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Abstract

In the 2003-2004 academic year the KQIP Steering Committee identified the need for additional and expanded faculty development opportunities. A team was formed to examine both the current faculty development process at Kirkwood and make recommendations for improvement. The 2004-2005 KQIP Faculty Development Team recognizes the hard work of the 2003-2004 KQIP Faculty Development Team and the foundation it set to implement changes in the current faculty development process.

Through research, including a visit to Parkland College it has become apparent to the KQIP Faculty Development Team that it is necessary to both centralize and expand the faculty development efforts at Kirkwood Community College in an effort to strengthen some of the already existing programs as well as to add some components that seem to be either lacking or missing from the current Kirkwood process. It is the hope that, with this proposal, more faculty will be aided in their development needs.

With the groundwork being set by the original committee, the current committee was focused on implementing college-wide changes in the faculty development process. This report includes the brainstorming activities of this committee on how to improve faculty development at Kirkwood as well as the descriptive information regarding Parkland College’s impressive faculty development process. We have provided a timeline, a cost analysis and solid recommendations.

The KQIP Faculty Development Team respectfully asks the KQIP Steering Committee to approve the plan presented. To do so will enhance the experiences of faculty and staff at Kirkwood Community College.
Mission, Vision, and Purpose

Kirkwood’s Mission

- Identify community needs
- Provide accessible, quality education and training
- Promote opportunities for lifelong learning

Kirkwood’s Vision Statement

Invent, develop and deliver learning solutions for the 21st century

Faculty Development Vision

Improve, enhance, and promote faculty development to improve student learning

Purpose Statement

Improve student success through improved faculty development

“The new paradigm says that community colleges are learning, not teaching institutions. The mission is student learning. The most important people in the institution are the learners. Everyone else is there to facilitate and support students’ learning.”

- Boggs, 1993, p. 2
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Current Faculty Development Process
(Per the 2003-3004 KQIP Faculty Development Team Report)

Faculty development is expected of all instructors, librarians and counselors, and is a component of the annual evaluation process. In their annual evaluations, faculty members are expected to report on development activities in which they have participated in the previous year and to outline those activities they plan to undertake in the coming year. For faculty on the professional track, there are no requirements for how often or what kind of activities they should pursue. Faculty on the probationary track, however, develop a specific plan with their deans so they can demonstrate they have attained the competencies spelled out by the Quality Faculty Plan and the Probationary Plan (which is more inclusive) before the end of their probationary period.

Development Opportunities Available to All Full-Time Faculty

Development opportunities for all full-time faculty are accessed through three major avenues:

- Individual academic departments offer a variety of opportunities including travel and conference attendance for individuals, sponsorship of group projects, department retreats and other activities. Some departments, for example Math/Science and Social Science/Career Option, annually sponsor events to which faculty from all departments are invited.

- The Faculty Professional Development Committee funds projects in four different categories with money allocated for that purpose through bargaining. Funds can be used for individual projects such as travel to a conference, group activities, a contract
extension to allow for extended research or discipline exploration, or leave to pursue a higher degree. (See Diagram A and Appendix A.)

- The **Learning Services Department** offers a variety of opportunities throughout the year, mostly at the request of faculty who wish to develop an activity focused on a specific aspect of teaching and learning. Recent opportunities include the CASTLE project which focuses on the development of learning outcomes and computer-based testing; CATs, which promotes the use of classroom assessment techniques; teleconferences on student success; and teaching circles on brain-based learning; ethics; and the Formation movement. (See Diagram B.)

Additional funding is occasionally available through the Foundation and through grants that include faculty development as part of their projects. A new opportunity beginning Spring 2005, the Endowed Teaching Chair, will provide funds for additional long-term projects through endowments made specifically for that purpose to the Foundation.

**Development Opportunities Specifically for Probationary Faculty**

Development activities specifically for probationary faculty reflect a change in Iowa Code, which in the summer of 2003 handed over to individual colleges responsibility for assuring the quality of their faculty. Committees at each school were charged with developing a Quality Faculty Plan, which addressed hiring, orientation, professional development for new faculty and continuing professional development. (See Diagram C and Appendix B.)

Kirkwood was fortunate in having in place solid hiring standards, comprehensive orientation activities, and an evaluation process that required continuing professional development. The committee concentrated its efforts on developing a set of competencies
probationary faculty were expected to attain before they reached the end of their probationary period. Competencies were developed for instructors, librarians and counselors (all of whom were affected by the new legislation), and appropriate development activities were developed and formalized. These include:

- **The New Teacher Workshop**: This two-credit course from the University of Iowa was required under the old licensure program and continues to be required under the new Quality Faculty Plan for instructors with little or no teaching experience and no formal educational license or degree. NTW is now offered on the Kirkwood campus each August and the college pays tuition and all associated costs.

- **Teaching at Kirkwood Workshop**: This one-day workshop was developed by experienced Kirkwood faculty as an orientation to community college teaching and the “learning college” focus at Kirkwood. It is offered in August and is required for all new teachers who do not attend the New Teacher Workshop.

- **Community College A to Z**: This series of seven two-hour workshops introduces new faculty to Kirkwood and the community college system through presentation by campus leaders on a variety of topics, including finances, the infrastructure, continuing education, the Foundation, and off-campus programs. New faculty may take this program or the credit Community College course from the University of Iowa.

- **LENs**: The LENs curriculum was developed by three League for Innovation colleges as a year-long introduction to teaching. The curriculum builds on the skills introduced in the New Teacher Workshop and includes units on
  - Creating a Positive Learning Environment
- Developing Learning Outcomes and Competencies
- Selecting Teaching and Learning Strategies
- Enhancing Teaching and Learning Using Educational Technologies
- Classroom Assessment: Formative and Summative Strategies

New faculty may substitute credit classes for the LENs program, but most have not.

- **Professional Ethics: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities:** Jack Terndrup, Professor/Coordinator of Education Careers, offers this workshop as part of the August orientation and at other times during the year. It has become a formal part of most Quality Faculty Plans.

In addition, first-year faculty participate in an August orientation and a mentoring program that includes monthly lunches with a speaker on a topic of interest. They also meet with the Board in September each year to be introduced, attend a Board meeting, learn about the history of Kirkwood and the community college movement, and socialize with Board members at a dinner to welcome them. Second- and third-year faculty are invited to monthly lunches with speakers of their choosing.

**Development Activities for Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty are invited and welcome to attend all faculty development activities offered by the Learning Services Department, except the New Teacher Workshop, the Teaching at Kirkwood workshop, and LENs. Many department activities are also open to them. They are ineligible for funding from the Faculty Professional Development Committee, which draws on bargained money. However, a separate fund, managed by the Vice President of Instruction, provides adjuncts with stipends of up to $500.00 for similar activities. (See Diagram D.)
A half-day orientation is held every fall for new adjunct faculty, addressing such topics as accommodating students with disabilities, classroom behavior guidelines, developing a syllabus, classroom assessment techniques, getting along in your department, and opportunities for professional development. The Adjunct Faculty Advisory Committee sponsors development activities specifically for adjuncts on an occasional basis.

How Information about Opportunities is Communicated

Information about all opportunities is sent to the deans, who then distribute it to faculty in their departments. Many activities are also publicized through the eTempo, and a session on faculty development opportunities is a regular luncheon topic for faculty in the first three years. Instructors report that informal conversations with their colleagues are also a popular and reliable way to find out what’s going on.

How Participation in Faculty Development Activities is Recorded

This is no central location where all information about faculty participation in development activities is recorded. Human Resources documents information for probationary faculty and for all activities submitted for professional renewal credit. Departments track activities for probationary faculty through their Quality Faculty and Probationary Faculty plans and for all faculty through the annual evaluation process. Learning Services has class lists for current activities and forwards attendance records to deans as appropriate, but does not maintain files to track the participation of individual instructors. No system exists for tracking adjunct faculty participation, at either the department or college level, although many adjuncts keep personal, up-to-date portfolios of their activities.
**Incentives for Participation**

Incentives for participation vary widely depending on the activity, the source of the funding, and the intended audience. Very few of the activities sponsored by the Learning Services Department include a stipend or release time for the participants. Materials for those activities are always provided, however, as are food and beverages appropriate to the time of day and activity. The greatest incentive is the opportunity to learn something new in a collegial setting. Of course, those on probation must attend many activities in order to remain at Kirkwood. Successful completion of the Quality Faculty Plan is a “required but not sufficient” component of continuing employment.

