President’s Message

The overall motif I use to describe the work of the executive committee and the Core this spring and summer is “good stewardship.” Much of our efforts have been directed at improving POD’s internal functions and developing our capacity for future growth as an organization. Let me outline some of the ways this has unfolded:

Organization Development and Strategic Planning

This past spring, the Core carefully reviewed and realigned POD’s strategic plan. We were gratified to see that we have, collectively, continued to meet many of the goals set by recent boards. In addition, we benefited from reflecting on and recommitting ourselves to goals that have not, to date, been fully met.

As good stewards we pay close attention to POD’s budget with two goals in mind: continuing to provide members’ services that are the absolute best value for the dollar and developing our organizational capacity for growth by seeking out creative new funding plans and opportunities for partnerships. Some examples of this include recent collaborative efforts to seek grants from the United States Department of Education Fund to Improve Secondary Education (FIPSE) and working collaboratively with foundations concerned with higher education issues and other national and international higher education organizations.

POD members (e.g., Nancy Chism, Cynthia Desrochers, Dee Fink, Jim Groccia, Karron Lewis, Lynn Sorenson and Mike Theall, as well as many others) continue to represent us in a range of important ongoing regional, national and international dialogues on the development of the future of higher education. The current intense focus on high stakes accountability – just one aspect of teaching and learning -- underlies the crucial need for POD members to understand and respond -- regionally, nationally, and internationally -- to do our best to influence decisions that shape the higher education milieu.

Electronic Communication and Resources Committee (ECRC)

The importance to any organization these days of an “online” presence can hardly be overstated. This is especially true for one as decentralized as POD. Connie Schroeder (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) and the members of our Electronic Communication and Resources Committee (ECRC) have been working incredibly hard to make sure that our website is outstanding. This year we have seen a substantial improvement in two ways. First, the ECRC has undertaken a remarkable overhaul of the entire website. They have realigned the appearance, the organization and all of the content during a process that has, literally, gone from logo to search engine.

In addition, Sally Kuhlenschmidt (Western Kentucky University) has been refining a great new innovation for our webpage: a Google Custom Search Engine that will be accessed via our new website, enabling more narrowly targeted searches of POD member websites. More information on the new website and the search engine will be available soon!

International Institute for New Faculty Developers

Offering POD members a range of opportunities to come together to learn and grow as educational developers is another example

– Continued on page 3
Notes from the POD Office

2007 POD Conference
If mathematics is “the poetry of logical ideas,” (Einstein), I hope the following numbers entice every POD member to attend the 2007 POD conference in Pittsburgh. Attendees will encounter, among other things:

- 45 poster presentations
- 133 concurrent sessions
- 1 copy of *To Improve the Academy*, volume 26

An unknown but significant number of interactions with like-minded and supportive colleagues & 3000 home-made cookies (Saturday night)

No swans a-swimming or pipers piping, but you get the idea. Hope to see you there!

Essays on Teaching Excellence
The Executive Committee and the Publication Committee have approved a new essays publication schedule beginning with the 2007-08 *Essays on Teaching Excellence*. The eight essays will be distributed in January 2008, rather than four in the fall and four in the spring. Subscription forms for reading packets and the essays will soon be available online, distributed at the October conference, and mailed to all non-attendees.

– Hoag Holmgren,
Executive Director

2007 POD Network Conference

William Penn Hotel
Pittsburgh, PA
October 25-28, 2007

The early bird registration deadline for the 32nd POD Conference is September 21st. The Conference will be held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, from October 25 – 28, 2007.

The theme for the 32nd annual meeting, “Purpose, Periphery, and Priorities,” invites participants to raise important questions about what we choose to prioritize in higher education and what we choose to leave in the periphery.

Special Session: “Bring an Administrator”
If you have an administrator (president, provost, dean, or chair) who is ready for or in need of a better understanding of faculty development, bring them to the POD conference this year. Like last year, a special session for administrators will take place as a pre-conference workshop on Thursday afternoon, focusing on “Faculty Development and Institutional Empowerment.” Led by Dee Fink, former director of the Instructional Development Program at the University of Oklahoma and a former president of POD, and Devorah Lieberman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Wagner College, this workshop will explore the nature of faculty development, why it is critical for institutional empowerment, and the various ways administrators can support the process when they return home. Participants at last year’s sessioncommented that they found this session quite helpful.

Special Session: To Improve the Academy
Would you like to learn more about either submitting a manuscript for publication in *To Improve the Academy* or reviewing for it? If so, Linda Nilson, Editor, and Judith Miller, Associate Editor, will be facilitating an informational roundtable session, “Getting Your Article Published in *To Improve the Academy*” at the upcoming POD conference on Friday, October 26, 2007, 10:15-11:15 AM. Please check the final conference program for the location.

