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Stop! Before you do anything else, turn to the yellow sheet accompanying this newsletter and write a program description for Glenn Erickson before he comes after me. As you all know, he's a lot bigger than I am, and he really wants those program descriptions. So help me avoid serious bodily injury by sending your program description to Glenn today.

A Final Report from Kerrville

OK, now to the real business. For those of you who were at the conference, greetings, and congratulations, you got out of Texas just in time. The next week it rained. For those of you who missed the conference, I'm sorry you couldn't come because we had a fine time and beautiful weather to boot. (What an appropriate idiom for Texas.) For everyone's benefit, let me just highlight some of the things coming out of the conference. After a somewhat unusual beginning, all in attendance got down to some serious networking as we began generating our second annual Bright Ideas booklet and sharing those ideas around the dinner tables. This year's winner of the coveted Bright Ideas lamp was John D.W. Andrews of California, San Diego, who contributed an idea about helping both faculty and students understand more about the problem solving process by having faculty articulate their own problem solving strategies and then combining them into a suggestion list for students. The Big Flicker award went to K. Paul Jones for a way of demonstrating to fairly unsophisticated students the purposes of flying buttresses by using the students themselves. The bright ideas which were turned in at the conference will be compiled under appropriate headings and sent out to each of you at a later date. You'll find them fascinating. By the way, Linc. Fisch, who is compiling the booklet, asked me to find out who submitted the following ideas: 1. catalyst sessions at a conference and 2. using videotape to help learn students by name. If you are willing to own up to being the clever people who submitted those ideas, call Linc. at 606-278-1457 right away.

On Friday Jack Lindquist got us started thinking about fostering democracy through teaching, particularly by helping students understand the values of freedom with responsibility and independence with cooperation which underlie our society. It was an excellent way to begin a conference which focused on encouraging people to take risks and explore new options. The high quality continued throughout the concurrent sessions which filled Friday, Saturday and Sunday with many of the session organizers taking the notion of risk to heart and trying things they had not done before, including allowing the attendees to set the agenda for a session. POD itself tried some new things, especially the mentoring process, which seemed to be very successful. Our sincere thanks to Art Crawley and Marilyn Leach for organizing this new addition to the conference.
There was, of course, the usual silliness, including the learning of the Cotton-eyed Joe, a discussion of the appropriate way to eat a tamale and the Wreck-ree-a-shun night Olympics. Your executive director even managed to win one of the coveted POD gold medals by getting the lowest score in bowling....(you mean, that's not the way it's supposed to work?) And the beautiful weather allowed for a lot of outdoor networking around the pool and by the river.

All in all, it was, as usual, an invigorating experience. Our special thanks go to Karron Lewis for the outstanding job she did in organizing the myriad of details which made the conference run so smoothly.

Core Committee Business
As usual, the Core Committee met prior to the conference, but not as usual for the everyday business of the organization. Rather this meeting was devoted to some serious self-evaluation and visioning about what POD should be now and in the future. We were assisted by Ron Boyer in examining the values which make POD what it is and determining the implications of those values for program planning. We reaffirmed our commitment to POD as a support network, that being cited by all as one of the most desirable characteristics to retain. We also re-examined our desire to be on the forefront of change and not to let ourselves become too complacent or too committed to the status quo. This is true whether we are considering our home institutions or POD's programs themselves. There was a strong sentiment to experiment with new forms of renewal for the membership, old and new, and plans are underway to explore the feasibility of some of the things suggested. And we added a new dimension, the desire to make sure that others out there involved in or interested in the quality of postsecondary education are aware of our efforts and existence so that we can take advantage of what they have to offer and vice versa. Finally, we agreed that POD is not a political organization, but a support organization. By making these values clearer to ourselves, it should be easier to generate new programs and evaluate old ones to keep the organization moving forward.

