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President's Message

Making Headlines

This summer, I traveled to Bangkok to represent POD at the annual council meeting of the International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED). Currently, the consortium is comprised of 22 national faculty development networks that share research and practices with the goal of using faculty/educational development to improve higher education worldwide. In Bangkok, I also attended ICED’s biennial conference, “Across the Globe Higher Education Learning and Teaching: Where East Meets West,” where I had the pleasure to network with other POD members such as Nancy Chism, Dee Fink, David Green, Cameron Harris, Matthew Holley, and about 300 other international leaders in the field. As a newcomer, my primary goal was to learn. As I listened to the network representatives update the council on their yearly activity, I gained insights about the common challenges we face. The first common thread was the ongoing professionalization of the field. Faculty developers gravitate toward the profession because of their love of teaching and their desire to improve teaching beyond their own courses, but generally without formal training or entrance exams. This translates into a wide range of background knowledge and skills. National networks are confronting the challenge of ensuring that entering practitioners are equipped with the skills they need to survive, be effective, and thrive. In the United States, we address this need with the yearly “Getting Started in Faculty Development” pre-conference workshop and the biennial “Institute for New Faculty Developers.” More formalized models include courses and certificates, as in the United Kingdom and Australia/New Zealand. A related challenge is to balance the academic and research orientation of the field with the community-of-practice aspect. Some networks have emerged as sharing spaces and are now trying to become more active as research communities, while others might have started as a field of research, but gradually lost this aspect (and the prestige that comes with it in academia) and are now trying to reclaim it. The size and longevity of the network and other contextual variables influence the approach, but we all grapple with this issue.
Another major concern on the table was the relationship of our organizations with the government and other players in higher education. As all governments work to increase access to higher education and graduation rates and set the strategic priorities, standards, and incentives, how does faculty development factor in the equation? We have expertise in crucial areas, such as learning theory, assessment, organizational change, leadership development, faculty evaluation, and so forth. How can our knowledge be valued and used productively? In the United States, our relationship to the federal government is mediated by the accreditation agencies. We have had local success by positioning teaching centers on campus as the unit which can help administrators grapple with the ever-changing demands of accrediting agencies. Other nations share different stories. Some networks, like Japan, are regulated by the government, which has mandated that every university have faculty development. The young ThaiPOD is already savvy in this respect, and recruited Dr. Hwang DaeJoon, Secretary General of Korean Council for University Education, as one of the keynote speakers for the ICED conference. The UK network, SEDA, has had recent success in positioning itself as an important voice in higher education. Following aggressive advocacy (see my previous column), it has been commissioned by the Higher Education Academy to perform an evaluation of the new UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning.

This success story creates a trajectory for growth for our own network. We can transition from the group of people who help in meeting mandates to the group of people who has something meaningful to say about those mandates, and can even shape them. In the spring, I traveled to Ann Arbor to attend the 50th Anniversary Celebration of the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan. There, Matt Kaplan guided us in a brainstorming exercise, asking us what headlines we’d like to see in five years about teaching centers. My bold entry was “President Hillary Clinton appoints a former Teaching Center director as Secretary of Education.”

How can we move in that direction? As we keep shaping our new strategic plan, the Core committee is very interested in dialoguing with the whole membership on this and other issues. This is why, starting with the Seattle Conference, we are holding a formal Membership Meeting. The wonderful conference team (see their update in this issue) has assigned us a space to meet. Please plan to meet on Friday in Grand Ballroom A from 1:30-2:00PM to learn more about the direction POD is embarking on taking to shape that course with your contributions! Looking forward to seeing many of you in Seattle!

--Michele DiPietro, POD President
The POD office is abuzz with pre-conference work on the fast-approaching 37th annual POD conference (October 24-28, Seattle). If you haven’t yet registered, please remember to do so before October 1st to take advantage of the early-bird rate of $465. The conference will be held at the Seattle Sheraton in the heart of downtown Seattle. We were again able to negotiate free wireless internet access in all guest rooms, in all lobby/public spaces, and in all sessions.

Please plan to stay through Sunday for this year's Anchor Session entitled From the Conference to the Campus: Educational Development through the Lens of Crowdsourcing, facilitated by Derek Bruff, with Judy Brophy, Amy Collier, Jim Julius, Rachel Niemer, Mark Connolly, Jose Vazquez Cognet, and Jennifer Russell.

See you in Seattle!
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The POD 2012 Conference, *Pencils & Pixels—21st Century Practices in Higher Education*, is shapin’ up and people are signin’ up! The Conference team is super excited about exploring “Pencils & Pixels” with all of you at the conference—with more ways than ever to share and collaborate in both physical and electronic forms.

**Michael Wesch** (pictured left), Anthropology Professor from Kansas State, whose videos on anthropological lens on social media took his videos viral on YouTube, will explore: *The End of Wonder in the Age of Whatever* in his plenary.

