I. Background
In Spring 2016 the Executive Committee of the Arts and Science Council charged a four person committee (Michael Munger, Chair; Carol Apollonio, Owen Astrachan, and Andrea Novicki) to conduct a survey and make a recommendation on the possibility of creating a standing committee on “teaching development and support.” This committee, called FTDAS (Faculty Teaching Development And Support), had this origin, in the words of ECASC Chair Anita Layton:

*If you look at the Council itself, we have a standing committee on faculty research but we don’t have anything on faculty teaching. ECASC looked at this and we formed an ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Teaching Development and Support. This is a committee that has a few charges that are intentionally short term and limited. What I want to do with this committee is to look around and see what our peer institutions are doing in terms of support for faculty teaching. We’re going to decide and send out a survey to all of you, and actually hopefully all Arts & Sciences faculty to see what the greatest needs are for teaching support at Duke. Then we’ll make recommendations as to whether we need a standing committee and if we do, what should the charges be. We’re going to focus on pedagogy instead of technology.*

The charge for the committee was deliberately open-ended:
1. Survey faculty about what would be useful for future standing committee to do
2. Put together "best practices" list from other peer schools
3. Inventory resources that Duke already has for teaching/technology assistance for faculty
4. Explore (and by implication highlight and promote) the larger opportunities for development, mentorship, and collaboration of individual faculty members regardless of their discipline and varying degrees of involvement with technology
II. Main Recommendation
A standing committee on “Teaching Development and Support” should be created, to represent faculty interests and to serve as center for gathering information from faculty and communicating with the administration.

The “charge” for this new standing committee should be along the following lines:
A. Investigate and improve current process for evaluation, recognition, and reward of instruction. Rather than “teaching is part of your job” and leaving it at that,
B. Work to connect existing and newly created resources from the university with faculty. In many cases, scattered and unconnected efforts, some quite effective, already exist. But a single web site and “ombuds” person to answer questions and direct inquiries would make a big difference, at a small cost.
C. Represent faculty so that instructors are involved in classroom design and outfitting. At a minimum, ensure that decisions relating to classroom design and outfitting, including technology and furniture choices, originate with the faculty who are to be using the classrooms. As it stands, there is a substantial feeling that technology and furniture choices are made in a context that is completely isolated from the actual needs and practices of instructors on the front lines. To be fair, this is likely because the administration has no way to consult faculty, and decisions often have to be made quickly, at the end of the construction process. Involving faculty representatives from the beginning should make the process go more smoothly, and possibly even faster.
III. Summary of Survey Conducted April 4-22, 2016

A. Sent to approximately 1,000 potential respondents, with two reminders. Conducted using “Qualtrix.”

B. Responses:
   - Number of surveys started: 226
   - Number of surveys completed: 196

C. Main findings (Tables)

The following tables are either reproduced directly from the summary data produced by Qualtrix, or adapted from those data.

Table 1 is a description of the responses to the question, “How important is each of these factors for your practice of teaching at Duke” with a “1” meaning “very important” and a “5” meaning “unimportant.

The largest number of “very important” responses went first to “TA Support” and second to “Administrative departmental support for recognizing, evaluating, and rewarding teaching.” These were also the highest mean scores for the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>somewhat important</th>
<th>not too important</th>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative departmental support for recognizing, evaluating, and rewarding teaching</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistance designing courses/lessons</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assistance with teaching technology</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TA support</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Classroom technical support</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recognizing and addressing differences in culture or learning styles</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other factor(s)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 is a response to the question, “How satisfied are you with the ways that your teaching is recognized, evaluated, and rewarded?”, breaking down the categories ranging from “1: very satisfied” to “4: very dissatisfied.” There was no “neutral” category, to try to encourage responders to choose a valence as well as an intensity.

The results are interesting, in that there is (relatively) good satisfaction about the way that teaching is recognized (slightly more than half the respondents are “somewhat” or “very satisfied”). Almost half were satisfied with the way that teaching is evaluated, but there is less satisfaction about evaluation.

The clearest dissatisfaction, then, is in the way that teaching is “rewarded”: 139 respondents of 210, or almost exactly 2/3, are either “somewhat” or “very dissatisfied” with the way teaching effort is compensated by awards or incentives.
Table 3 addresses the use of resources by instructional personnel. Nearly 80% of respondents had used “classroom technical support”; more than half had used “assistance with teaching technology.” But only 20% or less had obtained assistance with designing courses or lessons, mentoring, coordinating classroom arrangements, or mentoring.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistance designing courses or lessons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistance with teaching technology</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Classroom teaching and coordination</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Classroom technical support</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adapting teaching to different department cultures or learning styles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mentoring opportunities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Funding opportunities or institutional initiatives</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 24-41 in Table 4 are demographic-identification questions, and are self-explanatory. One thing to note is that the sample is not fully representative of the population, as the sample tends more heavily to people who have been at Duke 15 years or more, and more in the Humanities, than the population as a whole.

Table 4: Demographic Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>How long have you been at Duke?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fewer than 5 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. What is your division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Responses Compared to Actual Distribution of Instructor Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tenured Professor/Senior Professor</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenured Associate Professor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tenure-Track Assistant Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Instructor/Lecturer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professor of the Practice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Associate Professor of the Practice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of the Practice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Untenured, Tenure Track</th>
<th>Other RR</th>
<th>Non RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>411 (41%)</td>
<td>90 (9%)</td>
<td>147 (15%)</td>
<td>352 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>93 (52%)</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
<td>32 (18%)</td>
<td>41 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Basic Crosstabs

Basic “crosstabs” were calculated from the data adapted from the survey, to determine if the results of the main questions skew in terms of the identities of the respondents. Because the respondents were promised anonymity, only these aggregate measures are presented.

