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Strategic Planning: The Key to Organizational Success and Change

As I write the Winter 2012 President’s Message and think about what we have accomplished, I am excited at the work ahead that we need to complete during 2012. It is to our advantage during this time, we have a hard-working Core Committee committed to the furtherance of POD beyond its current status in academia. In this last issue from me, I want to reflect on our past and discuss the now to inform our future.

In the Winter 2008 President’s Message, Matt Ouellett talked about working together to shape a humane and inclusive professional organization by moving from traditional patterns of mentoring and communication. In the Winter 2009 President’s Message, Virginia Lee discussed our core set of values rooted in a compassion that extends beyond us to students, the community, and to those who are different from ourselves. In the Winter 2010 President’s Message, Michael Theall connected to the conference theme, Welcoming Change: Generation and Regeneration. He used the theme to address the need for instruction, assessment, evaluation, feedback and follow-up to justify the creation and sustainability of teaching centers, professional development resources and related services. Lastly, in the Winter 2011 President’s Message, Peter Felten continued from where he began his Presidential Address at the 35th annual conference, with the glass half full metaphor. Felten concluded that POD’s glass is, in fact, much more than half full as a result of the flood of work surrounding innovative pedagogies, new technologies, and networks that connect and collaborate “looking forward.”

Similarly, I will elaborate on my Presidential Address for this Winter 2012 President’s Message. The theme for the 36th Conference was Create-Collaborate-Engage. This theme was chosen for the joint conference between the POD Network and the HBCU Faculty Development Network (F DN). This was an excellent conference coordinated by the POD Conference Committee with Michael Palmer and Martin Springborg as Co-Chairs, and on the HBCU side by Eugene Hermitte and Laurette Foster. The traditional Presidential Address time was shared with Henry Findlay, President of the HBCU Faculty Development Network.

In preparation for my portion of the address, members of the Teaching and Learning with Technology (TLT) Group, under the leadership of Steve Gilbert, President, and members Derek Bruff and Bonnie Mullinix who are also members of Core were consulted. The TLT Group assisted me in identifying and successfully using a tool called Poll Everywhere. The tool extracted responses to the question, “In what ways can POD and the HBCU/FDN members create, collaborate or engage during the conference?” Of the 600-700 audience participants, 13% of the responses came via the web and the rest through text messages. The responses evolved into the word cloud pictured below:

The themes in the cloud yielded words such as together, share, talk, dance, exchange, sessions, and others which revealed how we could collaborate and engage. Furthermore,
my presentation component included information on how we can jointly share visions, promote inclusiveness and diversity, and support educational development. Extending upon Virginia Lee’s message, my address also promoted extending our joint core values to students, faculty, staff, the community and the world. Findlay concluded the address by eloquently lecturing on “In Search of Teaching and Learning Excellence: Engaging, Creating and Collaborating.”

The issues in all of the aforementioned President’s Newsletters about promoting a multicultural organization, committing to a set of core values, engaging in program assessment and evaluation, working from a half-glass metaphor, and jointly collaborating to engage and create will be reinforced in our revised strategic plan. In 2012, POD will introduce a new strategic plan for 2012-2017.

During the Fall 2011 Core Retreat held prior to the joint conference, we brainstormed the past and will propose for approval at the Spring 2012 CORE meeting a number of challenging objectives and activities. In the course of this meeting, Michele DiPietro and I led the Core members through a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threat) that looked at internal and external environmental forces impacting POD, reviewed the mission and vision, suggested goals and objectives, and revisited the standing activities (publications, website, conference, etc.) of POD.

The final product will be shaped by engaging in these activities as well as incorporating the results from the membership survey. Recently, the Membership Committee, with Mary-Ann Winkelman as Chair, released a summary of the survey results through the listserv. For the next three months, we will come to a consensus about how we want to move forward by being inclusive and more accountable.

As we continue to plan, we will also consider the impact of our other partners and networks, such as AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities), NEA (National Education Association), Josey-Bass/Wiley, HERDSA (Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia), STLHE (Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education), and ICED (International Consortium for Educational Development). Just this month, we will continue our joint collaboration with the HBCU Network by expanding our partnership with NEA. Under the leadership of Phadra Williams-Tuitt, we will be meeting in Washington prior to the AAC&U to explore new prospects.

--Phyllis Worthy Dawkins, POD President
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Thanks to the 784 POD members and 100 HBCU members who attended the historic and memorable 2011 joint POD/HBCU conference in Atlanta.

Volume 22 of Essays in Teaching Excellence, edited by Elizabeth O'Connor Chandler, is available online here.

You'll find provocative essays by Bill Rando, Yale University (included in this issue of Network News); Wayne Jacobson, University of Iowa; John Girash, Harvard University; Barbara J. Millis and Jose Vazquez, The University of Texas at San Antonio; Tami J. Eggleston, McKendree University; Mark R. Connolly, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Mary C. Wright & Laura N. Schram, University of Michigan; and Cynthia E. Tobery, Dartmouth College.