Fulltime faculty proposing development opportunities through the Faculty Professional Development Committee are eligible for release time or a stipend to cover costs up to the equivalent of three semester hours at the maximum part-time rate. Those who apply and are approved for professional extension may be funded for up to 29 days at their per diem rate. Adjuncts pursuing similar activities may be funded up to $500.00 per year.

Faculty may share the results of their development activities with their colleagues through such campus venues as department meetings, faculty forums and Staff Development Day, and also at national conferences, but relatively few choose to do so. No award process is in place to recognize outstanding projects.
Diagram A: Faculty Professional Development Committee
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Diagram C: Quality Faculty Plan
Diagram D: Adjunct Stipend
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Research

Literature Review

The Learning Revolution

After the 1983 release of the book *A Nation at Risk*, there became a growing recognition of the need to reform the established system of higher education in the United States. During the 1990’s, a paradigm shift took place in American higher education that moved the focus from instruction, research, and service to one that values student learning. In the early 1990’s, “for the first time in the history of education, ‘placing learning and the learner first’ became the universal cry of commissions, professional organization, business leaders, policy makers, and increasingly, educators from every sector of the educational landscape” (O’Banion, 1997a, p. 19). This shift in thinking has been referred to by many as the new “Learning Paradigm” or the “Learning Revolution.” “In a nutshell, the purpose of the Learning Revolution is to place learning first in every policy, program, and practice in higher education by overhauling the traditional architecture of education” (O’Banion, 1997b, p. 1).

There has been a “groundswell of interest in the learner from community college presidents, trustees, faculty, researchers, and state policy makers” (O’Banion, 1997a, p. 25). According to Boggs (1993), “the new paradigm says that community colleges are learning, not teaching institutions. The mission is student learning. The most important people in the institution are the learners. Everyone else is there to facilitate and support students’ learning” (p. 2).

Boggs (1999) outlined several important tenets to the learning revolution that must be met: “the mission of the colleges and universities should be student learning rather than teaching and instruction, institutions should accept responsibility for student learning, supporting and
promoting student learning should be everyone’s job and should guide institutional decisions, and institutions should judge their effectiveness and be evaluated on student learning outcomes rather than on resources or processes.” Thus, to truly embrace the learning revolution, a college must undergo overall campus philosophical changes, teaching/instructional changes, and must be accountable for those changes.

**Philosophical Changes**

The current college system is currently bound by many constraints, yet to make “any progress towards the Learning Revolution, we need to replace the current educational systems with a system designed for the kind of society in which we live, designed for the kinds of students who attend college, and designed to take advantage of new research on learning and new applications of information technology (O’Banion, 1999, p. 3). O’Banion continues that the transformation into the Learning Revolution will require great philosophical changes that have been embedded in our colleges. Most community colleges currently place a strong value on teaching yet rarely mention “learning” in their mission statements. It is important to note that “the current reform effort does not ask institutions to place less value on teaching or other missions, but to review their statements and reward systems to ensure that learning is valued as visibly as teaching and other missions…. For community colleges that want to become more learning centered, it will make a difference in policies, programs and practices if learning is embedded in the institutional culture as the highest priority” (O’Banion, 1999, p. 2).

The creation of an emerging vision could be a central activity in moving a college towards becoming a Learning College. O’Banion (1997a) states that “the vision statement for the Learning College is the guiding star by which leaders will steer their activities” (p. 21). Yet these
new policies and alternate vision could be difficult to change in a community college and it is important that the college is careful to research its needs and articulate its vision to all stakeholders. “The reality is that solutions to postsecondary education policy problems are seldom achieved in the absence of either collective understanding of the problem or widespread agreement that the problem is identified is of sufficiently high priority to be addressed” (Education Commission of the States, 1999, p. 8). It is also important, as actions are implemented that move the college towards a reconstruct into a “Learning College,” to be careful to always consider the following questions: “1) Does this action improve and expand learning?, and 2) How do we know this action improves and expands learning?” (O’Banion, 1999, p. 2).

The current college structure provides “no space and support for redesigned learning environments or for experimenting with alternative learning technologies, … [it also does not] provide for, warrant, or reward assessing whether student learning has occurred or is improving” (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 8). Shulman (1999) has outlined four basic models that could be implemented into a “Learning College” to promote teaching and learning. The first model has the Teaching Academy as an interdisciplinary center that draws all faculty members in from different disciplines who have an interest in enhancing their own teaching and learning. The second model would locate the Teaching Academy within a graduate school and/or education program within the institution as a component of their mission in the preparation of teachers. A third model would be to organize the Teaching Academy around the use of technology and the use of technology in teaching and learning. Finally, Schulman discussed the possibility of a distributed Teaching Academy that would exist in isolation within each discipline or culture in the college.
Regardless of the physical layout, for movement towards a Learning College to occur, the philosophical culture and principles of the college must change and its direction must move in such away to continually align it with the efforts of promoting learning. O’Banion (1999) recognizes the importance of celebrating changes and accomplishments on the path towards the movement towards a Learning College indicating that it is a “good idea to develop a culture of celebration that recognizes milestones of special achievement…[since] most staff will not join the long journey unless they can see results along the way, preferably during the early stages” (p. 36). The philosophical changes at the college must permeate all levels and all areas of the college for all stakeholders to embrace the idea of placing learning first in every facet of the college.

**Instructional Changes**

O’Banion (1999) outlined six key principles that must be in existence in a Learning College. The first five are listed below and the sixth one will be addressed in the next section on accountability:

- “The Learning College creates substantive change in individual learners.
- The Learning College engages learners in the learning process as full partners who must assume primary responsibility for their own choices.
- The Learning College creates and offers as many options for learning as possible.
- The Learning College assists learners to form and participate in collaborative learning activities.
- The Learning College defines the roles of learning facilitators in response to the needs of the learners.” (p. 5)
All five of these principles encompass a model of a Learning College that is designed “based on the assumption that [the] educational experiences are designed for the convenience of learners rather than the convenience of institutions and their staffs” (O’Banion, 1999, p. 5).

Barr and Tagg (1995) echoed this theory when they compared the difference between an Instruction Paradigm and a Learning Paradigm stating that the “Learning Paradigm prescribes no one ‘answer’ to the question of how to organize learning environments and experiences. It supports any learning method and structure that works, where ‘works’ is defined in terms of learning outcomes, not as the degree of conformity to an ideal classroom archetype. In fact, the Learning Paradigm requires a constant search for new structures and methods that work better for student learning and success, and expects even these to be redesigned continually and to evolve over time” (p. 8). They went on to identify differences in both the teaching/learning structures of the Instruction Paradigm and the Learning Paradigm as well as differences in the learning theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching/Learning Structures</th>
<th>Instruction Paradigm</th>
<th>Learning Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atomistic; parts prior to whole</td>
<td>Holistic; whole prior to parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time held constant, 3-unit courses</td>
<td>Learning held constant, time varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-minute lecture, 3-unit course</td>
<td>Learning environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classes start/end at the same time</td>
<td>Environments ready when student is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One teacher, one classroom</td>
<td>Whatever learning experience works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent disciplines, departments</td>
<td>Cross discipline/department, collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covering material</td>
<td>Specified learning results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-course assessment</td>
<td>Pre/during/post assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading within classes by instructors</td>
<td>External evaluations of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private assessment</td>
<td>Public assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree equals accumulated credit hours</td>
<td>Degree equals demonstrated knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Paradigm</th>
<th>Learning Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge exists “out there”</td>
<td>- Knowledge exists in each person’s mind and is shaped by individual experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge comes in “chunks” and “bits” delivered by instructors</td>
<td>- Knowledge is constructed, created, and “gotten” by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning is cumulative and linear</td>
<td>- Learning is a nesting and interacting of frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fits the storehouse of knowledge metaphor</td>
<td>- Fits learning how to ride a bicycle metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning is teacher centered and controlled</td>
<td>- Learning is student centered and controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Live” teacher, “live” students required</td>
<td>- “Active” learner required, but not “live” teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The classroom and learning are competitive and individualistic</td>
<td>- Learning environments and learning are cooperative, collaborative, and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Talent and ability are rare</td>
<td>- Talent and ability are abundant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Instructional Paradigm vs. Learning Paradigm**  
Source: Barr & Tagg, 1995.