Save these dates!

POD Innovation Award application deadline, September 12, 2007.

Earlybird registration deadline for the POD Conference, September 21, 2007.


Self-nominations for the CORE Committee deadline, November 9, 2007.

Manuscript submission deadline, *To Improve the Academy*, December 7, 2007.

of good stewardship. This past June POD sponsored the sixth Institute for New Faculty Developers. This year the institute was hosted by the University of Ottawa, the University of Waterloo and the Institute for the Advancement of Teaching in Higher Education and as such was our first International Institute for New Faculty Developers. Our program co-chairs Eric Kristensen (University of Ottawa), Donna Ellis (University of Waterloo) and Adam Caron (IATHE) did an absolutely superb job of assembling a terrific faculty, gathering over 100 participants from around the world, and designing a wonderfully challenging and engaging learning opportunity for all.

Building Opportunities for Seasoned Faculty Developers

To extend our work in providing professional development for our members, Virginia Lee, our president-elect, has led the way in developing the idea of a comparable institute for seasoned faculty developers in which we might, for example, have the opportunity to pursue in greater depth some pertinent organization development issue.

I’m delighted to announce that to launch these efforts POD will be co-sponsoring with the California Institute of Integral Studies a small, invitational Institute in the fall of 2008. This institute, a follow up to the Uncovering the Heart in Higher Education conference held in San Francisco in February 2007, is supported by a grant from the Fetzer Institute and will be hosted by them, as well. Participants in the Institute will explore in greater detail the organizational and structural implications for institutions of higher education of developing and sustaining an educational environment that fosters compassionate action and helps students and faculty live moral and meaningful lives in an increasingly interdependent world. More information on the institute will be forthcoming this fall.

“Purpose, Periphery, and Priorities”

For many members, our annual conference is such an important part of our professional and personal growth and renewal that many of us plan our academic and professional commitments around it. I know that our esteemed annual conference committee chairs Peter Felton (Elon University) and Theresa Huston (Seattle University) and our program chairs Kathryn Planck (the Ohio State University) and Laurel Willingham-McLain (Duquesne University) have a truly remarkable experience in store for us all. Please do join us for our 2008 annual conference at the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania from October 25 – 28th.

Finally, I would be remiss not to thank Hoag Holmgren, our executive director, for his dedication to excellence and the countless ongoing contributions he makes daily to the health and wellbeing of POD. “Thanks, Hoag!”

We look forward to seeing you in Pittsburgh!

– Matt Ouellett

ICED Conference June 2008 in Salt Lake City, Utah: Make Plans Now to Attend

Sponsored by POD and hosted by Brigham Young University, the 7th biennial conference of the International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED), is scheduled for June 12-15, 2008 at the Olympic Village (site of the 2002 Salt Lake Winter Olympics).

Located on the campus of the University of Utah, the conference takes place in an incredible setting nestled in the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains. The conference theme is “Towards a Global Scholarship of Educational Development.”

Participants will be informed and inspired by international experts and have the opportunity to build professional relationships with peers worldwide. They’ll interact with colleagues from over 40 countries. Be thinking ahead NOW about presentations you can propose. Consider pre-conference workshops, concurrent sessions, and—for the first time at an ICED conference—a resource fair and displays.

To enjoy this spectacular vacationland (before or after the conference), consider bringing your family and friends for a holiday at any of Utah’s dozen National Parks and Monuments. And/or take in the Canadian STLHE conference just 3 days after the ICED conference. The annual conference of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE-ŠAPES) is hosted by the University of Windsor, just across the bridge from Detroit, Michigan.

Volunteers are needed to serve as ICED proposal reviewers; others are encouraged to offer their services and expertise in other areas to help make this U.S. ICED conference a smashing success.

A Web site and more information are forthcoming on the POD listserv, in the next POD newsletter, and at the fall POD conference. This notice is a “heads up” to be sure the ICED conference is on your calendar: June 12-15, 2008, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Conference Chair (Convener) is Lynn Sorenson, Brigham Young University, lynn_sorenson@byu.edu. Virginia Lee, POD President-Elect, is serving as Conference Program Chair, vslee@virginiaslee.com.
Reconnecting with our Past

We learn from the legacy of the past as, together, we create a new future.
The Oral History Project is supported by a POD Network Grant.

