**Delaware Will Shine Concept Paper**

**Models of the New American Research University**

**Curriculum & Delivery Subgroup**

21st Century Faculty

UD’s faculty must do more than teach, they should be engaged learners, absorbing new discoveries from students, other experts, and sources of knowledge. This requires constant feedback on instruction through the assessment of learning, and incentives and opportunities to invest in their professional abilities to help create and sustain a learning centered culture. We propose that this can only happen in an academic environment that values learning (an outcome) over teaching (a practice), and where that value is institutionalized in the workload, evaluation process, and other professional expectations of faculty. UD should shine by being one of the first universities to restructure faculty workload policies to emphasize learning. We envision a New American University with renamed evaluative faculty categories from teaching, research, and service to *learning*, *scholarship*, and *engagement* respectively.

These new categories have greater and more accurate alignment with the strategic priorities of the University. For example, *learning* is the valued outcome of the University, whereas teaching is a method for attaining the former; in fact, assessment of teaching is commonly based on learning. Similarly, *scholarship* encompasses many aspects of a faculty member’s work, including seeking external funding, publishing, presenting to the public and professional peers, and applied work, whereas research primarily connotes specific project activities designed to answer a question. Research may have a broader meaning, but that meaning is implied; however, scholarship is a more comprehensive term for the range of activities since there are many times where a faculty member is not discovering knowledge but sharing it. Finally, engagement, is both behavioral and psychological involvement in not only university activities, but also those in the community; whereas service connotes unidirectional work where faculty give but receive very little. Engagement is a term that emphasizes the target of the activities rather than the expended effort. Consider the phrases “community engagement” versus “community service,” the former symbolizes the connectedness to community and the latter symbolizes the effort. The same could be said for “faculty engagement” versus “faculty service” for those academic work activities.

These labels may appear to be an immaterial concern, however, the symbolic effort to recast what faculty do would go a long way in helping to frame who we are.

Evidential Ideas (Based on a Search of Information on the Future Faculty in Higher Education)

**A. Challenges for Faculty**

University of Michigan Committee on the 21st Century Faculty Member:

<http://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/Being%20A%20Faculty%20Member%2021%20Century%20Report.pdf>

**[What are] the characteristics of faculty jobs that are most important to ensuring that UM faculty are successful and satisfied in their work?**

“University should find ways of freeing up time for faculty, and any new tasks that tax faculty time should be of very high yield with respect to improvement of the University. Specifically, asking a faculty member for 1 day per year will not have a significant negative impact on scholarship or teaching, while a new request for 1 - 2 weeks per year will meet with resistance as it has a tangible negative impact on scholarship and teaching.” (p. 3)

“The faculty needs strong support and assistance with some teaching activities, such as the maintenance of on-line components (Ctools components; grade book) along with classroom support. Electronic communications with students allows faculty to quickly and effectively inform and interact with students (e.g., class announcements through Ctools; on-line office hours), but some types of interaction can be quite demanding on an instructor (e.g., email; chatting, before homework is due).” (p. 4)

**[What are] the external pressures on faculty?**

“There is evidence that pedagogical and technological innovations improve learning outcomes, but the “best” approach is far from obvious. Faculty members are expected to navigate these waters with only modest guidance, which is both stressful and time-consuming.” (p. 6)

**[What are some] recommended approaches that can be taken at the University of Michigan to ensure that while we respond to the changing environment (p. 10)**

1. Training faculty in pedagogy and providing them with the right information

- We recommend that all instructors receive continuing pedagogical training in their area.

- Within Departments, it would be useful to have at least one faculty meeting per semester devoted to a discussion of teaching issues, which is a good way of sharing experiences as to which approaches are successful

- Each Department should produce a brief compendium of [teaching] approaches, techniques, and policies that have worked especially well.

2. Support of classes

- We recommend that all active classrooms conform to [uniform standards regarding technology, disability support, and other relevant supplies and equipment]

3. Mentorship, feedback, and evaluations

- We recommend a system where the instructor regularly receives feedback from designated individuals, which may include a faculty mentor, graduate student instructor, or undergraduates.

4. Defining the “brand” of education that we offer

- Within at least each College, we need to clearly explain the nature of the education and how it will contribute to the future professional and personal success of the students (e.g., learning writing and quantitative skills, critical thinking.

- The university should decide whether MOOCs (or distance learning in general) will play an important role in the future and determine how they are to be structured. This is an area that is in its infancy but the university should decide how the University of Michigan versions of distance learning will be better and distinct from those offered elsewhere at low cost.