**Alex Soojung-Kim Pang** (pictured right), Stanford University, who has studied blogging Buddhist monks—really, it’s not as oxymoronic as it sounds—will engage us with his plenary on Saturday: *Contemplative Computing and Our Future of Education*.

**Derek Bruff** has assembled a crack team to lead the final Sunday morning anchor session: *From the Conference to the Campus: Educational Development through the Lens of Crowdsourcing*. This session will be an active, participatory synthesis of ideas emerging throughout the conference. As a special feature, we’ll have a visual facilitator graphically capturing the anchor session’s conversations.

(Photo by Derek Bruff)
Click [here](https://sites.google.com/a/podnetwork.org/wikipodia/pod-network-news-page/pod-network-news-archives/fall-2012/conference-news) for more on the plenaries and anchor session or scan the square “QR Code” at the bottom of this page with your smartphone for an instant link.

Thanks to the tireless work of the ECRC (Electronic Communications and Resources Committee), session titles and abstracts will be available soon. You can choose from a variety of formats to peruse on your preferred electronic device before you come to Seattle. Watch the POD listserv and Twitter feed for details.

For those who feel a need to break out of academic constraints, [create@pod](https://sites.google.com/a/podnetwork.org/wikipodia/pod-network-news-page/pod-network-news-archives/fall-2012/conference-news) is back this year! Mark your conference schedule for Thursday evening Oct. 25! Create@pod digital stories and speed-presentations provide comic, creative, informative, and sometimes very moving entertainment one the first day of the POD Conference. Many of us are still laughing about Texas Wesleyan’s office prank (implemented after consulting L.Deepink’s model for course design, of course). Anyone planning to attend the POD conference can submit a proposal. Details are on WikiPODia.

POD 2012 will be held **October 24-28, 2012** at the Sheraton Seattle, 1400 6th Avenue. Click [here](https://sites.google.com/a/podnetwork.org/wikipodia/pod-network-news-page/pod-network-news-archives/fall-2012/conference-news) to register.

And don’t forget to make your hotel reservations!

We're looking forward to seeing you in Seattle!

*(Photo by Jake Jacobson)*

From left to right, Danilo Baylen & Victoria Bhavsar, Program Co-chairs; Natasha Haugnes & Cassandra Hori, Conference Co-chairs
Reconnecting with Our Past: Faculty Development from 1920 to 1976

Dakin Burdick, Chair of POD’s History Committee

Faculty development as we know it began after the First World War. Many veterans entered college, which was believed to be the path to success. With the 1920 census, the country became predominantly urban, and urban jobs required an education. Colleges grew immensely during the 1920s and in their desperation to hire new faculty members, they could not afford to be picky. Not all of those hires were skilled teachers. Students complained bitterly of poor teaching and the administrators could not afford to ignore them. It was in the 1920s that discussion classes became seen as more successful than lecture classes. Fifty-six percent of students preferred discussion classes while only fourteen percent favored lecture classes. That did not stop people from lecturing (as we can still see today!).

To identify areas of teaching needing improvement, the University of Washington began administering student evaluations of teaching (SETs) in 1920. In 1924, the Phi Beta Kappa students at the University of California at Berkeley began surveying problematic teaching, passing on what they found to the administration. By 1928, student opinion was “influential in rating the teaching efficiency of instructors” at “all institutions.” Where the administration did not implement SETs, the students did, as did the students at the University of California at Berkeley, who were mimeographing SET results for each other by 1939.

The 1930s saw the spread of “The Improvement of College Teaching” movement across the country. It began in 1929 with a graduate course of the same name at Stanford University and quickly spread to other institutions. The preparation of doctoral candidates began to include teaching techniques, a move that was supported by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The “teacher's diary” was an early attempt to encourage reflective teaching. These efforts were only a beginning. Research and content mastery were still viewed as the most important elements in instruction, and “adequate library facilities” received the highest ranking as a suggested means of improving college teachers.

The Improvement of College Teaching movement was interrupted by the Second World War, but immediately thereafter began with renewed vigor. A lot of former servicemen brought the training skills they had honed in the military into new positions in industry and academia. Bob Diamond was one of those (Burdick, Winter 2008). The Servicemen's Readjustment Act (G.I. Bill of Rights, 1944) put a lot of veterans through college and the increased enrollment transformed colleges into universities.
Like the students of the 1920s, the students of the late 1940s faced instructors of uneven preparation for teaching. By 1948, 11.3% of the colleges & universities in the U.S. had courses on college teaching and 27.5% had a course that touched on the subject. Wilbert McKeachie's *Teaching Tips*, still in publication, was first published in 1951. Delmer Goode, who studied at Stanford University in the 1930s, continued the Improvement of Teaching movement at Oregon State University after the war. In support of that effort, Goode founded the journal *Improving College and University Teaching* in 1953, which is still in publication today as *College Teaching* (Burdick, Fall 2006).