Joan North, POD’s First Executive Director, Part II

Edited by Dakin Burdick

There are a lot of wonderful stories coming out of the POD Oral History Project, but I’ve had to edit the interviews down to a reasonable size. Please don’t feel left out if you aren’t mentioned—it’s probably my fault. This issue we conclude our talk with Joan DeGuire North, Dean of the College of Professional Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point and POD’s first Executive Director. Last issue she discussed the origins of POD. This issue she discusses her experiences on the Core Committee and recent changes in POD:

Burdick: Can you talk a bit about your career path?

North: In 1975, I was at the University of Alabama in charge of a fledgling faculty development office. After we began to formalize POD, I took a job in Washington D.C. under a federal grant working with fifty small private colleges in faculty development. Four years the funding for the project ran out and I took an administrative job at one of the small colleges. I was Dean of the Adult College at Mercyhurst in Erie, PA. briefly and then I was recruited to Marycrest College, in Davenport Iowa, where I really slipped into administration. I was in charge of Admissions, and Financial Aid, and Recruitment, and Marketing, for a couple of years. Then I came to University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, where I became an Academic Dean, for the College of Professional Studies. I’ve been here for twenty-two years, a near record for a sitting dean. So, after six to seven years in faculty development, I spent the rest of my career essentially in academic administration, with the heart and spirit of a faculty developer.

I have been told that I am somewhat different from what people expect for a dean. I believe my “flair” should be attributed to having been deeply immersed in POD, and in the issues that POD was unearthing—“How can faculty members lead productive lives?” “How do you improve the culture of an institution?” “What does learning mean?” These were startling questions in the 1970’s. I took with me the values, challenges, and the processes from the young faculty development movement into administration and because of that, I am a different kind of Dean, less interested in business and more interested in people and process.

I would love to think that academic administrators would consider POD one of their professional organizations, but I don’t believe that’s going to happen, as faculty development has become more of a profession itself. The definition of a profession comes not only from what the professionals do, but also who is not qualified to their professional work. The more professional you are, the more people who can’t be what you are. So I think that the effort to get administrators interested in the philosophies and the plans and the ideas that faculty developers think about, may not come to fruition.

Burdick: We often hear that the spirit of POD makes it different from other organizations. Do you think that was present at the beginning?

North: The spirit of POD was there from the beginning. It was the beginning. It was the heart and soul of the beginning. When people got together, they had peak experiences with each other. It was just miraculous, mystical.

We sensed that we were creating something really important and not just following the mode of other national organizations. We wanted to put our “faculty development principles” into the new organization. There was a strong mix of personalities and philosophies, but all seemed to be committed to make this new thing work and to make people—members, attendees, committee members—feel wanted and valued. And yet we were forming an organization, a form of interaction that is not necessarily noted for those qualities.

Burdick: One thing that comes to mind is the idea of using consensus to make decisions on the Core Committee. Where did that come from?

North: From Sher Hruska. I had not met anyone quite like her. I thought of her as having characteristics I wanted in a mother—approving, supportive, listening, centered, and strong, from somewhere deep down. She did not talk much, which was notable among all the other busy talkers, but when she did the room got quiet. She asked questions, considered values, and commented on our process instead of just giving her views. She is the one I most associate with our “decision” about making decisions by consensus. The decision to use consensus as an operating principle for the organization has been, I think, both our spirit and our downfall.

Burdick: I understand that using consensus is collaborative, and a way of making sure that all voices are heard, something that seems emblematic of POD. What do you mean by it being our downfall?

North: It’s difficult to make decisions by consensus. It’s certainly not efficient. There were times that a decision could not be made because of hold outs, for instance. There were people who really scoffed at this kind of organizational structure or process and wanted to vote, to have consensus eliminated. I’ve observed some really interesting organizational dynamics over that decision.
POD’s 2007 International Institute for New Faculty Developers an Outstanding Success

The POD-sponsored Sixth International Institute for New Faculty Developers took place in Ottawa, Ontario from June 23 – 29, 2007. This year’s program was co-sponsored by the University of Waterloo, the Institute for the Advancement of Teaching in Higher Education (IATHE) and the University of Ottawa, where the sessions were held. Program co-chairs Eric Kristensen, Donna Ellis and Adam Caron recruited an outstanding faculty who offered 38 state of the art sessions to 107 participants from around the world.

Ever since Judy Greene at the University of Delaware started these programs in the early 1990s, POD has sponsored an Institute for New Faculty Developers every two or three years. This year marks the first time an Institute has taken place in Canada. Reflecting the success of the 2004 POD conference in Montreal, the number of participants greatly exceeded the planning committee’s expectations. In previous years, Institutes have attracted from 60 to 80 participants; this year, the planning committee had to scramble to find space to accommodate 107 participants who arrived in Ottawa from Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and North America.