Yet, there is great difficulty in training instructors to redesign their classrooms in an effort to move towards the Learning Paradigm. In a 1990 study within Washington State’s community college system, it was found that the single most desired faculty development activity was in training the faculty to work with and understand the needs of the students (Outcalt, 2001). This study also found that most faculty members do not have the time to take advantage of such professional development activities, even if they are available. Thus, it would appear that for college to move their faculty towards becoming more learning-centered, they need to change the mindset/philosophy of the faculty, offer the necessary training and facilities, and allow for development time for the faculty members to have the opportunity to truly learn the methods necessary to best enhance learning.
Accountability

According to Hutchings and Schulman (1999), “a scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of ‘going meta,’ in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning – the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth – and do so with an eye not only to improving their own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it” (p. 12). Thus, ongoing assessment of this shift towards becoming a Learning College is required. As Palomba and Banta (1999) stated, “assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development” (p. 4).

O’Banion (1999) also included accountability as the sixth principle that must be in existence for a Learning College: “The Learning College and its learning facilitators succeed only when improved and expanded learning can be documented” (p. 10). Banta (2002) concludes that assessment should be used for the purpose of improving student learning by stating that “there is now broad agreement among accrediting agencies, disciplinary and professional associations, administrators, and faculty opinion leaders that improving student learning is (or should be) the primary goal of assessment” (p. 188).

“The college devoted to learning first identifies the knowledge and skills it expects its graduates to possess, without regard to any particular curriculum or educational experiences. It then determines how to assess them reliably” (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 9). Thus, the use of outcomes indicators can be implemented as a method to measure institutional effectiveness.
Gaither, Nedwek and Neal identified the intended goals of outcomes indicators as “to require institutions of higher education to demonstrate accountability and achievement of their missions and goals” (p. 2). A related concept of community college effectiveness has been defined similarly as “the capacity of a college to match its results with its mission and the needs of its stakeholders within the limits of costs and available resources” (Alfred, Ewell, Hudgins, & McClenney, 1999, p. 9). Both definitions seem to emphasize that there are three important, interrelated components of effectiveness: the mission of the colleges, the results of assessment, and the needs of the stakeholders.

![Core Concepts in Institutional Effectiveness](image)

**Figure 1. Core Concepts in Institutional Effectiveness**

The assessment process can be tedious and time-consuming yet it is necessary to move a college in the direction of becoming a Learning College. “Creating a Learning College is, in part, a journey into the unknown. Evaluating activities along the way is necessary to gauge progress...
and make corrections. Only by evaluating what is happening and what has been achieved will community colleges be able to develop models of the Learning College that others will want to emulate” (O’Banion, 1999, p. 35).

**Conclusion**

Thus, it appears as though to embrace the changes in the age of the Learning Revolution, a college must undergo many internal changes. They must change their philosophy or paradigm to match that of a Learning College – they must continually focus on the goal of improving learning in every facet of their institution. Instruction must change to be more learning-centered and must be on the constant hunt for new and better structures and methods for learning success. Finally, there must be measurement and accountability at all levels of the college to ensure that the college is moving in the desired direction.
Additional Research

This project was focused on collecting information from various sources that would provide the KQIP Faculty Development Team with the necessary background and data to create the best faculty development process possible at Kirkwood Community College. There are three main objectives for this project:

- **Objective 1: Physical/Web Presence.**
  Collect data on the physical and web presence of other faculty development programs as well as the physical and web needs of Kirkwood Community College.

- **Objective 2: Staff.**
  Collect data on the current staffing of other faculty development programs as well as the staffing needs of Kirkwood Community College.

- **Objective 3: Culture.**
  Collect data on the campus culture surrounding the other faculty development programs as well as any cultural concerns at Kirkwood Community College.

There are four target groups for the collection of data related to the aforementioned objectives. These sources of data have been grouped as either external to Kirkwood Community College or internal.

**INTERNAL:**

Target Group 1: Kirkwood faculty

*Data Collection Methodologies: Survey of full-time and adjunct faculty and focus groups of probationary faculty.*
EXTERNAL:

Target Group 2: The eleven other Vanguard Learning Colleges
Target Group 3: The core members of the League for Innovation
Target Group 4: Other local community colleges and other institutions of higher education

Data Collection Methodologies: Internet research and a site visit.

Survey and Focus Group Findings

In November and December of 2004, eight focus groups containing sixty new faculty members met and the following are a series of recommendations involving the New Teacher Workshop and Faculty Orientation:

- In general, this audience should be treated as you would expect Kirkwood teachers to treat their students. They should be treated as busy, intelligent professionals.
- The entire process (all components) should be broken apart and re-built as you would have faculty develop a curriculum for a new class.
- Presentation of information should be done in a manner becoming the presenters and, importantly, the audience.
- One new faculty plan with all its mapped-out components should be presented to new faculty at the time of their hire and should begin with the college mission.
- In lieu of what is reported as a “hodgepodge” of college information, one “FAQ” booklet should be prepared and distributed.
• Cohort socialization is considered a key attribute of the process and should be enhanced and encouraged.

• New faculty desire to know “their college,” yet is lacking considerable information about many aspects of Kirkwood.

• The mentor program is in need of considerable re-working beginning with providing mentors with concise goals.

• Implementation of many aspects of the programs varies considerably by department and said inconsistency is very well known and, as a result, is problematic.

• The program components now in place are more often than not perceived as an “endurance test.”

• These people want to be good/better instructors and teachers. They will appreciate any help you can provide them and balk at obstacles to that goal.

• The college needs to consider whether the gender mix of faculty is being met with perhaps too “female” an approach.

• The most often (every group) descriptor used to describe some aspects of the programs under study was “redundant.”

• Significant confusion is present on the topic, goals, and inconsistent implementation of the portfolio process.

• Most feel that the programs have been “cobbled together” and are desirous of some semblance of (a) one plan, (b) non-redundant components, and (c) consistent implementation throughout the Instruction Branch.
Also, in a January 2005 survey of faculty, in which 157 full-time faculty (60%) and 103 adjunct faculty (40%) responded, the following was found:

- 69% indicated that they would be interested in training on pedagogical theories (theories of learning, motivation, and instruction) related to the implementation of learning technologies (i.e., software applications, Internet) in their courses,
- 65% would like an e-mail spam training course,
- 64% would be interested in training on how to “hybridize” their courses,
- of those teaching Internet Anytime/Anywhere, 73% would be interested in training on how they could assess the effectiveness and quality of the course and 77% would be interested in training on how to better retain students in their courses,
- 75% of the adjunct faculty would like a web development training session just for them,
- and 97% of faculty either agree or strongly agree that Kirkwood should develop a process by which technology products and services can be brought in-house for implementation consideration.

Overall, although Kirkwood does have many components necessary for quality faculty development in place, they appear to be decentralized and in need of structure and organization. It appears as though some sort of cohesive, consistent dissemination of faculty development programs is needed at Kirkwood Community College.
Internet Research Findings

Of the eleven other Vanguard Learning Colleges, the core members of the League for Innovation, and the Iowa community colleges, local 4-year colleges, and state universities, it was found that many of these schools had a strong web presence pertaining to faculty development. Upon further inspection, it was found that eight of these schools also had physical “centers” for faculty to use in their development aspirations. These schools are:

Community Colleges:

- Community College of Baltimore County
- Community College of Denver
- Johnson County Community College
- Maricopa Community College
- St. Louis Community College

4-Year Colleges:

- Iowa State University
- University of Iowa
- University of Northern Iowa

The KQIP Faculty Development Team felt that it was important to look closer at these centers to see what types of activities were included therein. It was quickly found that the 4-year colleges had activities within their centers that were not conducive to a community college environment and the focus was switched to the community colleges. All five centers housed the faculty development and adjunct faculty development activities.
Additionally, four of the five centers hosted computer-training centers, two hosted their new faculty-training program, two hosted a mentor program, and one hosted teaching circles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Center Name</th>
<th>Computer Training</th>
<th>New Faculty Training</th>
<th>Mentor Program</th>
<th>Teaching Circles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Baltimore County</td>
<td>The Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Denver</td>
<td>Teaching/Learning Center (T/LC)</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Community College</td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)</td>
<td>Distance Learning Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Community College</td>
<td>Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction (mcli)</td>
<td>Instructional Design / Technology</td>
<td>Offers New Faculty Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Community College</td>
<td>Center for Teaching &amp; Learning (CTL)</td>
<td>Offers Computer Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Elements of Faculty Development Centers

