

**Faculty Development at Augustana:
Creating a Center for Faculty Enrichment**

**Report from the Faculty Development Working Group
2012-13**

Margaret Farrar
Katie Hanson
Mindi Mull
John Pfautz
Eric Stewart
Bob Tallitsch
Paul Weissburg

Executive Summary: We recommend creating a Center for Faculty Enrichment that builds on the work begun by the Augustana Center for Teaching and Learning to provide more intentional and more consistent faculty development opportunities across the multiple facets of faculty careers. Specific recommendations include:

- Expand our commitment to staffing faculty development efforts, including funding a Faculty Fellows program, to assist with the work of the Center and provide a source for future leadership of the CFE.
- Reallocate some faculty grant resources to provide grants for different purposes, and at different stages in faculty careers (e.g., competitive grants for faculty transitioning into new research areas post tenure; competitive “transitions” grants for faculty moving into retirement, etc.)
- Create a substantial web presence for the CFE to house faculty development resources and to promote faculty development opportunities. Ensure a central physical space for the Center that allows for a director’s office, a resource/”drop in” room, and a space for meeting with groups.
- Do more to foster the professional development of midcareer faculty members, including leadership development opportunities.
- Acknowledge more fully the valuable contributions our adjunct and part time (APT) faculty make to the campus and address their needs by considering how they might be supported through the resources of the Center for Faculty Enrichment.
- Create opportunities for senior faculty members to contribute their insight and wisdom to campus leadership. Ensure that our most experienced faculty members feel valued by the college.

Contents:

Introduction

Where we've been: a short history of teaching and learning initiatives at Augustana

Recommendations by Rank

- Prospective Faculty
- New Faculty
- Adjunct and Part Time (APT) Faculty
- Midcareer Faculty
- Senior and Emeriti Faculty
- What Should a CFE Look Like? Staffing and Organization

Sources consulted

Appendix A: Faculty Certificate Programs

Appendix B: Center for Faculty Enrichment Webpage Information

Introduction

This year the Faculty Development Working Group (FDWG) was charged with thinking about how we approach faculty development efforts at Augustana, and what we might do differently to ensure that our faculty members are getting the support they need in order to make the greatest contributions possible to Augustana. FDWG approached its work using the following assumptions:

First, we know that we expect a lot of our faculty. We expect that they are inspiring teachers deeply committed to continually bettering their craft; that they are motivating mentors who have the time and skill to work closely on guided student projects; that they are creative scholars who embody the spirit of inquiry in producing their own work; and that they are models of servant-leadership in their work on campus, in our community, and in higher education generally.

Second, we know that faculty members' needs and priorities change across the course of their careers, and that no two faculty careers are identical. We need to be sure that we engage and encourage faculty development at each step along the way. This means offering a meaningful and robust New Faculty Orientation program, as well as providing tools to transition into different phases of a productive career. It also means recognizing that the profile of the Augustana faculty includes tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, and that we are unlikely to see a reduction in APT faculty in years ahead. As a result, faculty developers will need to ensure that our efforts are not directed at a single, uniform audience.

Finally, we recognize that faculty members are facing increased pressures to participate in the obligations and privileges of shared governance. At a time when higher education is under a tremendous amount of public scrutiny and governing boards are more active than ever before, faculty need concrete resources for helping to navigate new and more complex leadership roles.

Given these assumptions, we considered the following questions:

- What is the current state of faculty development at Augustana?
- What do models of best practices of faculty development look like?

- How do faculty members' priorities change at different stages in their careers? What types of resources are necessary to help faculty members achieve success at these different stages?
- How might we incorporate our historically strong ACTL programming (New Faculty Orientation, teaching observations groups, etc.) into a more holistic faculty development center that addresses the multiple dimensions of an academic career?

Building on the assumptions above and the vision statement that faculty created during the 2012 Faculty Retreat,¹ we consolidated our thoughts into a mission statement for the working group and beyond. We then researched the work being done at other institutions to flesh out what our mission statement might look like in practice. While we have divided our recommendations by faculty rank (simply for organizational convenience), it should be noted that many of the recommendations hold true across and regardless of rank. (One example of this is the section on faculty development certificate programs that might be helpful to faculty at all ranks, depending on topic; see Appendix B.)

In short, we recommend creating a Center for Faculty Enrichment that builds on the excellent foundation laid by the Augustana Center for Teaching and Learning to provide more intentional and more consistent faculty development opportunities across the multiple facets of faculty careers. We believe that any investment in faculty development benefits the institution in terms of faculty retention, faculty satisfaction, and ultimately our students' experience at Augustana.

Mission Statement for Proposed Faculty Development Initiative

The Center for Faculty Enrichment at Augustana College will provide faculty with opportunities and resources to experience growth and renewal in the myriad ways they serve the College: as teachers, scholars, advisors, leaders, ambassadors, entrepreneurs, and campus citizens. Faculty development at Augustana is inclusive, collaborative, and ongoing.

Inclusive: We support all faculty, including those who are tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure track, administrative faculty, and staff whose work impacts our students. We offer a wide range of programs and support for faculty work.

Collaborative: Faculty development is a partnership that can only occur in a community characterized by mutual trust and respect. We help build that community in two ways: first, by facilitating conversations and building partnerships among those with common interests and goals. Second, we are attentive to the fact that professional development is intrinsically related to personal well-being.

Ongoing: We aim to be relevant to faculty at all stages of their career, from those interviewing for positions to retirement and beyond. Our programs and workshops help faculty respond to the new challenges and possibilities of a rapidly changing academic environment.

¹ Academic Planning Vision for Faculty: To serve as architects of a vibrant and diverse intellectual community, and models of integrity and inquiry for our students. To be passionate teachers and mentors who embrace reflective thinking, and are socially conscious and engaged in the larger community.

Where We've Been: A Short History of Teaching and Learning Initiatives at Augustana

Augustana's teaching and learning initiatives have a long and varied history. Ellen Hay started the Teaching Resources Advisory Committee (or TRAC) in 1994; it was "an ad hoc group of faculty... [who] planned a series of brown bag discussions and Friday afternoon programs" ("Tradition and Transformation," 84). When Ellen became Associate Dean, TRAC planning and programming moved into the Office of Academic Affairs and Ellen secured a modest amount of institutional funding. TRAC sponsored a Teaching Partners program and regular sessions on teaching and learning.

The next iteration of a teaching and learning initiative came with the recognition that while generalized faculty development programs are valuable, there was also a significant need for individual and confidential consultation for faculty members – consultation that would exist entirely outside the tenure and promotion process. Lendol Calder, Jon Clauss, Mark Vincent, and Dara Wegman-Geedey began organizing teaching and learning sessions and brown-bag lunches. Mark Vincent served as the director for the group (then called the Augustana Center for the Study of Teaching and Learning) during this time.

When Dean Jeff Abernathy arrived on campus, he provided the initiative with an institutional budget, and appointed Dara Wegman-Geedey as the director of CSTL in 2005. Shortly thereafter, the dean decided that support for Teaching and Learning should be housed in Founders and gave the duties to Associate Dean Mike Green, who renamed it ACTL (the Augustana Center for Teaching and Learning). Mike Green ran faculty development effort for three years. During Green's tenure as coordinator, ACTL organized the New Faculty Orientation, the Teaching Circles sessions, a mentoring program, and Teaching Observation Groups. When Mike Green left for a deanship in Pennsylvania, the dean asked Jon Clauss to take over ACTL. Clauss continuing many of the same programs begun with Green and adding initiatives on blended learning, e-portfolios, and an expanded consultative role. In 2012, the Office of Academic Affairs took over teaching and learning initiatives again, and this year's efforts were managed by Associate Dean Margaret Farrar. In 2012, Dean Pareena Lawrence asked for the formation of a faculty development working group to look at what the future of faculty development efforts at the College might hold.

