I OVERVIEW

The 2009–10 academic year was both an exciting and a challenging one for CETL. On the exciting end, we hired an outstanding new Senior Administrative Assistant; we brought in a variety of outside specialists to lead engaging workshops for faculty; we had the largest number of applicants for our annual Writing Retreat; and we received approval to add a new part-time position for the 2010–11 school year. We also ensured that when a faculty member requested to meet with someone one-on-one to discuss a teaching or learning issue, that instructor had the chance to meet with a CETL colleague within a week. But the year also presented one considerable challenge: CETL was without an administrative assistant for the first 5-1/2 months of the year. We had to make some difficult choices so that we could remain nimble and responsive to faculty needs while keeping the workload manageable. We’re proud of what we accomplished, as this report details.

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. Another fundamental role of these workshops is to provide faculty with up-to-date research on teaching and learning practices. Because of staffing shortages, no workshops were offered in Fall Quarter 2009 (see section III, “CETL’s Internal Changes” for further explanation). In Winter and Spring Quarters 2010, CETL organized 9 workshops, with 139 attendees and 84 faculty served.

2009–10 Workshops

- Responsive teaching: How mid-term evaluations and minor course adjustments can improve student learning | Presented by Therese Huston and David Green | 2 sessions; 21 attendees
- Teaching to diversity: The multinational classroom (co-sponsored by Albers School of Business and Economics) | Presented by David Green | 2 sessions; 35 attendees
- Encouraging students to read: Incentives, disincentives, and raising the bar intellectually | Presented by David Green | 2 sessions; 25 attendees
- Project and protect: Voice skills for faculty | Presented by Sibylle Just, Neurologisches Reha-Zentrum Wiesbaden & University of Giessen, Germany | 2 sessions; 12 attendees
- Looking to learn: Developing visual literacy across the disciplines | Presented by Deandra Little, University of Virginia | 2 sessions; 24 attendees
- What’s said and not said: Navigating classroom discomfort around gender, race, and social class | Presented by Ed Reed, Matteo Ricci College, Seattle University | 2 sessions; 22 attendees
Observations
The absence of any Fall Quarter workshops (beyond the New Faculty Institute) led to a serious drop in the number of faculty attending workshops in 2009–10. With only 84 faculty served, this marked the lowest year in workshop participation in CETL’s history. In contrast, in 2008–09, 125 faculty participated in one or more of the 12 CETL workshops.

As seen in the chart below, faculty participation in the workshops was not uniform across colleges. Although it is typical for A&S to have a high proportion of workshop participants, Albers and MRC both had higher workshop turnout than we would expect (22% and 8%, respectively), given their total numbers at the university (12% and 1%, respectively). We suspect these higher numbers reflect the prominent roles these 2 colleges played in our 2009–10 workshops: Albers co-sponsored a workshop in the winter and an MRC faculty member facilitated 2 workshops in the spring. This can inform our future planning. If we wish to increase faculty turnout in Law or STM, for instance, we could invite one of these schools to co-sponsor a workshop, or we could approach a faculty member to facilitate a session.

b. Consultations
Providing meaningful and useful consultation on faculty-driven teaching issues continues to be one of CETL’s top priorities. During 2009–10, CETL’s Director, Associate Director, and Senior Faculty Fellow consulted with 86 individual faculty members and 14 teams of faculty, averaging approximately 4.37 hours per individual or team. As noted in the overview, we ensured that any faculty member who requested a consultation had the opportunity to meet with one of us within 1 week.

Status and affiliation of faculty served by workshops and consultations*

* The data in the chart above was revised slightly in August 2011 due to a change in data tracking methods.
Observations
In recent years, faculty sometimes had to wait as long as 2 weeks before they could meet with Therese or David about a teaching or learning issue. We were able to cut our consultation wait time this year for 2 reasons:

1) we had a Senior Faculty Fellow and a cohort of 8 peer consultants, so the consultations could be distributed among more people; and

2) if a consultation request came in during a terribly busy week (typically weeks 3–8 during the quarter), Therese or David would offer to meet with the instructor for 20–30 minutes that same week and schedule a longer appointment, if necessary, at a later date. In some cases, instructors were able to get their issues resolved in a quick meeting or phone call, and in other cases, the instructors preferred to wait and simply have the longer appointment 1–2 weeks later.

