

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW

II. ACTIVE TEACHING SUPPORT

a. Workshops

b. Consultations

c. New Faculty Institute

III. RESEARCH FROM CETL

a. Research questions on campus

b. Research study on course evaluation comments

IV. PROMOTING SCHOLARSHIP

a. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Writing Retreat

b. Writing Fridays

c. CASTL Conference: Developing Scholars of Teaching and Learning

d. Focus Groups on Support for Scholarship

V. STRATEGIC CONNECTIONS AND LEADERSHIP

VI. IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION PRACTICES NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

I. OVERVIEW

The 2007-08 academic year was notable for CETL in several regards. After eight months of intensive planning and coordination, we directed our first New Faculty Institute for 49 faculty in September 2007. Our faculty workshops facilitated cross-disciplinary discussions of teaching and learning among 90 faculty and our consultations led to direct teaching support for 77 instructors. In winter and spring quarters, CETL conducted an extensive study of student comments on the course evaluation forms in the College of Arts and Sciences. We also sought to provide broader campus leadership in a variety of timely institutional initiatives, such as the Academic Excellence Strategic Planning group and the Core Assessment Committee. On a national note, the Director and Associate Director offered six conference presentations at national and international meetings, and the Director signed a book contract with Harvard University Press. CETL continues to find innovative ways to support faculty satisfaction with their teaching and promote educational excellence across the university and across the country.

II. ACTIVE TEACHING SUPPORT

a. Workshops

One of CETL's fundamental goals has been to establish and support a community of faculty engaged in scholarly discussion around teaching and learning. CETL workshops play a key role in supporting this goal as they provide a dynamic space for faculty to collaborate and share their teaching and learning ideas. Research on teaching and learning best practices is also presented so that faculty are up-to-date with current scholarship. Faculty from every college and teaching level attended, allowing for rich and vibrant discussions across disciplines. Quantitative figures for CETL's workshop services are provided below:

17 workshops
191 attendees
90 faculty served

Larger events were co-sponsored with the Department of Chemistry and the Wismer Center to bring in outside speakers such as Mark Cracolice and Yolanda Flores Niemann. Due to the size and co-sponsorship of these events, faculty statistics were not gathered, although it is estimated that 50 people attended Mark Cracolice's Active Learning brownbag and 40 faculty members attended Yolanda Flores Niemann's two seminars on tokenism in academia.

A complete list of CETL's 2007-08 workshops are listed below:

FALL QUARTER 2007

- Using Midterm Evaluations to Improve Your Teaching (2 sessions: 21 attendees)
Therese Huston and David Green
- Integrating Service Learning Through Reflection (1 session: 18 attendees)
Kent Koth (Center for Service and Community Engagement), David Green, Therese Huston
- Carrot or Stick: Getting Students to Do the Reading (2 sessions: 21 attendees)
Therese Huston and David Green
- Tokenism in Academia (2 sessions: 40 attendees)
Yolanda Flores Niemann (Co-sponsored with the Wismer Center)

WINTER QUARTER 2008

- Responding to Challenges in the Classroom: Disruptive Student Behavior (2 sessions, 15 attendees)
Therese Huston and David Green
- Thinking Outside the Box: Promoting Students' Independent Thinking Skills (2 sessions, 23 attendees)
David Green
- "But the test had nothing to do with the class!" Redesigning courses to match assignments, outcomes, and teaching methods (1 session: 11 attendees)
David Green
- Globalization in the classroom: Making the most of multinational student groups (2 sessions: 17 attendees)
David Green

SPRING QUARTER 2008

- Active Learning: Brown bag lunch seminar (1 session: 50 attendees)
Mark Cracolice (Co-Sponsored with the Department of Chemistry)
- Why is active learning important? An interactive workshop (1 session: 21 attendees)
Mark Cracolice (Co-Sponsored with the Department of Chemistry)
- From Monologue to Dialogue: Moderating Online Discussions (1 session: 9 attendees)
David Green, Bill Hill (Learning Technologies), Carlos Mello-e-Souza (Accounting)
- Art of Good Seminars (2 sessions: 23 attendees)
Russ Lidman (Institute of Public Service)
- Feedback that informs: Creating stimulus for change in peer reviews of teaching (2 sessions: 16 attendees)
Carol Weaver (Adult Education and Training)

b. Consultations

Providing meaningful and useful consultation on faculty-driven teaching issues has consistently ranked as one of CETL's top priorities. During 2007-08, CETL's Director and Associate Director consulted with 77 faculty (either individually or in teams) averaging approximately 5.9 hours per consultation. These numbers are roughly the same as they were for the 2006-07 school year. Whereas the number of

teaching consultations grew steadily from 2004 to 2006, our sense is that we have reached a plateau and expect to conduct 70-80 teaching consultations a year with two professional full-time staff.

