President’s Message

Organization growth and development issues resonate through every aspect of our work. POD itself is a growing and developing organization. Over the past five years our membership has grown an average of about 10 percent a year, from approximately 1,000 in 1998, to just under 2,000 in 2008. As our membership grows, our member profiles become increasingly diversified in terms of institutional type, location, mission, and nationality. Our members, faculty and organizational developers, engage with individual instructors, departments, colleges or systems, as we constantly assess, prioritize and initiate responses to a variety of needs from a range of constituents. Sometimes these needs are persistent issues well known to us; sometimes they are emergent and indeterminate. The one constant across all of these challenges is the need to continue learning – about ourselves, each other and the issues facing our communities.

Sorcinelli and colleagues (Sorcinelli et al, 2005) describe this time in faculty development as the “age of the network.” This description appeals to me on a variety of levels but it rings especially true as I hear formal and informal stories of how POD members continue to cherish finding a welcoming, inclusive and generous community. However, I find that we often still communicate with each other using relatively traditional (linear and hierarchical) perspectives on engagement and discourse. It’s impossible in the brief space of a column to unpack the implications of traditional modes of communication long favored in higher education, but here are common examples you may recognize:

- A preference for engaging each other in debate – “encounters” where one participant “wins” and one “loses” based on “points” and the process is governed by a complex set of guidelines (aka Rules of Order) delineating who speaks, in what order, for how long, and to which question. And, most sadly, mistaking such processes for rigorous, critical analyses;
- An over-emphasis on the cognitive dimension of knowledge reinforced by a generalized distrust of affective or kinesthetic ways of knowing;
- Expectations that arguments are anchored solely to a set of “neutral” facts presented in a linear, sequential manner that ignores the reality that many of the most important issues being investigated by scholars today are inextricably linked to issues of social justice and equity and have implications for the quality of life for all people, both in the United States and elsewhere; and
- Finally, even well meaning colleagues fall into the trap I describe as “hit and run dialogues.” By this, I mean encounters in which listening closely to and genuinely trying to understand the perspectives of others’ is replaced by a pattern of biding one’s time until the chance to hurl your own points while remaining impervious to the views of others or the impact this has communication – hence the “hit and run.”

The demands on faculty and instructional developers are changing, just as surely as are the traditional scope and rewards of faculty life in the academy. Perhaps it’s time our communication methods change accordingly?

– Continued on page 3
Notes from the POD Office
Greetings from Nederland, Colorado

POD held its first-ever web-based Core Committee election in 2007. I along with Jim Groccia, past president of POD & chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, confirmed the results as tabulated by Zoomerang, the online survey provider. Happily, the new paperless procedure went very smoothly with 230 out of approximately 1780 active POD members voting in the election—just under 13%. While not exactly a jaw-dropping percentage, this nonetheless constitutes a jump in voter turnout as compared to 2006 where 9% of members voted (147 out of approximately 1615). Hopefully, this trend will continue with more and more members voting each year.

Even more encouraging is the fact that 56% of 2007 POD conference attendees completed the Zoomerang conference feedback survey (427 out of 759 attendees) as compared to 34% in 2006 (254 out of 744 attendees).

Work on the 2008 joint POD/NCSPOD conference in Reno, Nevada, began in earnest immediately following the 2007 conference. Conference Co-Chairs Kathryn Plank, The Ohio State University, and Laurel Willingham-McAlin, Duquesne University, along with Program Co-Chairs Kevin Barry, Notre Dame, and Debra Fowler, Texas A & M University, are hard at work cooking up a unique inter-organizational networking and professional development event for us all. For more information on NCSPOD, please visit their website: www.ncspod.org. The conference will be held at The Nugget.

As part of our tribute to Bob Diamond, we’re printing two of his wry cartoons in this issue of the newsletter. We hope you enjoy them.

Sincere best wishes to all for a great 2008!
– Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director

Karen Santos and Carol Hurney Receive POD 2007 Innovation Award

Karen Santos, Director of the Center for Faculty Innovation at James Madison University and Assistant Director Carol Hurney were awarded the POD 2007 Innovation at the POD Conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for The Leadership Book Chain. Designed to get the right books into the hands of those who need the information most, this program circulates carefully selected books on a variety of topics of interest in a “chain like” manner among academic leaders on campus.

