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The University Teaching Center at Carnegie Mellon University sponsors a series of between seven and ten faculty luncheon seminars each semester. About one-half of the entire faculty have attended at least one seminar during the past three years. These seminars focus on ways to improve the quality of teaching at Carnegie Mellon and thus include a variety of topics concerning teaching, learning, students, and even the physical space which affects teaching and learning. This paper discusses the background of this successful program, the genealogy of the luncheon seminar sessions, the outcomes of the seminar series, and our conclusions after three and a half years. As co-directors of the Center, Edwin (Ted) Fenton and I believe that our model of faculty luncheon seminars, their content, style, and organization is adaptable to other college and university settings.

Background

In 1982 Dr. Richard M. Cyert, President of Carnegie Mellon University (CMU), created the University Teaching Center (UTC) to improve the quality of instruction. Between the Center’s inception and 1986, the focus of the UTC was primarily on teaching assistant development, although staff worked with faculty members through individual consultation. In 1986, we decided to develop a series of faculty luncheon seminars in order to reach a wider audience and to help establish our credibility in
the university community. Expanded opportunities for the already-established observation, videotaping, and consulting services to supplement the luncheon seminars and to help produce lasting changes in teaching behavior when faculty left the seminars (Levinson-Rose and Menges, 1981) were put in place.

Originally we outlined three goals for our faculty development program, and the luncheon seminars responded to all three goals:

1. To develop a *culture of teaching* at CMU which parallels the culture of research by providing an institutional forum to discuss pedagogical issues and thus encourage an attitude that teaching is as scholarly an activity as research;

2. To provide pedagogical *development* by enhancing faculty talents, expanding their interests, and improving their competence as instructors, competence which PhD programs have traditionally failed to teach, nurture, or hone;

3. To provide *renewal* for faculty to rejuvenate them in their pedagogical roles by introducing new types of teaching activities and providing opportunities to learn from colleagues. (Gaff, 1975)

These goals are based on two sets of assumptions validated by much of the literature on faculty development. First, we believe that teaching is a complex set of attitudes, knowledge, skills, motivations, and values which can be taught. Because no single model of effective teaching exists and because of the great diversity among students, we needed to help our faculty develop a variety of pedagogical techniques and strategies (Gaff, 1975; Joyce & Weil, 1972). Second, we agree with a number of researchers (Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Bennett, Joyce, & Showers, 1987) that the conditions under which faculty develop and change their instructional approaches include exposure to theory, modeling, practice, feedback, and coaching. The seminars could provide both theory and modeling.

Our objective—developing a culture of teaching at CMU and providing both faculty development and renewal—clearly indicated that we should target the entire five hundred member university faculty as our audience for the luncheon seminars. We realized that the seminars would fail if the faculty perceived them as remedial, so we advertised them as an opportunity for faculty to share their experiences with colleagues from across the university. Curiosity attracted many faculty to the initial set of luncheons in the spring of 1986, including many tenured faculty members who were among our most prolific researchers and best teachers. The
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presence of these well-respected scholars who took pride in their teaching—and whom we later asked to assume leadership roles at the seminars—drew an increasing number of faculty to future seminars.

We planned to use the faculty luncheon seminars to introduce our colleagues to research on effective pedagogy and to provide them with opportunities to view theory in practice. To introduce faculty to research findings, we provided them with written materials which we sent prior to each session. The UTC staff produced short Teaching Center Papers of ten to fifteen pages which either synthesized research findings on issues such as lecturing or conducting discussions, or presented carefully edited views of faculty whom we had interviewed on specific topics such as how to integrate research into teaching. We also drew on materials which our faculty had published on issues such as teaching studio courses or facilitating writing across the curriculum. Finally, we reproduced short articles which we found to be relevant to faculty in the areas in which we felt least competent, for example, teaching by the case method. In all of these instances, we kept the written material short and direct, with extensive bibliographies for participants interested in reading more about a subject.

Our experience over the last three years indicates that about fifty percent of the participants read the materials prior to the session; another twenty-five percent glanced at or skimmed them; finally, of the twenty-five percent who “filed” the material for future reading, some told us that they read it months later. Often faculty members reproduced copies of the material to give to colleagues or graduate students, or they pulled out the material a year or two later when the occasion for use arose. Overall, the material seems to have served a number of purposes.

