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President's Message

How Diverse, Global, and Inclusive are We?

My experience at Dillard University, a historically black institution, influences my desire to understand "How Diverse, Global, and Inclusive are We?" The POD Network in Higher Education is committed to personal, professional, instructional, and organizational development; we are also committed to diverse perspectives. Our membership of faculty, graduate students, instructional developers, organizational developers, faculty developers, department chairs, deans, student services staff, Chief Academic Officers and instructional, educational, organizational and faculty developers represents diverse functions. By race, gender, ethnicity, disability, social class, and sexual orientation we are diverse. As Virginia Lee stated in her President's Message, Winter 2009, "POD has tried over the years to become an increasingly more inclusive organization."

The Diversity Committee (DC), under the leadership of Stacy Grooters, Lori Schroeder, Frank Tultt, and others, holds us accountable by assessing and promoting an inclusive environment at the conference, and through DC objectives focusing on membership, leadership, grant awards, awareness, and scholarship. But, are we inclusive?

In 1994, I became one of the co-founding members of the HBCU (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) Faculty Development Network and joined the POD Network. Christine Stanley (President, 2000-2001) and Mathew L. Ouellett (President, 2007-08), who started the Diversity Travel Grants in 1994, recruited Steve Rozman, Tougaloo College, founder of the HBCU Faculty Development, and me (then at Johnson C. Smith University) to attend our first POD Conference in Portland, Oregon.

The Network connections surfaced again after the publication by Sorcinelli (President, 2001-2002), Austin, Eddy, and Beach of Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present (2006). All are or were POD members. Sorcinelli, and Austin in 2004 gave the HBCU Faculty Development Network permission to use the same survey they administered to the members of POD in 2001. The results of the survey...
allowed us to directly compare the HBCU to POD member responses. The first publication of this work is by Worthy Dawkins, Beach, & Rozman (2006) on the “Perceptions of Faculty Developers about the Present and Future of Faculty Development at Historically Black Colleges and Universities” in To Improve the Academy, 23, 104-119. The second publication is by Beach, Dawkins, Rozman, and Grant (2008), “Faculty Development at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs): Current Priorities and Future Directions,” in M. Gasman’s, Interdisciplinary Approaches to Understanding Minority Serving Institutions.

It is fitting that the POD Network and the HBCU Faculty Development Network conduct a joint conference in Atlanta, Georgia. As the President of POD I am attending this conference also as Past President of the HBCU Faculty Development Network. Henry Findlay, Tuskegee University, is the current President of the HBCU Network. The theme of the conference is Create-Collaborate-Engage. POD Conference Co-Chairs, Michael Palmer and Martin Springborg, Program Co-Chairs, Natasha Haugnes and Cassandra Horii and HBCU Faculty Development Network Conference Coordinators Laurette Foster and Eugene Hermitte declare “this partnership—enriched by each organization’s long-standing traditions and thoughtful, dedicated members—signifies [POD Network and HBCU Faculty Network’s] commitment to diversity and recognizes its central role in faculty, professional, and organizational development.” But, are we inclusive?

Inclusiveness is also relevant in the upcoming International Institute for New Faculty Developers, to be held June 18-22, 2011, in Kennesaw, Georgia co-sponsored by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Kennesaw State University and the POD Network. Every two years, the POD Network sponsors an institute for new faculty developers. According to the planning team, under the POD President-Elect and Executive Director of CETL, Michele DiPietro, “the Institute is designed to answer questions asked by new faculty developers and to provide the resources to get them started in planning, developing, and managing programs that will be effective in strengthening teaching and learning on campus.” We welcome our international education developers and once again continue to create a seamless global environment. But, are we inclusive?

Peter Felten in his President’s Message, “Is POD FLAT?,” was able to reflect on his experiences with the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE), a Canadian partner of POD and the International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED). He concluded that our scholarship was not flat, and stressed the need to seek innovative opportunities that expanded our partnerships and taught us to learn from each other. Although I will not attend the STLHE conference on Diversity and Inclusive Practices in Higher Education from June 15-18, 2011, the theme reflects my stance of continued dialog on this topic. I will be attending the INFID and the ICED Council meeting, June 23-24, 2011 in Belgium. ICED has grown into a network representing over twenty nations. But, are we inclusive?

Another way POD has worked to promote inclusiveness is through access. On May 6, 2011, we will partner with Jossey-Bass to conduct an online workshop on "Why Faculty Development Matters: Assessing Impact." During this virtual event we will explore how to assess our work as developers and how we can partner with colleagues to assess the impact of our work on student learning and overall institutional vitality. For more information, please visit http://www.wiley.com//college/wfn/podevent/.

