I. UM – Crookston Campus Goal

Introduction and Background on UMC
The University of Minnesota, Crookston (UMC) was the first laptop university in the United States. In 1993 UMC began a new initiative with the implementation of a mobile computing and learning environment for the entire campus. All faculty and students were issued a laptop computer. Campus administrative leadership was totally committed to embarking on a technology cultural change at UMC. Students eagerly embraced the use of computers for class-related work. Faculty members demonstrated both eagerness and a resistance to learning how to use technology in their classes. Changes occurred very quickly for faculty, and initially, training and support for faculty was perceived as haphazard. Experiential data suggest that faculty have become segmented into different clusters based on their use or perceived use of technology - faculty users, faculty attempting to use technology and faculty resistant to use technology. Many faculty members have viewed the technology initiative as an added burden. Research supports this faculty perspective. Nasseh (2000) reports that computer and communication technologies are changing our work life and that faculty now need two different types of competencies to work in higher education: discipline and subject matter competency and information technology competency. At UMC the challenge of motivating and training faculty has continued to be a focus of the campus. Even with the implementation of an aggressive training and support program, faculty members constantly need to be trained to keep up with significant software changes (Lim, 2000).

We’ve come a long way since 1993 and faculty members have recognized the influence of technology on the teaching and learning environment. With a new leader in the position of Information Technology Director, UMC administrative leaders have changed from a technology-focus to a learning-focus, viewing technology as a tool built around how teachers teach and students learn. “The question is not if a university has the necessary technology but if the technology is meeting the needs of teachers and students. Technology should not dictate how teacher teach, but teachers should determine what technology is best suited for achieving specific learning outcomes” (Lim, p. 243). “The ultimate goal is not to ‘sell’ a particular brand of technology to the faculty, but to use the most appropriate technology to ‘sell’ learning to the students” (Lim, p. 243).

At the cornerstone of reflective practice and the scholarship of teaching is the idea that educators continually examine what they do and the contexts in which they do it. Faculty members feel more comfortable now in acknowledging their need to analyze and evaluate if, and how, technology makes a difference in student learning. Faculty members must individually and collectively make time for reflective teaching and to pursue the scholarship of teaching. Boyer (1990) states, “As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows” (p. 23). Faculty members need to be intellectually engaged in the inquiry of technology as a tool and the assessment of the affect of technology on student learning in the context of their respective course.
Faculty Development Goal
- To focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education and its application for students and faculty in the teaching and learning environment at the Crookston campus of the University of Minnesota.

II. Problem/Needs to be addressed

In the spring of 2000, UMC faculty members were given a survey to assess what they perceived as problematic student issues, professional development training participation, and the types of teaching and learning activities in which faculty members would most likely participate. The problems or needs to be addressed on this campus for the Bush Faculty Development Program are based on the data of this UM Crookston Faculty Survey. (Attachment # x )

A. PROBLEMATIC STUDENT ISSUES
1. “Student study skills”
   Evidence of Support:
   56% faculty respondents indicate “very problematic” and 44% indicate “somewhat problematic”; represents 100% of faculty responses

2. “Students not doing reading or note-taking”
   Evidence of Support
   58% faculty respondents indicate “very problematic” and 37% indicate “somewhat problematic; represents 95% of faculty responses

3. “Student motivation”
   Evidence of Support:
   47% faculty respondents indicate “very problematic” and 53% indicate “somewhat problematic”; represents 100% of faculty responses

4. “Student preparation - math, reading, writing”
   Evidence of Support:
   37% of faculty respondents indicate “very problematic” and 63% indicate “somewhat problematic; represents 100% of faculty responses

5. “Student performance on assignments and tests”
   Evidence of Support:
   32% of faculty respondents indicate “very problematic” and 68% indicate “somewhat problematic; represents 100% of faculty responses

B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – “HELPFUL TO LEARN MORE ABOUT FOLLOWING TRAINING TOPICS”
1. “Active learning styles”
   Evidence of Support:
   58% of faculty respondents indicate “very helpful” and 37% indicate “somewhat helpful”; represents 95% of faculty responses
2. “Multi media teaching tools”
   
   Evidence of Support:
   41% of faculty respondents indicate “very helpful” and 53% indicate “somewhat helpful”; represents 94% of faculty responses

3. “Web-based course instruction”
   
   Evidence of Support:
   42% of faculty respondents indicate “very helpful” and 42% indicate “somewhat helpful”; represents 84% of faculty responses