It was also found that these centers varied in their staffing from having one to three full-time staff members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Center Name</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Baltimore County</td>
<td>The Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence</td>
<td>1 Coordinator and 1 Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Denver</td>
<td>Teaching/Learning Center (T/LC)</td>
<td>Instructional Designer and 2 other staff in charge of computer and adjunct training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Community College</td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)</td>
<td>1 Faculty Director (2-year appointment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Community College</td>
<td>Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction (mcli)</td>
<td>Director, Instructional Technologist, Office Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Community College</td>
<td>Center for Teaching &amp; Learning (CTL)</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Staffing of Faculty Development Centers

Site Visit Findings

To get a better understanding of these centers, it was decided that it would be necessary to visit the site of a successful center. The findings of this site visit will be discussed in a later section of this report.
Site Visit

Background

“She whole professional career is a learning journey.”
Parkland College

Parkland College is a two-year community college in Champaign, Illinois, that has provided both vocational-technical and transfer programs to its area residents since 1966. Currently, more than 11,600 credit and noncredit students attend Parkland College. Parkland College houses an award-winning Center for Excellence that “empowers professionals to address challenges while fostering the scholarship of teaching student services” (per the Center’s mission statement).

The Kirkwood KQIP Faculty Development Team met with Executive Director Fay Rouseff-Baker and the other staff of the Center in February of 2005. The Team was also provided a tour of the Center facilities and met with many faculty members of Parkland College. It was the hope that this site visit would provide the team with more insight as to how to centralize the faculty development initiatives at Kirkwood as well as with ideas on additional faculty development programs that could be implemented. The 2004-2005 KQIP Faculty Development Team strongly recommends taking steps towards developing a Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching similar to the one found at Parkland College.
Center History

“The Center is a powerful recruiting tool and it allows us to recruit faculty who know we’re about teaching and learning.”
Parkland College

(Per Parkland College website)

The Center for Excellence is an agile and responsive professional development system driven by the people, and strongly supported by the administration at Parkland College. After President Zelema Harris proposed the idea for a faculty center in 1991, a team of faculty designed a system to address the ever-changing needs of the faculty and staff at Parkland.

The chronological history of the Center is as follows:

- In 1994 a committee comprised of Parkland faculty and Department Chairs selected the current director, Fay Rouseff-Baker.
- The PCA Professional Development Committee for Faculty Concerns became the Advisory Board to the Center for Excellence.
- That same year, the Mentoring Program was first piloted; this remains a successful support system to this day.
- In 1996, the Classroom Assessment and Research initiative was piloted; the courses that make up this initiative are still offered every semester.
- In response to faculty request, the Instructional Strategies and Techniques Workshops and the Learning Issues Seminars were begun in 1997.
- The New Full-Time Faculty Orientation program was initiated in 1998 to meet the needs of the growing number of new faculty.
• In 2000, the Faculty Academy was launched, allowing Parkland College faculty to obtain credit for attendance at approved Center for Excellence programs.

• In Summer 2004, the Distance and Virtual Learning Unit of Parkland College merged under the Center for Excellence department to ensure support for online faculty and students.

• In April 2004, the Parkland College Board of Trustees approved the new position "Professional Development Coordinator for Staff and Faculty," in order to increase and enhance staff programming, and further support faculty programming.

Center Components and Programming

“The Center has been designed with multiple points of entry.”
Parkland College

(Per Parkland College website)

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning has six major components in place for Parkland College faculty and staff:

• a New Full-Time Faculty Orientation course,

• a Mentoring Program,

• Classroom Assessment and Research courses,

• Learning Issues Seminars,

• Instructional Strategies and Techniques (IST) Workshops, and

• Discussions.
The Center for Excellence also hosts other learning opportunities throughout the semester, particularly during the Preparation and Development Week that proceeds each semester.

The Center for Excellence offers multiple options for participants to learn more about teaching, learning, and workplace issues. All programming is designed in response to faculty and staff requests, and incorporate classical and useful learning theories based on solid research. Sessions are taught by recognized volunteer faculty and staff facilitators. The delivery options vary in modes of time commitment in order to best meet the needs of busy faculty and staff. Participation is not mandatory, yet the participation numbers prove that Parkland faculty are committed to improving student learning by keeping on the front lines of teaching and workplace excellence.

Facility

“This is a place to relax, sit down, and rejuvenate. A lot of teachers use this Center as a ‘safe place’ to come and ask questions.”

Parkland College

In 2001, Parkland College built a new facility to house the Center for Excellence. This facility includes both a conference room as well as a large training room. Additionally, there is an adjacent computer training room and another open workroom. The conference room, seen in Figure 2, had a round conference table in the middle of the room. There were also comfortable lounge chairs with books and other resources around the room. In one corner was a small computer area with three computers and the other
corner had a kitchenette with coffee and, occasionally, snacks. There was soft music playing in the room and an assortment of music CD’s available.

The large training room also had a table in the middle of it with a screen and whiteboard for presentations. What was most evident in this room was the wall with the many pictures of those who had participated in the training sessions in the past.
The computer training room contained fourteen computers for training or for instructors to come work on during their free time. This room also had an e-whiteboard in the front
of the room and had the Director of Distance and Virtual Learning located directly across
the hall to assist faculty as needed.
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**Staffing**

“This place is such a place of positive energy. People walk in and want to know more about their job and walk out invigorated and more excited about their job.”

*Parkland College*

The Parkland College Center for Excellence is staffed by four full-time positions: an executive director, a professional development coordinator, a director of distance and virtual learning, and an online student support coordinator. It became evident by everyone interviewed during the site visit that the staffing of the Center was vitally important to its success. The executive director was affirming to all individuals and treated everyone with a great deal of respect. She stated, “It’s okay to fail in here and be honest about what you’ve tried and doesn’t work. This is a politically neutral, safe place to come.”
Parkland College’s Center for Excellence also has an Advisory Board that provides advice and guidance to the staff throughout the year.

Evaluation

“All faculty members who complain are really crying for help.”

Parkland College

(Per Parkland College website)

A study of final reports from the Introduction to Classroom Assessment and Research course offered through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning was done by Parkland faculty member Gina Walls in Spring of 2002 in order to gauge the impact that participation in Center for Excellence programming has on student learning at Parkland College.

In the seventy-eight reports examined, a total of 150 comments reported clear and strong evidence of changes in teaching as a result of participation in the process of classroom assessment. Every faculty member reported at least one significant change in teaching, while most reported at least two. These comments showed evidence of the following changes:

- increased learner centeredness,
- changes in teaching strategies,
- more efficient use of instructional time,
- increased active learning,
- improved metacognition,
- improved positive affect toward learning,
• enhanced academic confidence,
• acquisition of new knowledge, and
• development of new skills.

In summary, these seventy-eight faculty improved their ability to reach and teach their students. They became more learner centered. This directly benefited the students in their courses at the time of the project and more than likely will continue to positively affect students being taught by these faculty today and in years to come.

In addition to the improvements seen by their own faculty, this Center has won numerous accolades and awards such as:

• The 2001 Futures Assembly Bellwether Award Finalist: Recognition as one of the top ten instructional programs in the nation
• League for Innovation: Learning College Champion, 2001
• The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness: 1998 David Pierce Leadership Award
• The Illinois Community College Board: 1994 Award for Excellence in Teaching and Learning: Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
• The Illinois Community College Board 1998 Award for Excellence in Teaching and Learning: Classroom Assessment and Research Initiative
• Parkland’s CARI program was described by K. Patricia Cross in Developing Professional Fitness through Classroom Assessment and Research, The Cross Papers Number 1 as an outstanding example of an ongoing delivery system of Classroom Assessment and Research in 1997
Recommendations

“The Center is by you, for you.”
Parkland College

When the executive director was asked if she had any parting recommendations to our team before we left Parkland College, she offered the following advice:

- hire a great director that is really there for the needs of the college,
- build the facilities to accommodate you in the future, not just for your current needs,
- infuse the Center into so many pieces of the college that it would be hard for the college to ever get by without it, and
- be sure to always remember that the Center is for the people and must try to include as many people as possible in both the planning and the implementation phases.
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Proposal

1. Beginning in the Summer of 2005, this team recommends that Kirkwood offers a faculty member 6 credit hours release time per semester to redevelop the New Faculty Orientation/Mentor Program (see Job Description in Appendix H).