The POD Innovation Award recognizes new and innovative ideas in professional organizational development and is awarded each year at the national conference. This year 17 strong submissions were considered for the award. To win the award, the idea must be more than innovative. It needs to demonstrate effectiveness, be relatively inexpensive to implement, and easy for others to replicate. Each year, the finalists for the award form a strong contingent of ideas representative of the great ideas often shared by POD members.

Six finalist ideas were selected by committee and the originators of the ideas were invited to present their concepts at the Poster Session and Resource Exchange. Finalists included: Mary Deane Sorcinelli and Jung Yun (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), Mutual Mentoring for New and Underrepresented Faculty; Karen Sirum (Bowling Green State University), Assessing Impact of Faculty Development Programs on Student Learning: The Participant Assessment of Learning Gains (PAL Gains) Survey; Ther- on Destosier (Washington State University), Raising the Bar: Communicating High Expectations and Getting Results; Teresa M. Redd (Howard University), A Multi-purpose Syllabus Database; and Emily Donnelly Sallee and Amber Dailey-Hebert (Park University), Development on Demand.

More information about this and past award winners can be found at the POD Network website at the following address: http://www.wku.edu/teaching/db/podbi/. Questions regarding the POD Innovation Award can be directed to Todd Zakrajsek (Central Michigan University) at zakra1t@cmich.edu or 989-774-2757. Keep track of any new programs or services you develop over the coming months and consider submitting them for consideration in Reno, Nevada at the POD Network meeting next fall.
At our conference this fall, many of us participated in the series of topical interest group or TIG discussions, as well as workshop and keynote presentations. Efforts of some of our committees, such as the Diversity Committee, also reflect principles of mutual mentoring and life-long learning. These examples are models of how we can move beyond the boundaries of traditional notions that seniority automatically equates with greater knowledge or, that status within a hierarchy (higher or lower) licenses particular authority.

As we continue to work to answer the questions of what should be the fundamental focus of POD, I hope we will ultimately decide to work together to shape what we all desire and deserve—a humane and inclusive professional organization—and life in higher education. We can build such a model of personal and organizational development by moving away from traditional patterns of communication and mentoring that so often rely on the chance of propinquity, interpersonal chemistry, or special access and seem only to lead to one-on-one, senior-junior matches.

As a multicultural organization POD members actively create new models of inclusive teaching, academic leadership and institutional development. Already understanding the importance of these values and practices, what we may benefit from most are sustained opportunities for learning from each other’s perspectives and strengths—a conscious effort at such dialogues could create a foundation in POD for a new kind of “mutual mentoring.”

The key attributes of these relationships would be a sense of reciprocity and equality. Rather than a sort of “grab and go” attitude (i.e., let me grab your ideas and go on to my next interest) we focus on creating and sustaining mutually beneficial, permeable and flexible, networks of peer mentors. In so doing, we not only share ideas but come to understand why we think the way we do. As we interact with this degree of honesty and flexibility these become equitable relationships, founded on respect and reciprocal learning, and move us beyond boundaries constructed by false notions of formal status, gender, age or race.

POD members can play a vital role in building and sustaining new forms of relationships in our increasingly global society. If we are successful within our own organization (and I believe we will be), we can contribute more effectively to efforts in our home institutions, nationally and internationally. I look forward to continuing to work with POD members and leaders in 2008 as we facilitate such new dialogues and relationships.

Sources

— Matt Ouellett

Core Committee Elected

POD Welcomes 2008-2011 Core Members

Congratulations to the five new Core Committee members and sincere thanks to all seven candidates for their willingness to serve and guide the POD Network in Higher Education.

Class of 2011

Leora Baron is POD's next President Elect

Leora Baron is Director of the Teaching and Learning Center at University of Nevada at Las Vegas.

Margaret (Peggy) Cohen, University of Missouri - St. Louis

Dieter J. Schönwetter, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Frank Tuitt, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver

Julie-Ann McFann, New Professor Mentor Coaching

Niki Young, Western Oregon University
In Memoriam
Bob Diamond – A Pioneer in Our Field
1930 - 2007

Bob Diamond was someone who made a difference in POD and in the field of higher education. He was a person of big ideas. His work within POD helped shape its principles, strategies and working models. His efforts across higher education helped place POD in greater prominence in addressing institutional change.