The Institute’s faculty deserve special praise. According to POD policy, Institute faculty members take a week out of their summers and serve without remuneration. Our stellar faculty included POD members Nancy Chism (Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis), Tuesday Cooper (Eastern Connecticut State University), Bob Cox (George Brown College), Donna Ellis (University of Waterloo), Alan Kalish (Ohio State University), Judith Kamber (Northern Essex Community College), Eric Kristensen (University of Ottawa), Karron Lewis (University of Texas), Matt Ouellett (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), Megan Palmer (Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis), Dieter Schönwetter (University of Manitoba), Mary Deane Sorcinelli (University of Massachusetts), Marilla Svinicki (University of Texas), Peg Weissinger (Georgetown University) and Peter Wolf (University of Guelph). They represented a broad array of institutional types and program designs from the U.S. and Canada. The keynote address was provided by Tim Pychyl from Carleton University, founder of the IATHE and a 3M Teaching Fellow (Canadian national teaching award). Other sessions were offered by University of Ottawa colleagues Elizabeth Campbell (Centre for e-Learning), Linda Manning (Department of Economics) and Andréé Robertson (Centre for University Teaching). Finally, Jeanette McDonald (Wilfred Laurier University) and Denise Stockley (Queen’s University) organized an international panel on professional pathways that included Lynn Taylor (Dalhousie University), Kym Fraser (Charles Darwin University), Ray Land (University of Strathclyde) and David Gosling (University of Plymouth).

For more information on the Institute, including the complete program and faculty bios, please visit the Institute’s website: www.iinfd.org

— Eric Kristensen
University of Ottawa
Power in College Teaching

Linc. Fisch, Lexington, Kentucky

Power appears in many guises. It ebbs and flows, seen or unseen, beneath most teacher-student relationships. It may serve teaching purposes well, but it also may erode the best intentioned efforts.

Power in college teaching is a topic that has drawn the attention of faculty members for many years. We long to use it properly and effectively, and we worry about succumbing to its misuse and abuse.

In conversations with colleagues about this subject, I find that we commonly think about power in its two more obvious senses. The first of these is maintaining control in the classroom - that is, being able to run through our agenda or accomplish our goals without distraction or disruption, maintaining the authority that derives from our knowledge and position.

The second sense in which we commonly think about power is avoiding the abuses of power. Generally, this involves a compendium of commandments, often unwritten, yet in large part understood and accepted. Among such dicta are: Thou shalt not be arbitrary. Thou shalt not ridicule or hassle students. Thou shalt not use students for thy personal gain. Thou shalt not do power trips.

I don’t mean to downplay such injunctions. Of course it’s important to treat students with dignity and respect. We all discourage abuse, and we condemn violations, whether major or minor.

And of course it’s important to stay on educational track and to maintain reasonable classroom decorum. It’s part of our implied contract with students to use class time wisely for learning purposes.

But over the years, I’ve found that the issue of power in teaching is much more complex than this. Power is an undercurrent that ebbs and flows beneath most of our activities and relationships with students. It may support and reinforce our teaching purposes, but it also may erode some of our best intentioned efforts. It may surface quickly and unexpectedly. And it may lurk in hidden pools and quicksands, waiting for the unwary to misstep.

Power appears in many guises. And it’s unseen or unrecognized power that may be the most troublesome for teachers.

Power is often perceived differently by teachers and students.

There is no question that power is available to teachers. We are endowed with power by our disciplines and by the structure of our institutions. Yet, many teachers choose not to overtly exercise this power, preferring to accomplish their missions through the less obvious means of encouragement, motivation, example, reason, and persuasion. For many, having to resort to power --- for example, using the threat of a grade to obtain compliance with requests or speaking sharply to quiet a disturbing student --- represents a breakdown of other strategies. Those of us who are of this mind continually explore alternatives and ask ourselves if we have exhausted all reasonable options before we succumb to employing raw power to achieve our purposes in the classroom.

In reality, we may not have as much choice as we think. Many students in our classes, whether by virtue of their previous educational conditioning or their concept of the roles of student and teacher, perceive us as powerful. If students endow us with power, we are powerful, and that will be reflected in their relationships with us, no matter what attempts we may make to lower our power profiles.

Here’s an example of such a situation. A student is conferring with me about a subject for a term paper. I try to be helpful and suggest several alternatives in the interest of narrowing the topic to a manageable size. But he takes each suggestion in turn as a mandate, and finally he presses me to identify the best one. I reply that it’s his choice. He leaves my office confused and upset because I did not tell him what to write about.