Recommendations: Faculty Development Efforts by Rank

Prospective Faculty

Faculty development actually begins before faculty members teach their first classes at Augustana; we hope that from the moment we begin recruiting candidates, we are thinking about them as potential colleagues and collaborators, and are conscientious about our role in their career path. While we have made strides in thinking about how we work with potential colleagues, we recommend that the CFE (in conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs):

- Update our prospective faculty website (www.augustanafaculty.org), and integrate it with Augustana's main website for easier maintenance
- Provide clear guidelines for department chairs and host departments for campus visits, reimbursement policies, etc.
- Sponsor "best practices" workshops for departments with upcoming searches on navigating legal issues, diversifying search pools, and transitioning international faculty members.

New Faculty

The importance of faculty development for new and early career faculty cannot be overstated. Without adequate support and guidance, new faculty members are not likely to succeed in the classroom, in service to the college, or in research endeavors. New faculty development programs are becoming more common all the time (Puri et al., 2012). This is an area in which Augustana has been strong in recent years, though there are elements that could be improved.

Concerns of new faculty:

Obviously new faculty are concerned with everything from “where do I park” to “how can I get tenure” (if they are tenure track). There are several patterns to the concerns of new faculty that point to what we are doing well, and what might be improved. Robert Boice has studied new faculty members and labeled some as “quick starters” and some as “slow starters.” In a general study of 300 new faculty members at three different institutions, Boice noted that most new faculty generally demonstrated the following characteristics:

- They taught in a “facts-and-principles” style of lecturing
- They taught “defensively, with the specific aim of avoiding complaints made by students to senior colleagues, especially chairpeople”
- They underperformed their own expectations on student evaluations and tended to blame students, teaching loads, class times and sizes, or the design of the evaluations themselves
- They generally did not plan teaching improvements beyond better and more organized lecture notes
- They prioritized getting to a stage in teaching in which they spent less time on preparation and felt more comfortable in the classroom
- They went to class over-prepared
- They established comfort, efficiency, and student acceptance slowly (Boice 1991:11-113)

These characteristics applied even when faculty were new to an institution but had previous teaching experience.

A second category of new faculty that Boice examined was “quick starters.” These new faculty members accounted for between five and nine percent of the new faculty he studied. They generally had the following characteristics:

- They still lectured in a “facts-and-principles” way, “but in a comfortable fashion that allowed time for student involvement”
- They had uncritical, optimistic attitudes about the students
- They had “low levels of complaining and cynicism” about their schools and colleagues
- They sought advice about teaching and learning from colleagues, readings, observation, and faculty development programs
- They quickly moved “away from spending the bulk of work weeks on teaching preparation”
- They balanced their activities so that they spent at least three hours per week on scholarly writing
- They integrated their research interests into their teaching
- “They displayed high energy, broad interests (for example, singing in choirs), concern with self-presentation, and a sense of humor” (Boice 1991: 113-114)

The most interesting and provocative suggestion Boice made was that using the principles and practices of quick starters (i.e. documenting how they spent their time, decreasing classroom preparation time, increased social networking for teaching and scholarship support, increasing time spent on scholarly writing, and

integrating their own scholarly interests into their courses) made the slow starters more effective as teachers, scholars, and citizens of their colleges.

Boice's suggestion comports well with other research in this area. For example, Puri et al. find that factors that new faculty identify as important to their own success include course release time, funding, training, opportunities to network, orientation programs, and workshops on teaching and grant writing (Puri et al, 2012: 1).

Areas of strength:

At Augustana we have a relatively robust new faculty orientation that runs throughout the first year on campus. This includes several days of orientation before the fall term begins and Teaching Circles throughout the year. Other areas of strength include:

- Course release for (tenure track) new faculty. The literature often points to release time as a significant factor in their development as teachers and scholars. This practice (an 18 credit, as opposed to 21 credit teaching load for TT faculty) is a strength for Augustana to retain, though it currently is not extended to teaching fellows and other limited term appointments. In return for the course release, new faculty members' participation in teaching circles is expected. It is worth considering if visiting faculty or fellows should also have a reduced load, given their often more immediate publication and research needs.
- Teaching Observation Groups. Based on Boice's findings above, observation (especially of quick starters) is a particularly useful element for improving not just teaching, but all aspects of faculty life.
- Startup funds for those in tenure track positions. This is a strong point of Augustana's current system, although the criteria for approval are not always as clear as they might be. This lack of clarity could easily be addressed in a revised new faculty handbook.
- Pre-tenure leave. The fairly recent adoption of a one-term pre-tenure paid leave (PTPL) is certainly beneficial to new tenure-track faculty.
- Two pre-tenure reviews. The opportunity to have two pre-tenure reviews before the tenure hearing allows for tenure track faculty to learn from the process twice before their actual tenure hearings.

Areas for improvement:

While much about our current programming benefits new (and especially tenure track) faculty, there are several areas where we could do more to support our colleagues:

- Ongoing mentorship program. New faculty who experience ongoing mentorship "show significant career advantages," "demonstrate improvement in risk-taking, political savvy, and specialized professional skills," and "greater research productivity and career advancement as compared with their peers" (Boyle and Boice 1998: 158). Such mentoring often doesn't happen because of an incorrect assumption that it will "happen naturally" and does not need to be planned. Mentoring works best when it is done across disciplines and not "between friends." Successful mentoring programs call for coordinators (Boyle and Boice 1998: 161). This role might be played by one of the fellows in a faculty development center. Such a mentorship program might offer possibilities for mid-career faculty to become involved in acclimating newer faculty members to the culture of Augustana. The most successful mentors in Boyle's and Boice's study had been on campus between 3-5 years, though many of the mentors had been on campus somewhat longer than that (Boyle and

Boice 1998: 176). In both faculties they studied, the mentors reported even more gains in terms of teaching and learning than the protégés.²

- New faculty handbook. The current faculty handbook is dated and inadequate in several ways. The development of a new faculty handbook must be something that is updated yearly.
- Preparing our new faculty to be successful as teachers and scholars could also be augmented by the kinds of proposals suggested in the community building section of this study. Community building is, as we will argue, has a strong correlation to faculty retention. Failing to retain new and talented faculty costs the college both in terms of losing faculty members to other (sometimes competing) institutions and in the cost it takes to hire and train replacements for them.

Adjunct and Part-time Faculty

At Augustana College, there are currently 21 adjunct and 64 part-time (APT) faculty, and 150 tenure and tenure-track faculty. APT faculty members are hired to teach at colleges for various reasons-- because they are a less expensive, they provide a specific area of expertise that the institution needs, and/or they give departments and the institution more flexibility in terms of course offerings.

Faculty work as APTs for various reasons. Gappa and Leslie (1993) categorize APTs as: career-enders (retired or in transition), specialists/experts/professionals (work at least part time elsewhere), aspiring academics (faculty with terminal degrees interested in FT work), and freelancers (writers or consultants, not seeking FT academic positions) (qtd. in Tarr 349). Augustana has APTs in each of these categories.

There is a general perception that the use of APTs has had a negative impact on teaching quality and student retention. Yet, research by Wallin (2007) shows that “students learn as much and are as likely to be retained when taught by an adjunct faculty member as when they are taught by a full-time faculty member” (qtd. in Tarr 351). Additionally, Gappa and Leslie (1997) found that “part time faculty members are a well-qualified and valuable resource, if properly used,” and they determined that “the most serious threat to academic quality comes from casual, inconsistent employment practices and a lack of institutional support rather than from the quality of the part-time faculty members themselves” (qtd. in Tarr 351) Indeed Leslie and Gappa claimed in a 2002 report that thinking of APTs “as an asset and investing in them rather than ignoring and devaluing them can lead to increases in their teaching effectiveness and institutional contributions” (qtd. in Tarr 351).

