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Who is Here?

- Graduate Student
- Faculty member
- Department chair
- Academic dean, associate deans
- Provost/Dean of Faculty, vice provost/associate dean
- Directors, T&L, Assessment, Global, Diversity and Inclusion, Libraries
- Others
Guiding Questions for Session

• What is currently the work of teaching, learning, and faculty development centers?

• In what directions WILL and SHOULD centers/the field of FD move in the next decade?

• How can we leverage our knowledge, resources & expertise to create new solutions to emerging T&L challenges?
Large Scale Studies of FD: 2006 and 2016
Studies of Faculty Developers in North America

- **2006**
  - 494 responses from U.S. & CAN faculty developers
  - Response rate 50%; 40% center directors

- **2016**
  - 385 responses from U.S. % CAN faculty developers
  - Response rate 30%; 45% center directors

(Beach, Sorcinelli, Austin & Rivard, 2016; Sorcinelli, et al., 2006)
What We Learned About the Field of FD

• Who developers are – gender, race, age, years in FD
• Goals guiding centers and FD programming
• Structures of FD
• Collaborations
• Reporting structures, staffing, budgets
• **Issues centers address (and don’t) through services**
• Approaches to providing FD services
• Assessment of faculty development outcomes
• **What direction the field of FD will and should take**
What Issues Do T&L Centers Focus On?

1. New faculty development/orientation (3.48)
2. Integrating technology into traditional T&L settings (3.28)
3. Learner-centered teaching (active, evidence-based) (3.25)
4. Assessment of student learning outcomes (3.21)
5. Course and curricular redesign/reform (3.08)

4-point Likert scale 1=Not at All; 2=Slight Extent; 3=Moderate Extent; 4=Great Extent
Address at *Slight* to *Moderate Extent*

6. Blended and online learning (2.88)
7. Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) (2.80)
8. Mentoring programs for underrepresented faculty (2.71)
9. Orientation for part-time, fixed-term faculty (2.62)
10. Program assessment (e.g., for accreditation) (2.61)
11. Multiculturalism & diversity in T&L (2.60)

4-point Likert scale 1=Not at All; 2=Slight Extent; 3=Moderate Extent; 4=Great Extent
If T&L Centers Could Add or Expand Services...

• Evidence of learning (SoTL, learning analytics)
• Midcareer & senior faculty development
• Mentoring programs for underrepresented faculty
• Departmental leadership and support
• Peer review of teaching
• Multiculturalism & diversity in T&L
We WILL head in these directions...
We SHOULD head in these directions...
Food for Our Discussion

- Research indicates several areas of intersection b/w instruction and student learning outcomes, arguing that what faculty do matters:
- Design of courses, with an emphasis on alignment
- Active, learner-centered pedagogies
- Assessment, reflection, timely, formative feedback

(Jankowski, 2017)
Paired/Small Group Discussion

Consider what T&L/FD centers are currently addressing at your own institutions:

- What in the results we have presented is reflected on your campus?
- What are the key priorities (or other priorities) that you think your T&L/FD center should be attending to?
2025: A Forecast to the Years Ahead

A picture here that connotes the future of FD—a faculty member or student with computers, smartphones, or internet, etc. could be in it!
Advance Evidence-Based Practices

- Support faculty to assess, investigate, document student learning (e.g., SoTL)
- Use more evidence-based FD approaches (e.g., faculty learning communities)
- Promote development & use of strong measures of teaching excellence
- Assess quality, impact of T&L programs
Need time-efficient, customized, scalable, quality approaches:

- **Keep face-to-face**: short-term, intensive institutes (2-3 days); faculty learning communities (disciplinary, interdisciplinary); individual consultation

- **Create more on-line**: asynchronous online programs; web-based resources (e.g., links to articles, internet content); webinars (1-2 hour synchronous web-based seminars to save & view later)
Foster Collaborations, Partnerships, Networks

Break down divisions, hierarchies that structure T&L on campuses:

- Build collaborations with IT, library, assessment office, etc.
- Engage in department-level change (e.g., STEM)
- See students as co-creators of knowledge, agents in own learning
- Align faculty-led & administrator-led efforts for institutional change
“Studies provide evidence of a positive relationship between instructional improvement and student outcomes that relate to engagement, learning, course success, persistence, and retention. In particular, they suggest that investments in professional development and particular pedagogical practices can effectively improve student success.”

(Brown & Kurzweil, 2017)
In small groups, discuss: What are one or two ways that you are/can work with your T&L center to more effectively prepare and engage faculty members in improving student learning and success?

Reconvene: What is one thing you would most want us to hear from your group discussion?
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