2. It is also recommended that, throughout the 2005-06 academic year, this new position will work with small groups of people and survey both full-time and adjunct faculty to identify their development needs. This new position will begin laying the groundwork for a physical center and begin working towards creating a web presence for faculty development needs.

3. Additionally, throughout the 2005-06 academic year, it is the recommendation of this team that the college start to build an Advisory Committee made up of at least one representative from each department.

4. It is the long-term recommendation of this team that a physical center be designated or built in a centralized location that could exist for all faculty and staff development needs and would eventually be staffed with full-time positions, as needed.
Assessment/Expectations

A. Assessment of New Faculty Orientation/ Mentor Program

- In the fall of 2004 focus groups were held with new faculty involved in the program. The results of these focus groups were documented and the same faculty will be surveyed to obtain numerical “level of satisfaction” scores for the process.

- In the Fall 2006/Spring 2007 focus groups will be scheduled and results documented. Surveys of the same faculty will be repeated and then analyzed for areas that have improved and areas that need continued improvement.

B. Assessment of Faculty Development Center

1. Each faculty development activity will be assessed by participants. Strengths and areas to improve will be identified and taken into account when planning future faculty development opportunities.

2. Participation totals per fiscal year
   
   i. Percent of faculty who attend one workshop
   
   ii. Percent of faculty who use the center 3 or more times

3. Effects on student learning

   All faculty who use the center 3 or more times will be surveyed to determine effects on student learning in their classroom, or improved effectiveness and efficiency of their preparation for their classroom.

4. The website for faculty development will have a hit counter to track usage of each component.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Spring '05</th>
<th>Summer 05</th>
<th>Fall '05</th>
<th>Spring '06</th>
<th>Summer '06</th>
<th>Fall '06</th>
<th>Spring '07</th>
<th>Years 3-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou Lauer, Bob Walker</td>
<td>KQIP team forms and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou Lauer</td>
<td>Job Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou Lauer</td>
<td>Hire Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and Mary Lou Lauer</td>
<td>Revamp and coordinate new faculty orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Mary Lou Lauer, KCEL Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Find a temporary home for KCEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, KCEL Advisory Board, Mary Lou Lauer</td>
<td>Establish measurable objectives for KCEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Quality Faculty Plan Committee</td>
<td>Work with Quality Faculty Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Mary Lou Lauer, Lois Nanke</td>
<td>Start planning a permanent home for KCEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Faculty Development Committee</td>
<td>Work with faculty to develop and implement a plan for faculty development for all faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Short Term 1 – 2 Years</strong></th>
<th><strong>Long Term 3+ Years</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release time/Semester</td>
<td>$13,500/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>% To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Training</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups Survey Tabulation/Classroom Research</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Materials/Supplies</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources Budget**</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing: Brochures</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads in Communique</td>
<td>Ads in Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Handbooks/ Tech Manuals</td>
<td>Faculty Handbooks? Tech Manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Fund/Honorarium/ Training Services</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Budget/Conf. Budget (out-of-state/ in-state)</td>
<td>$8,000/ $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Mentor Stipends</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design Consulting</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate Learning &amp; Awards/Wall of Honor</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Expenses</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Conference State-wide</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICN Fees Budget</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Series/Annually</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated total amount = $55,700 plus amounts to be determined**

*We are seeking approval of the basic concept from the steering committee. Final figures for a budget would need approval once fully developed.  
**How about build a new Library/Labs and give KCELT the present centrally located space?
## How this Project Meets the Nine AQIP Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>How Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Helping students learn</td>
<td>Students learn best from instructors who are current in their disciplines, aware of appropriate pedagogies, assessment techniques, learning styles, instructional design and teaching methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Accomplishing other distinct objectives</td>
<td>Faculty will have a safe place to go to improve their teaching, assessment, learning styles and instructional methods, therefore. Information about faculty development activities will also be more accessible and therefore better used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Understanding students’ and other stakeholders’ needs</td>
<td>By having a Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, we are focusing on the learning and improving the teaching of all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Valuing people</td>
<td>Valuing individual and individual learning styles, understanding learning styles and designing courses curriculum to take into account learning styles, we are valuing the students as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Leading and communicating</td>
<td>The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching will be lead by faculty for faculty with the mission to improve student learning. Web presence and flyers will be created to improve communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supporting institutional operations</td>
<td>Institutional commitment and support will communicate to all faculty that excellence in learning and teaching is a major priority of Kirkwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Measuring effectiveness</td>
<td>Data will be collected on number of faculty served, surveys and focus groups will be conducted with new faculty and existing faculty to measure effectiveness and develop continual improvement plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Planning continuous improvements</td>
<td>Feedback from users, CCSSE data, surveys and focus groups will be used to determine needs and wants for continuous improvement. A faculty advisory committee will be established for input on continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Building collaborative relationships</td>
<td>Faculty development activities will be designed to encourage collaboration and help foster collegiality within and across departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Steering Committee Feedback

Team name: Faculty Development  
Team Co-Sponsors: Mary Lou Lauer & Bob Walker  
Date: April 15, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea for Improvement</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beginning in the Summer of 2005, this team recommends that Kirkwood offers a faculty member 6 credit hours release time per semester to redevelop the New Faculty Orientation/Mentor Program (see Job Description in Appendix H).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is also recommended that, throughout the 2005-06 academic year, this new position will work with small groups of people and survey both full-time and adjunct faculty to identify their development needs. This new position will begin laying the groundwork for a physical center and begin working towards creating a web presence for faculty development needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Additionally, throughout the 2005-06 academic year, it is the recommendation of this team that the college start to build an Advisory Committee made up of at least one representative from each department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is the long-term recommendation of this team that a physical center be designated or built in a centralized location that could exist for all faculty and staff development needs and would eventually be staffed with full-time positions, as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Guidelines for Faculty Professional Development Awards

KIRKWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION AND AWARDS

I. Purpose

The purpose of the Faculty Professional Development Program is to support professional development activities for intellectual stimulation or technical updating as requested by members of the faculty. The purpose of these activities is to enhance the educational program of the college by improving faculty competency. In determining whether or not to recommend a proposal for funding to the Vice President, Instruction, the committee may consider the merits of the proposal, the frequency with which the applicant has used faculty professional development funds, and the amount of funds available.

II. Committee Membership

The Faculty Professional Development Committee will consist of eight members: four faculty members appointed by the Kirkwood Faculty Association and four administrators appointed by the president of the college. All members serve on three-year rotation basis.

III. Committee Meetings

The Faculty Professional Development Committee will meet five times during the calendar year to consider requests from faculty for professional development awards. Special meetings may be scheduled at the discretion of the chairperson. Appointment of new members shall be in April prior to the spring meeting of the committee. New members’ first attendance will be at the spring meeting.

IV. Award Categories

The committee has established four award categories for the purpose of activities that will be considered for funding. These categories are (A) individual awards, (B) group awards, (C) the professional extension program, and (D) residency leaves.

A. Individual Awards

Individual awards may be granted for the following activities:
1. relevant educational course work
2. individual projects focused on scholarly or creative research or assessment
3. individual projects demonstrating artistry, creativity or innovation
4. updating or expanding knowledge in a subject field
5. travel necessary to fulfill individual project requirements
6. conferences, meetings, workshops and seminars
7. job shadowing
8. publication of research (funds may be used to pay a scholarly or professional journal’s “per page” fees)

B. Group Awards

Projects involving a number of faculty may be submitted by departments, a group of faculty within a department, or an interdisciplinary group of faculty who have identified a common professional development activity. (Proposals where more than one faculty member requests the same activity and requires separate funding should be submitted on the application form as individual awards.)

The Faculty Professional Development Committee may also sponsor group activities as demonstrated by a faculty needs analysis, or on the recommendation of an administrator, or as a way of efficiently combining similar requests from individuals or groups.