Given that we employ APTs to teach at Augustana, and given that the number of APTs is unlikely to be reduced, and given that the research indicates that APTs are fully capable of providing quality classroom experiences, it seems it would be wise to acknowledge their valuable contributions to the campus and address their needs by considering how they might be supported through the resources of the Center for Faculty Enrichment. This means not only including APT faculty in the programming offered by the CFE, but developing resources specifically targeted at recognizing and supporting our APT faculty.

Areas for Improvement:

- Develop and implement focused, purposeful community-building efforts to promote a culture shift in terms of recognizing the positive academic contributions of APTs on this campus.
- Invite APTs to offer workshops or participate on committees. Research from the University Leadership Council report on Adjunct Faculty (2011) indicates that when APT faculty are involved in

² Macalester College has a "connected colleagues" program (http://www.macalester.edu/cst/services_and_resources/connected_colleagues.html) that could be of interest to us. It involves linking second and third year faculty with senior faculty outside their department.

committees and that work is valued, they are “more personally invested in the success of the institution” (12). Since they are not expected to do this work and are not compensated as a full-time faculty member is, some institutions assign APTs who do this additional work a different status to reward their academic leadership and involvement.

- Consider paying APT faculty modest stipends to attend important workshops or meetings (like fall faculty retreat) that might not be required of a part-time person, but might benefit their students and the institution.
- Encourage and allow APTs to participate in ongoing professional development. Years ago, APTs received a percentage of PMA funds relative to their credits taught. If they taught 80% of 21 credits, they got 80% of the funds. For the past few years, there have been no funds available for APTs. In 2012, Dean Lawrence created a fund that APTs could access through an application process, which has been greatly appreciated, but the fund ran out early in the year and APTs agreed that having a specified amount per person that could accrue over several years would enable attendance at a conference periodically. This would encourage their ongoing professional development, which will have a positive impact on their students.
- Create an orientation handbook and/or training sessions for new APT faculty. This could be an online resource, a resource handbook, and/or a face-to-face session offered at different times in order to meet the needs of faculty who may not be on campus every day, or teach in the evening.
- Offer sessions or resources that address *logistical needs*, specific to Augustana: library access and use, how to reserve a computer lab or classroom, how to take a fieldtrip, a map of the college and where technology is available, what to do in an emergency, who to call if they are ill/unable to hold class, where to get keys, where to get mail, how to get parking permit, security information
- Provide sessions related to *faculty academic needs* that provide important information and an opportunity for APTs to meet each other: how to use Arches/MOODLE/PUG/Grading, drop/add policies, how to order texts, information about IDEA, information about tutors and counseling that are available for at-risk students, seat time requirements, syllabus expectations, honor code, attendance policies, FERPA information, exam policies, departmental and faculty meeting times and whether the APT should attend, meet the staff, get copy code and training on how to copy, get a mentor, give contact information of chair of APT committee
- Consider paying APTs a stipend to attend the new orientation and/or require the orientation. Some schools provide new APTs with orientation and a book on teaching. Some require that APTs complete an online orientation before they start teaching. Some schools have a person assigned to help the new APTs transition onto campus. This person could be in the faculty development center—part welcome wagon, part advocate, part resource.
- Offer APTs an option of having a mid-course review. Someone from the Center for Faculty Enrichment meets with students half way through the term and discusses strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member. The responses are given to the APT and are not shared for promotion or continued employment. This is solely used for teaching improvement, and could be a useful tool for all faculty, not just APTs. If an APT is asked to do the IDEA, this will offer some opportunity for formative assessment prior to the IDEA assessment. If an APT does not get reviewed every five years, this offers an opportunity for the APT to gather data to offer to the department when contracts are reconsidered.

The seventy-five adjuncts, part-time, and continuing non-tenured faculty teaching at Augustana College were surveyed to ascertain what this various and unique “group” might need in terms of faculty development and support.³ Conclusions from the survey include:

³ The survey was open for one week and garnered twenty-one responses. The number of credits/year taught by the respondents ranged from 3 to 20 credits. The degrees ranged from masters to PhD, and years of service at Augustana ranged from one to over twenty.

- Just as the research shows, the Augustana APTs would like to feel valued and have their work recognized. They want to contribute to the college and their departments, and participate more fully on campus, but they would like to be compensated for their work, or at least have that work recognized.
- They wish for consistency across campus in terms of what APTs are told and what they are asked to do. They would like more guidance and assistance when first arriving on campus. They do not know how involved to get in their departments or on committees, and they are torn about how much extra work to do. Some are teaching more courses and credit hours than full time faculty in their department and yet are treated with little regard. Other APTs teach only a few credits, but feel respected and integrated into their departments. Some departments encourage APTs to attend department meetings and some departments tell APTs not to attend, which leaves the APTs feeling uninformed and unheard.
- Several APTs said they'd like to get travel money again, to support their ongoing professional development.

The experiences of APTs are as various as their interests and their needs. Almost every APT commented on how much they enjoy teaching at Augustana, but they hope the on-campus environment could be more welcoming and they could be offered the same level of intellectual and academic support as other teaching faculty. (Data available upon request.)

Midcareer

The experiences and needs of faculty members vary widely throughout an academic career. Planning effective faculty development programming requires knowledge of how faculty careers change over time. Midcareer typically parallels middle age, which often involves reassessment of goals and priorities. However, relatively little is known about the experiences and needs of midcareer faculty. The research that has been conducted on faculty needs and the impact of faculty development programming has focused primarily on pre-tenure faculty, even though midcareer faculty comprise the largest group of academics. The research that has explored the midcareer level reveals some unique challenges.

Challenges for midcareer faculty:

- Higher expectations – It is common for service, leadership, and administrative responsibilities to increase in midcareer when many faculty are expected to become department chairs, head major committees, and fill other important leadership and management roles. Evidence suggests that midcareer faculty today may have even higher expectations regarding service and leadership than in the past (Austin, 2010). This is due to the growing cohorts of both pre-tenure and non-tenure track faculty, who are typically not expected to take on these roles. Therefore, there are fewer faculty members to fulfill these responsibilities. Time management is often reported as a challenge in early-career; however, time pressures may become even greater at midcareer.
- Anxiety – Aside from attaining the rank of full professor, there are few clear markers of achievement beyond tenure. This ambiguity can lead to increased anxiety surrounding goal setting and self-assessment (Baldwin, et al. 2008).
- Neglect – Despite their increases in responsibility, midcareer faculty often report feeling neglected and taken for granted as attention and resources are typically directed toward early-career faculty (Austin, 2010). Some believe that once a faculty member has gotten tenure he/she has achieved a level of professional maturity that suggests the department no longer needs to provide guidance. For some this can be liberating, however others perceive this as neglectful. In fact, there is evidence that many individuals at midcareer experience low morale, feel disengaged, and isolated (Karpiak, 1997).

- Adapting to change, maintaining vibrancy and enthusiasm – Teaching the same courses for many years can be difficult. Some midcareer faculty report difficulty keeping up with the changes in their rapidly evolving disciplines (Baldwin, et al. 2008). This is especially true in disciplines that are based heavily on technology (e.g., STEM fields). Additionally, as student needs change and the student body becomes more diverse, best practices in teaching change as well. Finally, as faculty members grow older many feel they cannot relate to younger students as easily as they could at the beginning of their career (Austin, 2010).

While the above challenges may portray a dismal picture of midcareer faculty, it should be noted that there are also many positive aspects of reaching the midcareer level. For example, many faculty report feeling a sense of relief after achieving tenure that results in higher job satisfaction, as well as freedom to explore new interests that can revitalize one's career. With this in mind, it is important to acknowledge the above challenges and re-frame them as opportunities to implement effective faculty development programming that would allow an even greater number of faculty to experience these advantages.