The 2012 annual conference will be held in Seattle from October 24th-28th at the Seattle Sheraton. The theme this year is Pencils & Pixels: 21st Century Practices in Higher Education. Full details, including the call for proposals, can be found here.

Please plan to attend and engage the timely topic of best practices in higher education, whether high-tech, contemplative, or somewhere in between. Hope to see you there!

--Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director

Contact the Editor (Fall 2014)
edited by Emily Gravett

Contact the Editor (Spring 2015)
edited by Emily Gravett

Comments

Emily Gravett

Add a comment
The 2011 POD • HBCUFDN Conference was a great success, thanks to the many presenters and volunteers who helped make it a reality. Not least of our achievements at this conference was the record-breaking POD member attendance, which was 784.

Members of the conference committee would like to reiterate their sincere thanks to everyone who donated their time and talent during the 2010-2011 conference cycle. In particular, they would like to acknowledge Hoag Holmgren as well as the Core Committee and POD President Phyllis Dawkins for their guidance and assistance in the planning process.

Jake Jacobson once again coordinated the photo documentation of the conference, which continues to be a shared endeavor between any and all conference attendees who wish to participate. Images from the 2011 conference are available on Flickr.

Create@pod was an informal Thursday evening event that allowed POD attendees to explore their more creative and often humorous sides. Chris Clark emceed the successful event where participants shared digital stories and five minute “20x15” Pecha-kucha type presentations on topics of their choice. Audience’s choice for best 20x15 went to Andi Sciacca for her presentation on educational development at the Culinary Institute. Best digital story (How to Prank Your Boss by Arturo Ozuna, Chris Faulkner, and Bill Watson) can be viewed here.

The Sunday anchor session, in keeping with the conference theme “Create • Collaborate • Engage,” was particularly innovative. Martha McGinnis, a graphic facilitator, captured the session in large-scale text and images. A PDF of this graphic as well as anchor session handouts are available on WikiPODia.

This year’s conference Pencils & Pixels: 21st Century Practices in Higher Education will be held in Seattle! 2012 conference chairs Natasha Haugnes and Cassandra Volpe Horii are in the midst of planning what promises to be another exceptional event. We hope to see you there!
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Robert J. Menges Award for Outstanding Research in Educational Development

To mark the 10th anniversary of this award recognizing important research in educational development and the beneficial impact this research has had on our careers over the past decade, Robert J. Menges' wife and son joined POD's celebration in Atlanta. Jon Menges, a renowned jazz musician, provided music during the Diversity Committee's reception and Gay Menges addressed POD members during the awards banquet. Gay and Jon joined this year's Menges Awards Subcommittee (Allison Boye, Peter Felten, Stewart Ross, and Mary-Ann Winkelmes, chair) in presenting the 2011 awards for two projects:

Allison BrckaLorenz, Eddie R. Cole, Jillian Kinzie, and Anthony Ribera at Indiana University at Bloomington, "Examining Effective Faculty Practice: Teaching Clarity and Student Engagement"

This project worked to identify teaching behaviors that thousands of students associated with clarity. It uses measures from the NSSE and the Wabash study, along with regression analysis to examine relationships between students' perceptions of instructional clarity and other benchmarks of effective educational practice. This study helps us to further identify practices that improve students' learning and success. The Menges Awards committee especially admired this work for its rigorous analysis of data and its broad applicability to informing POD members' work.

Jung H. Yun, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, & Brian Baldi at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, "Five Years Later. What Have We Learned about Mentoring Networks?"

This project worked to identify teaching behaviors that thousands of students associated with clarity. It uses measures from the NSSE and the Wabash study, along with regression analysis to examine relationships between students’ perceptions of instructional clarity and other benchmarks of effective educational practice. This study helps us to further identify practices that improve students’ learning and success. The Menges Awards committee especially admired this work for its rigorous analysis of data and its broad applicability to informing POD members' work.

Allison BrckaLorenz, Eddie R. Cole, Jillian Kinzie, and Anthony Ribera at Indiana University at Bloomington, "Examining Effective Faculty Practice: Teaching Clarity and Student Engagement"

This project worked to identify teaching behaviors that thousands of students associated with clarity. It uses measures from the NSSE and the Wabash study, along with regression analysis to examine relationships between students' perceptions of instructional clarity and other benchmarks of effective educational practice. This study helps us to further identify practices that improve students' learning and success. The Menges Awards committee especially admired this work for its rigorous analysis of data and its broad applicability to informing POD members' work.

Jung H. Yun, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, & Brian Baldi at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, "Five Years Later. What Have We Learned about Mentoring Networks?"
was established in recognition of Bob Menges, an honored scholar, caring colleague and consummate mentor whose rigorous research is widely respected. The awards recognize original research—quantitative or qualitative that leads to systematic investigation and evidence-based conclusions. Awards criteria are listed here.

For almost 11 years, POD’s Menges researchers have offered prescient insights on topics that have become central ones 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, Mentoring current faculty
- Engaging students

To conclude the tenth anniversary celebration, 16 recipients of Menges Awards from the past decade joined Gay and Jon Menges at the awards banquet.