We planned the luncheon seminars from 12:00 to 1:20 on Wednesdays and Thursdays to accommodate diverse teaching schedules. The UTC paid for lunch, and we served juice, a chef’s salad, rolls, coffee, and dessert and set tables for six people. Typically each seminar session attracted between twenty and thirty participants. We provided all participants with name tags and asked that faculty members sit with colleagues from departments other than their own and whom they did not know in order to create a sense of collegiality extending beyond insulated departmental boundaries. We scheduled the first thirty minutes of the session for informal conversation—hopefully about the day’s topic—as people ate lunch, which left fifty minutes for the substantive part of the program. We realized that fifty minutes would enable us to focus on only one or two critical aspects of a topic, especially because we wanted seminar leaders to talk no more than fifteen or twenty minutes in order to allow ample time
for discussion. Our previous experience with faculty at Carnegie Mellon indicated that faculty did not want to sit through lectures on teaching, but preferred to participate actively in discussions. Consequently, we traded-off more concentrated information on pedagogy for discussion about pedagogy by the group, although we were always careful to reiterate or expand upon pedagogical issues which arose during the discussions. The nature of our faculty leads us to believe that they learn best from each other.

Over the past three years we have conducted the luncheon seminars in two ways, both of which we have found effective. At times one of the two members of the professional staff of the UTC, either Fenton or myself, presented material or utilized videotapes to facilitate discussion on general pedagogical topics, such as designing a course and preparing a syllabus, leading discussions, lecturing, providing feedback and correction, or evaluating instruction. Because we believe that there is no single model of effective teaching, we always presented a variety of effective models. For example, we utilized videotapes to initiate discussion about effective lecturing techniques by showing short excerpts from videotapes of two or three CMU faculty members lecturing in different disciplines. Although all of the tapes exhibited the same basic principles—illustrating major concepts with examples or providing periodic summaries, for example—the lecturers had very different lecturing styles. Likewise, when we discussed planning a course and developing a syllabus, we utilized five syllabi from five different disciplines. All of the syllabi contained information vital to the success of student learning—clearly stated objectives, instructional cues, and active learning strategies, for example—but each looked very different. We always used examples from Carnegie Mellon faculty and courses, which enticed curious faculty to the luncheon seminars, and we tried to model the behaviors which we advocated. For instance, we were careful to summarize during discussions, call on people who had not volunteered, and ask participants to respond to others’ comments.

We often ask colleagues from different disciplines to facilitate discussion in the seminars by outlining their approaches to pedagogical techniques, such as teaching project courses, teaching by the case method, or teaching studio courses. Fenton or I plan each session with the faculty presenters to insure that they not only discuss their methods and experiences, but also indicate the applicable pedagogical principles which underlie their successes. Again, our approach endorses no single model of effective teaching. We ask two faculty members who use the same strategy but do
so in different ways to conduct the seminars. Utilizing Carnegie Mellon faculty as opposed to outside speakers serves a very important function: It enables us to build a core of faculty members to whom other faculty can turn for help, guidance, or advice. This model also helps to create a sense of collegiality which facilitates the development of a culture of teaching at Carnegie Mellon.

As a result of the format and content of these seminars, faculty leave with a variety of specific teaching techniques which they can adapt to their own disciplines and teaching styles. Participants, both those who are floundering in the classroom as well as those interested in experimenting with new (for them) teaching activities, claim to find this useful.

Genealogy of the Sessions

We offered the first series of luncheon seminars as a package of six related sessions. We sent an invitation and a list of seminar topics to all faculty members and followed up with memos to department heads and deans. Seventy faculty members responded, signing up for all six sessions in the spring of 1986. Another seventy signed up for a repeat of these sessions in the fall of 1986. We decided to focus on six general topics of concern to all faculty:

Five Ways to Improve Student Learning. We discussed and demonstrated teaching techniques which can enhance student learning: increasing active learning time, providing instructional cues, utilizing effective feedback and correction, showing enthusiasm for a subject and interest in students, and evaluating one's teaching.

Designing a Course and Preparing a Syllabus. We discussed strategies for designing a course and elements of an effective syllabus, using CMU course syllabi.

Leading Discussions. We utilized videotapes of two CMU faculty members from different disciplines to initiate a discussion of effective discussion techniques, while trying to model the behaviors we advocated.

Lecturing. We utilized videotapes of three CMU faculty members lecturing to illustrate the components of an effective lecture.

Providing Feedback and Correction. We discussed both verbal and written feedback and correction as a means of helping students to learn. We asked participants to grade either a quantitative or qualitative exam with a solution key and then compared scoring and the rationale for awarding points to generate principles of effective grading.
Evaluating Instruction. We discussed various formative and summative measures to assess teaching and provided faculty with a variety of formative instruments designed for early course evaluation.