So, when students grant us more power than we choose to exercise, problems can develop. There is another side to this issue: Some students may grant us less power than we may need to exercise in order to fulfill our teaching responsibilities. These students may resist meeting the requirements of a course or may meet them grudgingly or barely within the letter of the syllabus. They may even try to defeat the objectives of the course through less than honorable means.

Of course, we are likely to have both kinds of students in any given course, with many shadings between the extremes. Furthermore, students’ perceptions are likely to be in a continual state of flux. And we teachers may vary our exercise of power according to the subject matter, as well as to where we are in a course. Whenever there is a disparity between students’ perception of a teacher’s power and the teacher’s own perception and employment of power, tension will result --- often to the detriment of accomplishing learning goals. With such a fluid situation, it’s no wonder that it’s easy for us to become enveloped by the flash floods and quicksands of power.
In almost every situation in which power surfaces, decisions are judgment calls. There seem to be no uniform rules that can be applied with high assurance of success. In my own teaching, I try to cope by seeking answers to some key questions:

How can I make abundantly clear to students my goals and expectations?

How can I assess students’ perceptions of my power?

Can I (and should I) adjust to the disparity in power perceptions?

How can I affect students’ perceptions of my power in order to bring them closer to the level that I feel is appropriate for me to exercise?

What level of power is appropriate for me to exercise?

Power is inherent in promoting change and learning.

Education is a process of change, change in students. Teachers are agents of that change. With but few exceptions, we impinge on students: sometimes subtly, sometimes intensely. We challenge students. To some of them, however, the process can be discomforting, and they may perceive it as threatening to their well-being and perhaps even a downright violation of their person. Yet, the process of education almost always involves a teacher exercising power over a student in some way.

Suppose that I try to engage students actively in the learning process by setting up a simulation in which they play assigned roles. Some are developers, some are financiers; some are politicians, and some are concerned citizens; together they are to hammer out a community’s policy on growth. It might work well as an educational exercise. Or it might struggle because some students may refuse to play roles that they feel are in violation of their personal principles; some may react against having to reveal their emotions and values; and some may protest that they are in class to learn from the teacher and pass tests, not to play Mickey-Mouse games.

Or suppose I try to get students to prepare for ethical decisions they’ll face in their chosen careers. Since ethical decisions derive from personal values, I devise classroom activities designed to get students to understand their personal values — and perhaps even to modify them, if they choose. But two weeks later, a delegation of my students calls on the dean to protest that I’m meddling with their personal lives instead of teaching the subject matter; they say they would have dropped the course if they had known in time that it was going to be like this. I point out to the dean that I’ve been very careful to disclose up-front what I expect from students, but I’m not sure my arguments convince her.

In both cases, I’ve directed my power as a teacher legitimately (I think) toward educational goals, but some students think I’m using power improperly. If I try to engage students in stimulating dialogue, some of them may feel inappropriately imposed upon. Some may defer, accepting my arguments as gospel and declining to uphold their own beliefs. Those at relativist stages of development will react differently from the dualists (to use Perry’s schema for levels of development in the college years) and differently yet from the few who may be at a commitment stage. Even in everyday discussions, women tend to respond differently from men. When I choose to assume a particular position for purposes of discussion, I’m never sure that all my students understand that I’m playing a role (despite the bright red Devil’s Advocate T-shirt I sometimes wear to signal my temporary transgression). And I’ve found that using satire runs a great risk of total misinterpretation.

Indeed, teaching is an intrusive activity. It’s easy for aggressive educational postures to cross over into an adversarial relationship. It’s easy for exercise of influence to be interpreted as manipulation. It’s easy for requests, challenges, and demands to intrude too far on the persons of students. Even a modest display of power can lead to procedural dilemmas, not to mention the possibility of ethical transgressions.

But unless we are content to be bloodless pedagogues, carrying the title of Teacher in name only, we will have to take some risks. Taking risks knowingly does not mean that we should take them recklessly, however. We must constantly monitor our teaching activities. For myself, I do that by asking more questions:

How can I affect students’ perceptions of my power?

Can I (and should I) adjust to the disparity in power perceptions?

How can I assess students’ perceptions of my power?

How can I be more perceptive to students’ reactions and perceptions?

Am I dealing with students as individuals insofar as possible?

In challenging situations, do I leave students a sufficient out without providing a too easy cop-out?

Have my disclosures of the course processes been thorough enough to give students every chance of avoiding situations that really might violate their principles?

Have I shared and discussed with students my concept of my role as teacher, philosophy of learning, and view of power?