Pictured L-R (Bonnie Mullinix, Mike Theall, Deborah DeZure, Jon Menges, Gay Menges, Eddie R. Cole, Nancy Chism, Donna Ellis, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Sally Kuhlenschmidt, Jillian Kinzie, Allison BrckaLorenz, Pat Lawler, Thomas Nelson Laird, Donna Ziegenfuss, Joan Middendorf, Allyn Shaw, Connie Schroeder).

All Menges Award recipients’ projects and subsequent, related publications are listed here on WikiPODia.

**POD Innovation Award**

Anna Olsson (American University) is the recipient of the 2011 POD Innovation Award. Olsson’s submission, “Green Teaching: An Incentive to Maximize the Use of Technology in Teaching While Saving the Environment,” details a certificate program that rewards professors for teaching sustainably with a “Certified Green Course” logo on their syllabi.

Certificate applicants can collect points through: 1) reducing paper use by posting readings and assignments electronically, only accepting electronic assignments, or scheduling exams in computer labs, and 2) saving energy and reducing emissions by scheduling office hours around class times to minimize commutes, using online office hours, or using video conferencing to bring guest speakers into the classroom. In the last year alone, 150 faculty members at the university earned certificates, and several other universities are working to replicate the program.

Finalists for the Innovation Award included: Catherine Ross (Wake Forest University) for “Pedometers and Pedagogy”; Adriana Signorini, Karen Dunn-Haley, and Robert Ochsner (University of California, Merced) for “Students Assessing Teaching and Learning”; Bill Watson, Amy Collier, Arturo Ozuna, and Chris Faulkner (Texas Wesleyan University) for “Stressbusters: Keeping Faculty Healthy, Sane, and Stress-Free at the End of the Semester”; Carol Humey, Edward Brantmeier, and Cara Meixner (James Madison University) for “The Faculty Flashpoint Series”; and Anton Tolman (Utah Valley University) for “Promoting Student and Faculty Learning through Metacognitive Instruments.”
The Innovation Award is presented each year at the POD Conference to honor faculty developers who have implemented creative ideas that enhance teaching and learning or faculty development.

Bob Pierleoni Spirit of POD Award

Each year, the Spirit of POD Service Award Subcommittee has the option of presenting this award to one or more POD members. This award recognizes members who have made selfless contributions through their long-time professional service to the organization and the field through: a) steady participation in POD in more than routine ways, b) sharing knowledge, experience, materials, ideas and support freely to others, c) exercising innovative leadership in the organization, d) exemplifying the philosophy, principles and practices of POD, and e) contribution substantially to the profession of faculty, instructional and organizational development as well as to the larger education community.

At the 2011 Annual POD Conference this award was given to Michael Theall, Associate Professor of Education and Director of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning at Youngstown State University. Mike is a past POD President and has contributed substantially to the POD Network through presentations at conferences and publications that help all of us understand more about assessment and evaluation in higher education. In his writing and professional activities, Mike has consistently demonstrated a focus on the support of colleagues, students, and faculty. His outreach efforts and integration of ideas and practice reflect continuous engagement with the connection of scholarship to teaching and learning and the ways in which learning about theory and practice relate to relevant, real-world situations. His work has helped individuals, the POD organization, and the profession to grow and change in important and productive directions. In his presidential address at the POD conference in Houston, he recounted the importance of sharing and caring, and how much the actions of POD colleagues meant to him when he missed a conference because he was hospitalized. As he said, that support ‘came from the heart’ and it was a perfect example of the meaning and importance of the “Spirit of POD.”

Congratulations, Michael Theall!!

(1 From the documents submitted to nominate Michael Theall.)
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Core Committee Elected

Congratulations to these new Core Committee Members.

Pictured L-R: Hugh Crumley, Duke University; De Gallow, University of California—Irvine; Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Purdue University; Martin Springborg, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities; and Mary Wright, University of Michigan.

Kathryn Plank POD's next President Elect

Plank was elected by the Core Committee at its meeting in October. She is the Associate Director of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching and an Adjunct Assistant Professor of Education Policy & Leadership at The Ohio State University.
Lance Buhl is Deputy Director of the Center for Leadership and Public Values at Duke University and Senior Fellow of MDC, the leading social and economic justice nonprofit serving the American south. He was one of the founding members of POD and was involved in discussions that preceded the founding of POD. He was also POD’s fourth President, although the title at that time was Executive Director. This interview took place on Feb. 19, 2010.