We surveyed the one hundred and forty faculty members who attended the first group of luncheon seminars and asked them for suggestions of topics. Some faculty members expressed interest in extensions of previously held seminars, for example, more information on "Making Lecture Courses Interesting," "Asking Good Questions in Discussion Classes," and "Evaluating Faculty Performance." In addition to these three topics, we organized seminars in the following:

Educational Computing. We asked the Director of Educational Computing to present examples of the use of computers in courses, drawing on material from several disciplines.

Teaching by the Case Method. We asked two faculty members who used the case method in their courses to discuss why they use cases, how they use cases, and what the implications are for teaching and learning.

Teaching Project Courses. We asked two faculty members who teach project courses to discuss their educational goals and describe why and how they use projects to meet these goals.

Guiding Doctoral Dissertations. We distributed several short articles about guiding dissertations and a list of possible discussion topics which arose from the articles. We asked faculty to either choose three topics from the list or add their own topics to the list, and then we determined by voting which issues to address in which order.

Conducting Graduate Seminars. We interviewed fifteen faculty members about the variety of techniques they use to conduct graduate seminars and the array of problems which arises in this format. We edited the interviews, sent them to seminar participants in advance, and identified key techniques which seemed generally applicable for discussion in the seminar.

Dealing with the Stress of Teaching. We asked the Director of Counseling Services to conduct a discussion about how to deal effectively with the stresses of teaching.

Using Research as a Resource in Teaching. We interviewed seven faculty members about ways in which they use research as a resource in teaching. We edited these interviews, distributed them before the session, and identified key techniques to discuss.
The University Core Curriculum. We asked the person in charge of the University Core to discuss future plans and objectives and to respond to concerns of both faculty who teach in the core and elsewhere.

Writing Across the Curriculum. We asked our resident expert on this subject to conduct a discussion about reasons and ways to incorporate writing into the curriculum, and we asked several faculty members involved in this movement on campus to share their experiences.

Teaching in Studio Courses. We distributed an article about teaching in studios written by one of our architecture faculty members and asked her and another faculty member to conduct the session.

Fenton and I conducted only six of the above thirteen sessions; we asked faculty who are noted for their expertise in other areas and whom we had observed in class or on videotape to conduct the remaining seven sessions. No one who we invited to act as a discussion leader turned us down. We spent two hours with each of the discussion leaders prior to their sessions to insure that presenters identified sound pedagogical principles underlying their techniques.

In the fall of 1987, we repeated seven of the sessions from the previous spring and added a session on Computing Support for Education. We opened the series to all faculty since we had invited only the original one hundred and forty faculty (from the first round of seminars in 1986) to attend the spring series. We made a particular effort to involve the sixty incoming faculty members. For that group, the luncheon seminar series was an extension of the three-day incoming faculty orientation which we had conducted the week before classes began.

We had a different goal for the fourth set of luncheon seminars offered in the spring of 1988. We wanted faculty help in developing a new program, in assessing two recently-developed programs, and in suggesting ways to help us develop a culture of teaching at Carnegie Mellon. We also wanted to provide assistance to junior faculty facing reappointment, promotion, or tenure. We offered:

Developing an Academic Orientation Program for Incoming Freshmen. We invited administrators, faculty who teach freshmen, and support staff to help us brainstorm a comprehensive program for orienting freshmen to the academic demands of their first college semester.

Developing a Culture of Teaching at a Small Research University. We distributed a paper on developing a culture of teaching at CMU and discussed its major premises.
Developing Teaching Components of PhD Programs. We presented a synopsis of programs in several departments which prepare PhD candidates for their roles as faculty and solicited feedback about the programs.

Orienting Newly Hired Faculty to the CMU Environment. We invited new faculty who had participated in the first Incoming Faculty Orientation and faculty who came to CMU without any orientation to discuss how we might orient new faculty to the Carnegie Mellon environment and provide continued support for teaching throughout their stay.

Developing Your Case for Quality Teaching for Promotion/Tenure Decisions. We asked several faculty members who had participated in departmental, college, and university promotion/tenure committees to discuss the process.

Each of these seminar series introduced us to a number of faculty members who had never before participated in University Teaching Center functions. Because we were conducting other programs simultaneously with these luncheon seminars—Incoming Faculty Orientation, Teaching Assistant Training, Teaching Fellow Training, Teaching Component of PhD Programs, Videotaping and Consulting—we had frequent contact with faculty who had interacted with us in the past and those who had not. Slowly we had expanded our clientele to reach about one-half of the five hundred tenure-track faculty members at Carnegie Mellon.