Our POD partnerships with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), the National Education Association (NEA), the Teaching and Learning with Technology (TLT) Group, and others promote inclusion. In January, 2009 during the inauguration of President Obama, POD, in conjunction with the AAC&U Annual Meeting, conducted a pre-meeting workshop on Fulfilling the Promise: “Using Multicultural Organizational Development to Transform Higher Education.” POD presenters such as Mathew L. Ouellett, Linda Marchesani, Frank Tuitt, Virginia Lee, and I delivered several sessions on increasing diversity and inclusion efforts in higher education. Building on the work of AAC&U, Making Excellence Inclusive, we promoted the new framework for
excellence that integrated diversity and inclusion as critical components of institutional excellence. The framework of multicultural organization development (MCOD) can be used to guide organizational planning, assessment, implementation and evaluation. The final thrust of the workshop and POD’s thrust is to strategically convey and advocate long-term systemic diversity and inclusion changes within our organization and in higher education institutions.

As POD revises the Strategic Plan in 2012, we should seek to answer the question: To what extent are we diverse, global, and inclusive?

Phyllis Worthy Dawkins, POD President
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We hope to open registration for the 2011 POD Conference (a joint POD / HBCU Faculty Development Network event) by May 30. If you know you're going to register and would like to register even sooner, please send an email to podoffice@podnetwork.org. Conference fees will not be increased in 2011! Early-bird registration will again be $450.

As a reminder, please note that there are three listservs available for POD members. The first is the POD Members-only listserv. Members are automatically subscribed unless they opt out. This listserv sends periodic, official announcements from the POD office related to POD operations, events, and news.

The second is the discussion listserv, which is unmoderated and open to both POD members and non-members. This listserv receives daily posts, sometimes dozens per day. Many subscribers choose the digest version where they receive just one email per day with a summary of all posts. To join, go to http://listserv.nd.edu/archives/pod.html and click on the "Subscription Options" link.

The third listserv is the diversity listserv. This listserv is open to all POD members and provides a forum to discuss any and all matters related to diversity, including announcements about grants and fellowships. To register for the diversity listserv, go to http://listserv.nd.edu/archives/pod-diversity.html and click "Join or Leave POD-DIVERSITY."

--Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director
Letter to Japan

March 27, 2011

To Colleagues and Friends in Japan:

On behalf of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network, we extend our sympathy to you. The recent disasters in Japan have saddened people everywhere. We hope that you, our colleagues in POD, find comfort in knowing that we are thinking of you, and we are ready to offer support as you rebuild your educational systems.

We know the most pressing need now is to attend to the consequences of this disaster. To this end, some of our POD members have contributed funds. We also offer resources on teaching and mentoring in higher education during times of crisis and trauma. Please also make use of the POD listserv to solicit advice and information from your colleagues.

We are eager to help you rebuild your universities and your lives. In closing, we offer our compassion to students, faculty, staff, and the country of Japan.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Worthy Dawkins, PhD

President and The Executive Committee

The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network
Planning for the 36th Annual POD Conference is well underway! This year’s conference is a collaborative endeavor between POD and the Historically Black Colleges & Universities Faculty Development Network (HBCUFDN). This partnership—enriched by each organization’s long-standing traditions and thoughtful, dedicated members—signifies our commitment to diversity and recognizes the central role of diversity in faculty, professional, and organizational development.

Conference Theme

This year’s conference theme is Create • Collaborate • Engage. Guided by this theme, the joint conference planning team has invited members of POD and HBCUFDN colleagues to work side-by-side to create new ideas and ways of thinking, to collaborate innovatively across traditional boundaries, and to engage each other and the broader higher education community in meaningful and sustainable dialogues and activities. Our membership has responded to this call and we are putting the finishing touches on one of our most exciting programs!

Dates and Location

This year’s conference will be held in Atlanta, Georgia on October 26-30. Atlanta is the ideal setting for this year’s conference. Though the city is shaped by its traditional Southern
culture, it is no longer defined by it. Atlanta is a rich, multicultural and international community comprised of migrants from all over the United States and the world. Its unique combination of history, diversity, entrepreneurship, and inventiveness will undoubtedly foster new ways of thinking, stronger partnerships, and a heightened level of engagement.

2011 Plenary Speakers

James A. Anderson, Chancellor, Fayetteville State University

Can you sustain an environment that enhances department- and program-based student learning in the absence of a student-centered and learning-centered institution? Does your model of teaching and learning demonstrate accountability to various internal and external stakeholders? How, for example, does feedback from employers impact academic program improvement?

The most effective models of teaching and learning exist within a broad organizational context that can impact the success or failure of that model. One example that will be explored during this session involves the rapid rise of academic entrepreneurial programs that take advantage of inputs from the organizational context.

Belle S. Wheelan, President, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges

Dr. Wheelan currently serves as President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges and is the first African American and the first woman to serve in this capacity. Her career spans over 30 years and includes the roles of faculty member, chief student services officer, campus provost, college president and Secretary of Education. In several of those roles she was the first African American and/or woman to serve in those capacities.