**Buhl:** I’m convinced that effective teaching needs several things, but fundamental is coming to terms with one’s own power. That is, deciding that whatever power (personal or institutional) I might have has to be devoted to serving others, to empowering others in their own terms. That involves an ongoing battle to rid myself of delusions of adequacy. Servant leadership is a transformative idea. Part of that came out of an experience I had as Assistant Dean and Assistant Professor in the History department at Cleveland State. My syllabus for the basic American history course turned out to be very different from the norm. That irritated the senior history faculty even more, because I was, to their way of thinking, violating standards by allowing students to achieve and, get the appropriate grades for doing so, at the level they each wanted attain. I taught courses there. They were well-reviewed. But I was also somewhat anathema to the senior faculty there because they didn’t like the Dean at all. He was much too oriented towards educational reform and new thinking. These were perfectly competent historians, good people, but on these matters very conservative. So I was kind of foisted on them and they weren’t happy about that. After a couple of years, probably inadvisably, I said, “Well, I’m going to see if I can go for tenure, move from Assistant to Associate Professor.” It turned out to be a pretty humiliating experience. They didn’t even give it serious consideration. They just simply said no. For me, it was a terrible time because I felt entirely powerless—the first time really as an adult I felt that way. It caused me to do a lot of thinking about how I used power, how power ought to be used, and I began to think about that also in terms of how I must be as a teacher. Indeed, any teacher,
anyone who's interested in the profession of teaching, whether it is kindergarten or grades 1-12, college or graduate school, needs to think first about how it is that you use the power of your position, the power you have in the classroom, the status you have in order to make sure that all students have a chance to learn and to be rewarded for learning. The second thing is closely related to that. Unless you go into a classroom believing in your heart that every student can learn, you’re not going to be as effective as you can and not all students are going to learn as much as they might.

For me, one of the most telling experiences, and this was a second experience, but it had to do with two faculty members at Cleveland State, two senior members in the math department—Richard Black and Alan Brunson. For me, it’s so illustrative of what I hope has changed in higher education, but I don’t know. They had decided that they were teaching like almost every other math professor. They had to teach a basic course as well as advanced courses. They had two or three or four sections of a basic course that most of the Business Administration students took and a number of people in Arts and Sciences. So they had quite a few people, probably 50 or 60 every quarter, maybe more. And they decided that what they were doing wasn’t terribly effective. That is, they didn’t like the outcomes they were getting from students and weren’t sure that while students were getting out of the course and were passing successfully, that they really understood math or even basic math as well as they might. I don’t know where they got the inspiration, but by the time I knew them they had already had this in place. They had essentially set up a total mastery learning system. Seldom did they lecture. Seldom did they have large course structures, and you can imagine what the rest of it looks like. They called it a learning garden, as I recall. They developed batteries of questions, of comparable questions, probably in the hundreds or thousands of them. They were very clear about what people had to do to get out of the course successfully, that is pass at a high level a set of tests on the various math concepts a typical introductory course was set up to teach. Indeed, Black and Brunson made sure that this course was equal in content to the introductory courses their colleagues in CSU’s math department taught. But, they depended heavily on tutorials which were offered to students as they individually required, tutorials Black and Brunson and their assistants took an active part in. They were getting outcomes that were quite spectacular. They were getting people who knew little about mathematics getting out with A’s. That is, they had earned them. They had passed tests at that level. And quite a number of B’s. Well, it was a very successful sort of thing. And when I left the university, they were going full bore having great success.

A year or two later, on a visit to campus, I ran into Professor Black, and asked him how the course was doing. He said that they were still committed to it, but that it just wasn’t working as well as it had been. What had happened? He recounted how the other faculty had got very nervous about how Black and his colleagues were teaching the class, and, further had begun to suggest that their approach was destroying standards. In fact, with the support of the department’s chair, the math faculty passed a new rule about any course’s grade distribution pattern, essentially prohibiting any faculty member from giving any more than x number of A’s, y B’s, etc., describing, of course, the perfect Gaussian curve. Black said that while the course was still set up as it had been in the past, students understand very quickly that they’re not going to be able to get great grades. Most of them, understandably, do what they can to pass and don’t waste their time in moving beyond the minimum.

I thought, “My God, isn’t that a perfect example of how it is that faculty abuse power and distort the teaching/learning dynamic. Could there be any more apt way to demonstrate how dis-empowering false beliefs about status and standards can be? The academy in my day (and I hope it has changed) had very odd, confining ideas about what learning is all about and about who is included in the circle of those who can learn. And here is an instance, a very typical instance, where the politics of grading, the politics of an organization in this case, the department, overwhelmed the obvious data-proving success of a teaching system that is geared to making sure that every student can realize his or her oft-times unknown or denied potential. For me, all of that fits together. It has to do with power and how you think about it. It has to do with your commitment to teaching and to people’s learning and the
assumptions you make about them. It has to do with the fundamental values you hold about others.

Burdick: That's a great story.

Buhl: It comes back to me often.... In any case, as I said, I was simply tired in 1980 of working in the vineyards of faculty development, hearing the same conversation about teaching, learning, grading over and over again. I certainly hope higher education generally has become more enlightened, open, and data-based. I’m really quite encouraged that POD has grown so much, with so many members, representing such a broad array of institutions, not only here but internationally. We never imagined 40 years ago that it would grow as much as it has. When we started to think about it, we had maybe 30 or 40 folks in the room. As I skim each year To Improve the Academy, and see just how many folks are engaged in thinking creatively about serving the learning process, I find many reasons for optimism. So, I'm hoping POD is an influential force for reform of higher education to make differently more broadly about what it is that we're all about no matter what level of education we're working for.