Compared to previous years, one population that sought more one-on-one teaching consultations during the 2007-08 school year was faculty in their first three years at SU. Over a third of our consultations (37%) this past year involved work with faculty who had been at SU for three years or less. This is higher than it has been in previous years (17% in 2005-06 and 30% in 2006-07). We anticipate that newer faculty are seeking us out more regularly because of their frequent contact with us in the New Faculty Institute.

c. New Faculty Institute (NFI)

CETL was given overall responsibility for planning and organizing the New Faculty Institute (NFI) in November 2006, and we successfully directed our first institute in September 2007. The three-day event had 49 participants representing five colleges and schools. New faculty were able to network with colleagues from across the campus, including the President and Provost, as well as 14 students—both undergraduate and graduate. NFI also included three break-out sessions designed to accommodate different levels of experience and interest in higher education. CETL and the NFI Planning Team coordinated 41 faculty and student presenters for the three-day event.

CETL also coordinated three of the five follow-up sessions during the academic year, where the focus was on teaching and learning. (The Provost's Office coordinated the two sessions on Mission.) To accommodate different levels of experience and respond to prior cohorts' feedback of NFI, the Action Learning Sets model was used so that faculty worked together in small interdisciplinary groups to support one another in ongoing projects throughout the year.

The Provost's Office set four goals for NFI:

1. To build community across campus
2. To explain Seattle University's Jesuit mission
3. To demonstrate academic excellence by modeling good teaching practices
4. To provide expectations around rank and tenure for tenure-track NFI participants

At the end of the three-day event in September, both qualitative and quantitative feedback were gathered to assess the extent to which NFI achieved these goals. On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is "strongly disagree" and 7 is "strongly agree," mean scores were as follows:

6.71	NFI was well organized
6.53	NFI modeled good teaching practice
6.44	I have a clear understanding of the University's mission
6.02	I have a sense of belonging to a community at SU
5.96	I understand what is expected of me in my role at SU
5.41	NFI addressed my priorities in my new role
4.60	NFI took account of my prior experience

3.04 NFI was too short

From this feedback, it is evident that NFI substantially met its goals. An area to work on further for NFI 2008 is addressing the needs of faculty who are entirely new to teaching—this group felt slightly less well served at this year's NFI than other participants. Evaluations at the end of the academic year also informed us that we should continue with the Action Learning Sets model, since faculty found it valuable to work on their academic priorities with the support and feedback from their interdisciplinary groups.

Coordination of NFI has affected CETL's other work significantly. While the Director contributed around 45 hours per year when involved in NFI as a Planning Team member, this figure rose to around 140 hours in 2007/08 due to the increase in responsibility. In addition, the Associate Director approximately spent 300 hours over the year on NFI, and CETL's administrative assistant contributed a further 235 hours. Naturally, this means that CETL has had to reduce other services, particularly workshops and visiting speakers. One silver lining to this shift in workload is that CETL is now far more visible to new faculty and in 2007/08, this translated into higher new faculty attendance at CETL workshops and events.

III. RESEARCH FROM CETL

a. Research questions on campus

From time to time, SU colleagues come to us with specific inquiries relating to research into teaching and learning. At faculty requests, we search the literature to inform their decisions around instructional and assessment practices, curriculum design, or educational policies. We generate a tailored report for the individual instructor or department that makes the request. The report summarizes the literature and provides them with a ready list of references for further reading. In 2007-08, some of the research requests included questions around:

- Faculty of color and patterns within their teaching evaluations
- Corruption and learning
- Faculty titles and the impact on students' perceptions of faculty credibility
- Use of blogs as instructional tools

b. Research study on course evaluation comments

In Fall of 2007, CETL began planning a research study titled "Assessing the Helpfulness of Student Comments on Faculty Course Evaluations." The study was focused on the course evaluation process in the College of Arts and Sciences because this is the largest population of faculty within a single school on campus. The purpose of the study was to address two key questions:

1. Which questions on the current evaluation form used in the College of Arts and Sciences elicit the most helpful student comments and which questions elicit the least helpful comments?