A notable trend is that we’ve had a growing number of “groups” requesting consultations. A “group” might be 2 faculty who are co-teaching a course; it could be 3 instructors in different departments who are trying to improve something, such as writing assignments in the Core; or it could be an entire department or college that consults CETL on a broad teaching and learning issue, such as revisions to a course evaluation instrument. It’s fantastic to be working with groups of faculty—it ensures that people don’t feel alone; it brings more ideas to the table; and it often leads to broader conversations about how to change the contexts in which we teach.

One problem, however, is how to track these group consultations. In the past, we’ve counted each group as just 1 consultation, even if it’s with a department of 10 people, and we haven’t recorded the different departments represented in cross-disciplinary conversations. Starting with Fall 2010, our new database will be equipped to record all of the names and departments of group members so that we can better track CETL’s reach.

Peer Consulting Program
The goal of CETL’s Peer Consulting Program is to support quality teaching on campus by creating more opportunities for constructive and formative dialogues about teaching through one-on-one consultations with trained peer consultants from across the university.

In 2009–10, the following peer consultants provided consultations to 11 individual faculty members, averaging 2.53 hours per consultation:

- John Carter | Mathematics, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & ENGINEERING
- Michelle DuBois | Biology, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & ENGINEERING
- Theresa Earenfight | History, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Nirmala Gnanapragasam | Civil and Environmental Engineering, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & ENGINEERING
- Lyn Gualtieri | General Science, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & ENGINEERING
- Antwinett Lee | COLLEGE OF NURSING
- John McLean | Management, ALBERS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
- Heath Spencer | History, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
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c. New Faculty Institute (NFI)
CETL successfully directed its third New Faculty Institute in September 2009. The 3-day event had 21 participants. New faculty were able to network with colleagues from across the campus, including the President and Provost, as well as undergraduate and graduate students. NFI also included 4 break-out sessions designed to accommodate different levels of experience in higher education. CETL and the NFI Planning Team coordinated 52 presenters (35 faculty and 17 students) for the 3-day event.

The Provost’s Office expanded the goals for NFI as follows:

a. Orient our new colleagues to all aspects of life at Seattle University and begin the process of building a sense of community for them at their new academic home
b. The further exploration of the Jesuit Catholic mission of the university and review the institution’s strategic goals and initiatives
c. Discuss/review general strategies associated with teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes
d. Discuss/review the art of balancing teaching, scholarship, and service
e. Provide opportunities for junior tenure-track faculty to gather additional information about rank and tenure procedures, time-lines, and performance expectations in all 3 professional areas to promote their success in the tenure-track process

At the end of the 3-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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFI was well organized.</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI modeled good teaching practice.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of the University’s mission.</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a sense of belonging to a community at SU.</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand what is expected of me in my role at SU.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI addressed my priorities in my new role.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI took account of my prior experience.</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI was too short.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CETL also coordinated 3 of the 5 follow-up sessions during the academic year, where 2 were focused on teaching and learning and one comprised a panel of former University Rank and Tenure Committee members answering new faculty questions on the tenure process at university level.

III. CETL’S INTERNAL CHANGES

a. Staffing
Faced with University-level budget concerns, the Provost's Office asked CETL to work without a Senior Administrative Assistant position for 5-1/2 months when this position was vacated in June 2009. With full-time staffing reduced by 1/3, the Director and Associate Director examined which programs and services to prioritize and which activities to put on hold. With the approval of the Associate Provost, Jacquelyn Miller, the decision was made to continue offering individual faculty consultations, since this service has the most immediate impact on teaching and learning practices and requires relatively little administrative support, but to discontinue CETL workshops until a new administrative assistant was hired. The New Faculty Institute, however, clearly needed to continue, so CETL hired a part-time administrative assistant, Beverley Silver, to oversee the myriad of administrative tasks surrounding the New Faculty Institute.

CETL was given permission to initiate a search for a full-time administrative assistant in mid-October 2009, and after an intensive search with over 70 applications, Rebecca Jaynes was hired and began working for CETL in December 2009.

Without any Fall Quarter workshops, we knew that the number of faculty participating in CETL workshops would be lower for 2009–10 compared to previous years, as detailed earlier in the section on Workshops. We also wondered if the number of individual consultations would drop for 2009–10 since faculty were not receiving regular announcements in the fall about teaching and learning workshops. Consultations were lower in Fall Quarter (we worked with only 19 faculty, compared to 27 the year before), but we had such a high number of consultations requests in Winter and Spring Quarters that by the end of the year, we approached our normal numbers for the year: in 2008–09, CETL staff worked with 93 individuals and 10 teams of faculty, and in 2009–10, we worked with 86 individuals and 14 teams.