Burdick: Let's talk about Jack Lindquist. From what I can tell, he was the early leader for organizational development within the POD.

Buhl: I agree. Bill Bergquist was interested in POD, but not as much as Jack.

Burdick: What can you tell me about Jack Lindquist? Since he's not here, I've kind of had to rely on Bill and some of the other people to tell me about him as a person and his role.

Buhl: Well, Jack was extraordinarily articulate, absolutely committed. I think he was one of those magnetic personalities. Here’s this kid who grew up in Michigan's Upper Peninsula in Escanaba, I believe. A big kid and a fine athlete he was recruited by Michigan and played tight end on the varsity football team. He was 6'3” or 6’4”, always kept in good shape. He was one of the handsomest guys I’d ever met. Some women literally swooned over him. He was charming. He didn't care about that. What he cared about and passionately was teaching and how do we make education, higher education, something that’s better. He was committed to that.

Burdick: Thank you, it is good to know something about him. Do you have any final words?

Buhl: It's nice to be thought of as someone who was among the founding group and not the inspiration for it but among those that say, "Yeah, this is a good idea, let's do it." I’d like to think that at least what I and other “founders” said and did continues to have positive traces through the system. In reality, however, that doesn't matter much. POD is thriving, and when I look at its membership, I am very impressed by the number of schools that have gotten involved all across the spectrum of higher education. It’s nice to think that I was a part of planting a small seed, one we helped to nurture in the early days. To see how it’s grown into a pretty substantial tree is heartening.

Burdick: Yes, it is. Thank you so much for talking with me.

Dakin Burdick (Endicott College) is Chair of the History Committee.
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Continuing our series of international exchanges, our guest column is by Phyllis Worthy Dawkins (Dillard University), President of POD, the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, U.S.A.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and a Culture of Change in the Academy

Since the announcement of the Spellings’ Commission on the Future of Higher Education on September 19, 2005, with the report released in 2006 by Margaret Spellings, U.S. Secretary of Education, institutions have been struggling to address student performance and learning in American colleges and universities. The higher education regional accrediting bodies that hold institutions accountable for quality student learning experiences are recognized by the Department of Education (DOE) as well as the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and include the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS), New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WSCA). Each accrediting body promotes quality of learning, improvement, accountability and effectiveness among its member institutions. Each regional body represents a number of states, territories, and some international bodies. For example, my own institution, Dillard University, is accredited by SACS, which governs degree-granting higher education institutions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia as well as colleges and schools in Latin America, and other international sites. In addition, many degree-granting programs are accredited by a number of specialized organizations such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, Inc. (NLNAC), etc.

What is common among all of these regional and specialized accrediting agencies is the focus on student learning outcomes as a means to demonstrate institutional effectiveness and accountability. SACS Standards 2.5 (Institutional Effectiveness), 2.12 (Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)), 3.3.1 (Institutional Effectiveness (degree programs)), 3.5.1 (College-level Competencies) and 4.1 (Student Achievement) require institutions to demonstrate continuing efforts to enhance student learning (SACS, Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2012 Edition). In NEASC, parts of Standard 4 (The Academic Program), require the institution (1) establish a standard of student achievement appropriate to the degree awarded; (2) develop the systematic means...
to understand how and what students are learning; and (3) to use the evidence obtained to improve the academic program (NEASC, 2011 Standards for Accreditation). WASC's Standard 4.3 states that planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed data (quantitative and qualitative), and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning (WASC, Handbook of Accreditation 2008). To support the realization of this standard, WASC provides member institutions with an educational effectiveness framework and a wealth of resources to guide the process.

As I travel across the U.S. attending conferences sponsored by the Council on Independent Colleges (CIC), the Southern Education Foundation’s Student Learning Outcomes Institute, POD/HBCU Joint Conference, SACS and others, all offer significant numbers of workshops on how to develop, assess and demonstrate student learning. At the 2012 American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Annual Meeting on SHARED FUTURES / DIFFICULT CHOICES: Reclaiming a Democratic Vision for College Learning, Global Engagement, and Success, many of the workshops and sessions also focused on student learning. POD offered three sessions at the Annual Meeting. In the panel presentation that I co-presented with Peter Felten (Elon University), Virginia Lee (Virginia Lee & Associates) and Angela Linse (Penn State), one component was on student learning outcomes. This session highlighted the role of teaching and learning centers in forging collaborations for institutional transformation.

What I have also learned and heard in the national dialogue is the key role of faculty in addressing college student learning. Success in faculty impact on student learning will require a major shift in creating a culture of change in the academy. Faculty assert that they provide the content for learning, but how many can document their effectiveness, i.e., assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of our general education and degree learning outcomes. Although faculty already assess their work, it is the intentional improvement efforts that often fall short. Therefore, this thrust to focus on learning presents an opportunity for POD and other higher education teaching and learning organizations to provide the training and skills faculty need to create, implement and assess student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. It also presents an opportunity for our international colleagues, such as the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE), Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia (HERDSA), International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED) and others to respond and contribute to this culture of change in the academy. We also should pair with other organizations such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) to promote The Essential Learning Outcomes and to support the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) project on Making Learning Outcomes Usable and Transparent.

