FPDC Re-Design Steering Committee Report

Summary

Since 1998, the Faculty Professional Development Center has been offering programming to assist with the professional expectations of faculty members at Kent State University. This center, formed through a collaborative relationship between the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the university administration, has not experienced significant changes in budget, structure and/or function over the last fifteen years. In June 2013, Provost Todd Diacon requested that, through the proper shared governance processes, appropriate faculty members and administrators examine the current direction of the center and consider clarifying the mission and focus.

The Faculty Professional Development Re-design Steering Committee was formed to meet this purpose. The committee members were nominated by Deans, Chairs and Directors, Faculty Senate, and AAUP. The core working group considered all elements of the center including name, focus, location, staffing, etc. and consulted with faculty colleagues throughout the process. In an effort to include as many perspectives as possible, an advisory group to the steering committee, consisting of other nominated faculty colleagues as well as professional development individuals from within and outside the university periodically provided feedback and insight as the ideas and suggestions were created.

This report outlines the changes recommended by these two groups. The more significant recommendations include: a) the re-focus of the center’s mission towards teaching and learning, b) significant increase in the staffing of the center to support expanded offerings, c) the creation of a virtual university-wide clearinghouse of information to ease faculty access to the support services available, and d) adjustments to the center’s advisory council to be more representative of the current structure of the university.
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Center History

The Faculty Professional Development Center (FPDC) had its beginnings in the collaborative efforts of the Faculty Professional Development Study Committee (FPDSC), a body initiated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), developed with the Administration, and put forth in the
contract agreement signed in April, 1993. In their report, based on two and one-half years of study, the committee drew attention to the many and diverse forms of support for faculty professional development in existence at Kent State University, most notably the University Research Council (URC) and the University Teaching Council (UTC). The report contained suggestions for strengthening some of these efforts, for making all efforts more broadly known and available, and for creating other opportunities as needed. The committee offered a conceptual framework for faculty professional development and recommended the creation of the Center. The report was presented to the President and to the Faculty Senate for discussion. President Cartwright and Senate Chair Robert Johnson created a planning committee to provide detailed recommendations on housing, staff, budget and reporting. In February of 1997, the planning committee submitted its report. By late August 1998, a director was appointed and in September the Center and its staff began formal operations (http://www.kent.edu/fpdc/index.cfm).

Committee Process

The Faculty Professional Development Re-design Steering Committee first began in October 2013 by examining and reviewing the faculty development services currently available at Kent State University. This process revealed that faculty support services are vast and varied but are not housed and/or organized in a user friendly manner that allows for easy access and identification of support. The committee also identified that teaching and learning support was not the specific focus of any one of these support services. Finally, the committee recognized that many of these services grew out of the work of particular individuals rather than strategic and organized planning. At this point the committee examined previous reviews of the current center as well as recent scholarship from the field of faculty development in order to identify current trends, practices, and perspectives that needed to be considered within the redesign process. This provided the committee with a conceptual framework for analysis.

To identify a clearer picture of best practices within the field of faculty development, the steering committee and the advisory group conducted a two day on-line virtual discussion hosted by the Civic Commons. This virtual discussion featured center directors from a variety of institutions including Penn State, Ohio State, Ohio University, Virginia Tech, Miami University, and Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. Thirty-two different faculty participated in the conversations with over fifty unique responses.

After the Civic Commons discussion, the steering committee and advisory group created over fifty value statements outlining the important services that should be supported by the center. Utilizing the Q-sort methodology, the steering committee reduced these value statements into four different perspectives that could be utilized in the center. Each of these four perspectives would prioritize different services in different ways. At that point the steering committee was able to identify fifteen critical services that would model best practices from the field.

In order to prioritize these services the Civic Commons was again utilized for a community ballot. This ballot asked participants to select then rank the top ten critical services each felt should be offered by the center. Points were assigned to the options as ranked (#1=10 points, #2=9, etc.). Eighty-one faculty participated in the voting process and the results are included (Appendix A). Once these critical services were identified, the committee was able to examine the appropriate support structure that would be needed to implement these services. Additionally, space and name considerations were also considered that would best support and reflect these services.
Community input was also gathered throughout the academic year through more traditional means. An information booth was utilized at the University Teaching Council’s Annual Celebration of College Teaching Conference to gather suggestions and ideas from attendees. Also, information cards were available at the current center’s main office in Moulton Hall for anyone to provide input into the re-design process and findings. Finally, the Faculty Professional Development Center co-hosted the university-wide April Faculty Club and again solicited input on the name of the center as well as other important suggestions on key services. All of this information was utilized to reach the final recommendations.