Teachers can be models of how to manage power wisely.

Aside from the significant impact on the formal education of students there is another important aspect involved in how teachers manage the power relationship: the model of power and its exercise that we portray. If we wish our students to become persons who use power wisely in their lives, let them see that quality in us.

Perhaps it’s how teachers conceive of power that makes the ultimate difference. Consider this statement by Peter G. Beidler, Professor of English at Lehigh University and CASE Professor-of-the-Year in 1983, in an essay in which he enumerates the reasons why he chose to become a teacher:

“... And I have power. I have the power to nudge, to fan sparks, to ask troubling questions, to praise an attempted answer, to condemn hiding from the truth, to suggest books, to point out a pathway. What other power matters?

Many of us share this viewpoint. That positive and wise use of power to advance learning, to change lives for the better, to affect eternity through our students, is what makes teaching such a noble—and yes, powerful—enterprise.”
Members on the move

Cynthia Desrochers (California State University, Northridge) is the new Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning of the California State University system. Her new email address is: cdesrochers@calstate.edu

Ken Jones, former Director of Learning Enhancement Service at the College of Saint Benedict/Saint John’s University (MN), is now the Director of the Common Curriculum at the same institutions.

David H. Krause, former Assistant Vice President for Teaching and Learning Initiatives and Founding Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence at Columbia College Chicago, is now Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at Dominican University (River Forest, Illinois).

Ed Nuhfer, former Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning at Idaho State University, is the new Director of Faculty Development at California State University Channel Islands, located at map coordinates N 34°09.676', W 119°02.452'. His new email address is: ed.nuhfer@csuci.edu
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as time went on.

Burdick: What has POD meant to you?

North: I feel like I grew up in POD. In the beginning I was thirty-four and I will be sixty-five in 2007. Here are some memories. I got engaged to my second husband in absentia at the POD dinner in San Francisco when he sent flowers and the big question. I made the announcement before the whole group and then shared my flowers, giving one to each person there. And then I danced the night away. I remember quiet times with Bette Erickson who was my rock for years. I was so thrilled to be in the presence of people whose names were on books I used. I have flashes of square dancing somewhere and long bus rides to distant conference sites. During one of those trips Bob Diamond kept expounding on his latest idea, shaking his finger in my face the whole time for emphasis. I was cross-eyed by the time we arrived. I saw the country year by year via POD. I shuddered hearing people say pod (like a flower) instead of P.O.D. In Vancouver, I received the Spirit of POD award, completely unaware that it was coming. I hoped that I had not had too much wine at dinner as I skipped to the podium in disbelief. I don’t remember what I said, but I was thrilled. I did a presentation that year on the history of POD wearing my recently departed Dad’s trousers. And I remember my first POD keynote, which was soon after my mother had died; and I put a small stuffed animal on the podium to remind me of her and to make me less nervous. I did workshops on meeting management (lord knows, I picked up a thing or two from POD Core Committee meetings?), on wellness, against post tenure review, on gaining administrative support for faculty development and on our college’s Teaching Partners approach.

Over the years I related to people I met at POD in a way I don’t relate to other people. I am more open, and I can feel they’re being more open, and willing to be more vulnerable, willing to say what’s really bothering them without posturing so that no one thinks poorly of them. I was as real and as fully there at POD gatherings as any place in my life. I think the organization made a bigger impact on its members than other organizations, saved lots of new directors (with information, contacts, enthusiasm, colleagues), helped experienced personnel to keep in touch, and modeled different ways of doing business, ways that might be tried in other parts of academia.

At my last POD conference the sea of people overwhelmed me. I knew very few of them and few people knew me. One afternoon I sat in the refreshment area, fairly visible, but just watching. No one came up to me, not even people I remembered. I felt lonely, out of place, and invisible. The increased size had stunned me. From a financial point of view it must have been wonderful. But, it was so far away from that small, cozy, reassuring group that I remember. But then, I myself have grown up, gained weight, and moved on too.

Burdick: Can you give us an example of the dynamics of early POD?

North: I remember how Bob Diamond said goodbye to Charlie Seashore at Mount St. Joseph College at the end of the “t group” in 1976. Bob is not a touchy-feely person to say the least. So here he found himself at this meeting, I’m sure entirely under false pretexts, because if he had known what a T-group was to begin with, he certainly would not have found himself in the middle a weekend retreat where the group was gnashing their teeth, laughing and crying. I could see he was getting more and more and more uncomfortable. The whole group wanted him to talk too and unburden all of his problems, and he kept saying, “Well, I don’t know about your campuses, but things are just fine with me, I’m just fine. Nothing wrong.” In the end he had to leave a little bit early. Our facilitator was Charlie Seashore, who was a well-known National Training Laboratory trainer. As he was making his excuses and leaving—after saying nothing personal about himself at all—Bob raised Charlie Seashore’s t-shirt from his rather large belly, and took his magic marker out, and drew a large cartoon. In a way, that said it all.