She has received numerous awards and recognition including four honorary degrees; the Distinguished Graduate Award from Trinity University (2002), and from the College of Education at the University of Texas at Austin (1992); Washingtonian Magazine’s 100 Most Powerful Women in Washington, DC (2001); the AAUW Woman of Distinction Award (2002); the Suanne Davis Roueche National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development’s Distinguished Lecturer Award (2007); and the John E. Roueche National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development’s International Leadership Award (2010)

She holds and has held membership in numerous local, state and national organizations including Rotary International; Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.; the American College Testing, Inc., board of directors; American Association of Community Colleges’ board of directors; the Lumina Foundation for Education, board of directors; and the President’s Round Table of the National Council on Black American Affairs.
This year's conference fees are the same as 2010!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>“Early Bird” Registration Fee (Postmarked or submitted online by October 1; deadline strictly observed)</th>
<th>Regular Registration Fee (Postmarked or submitted online after October 2 and before November 1)</th>
<th>On-site Registration Fee (On or after November 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (member)</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (member)</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Day Only (member: includes lunch)</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals only for attendee's guest (for entire conference). Membership is not required for meals only.</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions?

For more information about the 2011 POD Conference, please visit the POD website, www.podnetwork.org and click on the conferences link. The Conference Team would also be happy to answer questions and invite you to contact any of us:

Michael Palmer mp6h@eservices.virginia.edu

Martin Springborg martin.springborg@gmail.com

Natasha Haugnes nhaugnes@gmail.com

Cassandra Horii chorii@curry.edu
Nancy Chism

Edited by Dakin Burdick

Nancy Chism (Professor, Higher Education and Student Affairs, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI)) earned a Ph.D. in Staff Development from Ohio State University (OSU) in 1984. She joined POD in 1985 and two years later she became Director of Faculty and TA Development at OSU. She later moved to IUPUI in 1999. Prof. Chism has been POD President and is a recipient of the Spirit of POD Award. She is also responsible for founding the POD Listserv. This excerpt is from an interview on Sept. 20, 2007, and discusses her involvement with both teaching with technology and with diversity in POD.

Burdick: Here at the Center of Teaching and Learning (IUPUI), you have a very good partnership with Instructional Design (ID) and Instructional Technology (IT). Would you say that’s a consistent element in your career?

Chism: It definitely was in the sense that I had been exposed early on to thinking about using technology. This is again even before PC’s were being used. But in another way after that reorganization, there were separate units for support. The unit in the Center for Teaching Excellence (OSU) that had to do with instructional technology was mainly devoted to delivering and servicing classroom equipment. The faculty development for technology was actually in the computing organization. I didn’t feel that that was a satisfactory mix to have that separate from what was being done in the teaching unit, particularly as technology became more pervasive. It was a struggle because of that separation. There was a territory there — sometimes we were chastised for doing workshops on using discussion forums in classes and things like that.

So when a position opened at IUPUI and it promised to have a blend of that, I think I was so excited for it. I had pursued it in my scholarship, even if I wasn’t allowed to do actual development. I had become an Ameritech faculty fellow so I won an award at Ohio State that allowed me to do a project on how faculty were using listservs with classes. I was looking at the pedagogical implications and the learning implications, and in fact that was my
faculty talk when I came to IU. My research talk was based on that study. So I had that in my background. But I also thought really strongly that any unit that was serving faculty in the current time really had to get a handle on how to coordinate those services across units, how to either integrate them or have a close partnership with the IT. It wasn’t a good situation there at Ohio State with respect to the IT connection. I had been contacted by Ervin Boschmann in 1998 or 1999 I guess about a position open here (at IUPUI) and I very politely told him that I wasn’t interested in leaving Ohio State. I didn’t think I would ever not be a Buckeye. Bill Plater [William M. Plater], who was then Associate Dean of Faculty (IUPUI), has a very wily way and a persistent way of pursuing candidates that he was interested in. He asked me to be a consultant to the search, so he and Erv and I met at – I think it was an AAHE conference – to talk about the search. And then eventually they strong-armed me into being a candidate and coming for a visit. Bill said, “This is just a visit – that’s all.” Little by little they convinced me that this would be a good opportunity for me.

And there were some issues at Ohio State. I was an adjunct faculty member and it didn’t look like that would ever change, so there were some attendant credibility issues although I loved the people that I worked for and the faculty. I still, as you know, go to Ohio State games. I still have a great Buckeye loyalty. I think that I decided for my career that was the thing to do. It was hard because my husband did not want to leave. He wanted to put some more time in, so he could get full retirement from Ohio State. Our kids had left home except for the last one, who was a senior in High School and I worried about her, but it was within commuting distance so I decided to make a go of it. We used to see each other only on weekends and a lot of phone time and email in between. We did that for five years. But I think it was the right move for me, and now that Grady is here, it’s good for him too. I think it gave him another interest in life after retirement, so things have worked out fine. Having a Ph.D. from another institution meant getting faculty aligned was much easier here than it would have been at Ohio State where I guess I was always destined to be a graduate student.

Burdick: Okay. You mentioned things were difficult at Ohio State. Do you have any advice to people who are in similar situations? How would you handle it?