5. Communications between the instructor and student

- We believe that there has to be a new understanding of what it means to be a student in the 2st century as well as being an instructor.

- A set of expectations should be developed and communicated to students upon entering the university. Such guidelines are most naturally developed at the College level and could be part of orientation. Also, specific guidelines should be communicated at the beginning of courses.

6. Defining the practical application of a University of Michigan education

- Help students understand the important skills that they have acquired, as it will help them (and their parents) appreciate the value of a liberal arts education

**Assessment of Faculty Instruction**

AERA Report: Recommendations for Rethinking Faculty Evaluation for the 21st Century

<http://www.aera.net/Newsroom/NewsReleasesandStatements/AERAIssuesRecommendationsforRethinkingFacultyEvaluationforthe21stCentury/tabid/15254/Default.aspx>

The AERA report offers research-based guidelines for rethinking how to evaluate research, scholarship, and teaching by tenure-line faculty in the field of education, whether for hiring, annual evaluations, tenure and promotion, or post-tenure review. The points below are those related to “teaching.”

AERA comments and recommendations include

“The evaluation method most often turned to – student ratings, sometimes supplemented by measures of teaching productivity such as the number of advisees – can identify the very worst teachers, but *do not promote student-centered learning*, and *do not identify and reward the most effective teaching practices*.

“Evaluations of faculty teaching should focus on what and how students learn using evidence-based criteria. Research suggests four kinds of evaluation that can help meet these goals:

1. Teaching portfolios and artifacts can illustrate how instructors develop and teach their courses, including details such as learning objectives, rubrics that tie those objectives to classroom activities and assignments, and tools to assess student learning.

2. Classroom observation using formal observation protocols can assess instruction and identify what kind of professional development a faculty member needs to improve his or her teaching.

3. Surveys and interviews with faculty members can measure how their teaching behavior changes over time and how well they understand teaching strategies.

4. Surveys and interviews with students can assess whether students have met goals for learning.

The selection and weighting of particular approaches should reflect the institutional context, including program mission, teaching loads, and institutional resources.

**Understanding Needs for Faculty Development**

Article: “Faculty Development for the 21st Century” by Veronica Diaz, P. B. Garrett, Edward R. Kinley, John F. Moore, Celeste M. Schwartz, and Pat Kohrman, in *EDUCAUSE Review Online*.

<http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/faculty-development-21st-century>

“21st-century faculty members have unique professional development and support needs, especially in the area of teaching and learning.” (p. 52)

“1st-century faculty will continue to need support in some of the same areas as their predecessors: orienting to the institution, teaching and conducting research, navigating the tenure track, and developing professional networks. But they will need support in new areas as well: keeping up with an increasingly technological workplace, developing ways to further integrate technology into the instructional experience, and assessing student learning in a variety of instructional delivery modes.” (p. 48)

The authors discuss the need for a long term plan for faculty development that supports “high quality teaching and learning.”

1. During Year 0, institutions can support colleges and departments by offering pedagogical programs or training institutes.

2. During Year 1, institutions provide entering faculty members with some form of orientation designed to acquaint them with institutional mission, policies, procedures, and culture.

3. During Years 2-5, institutions can leverage the 21st-century faculty members’ instructional and technological skills and also to engage and begin integrating them in the academic community. This would include a “reverse mentoring” approach in which newer, more technologically savvy faculty members assist and work collaboratively with the senior faculty.



Fig. # 1 Faculty Development Plan

The authors recommend the following:

1. Avoid making assumptions about what faculty members need. Instead, develop and administer an annual faculty survey to compile demographics and to identify trends in faculty development needs.

2. Become familiar with and establish a diverse menu of instructional technology tools, including discipline specific technologies.

3. Develop collaborative support programs by exploring ways to engage and enlist the aid of new faculty in collaborating with and helping to lead faculty development.

4. Incorporate assessment into faculty development programs, which need to align with institutional strategic initiatives. Anticipated outcomes should be clearly defined and measured.

**Changing Faculty Culture to Better Serve the Community**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Committee on “A Faculty for the 21st Century”

<http://web.mit.edu/committees/sll/f5.html>

MIT has what they call an “Educational Triad” which consists of academics, community, and research. The purpose of the Triad is to “develop an educational product that can serve as a model for elite universities around the world. The Educational Triad involves treating research, academics, and community as equal contributors to the education students receive [at MIT], integrating them as much as possible to create a coherent, unified educational product not available elsewhere.”