However, some business was conducted at the end of the Core meeting. Most important was a proposal to expand the process of selection for some of the working positions in the organization. The Core Committee agreed on the following changes in procedures:

a. The Executive Director will be selected on a consensus basis from a list compiled by a nominating committee made up of Core members. The nominating committee members will work during the year to identify interested members who would be willing to serve a two year term as Executive Director. They will prepare a summary of qualifications for each person on the list, based on a job description of the Executive Director. The list and qualifications summary will be brought to the Fall meeting and discussed by the Core Committee and from that list a new Executive Director will be chosen. This process will begin next spring in preparation for selection at next fall’s conference. In the meantime, I will continue to serve as Executive Director for another year.

b. The same process will be used to identify qualified members interested in serving as the editor of To Improve the Academy. Selection for that position will made at each spring Core meeting, beginning with this spring. If you are interested in serving as the 1989 editor, please consult the job description attached to this newsletter.
c. The conference selection process is to be coordinated by a standing committee of representatives from four regions of the US, a Canadian representative, the previous year's conference chair and the Executive Director. This will enable us to be planning far enough in advance to get into our preferred sites, such as Asilomar. The committee appointed at this fall's meeting will begin planning for 1990.

The Core Committee also heard a report from Rusty Wadsworth about the progress of the Handbook for New Developers. It is progressing nicely and she is currently exploring alternative formats with the publisher to see what is feasible.

Finally, the Core Committee is making plans for a possible set of outreach activities, including mailing information about the organization to certain key associations and others who might have similar interests. As those plans develop, I'll keep you posted.

Grants Program

Attached to this newsletter is the POD grant program call for proposals. This program is an attempt to promote the professional growth of our members by supporting their activities in research and program development. If you are interested in entering a proposal into the competition, consult the blue sheet for details. I encourage you to consider applying.

To Improve the Academy

I also encourage you to consider submitting an article for publication in the book of readings. As more and more people submit articles, the quality of the volumes increases, and this becomes an even more useful resource. The call for papers was included in the last newsletter. If you need a copy, give me or Joanne Kurfiss a call.

Membership Renewal and Networking Information

And speaking of the book of readings, those of you who have not renewed your membership for 1987-88 have also not received your 1987 volume of To Improve the Academy. It is waiting for you here in my office. You need only return the membership renewal and information form (enclosed) along with your check, and it will be speedily on its way. Most folks renewed at the conference and therefore received their copies there, and some very efficient folks responded to my suggestion in the last newsletter and sent in their renewals already. They, too, have been sent their copy by now. The rest of you will have to return your renewal to receive it, so don't delay.

If you have renewed, you will not find the membership renewal form enclosed. Instead you will have a membership information card. The networking guide which you either received at the conference or which is included in this mailing is an attempt on our part to enhance your ability to link up with those folks whose interests and situations are similar to yours. This was a suggestion made by one of the subcommittees of the Core Committee at the meeting last spring. At this point the only information I could use to group people was institutional type and geographical location, hence the current guide. However, several other groupings were suggested and this membership information sheet is an attempt to get relevant data on those items. If you are interested in linking up with other people who have similar jobs,
similar responsibilities, similar disciplinary backgrounds, or who attend other conferences which you attend, fill out and return the card. I'll collate all this information and issue a supplemental networking guide in the spring. I hope you'll find it useful.

Core Members Election

And now the most important purpose of this newsletter - to begin the process of selecting this year's new Core Committee members. First an advertisement. I began working in the field of faculty development in 1974, a rank novice with no confidence and no contacts. Shortly thereafter, I took a chance and ran for the Core Committee. Lo and behold, I was elected and served my first three year term. I can say unequivocally that that was the best move I ever made professionally. Not only did I make a lot of contacts who subsequently became my best friends, but I was able to have an impact on my profession by helping this organization serve it. I have never regretted the time which serving on the Core Committee requires, which is minimal in comparison to the benefits I derive from feeling at the heart of things. I encourage you to consider not only what POD can do for you, but what you can do for POD (to paraphrase President Kennedy). And serving on the Core Committee is one way to have the best of both.