Chism: Well, I think in many ways things were great there. But one thing structurally that I didn’t think was very functional was the relationship between faculty development for instructional technology and faculty development in more general terms. I don’t think we were working together well. That may be better now at Ohio State. For a time – and this was just a very hellish period in my career, there was a time when Faculty and TA Development was put inside that technology unit and it was clear to me very quickly that the technology unit did not understand our work or value it. Our budget was cut by a third in that one year. We are talking like $100,000. I actually felt unhappy enough to seek another position. I did get another job offer and I had until a certain date to make up my mind and at about 4:50 that afternoon the Director came to me and said, what would it take for you to stay at Ohio State? I said basically the preservation of this unit and its budget, and he agreed that we could do that. So I stayed and I turned down the other job at the last minute. But a new Provost came the next year and as early as I could I went to see the Provost and told him that the situation was untenable and we needed to get out of that situation and he did create a different line for us.

I became conscious at the time that a lot of other institutions were going through that same struggle of how to coordinate these two thrusts. Technology units were and still are very powerful in terms of the amount of money and staff they have and the urgency with which their support is needed by the institution. I visited one institution – the University of Colorado – and talked with their Provost for maybe a different kind of reason. But at that institution, they had decided to have the faculty development for technology folks report to the teaching center, which struck me as the right way to do it rather the tail swaying the cat. Having the faculty development office report to the technology unit just did not make sense to me. So at that point I became very interested in these organizational mixes and really tried to get some kind of synergy in the people that I talked with or whoever asked me for advice about how to
work this out. And from institution to institution, it works very differently.

When I came here, one of the things that I remember asking is “How is this a Center for Teaching and Learning?” because when I walked in here, it was a big beautiful lab. It was in the library, but the staff were all technology folks. There was one half-time consultant who was by name faculty development, but that came out of E.A.C. (the Executive Associate Chancellor’s Office) and they weren’t part of the same organization. So that was one of the first things I did. I considered myself very lucky that the technology folks who were here had over the years learned how to work well with faculty. They had figured out on their own some important things about the pedagogy of using technology. Then I was able to build up the instructional design staff so that there was a balance there and teamwork developed. The support here was incredible. Dean Plater and the technology folks and everybody seemed to be on board. We had one of the first TLT (Teaching and Learning with Technology) roundtables here where the library was a part of it and I had never really figured how strongly the library should be a part of it. So I learned some things about how to put it together here. I will say though that the thing that always struck me as strange and it is still strange about this organization is that the salaries for these people are in the instructional technology group. That always makes me vulnerable and we have seen some cuts in recent years because of that. So the formula is a little off still, but as far as the range of services for faculty being coordinated I think this place is as good as it gets.

Burdick: Okay. What about your leadership in bringing greater diversity to POD?

Chism: I was one of the first people who actually wanted to talk about multicultural teaching, and fortunately Christine Stanley was with me shortly after I started talking about that. Christine was recruited and became a very important partner for me in that work. The other kind of thing that I think I brought to attention was physical space and the importance of physical space in learning. So I’ve been involved in some issues I think that have become more talked about by virtue of my interest and those of others who were there early on too. I would say that those are maybe contributions.

Burdick: That was in the late 1980s?

Chism: Yes.

Burdick: What was it that spurred you most in pursuing multicultural teaching? Was it personal interest? Was it the culture at OSU? Was it the ongoing conversation at POD?

Chism: I think maybe the first two. I have always had an interest in this field. From High School, I can remember civil rights marches and all of that and being very interested. As a teacher I certainly continued to use multicultural content because I taught in a multicultural environment. I was on the speaker’s bureau for a group that was trying to bring peaceful desegregation to Columbus Public Schools. In fact, one of the funny things that I remember is that I gave a speech on peaceful desegregation on the night before my daughter was born and I was in labor at the time and the speech was given at Immaculate Conception church in Columbus, Ohio. I always thought that was a funny thing. At Ohio State, when we were in the unit called The Center for Teaching Excellence, our Director was Anne Pruitt, who is a very well-known African-American woman and administrator in higher education. So of course with Anne’s mentorship and the scenario that was happening at Ohio State, it was ripe for our attention. We were having a problem then, as many places do, in graduating African-American students. It was a revolving door situation where students that we recruited would not graduate, so we launched a program called Teaching for Black Student Retention that had us doing over a hundred workshops for faculty and departments on multicultural teaching. That was in the 1980s and going up to 1990 when Chris joined, we were starting those workshops and continuing on. But my research for a while was on the issues and needs of various groups. I published with a graduate student a piece on gay and lesbian students, and worked with African American students. I did a piece with the same graduate student on Latino student issues. We wanted to go through the various
multicultural, diverse groups at Ohio State and learn how they were experiencing college. That was my research as well as my practice and it led to those kinds of workshops. But it was huge. Then of course Christine and I took a step back from that and Jim Bonilla joined us and others and thought about how we could help our professional colleagues do some of those things at their institutions. So that’s how it started.