The “crosstabs” contain predicted (under the assumption of independence) and actual proportions of responses, and evaluate the hypothesis of independence using a chis-square test.

Table 5: Responses to Teaching Recognition, Evaluation, and Rewards by Rank and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Recognition</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Untenured, Tenure Track</th>
<th>Other RR</th>
<th>Non RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>55 (49)</td>
<td>8 (7)</td>
<td>17 (16)</td>
<td>14 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>37 (43)</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
<td>14 (15)</td>
<td>27 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table total observations: 177

Table $\chi^2$: 8.29 ($p<.05$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Evaluation</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Untenured, Tenure Track</th>
<th>Other RR</th>
<th>Non RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>41 (42)</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
<td>12 (14)</td>
<td>17 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>52 (51)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>19 (17)</td>
<td>23 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table total observations: 177

Table $\chi^2$: 3.45 ($p<.40$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Rewarded</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Untenured, Tenure Track</th>
<th>Other RR</th>
<th>Non RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>39 (32)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>9 (11)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>53 (60)</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>22 (20)</td>
<td>32 (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table total observations: 175

Table $\chi^2$: 7.07 ($p<.10$)
Perhaps unsurprisingly, tenured respondents are substantially more satisfied, and non-regular rank respondents are less satisfied, than a hypothetical independent distribution would imply. Interestingly, this is even true among those responding to the “rewards” question.

Table 6 contains cross-tabs for “desire for support” by rank, for the two most highly desired categories of support, administrative support and TA support. The results for administrative support do not indicate statistical significance for the rejection of the null of independence, meaning that the desire for improved administrative support is broadly shared across all faculty ranks.

Table 6: Desire for Administrative Support By Rank and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin Support</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenured, Tenure Track</th>
<th>Other RR</th>
<th>Non RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>1 (75)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>6 (25)</td>
<td>8 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>0 (17)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table total observations: 176

Table $\chi^2$: 6.07 (p<.20)

This uniformity is not indicated for the desire for TA support. It is far and away the tenured faculty who desire better TA support, with “other RR” and “non RR” faculty exhibiting much less interest in TAs.

Table 7: Desire for TA Support by Rank and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Support</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenured, Tenure Track</th>
<th>Other RR</th>
<th>Non RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>6 (77)</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>7 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>16 (16)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table total observations: 179

Table $\chi^2$: 17.41 (p<.01)
E. A Summary of Comment Responses on the Survey

This is an attempt to curate the comments from the survey. There are many ways of classifying the comments, of course, but we attempted to present the information in a way that allows some conclusions about central tendency and yet preserve the purely qualitative nature of the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no committee</th>
<th>better evaluation and rewards</th>
<th>mentorship</th>
<th>train teachers</th>
<th>Classroom design</th>
<th>salary or course release incentives</th>
<th>teaching and learning center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>better evaluation and recognition. Perhaps departmental leverage, and more of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentorship / Teaching awards for non tenured faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Making sure we are constantly training teachers on what works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Making sure teaching plays a significant role in evaluation, promotion and tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Providing salary incentives for our best teachers to teach courses to freshmen, intro courses, and other courses where quality teaching is critical. The administration says we are already paid to teach and shouldn't need salary incentives. But Duke salaries are very low, something the administration has admitted in candid moments many times over the years. In effect, we are incentivized to do the absolute minimum, and he admin wants us to do more, they're going to have to pay us. / 2) Stop wasting time, energy, money on teaching technology. The technology is occasionally useful, but not enough to justify the enormous promotion for it that's been going on for years. / 3) Stop wasting time, energy, money on modern teaching methods. Flipped classrooms, online courses, and such are fads. (I predict they'll be recognized as such before very long.) / 4) I have much more to say about the above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching people to teach. Mentoring support for teaching. Having the attitude that teaching matters or is important interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support for new teachers - ways to be more effective and more efficient in your teaching. Support for experienced faculty who need to refresh their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creating a culture where excellence in teaching is fostered, recognized, and rewarded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All classrooms must be first-rate -- too many are shabby, poorly designed, and poorly equipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In a landslide: Identifying the standing committee(s) that will be sunset in exchange. There are too many committees already, and no one ever seems to kill them. If I can rant angentially a bit, I would love to see ECASC push the following agenda: reduce the number of committees at ALL levels (Provost, Dean, Department, etc...) by 30%; reduce the average membership of each committee by 30% (cut some by half, keep some the same, etc...), and reduce the average time per year each committee meets by 30% (again, cut some by half or more, keep some the same, etc...). Even if we fell way short, that could reduce by 50% the time the average faculty members spends on committee work! C'mon, tell me that wouldn't be the single greatest advance in quality of faculty professional life at Duke in a generation. And it's free. And I bet no one would tell the difference in terms of day-to-day consequences for decisions, etc...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valuation of teaching quality with means beyond just student valuations. It's ridiculous that we rely so heavily on just this metric. We claim to look at other things like syllabi, but we almost never have peers or observers IN THE CLASSROOM valuating what's happening, and we rarely (except for some intro classes) use any sort of empirical evidence to evaluate retention and long-term effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appreciate the flexibility of designing courses that blend two disciplines. To do this well requires resources: possibly having two instructors, or two TA's or graders. It also requires a great deal of planning, so that the assignments, lectures, and readings are very well designed. Thus creating a course like this...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should be recognized as a big investment of faculty time, and one should be able to get a course reduction if one thoroughly designs a new course across two disciplines.