4. “Assessing student learning”
   
   Evidence of Support:
   42% of faculty respondents indicate “very helpful” and 42% indicate “somewhat helpful”; represents 84% of faculty responses

5. “Enhancing lectures”
   
   Evidence of Support:
   37% of faculty respondents indicate “very helpful” and 47% indicate “somewhat helpful”; represents 84% of faculty responses

C. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN TEACHING AND LEARNING ACTIVITIES

1. Workshops led by teaching and learning specialists
   
   Evidence of Support:
   68% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 26% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 95% of faculty responses

2. Workshops led by faculty
   
   Evidence of Support:
   42% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 47% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 89% of faculty responses

3. Activities designed for mid-career teachers
   
   Evidence of Support:
   42% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 42% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 84% of faculty responses

4. Interdisciplinary groups
   
   Evidence of Support:
   44% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 33% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 78% of faculty responses

5. Short courses
   
   Evidence of Support:
   37% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 47% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 84% of faculty responses
6. Small grants for individual or group development

Evidence of Support:
68% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 26% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 95% of faculty responses

7. Joint student-faculty programming

Evidence of Support:
26% of faculty respondents indicate “very likely to participate” and 58% indicate “somewhat likely”; represents 84% of faculty responses

III. Proposed Program

WHAT DO WE WANT TO CHANGE?

1. Increase student ability to successfully improve their study skills, as evidenced by survey results of faculty knowledge and perception that student study skills are less problematic in their classes.

2. Decrease the number of students who are “not doing reading or note-taking”, as evidenced by survey results of faculty knowledge and perception that students not reading or note-taking in their classes is less problematic.

3. Increase student motivation to learn as evidenced by survey results of faculty knowledge and perception that student motivation is less problematic in their classes.

4. Improve student preparation for math, reading, and writing as evidenced by survey results of faculty knowledge and perception that student preparation is less problematic in their classes.

5. Improve student performance on assignments and tests as evidenced by survey results of faculty knowledge and perception of student performance on assignments and tests as less problematic in their classes.

Research Support
Motivation to learn and how to encourage it effectively is a challenge we face with both students and faculty. “Motivation is the natural human capacity to direct energy in the pursuit of a goal, and learning is a naturally active and normally volitional process, but that process cannot be separated from the cultural context of the classroom or from the background of the learner” (Wlodkowski, 1999, p. 7). The goals for students’ may be quite diverse, as well as what they believe is relevant to learn. Our beliefs, behaviors, language, and values become our culture and our culture significantly influences our motivation. People learn when they are interacting with other people and when they feel supported by other people. What a student finds personally significant or relevant is based on his/her own social experiences and values. The Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching represents “four intersecting
motivational conditions that teacher and student can create or enhance” (Wlodkowski, 1999, p.11). The four conditions that affect a learner's experience at any given moment are: a) Establishing inclusion - students and faculty feel respected and connected to one another; b) Developing attitude – one’s disposition affected through personal relevance and choice; c) Enhancing meaning – creating thoughtful and challenging learning experiences representing students’ perspectives and values; d) Engendering competence – understanding that students are effective in learning what they value. (Wlodkowski, 1999)

**HOW WILL WE GO ABOUT CHANGING IT?**

**Objectives**

1. Develop at least two (2) Faculty Cohort Teams with a minimum of five members and a maximum of seven members in each group during Program Year One; four (4) Faculty Cohort Teams with a minimum of five members and a maximum of seven members during Program Year Two.

   a. Faculty Cohort Team will select at least one (1) of the problematic student learning issue(s) identified in this proposal (study skills, reading/note-taking, motivation, preparation, performance) to discuss and design work for the improvement of student learning and faculty teaching and learning.

   b. Faculty Cohort Team will meet to discuss the selected teaching and learning problem (study skills, reading/note-taking, motivation, preparation, performance) a minimum of once a month, with frequency of meetings determined by the Faculty Cohort Team.

   c. Faculty Cohort Team members will choose the methodology to structure their work on assessing the teaching learning environment in which these “problems” exist, design and/or implement a classroom assessment activity, determine learning outcomes and instructional purposes for their content area, deliberate regarding potential approaches to affect desired change in the teaching and learning environment, discuss and/or seek technical support for the selection of the technology most suitable to facilitate meeting the learning outcome for a specific course, and work collaboratively to design and implement at least one (1) teaching activity to either improve student study skills, student reading or note-taking, student motivation, student preparation, and/or student performance.