Delmer Goode began organizing teaching workshops during the summer in 1955 and by the 1960s the first teaching centers were opened. The Center for Research on Teaching and Learning (CRTL) at the University of Michigan is by all accounts the first of these, and it has lasted to the present day. Other centers opened soon after in the South, but they have since disappeared. Those who have been in the field for a while know that centers come and go as they gain or lose champions among administrators. Very few have the longevity of the CRTL.

The next twenty years saw the refinement of instructional design. Benjamin Bloom and his colleagues studied the types of discussion in classrooms at the University of Chicago and eventually developed a taxonomy of the cognitive domain that was published in 1956. Taxonomies on the psychomotor and affective domains followed soon after. Dwight Allen introduced microteaching as a form of teacher training in 1963, and it is still used in a variety of forms around the country. The Perry scheme of intellectual development appeared in 1970.

In 1968, the University of Massachusetts-Amherst hired Dwight Allen away from Stanford, the home of the Improvement of Teaching movement. Allen became the Dean of the College of Education and one of his experiments was an attempt to reduce the time for a doctoral degree by having students start specializing in their undergraduate years. The result was a 1972 doctoral dissertation by Michael Melnik entitled "The Development and Analysis of a Clinic to Improve Teaching." The Kellogg Foundation provided three years of funding, with Melnik as its first Director. The Clinic ended when funding ran out, but in that time it greatly established the consultation model used by POD today and several of the graduate students who worked at the Clinic have gone on to very successful careers in academic development (Burdick, Winter 2011, Fall 2009, Spring 2009).

Just as the Clinic was ending, Bill Bergquist and Steven Phillips published a key article on faculty development in the *Journal of Higher Education*. Bergquist and Phillips based their work on the personal development of the Clinic, Jack Lindquist's "organizational development," and the "instructional development" that Bob Diamond was doing at the University of Syracuse. They organized a workshop at Mount St. Joseph in 1976 to recruit members for a new organization to be called POD-HE (Professional and Organizational Development in Higher Education). The name was shortened to POD, and the organization was begun, and some thirty-six years later, it is the pre-eminent organization of its kind (Burdick, Spring/Summer 2006; North & Scholl, Spring 1979).
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Call for Core Self-Nominations

POD members who have been members for at least three years are invited to submit their name as a candidate to the POD Core Committee. The Core Committee is the primary governing body of POD and functions as its board of directors. Each member serves for a period of three years, beginning in the fall after the Core Committee election has occurred. Members are expected to attend all of the six meetings that occur during their term plus the spring Core meeting in 2013 (March 22-23), for a grand total of seven core meetings.

To nominate yourself, send your candidate’s statement to the POD office at podoffice@podnetwork.org with “Core Self-Nomination” in the subject line. Statements must be received by November 15, 2012. Your statement should include:

- Name, title, institution;
- Background in professional and organizational development;
- Response to the question: What would you like to see POD accomplish over the next three years?

Statement should not exceed 750 words. Contact the POD office or the chair of the POD Nominations and Elections Committee, Phyllis Dawkins, pdawkins@dillard.edu, with any questions.
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Call for Reviewers

You are invited to shape your discipline by serving as a reviewer for To Improve the Academy, Vol. 32. If you are interested, please download and complete the Self-Nomination Form below and return the form as an email attachment to: James Groccia, Editor, TIA@auburn.edu. The form must be received by November 11, 2012.

POD Sponsored Session: Getting Published in To Improve the Academy

This session is intended to help potential contributors to To Improve the Academy succeed in getting their manuscripts accepted. On Saturday, October 27, from 4:30-5:45 in the Virginia Room, the current Editor, the Associate Editor, and experienced reviewers will explain the procedures for preparing and submitting a manuscript for next year’s volume, as well as how manuscripts are reviewed, selected, and edited. Potential contributors can ask questions and obtain copies of the required cover sheet, submission instructions, and the reviewers’ form. Recent experience has shown that prospective authors who attend this roundtable submit higher-quality manuscripts as a result.

Call for Manuscripts: To Improve the Academy, Vol. 32

Deadline for Submission: Saturday, December 1, 2012

The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education invites submissions for the 2013 edition (Volume 32) of To Improve the Academy. Since its inception in 1982, this annual publication has showcased articles demonstrating scholarly excellence in research, innovation, and integration in faculty, instructional, and organizational development.

Manuscripts should focus on informing and helping these professionals with their work. They may be research-based, programmatic, or reflective pieces, but those describing new approaches and programs must include evaluative information. Manuscripts addressing issues of...
diversity, inclusive education, and other reflections of POD's core values are encouraged.

Manuscripts must be well written. **You are strongly encouraged to ask (a) colleague(s) to review your manuscript before submission.**

**Submission Requirements**

- Maximum length of articles is **20 double-spaced pages** in 12-point type, Times New Roman, standard margins (1" on all sides). Each chapter should be 4,375-5,625 words (approx. 17.5-22.5 double-spaced pages) including references, tables and figures.