One. There should be no such committee.

we're going to the 'lab' model suggested by the new curriculum, then possibilities for co-teaching should be priority think addressing the thorny issue of how to seriously assess teaching, how to detect problems and help instructors improve their performance, and - as a side benefit - recognize outstanding instructors who should be recognized and/or asked to mentor others, is an essential first step to improving eaching.

Just from these questions I imagine it would be helpful to recognize that you are running a hierarchical system where eaching is ranked far below research in terms of support, respect, and status: Perhaps an openness to work with the new union which will be representing so many of your actual eachers?

recognizing and rewarding good teachings and not letting bad eachers teach.

encouraging and supporting ALL faculty by FAIR recognition.

rewarding dedicated employees! Evaluations should focus on a qualitative and quantitative approach to our individual work (e.g.: an instructor or a T.A. of Spanish 101 doesn't have the same involvement/workload as an instructor of Spanish 301, yet all are considered as instructors and have the same pay-check) / / Re-think job titles to reflect education of instructors I have a Ph.D. and I have the same title as someone who has a Master's degree: "Lecturing Fellow")

connecting pedagogical innovations with technology and classroom support

do no harm.

ive students an opportunity to be challenged without forcing them into areas where they have little interest. As an advisor I sometimes have a hard time giving out the line that "it will be good for you as part of your liberal arts education" when I now that it won't matter at all, the student has no interest in
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hat area, and actively seeks the easiest way out. That is opposite to the challenge we should be providing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a commitment to viewpoint diversity more than skin color diversity. Good teaching requires the ability to look through other people's lenses and take their arguments seriously. Like many universities, classes with political content at Duke are often in danger of promoting a particular worldview rather than teaching students to practice charity in interpreting texts, and in trying to understand arguments they (think) they oppose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognizing all its staff as valuable assets regardless of their ranks” /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low classes are evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think we face a huge challenge in teaching. None of us are sufficiently trained in identifying pedagogical goals and thinking through the best way to deliver them - and the best way to use technology. Lots of my colleagues (and I too) have experimented with flipped classrooms, class collaborative websites, etc. But what model really offers the most value? Sometimes I think the students just want to be spoon-fed material that they could get through resources outside the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing a clear statement on how teaching counts for tenure and promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing more ways for departments to review teaching effectiveness in their review processes. Providing feedback on teaching by professionals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want to say that a standing committee on Teaching can mirror the Research committee and award grants for teaching innovation projects. But I think CIT has something like that seems to be linked to technology though). / What do the teaching/Learning centers at our peer institutions do? Will there be such a Center at Duke? If so, can the standing committee facilitate the interactions between that Center and A&amp;S?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical analysis; history of world societies and cultures;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
holding part time teachers to the same qualifications and scrutiny as PoPs. We are reviewed at every renewal of contract. Part time faculty seem to go on for decades with no oversight.

Ensuring that the Thompson Writing Program is not closed with the curriculum committee's proposed changes and that academic writing is maintained as a required class that all first-year students must take.

I want to add - since I am not sure where this would go, that the Rare Book Library (Rubenstein - Sara Seten Berghausen, Elizabeth Dunn, Heidi Madden and all the other great librarians) and the Nasher (Molly Boarati in the past and Erin Janas now) both offer incredible assistance. Teaching is greatly helped by these resources. These people should be recognized as well as CIT and if there is ever a center developed that is for teaching (not just with an emphasis on technology) these two resources should be considered. Unlike technology, the holdings in Rubenstein and Nasher are not going to disappear barring an apocalypse), so these materials can be worked into a class and used in a similar way in different semesters, allowing an instructor to improve how s/he uses the resources rather than focus on innovation for a limited period of time. In addition to what it adds to the class itself, students are often amazed at the resources of Duke and what they have potential access to. They will not necessarily be exposed to some of these incredibly holdings specific to Duke if it is not done through a class. / / Lilly library and the people in charge of digitization have also transformed teaching -- being able to put up numerous films for students to watch out of class is incredibly helpful and the quality keeps improving. The digitization (Kenneth Worthington) people are extremely responsive and make a big difference. / / Sometimes these wonderful resources are not made as clear as they could be for instructors. There is an emphasis on CIT which does not necessarily point people toward these other great resources. / / Finally, if teaching really is valued at Duke then evaluations should be used not just as an excuse to get rid of people, but also in a positive way (monetary recognition in some way?). More faculty should be regularized and put on the tenure-track.
o that the students are not being taught (42%) by non-tenure faculty who can feel voiceless and marginalized -- and unfortunately sometimes have to focus on other things (like finding a job somewhere else that is sustainable long term). If teaching really means something to the administration, it should be paid as if it means something. Professors and instructors who put energy into teaching are more important than any center or newly conceived innovative innovation that may not last.