2. Are there certain groups of faculty or certain types of courses that receive more or less helpful feedback than others?

We prioritized these two research questions because course evaluations are typically used for two purposes: by committees to evaluate the quality of an instructor's teaching and by individual faculty to make decisions about how to improve their teaching. Faculty must rely heavily on student comments to make these decisions. This study was designed to examine whether the comments that students provide on the Arts & Sciences evaluation form have the potential to help faculty improve their teaching. Research at other institutions has focused on the numerical ratings of teaching performance; our study examined students' comments in the context of these ratings.

Potential impact: If we have a better understanding of students' comments, we can affect change on several levels:

- Individual faculty members: The findings will help individual SU instructors interpret students' comments and improve their teaching.
- Institutionally: The study will help the university interpret students' comments in rank, tenure, and promotion discussions and ultimately improve the teaching evaluation instrument.
- Nationally: The study will make an important contribution to the literature on student course evaluations and potential biases in the standard evaluation process.

From December through March, a rigorous coding process was developed based on a small number of published studies and extensive repeated testing of different coding schemes. At the end of the development process, the coders had achieved an inter-rater reliability of 89.5% on the two most important variables. Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences were invited to participate in the study in April 2008, we collected faculty data through the end of May, and we coded data through early June. A total of 46 faculty participated and we coded data for 106 courses. Once students comments had been separated into distinct issues (i.e. "I loved the topic but hated the textbook" would be counted as two comments because it raises two distinct issues), we had a data set consisting of 9,874 comments.

CETL staff will be analyzing the results throughout Fall 2008, offering faculty workshops on the research study and their implications in November 2008, and providing an extensive report of the findings to faculty and administrators in January 2009.

IV. PROMOTING SCHOLARSHIP

a. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Writing Retreat

CETL hosted its second Writing Retreat for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) from June 7-9, 2008. To accommodate a larger number of participants, John Bean was asked to be a third facilitator. 10 faculty were selected in a competitive process based on the strength of their SoTL writing proposal and 9 participated (1 faculty member fell ill and could not attend the retreat). The following interdisciplinary cohort was selected for the 2008-09 academic year:

- Charles Tung | English
- Mark Cohan | Sociology
- Jeanette Rodriguez | Theology & Religious Studies
- Teresa Ling | Albers School of Business & Economics
- Sarah Bee | Accounting
- Sharon Callahan | School of Theology and Ministry
- Nina Valerio | Curriculum & Instruction
- Amy Eva | Master's in Teaching
- Bridget Walker | Master's in Teaching

John Bean, David Green, and Therese Huston facilitated the Retreat using the Action Learning Set model of small-group accountability to help attendees flush out their manuscripts. The Retreat received very positive feedback, including the following comments:

- I can do it! With support/ opportunity/ mentoring/ guided work/ trust that this amazing retreat provided, I CAN DO IT!
- I loved the use of time. The action sets motivated production without stress and made the time efficient. The freedom to use our time in a relaxing context was wonderful.

We would also like to report that the seven SoTL participants from 2007 have continued to be prolific since their retreat last June, and combined, they credit 22 scholarly works to their experience at the SoTL Writing Retreat (including articles, chapters, conference presentations, etc.). Several of these colleagues reported that the SoTL Retreat helped them become more productive than they thought possible in their writing endeavors. We are excited to see the fruits from this year's writing retreat participants as well!

b. Writing Fridays

Research shows that faculty are more productive if they can schedule time for scholarship like their other commitments (Boice, 1990), and so CETL began the Writing Fridays initiative in Winter Quarter 2008 in collaboration with Lemieux Library. This provides a quiet, collegial space in the Library where faculty can come and work on their scholarship (on any topic) without interruption. While faculty have commended CETL on this initiative and are glad that Writing Fridays exists, attendance was small over the 15 Fridays when we offered it: at most four faculty members used this opportunity on any given Friday. Attendees have reported that this has enabled them to finish projects far more swiftly, and to make greater headway with their research. Writing Fridays will require careful review in 2008/09 to establish whether this is an effective use of CETL resources and time.

c. National CASTL Institute: Developing Scholars of Teaching and Learning

In a joint sponsorship by CETL and the Provost's Office, we were excited to fund three outstanding SoTL faculty for the CASTL Conference in Omaha, Nebraska from June 4-7 which focuses on "developing scholars of teaching and learning." (CASTL is the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and

Learning, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation.) Two participants applied and were accepted to the separate “Scholars Program” in a competitive process that only accepts 28 proposals nationwide. These scholars then received intensive mentoring on their SoTL work-in-progress during their three days at the conference.