From my first meeting with Bob, he demonstrated his advocacy for the importance of teaching and learning. His philosophy of systematic instructional development at the Center at Syracuse University demonstrated how to work with faculty in their courses to improve learning and with departmental curricula to document outcomes and to make instructional improvements. While many were emphasizing activities, Bob focused on collected data that demonstrated improvements long before the current emphasis on accountability. His Center had an evaluation specialist on staff to ensure he was collecting the data to address significant instructional questions.

As those who interacted with Bob are aware, he continually presented workshops and conference sessions. They were always challenging and well attended. Bob was one of the original group that started POD. Because Bob was quick to see things and a man of action, I know that he suffered through the T-Group experience at the founding meeting in Cincinnati (he recounted it many times) and then suffered through the consensus driven CORE Committee – twice! A less dedicated person might have stepped away but he stayed with his principles and a belief in POD. Bob was awarded the second Spirit of POD Award - a tribute to his tireless effort and indomitable spirit. His instructional development work is a foundation of today’s work.

In addition to his work in POD, Bob widened our efforts with AAHE (American Association for Higher Education) which helped to highlight the way POD could collaborate with higher education administrators to address institutional change. A centerpiece was a major grant funded project involving several large universities that examined rewards for teaching. This research precipitated an important national discussion that lead to new policies and improved reward structures.

Bob’s writing addressed various instructional development and leadership issues in higher education. His books were thoughtful, systematic and practical. Major titles include: Field Guide to Academic Leadership (Ed.) (2002), Designing and Assessing Courses and Curricula (1998), and Aligning Faculty Rewards with Institutional Mission: Statements, Policies and Guidelines (1995). Two popular, practical guides he authored Serving on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Review Committees: A Faculty Guide (1994); and Preparing for Promotion, Tenure and Annual Review: A Faculty Guide (1995) are widely used in higher education. As you can see, Bob had an eye for meeting a need.

One of Bob’s big ideas was the National Academy for Academic Leadership. He was committed to providing a means for those, particularly administrators in higher education, to make important changes using the best theory and practice available. Although NAAL met with limited success, it is still a grand idea which with the right timing and funding could be the kind of organization envisioned.

On a personal basis, Bob was a colleague and friend who would just call to see how you were doing or try out an idea. He was always working on something. It’s characteristic of Bob that he just completed a revised manuscript for Jossey-Bass. My hope is that his spirit will live on in POD through his works and ideas. We will miss his wise counsel and strong voice for institutional change.
Robert M. Diamond on Organizational Development in POD
Edited by Dakin Burdick, MSU

One of the founders of POD, Diamond served for over twenty years as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Instructional Development at Syracuse University, where he was Research Professor and Director of the Institute for Change in Higher Education. He directed the National Project on Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards from 1991 to 1999 and was President of The National Academy for Academic Leadership.

I started out as a secondary school teacher and was one of the first teachers on television when I got out of the service back in the mid-50’s. I was doing an enrichment program in math on television. We didn’t have videotape, everything was live and I was making mistakes in three or four states simultaneously. So, you prayed a lot and you screwed up regularly. From there I headed up one of the first closed circuit operations.

Then I was offered a position at San Jose to see how we could use television to improve the quality of teaching.

Right after the Second World War, you had all these people who got their training in the military on uses of technology in the training of soldiers, sailors, and so forth. God, it goes back that far. That group became the core of what was then called DAVI, which was the “Division of Audio Visual Instruction.” That was an interesting group headed by Dick Lewis. The members were in many ways the top visionaries in the whole instructional technology movement. There was Jerry Kemp who was very high in the graphic end, and Bob Mager, who was one of the early leaders in program instruction. While I was working with television, I was also mucking around with some of the early things with program instruction, and how we could use it to solve some of our academic problems. I was sort dead ended because in those days, out in California, you missed most of the action going on in the rest of the country.