What does being a Core Committee member entail? First, you must nominate yourself to the ballot. That involves filling out and returning the white sheet attached to this newsletter. Seven new members are elected every January. Second, you will serve for three years and during that time attend two meetings a year, one prior to the annual conference and one in the spring prior to AAHE. Third, you will be called on to offer advice and assistance to the Executive Director during the year by serving on selected subcommittees. While none of these subcommittees meet physically during the year, there is some measure of phone calling and letter writing as well as leg work. Service on the Core Committee is not an honorary sinecure; it means taking an active part in the running of the organization and having a real impact on its future.

If you are interested in a wonderful personal growth experience as well as an opportunity to have an impact, please don't delay. I know that it may seem self-aggrandizing to nominate yourself, but it isn't; it's making an offer of yourself to help your profession, and we want your help. Fill out your self-nomination form and send it to me right away. The ballots will go out to the members in January, so I will need your form by December 14th. I know that December is a busy time for a lot of people, so I hope you will not delay, but send your nomination to me right away while the spirit moves you.

And thanks again for your support,

Marilla Svinicki

THINGS FOR YOU TO DO

| Send Glenn your program description | DONE: 0 |
| Submit a grant proposal (optional)  | 0       |
| Submit an article (optional)       | 0       |
| Renew your membership, if necessary| 0       |
| Mail your membership information sheet | 0      |

and most important of all

Nominate yourself for Core Committee 0
Program Description Project

Please help us gather program descriptions for one of the sessions at the conference and for the book for new developers currently being assembled by Rusty Wadsworth. The information may also be used to link similar programs and to respond to requests for information. When you have completed your program description, please send it as soon as possible to:

Glenn Erickson
Instructional Development Program
201 Chafee
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881

Thanks for helping with this project.

Some sample program descriptions are included on the reverse of this sheet.

---

Program Description

We think that program descriptions are likely to be of most value to folks if they all include some of the same sorts of information. Moreover, we are certain that editing and compiling a set of descriptions will be easier if everyone cooperates by following a relatively standard format. Please think of someone editing a couple hundred or more of these before you give in to the temptation to mail us that description you just happen to have in hand that includes virtually all they want to know even if it runs a little long and doesn't slavishly follow the overly rigid and restrictive guidelines put together by someone without anything better to do . . .

**Typing**

1. Single space copy; double space between paragraphs
2. Please do not indent paragraphs
3. Use 1" margins left and right
4. Do not exceed 9" of one page in length
5. Please follow the recommended format

**A. Program name, address, etc.** — On the first line, type the name of your center, program, committee, whatever. On the next line(s), type the address. Finally, on a separate line, include the name, title, and phone number of the director, coordinator, chair, or other contact person.

**B. Quick reference institutional information** — Include all of the following information as the first one or two sentence paragraph.

- **NAME** (of institution)
- **CARNegie CLASSIFICATION** (recently listed in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 8, 1987, pp. 22-30)
- **CONTROL** (public or private)
- **FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)** FACULTY
- **FTE UNDERGRADS**
- **FTE GRAD STUDENTS**

**C. Some program information** — In another paragraph, before your description of what you do, please include the following:

1. The year your program was created
2. Where the program is located administratively
3. Staffing information, including FTEs, type of appointments, whether permanent or rotating, etc.
4. Non-personnel budget information, including funding source (hard or soft monies), major or atypical budget lines
5. Other faculty/instructional/professional/organizational development programs or services offered by the institution, but not your program, that you'd like to note

**D. Program goals and activities** — At last, time to describe what you are trying to do and how. Try to be explicit and clear about your program's goals. It's probably not useful to list every activity, but some indication of the range of services, the extent of their use, and brief descriptions of the most central would be informative.
Sample Program Descriptions

Teaching and Learning Committee
Wabash College, Crawfordsville, IN. 47933
Peter J. Frederick, Chair 317-364-4314

Wabash College is a private, Carnegie-classification liberal arts college with 75 FTE faculty and 900 undergraduates.

The Teaching and Learning Committee was created by the faculty in 1977 as an outgrowth of a Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) consortial Faculty Development Program funded initially by the Lilly Endowment in 1974. The GLCA pilot program spawned a variety of different faculty development models in the 12 member colleges, including committees such as ours, half-time teaching consultants, and small centers serving multiple purposes for faculty development and the improvement of learning.