1) Availability of classrooms that work well for small group activities in moderate-size classes. / (2) Adoption of assessment methods that complement the TCE's completed by students and focus more constructively on improvements in pedagogical methods.

making sure that excellent teaching is seen and valued, regardless of the faculty member’s rank.

o emphasize repeatedly that there are many different but effective ways to teach. That the faculty member needs to take into consideration the subject matter, the aims of the class, the individual group of students (that changes every class). That the faculty member needs to be flexible, and willing to make adjustments during the course even of a semester. That it’s not a competition or zero-sum game. / I also would like to have it encouraged that at least w/in departments faculty should make their syllabi available to others. Even that doesn’t happen in my dept!

m not sure that I see a need for such a committee.

-This is not necessarily a top priority, but simply an observation. Just because a person is an expert in math, for example, does not mean that she/he is necessarily an expert in teaching math. There is content knowledge and there is pedagogical content

Cross disciplinary dialogue on topics, how new courses could be designed, what would be the best way to teach these courses to encourage critical thinking and heightened learning. / Ted Talks - training, on new research in teaching and
Learning, best practices at other universities, new practices at other universities, information dissemination. Rewarding teaching to a greater extent than currently. There seem to be very few teaching/mentoring awards. I'm not sure beyond helping to recognize and support good instruction.

Don't only recognize and laud the 'famous' professors. Lots of us are doing good things for students that don't seem to matter to the administration, but we know they make a difference in the current and future lives of the students. Recognizing the good teachers (recognition is more important than rewards) and getting rid of the lousy ones.

Make sure that the instructors take teaching seriously rather than it is something they have to do. Another is that it is harmful that some departments cannot find enough resources to do adequate teaching.

Recognition of classes that require non-traditional scheduling and time/resource allocation. As a single example, I'd very much like to teach physics here exactly the same way I do at the Marine Lab, with a unified block of time which I can then split up as needed, week by week or subject by subject, between lecture, in class discussion and problem solving, and lab or other hands on experiences. In the case of intro physics, that would involve me getting a block of 2.5 hours (lecture) + 2 hours (lab) + 2 hours (discussion) or a bit over 6 hours a week of classroom time, all "flat" and not specified or named. /* That class would need to be taught in a single, large classroom, with e.g. hexagonal tables for six person teams with whiteboards for the teams to work problems. The classroom would need adequate projection, doc camera, and internet resources. It would need to be staffed by me as lecturer AND by several TAs to help mentor problem solving activities or lab activities, scaled to the size of the class. /* In fairness to the students, who already spend almost twice as long on physics as any other subject they study, it would truly be lovely to have his recognized by the University and to have the course count as 1.5 or 2 credits. I know, this will make so very many people cream, but the way we do it now is really pretty insane. MOS
Universities give semester hour credit for -- hours spent in class! There is absolutely no way (and I say this as a philosophy and physics major, at Duke, back when one could not do a BS in physics and a BA in philosophy, and I love philosophy as a subject and completed a BA without any recognition or "credit at all) that a philosophy course with 2.5 hours of in-class discussion, some reading you can usually get away without doing or without doing thoroughly, and a handful of term papers is one HALF of the work required in an introductory physics, or chemistry, or biology class. Students work an average of 12 hours a week on physics between the time spent actually in class and the time spent on preparation and homework and study. The philosophy course would be fortunate to have students doing 6 hours of work a week (on average) including class time. Yet they both earn the student the same "credit", which is not fair. / * See remarks above on the need to do cognitive and skills testing on matriculation, having a required course teaching them how to learn their first semester here (that includes tutoring in weak skills as well as coaching to get them through their first semester classes with realistic amount of effort), and the need to provide a lot more support for students with anxiety, mental health and learning disability issues, instead of leaving them out there uncoached, unmentored, pretty much sink or swim with the sop of a bit of extra time on quizzes or exams. / / We are a long ways away from...
larger enrollment courses. More emphasis on teaching effectiveness when setting salaries.

eaching how to engage undergrads, who are often texting or surfing the web during class instead of paying attention, even luring smaller discussion sections. Not every class lends itself to group exercises. How to balance regular-rank and non-regular rank teaching in a department. Often non-regular rank faculty are better teachers and yet are not considered as valuable in the Administration's eyes. Tenure-track faculty are overburdened and can't really spend the time needed to engage in creative teaching pedagogy.

honesty in assigning teaching awards; awards for good teaching whether they are large or small classes.

Supporting and rewarding good teaching. I know that this is difficult because the primary source of information about good teaching comes via student evaluations. While those evaluations have a place in producing information about teaching, not many undergraduates are thoughtful or coherent enough in their comments or scoring to be relied upon as heavily as they are. Undergraduates have really diffuse and often inchoate thoughts about teaching so many of the evaluations scores are driven by how close to or far away from their idealized and romantic expectations in the classroom. We found, for example, that many students who complain about their experience in the classroom have no sense of how much their classroom expectation is tied to an early 20th century sense of the traditional "master" stereotype of faculty.

Examining a system for rewarding excellence in teaching by faculty; examining how to develop a student oriented teaching culture among faculty, and an interest in innovation; possibly providing some small grant funds to support innovation; pushing for upgraded teaching facilities, especially appropriate paces for larger flipped classrooms.