   d. All Faculty Cohort Team members will be responsible for the following: 1) reading preparation prior to team meeting; 2) participation in discussion, reflection, and feedback at team meetings; 3) designing and implementing at least one new teaching activity; 4) and attending at least one teaching and learning workshop.

   e. The development of Faculty Cohort Teams is an attempt to design a process for the professional development of faculty, which will empower faculty members. In addition, Faculty Cohort Teams are a vehicle to motivate, share labor, and build in a supportive group process.
f. Co-facilitators for each Faculty Cohort Team will assume a role of consensus building, not of leading or directing or controlling group activity. Consideration will be given for a faculty member of the sub-committee for Professional Development to serve as one of the co-facilitator team members.

g. A summary of thoughts and ideas generated during each Faculty Cohort Team meeting will be posted on the Web after each Faculty Cohort Team meeting so that other members of the University community may contribute and be involved in the exchange of ideas.

Research Support:
In their review of research literature, which includes qualitative studies, case studies and surveys, Feldman and Paulsen (1999), report on prominent characteristics of cultures that support teaching and its improvement. “Faculty involvement, shared values, and a sense of ownership” (p.72) is cited for its role in encouraging instructional excellence. In addition, “frequent interaction, collaboration, and community among faculty” (p. 73) is identified as a significant element positively impacting the teaching and learning environment. “One of the most important institutional characteristics that can help increase the intrinsic rewards of teaching is the availability of opportunities to talk about teaching” (p. 73). Three of the benefits of faculty collaboration in teaching identified by Austin and Baldwin (1991) are: improvement of teaching ability, increased intellectual stimulation in teaching, and reduction in the degree of isolation associated with traditional teaching.

Eifler (1998) reported, “Collegiality and a better sense of shared mission have emerged through the first year. Many faculty members in each cohort reported deep satisfaction at being able to work and learn with colleagues from other departments and units across campus, people they ordinarily would not have more than passing contact with, which bodes well for the early steps at program restructuring which lie ahead, where cooperation and collaboration will be imperative” (p. 22).

Licklider (1993) reminds us “members of the professoriat belong to one of the few professions that do not engage in continuing conversations with colleagues. This ‘privatization of teaching’ (Palmer, 1993) has had negative consequences for faculty, leading to isolation and dissatisfaction, and for institutions, making it difficult for academe to improve student learning” (Licklider, p. 123). Palmer (1993) and Shulman (1993) recommend the creation of a community of discourse about learning and teaching. They argue that faculty must move toward a view of learning and teaching as a community experience rather than pedagogical solitude.

Palmer (1993) believes that for faculty to understand their students, they must first understand themselves. It is through reflective practice that faculty can create more coherence between what they do or intend to do and how students experience these actions.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) state that a key characteristic of the learning organization is the ability of its members to make opportunities to learn and to add value to the organization by converting individual information into organizational knowledge. The learning organization is an environment in which “organizational learning is structured so that teamwork, collaboration, creativity, and knowledge processes have a collective meaning and value” (Confessore, Kops, p.366).
Self-directed learning is associated with “setting goals, selecting learning resources, and managing time. Together, these characteristics suggest that self-directed individuals reflect, assess, and evaluate rather than uncritically accept and internalize information” (Confessore and Kops, p. 365). Faculty members in higher education institutions are self-directed learners.

Karabenick Collins-Eaglin (1995) report that university programs designed to improve instructional effectiveness by increasing faculty awareness of beneficial teaching practices usually promote recommendations based on the premise that “students learn best when they are self-regulated and actively involved in the learning process. However, faculty development techniques designed to encourage faculty to promote active student learning are themselves often passive and brief (for example, newsletters, seminars, or speakers) and do not model the prescription” (p.71).

2. **Offer opportunity for faculty to apply for Teaching and Learning Mini-grants to design classroom assessment activities or to use technology as a tool for the enhancement of the teaching and learning environment.**

   a. Eligibility for mini-grant funding can be achieved by any of the following: 1) individual cohort member; 2) cohort partners; 3) cohort team; or 4) cohort member and campus non-cohort member.

   b. The Program Coordinator, Bush Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee members, and one elected representative per Faculty Cohort Team will be the decision-making body to determine criteria for authorizing any funding requests or awards.