- Manuscripts **must** be prepared according to the guidelines in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, Sixth Edition (e.g., include running head and page headers; headings not numbered; correct reference format).

- Compose a title (up to 12 words) that clearly informs the reader about the content.

- Include an abstract of 100 words or less.

- Do **not** use footnotes.

- **Electronic submissions only.**

**Submission Process**

Please submit two (2) copies of the manuscript as email attachments in MS Word or rich text format:

- **One complete copy** with a title page that includes the names (in the order in which they should appear), mailing addresses, telephones, faxes, and emails of all authors; and

- **One “masked” copy** without author name(s), institution(s), or contact information. Identifying information in the text of the article should also be “masked.”

**Name the two files starting with the last name of the lead author** (e.g.: Smith CompleteMS, Smith MaskedMS).

**Email submissions by Midnight, December 1, 2012 to:**

James E. Groccia, Editor, *To Improve the Academy, Vol. 32*

Director, Biggio Center, Auburn University

tia@auburn.edu

Manuscript submissions will be acknowledged within two working days. If you do not receive an acknowledgment, please inquire.
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Continuing our series of international exchanges, our guest column is by Shelda Dobowski (University of Western Australia), President of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA).

An International Perspective on Research Capabilities

For the last three months I have had the enjoyable experience of visiting universities in the United Kingdom, United States and New Zealand on a Churchill Fellowship. The award was focused on how the sector is supporting the development of research capabilities, given the escalating expectations for high performance that are evident across the world.

I visited over twenty institutions and met with hundreds of people, including conducting workshops for an early career group in Michigan and research leaders in Dunedin, New Zealand. I met with deans, directors of academic development, provosts and deputy vice chancellors, other senior leaders and many academics striving to excel in a world that is increasingly limited in its sponsorship of good researchers.

Six key lessons were evident from the rich kaleidoscope of commentary and ideas that were shared.

1. The expectations are growing. In each institution (and nation) the prescriptions as to research performance have become more explicit and more complex. Effective researchers are expected to bring in grants (despite a dwindling pool) and to publish in top tier journals or equivalent, build collaborations and achieve a highly visible profile. However, the competition to do so is increasingly fierce and many find it hard to navigate the best path to reach the pinnacle of their potential.

2. Doctoral education is evolving. Only 10-20% of doctorates are likely to move into higher education as research or academic appointments, and yet, we still see that path as the likely outcome of doing higher degrees by research. In the UK there has been a substantial push to offer more tailored doctorates that are more strongly linked to industry needs and generic skills. However, I did not hear a strong pedagogic underpinning or discussions of postgraduate capabilities underpinning these initiatives. They largely seemed to be driven by external funding requirements more than a deep-seated consideration of what makes a highly...
In fact, the presence of considerable money from the Roberts funding in the UK resulted in many workshops for higher degree by research students, but many of my interviewees expressed doubt as to their efficacy in building effective skills. Perhaps this is a good time to take a step back and think again about the capabilities that should be taken from this extensive apprenticeship? In my work with early career researchers, for example, there is a notable uncertainty around career planning, moving into team settings and venturing into collaboration with other colleagues. A highly tentative approach to being an academic is not a great recipe for success in this very competitive sphere.

3. Mentorship is critical. In every nation participants highlighted mentorship as the key to success. A diversity of mentorship strategies was evident, ranging from the assignment of an orientation mentor at the start of employment through to complex sophisticated departmental programs at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Despite good intentions though, many people lacked a mentor and found it hard to initiate those first important relationships. When working with my early career group in the US, they noted a keen desire to gain effective mentors beyond their work group, but uncertainty as to how to do this. Perhaps this is another skill we should be encouraging at the doctoral level? I have worked with a research institute for the last four years, helping their graduate students find a mentor other than their supervisor, and believe this might a good practice for others to similarly adopt.

4. Research development requires more than osmosis. While some academics succeed and shine due to their natural talent, universities are now recognizing that the cultivation of effective research skills are very complex. Research success is predicated on sophisticated writing skills, grant seeking skills, collaboration, effective project management, the capacity to build the next generation and strong leadership skills. For the most part, these are additional capabilities that must be acquired after gaining a PhD. At the same time, teaching and broader engagement skills are also being developed. Universities are recognizing the need to build more effective support strategies for staff. Some have introduced academic development services that encourage improved research capacity building. Others have expanded and reformed the nature of the research office to include a more developmental element. In some instances the human resources division has taken on the challenge. This also raises an increasing challenge of coordination and collaboration across the many parties that are seeking to make a difference. The growth of the research developer is also notable, expanding the field of academic development to embrace another specialized element of academic support.