Our committee is composed of 7 or 8 faculty members with shifting membership and chairs. The only criterion defining the committee's composition, other than interest, is diversity of disciplines and experience. The Committee is funded from institutional faculty development funds administered by the Dean and three Division Chairs, funds primarily used for mini-grants to faculty but also available for workshops, colloquia, retreats, meals, and other activities that bring faculty together to talk about teaching, learning, scholarship, and their careers.

The primary function of the Committee is to sponsor activities devoted to enhancing teaching and learning. Between 1977 and 1982 the Committee organized several workshops and informal luncheon sessions toward that end. In recent years, there have been fewer "all-faculty" structured workshops and more focus on the special needs of new faculty and meetings with students to talk about teaching and learning issues. Two firm traditions established by the Committee are an annual late-August faculty workshop (variously on The First Day of Class, the Syllabus, Involving Students in the Classroom, Student Writing, Student learning, Discussion, etc.) attended by about 70% of the faculty, and a mid-fall discussion and dinner with new faculty to hear their successes and concerns.

In terms of faculty development generally the Committee has played a role in creating a Writing Center and other programs designed to improve student skills, in broadening the faculty's awareness of active learning alternatives to the lecture, and in stimulating annual developmental conversations by chairs and administrators with nearly all members of the community. Faculty development also occurs through the mini-grant program and in the weekly meetings of the 15 faculty members involved in each of two core course programs of the College. Faculty members also are served by the various Faculty Programs provided by the Great Lakes College Association.

Instructional Development Program
201 Chafee, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881
Glenn R. Erickson, Director 401-792-5078

The University of Rhode Island (URI) is a public, Carnegie-classification research university II with about 700 FTE faculty, 14,500 undergraduates, and 2500 graduate students.

The Instructional Development Program (IDP) was established in the fall of 1975, supported in part by a grant from the Lilly Endowment. We report to the Academic Vice-President and are monitored by the Faculty Senate's Teaching Effectiveness and Facilities Committee. Our staff includes a full time director and a full time teaching improvement specialist, without faculty appointments and hired from outside, and a full time secretary. Our operating budget is about $8,000.00 a year, with about half of that going to cover printing and meeting costs for workshops and seminars. We are funded entirely by hard money and our budget does not cover a separate small grants program for instructional development.

Our emphasis has always been on providing expert and practical service to faculty interested in improving their classroom instruction. We have attempted that especially through teaching consultation for individual faculty, an annual Course Planning Workshop Series, and our Teaching Fellows Program.

The individual consultation service is the cornerstone of our program and the most time-consuming. We spend many hours each semester observing and videotaping classes, reviewing course materials, studying student evaluations, and meeting with faculty to review these data and to plan class activities. We think it is the most effective and powerful service we offer and about 25 faculty use it each year.

The Course Planning Workshops include five half-day sessions held the week before classes begin each fall. Each session focuses on a different aspect of instructional design, including: defining course goals and preparing a syllabus; presenting and explaining; selecting teaching methods and creating assignments that provide appropriate practice for course goals; testing and grading; and meeting the first class. Separate afternoon sessions for science lab TA's are being added in 1987. About 60-75 faculty and TA's attend one or more of the workshops each year.

The Teaching Fellows Program began about 10 years ago with the help of another grant from the Lilly Endowment. It provides an opportunity for 10-15 faculty to meet regularly and to explore in depth a variety of topics related to teaching and learning. Activities include: a day-long orientation meeting which focuses on college student learning styles; the course planning workshop series described above; a seminar on college teaching methods and issues which meets about twice a month throughout the year; individual consultation focusing on one course each semester; and a wrap-up session to reflect on the year's activities and to plan for the future.

We also coordinate the National Faculty Exchange for our campus, collaborate with other departments or committees to plan or conduct special workshops, consult with individuals or groups on curriculum review and design, and so on, but such activities are secondary to those described above.
POD GRANT PROGRAM

This program is intended to promote the professional growth of POD members, increase research and exchange of information on issues in higher education, and strengthen local and regional programs for institutional and faculty development. The maximum award for any one project is $1000.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES
1. Develop useful research
2. Enrich professional expertise and career satisfaction of POD members
3. Facilitate the exchange of expertise and information among POD members
4. Promote development of activities and materials that benefit POD members and their institutions.