Group awards may be granted for the following activities:

1. visits to other colleges or work settings
2. visits to campus by consultants, content specialists, scholars (funds may be used to cover the cost of stipends including honorariums, travel, food and lodging; Kirkwood faculty may be compensated for expenses related to hosting or participating in these activities)
3. working retreats
4. experimental curriculum projects (not routine curriculum activities)
5. seminars conducted by Kirkwood faculty or staff
6. courses offered by another college or university on the Kirkwood campus
7. research designed to provide useful data for a specific department, division or the college as a whole

Initiating or participating in any group activity does not affect a faculty member’s eligibility for one individual award or professional extension leave every 24 months.

Beginning Fall 2001, the committee will set aside a dollar amount to fund group projects. The committee will provide funding of up to $3,000.00 per project, with a total of $12,000.00 set aside for this purpose. Applications for these projects will be accepted at the April, June, September and November deadlines, with projects meeting the guidelines being funded on a first-come, first-funded basis. Any money unencumbered after the November meeting will be returned to the committee’s general fund. Projects eligible for this special funding are listed
below. The maximum funding for group projects not listed below remains the equivalent of three credit hours at the maximum part-time rate.

Group awards funded by set-aside dollars may be granted for the following activities:

1. visits to campus by consultants, content specialists, or scholars. (funds may cover the cost of honorariums, travel, food and lodging; Kirkwood faculty may be compensated for expenses related to hosting or participating in the activity)
2. working retreats
3. seminars conducted by Kirkwood faculty or staff

C. Professional Extension Program

Professional Extension Program leaves may be awarded for faculty wishing to pursue the following activities:

1. service to the college
2. research and publication
3. curriculum and materials development
4. planned and approved travel related to the subject field
5. practical training or job experience in subject-related field
6. updating of knowledge in subject field

Note: The professional extension program provides opportunities for faculty to learn and grow in their discipline and profession. It may be used to attend a workshop if active participation is a requirement established by the workshop planners, and if the workshop lasts a minimum of three full days. (Two additional days may be used for travel.) Faculty who wish to attend a conference in which their active participation is not required, should apply for an individual award.

A letter of support from business, industry or the college must accompany requests for leave to pursue service to the college, practical training or job experience in subject-related field, or updating of knowledge in subject field. This letter should include verification that the number of days requested is appropriate.

At the September meeting the committee may vote to set aside a certain amount of the committee’s funds for Professional Extension activities. If any of the money set aside remains uncommitted by the June meeting, the committee may return those funds to the regular pool. The committee reserves the right to award more or fewer days than requested.

D. Residency Leave

Faculty doing course work toward an advanced degree may request a one-half time leave for one full semester to complete an on-campus residency requirement. Faculty requesting the leave
must have been accepted into a graduate program and be a full-time student during the semester the leave is awarded. Documents verifying that these conditions have been met should be included with the application.

While on leave, the faculty member shall receive two-thirds of his or her per diem salary. Funds for this leave are not drawn from the Faculty Professional Development fund established in the master contract.

No more than two residency leaves may be approved during any one semester.

V. Faculty Contract Days

A. When a faculty member submits a proposal in which the activity takes place on assigned contract days, appropriate arrangements must be made between the faculty member and his/her immediate supervisor to see that all teaching and other assigned responsibilities have been covered.

B. If a faculty member submits a proposal which does not fall within the faculty member’s contract periods, the faculty member cannot claim those days spent on the activity as contract days unless prior arrangements were agreed upon between the faculty member and the immediate supervisor. When the college requests a faculty member to participate in a faculty development activity during a non-contract period, the college will determine whether working days may be assigned for participating in the activity. If the faculty member disagrees with the administrative decision, he or she can refuse to participate in the activity.

C. Proposals submitted for the Professional Extension Program cannot include days already designated as contract days. For the Professional Extension Program, awards to faculty on a 174-day contract will be a five (5) to twenty-nine (29) day summer extended contract; awards to faculty on a 201-day contract will be for five (5) to twenty-nine (29) days through summer release time or extended contract.

D. A request for release time from a teaching assignment for summer or fall semesters must be submitted by the February deadline. A request for release time from teaching in spring semester must be made by the September deadline.

VI. Funding Guidelines

A. Individual and Group Categories
Maximum funding for individual and group award categories will be limited to three semester hours of release time from assigned teaching duties for a period of one semester or the equivalent monetary award of three semester hours at the maximum part-time rate. No overloads will be allowed during any semester when release time is scheduled.
B. Professional Extension Program
Maximum funding for Professional Extension leaves will be five (5) to twenty-nine (29) days at the faculty member’s regular per diem rate.

The award for curriculum and materials development shall not exceed an amount consistent with compensation for similar activities carried out as part of regular teaching load (not overload).

If a faculty member is paid by another employer in the course of a professional extension leave, he or she must turn that salary over to the college to receive the per diem rate.

C. Concurrent Awards
Faculty may receive individual awards concurrently with Professional Extension leaves or Residency leaves for the same project if the requests are complementary, not duplicatory.

VII. Application Procedures

A. Applications for professional development awards are available from the secretary of the committee and shall be submitted to the secretary for forwarding to Faculty Professional Development Committee members.

B. Applicants are encouraged to contact committee members for assistance in filling out the application form.

C. The following are the established deadlines for submitting requests. The committee strongly encourages application be completed in a timely manner before the event. There is no guarantee that something will be funded after the fact.

1. the fourth Friday of September
2. the third Friday of November
3. the third Friday of February
4. the third Friday of April
5. the third Friday of June

D. An individual faculty member will be eligible for an individual or professional extension leave only once in a 24-month period, counting from the time the project begins. If undistributed funds remain at the end of the year, this restriction may be waived. The 24-month interval does not apply to faculty who have received a residency leave and wish to apply for group or individual awards or professional extension leave. Nor does it apply to faculty who have sponsored or participated in a group award.

E. Final reports must be submitted before application will be accepted for another award.

F. All requests will be submitted on the application form. Supporting documents may be requested for certain activities. Please see “Section IV: Award Categories” for more information.
G. The following activities are funded from department or other budgets, and cannot be funded as individual or group projects with Faculty Professional Development funds:

1. proposals requesting a cash stipend for the purchase of texts, software or other course materials
2. proposals requesting release time for the review of texts, software or other course materials
3. proposals requesting release time for curriculum development or revision including those which incorporate technology components
4. proposals requesting individualized software training when that training could be more efficiently delivered to groups of interested faculty

H. The Vice President, Instruction, or the chair of the Faculty Professional Development Committee will be responsible for letting faculty know if their proposals have been approved. Minutes of Faculty Professional Development Committee meetings will be distributed to all academic departments.
Appendix B: Teaching Circles Application

Teaching Circles

Revised July 2003

Any full-time instructor is welcome to propose a Teaching Circle on a topic of interest likely to promote learning among the faculty. Adjuncts are welcome to co-propose with a fulltime faculty member and to participate in the Circles. Previous and current topics have included Classroom Assessment Techniques, Small Group Facilitation, Process Learning, Service Learning, and Formation.

Generally, Teaching Circles are organized following these steps:

1. A topic of interest is identified. The Teaching Circle may focus on a book of interest to the group.
2. Participants are solicited.
3. An initial meeting or seminar is scheduled, possibly involving an expert in the field.
4. Faculty meet regularly during the semester following the initial meeting to further discuss and study the topic. When appropriate, related techniques and principles are applied in the participants’ classrooms.
5. A report on the activities of the Teaching Circle and an assessment of its effectiveness is prepared and distributed to all faculty.
6. A Teaching Circle may be continued into a second semester depending on the interest of participants and other faculty.

The one or two faculty serving as coordinators for a Teaching Circle are compensated at one credit hour per semester at the maximum part time rate. Fulltime faculty participants may apply the hours toward professional renewal, and adjuncts are paid a stipend, the amount varying with the scope of the circle.