From where I went to University of Miami as a visiting professor to head up a Ford grant to see what we could do to improve the university college, which was the first two years of academic programs. While we were pretty heavy into television, we were getting into all sorts of stuff, and I continued developing my change model. This was interesting because the folks at Michigan State at the time -- Charlie Shuller and some others -- were for the first time starting to apply system theory to education. They heard about my work at Miami and came down for a visit. They said, “Could you tell us what you’re doing?” “What I had was rather complex. God, I look at now and it had all of these boxes and arrows in it. I did not come from Engineering, so I didn’t have a clue what I was doing, but I had this whole sequence laid out of the questions you asked and in what order. In those days, we were looking at large groups, small groups, and independent study. They looked at it and they advised me that I was an expert in instructional systems. I said, “I’ve never heard the term. What is it?” They answered, “You’re an expert at it.” So I got

anointed sort of. Then an article came out nationally with experts talking about “instructional system theory applied to education. “I was one of the people interviewed; an expert in an area I didn’t know existed. From there, I really got the time to develop the concept that if you really need a change, you need a synergism of a variety of talents. The article I did a few years back in To Improve the Academy talked about instructional changes, which is really what my thinking is now. Change can’t be just one piece. You need the process skills. You need people who understand the research and teaching and learning. You need the assessment and the data collection. You need the people who understand technology and process.

One of the things I never won with POD was having people really understand that their roles could be significantly greater if they had those process skills and expanded beyond just looking at faculty development. If you don’t,

– Continued on page 10

Dakin Burdick is the POD Historian. This interview is part of the ongoing POD Oral History Project.

1 Robert F. Mager, author of Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction (1962).
Changing Priorities in Higher Education:

Promotion and Tenure

Robert Diamond, Syracuse University

A recent study involving over 23,000 faculty chairs, deans and administrators at research universities indicated that even those most directly involved with the present reward system feel that the balance between research and teaching needs to be modified. Most significantly, the results indicate that an effort to modify the system must be sensitive to the unique characteristics and strengths of the institution.

The system must be sensitive to the differences among the disciplines. As part of a recent initiative spearheaded by Syracuse University and supported by the Lilly Endowment and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, a number of professional associations established task forces to develop statements articulating the range of activities that could be considered “scholarly.” As this project has progressed, significant differences among the disciplines have become clear. There are differences in what faculty do across disciplines as well as in the language they use to describe what they do. It is important that the reward system acknowledge and honor the inherent functional differences among the humanities, the social sciences, the sciences, and the professional schools.

The work of the professional associations to date reveals that one thing is common across disciplines: important faculty work is not being rewarded. The problem appears in drama departments with the production of a play; in English or writing departments when a faculty member works in the community to develop a literacy program; and in management, economics, sociology, or retailing when a professor’s skills are used to help a community group address a significant problem. To put it bluntly, the focus on research and publication and the mad dash for federal funds and external grants has diverted energies away from important faculty work and has had a direct and negative impact on the quality of classroom instruction and the ability of institutions to provide support to and involve their communities. It also diverts energies from types of research that do not fall within the traditional publication realm.

Real limitations exist for faculty who want to ensure recognition for their scholarly pursuits. The choice is often between research that intrigues and excites them and the type that can be represented in a publication and will appeal to the prestigious journals or publishers. The result has been a proliferation of what might be called “establishment research.”

The system must be sensitive to the difference among individuals. We each bring to our work different strengths, interests, and perspectives. Establishing an identical set of criteria for all faculty, as we have tended to do, is unrealistic and can undermine the quality of an academic unit. The truth is that outstanding researchers are not necessarily great teachers, and great teachers are not always exceptional researchers. The goal for each department, school, or college should be to bring together a group of talented individuals who can work together in a synergistic manner to reach the goals of that unit. The reward system must also recognize that
faculty, at different times in their careers will focus their attention in different areas. This may be the result of a departmental assignment; on other occasions it will be inherent to the discipline. In some fields a faculty member's major research accomplishments are early in his or her career; in others a scholarly focus occurs later, when the individual has had the opportunity to expand his or her perspectives.

The system must develop an assessment program that is appropriate, perceived to be fair and workable. To reach this goal, we suggest a “selected professional portfolio” that is tailored around the specific responsibilities of an individual faculty member. This system would permit an in-depth evaluation of representative items and activities rather than the more customary quick review of often overlapping and redundant studies and publications. It should be a system that, where appropriate, stresses process as much as product and in which the expert judgment of peers or colleagues is incorporated.