Increasing recognition and reward for faculty who invest a lot of time in improving or innovating ways to teach.

everyone can improve their teaching but it's unlikely to occur in a vacuum solely in the mind or daily practice of an individual faculty member who faces many clashing priorities (finish
| Research, articles due, service, writing grants, and so on). A community of teacher learners would be important as well as a resource to which we might go for additional and ongoing discussion and training. |
| Fixing the broken system of evaluations. |
| A clear career path for contingent faculty |
| First and foremost: Find ways to make class sizes smaller. E.g., departments that teach very large classes should be given more faculty positions (at least professors of the practice, and at least on temporary contracts). If contracts are temporary, they should be a few years long at least, to ensure consistency and quality of teaching. Duke prides itself of having small classes (as it should, especially given the cost of tuition), and right now that's a lie for many parts of the University. |
| Fixing technology in labs and classrooms |
| A teaching and learning center would provide a useful space to aggregate many of these initiatives, and also to study pedagogy and its associated practices. |
| Create a ladder system for instructors (non regular faculty) to be promoted and grow professionally. |
| Incorporating technology into classrooms more effectively |
| Honestly, I need to give this more thought and don't have time right now -- have to teach twice tomorrow --. |
| Improve the technology in labs and classrooms |
| How can we create a culture of teaching here through incentives and supportive structures? |
| How to evaluate teaching outside of student evaluations? |
Develop explicit guidelines and advocate for innovative teaching (and the research that goes into it) for greater weight in promotion and tenure decisions.

Bring *every* classroom at Duke into the modern era. Get great tech available everywhere. At present it is something of a lottery.

Classrooms. We have lost many classrooms over the years, many classrooms are really not great even after being refurbished, and classes are still being held in inappropriate spaces such as Griffith. Good teaching can only do so much to overcome crappy classrooms, especially when the class size is large.

Testing center for students who are granted extra time on assessments.

Most effective ways to teach and how to disseminate them to the instructors/professors.

Recognition for teaching / Course evaluations / Changing the culture of coursework often being a second priority for students below extra-curricular activities.

Converting most non-regular rank positions focused on teaching, including labs, to regular rank. / Converting people on short term contracts to multi-year contracts. / Examining and working to narrow the gap in pay between faculty with heavier teaching loads & larger class sizes to those who frequently receive teaching releases to conduct research or teach smaller classes. / Moving more Duke faculty into the 21st century in terms of learning about teaching technology and evidence-based pedagogies.

I'm not sure that I see _why_ there should be an Arts and Sciences Council standing committee on Teaching: i.e., I don't really see the problem that this committee would be addressing. (And, in the absence of a specific problem, it seems like this will be yet another committee that will seek to micromanage aspects of the faculty). If the goal is simply to optimize teaching at Duke, then let the faculty do that on their own. / / If such a committee is created, I would urge the members of the committee to reconsider completely how
Courses are evaluated/assessed. The current system—which evaluates courses only at the end of the semester, and does so only because this is the easiest (rather than best) time to get students to fill out course evaluations—provides information that is of minimal use; it is basically consumer-oriented information of Facebook like "likes." It would be much more meaningful to gather data about a student's sense of a course years, 5 years, and 10 years out (e.g., a course that a student initially found frustrating, and ranked low, might turn out to be one that really "stuck" with a student, whereas a course that a student "really liked" at the end of the semester might then turn out, in hindsight, to have left very little mark in a student's memory and intellectual development).

Occasional workshops on evidenced-based learning/teaching; open discussion of tenure process and evaluation process, given that research is often the priority of both professors and the university yet teaching is also important - how can we meet these challenges and support faculty so that they are meeting their own professional goals?

Recognizing and rewarding good teaching / / * improved means of assessing teaching ** / faculty incentives for good teaching

Actually valuing and recognizing the connections that faculty make with their students, as well as the time, effort, and creativity that professors put into teaching. It would also be great to have some training available on new teaching techniques and theories etc. Or a resource center perhaps?

We are going through a paradigm shift in the way information is disseminated and utilized. We do not see the end of the tunnel yet and there is need to explore how to adapt to changes the direction of which we cannot tell yet. This calls for room for experimentation and exploration to find out what works.

Making sure the best teachers are working with students. Let the researchers do what they do best.

S incentivize good teaching, so that is it valued nearly as much as good research
The list of kinds of support for teaching I saw on the first page was a total surprise to me. I've never known I could get support for designing a course—and frankly, I wonder whether that means "designing the tech aspect of the course." What his university really needs is a Center for Teaching, not just a Center for Information Technology. Teaching is a lot more than technology, and not all problems can be solved with a byte or a chip. There should be, e.g., videotaping available so that a teacher can record herself giving a lecture, then watch it with an expert who can tell her how to improve. Also, support should be available on such fairly specific topics as how best to teach a language, along with more general information on the types of teaching styles available and how to implement them (small groups, peer-teaching, etc.). Most newly minted PhDs and a lot of more advanced professors, too) have spent the majority of their time prior to Duke obtaining the specialized skills for their discipline, and polishing their research. Teaching is not emphasized in every graduate program, or every institution. And even if it were, that doesn't mean every professor got help with bringing up her teaching game. We need a center for teaching support that more closely resembles what UNC offers.

valuations. Faculty enrichment and retooling for changing technologies. Faculty development within in our changing fields. Faculty funds for workshops/additional degrees/courses

to better support teaching using peer to peer methods / funding for teaching and re-vamping existing courses / how to make teaching more a part of the promotion process

valuate teaching professionals on teaching only; PoPs shouldn't have to compete with tenured and tenure-track faculty for recognition or raises / / Some mechanism for performance evaluation by qualified peers / / Cultural decoupling of prestige within field and assumed teaching capability -- someone who does outstanding research is not necessarily an outstanding instructor, and there is no mechanism for lower-ranked personnel to convey that Prof. bigName is bad at teaching and should be kept away from undergrad classes
Many Duke professors deplore the plight of NC Public School teachers but ignore the plight of less securely employed and more poorly paid Duke adjunct faculty.