Areas for improvement:

Teaching

- Offer teaching programs/faculty learning communities designed for the needs of midcareer faculty. A successful year-long program implemented at the University of Minnesota provided the opportunity for post-tenured faculty to meet together to discuss teaching and learning issues in depth, to refine their professional identities to fit their current goals, and to adapt their teaching styles to meet the needs and expectations of today's students (Romano, et al. 2004). Assessment of the program revealed positive changes in teaching behaviors, as well as an increase in teaching satisfaction and confidence. The participants also reported that the program renewed their energy and enthusiasm, and positively impacted their life outside of work.
- Provide more opportunities for teaching special topics courses or team-teaching interdisciplinary courses. Maintaining and strengthening our current Learning Community (LC) model is an important part of achieving this goal.
- Encourage faculty to offer study-abroad and service-learning courses
- Sponsor teaching awards

Research

- Provide second start-up packages to assist midcareer faculty in changing research areas
- Offer workshops on applying for and managing grants
- Offer writing retreats that can facilitate productivity, as well as collaboration with colleagues. This could be very informal (e.g., providing a comfortable and open space and encouraging faculty to come together to write) or more structured (e.g., offering a workshop where a facilitator guides the writing process and provides feedback). Additionally, while these retreats are often implemented to encourage research productivity, it does not have to be restricted in this way. Faculty could also come together to work on syllabi or course development.

Service/Leadership

- Develop workshops for chairs and directors (running meetings, managing personnel issues, providing career guidance, budgeting, motivating faculty, evaluating faculty performance)
- Offer workshops to develop skills that help with committee and task force leadership.

- Given the tremendous need for faculty to participate in shared governance effectively, leadership development is especially important (see Barden and Curry 2013).

Faculty Satisfaction

- Offer an orientation on the midcareer experience for newly tenured faculty
- Ensure that each department provides clear guidelines and expectations (comparable in clarity to the guidelines provided to pre-tenure faculty) regarding the process of being promoted from associate to full professor
- Offer ample merit raises to act as an incentive, and include criteria beyond teaching, research and traditional service (e.g., administration, leadership, consulting, interdisciplinary work)
- Make the review process more meaningful and developmental (e.g., the recently proposed Faculty Development Project)
- Encourage chairpersons to advocate for midcareer faculty, rather than focusing exclusively on pre-tenure faculty, and work with midcareer faculty to develop three- to five-year professional growth plans
- Provide opportunities for mutual mentoring (see Sorcinelli and Yun 2011).
- Make explicit the respect that the institution has for seasoned faculty. Some of the opportunities discussed above could help achieve this. For example, having teaching and/or research awards that are reserved specifically for those at the midcareer level, or encouraging and providing opportunities for newer faculty to seek out mentoring from more experienced faculty. Other institutions hold events such as a Mid-Career Faculty Appreciation Dinner.

Many of the above opportunities would require few financial resources for the college. Nonetheless, the potential impact could be quite profound. Survey data by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) indicate that at least one-third of the respondents had considered leaving academia (Lindholm, et al. 2005).

Taking advantage of these opportunities and implementing programming designed for midcareer faculty could not only increase job satisfaction, but also employee retention. It is important to remember the underlying goal of faculty development is to improve student learning. Because midcareer faculty comprise the largest group of faculty, it is fair to say students have more interactions with faculty at the midcareer-level, than with faculty at the very early- or late-career level. Therefore, in the interest of student outcomes, it is crucial for the college to foster the professional development of these experienced faculty.

Senior and Emeriti Faculty

Snow on the Roof with Fire in the Furnace

“Snow on the roof, fire in the furnace.” In many ways, this is what we hope for all senior faculty members at Augustana College: to be well-seasoned, experienced, and engaged. But, the reality is that without intentional efforts, the opportunities for continued engagement may not be seized. As Augustana College looks to create a Center for Faculty Enrichment, it is hoped that the unique challenges facing those of us with “snow on the roof” will be factored into the mission and vision of the center with these considerations.

Who are we? We might sketch out a senior faculty profile in this way. We

- have 10-12 years left before retirement
- have funneled through lots of committees departmentally and some campus-wide

- are genuinely amazed that we are at the front of the commencement procession where used to stand only the old faculty
- are sometimes curmudgeon-like, finding ourselves grumbling about how things used to be better, while offering the voice of caution on new ideas
- if married with children, our children have left or are leaving the home
- are probably not looking for a job at another college/university due to affection and attachment to Augustana, as well as having established relationships and roots in the Quad Cities

In *Rethinking Faculty Work*, we read that late-career faculty members face issues pertaining to the importance of maintaining vitality over time, a developing interest in leadership, and the expectation that we should and can keep up with the changing student profile and needs. In short, we are:

- hoping to have experience respected, and to be consulted on departmental and campus-wide issues
- hoping to be recognized in our field outside of Augustana College
- hoping to be recognized for our service to the college over the years
- hopeful that we can relinquish some of our duties to mid-career faculty without jeopardizing that for which we have worked so hard
- fearful of becoming obsolete, or that we already are obsolete
- fearful that without our insights the college will lose ground
- fearful that we aren't as sharp as we used to be
- fearful that the economy will prohibit our on-schedule retirement

Senior faculty members may pursue any one of a number of possible paths in order to stay engaged in the institution. These may include seeking out administrative duties, exploring leadership in professional organizations, exploring interdisciplinary opportunities, exploring study abroad opportunities, and/or exploring community service opportunities. John Pfautz offered an example of his own re-engagement in the life of the College:

With a great deal of soul-searching, just around the time I was turning 50, I found myself facing the prospect of a rather boring professional existence if all that I would end up doing for the rest of my teaching career was teaching lessons and directing operas at Augustana until retirement. Though those responsibilities had been enough to motivate me for the first 17 years of teaching at Augustana, the flame of professional stimulation was losing its dance. By providence or good fortune I was given an opportunity to teach in Nigeria during a 2005 sabbatical. Teaching in West Africa has been the catalyst that has propelled me into the remaining years of my career by providing riveting educational opportunities and experiences. Teaching in Nigeria, and teaching Augustana students in Ghana and Senegal has enriched my personal and professional lives in a way that not only enriches the content of my traditional teaching and interactions with students, but it also has enriched my contributions to the college through on-campus committee involvement, professional organization involvement, and renewed passion for teaching of new and traditional coursework.

The Center for Faculty Enrichment could create opportunities for this kind of re-engagement through mentoring, interdisciplinary initiatives, and outreach.

Areas for Improvement:

- **Mentoring:** Senior faculty could lead a purposeful mentoring program that pairs faculty seeking advice and leadership on a career issue with faculty who share an interest and can provide helpful insight and assistance. A well-managed mentoring program among the faculty would provide a

mechanism for building and sustaining these interdisciplinary interactions, and further engaging faculty at various career stages with each other across the departmental and divisional boundaries.

- Interdisciplinary interactions: With less concern for tenure, rank and promotion, senior faculty may have more available time and energy for building and strengthening interdisciplinary relationships. One of the strengths for faculty in the Learning Community teaching method is the collaboration that is thrust upon cooperating instructors by the nature of teaching a related topic from two disciplinary approaches. In the absence of this model of collaborative teaching/learning, senior faculty may have a great deal to offer a faculty that is without this mechanism of programmed interdisciplinary interactions.
- Outreach: Senior faculty may find themselves in a particularly strong position to offer assistance in recruiting of students and new faculty by providing big picture perspectives informed through valued institutional memory.