Dakin Burdick (Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis) is POD’s Historian.
If you have been a POD member for at least three years, you are invited to consider submitting your name as a candidate to the POD Core Committee.

Past Core members have reported that serving on the Core has been an invaluable way to learn more about POD and a wonderful opportunity to work closely with other very talented people. It also allows people to make a contribution to the organization in return for the benefits they have experienced professionally and personally from POD.

The Core Committee is the primary governing body of POD and functions as its board of directors. It has primary responsibility for the finances, policies, and strategic direction of the organization, among other things. The Core Committee consists of 15 elected members (5 new members each year) plus the officers. It meets twice each year, once for 1 1/2 days just before the annual conference and once in the spring for one day.

Role of members: Each member serves for a period of three years, beginning in the fall after the Core Committee election has occurred. Members are expected to attend all of the six meetings that occur during their term. Many Core members also take the lead in at least one POD committee. Members receive the agenda, committee reports, action items for discussion, and pertinent reading materials prior to Core meetings. Between meetings, official POD discussion and business are conducted through electronic mail and occasionally through conference calls.

Financial support: Core members receive $150 per day toward expenses for the day(s) on which the Core Committee meets.

Election procedures: Interested members are asked to submit their names for candidacy no later than November 9, 2007 using the instructions for self-nomination found at the end of this newsletter. The POD office will then post the candidates’ information on the POD website, and ballots will be sent to all members by mid-November. Election results will be reported by the end of December.

POD Core Committee Self-Nomination Instructions

POD welcomes nominations for the 2008-2011 Core Committee. Candidates’ statements are to be submitted electronically and will be posted on the website for members’ view. Please send your self-nomination in the body of your email and not as an attachment. The election itself will be conducted by mail. If for some reason you are not able to send your statement electronically, you can mail it to the POD office. It must arrive no later than November 9, 2007.

To nominate yourself, please complete the information below and provide your answers to the two questions (no more than 300 words each). Then send your candidate’s statement to the POD office at podnetwork@podweb.org. Statements must be received by November 7, 2007.

Please note that statements received after November 7, 2007 will not be included, and statements longer 300 words will be returned to the candidate for editing. Your statement will be reproduced exactly as submitted. Do not include any graphics. To be eligible you must have been a POD member for at least three years. If you have any questions about this process contact the POD office or the chair of the POD Nominations and Elections Committee, Jim Groccia at groccje@auburn.edu

Your statement should include:

- Name, title, institution:
- What is your background in professional and organizational development? (No more than 300 words.)
- What would you like to see POD accomplish over the next three years? (No more than 300 words.)
**Books by POD members**


---

**To Improve the Academy 27 Needs Reviewers**

You are invited to shape your discipline by serving as a reviewer for *To Improve the Academy 27*. Since all communication will be done electronically this year, reviewers will have about six weeks (roughly December 7, 2007 to January 18, 2008) to evaluate 6-10 manuscripts. The number will depend on how many qualified colleagues volunteer to review. To qualify, you should have at least three years’ experience as a faculty, TA, instructional, or organizational developer (full- or part-time) and as a POD member.

If you are interested and qualified, please email the Editor, Linda Nilson, at nilson@clemson.edu, and she will send you the Reviewer Self-Nomination Form as a Word file. The completed form must be returned by Friday, November 23, 2007.

You need not apply if you reviewed for the forthcoming volume, *To Improve the Academy 26*, or if you already agreed to review for Vol. 27. Linda will assume that you still want to serve as a reviewer. But if you now know you cannot serve, please let her know as soon as possible.

---

**CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS**

**TO IMPROVE THE ACADEMY, Vol. 27**

*Deadline for Submission: December 7, 2007*

The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education invites submissions for the 2008 edition of *To Improve the Academy*. Since its inception in 1982, this annual publication has showcased articles demonstrating scholarly excellence in research, innovation, and integration in faculty, instructional, and organizational development.

The audience for *To Improve the Academy* includes faculty and organizational development administrators and consultants, all of whom work to improve the climate for teaching and learning in higher education. Manuscripts should focus on informing and helping these professionals with their work. They may be research-based, programmatic, or reflective pieces, but those describing new approaches and programs must include evaluative information.

