors share information about teaching and learning across disciplines. • In some areas within the College there is fear and little to no trust among faculty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning communities need to be encouraged. • A peer mentoring program for instructors must be formative, cross-disciplinary, confidential, and should involve formal training. |
| The Faculty Association requires time to develop its leadership capacity before becoming involved with faculty development. | Advocacy for faculty development resides with College administration. |
| Classroom observations of teaching are summative and not practised regularly. | Classroom observations should be undertaken by faculty who are trained in pedagogy and appreciative inquiry, and must be formative. |
| Students have expectations for good teaching that are mirror images of faculty definitions of good teaching with confidence a reoccurring theme. | Educational interventions planned for faculty should reinforce college-wide learning outcomes as alignment has been shown to enhance learning. |

Appendix D

Policy Document Review

A review of existing and developing policy documents for the College was undertaken to determine how best to situate a model for faculty development that is in harmony with current policy and practice.

Reviewed Documents Included:

Faculty Growth and Evaluation: Professional Development Action Plan (1999)

Outcomes Based Education: Curriculum Developer's Guide (2002)

Standard Practice 7:21: Code of Ethics (2006)

Performance Management: Partners in Performance (P.I.P.) (2007)

College Environmental Scan Key Findings (2008)

| Key Findings | Implications |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Faculty Growth and Evaluation document: encourages self-assessment that is list driven observation reports encourage mediocrity in teaching, not teaching excellence form design limits growth by not giving responsibility to the learner (in this case the faculty member) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teaching dossier is a professional document that provides a framework for self-assessment and there is ample evidence that such documentation improves student learning. If faculty are encouraged to be satisfactory, they will only strive to be so and not aim for excellence. Being done 'to' a faculty member rather than being done 'with' a faculty member can impact job satisfaction (retention). |
| <p>Outcomes Based Education document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still a leading-edge document | <p>All new hires to the College, as well as existing faculty, need education to assist them with the transition to outcomes-based education.</p> |
| <p>Code of Ethics document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no ethical guidelines that define faculty responsibility in their role as teachers. | <p>No guidance or a College standard for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content competence Pedagogical competence Dealing with sensitive issues Student development Dual relationships with students (a form of conflict of interest) Confidentiality of student information Respect for colleagues Valid assessment of students College students and faculty could be at risk. |
| <p>Performance Management (P.I.P.) document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourages partnership with employer, allows for true growth, and encourages exceptional performance | <p>If applied uniformly throughout the College, this could positively impact the climate for working and learning (College culture)</p> |

Appendix E

Inventory of Post-Secondary Institution

Purpose:

To determine the administrative structure, funding, programs, services, and evaluation practices, fifteen post-secondary institutions in Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario were surveyed and data collected on faculty development within their institutions. To position the College strategically and to design a model of faculty development that is sustainable, it is critical to be aware of the viable practices of others.

Inventoried Institutions:

Community Colleges: Bow Valley, Alberta
Fanshawe, Ontario
Lethbridge, Alberta
NorQuest, Alberta
Red Deer, Alberta

University Colleges: Kwantlen, BC (new designation Polytechnic University)
MacEwan, Alberta
Malaspina, BC (new designation University of Vancouver Island)
Mount Royal, Alberta

Technical Institutes: NAIT, Alberta
SAIT Polytechnic, Alberta

Research University: University of Alberta

Consulted Institutions:

Ryerson University
University of British Columbia
University of Windsor

| Key Findings | Implications |
|--|--|
| Four institutions use formulae to determine the amount of money that is reinvested in their faculty for development. By calculating the total amount paid out in faculty salaries, and taking a % of that number, funds are set aside to build capacity and renew and refresh faculty. | If the College restructured its budget according to the 'college formula' it could become more strategic in developing capacity for change and growth within the institution. This would also impact the recruitment and retention of faculty. |
| All institutions reported mandatory training for new faculty ranging from 4 days (with a 3 year follow-up) to three weeks. Colleges and Technical Institutes monitored the process through fac dev area. | The College is morally responsible to its students and staff to set standards for teaching and curriculum reform. All new faculty (including casual) should receive support prior to their teaching assignment. |
| These interviews, plus conversations on the Educational Developers List serve (STLHE constituency), indicate that faculty across Canada are not attending 'one-off' workshops and seminars. | Educational interventions should be strategic and aligned with the evaluation practices of the College. |
| Centres/units of faculty development are managed by faculty who are active teachers. | While the head of any faculty development unit is a catalyst for change around teaching and learning, the real energy driving the development of faculty must be faculty themselves. |
| Faculty development centres have not always evolved in harmony with areas of technical expertise, and a tension has developed between teaching and technology. | Faculty development at the College should proceed in a collaborative manner with its educational technology area. |