During the fall of 1988, we repeated several of the sessions which we had conducted in the past, and we experimented with a new format—the faculty/student luncheon. We held one luncheon session entitled "The Art of Critiquing Students' Work" in which we invited faculty and undergraduate students from our College of Fine Arts to discuss the characteristics of effective and ineffective critiques. The luncheon was lively and provided both faculty and students with an opportunity to hear each other's views on what constitutes an effective critique. Faculty were intrigued by the idea of talking to students about such pedagogical issues; we then planned the luncheon seminar series for the spring of 1989 as faculty/student luncheons. Once again the UTC absorbed the cost of the luncheons. We surveyed various faculty members and student organizations to determine the content of the sessions and settled on the following topics:

Are Faculty Members and Students Too Distant From Each Other? We asked two faculty members and two students to discuss their experiences with student-faculty interaction.
Academic Advising: How Is It Handled in Each College? How Can It Be Improved? We asked representatives from each of the four undergraduate colleges to prepare a one page document which described the advising system in their college. We then asked both faculty members and students to comment on the effectiveness of the various systems.

The Roles of Competition and Cooperation in College Life. We asked two students and two faculty members to discuss their experiences with competition and cooperation at Carnegie Mellon. Then we opened the floor to discussion about how to decrease competition and increase cooperation.

Research Opportunities for Undergraduates: How Can We Improve Them? We asked two faculty members and two students to discuss opportunities for undergraduate research in their departments. Then we opened the floor to discussion of how we could provide more research opportunities to undergraduates.

What Do CMU's Students Think of Life Here? We asked a member of our Planning Office to summarize some of the results of a Quality of Life Report which he had researched and then asked students to comment on how we could improve the quality of life on campus.

Cheating in the Society and on the Campus? Can CMU Buck the Tide? We distributed a paper on the variety of ingenious ways in which students cheat in college. We opened the floor to discussion of ways to prevent or discourage cheating and means to deal with those who persist in doing so.

What Messages Do Physical Space, Such as Dormitory Rooms, Fraternity Houses, Classrooms, Libraries, Laboratories, Faculty and Staff Offices, and the Proposed University Center, Send to Members of the Community? Students from an architecture class reported their observations about how several spaces on campus were used, why they were used in particular ways, and what messages physical spaces send to the university community. Members of the Planning Office were on hand to note the compliments, complaints, and suggestions of students and faculty members.

These student/faculty luncheon sessions resulted in a list of eighty recommendations directed to the University, the seven colleges, the twenty-two departments, individual faculty members, and students. We distributed the full list of recommendations widely and published them in the student newspaper. More than half were so general that we had no way to determine whether or not they were widely implemented. For
instance, some faculty members had made the following suggestions to students: *Say something positive to a faculty member when you have had a particularly good class. Write favorable or constructive comments on faculty course evaluations.* Others, however, were quite specific so that we were able to follow up. For example, luncheon participants suggested that the university *develop a pamphlet to distribute to students which lists all of the opportunities for undergraduate research and creative projects now underway at Carnegie Mellon.* The University has either completed or made significant progress on twenty-eight of these specific suggestions.

During the fall of 1989, we introduced five new topics in which faculty had expressed interest, and we repeated two sessions (on Grading and Cheating) for which faculty indicated a need for continued dialogue:

**Diversity in Learning.** This session provided faculty with an overview of learning preferences and factors which impact their teaching styles. Among these factors are how people acquire and process information, and how environmental preferences and cultural differences influence learning. We also discussed concrete suggestions for varying teaching methods.

**Conducting Multi-section Courses.** This session provided faculty who teach multi-section courses and utilize Teaching Assistants with an opportunity to discuss issues such as the confusing interplay of autonomy and authority in the TA/professor relationship. Faculty, TAs, a clinical psychologist, an expert in negotiations, and an expert in organizational behavior were on hand to suggest ways to make the process more effective. The UTC prepared a written report of suggestions from the luncheon to departments, faculty members, and TAs which we distributed to those people involved in multi-section courses.

**Sexism in the Classroom and in Research.** The UTC prepared for this session by interviewing female undergraduate and graduate students. We asked them to identify behaviors which these women view as barriers to equality in the classroom, in research, and in relationships with faculty. We presented our data for discussion in the session. The UTC then prepared a written report of the sexist behaviors that CMU female students identified and incorporated suggestions from luncheon seminar participants on ways to curb such behavior. We distributed this short report to the entire campus community.