A more resource-intensive model might be found at the University of Chicago. Dr. Ken Olliff is Assistant Director for Program Development and the Executive Director of ARETE at the University of Chicago. (<http://arete.uchicago.edu/>) His responsibilities include helping senior faculty design and launch new research initiatives, which are usually interdisciplinary, often broader than one professor's scope. Dr. Olliff mentioned that professors love the opportunity to delve into an area where they haven't had the freedom to go while they were striving for rank and promotion. He reports that a large benefit to the U of C faculty is that they are much happier. Faculty love what his office does. Faculty seek out his office with their ideas, for ideas for financial support, and for assistance in finding collaborators either within the university, the private sector, or non-university institutions. Likewise, the university benefits by having happier faculty, having increased grant funding coming in, and an enhanced competitive profile for U of C.

Leaving these goals to ad hoc efforts minimizes the possible results. It takes intentionality to make new initiatives of this importance and scope succeed. Re-engaging Senior Faculty with their careers is cyclic. Engaged, challenged and respected Senior Faculty members are involved with, contributing to, leading and mentoring others across campus. As colleagues in the faculty and administration, student services and staff, as well as students interact with re-engaged senior faculty, an enthusiastically productive energy will infuse the campus, further invigorating those of us who care deeply for the institution to which we have devoted so much.

Transitioning into Retirement

Augustana College, like many institutions of higher learning, does little to help senior faculty members make the transition into retirement. Indeed, the current atmosphere here at Augustana College is, from some perspectives, becoming more and more acrimonious in this regard (for example, the termination of health benefits on the last day of May rather than the last day of the fiscal year).

In an article in the 18 June, 2012 issue of *The Chronicle* (Mole, 2012) it was announced by 15 colleges received grants for adopting innovative approaches to support faculty members before, during, and after their transitions to retirement. The article goes on to state "While many colleges provide financial-planning programs to faculty members nearing retirement, experts on faculty-retirement programs not related to the grant awards recommend that institutions do more to help retiring faculty members navigate the lifestyle transitions...The American Council on Education and the Sloan Foundation used the awards to single out colleges with policies that help faculty in three areas: establishing a legacy, switching to an emeritus position, and maintaining connections with their academic communities." (Mole, 2012) Examples of some of the various programs include:

- Mount Holyoke College (MA): A faculty member nearing or in phased retirement may apply for a “transitioning grant.” This one-time award allows faculty to complete a specific project as they move toward and into retirement. Over the past two years transitioning grants have been used to support publication costs for a recently completed scholarly project; secure usage permissions for illustrations to use in a recently completed scholarly project; and travel to archives facilities abroad
- Wellesley College (MA): This institution has an emeriti-faculty steering committee, which develops programs for retired faculty and works with faculty who are nearing retirement to help ease their transition. This committee provides a cohort to which retired faculty can belong, and has facilitated Wellesley College’s ability to define, formalize, and expand the college’s rights and privileges for emeriti faculty.
- Skidmore College (NY): In addition to exemplary financial planning and medical insurance to faculty members in order to assist them in their retirement, the college also provided a mechanism whereby retired faculty can remain connected to one another. To accomplish this, the college has taken a unique approach in focusing on special social gatherings for retirees. Some examples include an annual event honoring new retirees held at the home of the vice president for academic affairs; regular meetings with the college’s president; an informally constituted Retiree Initiative Group also arranges events for retirees.
- PennState: PennState publishes, both on the institution’s web page and on departmental web pages, announcements of faculty retirements. These announcements, which are co-written by the Dean and the retiring faculty member, summarizes the individual’s career accomplishments and his/her contributions to the institution as a whole. Departmental web pages at PennState will soon list emeriti faculty members’ current addresses and phone numbers, and list periodic updates on the lives of their emeriti faculty members

In the fall of 2012 the Provost of Columbia University appointed an institution-wide “Working Group on Faculty Retirement to advise him on the creation of a culture that would support transition to retirement as a normal stage in a faculty member’s career.” (Columbia University, 2013) Although one of the three recommendations from the working group is quite unique for Columbia (housing policies), three of the other recommendations are important for numerous institutions, including Augustana:

- The institution must continue to offer retirement savings plans that provide sufficient resources to support faculty during the post-retirement period of their lives. In this section, the working group addresses a plan, by Columbia University, that is quite similar to the proposed cut in Augustana’s contribution to faculty and staff retirement plans. In its report the working group concludes that a cut in an institution’s contribution to faculty members’ retirement plans will prolong the time to retirement by faculty members which will, in the long term, be more costly to the institution than its (Columbia University) current retirement contribution over the same time period; and a cut in an institution’s contribution to faculty members’ retirement plans will have a negative effect on future faculty hiring.
- The institution should improve communication and programming related to retirement planning *throughout* the faculty member’s career. The working group concluded that faculty members are not seeking advice early and often enough during the course of their careers, nor has the institution been proactive enough in this process. To that end the working group recommended the institution should create an Office of Faculty Retirement and appoint an administrator in the Office of the Provost dedicated to working on these issues; review all programming and materials provided to active faculty and retirees to ensure that they are part of a comprehensive approach to career-long planning services at each of the following five points in their career: the year after the awarding of tenure, age 50, age 60, age 65 and age 70.
- The institution should work with retirees to create meaningful and productive post-retirement experiences. Faculty want to remain active after they retire, and they want this activity to be rewarding and, to the extent possible, serve the institution. They look to the institution to mediate

these experiences on their behalf. The working group (of Columbia) recommended: Staff the new Office of Faculty Retirement at a level that would enable it to develop and maintain relationships with local cultural, educational, governmental, and other not-for-profit entities in support of retiree involvement with those organizations; invest in expanding and professionalizing an organization for retired faculty; allocate resources to support the professional activities of active retirees; and explore the feasibility of establishing a “center for retired faculty” on the campus.

Other reports from other liberal arts colleges point to the following incentives being undertaken by their institutions (Murphy, 2008).

- Enabling retired faculty to take courses with no charge.
- Encouraging new roles that retired faculty may assume (either with or without pay) in order to help their home institution.
- Investigating some form of financial assistance with regards to health benefit costs, as more and more faculty today are opting to work well beyond the normal retirement age due to the costs of health benefits.
- Integrating nonfinancial retirement counseling into some form of a personal assistance program (such as that at Duke University), as retirement frequently raises questions with psychological, social, domestic and financial implications.

Finally, the report by Bataille and Brown reiterates a fact that was found in each and every article and text read by this task force member that dealt with faculty members transitioning into retirement—be it from an institution like Augustana or any other institution of higher education: Helping senior faculty transition into retirement is beneficial to *both* parties—faculty and the institution. Faculty members that retire with a feeling of “worth” that is both bestowed upon them and reinforced by their former institutions of employment tend to be more willing to help their former employer—both financially and intellectually—than those that don’t.

Community Building and Celebration

Why Build Community?

At first glance, this might seem like a ridiculous question. We all know that community building is important, particularly at a small, liberal arts college like Augustana College. However, the question becomes far more relevant when it comes time to decide how many resources—financial and other—the college is prepared to invest in community building. There is a widespread consensus that community building is *good* and *important* but is it as important as providing financial aid for students, renovating buildings, maintaining the campus, hiring new tenure-track faculty, promoting diversity among faculty and students, marketing the college to draw in new students, keeping up with the rising costs of health benefits and retirement plans for faculty, staff and administration, etc.? When weighed against the many other needs of the college, it may be worth asking just how important community building really is. What does it do for the college? How much does it really matter?

A complete discussion of the benefits of community building is beyond the scope of this paper, but a few key points are worth mentioning:

- The liberal arts are central to the mission of Augustana College. That said, what can the college do to help facilitate *cross-departmental relationships*, promote *interdisciplinary projects* and embody a liberal arts approach to education? Interdisciplinary projects are unlikely to occur in an environment where

faculty from different departments have minimal social/academic interaction; what can be done to increase such opportunities?