5. Research leadership is a complex role that needs support. Certainly, this has been my experience at my own university, but it was evident in each institution that I visited. The workshop I ran at one The University of Otago, for example, attracted 24 leaders keen to explore how they could better support their research communities. There is a strong recognition that this work is complex, messy, challenging and critical to the success of the institution and the individuals concerned.

6. There is a growing emphasis on collaborative initiatives to support research capacity building. Notable was the Vitae initiative in the UK, where the government has funded a group to help formulate clearer expectations as to research skills, develop self-help resources and assist universities in developing their institutional strategies. Other collaborations that are making a mark across the world include the Epigeum group from Imperial College London, which offers a collaborative model to develop online support for university students and staff. In this model, twenty universities underwrite the cost of development and help to shape the emerging curriculum. This approach leads to very high quality resources that are highly reflective of the emerging challenges facing our communities. A new collaboration on research leadership will be launched in October, which is pleasing. This is being strongly supported by universities from the US and the UK.

While I could certainly see significant energy and a keen desire to achieve more effective outcomes from the investment in research, this is a new and growing space that will require
insightful leadership and a careful, well-informed strategic emphasis. At present, universities seem to be picking up different initiatives or ideas that can be adopted by their members without a stronger understanding of the core capabilities that underpin successful research. There were only a few institutions integrating research capacity building into their strategic planning to achieve more coherent institutional approaches. Funding for initiatives is minimal and largely dependent on external sources. It seems that this is a good time for some hard thinking about how much universities are willing to invest in their staff to help them achieve their full potential. And of course, it also requires university members to invest in their own future by also recognizing this is a professional skill base that requires conscious and ongoing skill acquisition.

Shelda Debowksi, Ph.D., is President of HERDSA and Winthrop Professor (Higher Education Development) at the University of Western Australia in Perth. Her latest book, *The New Academic: A Strategic Handbook*, Open University Press, will be released in October 2012.

Contact: shelda.debowski@uwa.edu.au

---

Emily Gravett

Add a comment
Michigan State University Hosts Inaugural POD Leadership Development Institute

The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) and the MSU Office of Faculty and Organizational Development (F&OD) welcomed 26 participants from 22 higher education institutions to the inaugural POD Leadership Development Institute (LDI) held at Michigan State University in East Lansing, MI, from May 22-24, 2012. Working collaboratively with colleagues from POD and MSU, the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development took the lead on hosting and facilitating this introduction to leadership development designed for faculty developers and higher education academic administrators. During this three-day conference, the participants explored key issues and decisions when designing and implementing leadership development programs and services for their institutions. This interactive Institute helped attendees create and/or update leadership development for their institutions.

A very special thank you to the POD LDI presenters:

**Deborah DeZure**, Assistant Provost for Faculty and Organizational Development, MSU

**Allyn Shaw**, Associate Director, Office of Faculty and Organizational Development, Director of Leadership Development Programs, MSU

**Theodore H. Curry**, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources, MSU

**Connie Schroeder**, Associate Director, Center for Instructional and Professional Development. UW-Milwaukee and author, *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development’s Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change* (Stylus, 2010)
POD Leadership Development Institute - WikiPODia

Jim Therrell, Director, Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching (FaCIT), Central Michigan University, POD CORE Committee

Paulette Granberry Russell, Director, Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives and Senior Advisor to the President for Multi Cultural Affairs, MSU

Patricia Lowrie, Director, Womens Resource Center and Professor, College of Veterinary Medicine, MSU

Jan Collins-Eaglin, Director, Counseling Center, MSU

Also, thanks to members of the POD Professional Development Committee for their support and input in shaping this program.
The peer-reviewed *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* has published the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning since 1990. Print and online subscriptions are available from just $79. The most recent issue focuses on “Defining and Assessing College Teaching” (Guest Editor Michael Theall). Upcoming issue topics include “Supporting Nonnative English-Speaking Instructors to Maximize Student Learning in Their Courses” and “Teaching for Brain-Based Learning.” Click here to search the issue archive, view a free sample issue, submit a manuscript, or subscribe.
At the end of February The National Teaching & Learning FORUM became an imprint of Jossey-Bass/Wiley. James Rhem continues as its Executive Editor and reports that in its new incarnation, it's expected that that FORUM will reach many more readers world-wide. Thus, POD members with interesting and informative thoughts to share about college teaching and learning should consider submitting an article to the FORUM. The FORUM’s acceptance rate hovers around 50%. Articles should be no more than 1500-2000 words, free of footnotes, and written in clear, non-jargon-filled English prose. “Pretend you’re writing a friendly letter to your interested but not necessarily expert brother rather than a report to the dean,” James says. Address submissions to James Rhem, The National Teaching & Learning FORUM, 2203 Regent Street, Suite B, Madison, WI 53726 or via email to jrhem@chorus.net.
POD members recently collaborated with The IDEA Center to update the POD-IDEA Center Notes, initially written in 2004 and 2005. Both The IDEA Center and POD have a long history of involvement in faculty development and teaching improvement and both organizations are dedicated to enhancing teaching and learning.

