

Faculty Development Center
Annual Report, 2007-08
Section B
Tony Rimmer, Director

Section B: Other Topics to be Addressed

1. Progress Report on Goals for this Past Academic Year -- Academic Departments & Programs and Non-Instructional Cost Centers

The FDC set three goals for itself in the 2007-08 academic year. The goals are first outlined here, then a discussion on progress regarding these goals is offered.

The three goals for 2007-08 were:

- a. Seek funding for, develop, and implement faculty development programs targeting three classes of faculty:
 - i. New faculty: Extend new faculty orientation activities with a year-long (fall and spring semesters) series of monthly meetings timed to fit with issues as they emerge through the year
 - ii. Junior faculty: Deliver a set of programs designed to support the unique needs of junior faculty (year 2 through to tenure)
 - iii. Senior faculty: Deliver a set of programs designed to support, even re-engage, senior faculty (associate through full rank)
- b. Develop, and implement a series of workshops on online teaching and learning to support the increasing growth of online courses at CSUF
- c. Bring FDC staffing back up to its full complement and integrate new staff into the Center's activities

Discussion on goals:

Goal a: Seek funding for, develop, and implement faculty development programs targeting three classes of faculty

Funding was acquired for the three classes of faculty, as follows:

- i. New Faculty: \$32,000 in a Missions & Grant application. The funding announcement came late in the fall so we were not able to begin the program for new faculty till the spring. Two meetings were held in each of three months during the spring semester (Feb, Mar, Apr) on a MWF and TTh rotation to fit varying faculty schedules. Attendance at each meeting ran from 18-26 new faculty. Topics included: Funding for teaching and research (offered by the Office of Grants and Contracts, and the Faculty Development Center); Pollak Library resources for teaching and research (offered by Library faculty); Retention, tenure and promotion issues as they affect new faculty (offered by Faculty Affairs & Records), and strategies for managing workload and finding balance in university life (offered by FDC Faculty Coordinators). Continuing appeals were made to new faculty inviting suggestions for topics which might

be offered at subsequent meetings. New faculty reported being satisfied with the format and content of the sessions, and we have sought funding to continue developing the program in the next academic year.

- ii. Junior Faculty: \$40,000 allocation from the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A series of programs for junior faculty were proposed in the spring, but delays in gaining approval of the programs meant we were not able to initiate them that semester. A request has been made to carry the funding forward to the next financial year in hopes of launching these programs next fall.
- iii. Senior Faculty: \$40,000 allocation from the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A series of programs for senior faculty were proposed in the spring, but delays in gaining approval of the programs meant we were not able to initiate them that semester. A request has been made to carry the funding forward to the next financial year in hopes of launching these programs next fall.

Goal b: Develop, and implement a series of workshops on online teaching and learning

Several new workshops have been developed in online instruction, including, for example:

- i. Our Summer Training Institute in May 2008 which featured three intensive days of workshops on the topic of enhancing discussion in online courses
- ii. The introduction to campus of the video conferencing technology iLinc, and the beginnings of integrating it into online instruction on campus
- iii. A reaching out to instructors in departments with heavier commitments than most in online instruction, e.g., Sociology. In this instance the FDC facilitated meetings of these instructors and offered workshops on particular topics in online instruction as requested by these faculty.

We now feel that we are close enough to our goal of a core repertoire of courses in this area that we have now proposed the development of an online teaching certificate program as one of our three goals for 2008-09.

Goal c: Bring FDC staffing back up to its full complement

A fully staffed FDC includes the Director, an Administrative Assistant, three Academic Technology Consultants, a graphic artist, and three half-time faculty coordinators. This goal has been partially met insofar as we brought three new faculty coordinators into the FDC in spring 2008. We still need two Academic Technology Consultants and a permanent Administrative Assistant – this latter position is presently occupied by a temporary hire. We hope to have these three positions filled in the next two to three months. The three new faculty coordinators have already introduced several workshops and activities within their portfolio areas of academic technology (e.g., iLinc and Blackboard), teaching & learning (e.g., teaching interest groups, speaking and writing skills in teaching and research), and research and creative activities (advanced statistical methods, qualitative research interest group).

Despite the reduced staff levels that we have operated under for the past year the continuing obligations of the FDC as a campus-wide event planner have continued, and in a few cases, even expanded. The activities we have engaged in this year include: New Faculty Orientation (Fall), New Faculty Orientation Monthly Series (Spring), Part-time Faculty Orientation (Fall & Spring), ad hoc visits to department faculty meetings, monthly Chairs Support Group Luncheons, Faculty Day (Fall), Academic Affairs Forum (Spring), Annual Author Awards (Spring), Outstanding Professor Lecture (Spring), Western Assessment Conference (Spring), Faculty Technology Showcase (Spring), Intramural Grant program competitions (Spring & Fall), hosting visiting faculty groups with presentations on FDC activities (Spring & Fall), Celebrating Research (a CSUF 50th anniversary event in association with the Office of Grants & Contracts) (Spring).

Describe the results and outcomes that your college, department, or unit achieved in terms of the goals that it set in the annual report for last year. Present these accomplishments in terms of measures of productivity (efficiency in meeting goals within available resources) and indicators of quality (evidence of how effective the college or unit is). You should use both qualitative and quantitative evidence for this progress report. Specific project-related case examples and anecdotal narratives are welcome.

Some FDC Data Exhibits

Exhibits 1 through 5 following offer descriptive data about FDC activities. Exhibits 1 and 2 report FDC workshop activity from which can be drawn ideas about the unit's productivity. Exhibits 3, 4, & 5 report data from the FDC's annual survey (N=100) and these include faculty perceptions of FDC services and offerings -- which might be viewed as indicators of quality.