The Instruction Branch will consider supporting up to four Teaching Circles a semester, including the cost of an overload for the coordinator/s, stipends for adjunct faculty attending the circle, materials, expenses associated with bringing in a consultant, and other related expenses. To propose a Teaching Circle, please complete the application on the back of this sheet. This information and the application are also available electronically on the H:faculty drive in the Faculty Development folder.
Appendix C: Quality Faculty Plan and Probation

The Quality Faculty Plan and Probation

History and Purpose
In April of 2002, the Iowa legislature determined that local boards, not the State, should be responsible for guaranteeing the quality of community college faculty. Each of the fifteen community colleges was charged with developing a plan to meet local needs while adhering to NCA and State accreditation standards. The committee who drafted Kirkwood’s plan included eight faculty members selected by the Kirkwood Faculty Association, three instruction branch administrators, and a representative from Human Resources.

Competencies
The Kirkwood Quality Faculty Plan Committee drew upon national and state teacher standards to develop a list of twelve competencies that new Kirkwood faculty are expected to demonstrate. These competencies have been accepted by the Faculty Association, the deans, and the Board of Trustees. Competencies can be demonstrated through experience, education or a combination of the two, as agreed to by the dean and instructor and approved by the Quality Faculty Plan Committee (see “Preparing Your Professional Preparation Plan” below.)

For Instructors
1. **Student Learning** The instructor understands how students learn, and provides learning opportunities that support their intellectual, career, and social development.
2. **Diverse Learners** The instructor understands how students differ in their approaches to learning, both individually and culturally, and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners.
3. **Instructional Planning** The instructor plans instruction based on understanding of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals and standards.
4. **Instructional Strategies** The instructor understands and uses appropriate instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.
5. **Learning Environment/Classroom Management** The instructor uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
6. **Communication** The instructor uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques, and other forms of symbolic representation, to foster active inquiry and collaboration, and support interaction in educational settings.
7. **Assessment** The instructor understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate student learning.
8. **Professional Development** The instructor continually reflects on and assesses the effects of his or her choices and actions on others, and actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally by maintaining professional competency in his or her field of expertise.
9. **Collaboration, Ethics and Relationships**  The instructor fosters professional relationships with students, colleagues and the community to support learning.

10. **Technology Related to Instruction**  The instructor uses appropriate technology in the planning, delivery and assessment of instruction.

11. **Community College**  The instructor understands the mission and history of community colleges and the structure and scope of the community college that employs him or her.

12. **Contribution to the College**  The instructor contributes to the institution through active participation in departmental and institutional tasks.

---

**For Counselors**

1. **Student Learning**  The counselor understands how students learn, and provides learning opportunities that support their intellectual, career, and social development.

2. **Diverse Learners**  The counselor understands how students differ in their approaches to learning, both individually and culturally, and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners.

3. **Instructional Planning**  The counselor plans instruction based on understanding of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals and standards.

4. **Instructional Strategies**  The counselor understands and uses appropriate instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.

5. **Learning Environment/Classroom Management**  The counselor uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

6. **Communication**  The counselor uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques, and other forms of symbolic representation, to foster active inquiry and collaboration, and support interaction in educational settings.

7. **Assessment**  The counselor understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate student learning.

8. **Professional Development**  The counselor continually reflects on and assesses the effects of his or her choices and actions on others, and actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally by maintaining professional competency in his or her field of expertise.

9. **Collaboration, Ethics and Relationships**  The counselor fosters professional relationships with students, colleagues and the community to support learning.

10. **Technology Related to Instruction**  The counselor uses appropriate technology in the planning, delivery and assessment of instruction.

11. **Community College**  The counselor understands the mission and history of community colleges and the structure and scope of the community college that employs him or her.

12. **Contribution to the College**  The counselor contributes to the institution through active participation in departmental and institutional tasks.

13. **Counseling Services**  The counselor understands student development concepts and uses appropriate assessments and counseling techniques.

14. **Crisis Intervention**  The counselor understands the dynamics of a crisis situation and helps meet the concerns of all involved by working closely with students, staff, administration and community agencies.
For Librarians

1. **Student Learning**  The librarian understands how students learn and provides research assistance and instruction, both in person and at a distance, that supports their curricular and personal information needs, that is transferable to other libraries and that promotes life long learning.

2. **Diverse Learners**  The librarian understands how students differ in their approaches to learning, both individually and culturally, and provides research assistance and instruction that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners including those with learning and physical disabilities.

3. **Reference Services**  The librarian understands and practices the principles of approachability, interest, listening and inquiring, searching and follow-up in reference transactions. The librarian helps students and faculty member obtain needed resources that the institution does not itself possess.

4. **Instruction Programs**  The librarian understands and practices the principles of sound program design in the delivery of library orientations including identification of content, identification of modes of instruction and evaluation and assessment.

5. **Diverse and Accurate Resources**  The librarian understands and practices the principles of collection development and maintenance. The librarian understands multicultural issues as they relate to the selection of library materials and makes selections based on the accuracy of the information provided, current and anticipated curricular needs of the college and the representation of diverse viewpoints. The librarian assesses learning resources based on such data as browsing, circulation transactions, document delivery and interlibrary loans and assists in the creation of a regularly updated collection development policy.

6. **Information Access**  The librarian has knowledge of the cataloging and classification of library materials including Marc record format. The librarian has a working knowledge of the hardware and software needed to maintain electronic forms of information storage and retrieval. The librarian uses and instructs students and faculty on the use of print and audio-visual sources and electronic technology appropriate to an individual’s information need including the evaluation of that information regardless of its format. The librarian develops user aids in appropriate formats to help users identify items in the collection relevant to their interest and needs.

7. **Communication**  The librarian provides research assistance and instruction based upon knowledge of community college students, community resources, the College curriculum and library resources.

8. **Professional Development**  The librarian continually reflects on and assesses the effects of his or her choices and actions on others, and actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally by maintaining professional competency.

9. **Collaboration, Ethics and Relationships**  The librarian fosters professional relationships with students, colleagues and the community to support learning. The librarian assists faculty in course development through his or her knowledge of existing resources and the selection of appropriate library materials.

10. **Community College**  The librarian understands the mission and history of community colleges and the structure and scope of the community college that employs him or her.
11. **Contribution to the College**  The librarian contributes to the institution through active participation in departmental and institutional tasks.

**Required Activities for All New Faculty**

The Quality Faculty Plan requires that all new faculty complete two activities: a **new faculty workshop** before beginning instructional duties and a credit or non-credit course in the **history and philosophy of the community college** before the end of the probationary period.

How an instructor meets the requirement for a **new faculty workshop** depends on his or her experience and training, and the preferences of his or her dean. New faculty who have less than three years relevant teaching experience and do not have a degree in education or a teacher’s license must take the three-credit New Teacher Workshop from the University of Iowa. The course is held on the Kirkwood campus, and tuition and fees for the course are paid by the college, this year at least. Check the 2003-2004 calendar for dates and times.

New faculty with more than three-years relevant teaching experience and/or a degree in education or a teacher’s license, may be required to take the New Teacher Workshop at the dean’s discretion. New faculty who don’t take the New Teacher Workshop must attend a one-day Kirkwood sponsored workshop, Teaching at Kirkwood. Check the 2003-2004 calendar for the date and time.

There are currently two options for meeting the **history and philosophy of the community college** requirement. Faculty may take the three-credit Community College class from the University of Iowa, which is usually offered once a year. (Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa offer similar courses on an occasional basis; these courses may also be used to meet this requirement.) The instructor is responsible for any tuition or fees. The second option is to take the non-credit Community College A to Z course, which is offered without charge at Kirkwood usually once a year. (Check the 2003-2004 calendar for dates and times.)

**Preparing Your Professional Preparation Plan**

The dean and the new instructor work out an individualized plan to demonstrate successful attainment of the competencies, then submit the plan to the Quality Faculty Plan Committee. Once the committee approves it, the dean and the instructor are responsible for making sure it’s carried out. Progress toward completing the plan becomes part of the new faculty member’s annual evaluation and is forwarded to the appropriate vice-president for review.

While each plan is unique, new faculty who have fewer than three years relevant teaching experience and do not have a degree in education or a teacher’s license will usually be expected to take a comprehensive course of study, such as the non-credit LeNS program which focuses on developing learning outcomes and competencies, classroom assessment, educational technology, and other relevant topics. (Check the 2003-2004 calendar for dates and times.) LeNS is offered free of charge to Kirkwood faculty. Faculty who wish to pursue a degree may prefer to take credit courses from one of the three regents universities. Your dean or the Director, Learning
Initiatives can help you identify and locate these courses. All costs related to taking these credit courses are the responsibility of the faculty member.