b. Strategic Planning
From Fall 2004 to Spring 2009, CETL had a 15–18 person Advisory Board consisting of faculty representatives from 7 colleges, 1 librarian, and select staff members. The Advisory Board was instrumental in guiding CETL’s strategic decisions for those 5 years, but communicating effectively and consistently with such a large group required considerable administrative work. In 2008–09, CETL’s Advisory Board embarked on an effort to revise and refocus CETL’s mission statement, but the large group found it difficult to make much progress. Without an administrative assistant in Fall 2009, Therese and David proposed to put the Advisory Board on hold for the year and notified members that they might be individually contacted for strategic input on specific issues.
Recognizing, however, that CETL still needed a) a 5-year strategic plan and b) a revised mission statement, a much smaller CETL Strategic Planning Group was formed, internally known as the Strategic Inner Conclave (SIC). Unlike the Advisory Board, which consisted largely of tenured faculty, the SIC group was made up of people Therese identified as rising campus leaders. The SIC members for 2009–10 are listed below.

- Peter J Alaimo | Chemistry, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
- Joyce Allen | University Registrar
- Sven Arvidson | Philosophy and Liberal Studies, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Jennifer Marrone | Management, ALBERS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
- Christina Roberts | English, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

c. New Faculty Development Position
Drawing from the priorities in the Academic Strategic Action Plan and at the encouragement of several key administrators, CETL worked with the SIC to propose 2 new full-time CETL positions for the 2010–11 budget year: a position focused on faculty professional development and a position focused on teaching with technology. Neither proposal for a full-time position was funded, but in late April 2010, funding was approved for a part-time faculty professional development position (10 work units). The new position will promote faculty professional development, supporting faculty who wish to become more effective and informed leaders in their key service roles at different career stages, such as committee or department chairs, program directors, and assistant / associate deans. A call for applications will be made in Fall 2010, with the new person starting his or her role in January 2011.

d. Database
One of CETL’s priorities since Fall 2008 has been to develop an internal, confidential, and relational database to track faculty who use the CETL throughout the year for workshops, consultations, and programs. A partial database was built in 2008–09, but the project was put on hold when CETL was without an administrative assistant for the first part of the 2009–10 school year. After many months of rebuilding and expanding the database to meet a wider variety of CETL needs, the database was completed during Summer Quarter 2010. We will begin actively using it to manage faculty data starting Fall Quarter 2010.

IV. PROMOTING SCHOLARSHIP

a. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Writing Retreat
CETL established the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Writing Retreat in 2007 as a way to support faculty committed to taking a scholarly approach to their work in the classroom. To date, 28 faculty have participated in the retreat, and each year we receive a larger and stronger pool of applications (from 9 applications in 2006 to 15 applications in 2010).
Therefore, one question CETL faces as we move forward is whether to expand the program or change the selection criteria. Because the applications were of such high caliber for the 2010 retreat, the review committee considered increasing the number of acceptances. Unfortunately, the costs were prohibitive. But the quality of SoTL research is rapidly improving at Seattle University—as evidenced both by the improved proposals and by the fact that last spring, 3 SU faculty, David Carrithers, Teresa Ling (a former Writing Retreat participant), and John Bean (an ongoing Writing Retreat facilitator), won a national award for their SoTL work. The scholarship of teaching and learning could easily become the focus of an interdisciplinary center for excellence on campus.

CETL’s fourth annual SoTL Writing Retreat was held from June 15–17, 2010. Of the 15 applicants, 10 faculty were selected in a highly competitive process based on the strength of their SoTL writing proposals.

The following cohort was selected for the 2009–10 academic year:

- Brenda Broussard | COLLEGE OF NURSING
- Angelique Davis | Political Science, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Theresa Earenfight | History, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Trisha King Stargel | Criminal Justice, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Marianne LaBarre | Pastoral Leadership Program, SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY & MINISTRY
- Tracey Pepper | History, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Bryan Ruppert | Marketing, ALBERS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
- Jeff Staley | Theology & Religious Studies, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Susan Weihrich | Accounting, ALBERS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
- Danuta Wojnar | COLLEGE OF NURSING

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

The alone-time is precious and in little supply during a normal day. Not being distracted by the need to answer a phone or do the laundry was invaluable. Engaging in purposeful, intentional conversation about the writing process and topic specific to my work was a gift.

This program has given me the best opportunity to achieve the publication component of tenure. The feedback I received from peers in another discipline was very helpful to achieve clarity and better flow of ideas.

The daily deadlines pushed me to produce writing that was at least relatively worthy of being read by others—sloppy notes were not acceptable!