Committee Recommendations

1. In considering faculty development as a whole at Kent State University, the steering committee identified a core problem to be addressed by a new center: that the professional development opportunities at Kent State University are spread across the campus without a structure that is coherent to most faculty members. This has made accessing the resources extremely difficult for faculty and, therefore, many of the services are underutilized. In an effort to address this problem, the committee recommends a Virtual Faculty Portal be created that will serve as the clearing house for all faculty resources. This should be maintained by the new center and should serve as the entry point to address critical needs and issues related to their role as faculty.

2. After careful analysis of the current faculty development services provided university-wide, the committee identified that a unit that specifically focuses on teaching, learning innovation, and educational support is needed. Having this clear and specific focus on teaching and learning will help to improve the quality of offerings from the restructured center. The committee recommends that the Faculty Professional Development Center should be re-named to The Center for Teaching and Learning to clearly represent this new focus.

3. Further, the committee has identified that faculty development has developed into a field of study with a rich body of literature to inform practice. The committee suggests that the university utilize an outside panel of experts which consists of Directors from various centers across the country to serve as an external advisory board to the new center. This will ensure that the new center remains current in best practices from similar institutions.

4. The leadership model of the center in the past relied too heavily on one person. The committee encourages the university to find ways to build future faculty leaders for this center. This may include fellowships, special appointments, etc. to allow interested faculty members a chance to experience faculty development to see if this is a professional option.

5. As noted in previous center reviews, the current unit is understaffed (2 Fulltime Staff, 2 Student Workers, and 1 Part-time Administrative Support position). In an effort to meet the critical services outlined through the review process (see attached) the committee suggests that the following support structure be instituted:
   a. Director- Tenured faculty member from Kent State University.
   b. Three Faculty Developers/Leaders with different strengths/background in teaching/learning in higher education.
      i. Qualitative
      ii. Quantitative
      iii. Education Technology/Innovation
   c. Staff member to develop and maintain the Faculty Portal.
   d. Administrative Assistant/Support.
   The committee urges the administration to think of alternative/shared appointments so that the center personnel can be connected across the entire university.

6. The committee suggests that moving the center to a more centralized campus location would ease faculty access to the services. This move should only occur if the new space signals the central value of teaching
and learning within the university community and is an accommodating space for the new focus of the center. If not, the committee suggests leaving the center in the Moulton Hall location.

7. The committee also suggests slight modifications to the internal advisory body (currently FPDC Council Membership). These changes include:
   a. Office of the Provost appointments should include one member from the Kent campus and one member from the Regional Campuses.
   b. Add an Assistant/Associate Dean from the Regional Campuses to the Non-Voting Members of the council.
   c. Add a representative from the Office of Continuing and Distance Education to the Non-Voting Members of the council.
   d. Remove the current language of having a non-voting representative from University Libraries. University Library faculty can now be selected as voting members of the council.

Appendix A: Critical Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Services As Ranked by Faculty Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearing House for Faculty Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Exploring, Testing and Implementing New Teaching Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting and Disseminating Research on Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1 Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Life Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C: Proposed New Mission Statement

The Center for Teaching and Learning has a primary mission to provide opportunities, leadership, and support for all faculty to grow in their scholarly and professional endeavors. The long term aim is to support community members in the process of creating, transforming, and/or maintaining Kent State University's environments for learning as spaces where all students can succeed.

The center's four main areas of service are to:

- Connect, network, and support continuity in opportunities for faculty to explore, research, and support student learning.
- Serve as a portal of all information and services related to faculty at Kent State University.
- Offer expertise and consultation related to specific areas of scholarship and professional issues related to teaching and learning.
- Provide peer review and guidance on teaching innovations and improvement.