Regarding the “research based learning” environment, MIT states that “the faculty must participate in all three areas of the Triad. Faculty are already involved in the three areas, but their involvement is heavily weighted towards research. The faculty as a whole should play a key role in linking the three areas into a single educational product.”

“Many faculty and junior faculty already excel at teaching in the classroom. However, because high-quality teaching is not generally rewarded in the granting of tenure or funding, it receives less attention and fewer resources. *The system thus fails to motivate good teachers to become excellent teachers, and prevents many superior teachers from getting tenure at all*. If the tenure process gives faculty little incentive to improve teaching or recruit better teachers, it does even less to promote faculty involvement in the community as a whole.”

**What is the ideal model of faculty participation in academics, community, and research, and how can the tenure process help us reach that ideal?**

“[First] We propose first that the faculty commit itself to excellence in [one of the] three areas: some professors must excel in research, some in teaching, and some in community participation. Some may excel in all three, but concentrate on only one area in a given year, while others may not demonstrate excellence in one or two areas.”

“[Second] the hiring and tenure process also presents an excellent opportunity to increase diversity in the faculty. A diverse faculty can play an educational role, both by increasing the opportunities for students belonging to underrepresented groups to find positive role models among the faculty, and enriching the entire community.”

“…each department should be responsible for meeting an Institute-wide commitment to teaching and academics. The point should not be to find teachers for all the classes the department would like to offer ... Rather, the purpose should be to alter the culture as a whole toward offering a balanced, integrated educational product.”

**Idea 1: The “Departmental Teaching Chair” Model**

“One way to reshape departmental commitments would be to allocate a portion of the funds to specific, prestigious teaching positions or "chairs": a professor holding a teaching chair would focus almost exclusively on teaching and advising. Departments would also allocate funds for a certain number of community chairs that would allow a professor to make a full-time commitment to participating and leading community activities, participating in Institute governance structures, and interacting with students outside the classroom.

Such positions might be two-year ventures - a professor who took a teaching or community chair would keep his or her tenure (rather than being treated as a second-class faculty member or non-departmental Dean's Office employee), and would return to the research track after the term of the chair-ship had expired. Other chairs might be filled permanently, with all the privileges of tenure. The "chairs" system would create a recognized leadership position in each department responsible for making sure that the commitment to teaching and community involvement is being met. This would allow departments to meet existing research commitments while still offering students a balanced, integrated educational product.”

**Idea 2: Funding Pool Model (similar to UD’s Center for Teaching and Assessment of Learning)**

“Collect an Institute teaching and community funding pool, serving a similar purpose as research grants, that could fund professors spending a certain number of hours meeting teaching and community involvement requirements. Such a system could be used to support tenure for junior faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and community leadership, or it could support a system of temporary "chairs" described above.”

**Idea 3: Summer Engagement Model**

“Emphasize faculty involvement in the community during the summer. Because the level of stress and pressure is lower, and the recreational opportunities greater, the summer is an excellent time to encourage informal interaction between faculty members and students, planting the seeds for stronger relationships between the two groups throughout the year. The summer is also a good time for planning community activities for upcoming terms, and for evaluating the effectiveness of established activities. Yet faculty members have little incentive to engage with the community during the summer.”

**Protecting Faculty Values**

Rethinking Academic Traditions for Twenty-First Century Faculty by Judith M. Gappa and Ann E. Austin in AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom (2010).

<http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/JAF/2010%20JAF/Gappa.pdf>

“This article discusses what faculty members seek in their working environments and offers suggestions for how these new concerns can be met while retaining the important academic traditions of academic freedom, shared governance and sufficient job security to make the profession attractive.” (p. 1)

[The authors] argue that institutions must ensure that respect, equity, academic freedom and autonomy, flexibility, collegiality, and professional growth characterize the faculty experience; especially during a period of shifts in in faculty demographics, appointment patterns, and work.”

“Changes in American colleges and universities, in faculty members themselves and their appointments, and in the nature of faculty work all mandate a reconsideration of today’s faculty, their working conditions, and what they seek in their employment.” (p. 3)

“The proliferation of knowledge and new technologies perpetuates the need of all faculty members for continuous professional development throughout their careers. Faculty members must keep up with their own learning and handle the barrage of information and knowledge facing them, even as they teach their students …. While the need for continuous learning can be an opportunity that brings meaning to faculty life, it is also a necessity as knowledge expands and new responsibilities emerge.” (p. 7)

“All faculty members also should be fully accepted and valued as members of their academic communities regardless of differences in academic appointments, time bases, and responsibilities.