**Burdick:** And you were on that first diversity committee. Who were the other members of that?

**Chism:** Peter Frederick. Diane Williams from Florida. For a while there was a joke that the diversity in POD was a function of Midwestern white women, so there must have been other Midwestern white women involved in that. But those were the two figures that I remember. Of course Christine Stanley joined and others, and thanks to her efforts many more African-Americans became involved, particularly when we had the grants to enable folks to come from HBCUs and all.

**Burdick:** Great! Thank you so much for taking time to share your insights.

*Dakin Burdick (Endicott College) is POD’s Historian*
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Grants

The Donald H. Wulff Diversity Travel Fellowships Program seeks to increase participation by people of color from underrepresented groups and individuals from underrepresented institutions in the field of instructional development. Named to honor the memory of an early supporter of the Diversity Committee, Donald H. Wulff, the travel grant program awards up to $1,000 to individuals (and up to $2,000 for teams of two or more) to support their travel to the annual POD Conference. Learn more about the application guidelines.

Faculty/TA Instructional Development Internship Program

The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) Diversity Committee enthusiastically invites proposals for the 2011 Faculty/TA Instructional Development Internship Program. The purpose of this grant is to provide a POD member institution with funding up to $5,000. Learn more about the application guidelines.

2011-2012 POD Network Grant Program

The purpose of the POD grant program is to provide funding to support POD members’ efforts to contribute new knowledge that can be applied to the fields of faculty, TA, instructional, and organizational development. The Core Committee has made a total of $8,000 available to be divided for multiple awards. The number and size of awards will be determined by the Grants Committee, based on the quality and potential impact of the work on the POD community and beyond. Proposals due Friday, June 3, 2011.

To learn more, see full guidelines here: www.podnetwork.org/grants_awards/grantprogram.htm. Should you have questions, please contact the POD Grants Committee Chair, Laurel Willingham-McLain, willingham@duq.edu, 412.396.5177, Duquesne University.

Awards

Bob Pierleoni Spirit of POD Service Award

Each year, the Spirit of POD Service Award Subcommittee has the option of presenting a “Bob Pierleoni Spirit of POD Service Award” to one or more of our members. The Spirit of POD Service Award is one way that POD can recognize members who have made selfless contributions through their long-time professional service to the organization and the field. If you know someone who exemplifies the characteristics of Bob Pierleoni (see the nomination
Menges Award Marks its Tenth Anniversary

This year, we marked a significant moment in POD’s history when we applauded the 2010 recipients of the Robert J. Menges Award for Outstanding Research in Educational Development: the tenth anniversary of this recognition for research. The award commemorates Bob Menges, a consummate mentor and rigorous researcher, and it recognizes outstanding research that advances the field of educational development. The 2010 honorees are:

- **Christy Crutsinger**, University of North Texas; Kieman Mathews, Brendan Russell, and Cathy Trower, Harvard University, “Multi-Institutional Perspectives on Senior Faculty Engagement”

- **Elizabeth Evans**, Concordia University Wisconsin, “Engaging Faculty in Outcomes Assessment.”

For a little more than a decade, our Menges award winners have offered prescient indications of crucial topics in educational development. Their research has been important in the evolution of critical issues in our profession, including:

- Diversity, including multiculturalism, internationalization and globalization
- The role of adjunct instructors
- Assessing the impact of our work on our institutions
- The changing scope and nature of faculty development
- Preparing Future Faculty
- Engaging students

Nearly all of the Menges projects resulted in significant subsequent research and publications. A full list of these publications (with live links to the full text of many of them) is now posted on WikiPODia at: [http://sites.google.com/site/podnetwork/podcommittee/research-committee/menges-award-recipients](http://sites.google.com/site/podnetwork/podcommittee/research-committee/menges-award-recipients).

As we look back with pride on the way POD’s Menges Award winners over the past decade have helped to shape our profession, we can also look ahead with high expectations for the contributions that POD’s researchers will offer in the coming decades.

**Graduate and Professional Student Development Committee Award to Provide Funding for Graduate Students and Postdocs to Attend POD**

POD’s Committee on Graduate and Professional Student Development (GPSD) announces a Reduced POD Conference Registration Fee Award for ten (10) postdocs and advanced graduate students across disciplines and professional schools to attend the annual conference.

Ten awardees will pay only $50 toward conference registration/POD membership fees. (Several meals are included in this fee.) All other travel and hotel fees will be born by the student or his/her sponsoring university. Awardees will be expected to attend the GPSD Breakfast at POD, which takes place 7:30-8:45 a.m. on Saturday, October 29, 2011. Applicants do not have to be POD members at the time of application.

Each applicant will be judged by two members of the Graduate and Professional Student Development Committee Award. Please go to [http://www.podnetwork.org/grants_awards/spiritofPOD.htm](http://www.podnetwork.org/grants_awards/spiritofPOD.htm) and fill out a nomination form and send it as an attachment to Karron Lewis at kglewis@mail.utexas.edu. The SPOD Award Committee will read the nominations and determine who meets the criteria most closely. Submit your nomination anytime between now and August 5, 2011.
Development Committee (members listed below), based on demonstrated commitment to teaching and learning, and demonstrated relevance of the conference to future career plans. The committee also seeks to make awards to a diverse pool of graduate degree-granting institutions. Previous GPSD awardees will not be eligible. Interested applicants should submit the documents listed below via email attachment to Mary Wright, mcwright@umich.edu, current Chair of the GPSD Committee, by Monday, August 1, 2011, 5 pm EST. Award winners will be contacted by Monday, August 15, 2011.