Manuscripts must be well written. To enhance the chances of acceptance, they should be professionally edited before being submitted.

**Submission Requirements**

- Maximum length of articles is 20 double-spaced pages in 12-point type, standard margins (1.25” on each side, 1” top and bottom).
- Manuscripts must be prepared according to the guidelines in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, Fifth Edition (e.g., include running head and page headers; headings not numbered).
- Compose a title (up to 12 words) that clearly informs the reader about the content.
- Include an abstract of 100 words or less.
- Do not use footnotes.
- Electronic submissions only.

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

- one complete copy with a title page that includes the names (in the order in which they should appear), mailing addresses, telephones, faxes, and emails of all authors; and
- one “masked” copy without author name(s), institution(s), or contact information.

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

Email submissions to:

nilson@clemson.edu

Linda B. Nilson, Ph.D.,
Editor, *To Improve the Academy 27*,
Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation, Clemson University

---

**Submission Procedures**
Congratulations

To Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Associate Provost for Faculty Development, and Jung Yun, Director of New Faculty Initiatives, at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, principal investigators awarded a $400,000 Mellon Grant to promote mentoring networks for new and underrepresented faculty. An important complement to faculty recruitment and development efforts, the Mellon Mutual Mentoring Initiative advocates a non-hierarchical, network-based approach ranging from one-on-one relationships to small groups to online connections, encouraging new and underrepresented faculty members to draw upon the expertise and support of a wide variety of mentors, such as peers, senior faculty, librarians, administrators, and coaches. Under the initiative, mentoring will be encouraged at three levels: individual; department/school/college/in-terdisciplinary; and campus-wide. At the individual level, projects funded by small grants will be used to encourage faculty to create self-selected networks. Larger grants will be made to encourage teams to create networks among departments, schools and colleges, interdisciplinary initiatives and across the Five Colleges. At the campus-wide level, programs sponsored by the Office of Faculty Development provide mentoring around issues of new faculty orientation, scholarly writing and productivity, tenure preparation and time management.

Members in action

Henryk Marciniewicz (Pennsylvania College of Technology) presented a preconference workshop at the Educause national conference in October at Dallas, Texas, “Planning for Faculty Development: Integrating Instruction with Technology.”

Barbara Millis (University of Nevada, Reno) was a featured presenter or invited plenary speaker at the Lilly South, Adult Learning Conference (Fairbanks, Alaska), Lilly East, and Lilly West. She offered workshops/keynotes for Life University, Ashland University, Northern Illinois University, Western Nevada Community College, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Texas Tech, Chicago Consortium of Faculty Developers, College of the North Atlantic in Qatar (Middle East), Eastern Kentucky University, University of Delaware, and the University of North Carolina-Charlotte. This summer she was a featured presenter at the “9th Annual Northwest Nursing Education Institute: Learning Like a Nurse: New Strategies” in Portland and at “Boot Camp for Pros” in Leadville, CO. She offered a workshop at the Improving University Teaching Conference in Jaen, Spain. Millis authored several articles:

• “Promoting Critical Thinking through Sequenced Activities.” National Collegiate Honors Council Monographs;
• “Teaching as a Human Event.” In John. Cartafalsa and Lynne Anderson (Eds), The Joy of Teaching: A Chorus of Voices. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.; and

She co-authored:

• Techniques for student engagement and classroom management in large (and small) classes. Journal of Teaching in Marriage and Family; and

POD Innovation Award 2007

September 12 is the deadline for submitting proposals for the 2007 POD Innovation Award. This award recognizes innovation in faculty development and is an important way to share good ideas about faculty development with your colleagues. Up to seven finalists and the overall winner will be recognized at the POD Network annual conference this fall in Pittsburgh, PA, U.S.A.

Following is a website that contains information about the award and submissions guidelines. http://www.podnetwork.org/grants_awards/innovative.htm

If you have any questions regarding the submission of an idea, please contact Todd Zakrajsek at zakra1t@cmich.edu or 989-774-2757.

New Lilly Conference Website

For nearly 30 years, Lilly Conferences have offered exceptional opportunities for faculty to share information about creating exceptional learning environments for students. With one international conference, several national conferences, institutes, and a journal, many opportunities exist for you to learn and to share with others, including our newest institute in Fairbanks, Alaska, U.S.A.. Please check out our website at www.LillyConferences.com for more information. You may also contact Todd Zakrajsek at zakra1t@cmich.edu or 989-774-2757 for more information about participating in a Lilly Conference near you.
Contacting the POD Office

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

Get the most out of your POD membership:

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


Bookmark POD’s Web site at www.podnetwork.org

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