Where to Begin

Change must begin at the department and the discipline level. Faculty priorities are, for the most part, determined by their disciplinary associations. Their second loyalty is to their departments. Here faculty develop a support group, receive departmental administrative guidance, and basically work. It is, therefore, essential that faculty at the departmental level be actively involved in developing revised tenure and promotion guidelines for their programs. The role of administration is to facilitate the process while supporting the concept that different departments will, and should, develop different criteria. To assist the process the central administration must develop and disseminate a clear and concise institutional mission statement upon which the new tenure and promotion system can be based.

Some Final Observations

Reconceiving faculty priorities requires a genuine commitment to change. All too often major institutional initiatives have been characterized by extensive rhetoric and little action.

The entire academic community must be actively involved in the change process. Unless the central administration, deans, chairs, and individual faculty members have ownership of any modifications in the tenure and promotion process that are being proposed, adoption and implementation will be problematic. This ownership can only come from giving faculty an active role in setting priorities, establishing criteria, and determining how revised tenure and promotion plans will be developed and assessed. Otherwise, the desired changes will not occur.

The process of changing the tenure and promotion criteria will be far more difficult in some academic areas than others. While the data from the National Study of Research Universities on the Balance Between Research and Undergraduate Teaching (1992) show that the sciences, engineering, and some of the social sciences tend to be most comfortable with the status quo, change in these fields is essential for a number of reasons. First, the emphasis on published research has had, in many instances, a detrimental impact on the quality of teaching and the scope of research conducted, on students’ attitudes toward these fields, and consequently on the number of students selecting science and engineering as careers. Second as federal resources for research continue to decline and as institutions begin to recognize that the number of research programs they support must be reduced to those that are of the highest quality, there will be increased pressure on many departments to re-establish priorities and re-assess the criteria by which faculty will be evaluated.

Other disciplines, particularly the humanities, performing arts, most professional schools, and some of the social sciences, will be facing a different problem. These disciplines have focused more and more attention on publishable research in order to gain “academic respectability.” They will now be asked to refocus their efforts on activities that, until now, have received little attention.

It Isn’t an Option: The Faculty Reward System Must Change

Those of us in higher education must modify what we do and where we invest our energies. A chorus of voices from the public and private sectors are calling for change, and our most important clients—our students—are demanding it. The question is how significant a role we, as faculty and administrators, will play in this process. We can sit back and mildly protest the status quo until that point when frustrated governmental and external accreditation agencies define for us what we will do and how. Or we can take a proactive role in shaping our future. The initiative is ours to take or perhaps forever lose the opportunity to set our own priorities.

References

Upcoming Conferences

JUNE 12-15, 2008
CONFERENCE
On the University of Utah campus at the site of the 2002 Olympic Village

As a member of the POD network, YOU are a member of ICED. POD is sponsoring this ICED Conference in a spectacular setting nestled in the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains.

The ICED 2008 Conference promises a wealth of opportunities:

- Networking with faculty developers from over 40 countries
- Pre-conference workshops, poster sessions, and a resource fair
- Thought-provoking plenaries by international experts and panelists
- Concurrent sessions on research, theory, and best practices in our field
- Excursions and events for interactions with POD friends and newfound colleagues

Register NOW on the conference Website to get the “early-bird” registration rate. See you in June!

www.ICED2008.org

STLHE Conference June 2008 in Windsor, Ontario:
A World of Learning par Excellence

The 28th annual Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) conference will be held in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, June 18-21, 2008, hosted by the University of Windsor.

Located on the campus of one of Canada’s most culturally diverse universities, the conference, themed A World of Learning, will explore the practices which foster diversity, support the professional growth of international faculty and teaching assistants, and stimulate the development of broader worldviews of all faculty and students.

Given the global theme of this year’s conference, we feel that this is the ideal time to take greater initiatives to minimize our energy consumption; hence, we are incorporating principles of environmental sustainability into conference planning as articulated in our green vision statement, Walking Lightly for a Greener World of Learning.

Join us in Windsor for a truly international experience as we share in a diversity of experiences, opinions, practices, and hopes. Visit stlhe.uwindsor.ca for more information.

Workshop/Field Experience proposal deadline was:
January 15, 2008

Deadlines for other proposals:
January 31, 2008

Pedagogy, Technology and Course Redesign

Join us at the 8th annual conference on Pedagogy, Technology and Course Redesign, June 4-6, 2008 at Fairfield University (CT). Located amidst rolling hills and trees on the Long Island Sound, campus is a one-hour train ride from New York City, and we provide housing to the first 50 registrants. Proposals due May 18, 2008; see http://www.fairfield.edu/caeconf.
The higher education context in Australia has changed markedly in the last few years. Academics are experiencing many dilemmas as they try to sustain their academic activities in the face of an increasingly bureaucratised sector.