In addition to gathering this feedback, CETL also tracks the number of scholarly works each cohort produces after the retreat as a longer-term measure of its impact. A year after completing the intensive
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writing program, the participants from the 2009 Writing Retreat attribute 9 scholarly works to the writing, research, and thinking habits they developed at the retreat (3 published works, 2 in press, 1 under contract, and 3 submitted for review).† Participants also report that the Writing Retreat sparked several other kinds of projects, including 3 research projects and the revision of course materials.

b. Expanding Your Expertise in Teaching (EYE) Mini-Grant Program

In 2010, CETL piloted the EYE Mini-Grant Program to support faculty assigned to teach in an area outside of their expertise. The program was composed of 2 elements: 1) a grant-supported project designed by the faculty member, which would help them gain the required expertise, and 2) a faculty learning community of grant recipients that met 4 times in Spring Quarter to study how to teach outside one’s expertise, build interdisciplinary relationships, share ideas, and discuss readings from the book Teaching What You Don’t Know (Huston, 2009).

From 8 applicants, the following 6 faculty were awarded grants:

- Sven Arvidson | Philosophy/Liberal Studies, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Sharon Cumberland | English, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Naomi Kasumi | Fine Arts – Digital Design, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Elise Murowchick | Psychology, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Susan Palmer | Fine Arts – Music, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
- Nina Valerio | Education – Curriculum & Instruction, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

A total of $6,810 in grant funds was given out to the grant recipients. The faculty learning community will meet again in Fall Quarter 2010 to discuss the outcomes of their projects.

c. Faculty Writing Clubs

In Spring Quarter 2010, CETL collaborated with the new Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects (ORSSP) to establish several faculty writing clubs. CETL and ORSSP presented research on the effectiveness of writing clubs and organized faculty into 4 interdisciplinary groups, including one group with faculty who are all parents, guardians, or caregivers. The writing clubs meet as regularly as they choose to (in most cases bimonthly), setting scholarship goals and holding one another accountable to those goals.

V. IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION PRACTICES NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

CETL contributes to both national and international conversations on teaching and learning and faculty development practices through presentations at conferences, publications, and professional service.

† These numbers reflect the scholarly works of 5 of the 10 retreat participants from 2009. We have yet to receive updates from the other 5 participants.
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a. Conferences

**International Consortium of Educational Development Biennial Conference, Barcelona, Spain | June 2010**

*Teaching what you just learned: Supporting common teaching predicaments in higher education.* Workshop presented by Therese Huston.

*Sustaining and championing academic development – in good times or bad.* Workshop presented by Peggy Cohen (U Missouri-St Louis), Shelda Debowski (U Western Australia), Therese Huston, James Groccia (Auburn U), James Wisdom (Middlesex U, UK).

*The political geographies of academic development: neutral, non-neutral and/or marginal?* Symposium presented by Catherine Manathunga (U Queensland, Australia), Trevor Holmes (U Waterloo, Canada), David Green, Deandra Little (U Virginia), Nancy Turner (U of the Arts London, UK), Brad Wuetherick (U Saskatchewan, Canada), Gail Rathbun (IUPU Fort Wayne), and Beverley Hamilton (U Windsor, Canada).

*How well do we know our students?* Workshop presented by Celia Popovic (Birmingham City U, UK) and David Green.

**Fairfield University Annual Summer Teaching Conference – Pedagogy, Technology & Course Redesign, Fairfield, CT | June 2010**

*Late nights and big questions: The joys and challenges of interdisciplinary teaching.* Conference keynote presented by Therese Huston.

**Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education annual conference, Houston, TX | October 2009**

*Teaching what you learned yesterday.* Workshop presented by Therese Huston and David Green.

*Educational gobbledygook: Does language discourage faculty from becoming faculty developers?* Workshop presented by David Green.

*Sustaining and championing faculty development – in good times or bad.* Anchor session presented by Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, Nancy Chism, Peter Felten, James Groccia, Therese Huston, Michael Reder, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, & Christine Stanley.

**6th Annual Innovation in Instruction Conference, Elon, NC | August 2009**

*Enjoying the adventure (and managing the chaos): Teaching what you don’t know.* Conference plenary presented by Therese Huston.
b. Publications


c. Professional service

THERESE HUSTON

**Committee member**
Core Committee (Board of Directors), Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) (2009–2012)

Chair, Professional Development Committee, Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education

Rethinking Liberal Education Project, Sponsored by the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U)

**Reviewer**
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DAVID GREEN

**Reviewer**
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**Conference submission reviewer**
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