The IDEA form was developed as a diagnostic tool to allow better understanding of the dynamics of teaching and learning and to be able to link teaching behaviors with the instructional objectives teachers have in mind for their students. Thus, the data can and should be used as a guide for enhancing teaching and learning. The purpose of these “Notes” is to provide users with a first reference in support of that goal.

Although, this series of “notes” was developed primarily as a resource for users of the IDEA student ratings system, the topics addressed are important to anyone who teaches and has served as a valuable resource to those who do not use the IDEA system as well.

The “Notes” contain four sections:

- Background. Provides a context for the item and the rationale for its relevance.
- Helpful Hints. Describes three or four ways one might successfully employ this method.
- New: Application for Online Learning: Provides additional helpful hints to apply the teaching method in online learning environments.
- Assessment Issues. Describes ways to assess the teaching method or student learning goals related to the method.
- References and Resources. Lists resources that often provide background, theory and additional suggestions for improving teaching.

POD members Mike Theall, Youngstown State University; Derek Bruff, Vanderbilt University; and Amy Gross, The IDEA Center, served as series editors—thirteen POD members helped update the papers. We hope that this series of notes will serve all POD members well in their continued efforts to support high quality instruction.
You will also enjoy the second series addressing 12 learning outcomes – the POD-IDEA Center Learning Notes also written by POD members in 2006.
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INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Notes from the POD Office

Newsletter Feedback

37th Annual POD Conference

Reconnecting with Our Past

Call for Core Self-Nominations

Call for Manuscripts & Reviewers: To Improve the Academy

Guest Column

POD Leadership Development Institute

Journal on Excellence in College Teaching

The National Teaching and Learning FORUM

IDEA Center Updates

Grants and Awards

Member News

Spirit of POD Award

Please consider nominating a POD colleague for the Spirit of POD Award. The deadline for 2012 nominations is Friday, September 28th via WikiPODia.

This award recognizes POD members who make significant, long-lasting contributions to POD members, the organization as a whole, and the educational development profession. Recipients should reflect some combination of the attributes below, but may also contribute positively in other ways:

1. Serving the organization and its members through steady participation in POD in more than routine ways;
2. Sharing knowledge, experience, materials, ideas, and support freely with other POD members;
3. Exercising innovative leadership in the organization;
4. Exemplifying the philosophy, principles, and practices of POD, such as generosity of spirit, kindness, compassion, sincerity, and civility;
5. Contributing substantially to the profession of faculty, instructional and organizational development;
6. Being actively involved in POD for at least 10 years.

New this year, nominations will be taken through an online form found via the Spirit of POD Award WikiPODia site. Further details appear on the WikiPODia site. We are also asking that nominators solicit and include examples from other POD members as part of the nomination to demonstrate a convergence of evidence. Such solicitation should not be done via a public venue such as the POD listserv since the identity of any recipient is kept secret until the banquet at the annual conference. Given the nature of this award, self-nominations are not accepted.

Please send any questions to Donna Ellis, Spirit of POD Award subcommittee chair, at donnae@uwaterloo.ca.
Member News
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Publications by POD Members

R. Kent Crookston. (2012). Working with problem faculty: A 6-step guide for department chairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Crookston is the director of the Academic Administrative Support Program at the Brigham Young University Faculty Center. In addition to researching academic administration, he currently researches and teaches effective decision-making. Click here for more information or view book announcement attached below.

Kevin Barry was recently appointed permanent director of the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame. Click here to view the press release.
G. Christopher Clark and Sherry A. Clouser. (2012). Teaching with technology volume 2: The stories continue. Clark is Assistant Director of the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame. Clouser is Coordinator of Instructional and Distance Technologies in the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Georgia. Click here for more information.
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2013 HETL Conference

Click [here](http://example.com) to register for the 2013 HETL Conference to be held in Orlando, Florida, USA. Early bird registration is open from June 23 to October 1, 2012. Regular registration is open from October 2 to December 15, 2012. On-site Registration is January 13-15, 2013.

2013 HETL Conference Keynote Speakers

**Eva Egron-Polak** is the Secretary-General of the International Association of Universities (IAU) and Executive Director of the International Universities Bureau (UNESCO). Prior to joining the IAU, she was Vice President (international) of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

**Dmitry Leontiev** is Professor of Psychology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia; Head of Research Lab of Personality Development of Physically Challenged at Moscow State University for Psychology & Education, Moscow; Director of Institute for Existential Psychology & Life Enhancement.

**Eric Mazur** is the Balkanski Professor of Physics and Applied Physics at Harvard University and Area Dean of Applied Physics. He supervises one of the largest research groups in the Physics Department at Harvard University. He is author or co-author of 249 scientific publications and 12 patents.