External pressures on universities increase as our federal government focuses more intensively on university governance and outcomes. The Teaching and Learning Performance Fund, which allocates funding to universities based on feedback from students and comparative rankings with respect to graduate outcomes, is a major influence. As universities seek to improve their rankings, unit evaluation has become the norm. Most universities monitor student feedback each semester and address poor performance, resulting in a profound shift from university teachers monitoring student ratings for their personal reflection to a more public corporate process of data collection and dissemination.

Universities which receive federal teaching and learning funds are motivated to not only maintain but improve their standing, thus creating more energy around teaching activities. Less successful universities are even more actively addressing their areas of weakness through reviews and interventions.

The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education is a strong presence of teaching and learning in the higher education community, promoting the status and valuing of good teaching through national teaching awards. Hundreds of people associated with promoting teaching outcomes now receive citations from the Carrick Institute. The citations have become an important form of recognition which complement the prestigious national teaching awards. The introduction of national teaching fellowships and significant funding for teaching and learning projects have also stimulated considerable activity across the sector.

The dilemma for academics is that teaching and learning, while assuming increasing recognition and importance, is also facing extreme competition from the research role that academics must also manage. At this stage the government intends to institute a new Research Quality Framework based on the British and New Zealand models. Most universities have already commenced the review of their academics to identify those who are research active and those who are not. Even more challenging is the fact that the data collection is emphasising research concentrations, thereby promoting a stronger focus on research collaboration. This has some very real consequences for those who research as individuals or whose collaborative effort has been marginal.

While these initiatives are in themselves strong stimuli for enhancement of academic outcomes, collectively they add to the pressure on faculty, who need time to reflect on their teaching, develop their research agendas, build relationships, and manage their careers. The reduced access to tenurable positions and the need to perform to a very high level in order to gain continuing appointments, coupled with the need to rapidly acculturate into the workplace and build a strong academic profile across both teaching and research is a major challenge for those new to academia. Mentorship and academic induction are critical supports to enable the fast-tracking of new academics to peak performance.

Recognizing and rewarding academics who contribute to the ongoing shift of the university culture toward a more nurturing and constructive collegial work community is important. This makes academic development more vital than ever, inviting us to ask how services can be more strategically focused to make a demonstrable difference. Areas of research concentration across Australia have related to the leadership of teaching and learning and research; the encouragement of academic mentorship as a supportive strategy for junior academics and the development of improved support for new and casual teachers. Another major national project focuses on research management to increase the skills of those responsible for people, resources and research outcomes. The challenge, of course, will be to draw the outcomes of these projects into ongoing university programmes and strategies.

Academics are clearly noting the increased pressure to perform in both teaching and research. HERDSA has experienced a big increase in article submissions for its journal and greatly expanded demand for its practical HERDSA Guides. The presentations and papers at its annual conference have also demonstrated a much greater focus on academic challenges, disciplinary concerns and holistic approaches to academic development. The 2008 conference, which will be held in Rotorua, New Zealand, (July 1 – 4) will explore Engaging Communities – a very appropriate theme for the academic community as it grapples with the ongoing dilemmas and challenges of working in different and more accountable ways. The next few years will be challenging for many academics. It will be particularly important to ensure that people feel supported and encouraged by their colleagues and university agencies.
Books by POD members


Diversity Grants Awarded

Congratulations to Helen Caldwell (Johnson C. Smith University), Elizabeth Hammer (Xavier University), Monica Huerta (University of Michigan), Janice Liddell (Clark Atlanta University), Leslie Richardson (Xavier University), Alice Stephens (Clark Atlanta University), Ju Park (Indiana University-Northwest), and Carmen Walker (Johnson C. Smith University), recipients of the 2007 POD Diversity Travel Grants.

TEAM Center (Teaching Excellence, Advancement, and Mentoring) at the University of Texas at San Antonio, is the recipient of the Faculty/TA Instructional Development Internship Grant.

On behalf of POD, the Diversity Committee would like to thank these grant recipients for their contributions to the session “In from the margins: Keeping diversity central in faculty development” at the annual conference in Pittsburgh, and we look forward to their participation in the POD community.