CATEGORIES OF AWARDS
1. Research:
   a. Classroom projects that encourage developers, instructors, administrators, and/or students to investigate basic teaching/learning questions relevant to their specific educational settings. Production of materials that assist or promote such research.
   b. Research that illuminates the nature of the individuals, organizations, or activities involved in institutional or professional development. Production of materials that reflect or advance the success of individuals or organizations working in these areas.

2. Development:
   a. Implementation of a new program of professional, organization, or instructional development for some group or institution. Expansion or revitalization of an existing program.
   b. Promotion of regional or inter-institutional exchanges or meetings.
   c. Activities or materials that increase the professional expertise, personal growth, and/or career satisfaction of POD members and their colleagues.

APPLICATION FORMAT
1. Title Page containing the proposal title and the name, institution, address, and telephone number of the applicant(s). Applicants must be current POD members.

2. Project Description (2 pages maximum) including as much of the following information as is applicable:
   a. What are you going to do? (project description)
   b. What are your goals? (objectives/desired outcomes)
   c. Why is this worth doing? What circumstances make this an especially valuable activity? (context/need/rationale)
   d. What is the general background of the setting and the personnel involved? (size/type of institution or participant pool; experience of personnel; other information helpful in evaluating the appropriateness and probability of success of the project) What is the role of the applicant?

NOTE: Do NOT actually name the applicant, the institution,
or local personnel. These should be identified ONLY on the Title Page so that the preliminary review of all proposals can be done "blind." It is appropriate, however, to identify and give the qualifications of any outside consultant involved.

e. How do you plan to evaluate the project?
f. How do you plan to disseminate what you learned to others? (regional workshop, POD conference presentation, article for POD's To Improve the Academy, etc.)

3. Budget including as much detail as fits on one page.
   It would be beneficial to mention any institutional or other supplementary support the project will receive. In the spirit of rewarding internally motivated participation, direct stipends to faculty are not encouraged.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE

1. Deadline for application is February 1, 1988.

2. Send the following materials to: Marilla Svinicki
   Ctr. for Teaching Effectiveness
   Main 2200
   The University of Texas at Austin
   Austin, Texas 78712-1111
   a. One copy of the complete 4 page application outlined above.
   b. Four copies of the Project Description and Budget. (These will be forwarded to the Review Committee and should NOT contain information identifying you or your institution.)

EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS

1. A Review Committee comprised of four Core Committee members will read all proposals and prepare a report including a preliminary priority listing and recommendations.

2. During its March meeting, the Core Committee will discuss the Review Committee's report and make the final award decisions. Applicants will be notified of the results by April 1.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

1. Closeness to the objectives and award categories described above.
3. Value to POD members.
4. Diversity of types of projects funded.
   (Final decisions may also take into account the factor of regional diversity.)

FUNDING AND EVALUATION OF PROJECTS

1. Any funds awarded will be distributed after May 1, 1988.
2. A written evaluation of the project is required and should be sent to the Executive Director within 60 days of completion of the project or by February 1, 1989. If the project is not completed by that date, a preliminary report should be submitted along with a request for an extension not to exceed six months.
EDITOR
1989 VOLUME
JOB DESCRIPTION

The editor is responsible for:

a) actively soliciting manuscripts and organizing the review process; communicating editorial decisions and suggestions for revisions to authors; overseeing the revision process; completing final editorial work on the manuscript; submitting copy in journal form to the publisher; reviewing the galleys

b) securing copies of keynote addresses from the annual conference for possible inclusion; organizing accepted articles into appropriate thematic sections; writing introductory sections; keeping the cumulative index up-to-date

c) negotiating with the publisher in cooperation with the Executive Director; selecting color for the cover

The editor is assisted by a co-editor and/or associate editors who share in the tasks outlined above at the editor's discretion. Experience desirable.

Anyone interested in serving as editor or in a related capacity should contact Julie Jeffrey, Glenn Erickson or Ed Neal.