- *Faculty retention and attracting new faculty* are essential for the long-term prosperity of the college. Community building provides low-cost opportunities to help retain and attract high-quality faculty. There is extensive research indicating that Millennials (generally defined as the generation born between 1981 and 2000) are motivated by intangible rewards, such as quality of life and personal fulfillment, as much as—or even more than—salary. The 14th Annual Global CEO Survey by Pricewaterhouse Coopers, for example, found that Millennials “ranked training and development three times higher than cash bonuses as their first choice in benefits.”⁴

This emphasis on quality of life and community is not unique to those born after 1980. A 1988 (Burke) study found that the reasons most commonly given by faculty for leaving an institution in the 1950s—prestige, security and authority—had shifted from “salary” to “quality of life” and “personal fulfillment.” Similarly, a 1985 study (Weiler) found that, although salary was a significant factor in leaving a college or university, it was largely supplementary to other, more fundamental factors such as “relationships with colleagues.” Matier (1990) also found that faculty seldom leave positions they find fulfilling for a higher salary. An increase in salary is undeniably an incentive to go somewhere else, but it does not trump work satisfaction.

The college’s ability to create an environment where faculty members feel that they—and their academic contributions—are appreciated does not require a large price-tag; rather, it depends largely on our willingness to experiment with new approaches to faculty recognition and community building. These efforts are particularly important for incoming faculty, many of whom come to the Quad Cities with no social network in place. Orientation Week provides a great opportunity to make new faculty aware of social organizations and events. This may also prove invaluable for faculty with families who are often eager for ways to meet other faculty and staff with similar interests.

In addition to helping with faculty retention, community-building efforts will be helpful in attracting new faculty. Each year, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* surveys faculty at colleges and universities throughout the country to make their “Best Colleges to Work For” list. Two of the twelve categories they consider are Teaching Environment (“Faculty members say the institution recognizes innovative and high-quality teaching”) and Respect and Appreciation (“Employees are regularly recognized for their contributions”). Although Augustana College is far ahead of many of its peer colleges in these and other categories, we have not yet managed to place on their list. Doing so would be a tremendous boon for faculty retention as well as for attracting new faculty.

- Social interactions promote the informal *spread of “best practices”* and the sharing of useful information. Community building results in increased *social capital*; this, in turn, can lead to greater success of faculty members within the classroom and outside of campus life. Faculty sharing lunch at the Wilson Center, for example, often discuss problems they’re facing in the classroom and share strategies to improve their courses. They also share practical information about doctors, dentists, school districts and employment opportunities for spouses in the Quad Cities area.

Suggestions for Building Community

There are plenty of options for community-building events; the challenge will be to find the ones that best fit this particular community and finding a way to promote them so that people actually attend/participate. A recent activity that had an excellent turnout was the Augie Night at the Ballpark that took place August 22, 2012. (Note: They received 542 RSVPs and it’s estimated that the final attendance was pretty close to that.)

⁴ “If you want to retain the best young workers, give them a mentor instead of cash bonuses.” *Business Insider* (July 28, 2011) <http://www.businessinsider.com/young-workers-mentor-2011-7#ixzz2PQxmthmP>

It's difficult to be certain why that event was so successful and others have been less so, but a few factors do stand out:

- Faculty were encouraged to bring spouses and children. In fact, this was one of the very few events we can recall that was open to families but also seemed welcoming to faculty members without families. Usually, events seem to target either one group or the other.
- The event took place early in the school year, when faculty tend to be far less stressed-out and busy.
- There was free food, which is always welcome!
- The event required an RSVP. Anecdotal evidence suggests that faculty are more likely to attend an event if they've RSVP'ed for it as opposed to events where one can decide at the last minutes, since there is a sense of commitment ("They've already ordered hot dogs for me and my family, so we should probably go.") that can counteract the inevitable last-minute "Gosh, I'm really worn out. That event sounded fun when I heard about it a few weeks ago, but maybe I'll just stay at home tonight and watch *The Bachelor*."
- Since facilities and dining services didn't have to work the event, they were also able to attend. And many did.
- There was an actual event (in this case, a baseball game) as opposed to a picnic or a cook-out where introverted faculty members might have no idea what to do with themselves once they arrive.
- One of the organizers of Augie Night at the Ballpark notes "I suspect some people just like the idea of a social event off-campus for a change. We did that deliberately...."

Other, similar events that might attract faculty with families as well as single faculty members would be:

- Family outings/activities that utilize a faculty member's unique expertise of the QC/Chicago area (Example: Norm Moline's Chicago tour)
- Annual sporting events (Example: Faculty vs. Administration kickball game, "hard-science" vs. "humanities" departmental flag football, staff vs. faculty bowling night, etc.)
- Putting up a big screen somewhere in the Quad to show family movies in the summer
- Inviting employees and their guests to enjoy annual sporting events such as the final game of the World Series and the final four games of the NCAA on big screen TVs—with snacks provided and organized activities for children of faculty in a nearby room

Most of these events would cost very little or nothing (beyond, perhaps, providing snacks). A few such annual events, however, might help faculty (and staff and administrators) to get to know each other better and might also provide something to do in the Quad Cities (particularly during the summer, spring or fall breaks.)

On a more scholarly level, the following events would focus on creating opportunities to celebrate/recognize the academic work of our faculty:

- Celebration of Scholarship / Celebration of Learning
- Once-per-year Department-Hosted Dinners. Example: The Biology department is going to host this year's dinner. So, they put together a program, during which they'll each talk a little about what they do, cool things they're working on (scholarly research and innovations within their classes, etc.), issues that their department is struggling with (in their case, maybe advising and/or Senior Inquiry, not enough tenure positions, etc.) and entertainment (sort of a talent show of the Biology Faculty). Faculty from the other departments (as well as administration and staff, potentially) just have to show up, eat some food and enjoy the show. A program like this would go a long ways toward helping us to learn about some of the cool things that other departments do, what issues they face, etc., and would go a long ways toward helping to develop good, inter-disciplinary relations

The role of the Faculty Development Committee could be as simple as helping to organize and promote the dinners (and provide funding for the food).

Activities like the ones described above would require minimal financial resources but might prove invaluable in providing opportunities for faculty to cross departmental divides and to interact with each other (and families!) socially. Some opportunities similar to these already exist (The Feminist Tea Talks, Friday Conversations, etc.) but are often poorly attended. It may be that focusing on a small number of “big events” that occur annually (and which, ideally, would be scheduled during long breaks or else early in the terms) might attract greater numbers of faculty.

The Center for Faculty Enrichment need not—and should not—reinvent the wheel. There are already committees and informal groups that organize activities and social outings. One thing that the college lacks, however, is an information clearinghouse, a place where someone can find out what is available and who to contact. The CFE may also provide funding and resources for additional activities as specific needs are identified. The immediate need, however, is for coordination of activities and events; a deliberate strategy for scheduling and promotion will help the college to maximize the resources that it already has in place.

Creating a Center for Faculty Enrichment: What should a Center for Faculty Enrichment Look Like?

As has been made clear in the previous sections of this report, there is ample work to be done in faculty development at Augustana. We need to retain the quality opportunities we have provided over the years (e.g., New Faculty Orientation, Teaching Circle, Teaching Observation Groups, and reading groups) and expand the opportunities available to more faculty at different stages and in more facets of their career. In this section, we propose what an expanded faculty development presence at Augustana might look like in terms of staffing and office organizational structure.

Director

In its most recent iteration, ACTL was staffed by a 3/7 time director with a 10-month contract, Dr. Jon Clauss, whose ACTL office was housed on the main floor of Tredway Library. This arrangement is not unusual for colleges like ours, where teaching and learning centers are often headed by faculty members whose release time ranges from none to release from all but one course (EAB 2009, Lee 2010).⁵

Our recommendations for how the director position is to be configured depend in large part on potential changes in the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). Given the history of faculty development efforts bouncing back and forth between faculty-led initiatives and efforts housed in Founders, we strongly recommend that any new initiative include both a faculty director and an administrative champion working together as partners. Such a partnership would make faculty development efforts less susceptible to disruption due to changes in leadership and organization.