Information about next year’s Diversity Committee Travel and Internship Grants, see http://www.podnetwork.org/grantsawards.htm. The application deadline for both Grants will be May 1, 2008.

POD is not really getting into discussions of impact. For years some of the most experienced people were getting continually turned down for program recommendations because the reviewers didn’t see the urgency of what they were talking about and the reviewers just didn’t have the experience or breadth to understand that urgency. We haven’t done a particularly good job of professional development of our own people. To me that is an unfortunate mistake because as important as POD people are, they could be having a much more significant role then they do have. I think POD has been a wonderful group. You have heard my frustration because I just think it could be so much stronger than it is. I don’t see the programs evolving at all. The key is institutional change, and the role of POD members in the process. The more important their role, the more impact they will have, and the stronger they will be.
Members in Action

POD Members Coordinate International Study of Faculty Roles

POD members Mike Theall (Youngstown State University), Raoul Arreola (University of Tennessee Health Sciences Center), Bonnie Mullinix (Furman University), Jennifer Franklin and former POD Presidents Marilla Svinnicki (University of Texas at Austin), and Nancy Chism (Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis), in collaboration with of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), are participating in an international study of faculty roles, work and skills. Results will be reported at the AERA annual meeting in April in a special session that includes Marilla’s invited address as recipient of the Special Interest Group in Faculty Teaching, Evaluation, and Development, McKeachie Career Achievement Award. The survey is located at: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=0S0ZhSgBLg8f5Nuvn1R1Q_3d_3d

POD members Michael Reder (Connecticut College), Paul Kuerbis (Colorado College); and POD President Elect Virginia Lee (Virginia S. Lee & Associates) co-presented a session titled “The Role of Centers for Teaching and Learning in Forging and Sustaining Campus-wide Collaborations in Support of Student Learning” at the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Conference in Savannah, George, on November 3, 2007.

Ron Berk (Professor Emeritus, Johns Hopkins University) delivered 15 presentations in fall 2007, including keynotes on humor at Umea University, Sweden; professional purpose at the European Students’ Biomedical Conference, Humboldt University Medical School, Berlin, Germany; and multimedia teaching at the California Community Colleges Chief Instructional Officers Conference, Monterey; and 12 invited workshops on humor; multimedia teaching; creating TV, movie, and Broadway parodies; 14 strategies to evaluate teaching; student assessment; and using music to improve learning at the Association for Medical Education in Europe Conference, Trondheim, Norway; European Students’ Biomedical Conference; Belmont University, Nashville; New Mexico State University; Umea University; and National Evaluation Systems’ Conference, Chicago.


Congratulations to former POD President Nancy Chism, (Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis), who will be serving as a Fulbright Scholar in Thailand from January through May 2008. She will be based at Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok and traveling to other campuses at the request of the Ministry of Education to support the newly-developed POD Thailand Network.

Members on the move

At Brigham Young University, PODders Lynn Sorenson, Trav Johnson, and Bryan Bradley have moved from the Faculty Center (which now focuses only on organizational and faculty development) to the new Center for Teaching and Learning (which focuses solely on instructional development—supporting teaching and learning). Many of those in both units are hard at work planning the POD-sponsored ICED Conference in Salt Lake City (June 12-15, 2008).

Resources for POD members

Newly available from Diversity Works, Inc. DVD and VHS on Diverse Hiring.

For more information email pkayes@diversityworksinc.net and visit www.diversityworksinc.net.

Newly available from Stylus publishing, two DVDs on Effective Lecturing.

For more information email StylusMail@PressWarehouse.com and see www.styluspub.com
Contacting the POD Office

It is our goal at the POD office to respond to members’ questions, concerns, needs, and interests as courteously and promptly as possible. Please contact us at the address below if we can assist you.
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Connecting with POD

Get the most out of your POD membership:

Subscribe to the POD listserv by joining at www.listserv.nd.edu/archives/pod.html. This electronic discussion list is hosted by the University of Notre Dame’s John A. Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning.


Bookmark POD’s Web site at www.podnetwork.org
Contact the POD Office at:
POD Network
P.O. Box 3318
Nederland, Colorado 80466
Phone - (303) 258-9521
Fax - (303) 258-7377
e-mail - podnetwork@podweb.org