1. Name and Contact Information

2. Curriculum Vitae (with date of graduation and degree indicated). Please attach your C.V. to your email in a separate document. It should include all of your relevant work on teaching and learning (e.g., classes taught; evidence of teaching effectiveness; professional development around teaching; work with a teaching center on your campus; teaching development services you have provided in your department and/or School).

3. A brief cover letter (1-2 pages) articulating your particular interest in attending the 2011 POD Conference, including its application to your future career. For details about the conference, please see http://www.podnetwork.org/conferences/2011/index.htm.

In the event that you will present a session or poster display at the conference, please also describe the presentation.

For questions, please contact Mary Wright (mcwright@umich.edu).

Graduate and Professional Student Development (GPSD) Committee
Chair: Mary Wright, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (mcwright@umich.edu)
Conference Subcommittee Head: De Gallow, University of California, Irvine
Governance Subcommittee Head: Kathryn Linder, Suffolk University
Outreach Subcommittee Head: Hugh Crumley, Duke University
Program Assessment Subcommittee Head: Mark Connolly, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Publications Subcommittee Heads: Judith Longfield, Georgia Southern University, and Jeton McClinton, Jackson State University
Continuing our series of international exchanges, our guest column is by Arshad Ahmad (Concordia University), President, Society for Teaching & Learning in Higher Education.

Dear Mr. President

Would you, as president of this university, have made the following statement in your keynote address to the two-day workshop, which recently took place in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on Transforming Undergraduate Education? I quote: “The recent experiences of many university Presidents and senior administrators has been a frustrating one, when the collective university membership lost its way… As an administrator, I have mainly managed crises, juggled loaves and fishes, raised funds, and learned alchemy. Is this my legacy?”

Would you have followed it up with this: “Canadian Universities are tied at the hip to Canadian communities in an aspirational, experiential, and consequential way. This need not be our narrative’s exclusive focus but its foundation. All the rest emanates from this. And this foundation rests on the quality of the undergraduate student experience.”

The keynote speaker, Dr. Robert Campbell, of Mount Allison University was brutally honest when he said just that. Intense discussion, brainstorming sessions and questions followed. The leading question was how university leaders can affect changes students can actually experience. I left wondering what we at the Society for Teaching & Learning in Higher Education can do to help define a new student-centered covenant in Canadian Higher Education.

If you, as President, were to genuinely refocus your leadership efforts, what kinds of questions should we ask to help you raise the quality of student learning? How do you instill an institutional culture committed to student-centered thinking? How do efforts to improve educational quality count in defining the prestige and reputation of the institution? What aspects of good teaching should be made public within the institution, with students and with their parents?

Here are six affirmations to improve the quality of the student experience that might move this important conversation forward.

1. Listen to your students and parents. Very few Presidents do. Students want more contact with faculty [1]; Students learn more outside the classroom [2]; Students have pragmatic suggestions about emerging technologies. Engaging them in policy decisions is necessary. As for parents, they tend to rely more on the media and especially magazines that rank
universities. Parents would be better served if they knew more about student learning.

2. Identifying institutional learning goals can drive deep approaches to learning. More and more students are getting by with superficial approaches to learning. These are reflected in the assessment of student abilities in successive courses they take and upon graduation. Entwistle & Ramsden [3], Trigwell & Posser [4] amongst others link surface, strategic and deep approaches to learning with qualitative differences in learning outcomes.

3. Teaching effectiveness measures must be more comprehensive than those currently in use. A well-designed rating instrument by itself provides inadequate evidence to measure teaching effectiveness. Separating formative and summative measures help teachers to improve and students to participate in their learning. Woods [5] suggests dozens of additional measures that one can select including Teaching Dossiers, Lancaster Approaches to Studying, Perry inventory, King & Kitchener’s Model of Judgment, Peer Evaluation, and Exit Surveys.

4. Embrace and champion a broader definition of scholarship. Boyer’s (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered [6] has been a landmark contribution in helping leaders to think differently about academic work. His work has sparked major contributions from Shulman [7], Palmer [8], Hutchings [9], Kreber & Cranton [10], and Healey[11] who conceive the work of faculty in a broader set of overlapping areas of scholarship. This conception is inclusive and critical to student learning compared to the traditional hierarchy of research followed by its two poor cousins - teaching and service.

5. Globalization demands inter-disciplinary approaches to teaching & learning. The tendency to specialize and departmentalize subject matter, knowledge and skills disintegrates education. Huber et al. [12] point to the building of necessary skills for integrative teaching. Innovative programs that integrate curricula co-taught by teachers with different disciplinary views need encouragement and recognition from Deans.