Foundational Programs

Appendix E

The environmental scan undertaken in April 2008 examined the faculty development practices at 15 post-secondary institutions in Alberta, B.C. and Ontario. The College was the only institution amongst those studied that did not have any programs or workshops in place to orient new faculty to their teaching roles and responsibilities within the College. This fact, coupled with an estimated 50% turnover rate for faculty over the next five years (D. Ganter, personal conversation), leaves the College vulnerable in the areas of faculty recruitment and retention and student learning.

The needs assessment survey undertaken in March 2008 indicated that faculty were not confident in their understanding of teaching and learning and they wanted more support for their teaching. Research into faculty roles has found that the modern college instructor must perform at a professional level in a variety of roles that require expertise and skills in areas that often extend beyond the faculty member's specific area of disciplinary expertise (CEDA, 2008). Faculty who are unprepared for their role as a teacher are more likely to lack confidence in their work, which can result in anxiety and impact teaching productivity (Gappa, Austin, and Trice, 2007). McKeachie (1997) links weak teaching skills to student learning: "student learning is heavily influenced by the degree to which students perceive the teacher to be competent, comfortable, and committed to their learning" (p. 69). Ensuring that all newly hired faculty have adequate preparation to teach is also a form of risk management.

The goal of foundational programs within the faculty development plan is to develop capacity/expertise and confidence amongst those new to teaching by providing three programs that establish standards for teaching, learning, and teaching with technology within the College.

A brief description of the three programs follows:

Learning-Centred Teaching at the College (LCT)

The Learning-Centered Teaching (LCT) Course is an intensive four-day learning experience that is followed with monthly sessions during the first year of an instructor's relationship with the students at the College.

The Learning-Centered Teaching Course is designed to provide a framework for teaching that encourages the students to take a deep approach to their learning. The course will also orient **new faculty** to the programs and services at the College that support learning. Instructors will receive a pre-course questionnaire prior to their participation in the course.

Over the initial four days of the course, faculty will examine course content and identify and explain the intended outcomes of their courses to their peers. They will learn about and make informed choices regarding instructional methods to increase student engagement and learning. Additionally, faculty will learn to design ways of assessing learning that are congruent with the intended outcomes that they had previously identified. Instructors will also learn about appropriate strategies to build a sense of community in their courses, and ways to give and receive feedback so that the course stays on track and students feel supported. As a result of this participation, instructors will be able to apply learning-centered principles to other courses.

During the monthly sessions that follow the initial course offering, instructors will have the opportunity to learn more about teaching and learning at the College.

NOTE: The Learning-Centred Teaching at the College program is designed to dovetail with the new day-long Orientation to the College being hosted by Human Resources.

Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW)

The Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW), an intensive three-day educational intervention, is a laboratory approach to the improvement of teaching and learning and will target all ***casual*** instructors at the College. The ISW is facilitated *by* people who teach, *for* people who teach. Participants review basic ideas about teaching, check current practices, and are encouraged to try new instructional strategies and techniques within the safe environment of the group. The ISW and its follow-up sessions include information on teaching skills, learner needs, and other teaching and learning themes that arise in learning environments.

The ISW is a developmental educational activity and is a peer process. It is collaboration between facilitators and participants that is grounded in active, experiential learning, and based on principles of learning-centred instruction. The ISW raises awareness of and sensitivity to some of the many dimensions of diversity and explores how to help learners benefit from opportunities presented in diverse classrooms. The ISW engenders competence and confidence as an instructor.

Teaching With Technology (TwT)

The Teaching with Technology (TwT) program is an intensive five-day learning experience that is offered to ***all those who teach*** at the College. Follow-up to the five day experience will involve a virtual classroom visit and technology consultation by a peer mentor.

The TwT program is designed to provide a framework for teaching with technology in different learning contexts including face-to-face, hybrid, and distance environments. The course will also orient new instructors to the College's learning platform and available technological programs that support student learning. Instructors will receive a pre-course questionnaire prior to their participation in the program.

During the TwT program of study, instructors will learn about appropriate strategies to build a sense of community in their courses, and ways to give and receive feedback so that the course stays on track and students feel supported. Asynchronous and synchronous activities will be explored.