Therefore, through our existing instructional, faculty, and organizational structures, we can collaborate with Offices of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment to develop and sustain a culture of assessment. Suggested activities might include professional development workshops on developing meaningful student learning outcomes; identifying appropriate assessments; and facilitating faculty members’ efforts to enhance the student learning process. After all, teaching, assessing and student learning outcomes are the business of faculty.

Phyllis Worthy Dawkins is the President of POD. She is the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at Dillard University.

Contact: pdawkins@Dillard.edu
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Joy Morrison (Office of Faculty Development, University of Alaska, Fairbanks) recently traveled to the University of Stellenbosch in South Africa and the University of Southampton in England. Below, she shares her insights on teaching training for new faculty.

After six months at the University of Stellenbosch in South Africa and the University of Southampton in England this year, I now believe that in the U.S. we cannot afford NOT to provide mandatory new faculty training.

At Stellenbosch, new hires attend a four-day retreat where they are immersed in teaching and learning, from theories to pedagogy. Each new faculty is presented with a large binder of readings prior to this retreat (none of the excellent selected readings were from U.S. sources). At the end of the four days, they each present a mini-class that is videotaped and critiqued. Other trainings are available year-long.

At Southampton, I participated in the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PCAP), a mandatory 15-credit course for all new faculty who are on probation until successfully completing the course. It consists of two modules: the first is on course design, intended learning outcomes, assessments and alignment of all with program outcomes. Faculty are exposed to a gamut of teaching styles and modes such as lectures, small group discussions, active learning, peer instruction, using technology, using a course management system, and even such virtual worlds as Second Life.

A professional from London's West End spent a day on performance and public speaking as well as British terminology and pronunciation for faculty from other European countries. Module 2 is the big picture about higher education in England, how a university operates, curriculum and program development, leadership, the importance of pastoral care of students (roughly personal and academic advising), adapting to varying physical abilities of students, and dealing with afflictions such as dyslexia, ADD, etc. There are three assignments that are completed over a period of six months, and evaluated by a team of senior faculty and trainers. Faculty members often get a failing grade on these the first time around but are given a second shot.

I visited the Oxford Learning Institute and found that they expect a high level of teaching from their new faculty. There is a Center for Excellence in Preparing for Academic Practice that offers training to post-grads, post-docs, and new faculty. Workshops such as “Examining & Assessing”, “Evaluating your Teaching”, “Course Design” are regularly offered. Depending on his or her field, a new hire receives a large reading packet entitled “Teaching Practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences” or Physical or Biological Sciences. Oxford faculty are expected to complete the Postgraduate Diploma in Learning and Teaching in
Higher Education

Oxford Brookes, also in the town of Oxford, offers a similar Postgraduate Certificate in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education—mandatory for all new hires.

I found myself wishing that we could impose mandatory teaching training on our new faculty. British students have the advantage of having trained instructors from the beginning, whereas I fear that many of our undergraduates are guinea pigs while our new hires learn through trial and error, sometimes over a period of year.

Kevin Barry, interim director of the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame, was the 2011 recipient of the College of Arts and Letters Award of Appreciation for Outstanding Service. This award honors exceptional Notre Dame colleagues outside the College of Arts and Letters who contribute immeasurably to the College’s success. One of the faculty members who nominated Kevin for the award writes: “Kevin contributes to the teaching mission of the College consistently and intelligently. He helped me and other colleagues develop a presentation for an important conference. We wanted to survey students in advanced Arabic but had no knowledge of how to write an effective questionnaire. Kevin worked very closely with us to create a very professional and useful survey that contributed to our presentation. This is just one example of Kevin’s generous spirit toward his colleagues.” John T. McGreevy, I.A. O’Shaughnessy Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, presented Kevin with his award on September 8, 2011.

Following an invitation from the deanship of academic development at King Faisal University (KFU), four POD members, Dorothe Bach, Deandra Little, and Michael Palmer, assistant professors and associate directors, Teaching Resource Center, University of Virginia, as well as Peter Felten, assistant provost and director of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, Elon University, traveled to Saudi Arabia to lead a week-long workshop series on course design, January 5-12, 2012. They were received with great warmth and generous traditional Saudi hospitality.

The workshop series, Improving Teaching and Student Learning through Course Design Activities: A Research-Based Seminar Series (schedule attached below), was modeled on the UVa’s Course Design Institute. Seventy KFU faculty from all disciplines participated. They came from a variety of countries, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, India, Jordan, Pakistan, Syria, Sudan, and Tunisia. Participants welcomed the highly interactive format of the sessions. Dorothe, Deandra, Michael, and Peter were impressed by their eagerness to learn about current research on teaching and learning and their willingness to engage in small group discussions and individual work on their courses.