Figure out how much time undergraduates spend on class preparation. My impression is that this time has been steadily declining over the past few years. They do not read as much as before. This seriously affects teaching. Do a survey. Find out how they use their time. Find out whether learning still is the top priority of undergraduates.

1. Finding ways to identify and reward great teaching, on some basis other than TCEs. / 2. Finding more ways to motivate departments to place more value on teaching. / 3. Encourage departments to give POPs more influence/oversight of teaching within their departments. / 4. Encourage departments to valuate POPs more on the basis of their contributions to teaching and less on their other work. / 5. Encourage the university to hire more POPs to force more focus on teaching across the university.

Incentivizing good teaching, investment in course development, content, assessment.

- 35 to 65 person lecture halls in Sanford style, on Main West specially (though I personally am happy to travel). / 2) 15-20 person seminar rooms with solid wooden tables (like 319 Grey), windows, and charm. / 3) Reliable, easy to use, analog friendly, technology in key classrooms.

Pay equity.

Committee is not necessary.

Defending a rigorous curriculum would seem to be an important objective, but it seems like that ship may already have sailed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting senior faculty into the freshman classroom, especially enured faculty in languages who leave all the heavy lifting to instructors.</th>
<th>Providing concrete incentives to ensure that faculty improve their teaching.</th>
<th>Valuation that isn't focused on student course evaluations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom space!!!!!!!!!!! I don't think faculty are consulted enough when classes are redesigned. There was an overhaul a couple of years ago, and most fac I know are unhappy with it. A lot of us have ideas about teaching and would be very happy to be consulted about classroom design. It's important! / / More up to date and better maintained technology and more support.</td>
<td>Do NOT set up another standing committee. That is our response to everything, and it is an enormous waste of everyone's time.</td>
<td>Thinking about ways to acknowledge the excellence in teaching that goes on every days at Duke but goes under the radar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering engaging instruction -- moving beyond lecture to more collaborative, interactive, student-driven and led learning experiences.</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes / Incentivizing time spent on teaching when teaching outside the box takes so much extra effort (and time away from direct research).</td>
<td>Developing methods of teaching support and recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for recognizing and rewarding excellence in teaching.</td>
<td>Liberal arts</td>
<td>Getting rid of the online evaluation process. Provide course relief or independent studies, and for those who actually spend time teaching and interfacing with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforming bad teaching. Some faculty just need to be stopped before they &quot;teach&quot; again.</td>
<td>The ongoing erosion of research faculty involvement in undergraduate instruction / / Articulating the value of a liberal arts education and translating these values into at multiple levels: university curriculum, majors, certificates, experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outside the classroom as well as course design and instruction.  
/ Countering the denigration of disciplines that aren’t  
reprofessional or majors that command less than the most  
remunerative salaries.

The committee should address the slide toward casualization -  
the increased use of POPs for scholars doing exactly what  
enure-track faculty do (rather than the original intent of using  
them for artists, creative writers, etc.), the increased use of  
specters and adjuncts for courses that should be taught by  
egular faculty (core courses that communicate the  
foundamentals of a discipline or field; specialized courses that  
provide research training, etc.)

Recognizing that Duke needs to make undergraduate teaching  
and mentoring a priority in evaluating the contributions of  
faculty -- much more so than now. Everyone brings unique skill  
sets, and some are amazing teachers; others incredible  
researchers. Let’s celebrate both.

These things are not directly applicable / to our field. I would  
appreciate a room I could use consistently, with a piano and a  
musical and in it, along with a shelf to store my supplies  
(furniture and a mirror to use for visual evaluations. We can  
record via cell phones and iPads, but music is still on paper and  
this is still a set of skills that is best learned one-on-one in  
person.

More TA support for large classes, designated teaching  
mentors for new assistant professors within departments,  
service points for helping with class prep, organization, etc.

Grade inflation.

1) Making sure not to get in the way of good teachers -- simply  
recognize what they are doing. / 2) Trying to identify poor  
teachers -- this is what has the potential for the greatest  
impact in the undergraduate experience.

Keeping teaching important. Too often teaching support ($$$)  
gets lost in the midst of other priorities.

First understand the current situation of what is being done  
well and what areas need attention, and in comparison with  
other top teaching institutions. / Formation of a teaching thin...
ank that explores and develops cutting edge ideas and strategies. / Actively explore ways to incorporate more interdisciplinary courses -- for example introducing humanities and sciences -- I personally think this is very important -- scientists benefit greatly from being able to view things from a humanities perspective -- see as one successful example IT390/PHY190 (the only course cross-listed in both literature and physics!!). / Have available teaching mentors to guide and discuss good teaching practices and how to actively engage with students. / Recognise that there is not a single solution to successful teaching -- highly dependent on personality and ability to engage. A teacher that can successfully engage students by incorporating, for example, inspirational, storytelling, humorous, etc. narrative, may not need the various technological aides available which could be more of a distraction. / Much of this is already being done to some extent, but is somewhat scattered.

Some of the classrooms in my building could be significantly improved. Sometimes my teaching style is inhibited by the poor classroom condition (too many desks and not much space to walk around, AV equipment not functioning, HVAC not working properly) / / Our department needs better classrooms.

