FPDC Re-Design Steering Committee Report

Summary

Since 1998, the Faculty Professional Development Center has been offering programing 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.

Steering Committee Members

Alicia Crowe	acrowe@kent.edu
David M. Dees	ddees@kent.edu
Vanessa Earp	vearp@kent.edu
Paul Farrell	pfarrell@kent.edu
Christopher Fenk	cfenk@kent.edu
Gary Hanson	glhanson@kent.edu
Dandan Liu	dliu1@kent.edu
Jenny Marcinkiewicz	jmarcink@kent.edu
Jonathan Secaur	jsecaur@kent.edu
David Smeltzer	dsmeltze@kent.edu
Raynette Smith	rsmith@kent.edu
Donald White	dlwhite@kent.edu

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**

Critical Services As Ranked by Faculty Input
Clearing House for Faculty Services
Support for Exploring, Testing and Implementing New Teaching Strategies
Research on Teaching
Conducting and Disseminating Research on Student Learning
Teaching Skills
Community Building
Technology Integration
Teaching Observations
1 to 1 Consultation
Career Development
Faculty Recognition
GTA Support
Mentoring
Adjunct Faculty Support
Work/Life Balance

Appendix B: **FPDC Re-design Steering Committee Advisory Board**

Heather Adams	hadams@kent.edu
Alfreda Brown	abbrown@kent.edu
Roxanne Burns	rhburns@kent.edu
Jessie Carduner	jcardune@kent.edu
Susanne Clement	sclement@kent.edu
Scott Courtney	scourtn5@kent.edu
Janis Crowther	jcrowthe@kent.edu
Joelle Cruz	jcruz15@kent.edu
David Dalton	ddalton@kent.edu
Deborah Davis	dldavis@kent.edu
Kevin Deemer	kdeemer@kent.edu

David Dumpe	ddumpe@kent.edu
Pamela Evans	pevans@kent.edu
Ernie Freeman	efreema2@kent.edu
Pat Gallagher	pgallag1@kent.edu
George Garrison	ggarriso@kent.edu
Willie Harrell	wharrell@kent.edu
Leslie Heaphy	lheaphy@kent.edu
Antal Jakli	ajakli@kent.edu
Rachel Johnson	rjohn112@kent.edu
David Kaplan	dkaplan@kent.edu
Assimoula Katramatou	akatrama@kent.edu
Valerie Kelly	vkelly@kent.edu
Deric Kenne	dkenne@kent.edu
Deborah Knapp	dknapp1@kent.edu
Yuko Kurahashi	ykurahas@kent.edu
Kiersten Latham	kflatham@kent.edu
Tracy Laux	tlaux@kent.edu
Catherine Leslie	cleslie1@kent.edu
Jessica Leveto	jleveto@kent.edu
Karen MacDonald	kmacdon4@kent.edu
Rick Mangrum	rmangrum@kent.edu
Carey McDougall	cmcdoug2@kent.edu
Grant McGimpsey	wmcgimps@kent.edu
Mary Miller	mmiller@kent.edu
Robert Miltner	rmiltner@kent.edu
Jayne Moneysmith	jmoneysm@kent.edu
I. Richmond Nettey	inettey@kent.edu
John Neuzil	jneuzil@kent.edu
Preeti Palvankar	ppalvan1@kent.edu
Butje Patuwo	epatuwo1@kent.edu
Kimberly Peer	kpeer@kent.edu
Eboni Pringle	epringle@kent.edu
David Purcell	dpurcell@kent.edu
Swathi Ravichandran	sravicha@kent.edu
Bev Reed	breed1@kent.edu
Curtis Reynolds	creynol9@kent.edu
Mary Rollick	mrollick@kent.edu
Sue Rossi	srossi3@kent.edu
Lynne Rowan	lrowan@kent.edu
Frank Sansosti	fsansost@kent.edu
Andrew Shahriari	ashahria@kent.edu
Bill Sledzik	wsledzik@kent.edu
Alison Smith	alisonjs@kent.edu
Elizabeth Smith	esmith1@kent.edu
Jeanne Smith	jrsmith3@kent.edu
Nancy Stanforth	nstanfor@kent.edu
Maryann Stephens	mstephen@kent.edu
Ellen Sullivan	esulli13@kent.edu
Susan Taft	staft@kent.edu
M. Temu	mtemu@kent.edu
Wendy Tietz	wtietz@kent.edu
Sharon Tkacz	stacz@kent.edu
Brandon Vaccaro	bvaccar1@kent.edu

Eric VanBaars   fvanbaar@kent.edu
Wendy   Wardell   wwardell@kent.edu
Neil Wells   nwells@kent.edu
Kathryn Wilson   kwilson3@kent.edu
Sonya Wisdom   swisdom@kent.edu
Jon Yoder   jyoder31@kent.edu
Ken Zakariasen   kzakaria@kent.edu
Marcia   Zhang   yzhang4@kent.edu

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.