The Saudi Arabian ministry of education currently devotes considerable resources to academic development, regularly sending faculty to Europe and the US for training and inviting developers to facilitate workshops (see Chronicle of Higher Education article Slowly Modernizing Saudi Arabia). They are not the first POD members to work with universities and faculty in Saudi Arabia; Dee Fink, Jim Groccia, and Virginia Lee kindly shared their experiences as they prepared for the trip and they assume that others have traveled to the area. As a result of these various efforts, faculty at KFU were generally well versed with concepts such as learner-centered teaching, active learning, problem-based learning, etc. and the level of discourse about teaching and learning was comparable to that in the United
Although the educational context has some notable differences – e.g. Saudi students get paid to go to college, are not entirely free to choose their major, and are strictly segregated by gender—many of the difficulties KFU faculty report about implementing good teaching practices sound surprisingly similar to those we hear in the US and Europe. Their dreams and aspirations for their students are also remarkably similar: KFU faculty want their students to become critical thinkers, caring health care professionals, future Nobel Prize winners, and educated citizens who will change the world for the better.

An article on the workshop can be found of KFU’s website. It is in Arabic but readers will see a few high resolution pictures. The pictures are taken in the men's section of the workshop; Saudi women will not pose in front of a camera. Below are additional pictures of a billboard announcing the workshop, of Deandra and Dorothe at the final reception hosted by the leadership of the women's college, and of Michael and Peter in traditional thobes.
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Reminders

The National Teaching & Learning FORUM is always looking for good, thoughtful, well-written articles on any aspect of college teaching and learning. The ideal article falls within a 1,500 word limit and, following Thomas Sprat’s praise of the Royal Society, holds to a style of writing that reflects a “close, naked, natural way of speaking.” Normally, articles come from faculty, but other voices, including student voices, are welcome. Submit manuscripts to James Rhem at 2203 Regent Street, Suite B, Madison, WI 53726 or via email at jrhem@chorus.net.

Save-the-Dates

The POD Leadership Development Institute (LDI), scheduled May 22-24, 2012, at Michigan State University, is designed to provide an introduction to leadership development for faculty developers and other academic administrators in higher education. The POD LDI will be analogous to the POD International Institute for New Faculty Developers, in providing a foundation by which to identify and explore key issues and decisions for those who wish to provide leadership development programs and services for their institutions.

At the close of the Institute, participants will be able to identify: 1) strategic decisions in planning a leadership development program; 2) working definitions (leaders, leadership, leadership development); 3) leadership competencies; 4) models and examples; 5) resources (both online and hard copy); and 6) a preliminary plan for their leadership development effort.

For more information, please contact Allyn Shaw, Director of Leadership Development, Faculty and Organizational Development (F&OD), MSU, at leaders@msu.edu or 517.355.5761 or visit http://fod.msu.edu/LDI/about.asp

A complete list of upcoming conferences is available [here](https://sites.google.com/a/podnetwork.org/wikipodia/podnetwork-news-archive/podnetwork-news/reminders-and-save-the-dates).
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We continue featuring a selected POD Essay on Teaching Excellence in each issue of the POD Network News.

The Associates in Teaching Program: Graduate Student Development, Faculty Renewal, and Curricular Innovation

Bill Rando, Yale University

Introduction

Conflicting goals define university life. Luckily, conflicting goals sometimes inspire creative innovation. The Associates in Teaching Program is one such example.

At research universities, administrators must balance the needs of graduate students and those of undergraduate students – graduate students need practice teaching to prepare them for faculty life; undergraduates (and their parents) would prefer instruction by more experienced faculty members. Nearly all universities meet the needs of graduate students through teaching assistant positions in labs and sections. Some go further by allowing graduate students to teach independent courses, which benefits most graduate students, but frustrates others who feel that excessive teaching primarily serves the institution. This practice can also annoy undergraduates, and invite scorn among the general public. Other universities, such as mine, have chosen to limit independent teaching by graduate students due to a long-held commitment to using faculty rather than graduate students in undergraduate classes. While laudable in its intentions, some would argue, limits graduate students’ preparation for faculty life and hinders their chances on the academic job market.

In an attempt to find a solution to this dilemma, we have piloted program called The Associates in Teaching (AT) Program that creates a new, transformative role for graduate students— that of co-instructor. Through the AT program, graduate students co-design and co-teach undergraduate classes with a faculty partner. The program, now in its third year, is growing in popularity, and our assessments indicate that AT courses are creating an exceptional teaching experience for graduate students and their faculty partners, and a unique learning opportunity for undergraduates. In addition, the program seems to be encouraging the development of courses that enrich our curriculum. This essay reflects on
some of what we’ve learned by assessing this program.

**Gathering Data about the Program**

Our assessment approach is formative and we use six data sources to learn more about the program: 1) an end-of-semester survey to graduate ATs; 2) a single-question survey to faculty partners; 3) on-line course evaluations from undergraduates; 4) syllabi, course materials, and websites; 5) an in-class observation and consultation in every course; and 6) focus-group conversation among AT participants.