**Conference on Teaching and Learning: Envisioning the Future of Teaching and Learning and the Active, Integrative Classroom**

Niagara University’s Committee on College Teaching and Learning (CCTL), in conjunction with Instructional Support, is pleased to announce that registration is now open for Niagara University’s 12th annual Conference on Teaching and Learning: Envisioning the Future of Teaching and Learning and the Active, Integrative Classroom. The 2013 keynote speaker will be [Dr. Ann E. Austin](mailto:egravett@trinity.edu), Professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education at Michigan State University.

Presentations will occur during concurrent sessions on Monday, January 7, and Tuesday, January 8, 2013. Proposals should include a 75-word description of the proposed session including the title, author(s), and the institutional affiliation and titles of the author(s). The description should include a statement of how the audience will be engaged. There will be a...
poster session on Monday, January 7, 2013. Poster proposals should be in the same format as concurrent session proposals and should describe the content of the poster. Proposals should be submitted electronically to www.tlsociety.org. The deadline for proposals is Friday, November 2, 2012.

Notification of acceptance will be given in late November. Please note that all presenters must register for the conference. Accepted presenters have the option of including their paper in a CD of the conference (non-copyrighted). The deadline for papers will be Monday, December 3, 2012. Further information will be provided in acceptance letters.

Click here for more information and to register.

**9th Annual International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (ISSOTL) Conference**

October 24-27, 2012
Hamilton Convention Centre & Sheraton Hamilton Hotel
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
Hosted by the Centre for Leadership in Learning, McMaster University

Click here for more information.

**2012-2013 Calendar of Teaching Conferences**
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Toward the Best in the Academy Volume 22, Number 2, 2010-11

We continue featuring a selected POD Essay on Teaching Excellence in each issue of the POD Network News.

Memo to Departments: Outcomes Assessment Really is a Good Idea

Wayne Jacobson, University of Iowa

Outcomes Assessment has an image problem. For some people, it calls to mind standardized testing and centralized data collection systems. Others may think of file drawers full of unexamined reports. For many, it gets pictured alongside those other “A” words (accountability and accreditation) that they associate with satisfying someone else’s expectations. For some people, in some places, at some times, these are the kinds of images that outcomes assessment has evoked.

But these are not the only ways to see outcomes assessment, and it has never meant just those things. Outcomes assessment is first and foremost for departments: It helps them identify what their students are learning, across courses and over time, and it helps them reflect on the effects that their educational programs are having. Departments that associate outcomes assessment primarily with accreditation requirements or institutional reports might miss out on the most valuable conversations that it could help their faculty members have: How are we doing, as a group, at helping students learn and challenging them to excel? What are the collective effects of our individual efforts to engage students in our discipline?

Outcomes assessment may have other audiences and purposes as well, but it serves them best when it serves departments first. This essay proposes a set of guiding principles to help departments develop productive approaches to outcomes assessment, and to help them gain the greatest benefit for the department from their assessment efforts.

**Principle 1: Collaborative Engagement**

First of all, outcomes assessment is best thought of as collaborative engagement in teaching and learning, similar to the natural cycle of teaching and learning that occurs in almost every course. In their courses, faculty members typically have particular goals in mind for what they want students to learn, and they take a variety of actions (lectures, discussions, assignments, projects, and a wide range of other activities) to help students learn those things.

As they teach their courses, most faculty assess learning in a variety of ways, both formal and informal, by observing indicators of student learning such as how they are doing on assignments and tests, how engaged they seem during class, and what kinds of questions they ask. These observations become a basis for faculty reflection and review of their teaching in the course: What should I expand on and further develop? What should I re-visit and re-iterate? What should I do
In outcomes assessment, the goal is to look beyond an individual course to examine what students are learning through their overall experience in the program. In the same way that faculty members individually engage in a cycle of teaching and learning in their own courses, so also faculty members as a group can engage in this process collectively to reflect on and review their curriculum as a whole.

A curriculum is inherently collaborative. Faculty members decide together on goals for the curriculum, and work together to give students reasonable opportunities to achieve those goals. Outcomes Assessment is the part of this cycle in which faculty members come together to examine and reflect on what students are learning across the curriculum, much in the same way that an individual faculty member examines and reflects on learning in a course while teaching it. This collective review sets the stage for collective action: Where can the curriculum expand or develop? What needs to be re-iterated or re-emphasized? What should we do differently next time? Examining a curriculum differs in at least three important ways from reflecting on a course:

1. A curriculum is distributed across a longer period of time, a larger group of instructors, and a wider range of learning experiences.
2. A course may naturally evolve from one iteration to the next, but a curriculum tends to remain in place unless intentional steps are taken to review and revise it.
3. Like the curriculum itself, the reflection and review requires a collective effort, rather than an individual one.

The most useful assessment plan is one that is based on the question, “What do we need to know, as a department, in order to work together to examine the effects of our program on our students?”