How to move from 'one off' innovations in the classroom that come new funding to sustainable models for successful ventures.

Rethinking Bass, please!

We need Spanish Linguistics and Applied Linguistics areas for research, and links with teaching and technology areas.

Maintaining our education in liberal arts capacities with vigor. Value old fashioned book learning as much as new gizmos, service learning, or screen time. Help articulate what those liberal arts capacities are for students, parents, student services, alumnae association, the press, trustees -- and show how they are valuable. In this work, foreground faculty who are articulating these principals and provide concrete examples of courses, including old-time pedagogy, e.g., seminar discussion.
2. Duke is facing increasingly prominent conflicts around race, gender, inequality. Yet in addressing these institutionally, Duke must play the place of its strength in scholarship in the areas, often referring to student services or Allen building committees. a) the standing committee can help articulate the role scholarship plays that is distinct from, if related to, student services or public discussions. b) A way to do this is to recognize the strengths Duke already has in scholarship that illuminates, and charts paths through, these issues. / 3. Continue to encourage depth in student curricula, with an emphasis on the way formal coursework is probably our best resource for achieving intellectual depth. Discourage students from pursuing a thesis on an idea that strikes them summer of junior year for which they've had zero coursework; encourage them to generate questions and projects from accumulated coursework or associations across readings/lab work. 

- Teaching conversations/discussion as a skill set as important as writing.
- Duke seems to have a lot of teaching-focused resources, so I think it would be beneficial to connect these resources. / Duke should avoid strategies that would increase administrative overhead.
- Professor retention / Gender equality (pay gap) / Resources or the arts /
- Find better metrics for evaluating teaching, and then find incentives and rewards for good teaching.

It is not sure. But in any case, and first, a wide-ranging discussion of: evaluation mechanism, institutional incentives (tenure), dept pressures (enrollments), approval mechanisms Courses committee process), ugrad review (we review grad programs at Ext Rev, but not, so far as I know, ugrad), a more substantive approach to assessment in general, achieving greater clarity on what we think Duke's curriculum is (we do we mean when we say that we are hybrid Liberal Arts / R1 Institution? this sometimes sounds more like a slogan than thoughtful reflection). This list could go on and on. But start with discussion.
In my estimation, priority number one for Duke regarding teaching should be the establishment of a center for teaching and learning to enhance the quality of undergraduate education, like those that can be found in Harvard and Princeton, for example. There are some ways those interested in teaching can sometimes get some support at Duke, from the Thompson Writing Center, from the CIT, from the Graduate School, but it is very piecemeal and haphazard. If Duke cared about teaching and learning, they would invest in a center and fund it.

*Ind ways to peg salary increases to teaching excellence.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Better Evaluation and Rewards</th>
<th>Mentorship</th>
<th>Train Teachers</th>
<th>Classroom Design</th>
<th>Salary or Course Release Incentives</th>
<th>Teaching Learning Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brown University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 6,320

Number of Full Time Faculty: 731

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Sheridan Center

- Description: “A place where faculty, graduate students and postdocs come together from across the disciplines to inquire about, explore, and reflect upon teaching and learning as ongoing and collaborative processes”
- Mission: To provide “practical advice about teaching and professional development”, “promote best practices and promising new practices in teaching” and “support instructors as they launch and develop their professional careers”
- Resources: Offer programs on teaching, course development grants, certificate programs, confidential consulting services, support for research, career planning, teaching and learning resources, and community
  - Have annual themes that focus on a different aspect of teaching
- Director: Sharon Schwartz
- Phone Number: 401-863-1141
- Link: https://www.brown.edu/about/administration/sheridan-center/

Sheridan Certificate Program
### Sheridan Certificate Programs

We offer five year-long certificate programs in which participants develop and reflect on their teaching and mentoring practice and prepare for professional careers. These programs are open to Brown graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, faculty and staff. Enrollment for all programs is limited, so register early if you wish to participate. Completion of Certificate I is a prerequisite for the other certificate programs, which can be completed in any sequence.

- **Certificate I: Sheridan Teaching Seminar - Reflective Teaching**
  Develop and refine fundamental teaching and assessment strategies and communication skills based on how students learn.

- **Certificate II: The Course Design Seminar - Principles + Practice**
  Develop strategies and practices for course design, implementation and assessment.

- **Certificate III: The Professional Development Seminar**
  Develop teaching portfolio, cover letters, CVs and interview & presentation skills for the academic job market. Separate sections for the Humanities & Social Sciences, and for the Life & Physical Sciences.

- **Certificate IV: The Teaching Consultant Program**
  Develop and apply peer observation & feedback skills and expertise in leadership & discussion facilitation.

- **Certificate V: Principles & Practice in Reflective Mentorship**
  Professional training in mentorship practices for future faculty careers. (This program will not be offered in 2015-16)

*Certificate I strongly encouraged but not a requirement for Certificate V.*

When should graduate students enroll in the Certificate programs? Graduate Student Timeline.