**Graduate Students and the AT Experience**

In their feedback, graduate students describe AT teaching as categorically different from serving as a Teaching Assistant. One AT described the coteaching experience as, “a game changer”—referring not only to the depth of the experience but to his new-found confidence regarding the job market. Other ATs describe similar transformations, stating that they feel fundamentally changed as teachers — they look back on being a TA as a former teaching identity that they have moved beyond. Even ATs who have previously taught independently using a pre-established syllabus, describe this shift. It seems that for ATs, building a course from conception to final class is an important developmental process that is heightened by the close partnership with a faculty partner. Our evidence suggests that faculty/graduate student partnerships create, in many cases, a more significant experience of academic maturity and satisfaction than TAing or even teaching alone. Simply explained, teaching in full partnership with a valued mentor, is more transformative than teaching in isolation. Given our belief in Ph.D. apprenticeship, this makes perfect sense, and is also consistent with the literature on co-teaching (Letterman and Dugan, 2004; Ramsden, 1992). It should be noted that the benefit comes with a cost. Most graduate students report that the AT is no easy gig. Most ATs report working harder and spending more time than anticipated, despite the fact that we alert them to this likelihood.

**The Faculty and the Curriculum**

Many of our faculty members love to mentor and teach, yet even among this exceptional group of scholars, the experience of co-developing and coteaching a course with a graduate student is, according to our assessment, extraordinary. Our preliminary review of the literature had suggested a positive faculty response (Roth & Tobin, 2002), but we remain happily surprised at how our faculty describe the AT experience. More than a few have stated, unequivocally, that it was their “best teaching experience”, ever. For many faculty members, ATs bring exposure to vastly different approaches to familiar topics. For others, prolonged exposure to a graduate co-teacher is the source of satisfaction. Most have never really co-taught before, and they revel in the level of engagement, feedback, and conversation.

Feedback suggests that our faculty members are seizing opportunities to work with graduate students whose perspective is divergent, and who bring new pedagogical approaches to the course. There is reciprocal mentoring going on here. The AT program creates renewal in faculty teaching that occurs, more or less, within normal responsibilities. Like their graduate student partners, faculty members report spending more time on these courses than anticipated, thought most (not all) admit that unbridled enthusiasm, rather than some insidious quality of co-teaching, is the culprit here. For many faculty members who have been teaching “solo” throughout their careers, co-teaching in the AT program is enthralling.

Regarding the effect on the curriculum, we had not anticipated the creative mix of courses this program would inspire. Because these courses are topically and pedagogically creative, they produce new experiences for undergraduates, and important enhancements to the curriculum. Here are a few examples:
Appropriate Technology for the Developing World: The AT pair create a studio course in which students design and build machines that function in places with limited technological infrastructure.

Science Writing: A faculty member in English and graduate student in Chemistry team up to co-teach science writing to undergraduates.

Undergraduate Students
Our assessment of student evaluations of AT courses is consistent with the literature (Benjamin 2000; Kimberly & Dugan 2008), which shows consistent high marks from undergraduates for co-taught courses. How do we explain this? First, they get two great teachers instead of one. One student said, “I think having two perspectives on such complicated, multifaceted films really added to the course overall.” Second, when co-teachers grapple with perspectives and interpretations, students get to peek behind the curtain of academic discourse, and see graduate students, who are close to them in age, actively engaged in critical discourse. I have observed as animated dialogue between co-teachers spills out and envelopes everyone in the class, blurring the line between professor and learner, and providing an exhilarating experience for undergraduates. As one undergraduate wrote, [having two professors] “contributed to the feeling of sharing and community that I dug in the class.”

Administrative Structures
The AT program is administered by the teaching center for the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. In this pilot phase, the number of AT courses is limited, so the selection process is competitive. AT pairs submit proposals through their academic departments to a committee of deans and faculty. Six, twelve, and sixteen courses have been selected for years one, two and three, respectively.

The teaching center provides support to the AT pairs. Consultation is available at all phases of the process: during the semester proposals are due, the Center hosts a lunch where experienced and aspiring AT teachers can meet and talk about the process, and we provide consultation on conceptualizing the course proposal; after acceptance, a consultant meets with each team to provide guidance on the co-teaching process, connect them to other campus resources, and pass on wisdom from former AT pairs; once the course is up and running, this same consultant visits each of the courses, and talks with each pair about the process of co-teaching and anything else that comes up in the observation. Finally, the consultant collects assessment data, reviews evaluations by students, and makes improvements to the program. Based on recent feedback, for example, we will provide additional opportunities for co-teachers to meet with other AT pairs during the semester they are teaching.

Conclusion
What started out as an attempt to solve a problem — namely, the creation of a substitute teaching opportunity for graduate students wanting to teach their own classes — has turned out to be significantly more. The AT experience, which pairs graduate students and faculty members as co-teachers, seems to have created an entirely new and deeply satisfying teaching and learning experience. Far from being a mere accommodation, the AT program is proving to be an innovation with the capacity to redefine the end stages of graduate teaching development and to reassert the classroom as a focal point for the multilayered community of scholars unique to research universities.
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