Research Support:

For decades, if not centuries, the main criterion for the accomplishment of any discipline-related task was discipline-related competency. Qualifications for faculty members in higher education focused on discipline-related competency. The rate at which computer and communication technologies are changing our work life has taught us that faculty now need two different types of competencies to work in higher education: discipline and subject matter competency and information technology competency. Nasseh (2000) states, “While the explosion of knowledge does create challenges, institutions of higher education can also benefit from the power and possibilities of computer and communication technologies to develop quality competency-based learning resources and programs. A computer application of a theory, a computer case study of an event, and a simulation program of a model can help students learn the subject matter in depth and use new knowledge and skills more effectively in real situations. Fortunately, every discipline has rich samples, events, and models that can be developed into computer case studies and simulation” (p. 225).

Self-directed learning that builds on personal autonomy, self-management and learner decision-making has recently been advocated for faculty development (Cranton, 1994; Candy, 1991). A self-directed model of faculty development would assume that faculty would initiate efforts to improve and make their own decisions about what they want to learn or do. Candy supports “the willingness and capacity to conduct one’s own education” (p. 23).

Weimer (1990) acknowledges that instructional effectiveness with faculty is more likely when they are engaged in long-term, sustained instruction and that an activity that meets these criteria is faculty-initiated research on teaching and learning.
3. Design, offer, evaluate, and conduct follow-up discussion of three (3) Teaching and Learning Workshops during each year of the program and one (1) Faculty Teaching and Learning Retreat once a year.

Research Support:
Recently, Nasseh (2000) stated, “an influx of technology, the need to retrain the workforce, demands for asynchronous education, and global needs for continuous learning have made education a mass and competitive market. Additionally, advancements in computer and communication technologies, changes in student body, the transformation from a data society to an information society (and soon to a knowledge society), and tough competition in the global economy and education have brought about the need for changes in the current educational system” (p. 226).

Research clearly indicates that single session workshops have little effect on staff behavior. “A more effective structure incorporates multiple sessions over an extended period of time” (Licklider, Schnelker, Fulton, 1997, p. 124).

4. Initiate dialogue with Student Leaders regarding the creation of Student Learning Focus Groups. A member of the Student Learning Focus Group would be a liaison with the Faculty Cohort Team that is working on the same/similar problem. (E.g. Student Learning Group: study skills; Faculty Cohort Team: study skills)

Research Support:
Nasseh (2000) reported that, “The coexistence of the Internet-generation and adult learners – with different expectations, abilities, styles, and needs – continues to change institutions of higher education’s missions, cultures, practices, instructional deliveries, and business operations” (226).

5. Design and implement a program which recognizes and provides incentives for faculty members to reflect on the use of technology as a teaching tool and to participate in the UM – Crookston, Bush Faculty Development Program.

a. Professional development funds will be used for three categories of expenditures: 1) funds for faculty travel to seminars, workshops, or conferences that they deem appropriate for their development as a teaching scholar; 2) funds for the development of educational resources to enhance teaching and learning; 3) funds for Summer Instructional Development Professorships (summer salary stipend for coursework development).

b. Level One Funding awarded to faculty who have actively participated in the project as evidenced by: 1) reading preparation prior to team meeting; 2) participation in discussion, reflection, and feedback at team meetings; 3) designing and implementing one new teaching activity; 4) and attending two Teaching and Learning Workshops or one Teaching and Learning Workshop and the Faculty Retreat.
c. Level Two Funding awarded to faculty who have actively participated in the project as evidenced by: 1) reading preparation prior to team meeting; 2) participation in discussion, reflection, and feedback at team meetings; 3) designing and implementing more than one new teaching activity; 4) and attending more than two Teaching and Learning workshops or more than one Teaching and Learning Workshop and the Fall Faculty Retreat.

d. The Program Coordinator, Bush Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee members, and one elected representative per Faculty Cohort Team will be the decision-making body to determine criteria for authorizing any funding requests or awards.

IV. Program Outcomes

Anticipated outcomes of this initiative include:

- Faculty cohort members will practice the scholarship of teaching and learning as they participate in self-assessment activities, review literature, engage in reflective dialogue, collaborate with campus colleagues, make changes in the courses they teach, observe and record changes in student learning, and communicate with peers regarding their experiences.

- Student study skills, student failure to do reading and note-taking, lack of motivation, and performance on assignments and tests will be perceived as less problematic by faculty cohort members based on data collected for program evaluation.

- Success of this faculty development process will be reflected by the level of faculty engagement with increasing numbers of faculty choosing too participate on faculty cohort teams, attend teaching and learning workshops, and make successful mini-grant applications.

V. Program Evaluation

(Separate submission)

VI. Budget

(Separate submission)
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