**Principle 2: Transparency, Reason, and Evidence**

Second, outcomes assessment reflects the same commitment to open, rigorous examination that we bring to all our scholarly work. Collective efforts to design, implement, and examine a curriculum are best when they are transparent and systematic so that all faculty members can see what is being learned about the program, what actions are being taken, and why. Many departments are attentive to informal feedback and anecdotal reports that might come their way, but it is not always clear how broadly this incidental evidence represents the overall experience of their students. The advantage of outcomes assessment is that the department takes initiative to gather and examine evidence in regular, intentional ways so that it is clear who and what the evidence represents, identifying what is working well in the program as well as possible areas for change.

Evidence of learning should reflect the nature and complexity of the department’s learning outcomes. Some outcomes are best demonstrated by direct indicators (such as samples of student work), while others require more indirect observations (such as surveys of students, alumni, or employers). Since no single source will provide comprehensive information about student learning, outcomes assessment should incorporate evidence from a variety of sources that each contribute partially to a composite picture of learning in the department.

**Principle 3: Useful, Timely Information**

A third important principle is that outcomes assessment is always a means to an end: Supporting well-informed decisions about teaching and learning in the department. Outcomes assessment is never an end in itself, and should be designed in ways that provide useful information for the department, at a time when the department is in a position to act on it.

An outcomes assessment plan is best thought of as a multi-year effort. Most departments have identified multiple learning outcomes for their students, and departments should have assessment plans that address each outcome – but not necessarily at the same time. Some departments might be in a position to gather comprehensive information about their programs every year, but very few are in a position to take comprehensive action every year. Partial evidence that the department can act on is worth far more than comprehensive evidence that doesn’t get used.

A multi-year assessment plan may need to be modified, even before it is fully implemented, in order to accommodate unanticipated events or changes in the department. Even so, approaching outcomes assessment as a multiyear project can help the department keep track of assessment efforts, sustain them over time, and avoid unnecessarily repeating work.
that has already been done.

Principle 4: Faculty-Based, Department-Led, Centrally Supported

Finally, the collective expertise of faculty members working together remains the best resource for assessment at the university, but faculty cannot be expected to do it all on their own. Faculty observations of student learning in their courses can provide both direct evidence for outcomes assessment and context for other more indirect evidence that comes in. However, few faculty members are in a position to examine learning across courses, over time, and it requires both department leadership and central support to bring together the parts into a more integrated whole. Outcomes assessment brings department-level breadth and purpose to faculty examination of student learning. **Departmental leadership** for outcomes assessment can include:

- **Coordination**: Bringing faculty members together on a regularly scheduled basis to review assessment findings and to participate in decisions with program-wide implications.

- **Context**: Keeping the department’s overall learning outcomes in view, as well as diverse perspectives of faculty, students, the discipline, and the institution.

- **Continuity**: Maintaining the memory of lessons learned as the program has developed over time; ensuring that ongoing efforts are systematic, thorough, and moving forward.

What we share across departments is a common commitment to the quality of our programs, and the institution can provide central support that helps departments carry out that commitment. **Central support** for outcomes assessment can take the form of:

- **Capacity**: Providing recognition and reward for assessment efforts, offering opportunities for faculty development, creating grants and other support for department initiatives.

- **Community**: Facilitating exchange of ideas and resources so that departments aren’t faced with re-inventing the wheel each time they develop or expand assessment efforts.

- **Connections**: Remaining informed of developments in the higher education community and expectations of institutional stakeholders such as governing boards and accrediting bodies.

A wide variety of assessment methods can be found online and in print, and there is virtually no limit to how they can be applied and adapted by faculty members and departments. Methods may vary, but they will be most worth the effort when they support collaborative faculty engagement in examining student learning, across courses and over time, in ways that are systematic, timely, and useful for the department.

**Essays on Teaching Excellence**
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POD Network News is published by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. Current members receive calls for content and notification of publication. Member contributions are encouraged and should be sent directly to the editor.

Since fall 2010, Amanda G. McKendree has served as editor of POD Network News. Amanda joined the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame as Assistant Director in August 2009 where her primary responsibilities include coordinating university-wide graduate student programming and managing a staff of Graduate Student Associates in developing and facilitating teaching assistant orientations, pedagogy workshops for faculty and teaching assistants, certificate programs, and teaching apprenticeships/fellowships. She also consults with graduate students, faculty, and departments, and provides research services on teaching and learning topics. Her teaching interests include presentations and argumentation, business communication, gendered communication, and integrated marketing communication. Her areas of research activity include crisis communication, business communication pedagogy, and graduate student preparation for the professoriate. She holds a BA in Global Policy Studies, an MPA in Nonprofit/Public Management, and a Ph.D. in Rhetoric.

Please direct any questions or comments to amckendree@nd.edu. She greatly appreciates your feedback!