6. Institutional prestige has little or no relationship to the quality of education. Research publications by themselves do not increase the quality of education unless students are involved deliberately in producing, interpreting and disseminating knowledge (Terenzini & Pascarella [13]).

Dear Mr. President. Indeed there is much we can do, especially if we work and plan together. Invite us to your office for a cup of coffee. We promise to ask good questions and give good advice.
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Crafting Artisanship: (Re)Considering the Future of Future Faculty Development

Written by Kevin M. Johnston, Director, Teaching Assistant Programs, Michigan State University

A valued colleague, internationally renowned for his work in Communications, admitted to me some months ago that he had serious concerns about the future of his discipline. He wondered to what degree disciplinary development spurred graduate students to acknowledge the art in their preparation, or whether faculty efforts to “craft” future faculty produced legions of sedulously parroting protégés. His comments started me thinking differently about future faculty development, and in particular, about our efforts to help graduate students teach. Read More.

Filling a PFF Gap Using Blended Learning: The University of Michigan’s Postdoctoral Short-Course on College Teaching in Science and Engineering

Written by Chad Hershock, Ph.D., Assistant Director, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan

Where do postdocs fit into the mission of teaching centers? The University of Michigan community includes approximately 1,200 postdocs, most of whom are affiliated with science, engineering, and math (STEM) departments. Data from our campus indicate that this population of future faculty typically lacks adequate preparation for faculty teaching responsibilities. By the time they enter the academic job market, most STEM postdocs on our campus have fewer than two terms of college-level teaching experience, and many have none. This dearth of teaching experience results in part because graduate studies in STEM fields are often funded by fellowships and research assistantships rather than teaching assistantships. Additionally, postdoctoral mentorship in STEM traditionally focuses on research, with few opportunities for classroom teaching or pedagogical training. Read More.
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Research-Based Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity

Michele DiPietro, Kennesaw State University

A cursory glance at the literature on cheating paints a bleak picture. In the past decades, the prevalence of cheating has hovered at discouragingly high level, with about 75% of students admitting to some sort of cheating, and with peaks of over 90% in some prevalence studies. Given these figures, where does a well-intentioned instructor start? A good place to start untangling this complex problem is to understand it better. Academic dishonest behaviors vary in their frequency, seriousness, and motivations behind them, but they have been extensively researched, and we can abstract general principles to conceptualize this problem. Once we understand the dynamics better, we can try to adopt contextualized approaches that get at the root of the problem instead of stopgap measures. Below are some highlights from both the leading theoretical models and the available empirical evidence.

Cheating decreases as a function of the consequences.
As with other undesirable behaviors, we can try to curtail cheating by attaching consequences to it. Research shows that if students think they won't be able to cheat with impunity they are less likely to cheat. Conversely, if they think they can plead their case successfully if they get caught, or if they don't deem the consequence severe (like a failing grade on the homework in question), they are still likely to cheat. While this approach regards students like rats in a maze, following the path of least resistance while trying to obtain rewards and avoid punishments, the research finding nevertheless holds (Zimring & Hawkins 1973).

Cheating is a function of the benefits relative to the consequences.
Everything else being equal, students are more likely to cheat if they expect a significant gain from cheating compared to the possible consequences they might incur. In essence, the decision to cheat is the result of a mental cost-benefit analysis, where the costs of cheating (e.g., not learning the material, failing the assignment or the course, being expelled from the university) are weighed against their likelihood and compared to the potential benefits (e.g., a better grade, time saved on an assignment, maintaining a certain GPA). What this means is that students are more likely to cheat when they feel overwhelmed by the workload, or on high-stakes assessments that count for a large percentage of the grade,
or when they are in dire straits, such as students on academic probation who risk being expelled if they fail the course (Cornish & Clarke 1986).

Cheating is a result of the opportunity to cheat coupled with the intention to cheat. Predictably, students are less likely to engage in cheating when instructors make it more difficult for them to do so, for instance by heavily proctoring exams. However, even if instructors succeed at curtailing cheating in certain situations by being more vigilant and enforcing more rules, they are not solving the problem at the root. Their students will still look for the next available opportunity to cheat. Conversely, if students feel an obligation to avoid cheating, they are less likely to do so. These findings together usher in the idea that students are more than strictly rational decision-makers, and that moral considerations can enter their cost-benefit analysis when those ideas are inculcated into them (Ajzen 1969).

Cheating happens in a context. Students don’t make the decision to cheat in a vacuum. Their social and cultural context influences their behaviors. Students are more likely to cheat in more competitive majors or courses or if they feel pressure (for instance, from the family) to achieve a certain GPA. Likewise, if the campus culture regard cheating not as a negative act but as a neutral one (a victimless crime) or even a desirable one – as in the case of a student ‘helping out’ a friend, roommate, or fraternity brother – cheating will increase in this environment. Conversely, on campuses with honor codes, where students sign an academic integrity pledge, commit to report any observed cheating, and in return serve on academic review boards and enjoy un-proctored exams, cheating is less likely. These findings caution us to think systemically, and not just in terms of the single offending student (Sykes & Matza 1957).