**Classroom Assessment Techniques.** During these sessions, twelve faculty members from different departments described and evaluated a small scale assessment measure which they had used in their classes for the purpose of discussing it at this session. These assessment measures
are quick and effective ways to obtain continuous feedback on what students are learning as a result of teaching efforts.

**Improving Instruction by Exposing Assumptions.** This session made explicit some of the assumptions which faculty members have about the learning process, student characteristics, communication dynamics, and other issues of the classroom in order to help improve instruction. We collected these assumptions from a random sample of faculty in survey form before the session. We wrote a two page summary of assumptions about lecturing for distribution after the luncheon seminar.

**Incoming Faculty Orientation—One Semester Old.** Over the past two years, incoming faculty have expressed interest in gathering with each other at the end of their first semester to discuss their experiences at Carnegie Mellon. These sessions also provide the UTC with an opportunity to learn what information which we provided during the incoming faculty orientation was helpful and what information we need to include in next year's orientation.

### Outcomes

Although we have no quantitative data which assess the success of these faculty luncheon seminars, abundant anecdotal evidence indicates that faculty members find the seminars useful and effective. Their written evaluations of the seminars provide indications of how well we are meeting our original three goals. Although many of the following statements from participants address more than one of the goals, I have categorized them into one of three areas.

Our first goal was **to develop a culture of teaching at Carnegie Mellon which parallels the culture of research by providing an institutional forum in which to discuss pedagogical issues and thus encourage an attitude that teaching is as scholarly an activity as research.** Faculty who attended the seminars clearly recognized and appreciated the opportunity to discuss pedagogical issues with colleagues from across the campus:

[I attend] partly because I hold the teaching mission of the University in high regard. Anytime there are going to be like-minded colleagues gathering, I want to be there. It supports and validates my priorities, and I usually learn something more about the art of teaching. It is easy to begin believing that my classroom difficulties are unique. Actually, they rarely are. The breadth of concerns touched by the UTC and the focus of individual sessions have provided a way for me to efficiently get to the information/problem/suggestions I need. I much prefer talking/listening to my colleagues to reading reports.
The faculty luncheon seminars . . . provide the opportunity for meeting faculty from all disciplines at CMU who I would not have met during the normal course of activities . . . this interaction allows me to view tasks from different perspectives and enhance my effectiveness as an educator. I have noticed my teaching improve because of the teaching seminars. I have also been able to enrich my professional life at CMU by interacting with my colleagues from other departments.

Assistant Professor, Electrical
and Computer Engineering

Our second goal for the luncheon seminars was to provide pedagogical development by enhancing faculty talents, expanding their interests, and improving their competence as instructors. Faculty articulated their responses to the luncheon seminars as a means to develop their teaching abilities:

The seminars seemed like a good way to enhance my own teaching by learning how my colleagues in other disciplines dealt with similar problems. It was intriguing to find that in vastly different fields the same difficulties arose and the methods of handling them were often much the same . . . . The seminars provoked a great deal of thought as to the many aspects of how we try to educate our students and promoted, at least in me, a rather gratifying period of self-examination.

Assistant Professor, Drama

. . . as the luncheon series progressed, I realized that the general attitude, as illustrated by many specific topics, was somewhat different than my own, and more appropriate. Specific suggestions were of some use, but much more important was the resulting process the series encouraged, of enlightened self-examination and reorientation of thinking about teaching. There is enormous wisdom that comes through experience....

Assistant Professor, Statistics

I learned some nuts-and-bolts tips on preparing syllabi, homework assignments, solution sets, and so forth. I also picked up some good tips on teaching in the large lecture-class format (which represents most of my teaching). It is amazing to me that we as faculty spend a good amount of time on teaching; teaching is one of the important missions in the university, but we are provided no professional instruction in the activity. It is quite an irony that we believe in teaching English, economics, biology, and acting but that we do not apparently believe that teaching itself can be taught. We would never expect an engineer to assume his or her professional duties without having received engineering instruc-
tion. Why would we expect teaching skills to be more innate or less amenable to instruction than what we ourselves teach?

Assistant Professor, School of Urban and Public Affairs

Our third goal was to provide renewal for faculty to rejuvenate them in their pedagogical roles by introducing new types of teaching activities and providing opportunities to learn from colleagues. Faculty responses once again indicate our success in meeting this goal:

My major interest in attending the luncheon seminars is to interact with people from other disciplines. Teaching techniques which are taken for granted in one discipline may be totally new in another. As an engineering professor, I have always been interested in developing effective methods in teaching technical courses. Often the best ideas come from listening to people in CFA [College of Fine Arts].