Regardless of how the staffing question is decided, though, we expect the Center to have direct and regular contact with the OAA, while maintaining the bright line between faculty development work and tenure and promotion evaluations. We also expect that the Center will have at least part time administrative support and/or the use of student workers to help with some of the more routine aspects of its work.

We propose three possible configurations for how faculty development might be structured:

⁵ A Fall 2012 query on the CIC deans' list serv found that release time for faculty developers ranged widely. On the high end: at Gustavus Adolphus, the director has 1/3 release time + a 10-month contract, and is assisted by four “faculty associates” (much like the Faculty Fellows we propose) who are also given releases and stipends. On the low end: Ancilla College does not have a director but a committee with no release time that is chaired by the Dean; in reality this responsibility then falls to the Dean.

Option #1 (Optimal staffing):

- An AD with at least half time responsibilities in faculty development
- A Director of the Center for Faculty Enrichment teaching only one course per year (this position might be filled through a national search, or could be filled internally much the same way as our internal ADs have been selected)

Option #2 (Adequate staffing)

- An AD with at least half time responsibilities in faculty development
- A Director of the Center for Faculty Enrichment with 4/7 course release time.

Option #3 (Adequate staffing)

- A Director of the Center for Faculty Enrichment with 6/7 release time and partnership with the OAA (likely in the form of an AD with faculty development as a small portion of his/her duties, although in this arrangement it might be preferable for the director to report directly to the Dean).

While all of these options require more staffing resources than we currently allocate to faculty development, it should be noted that it's possible to conceive of additional positions that might be housed within a Center for Faculty Enrichment. Some centers have dedicated educational technology specialists who work directly with faculty via the Center, for example. Others have half- or full-time grant writing specialists. Depending on the strategic direction(s) the College decides to pursue (e.g., developing more blended learning classes), an investment in these positions may be necessary to move the College forward.

Faculty Fellows

FDWG strongly supports the creation of a Faculty Fellows program to help carry out the work of the Center. We envision two to four fellows per year applying for a 2-year fellowship that carries one course release per year; a lower-cost model would award \$1000 in additional PDF. We see the need for a 2-year commitment to ensure some continuity in Center offerings and also give Fellows a chance to “learn the ropes” before vacating the position.

Faculty would propose fellowship projects in areas of their developing expertise; we can imagine a Faculty Fellow in Technology, a Faculty Fellow in Writing Instruction, a Faculty Fellow in Mentoring Undergraduate Research, etc. Fellows would assist the director in creating programming and faculty development opportunities through the Center, and would share their expertise with faculty colleagues. Faculty Fellows may also provide a source for future leadership for the Center.

Many centers include some sort of Faculty Fellow program that vary according to what sort of compensation they provide and how stringently the role is structured.⁶ Such a program would be a good fit for Augustana, with our emphases on teachers as reflective practitioners and on formative evaluation.

⁶ Some examples of fellows programs can be found at Augsburg (<http://inside.augsburg.edu/ctl/>); Brandeis (<http://www.brandeis.edu/magazine/2012/fall-winter/the-brief/curve.html>); Bridgewater State (<http://www.bridgew.edu/Teachingandlearning/>); Brown (http://brown.edu/Administration/Sheridan_Center/programs/junior.html); and St. Olaf (<http://wp.stolaf.edu/cila/associates/>)

Faculty Development Advisory Board

Like everyone else on campus, we have no great desire to see the creation of another committee. At the same time, we believe that faculty development is by its nature a collaborative endeavor that requires substantive faculty input in order to be effective. We therefore propose the creation of a Faculty Development Advisory Board to assist the Director and/or the Associate Dean charged with faculty development in creating and promoting faculty development opportunities, and advising the director as to the strategic direction of the Center. The Advisory Board will be a committee responsible to the faculty, and members will be selected through Nominations and Rules. While we anticipate the configuration of the Advisory Board may change, one initial possibility would include: the Center Director (committee chair), the Associate Dean for Faculty Development, the Faculty Fellows selected for that year, and four elected faculty representatives (one from each rank, with an eye towards divisional diversity).

We expect that the Center and the Advisory Board would work closely with the following groups: the Assessment for Improvement Committee, the Faculty Research Committee, the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Jaeke Awards Committee and the Institutional Research and Assessment Office.

Space

It is important that the Center for Faculty Enrichment have both a robust web presence and a physical presence on campus. The FDWG has sketched out the architecture of a future web site which we hope will serve as a repository for faculty development resources (see Appendix C). In terms of physical presence, we anticipate that the COE will require space for a director's office, a resource room, and/or a meeting (small conference) room. Of these, the director's office is most important, as it allows a place for confidential consultations with faculty.

Possibilities for Endowment

We realize that while many of the things we've suggested are at low-cost activities/practices, some of what we're hoping to accomplish will require more resources. However, it should be noted that faculty are already our most expensive and most valuable resource. It is the FDWG's position that investing in faculty development is in fact investing in the future of the College.

We came across several possibilities for endowing the work of the Center that may be of interest as the college works through our latest strategic planning process.

- A named center. Several colleges/universities have named centers for teaching and learning; Connecticut College's Joy Shechtman Mankoff Center for Teaching & Learning and Macalester's Jan Serie Center for Teaching and Scholarship are two examples. The Joy Shechtman Mankoff Center is endowed at \$1 million. That endowment does not pay for the director's salary but covers some administrative support and programming expenses for the year.
- Endowed funds for curricular development and/or leadership development. The Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching at the University of Puget Sound has an endowment for curricular development. The Center's director works with the faculty and with college administration to establish priorities for curricular development and can allocate funds accordingly; these funds can also be used for faculty development workshops and other programming. (The last major use of these funds was for a general education conversation process, where faculty needed to rework their courses to fit into the new system.)

Conclusion

The FDWG is excited about the future of faculty development at Augustana. We believe that investing in faculty development at all levels will contribute to faculty retention, morale, and expertise. All of these have intrinsic benefits, of course, but will also, ultimately, improve the student experience at Augustana as well. We welcome all feedback on our report.

Sources Cited

- “Adjunct faculty orientation and professional development.” (2011) University Leadership Council. Washington, DC: The Education Advisory Board. Print.
- Augsburg College: The Center for Teaching and Learning. <http://inside.augsburg.edu/ctl/>
- Augustana College. (2006) “Tradition and Transformation: A Self Study Conducted in Support of a Continuing Accreditation Visit by the Higher Learning Commission.” Print.
- Austin, A. E. (2010). “Supporting faculty members across their careers.” In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Gillespie (Eds.), *A Guide to Faculty Development*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley, pp. 363-378.
- Baldwin, R., DeZure, D., Shaw, A., and Moretto, K. (2008). “Mapping the terrain of mid-career faculty at a research university: Implications for faculty and academic leaders.” *Change*, 40, 46-55.
- Barden, D.M. and Curry, J. (2013). “Faculty members can lead, but will they?” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Bataille, G.M. and Brown, B.E. (2006). *Faculty career paths: multiple routes to academic success and satisfaction*. Phoenix: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- Blackburn, R. T., and Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boice, R. (1991). “Quick starters: New faculty who succeed.” *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 48: 111–121.
- Boyle, P. and Boice, B. (1998). “Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants.” *Innovative Higher Education* 22 (3): 157–179.
- Burke, D. L. (1988). *A new academic marketplace*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Columbia University (2013). *Final report: Working group on faculty retirement*. http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Working_Group_on_Faculty_Retirement.pdf
- Connecticut College: Joy Shechtman Mankoff Center for Teaching & Learning, <http://www.conncoll.edu/offices/center-for-teaching--learning/>
- “Designing a faculty development center.” (2009) University Leadership Council. Washington, DC: The Education Advisory Board. Print.