Overall, the conference received rave reviews by all three attendees, two of whom independently stated that the conference was the most enriching professional experience they have ever had as an educator.

- “I consider the CASTL institute as the most enriching professional experience I’ve had in my capacity as an educator. The quality of the conference is excellent—almost all of the attendees are devoted scholars in their own disciplines, but all are also dedicated to applying scholarly methods to improve their teaching... The conference energized me, and transformed the way I view my teaching.” (Attendee 1)
- “This conference, more than anything I have done in my 4 years as an assistant professor, has advanced my thinking and my research in the scholarship of teaching and learning.” (Attendee 2)
- “Whereas in my graduate training and early professional experience, caring about teaching was something to be embarrassed about, I now feel part of a vibrant and rigorous scholarly community through CASTL as well as through CETL’s own efforts.” (Attendee 3)

d. Focus Groups on Support for Scholarship

In January 2008, CETL was asked to oversee faculty scholarship needs and received a small budget to do so. Rather than running events immediately, CETL conducted focus groups to establish the needs that faculty felt were most important to supporting their scholarship. Participants were:

- Tenure-track faculty in their second, third, or fourth year at Seattle University.
- Faculty who received tenure in 2007 or 2008.

In total, 29 faculty participated in one of the four focus groups we ran: 17 tenure-track, and 12 tenured. College/School representation was as follows: 9 Science and Engineering, 7 Nursing, 5 Albers, 4 Arts and Sciences, 3 Education, and 1 Theology and Ministry.

The data were compiled in a report for the Provost’s Office, with topics clustered and organized by level of priority. When asked what type of support would help them be more successful in reaching their research and scholarship goals, faculty responses focused on the following areas:

- Faculty workload and expectations (146 votes)
- Funding (75 votes)
- Structural institutional support and resources (74 votes)
- Expertise and faculty development (20 votes)

Given the low priority placed on faculty development for research and scholarship, we decided that CETL was not the right office to meet these needs—the most important were areas that only the Provost's Office could initiate (in particular, release time for scholarship and additional staffing). CETL submitted the recommendations and returned the funding to the Provost's Office so that it could decide the best way forward for scholarship support at Seattle University.

V. STRATEGIC CONNECTIONS AND LEADERSHIP

CETL has continued to seek connections across campus and to offer leadership in areas of educational practices and policies. We have been represented on the following committees and working groups:

- Academic Excellence Strategic Planning group
- Core Assessment Committee
- Core Honors Committee
- Dialogue Planning Group

For Strategic Planning, CETL was represented at open forums for all five strands, and Therese Huston was a member of the Academic Excellence group.

Based on the Director's work with the Academic Excellence Task Force, Bob Dullea, the Vice President for University Planning, invited Therese to give a talk for all faculty and staff at the Mission Day celebration on April 24, 2008. She was asked to talk about what raising academic expectations for students would mean for the Seattle University community.

At least two members of CETL attended sessions with each of the candidates for Provost, and using our own rubric for the position, we were able to provide focused and ranked feedback to the Search Committee.

In January 2008, CETL gave a short presentation to all directors and leaders in Student Development so that they are aware of the services we offer to faculty and can identify connections to our work, as well as directing faculty colleagues to us if questions arise that are more specifically related to issues of teaching and learning practice and research.

Through workshops, we have collaborated with colleagues in:

- Center for Service and Community Engagement
- Learning Technologies
- Wismer Professorship
- College of Arts and Sciences
- Albers School of Business and Economics
- College of Education
- College of Science and Engineering.