Full Professor, Chemical Engineering

While I won a national teaching award in 1960... times have changed (and so have people, needs, and interests). I needed to get a new calibration on various ways to approach today’s student, who I think of as “visually oriented” much more now than 30 years ago. I have found, with very rare exception, that the perspectives offered [during the luncheon seminars] have given me at least something at every meeting and, on some occasions, a lot that I can use.

Full Professor, Metallurgical Engineering and Material Sciences

Conclusions

After three and a half years of conducting our faculty luncheon seminars, we feel confident to draw the following conclusions:

1. The luncheon seminars have been successful in attracting approximately one-half of our faculty to discuss pedagogical issues in an institutional forum. This forum is a vital step in improving teaching at a university and in creating an environment which values teaching.

2. We agree, however, with Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981) that programs such as the faculty luncheon seminars are unlikely to produce lasting changes in teaching behavior unless participants continue to practice new skills and to receive critical feedback and coaching about their performance. We believe that the continued attendance of a large subset of our faculty at these seminars keeps pedagogical issues in the forefront and, in the words of one faculty member, “encourages continual en-
lightened self-examination." We believe that these seminars, combined with UTC services such as observation, videotaping, and consultation, provide faculty with the critical feedback and coaching they need to make these changes an integral part of their teaching. The increase in the number of faculty members who request that we observe or videotape their classes reinforces our belief that the luncheon seminars are only a beginning and not a full faculty development program.

3. The luncheon seminars are cost-effective, particularly in comparison to the benefits accrued. The faculty spend about an hour-and-a-half of their time per session, and the cost to the UTC is about six dollars a participant for lunch. Compared to the cost of one-and-one-half hours of professional consulting, we are "buying" faculty time at a remarkably inexpensive rate. The cost of the luncheons is well below the cost of bringing in an outside expert, although our rationale for utilizing our own faculty was to take advantage of the resident expertise on campus and to create a culture of teaching where faculty could continue dialogue with colleagues in other departments. Contrary to the findings of some researchers (Eble & McKeachie, 1985), our faculty overwhelmingly rejected the idea of bringing in facilitators from other campuses; they preferred taking advantage of our own human resources. This issue may be college or university-specific, but again the cost of our program is relatively low in comparison to the other model.

4. We strongly believe that we can lure some faculty who have not participated in the luncheon seminars if we heed the suggestion of the UTC Advisory Committee to offer a variety of luncheon seminars which span the continuum from nuts-and-bolts issues to those which deal more with research findings for those faculty interested in an ongoing and more intellectual dialogue about teaching and learning. For example, we have thought about conducting faculty luncheon seminars around a series of books such as *The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities* (Kuh & Whitt, 1988), *Making Sense of College Grades* (Milton, Pollio, & Eison, 1986), *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* (Bowen & Schuster, 1986), and *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (Sykes, 1988). We might ask a faculty member to read the book of the week and review it in a presentation lasting no longer than fifteen minutes. We would then open the floor for discussion. We would hope to attract some new luncheon seminar participants with this different emphasis and to keep challenging our faculty regulars. We recognize, however, that the nature of the research university and the people it often attracts means that there will always remain a subset of
faculty not interested in expanding their knowledge of options or broadening their perspective on teaching.

We have also planned our next luncheon seminar series on the use of media in the classroom as faculty members continue to exploit traditional media as well as adopt new media to vary classroom activities. We will focus this series on ways in which faculty can use media to increase student learning. We envision the following sessions: Under What Conditions, If Any, Does the Use of Media Enhance Learning?; Using Documentary Videos or Films; Having Students Make Their Own Video or Film Productions; Developing Viewgraphs to Support Lectures or Inquire into Problems; Using a Videodisc for Inquiry into Ethical Problems; Projecting from Computers: Equipment and Techniques; and Organizing Slide Presentations to Help Students Process Information.

5. Finally, we need to continue to expand our complementary programs to help faculty members enhance their performance both in and out of the classroom. We currently offer observation, videotaping, consulting, and early course evaluation in a number of different ways. We are beginning a comprehensive program to upgrade course syllabi and to encourage more widespread use of early course evaluations. We are convinced, however, that the faculty luncheon seminar format will remain central to our faculty development program as we expand topics to meet the needs of our faculty.
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