- Edgerton, R. (1993). "The reexamination of faculty priorities." *Change*, 25 (4), 10–25.
- Gappa, J.M., Austin, A. E., and Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Gustavus Adolphus College: The John S. Kendall Center for Engaged Learning
<https://gustavus.edu/kendallcenter/>
- HERI Faculty Survey
- Ithaca College: Center for Faculty Excellence <http://www.ithaca.edu/cfe/>
- Johnsrud, L. K. and Rosser V. J. (2002). "Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, No. 4, 518-542.
- Karpiak, I. E. (1997). "University professors at mid-life: Being a part of ... but feeling apart." In D. DeZure (Ed.), *To improve the academy* (pp. 21-40). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Lindholm, J. A., Szelenyi, K., Hurtado, S., and Korn, W. S. (2005). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2004-2005 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles University of California, Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute.
- Macalester College: The Jan Serie Center for Scholarship and Teaching. <http://www.macalester.edu/cst/>
- Matier, M. W. (1990). "Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses." *Research in Higher Education*, 31, 39–60.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1979). "Perspectives from psychology: Financial incentives are ineffective for faculty." In D. R. Lewis & W. E. Becker, Jr. (Eds.), *Academic rewards for higher education* (pp. 37–39). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Mole, B. (2012). "15 colleges receive grants for innovation in helping faculty retire" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Murphy, C.H. (2008). "Thinking about retirement? Information you need to know!" *Focus on Colleges, Universities and Schools* 3(1).
- Puri, A., Graves, C., Lowenstein, A. and Hsu, L. (2012). "New faculty's perception of faculty development initiatives at small teaching institutions." *ISRN Education*: 9 pages. doi:[10.5402/2012/726270](https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/726270).
- Reder, M. (2010) "Effective practices in the context of small colleges." In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Gillespie (Eds.), *A Guide to Faculty Development*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley, 293 – 308.
- Romano, J. L., Hoelsing, R., O'Donovan, K., and Weinsheimer, J. (2004). "Faculty at mid-career: A program to enhance teaching and learning." *Innovative Higher Education*, 29, 21-48.
- Schroeder, C.M. (2011) *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Energizing Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. and Yun, J.H. (2011) "Mutual Mentoring Guide, University of Massachusetts, Amherst." <http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/downloads/Mutual%20Mentoring%20Guide%20Final%2011%20.pdf>

Tarr, T. A. (2010). "Working with adjunct faculty members." In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Gillespie (Eds.), *A Guide to Faculty Development*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley, 347-361.

University of California, Santa Barbara Instruction Development website (<http://oic.id.ucsb.edu/faculty-handbook-teaching/first-year-faculty/research-successful-new-faculty>)

University of Puget Sound, Center for Writing, Teaching, and Learning.
<http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/academic-resources/cwlt/>

Weiler, W. C. (1985). "Why do faculty members leave the university?" *Research in Higher Education*, 23, 270–277.

Appendix A: Faculty Development Certificate Programs

Many colleges and universities have certificate programs for new(er) teachers, whether these are for graduate assistants or for newly hired adjunct, part time, or tenure-track professors (see Brown University; University of Notre Dame). Brown University's Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning (http://brown.edu/Administration/Sheridan_Center/certificateprograms/) has four certificate programs on reflective teaching, course design, a professional development seminar, and a teaching consultant program. Notre Dame's Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning (<http://kaneb.nd.edu/programs/>) has three such certification programs in addition to their program for graduate teaching assistants: teaching well using technology; striving for excellence in teaching; and advanced teaching scholar. Such programs are designed to take folks who have been prepared largely for specialized research and ensure smooth transitions into teaching as a profession. Some graduate programs prepare their doctoral students better others for the challenges and opportunities of teaching, but it is safe to say, in general, that teaching is, at best, a secondary focus of preparing doctoral students for professional careers.

There are other schools that have programs designed for midcareer folks and those moving into administration or other leadership positions. Michigan State has the Lilly Teaching Seminar Series that consists of 6-8 workshops per semester that can be attended as a one-off or the entire series (<http://fod.msu.edu/opportunities/lilly-teaching-seminar-series>). It is not clear from their website whether this currently provides any kind of certification, but the program began as a way for junior faculty to be selected as Lilly Teaching Fellows. It seems as though they have brought in presenters in the past, but about half of the present term workshops are conducted by MSU faculty or staff. They also have the LEAD seminar series, designed to assist administrators (particularly new administrators) transition into their new roles. Macalester College has a mid-career faculty seminar in which participants are paid a \$2000 stipend and learn about "major issues facing US higher education," "working knowledge of how Macalester is put together," "knowledge of challenges of each operational unit in the college," "knowledge of how critical decisions are made at the institutional level," and "perspectives on the nature and role of academic leadership." The Macalester programs might be feasible (on some scale) for us. The idea of the mid-career faculty seminar seems designed to groom people for administrative posts (so it would likely involve small numbers here at Augustana), but a program for department chairs might be something that we could also do.

As we discussed the possibility of offering certificate programs in our working group, we thought of other topics or issues that might warrant a "curriculum" or series of offerings as opposed to "one off" workshop. In speaking with members of the WGS program, we thought that we could potentially do a certificate program on involving gender theory as an element of one's teaching. The external evaluators for WGS suggested in the program's 2011-12 review that we need more people trained to teach the 201 and 230 courses. Such a certificate program could also be a way to get people interested in those possibilities. Other possible certificate programs could be in adding ethics components to classes in support of the new ethics program, incorporating technology into one's classes, or building classes to develop students' intercultural competence. These certificate programs could be especially useful to cross-disciplinary programs as a way of staffing both core and supporting courses.

As a group, we don't think it would be overly difficult to put together some certificate programs, and the cost of doing these things seems relatively low since it would likely involve being somewhat more deliberate in sequencing and connecting various workshops/events that are already happening on an ad hoc basis on campus.

Appendix B: Faculty Development Website information

In terms of overall look, we liked Macalester's Center's site:

http://www.macalester.edu/cst/services_and_resources.html

- Large picture (rotator would be good, but just a pretty pic is fine)
- Very clear/clean – lots of white space
- Like the look of the sidebar on the far left and the events calendar on the far right

In terms of specific architecture:

Home page

HOME [content about fac dev at Augustana]

Resources and

Programs

Grants

Faculty Newsletter

Academic Affairs

About us

CONTACT US

Link to YouTube

channel *

**ONLINE
SUGGESTION
BOX**

[next page]

Resources and Programs page

For Prospective Faculty [link to website]

For New Faculty

- New Faculty Bios
- New Faculty Orientation Schedule
- New Faculty Orientation Handbook
- [New Faculty Orientation](#)
- Teaching Circle
- CMS: Moodle --and ITS Help Desk [link to ITS page]
- Course Approval deadlines and forms

For Adjunct and Part Time Faculty

- About review and promotion for APT
- APT opportunities

For Continuing Faculty

- Consultations
- Teaching Observation Groups

- Faculty Reading Groups
- Writing Retreats
- Friday Conversations
- Teaching resources [link to another page, with links]
- Workshop handouts [link to moodle site]

For Department Chairs

- Department Chair Handbook
- Position Authorization Request
- Department and program review schedule
- Department and program review guidelines
- Misc Department chair resources [link to page]

Requests for web folks:

- Can we have an easily updateable calendar function that will link to Google calendar? (like Macalester's)
- Not sure how the suggestion box would work, but we like the idea of being able to ask “are you willing to help?”

Requests for ITS:

- Coordinate with IT workshops?
- Create you Tube channel for Fac Dev?
- Assist faculty with creating blended learning classes, incorporating tech (more than Moodle)