An overview of FDC workshops and their attendance is offered in Exhibit 1 for the 2007-08 academic year, and for the purposes of comparison, the table includes data for the 2006-07 academic year. The lower number of workshops in 2007-08 is likely a reflection of staff turnover – we had fewer instructors available for some of the year and offered fewer workshops. So, quantity is down from the previous year, but efficiencies regarding available resources might be seen as increasing insofar as we offered more workshops taught by faculty rather than by FDC staff.

Exhibit 1

**FDC Workshops & Attendance for 2007-08 and
2006-07 Academic Years**

Workshop Statistics

July 1st, 2006 - June 30th, 2007

Month	Number of Workshops	Number of Faculty
July 2006	20	68
August 2006	21	139
September 2006	20	90
October 2006	24	162
November 2006	28	102
December 2006	16	77
January 2007	18	58
February 2007	28	94
March 2007	24	76
April 2007	34	138
May 2007	24	33
June 2007	16	43
TOTAL	273	1174

Workshop Statistics

July 1st, 2007 - June 30th, 2008

Month	Number of Workshops	Number of Faculty
July 2007	10	63
August 2007	13	70
September 2007	20	85
October 2007	19	109
November 2007	16	118
December 2007	2	19
January 2008	16	71
February 2008	17	73
March 2008	17	88
April 2008	19	175
May 2008	17	67
June 2008	8	29
TOTAL	174	1040

Exhibit 2 reports the unit's workshop output and attendance numbers by topic category. This is the first time we have reported this so context is missing here. We will attempt to develop this category approach in future annual reports so that ideas arising from trends in topic offerings might be developed.

Exhibit 2

**FDC Workshops & Attendance for 2007-08
Academic Year by Topic Category**

Categories	Number of Workshops	Number of Faculty
Blackboard	81	350
Multimedia	19	48
Internet	5	19
Non-Technical	10	41
TLAC	20	425
Scantron	10	21
SPSS	13	16
FrontPage	0	0
Assessment	0	0
Research	1	3
4CTA	0	0

Exhibits 3 through 5 report on data from the FDC’s annual survey, which is executed in the spring semester each year. These data, from 100 faculty members, should be viewed as coming from a convenience sample of faculty who choose to respond to the survey call. The data constitute an interesting quality indicator, but their validity is suspect given the nature of the sample. The survey asked respondents what topics they were interested in. Exhibit 3 reports that active learning, and getting students motivated were the two leaders, while close behind came technology integration in teaching, and online instruction. In each instance these have been areas of focus by the FDC in the past year.

Exhibit 3
“...Topics You Are Interested In ...” (n=100)

1. TEACHING			
Designing Cooperative Learning		33	35%
Helping ESL Students Succeed		25	26%
Hybrid Courses		22	23%
Incorporating Service Learning		30	32%
Increasing Student Motivation/Mentoring Students		46	48%
Promoting Active Learning		59	62%
Structuring Collaborative Projects		25	26%
Teaching Large Classes		31	33%
Teaching Online Courses		41	43%
Technology Integration		44	46%
Other, Please Specify View Responses		8	8%






Exhibit 4 asked faculty respondents what they would like to know more about with regard to writing and assessment. Designing good writing assignments and using writing to facilitate student learning were the most frequently reported items here, suggesting that there is interest among the faculty in promoting good writing. These data corroborate the findings of a larger survey by the campus WASC Steering Committee this past year – that the teaching of writing is important on this campus.

Exhibit 4
“...Writing & Assessment Topics You Are Interested In ...” (n=100)

3. WRITING AND ASSESSMENT			
Assessing Student Learning		37	47%
Designing Writing Assignments		51	65%
Developing Exams		42	53%
Program/Department Assessment		19	24%
Technology Assessment Options		21	27%
Using Writing to Facilitate Student Learning		48	61%
Other, Please Specify View Responses		3	4%

To the degree that these survey data do represent the faculty, Exhibit 5 seems to indicate that the FDC’s prime audience are Assistant Professors and part-time lecturers. More effort, apparently, might usefully be extended to the university’s associate and full professors, along with full-time lecturers.

**Exhibit 5
Rank of Faculty Respondents (n=100)**

16. RANK			
Assistant Professor		30	30%
Associate Professor		13	13%
Full Professor		15	15%
Part-Time Lecturer		26	26%
Full-Time Lecturer		15	15%
Total		99	100%

2. Systematic Compilation of Student Learning Goals

(Not applicable in the case of the FDC)

3. Faculty (and Staff) Scholarly and Creative Activities

There was no research or publication activity undertaken by the FDC in the past year. We have begun to remedy this situation this past year by working to incorporate data collection and evaluation activities into the unit’s ongoing educational activities. This began in earnest in the FDC’s Summer Training Institute where we have designed into the STI program data gathering and evaluation activities aimed at establishing the degree to which faculty participants change their behaviors, if at all, with regard to their use of enhanced discussion tools in their online instruction. Both quantitative and qualitative research approaches are included in this evaluation activity.

4. Activities of Research Centers, Specialty Centers & Institutes

(Not applicable in the case of the FDC)

5. A final indicator of quality that we feel we must report is the success this past Spring of FDC Academic Technology Consultant Susan Gaitan in the Titan Excellence Awards program (Academic Affairs Division). We are proud of all our staff, and particularly pleased that Susan’s great work has been recognized.