Through our coordinating role for New Faculty Institute, CETL worked with faculty in every School or College, with the President and the Provost, and also with colleagues in:

- Center for Service and Community Engagement
- Faculty Services
- Institutional Research
- Institutional Review Board
- A.A. Lemieux Library
- Mission and Ministry
- Office of Multicultural Affairs
- Sponsored Research

VI. IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION PRACTICES NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

CETL contributes to both national and international conversations on teaching and learning, and on faculty development practices. In particular, we have done this through our work at conferences and through our publications.

a. **Professional and Organizational Development Network annual conference, Pittsburgh, PA | October 2007: “Purpose, Periphery, and Priorities”**

Therese Huston was conference co-chair for this major national professional meeting that included over 800 faculty and administrators from more than 16 countries. She had also been program chair for the previous year’s conference in Portland, OR. Chairing the conference has helped raise the profile of Seattle University among faculty developers nationally and internationally. In addition, Seattle University was well represented in conference sessions:

TEACHING THROUGH TRAGEDIES | Therese Huston, with colleagues from: University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Carnegie Mellon University; University of Michigan; Virginia Tech; Texas A&M University; Harvard University.

This invited panel drew on an article published by Therese Huston with Michele DiPietro of Carnegie Mellon University on responding to tragedies. In the aftermath of deaths at Virginia Tech, this article became the most commonly referenced research into constructive practices for faculty to take after tragedies.

BENEVOLENT SUBVERSIVES: TRANSFORMING LEARNING AND TEACHING INTO AN INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY | David Green and Therese Huston

Here, we introduced American faculty developers to research from Sweden (“significant networks”) and the UK (“orientations to educational development”) and encouraged attendees to apply these notions to their own settings. We have subsequently learned that the materials presented have led to

productive, strategic discussions at both the University of Washington and at Penn State. In the latter case, the materials have led Penn State colleagues to propose a further conference session at the 2008 POD conference.

b. International Consortium for Educational Development biannual conference, Salt Lake City, UT | June 2008: “Towards a Global Scholarship of Educational Development”

ICED is the only international organization for faculty development, with the POD Network as its US arm. The international profile of Seattle University has been enhanced through the four sessions we delivered.

BORDER CONTROL: DOES “SCHOLARSHIP” KEEP ACADEMIC MIGRANTS OUT? | David Green

This session reported findings of our own international research into faculty reading habits at institutions in the UK and USA and the implications for faculty development and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Attendees represented 11 different countries.

RESPONDING TO TRAGEDIES: BUILDING THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING |

Therese Huston, with Matt Ouellett of University of Massachusetts, Amherst and Michele DiPietro of Carnegie Mellon University

Building on previous research and conference sessions, this session shared findings with an international audience as to the kinds of support and direction that faculty and students need in the classroom following a collective tragedy.

FINDING COMMON TERMINOLOGY IN ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT: ESPERANTO FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPERS | David Green

This roundtable explored the problem of differences in educational language in English-speaking countries, with a view to finding a common set of terms to suggest to ICED’s refereed journal, the *International Journal for Academic Development* as an opinion piece.

WHEN SILENCE IS NOT ENOUGH: NAVIGATING HEATED MOMENTS IN CLASS | Therese Huston and Kent Koth (Center for Service and Community Engagement)

The lessons from the three workshops run by CETL and CSCE in 2006/07 were explored in this session, focusing on issues of diversity and the potentially problematic situations can arise, particularly when students are engaged in academic service learning.

c. Publications

Green, D. (2007) "Supervising Master's Degree Research." *Hearing the Student Voice: Promoting and Encouraging the Effective Use of the Student Voice to Enhance Professional Development in Learning, Teaching and Assessment Within Higher Education*. (UK Government-funded project.) Edinburgh, UK: Napier University. Pp. 67-75. Also available at:
http://www2.napier.ac.uk/studentvoices/profdev/download/Final_report_studentvoice_web_v2.pdf

Green, D.A. (Forthcoming) "New academics' perceptions of the language of teaching and learning: Identifying and overcoming linguistic barriers." *International Journal for Academic Development*.

Huston, T. A. (Forthcoming). *Teaching What You Don't Know*. Harvard University Press.

Huston, T. A. & Weaver, C. (2008). Peer coaching: Professional development for experienced faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(1), 5-20.

Huston, T. A., Norman, M., & Ambrose, S. (2007). Expanding the discussion of faculty vitality to include productive yet disengaged senior faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 493-522.

Huston, T. A. & DiPietro, M. (2007). In the eye of the storm: Students' perceptions of helpful faculty actions following a collective tragedy. In D. R. Robertson & L. B. Nilson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 25, Resources for faculty, instructional and organizational development* (pp. 207-224). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.