Cheating is a function of the developmental level of the student. Research shows that students are less likely to cheat once they age, get married, move off campus, start holding a job and rely less on parental support. In other words, cheating decreases as students mature, develop independence, start taking responsibility for themselves and their actions, acquire perspective and focus their priorities on things more meaningful than getting an A. Unfortunately, development cannot be forced, but these findings suggest that effective approaches must foster holistic student growth (Whitley 1998). Many students do not understand issues of academic integrity and the rationale behind them. Several studies document that, while agreeing on clearly egregious behaviors, students disagree on whether some behaviors constitute breaches of academic integrity, or on the seriousness of the breach. This is especially true when it comes to plagiarism and appropriate collaboration. While it is disconcerting that students can make it to college without a basic understanding of plagiarism, it is important to remember that, for these students, there might be no malice involved (Power 2009). Below are some of the immediate implications of these research findings. Not all of them will apply to everybody’s specific situation, but instructors can go back to the findings and extract more strategies.

Reduce the opportunities to cheat. Instead of letting students sit in the back of the room or next to their friends, which we know facilitates cheating, use a seating chart, leave an empty seat between students, and use multiple versions of the exam, all prevention measures proven to reduce cheating. Report cases of cheating to the academic review board. Instructors do not like to report cases to central administration, either because of the hassle involved in the process or because of distrust in it. And yet, if the consequences for cheating are only at the homework or course level, this will not be enough to deter the students from cheating.

Lower the stakes. When appropriate, use policies that allow students to drop the lowest score and grading schemes that distribute the total points across a variety of assessments (rather than, say, just a midterm and a final). This will take the pressure off any particular assessment.
Create assessments that discourage cheating and promote or extend learning. Generally speaking, assessments based on memorization and regurgitation or employing multiple choice and true/false questions are easier to cheat on. More importantly, these forms of assessment tend not to promote deep learning. Whenever possible, create assessments based on analysis, synthesis, and higher level thinking skills, or assessments that more authentically mirror ways in which professionals in the field use knowledge. As we treat students as pre-professionals, we foster their development and maturity.

**Clearly articulate your expectations and policies.**

Just like for students, research shows that, other than the most egregious cases, instructors too disagree on what constitutes cheating or on the severity of the infraction. What is forbidden in one course, or discipline, or culture, might be allowed or even encouraged in another, especially when it comes to appropriate vs. inappropriate collaboration or rules for citing sources. Use the syllabus, rubrics, other handouts, and even class time to make your expectations to the students as explicit as possible. Clearly articulate the rational behind your policies. If students understand that certain policies are not our pet peeves, but are grounded in strong arguments of fairness, pedagogy, intellectual property, and so forth, they might cease to see cheating as a victimless crime, thereby de-neutralizing it and decreasing their motivation to cheat.

**Lobby to introduce honor codes at your institution.**

Since research shows they are effective at reducing cheating, it makes sense to adopt them. Some institutions have introduced modified honor codes, adopting only parts of the code (for example, dropping the peer reporting requirement, or the un-proctored exams). These modified honor codes are still better than no honor code at all, but much less effective than a full honor code. In particular, some schools have dropped the peer reporting requirement because it makes some students really uncomfortable, but that is the most effective clause.
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Groccia Awarded Fulbright Grant

James Groccia, director of the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, has been awarded a Fulbright Scholar grant to study in Estonia, where he will serve as a visiting scholar at the University of Tartu, beginning this fall. As a Fulbright scholar, he will consult with faculty and administration on programs to enhance university teaching and learning; conduct workshops and seminars on teaching and learning at the University of Tartu and other universities throughout Estonia; and participate in European Union-funded research on the evaluation of teaching. To read more, please visit http://wireeagle.auburn.edu/news/3525.

Faculty Development Arrives in India

Three POD Network members recently traveled to New Delhi, India, to introduce Indian faculty to active teaching and learning methods and help plan the development of the country’s first teaching centers. Jason N. Adsit, Director of the Teaching and Learning Center at the University at Buffalo, co-organized the three-day Indo-US Workshop on Effective Teaching at the College/University Level, which took place on the campus on the Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology (IIIT) February 10-12, 2011. Invited to serve as primary presenting delegates were Linda B. Nilson, Director of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation at Clemson University, and Jeff Froyd, Director of Academic Development at Texas A&M University. Jason, Linda, and Jeff led sessions and participated on panels on the attributes of effective teaching, effective lecturing and presentation methods, research-based instructional strategies, classroom design, promoting teaching excellence, assessing student learning, maintaining classroom civility, fostering academic honesty, and setting up a center. They also were on a panel for students on study skills. Session leaders wrote chapters for an edited book on best practices in teaching engineering to be published by Wiley India.

(Pictured L-R: Froyd, Adsit, Nilson)
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