Equity is not the same as uniformity; rather, equitable treatment requires that each faculty member be treated fairly while also taking into account differences among faculty members. Thus, institutions need to develop employment policies and practices for each appointment type: tenured and tenure-track, contract-renewable, and fixed-term (no guarantee of reappointment).” (p. 13)

**Communicating Recognition**

“Regular communication that explicitly expresses appreciation or highlights recognition of faculty members who have contributed goes a long way to encouraging collegiality and community. Some departments design specific occasions (formal and informal events that bring faculty members together) and physical spaces that encourage interaction (coffee shops, library meeting areas). Opportunities for colleagues to learn something new together, such as how technologies can be integrated into their teaching, can also promote community and collegiality as well as professional growth.”

**Continuous Faculty Learning (about Learning)**

\* Models some ideas about what faculty might do in the “Learning College”

Building Faculty Capacity for 21st Century Teaching Initiative

Program: <http://blogs.arcadia.edu/sepche/for-faculty/building-faculty-capacity-for-21st-century-teaching/>

Grant Report: <http://blogs.arcadia.edu/sepche/files/2012/10/Planning-Grant-Report.pdf>

This is an example of a collaborative “learning environment” for faculty. The initiative is a “faculty-led, continuous professional development model strengthening evidence-based teaching. The initiative integrates four components: emerging knowledge of how people learn, opportunities to test and apply knowledge, ongoing peer advisement and coaching support by a faculty development specialist.”

The program is sponsored by SEPCHE, “a consortium of eight independent colleges and universities in the southeastern Pennsylvania region (Greater Philadelphia) who engage in a collaborative approach to the challenges of higher education and work together to promote quality and efficiency of academic programming, student access, faculty development, institutional operations and community outreach, through sharing a range of activities, services, technology and information.”

Faculty engage in the following activities:

1. Learn about the science of “how people learn”

2. Develop a research question about an aspect of their teaching and/or faculty work and employ metacognitive techniques to gather data about the question

3. As data is gathered, engage with colleagues in professional development and coaching support with a faculty leader

4. Share progress online and in person with colleagues

**Delivery to Underserved Senior Communities**

\* I especially like the term “Collaborative Footprint”

<http://tnstatenewsroom.com/archives/16583>

This is a smart and innovative program implemented by Tennessee State University to serve seniors (elderly) in the Nashville area. TSU, a historically Black educational institution in Nashville, is partnering with a neighborhood organization for an initiative that [will] combine teaching, research, and service aimed at enhancing the lives of seniors (MIT is attempting this model, but TSU is truly applying it).

Under the agreement, the TSU Footprint Collaborative will develop lifelong learning programs that include classes on civic education and duties, oral history, technology, and community gardening. TSU says, “our goal is to find ways to connect academic knowledge with community needs through programs that improve the quality of life for the aging population in Tennessee.”

**Distance Learning Delivery Models**

<http://technologysource.org/article/distance_learning__implications_for_higher_education_in_the_21st_century/>

“Distance learning offers a delivery mode in which the physical classroom, the instructor, and the students are not all present in the same time and location (see the Figure below). *Distance learning* *delivery systems* can be categorized as those that help eliminate barriers posed by *location* (lower left quadrant), those that help eliminate barriers of *timing* (upper right quadrant) and those that help eliminate both *spatial* and *temporal* barriers simultaneously (lower right quadrant). In most cases, the shift to distance learning involves a movement to a more facilitative model of teaching that more closely approaches the Socratic Method, as opposed to more traditional lecture-based models.”

“There may be some learning outcomes that are more readily achieved in a distance learning environment than in a traditional classroom including supporting students' ability to develop and hone self-directed learning, communication, teamwork, and problem-solving skills.

While existing traditional curricular designs can serve as a foundations [for the 21st Century learner], it will probably require modification to fit distance learning formats. It will require *rethinking* 1) the desired academic outcomes and course objectives, 2) the range of learning activities that are best able to facilitate their accomplishment, and 3) the appropriateness of distance learning technology, in order to take optimal advantage of the strengths and attributes of each particular learning technology in facilitating learner attainment of course outcomes.”