New faculty with more than three-years relevant teaching experience and/or a degree in education or a teacher’s license, may show competency through experience, further education (credit or non-credit), or a combination of the two. You and your dean will work together to create a plan best suited to your needs and interests.

A complete copy of the Quality Faculty Plan is available on the H:Faculty drive in the folder Probationary Faculty. Other documents in that file that may be of interest include the “Calendar of Activities,” “Preparing a Portfolio,” and “Guidelines Based on Experience and Education.”

## Probation

### What is Probation?
Iowa Code places all new faculty on probation. The probationary period is one year for those who have successfully completed probation at another Iowa high school or community college, three years for those who have not.

### Probationary Goals
Instruction Branch Deans have established four goals for probationary faculty. While the Quality Faculty Plan (QFP) competencies are a subset of these goals, as shown in the charts that follow, Probation has a broader perspective and includes objectives such as active engagement in department activities and participation in college-wide events such as the Pancake Breakfast, concerts, plays, or sporting events.

Your dean will talk with you about how to document the attainment of these probationary goals. Most deans ask you to create a portfolio, and a workshop on developing portfolios will be offered spring semester. (Check the 2003-2004 calendar for dates and times.)

### Probationary Goal 1: Demonstrate excellence in teaching, thereby facilitating student learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1 Objectives</th>
<th>QFP Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create an effective learning environment</td>
<td>3. Instructional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Learning Environment/ Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Technology Related to Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in strategies for student success</td>
<td>1. Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Diverse Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in continuous improvement practices.</td>
<td>7. Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyze student perception data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modify classroom environment to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Probationary Goal 2: Demonstrate ethical professional and productive working relationships with students, peers, and supervisor.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2 Objectives</th>
<th>QFP Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate discipline knowledge and share this knowledge with others.</td>
<td>6. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively engage in the activities of your department.</td>
<td>9. Collaboration, Ethics and Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish, post and maintain office hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptly respond to requests for information or assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate competence in using the college’s communication technologies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Probationary Goal 3: Demonstrate an awareness of the comprehensive community college.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3 Objectives</th>
<th>QFP Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know and understand the breadth and diversity of Kirkwood’s programs and services.</td>
<td>11. Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know and understand Kirkwood’s systems and structures related to your own employment.</td>
<td>12. Contribution to the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know and understand Kirkwood’s systems and structures related to student registration and degree completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in college activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Probationary Goal 4: Pursue personal and professional growth opportunities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4 Objectives</th>
<th>QFP Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>There are no objectives for Goal 4</em></td>
<td>8. Professional Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARKLAND COLLEGE

Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

A learning center for a learning college
Mission Statement:

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning facilitates and enhances quality teaching, student learning, and excellence in the workplace. It empowers professionals to address challenges while fostering the scholarship of teaching and student service.
Mind Map Overview

Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

- Classroom Assessment & Research
- Seminars, Workshops, Discussions
- Mentoring Program
- Faculty Orientation
- Teaching Excellence Awards
- Diversity, Values, Respectful Workplace
- Other Major Initiatives
- Grant-Funded Work
- Staff Development
- Distance & Virtual Learning
Participation Totals per Fiscal Year

*The increase in participation is a result of database revamping in Spring 2003. These changes include counting participants each time they attend ongoing courses or seminars, and including facilitators in the participation totals.
Distance and Virtual Learning

- Online Courses
- Hybrid Courses
- Telecourses
- PCTV
- Interactive
Center for Excellence Awards

- Futures Assembly Bellwether Award Finalist (2001): Recognition as one of the top ten instructional programs in the nation
- League for Innovation (2001): Learning College Champion
- The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (1998): David Pierce Leadership Award
- Illinois Community College Board Award for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (1998): Classroom Assessment and Research Initiative
- Illinois Community College Board (1998): Award for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Special Recognition:
Parkland’s Classroom Assessment Program was described by K. Patricia Cross as an outstanding example of an ongoing delivery system of Classroom Assessment and Research, in Developing Professional Fitness through Classroom Assessment and Research, The Cross Papers Number 1 (1997)
This chapter describes how a center for teaching and learning has become the catalyst for major institutional change through the use of faculty-owned and -driven professional development programs, faculty leadership teams, and supportive administration.

Leading Change Through Faculty Development

Fay Rouseff-Baker

The idea of faculty learning centers has been around a long time. K. Patricia Cross reported in her 2001 article (p. 32) that “five years ago, Jerry Gaff led an approximately 200-campus program” that focused on teaching improvement. Gaff’s seminal work, Toward Faculty Renewal (1975), examined “how to keep a largely middle-aged faculty educationally alive and growing during the next 10 to 20 years” (as cited in Cross, p. 32). However, the purpose of these programs has changed in recent years. “The middle-aged faculty of the 1970s are retiring, and a new generation is taking their place in the faculty ranks” (p. 32). As faculty positions change and colleges grow and adapt with changing times, faculty improvement is a necessity, not an option.

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Parkland College, Champaign, Illinois, has embraced and supported the dramatic changes that have affected higher education in the twenty-first century. Nine years ago, when I accepted the position as director, I was elated. I had come to realize, during my twenty-six years of teaching English, that to thrive, I needed to be part of a dynamic teaching community. Fortunately, Parkland College’s president, Dr. Zelema Harris, recognized the need for such a community in which faculty could focus on the art, science, and scholarship of teaching. Our board of trustees supported Dr. Harris’s vision of a center that would be faculty-driven and a place where faculty from diverse disciplines could find support in an academic community.

The center has grown from a good idea into an organic system that has become part of the institution by adhering to good research and by recognizing and developing faculty talent. Studies indicate that any successful...
CONTACT INFORMATION

Mailing Address:

Parkland College
Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
2400 West Bradley Ave.
Champaign, IL 61821

Phone & Email:

Fay Rouseff-Baker
Executive Director
(217) 351-2524
frouseff-baker@parkland.edu

Haiti Eastin
Professional Development
Coordinator for Staff and Faculty
(217) 373-3767
heastin@parkland.edu

Brett Coup
Director, Distance and Virtual Learning
(217) 353-2639
bcoup@parkland.edu

Fax: (217) 351-2595
General Email: centerforexcellence@parkland.edu

For more information, please visit our website:

www.parkland.edu/cetl
Appendix G: SWOT Analysis

Strengths of Parkland College Center
Dynamic director
Safe place
Trust based
Politically neutral
Servant leader
Relaxing atmosphere
Good coffee
Music
Support staff well trained
Constant assessment and responsiveness
Easy to get to
Presenters carefully chosen (seasoned faculty, cross discipline, cross gender, new/okd, FT/PT)
Place of honor
Pictures of participants
Appreciation and respect for all
Cross pollination
Advisory committee very important

Weaknesses of Parkland College Center
PC had to do a lot of work that we have already done
Pecking order of FT/PT, AAS/A&S, competition for resources
Modeled after UI faculty development (university model)

Opportunities for Kirkwood
Online stuff – huge capability for growth
Centralize/build on all the disparate parts we already do
Offer professional development activities during the week before each semester
Catchy names for session offering
Choices of length of sessions
Important to work with Professional Renewal Committee
Partner with K12 (and get GWAEA people to come in and do some things so K12 teachers could get renewal credits)
Develop relationships with U of I, ISU, Coe, MMC, other colleges coming to our campus to offer (grad?) programs focused on learning and teaching
Eventually a Conference Center for our center
Plan for physical growth! More programs coming our way!
Having ATAW course development within the Center
Instructional technology design needs to be on the cutting edge! We need to have experts on board who will push the envelope on it and bring the new tech to the faculty!
Furnishings….lounge area, ambient lighting, library resources, computers, work tables, discussion areas
“Chili and Chat”

**Threats against Kirkwood**

**Funding**
Where did the money go that was used to pay for Dixie, Kay, & Bonnie?? We need that to come to Faculty Development!!
Developmental support for our techno experts…..we want cutting edge stuff brought to campus
Faculty buy-in
Even more than “faculty buy-in” is time and access for faculty
Ability to offer training at off times
Space!

**Burnout**
Turf and ownership of things we’d like to see in the Center
Need buy-in from off campus centers, adjuncts hired at last minute
Appendix H: Job Description

(The job description is in the process of being developed and approved.)
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