---

- **Link:** [https://www.brown.edu/about/administration/sheridan-center/sheridan-certificate-programs](https://www.brown.edu/about/administration/sheridan-center/sheridan-certificate-programs)

- **Instructional Technology Group**
  - **Description:** supports teaching and learning through researching and promoting new technologies and providing consultation on effective pedagogical practices. A division of CIS Academic Technology, ITG supports faculty, students, and staff on campus.
  - **Resources:** Technological support for faculty members such as “weather proof your course” & how to prepare for the spring
  - **Link:** [https://blogs.brown.edu/itg/](https://blogs.brown.edu/itg/)
    Learn Net: The Center for Staff Learning & Professional Development

- **Resources:** Offers training tutorials and different event registrations
  - **Phone Number:** 401-863-1000
  - **Link:** [https://www.brown.edu/about/training/](https://www.brown.edu/about/training/)
Welcome to learn-net!

Learn-net is your one-stop-shop for all of your training and event registration needs.

This new site includes....

learn-net includes the following:

- Links to various departments previously using training.brown.edu
- Short descriptions explaining what each department offers for training and
Columbia University

Undergraduate Enrollment: **8,613**

Number of Full Time Faculty: **3,876**

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Center for Teaching and Learning

- **Mission:**
  - Committed to advancing the culture of teaching and learning for professional development, curricular enhancement, and academic support through its programs, services, and resources.
  - Understands teaching as a critical practice, driven by inquiry, experimentation, reflection, and collaboration.
  - Promotes pedagogy that is inclusive, learner-centered, and research-based.
  - Supports the purposeful use of new media and emerging technologies in the classroom and online to foster the success of Columbia’s instructors and students.

- **Resources:** Offers a number of different programs for faculty and opportunities for peer consultation & in-house consulting services
  - **Director:** Kathy Takayama
  - **Phone Number:** 212-854-1692
  - For faculty [http://ctl.columbia.edu/faculty/](http://ctl.columbia.edu/faculty/)
  - For graduate students [http://ctl.columbia.edu/graduate-instructors/](http://ctl.columbia.edu/graduate-instructors/)
  - Peer Teaching Consultants program is for Columbia University doctoral students to enhance design, implementation, and assessment of graduate student instruction ([http://ctl.columbia.edu/graduate-instructors/peer-teaching-consultants/](http://ctl.columbia.edu/graduate-instructors/peer-teaching-consultants/))

- **Link:** [http://ctl.columbia.edu/](http://ctl.columbia.edu/)
Skills@Columbia
- Description: Online classes are provided for faculty (things like IT skills)
- Link: http://hr.columbia.edu/find-out-about/professional-development/online-learning

Classroom Learning
- Description: Human resources department under Professional Development also offers class-room courses that faculty can take
- Link: http://hr.columbia.edu/find-out-about/professional-development/classroom-learning

International Teaching Fellows Training
- Description: “Offers special language and teacher training for International Teaching Fellows in the graduate schools at Columbia University”
- Link: http://sps.columbia.edu/alp/programs/international-teaching-fellows-training

- Teaching College Certificates
- Description: Offers certificate programs for teaching
- Link: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/admissions/areas-of-study/teacher-education-and-teacher-certification/
Cornell University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 14,315

Number of Full Time Faculty: 1,648

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Center for Teaching Excellence
- Mission: Committed to advancement of teaching and learning at Cornell
- Resources: provide research based programs and services and sponsors Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows & Research and Teaching Fellows
- Director: Theresa Pettit
- Phone Number: 607-255-3990
- Link: http://www.cte.cornell.edu/

Teaching and Learning Consortium
- Mission: “To provide coordinated assistance and access to practices, technologies, and resources that support current, effective, and innovative teaching”
- Link: https://teachingconsortium.cornell.edu/
Language Resource Center

- Description: “Unit in the College of Arts and Sciences that supports language teaching and learning.”
- Director: Richard Feldman
- Phone Number: 607-255-5542
- Link: http://www.lrc.cornell.edu/lrc_info
Language Programs at Cornell
Languages are offered at Cornell by nine different academic units - six departments, one center and two programs, all in the College of Arts and Sciences. For questions regarding particular courses, placement, employment, and translations, please address those departments directly. The departments offer about 45 languages, about 30 of which offer courses through second year and can be used to satisfy the Arts College language requirement. The Einaudi Center for International Studies also provides support for some courses.

Language Resource Center
The Language Resource Center is a unit in the College of Arts and Sciences that supports language teaching and learning. The LRC is located at Noyes Lodge, overlooking the Beebe Lake falls. We maintain a student facility with technology-based resources and environments for language learning. The LRC also supports teachers in materials development. Our support team includes a director, administrator, web director and AV developer. Finally, the LRC arranges and sponsors events of intellectual interest to language teachers, with usually six to eight invited speakers each year.

LRC Media
The LRC maintains a large library of media files online. Some of these are created by Cornell language teachers, and some are part of publishers' packages, which we have put on the web with permission. The LRC media also includes media workbooks, which are web pages that combine audio or video with questions that students answer online. The LRC offers a set of web page tools specially designed for language program and language course web sites which can be easily customized and updated by teachers. Web Audio Lab, developed jointly by the LRC and Slava Paperno of the Russian Department, provides students with an efficient and powerful oral learning environment. The LRC also hosts the website of the Department of Asian Studies.
Dartmouth College:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 4289

Number of Full Time Faculty: 1,081

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Dartmouth Center for the Advancement of Learning
- Description: Facilitates professional development for Dartmouth’s teachers and cultivates a community of conversation about how people learn
- All teaching resources are in branches of this center
- Director: Lisa Baldez
- Phone Number: 603-646-6906
- Link: [www.dartmouth.edu/~dcal/resources/](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~dcal/resources/)

- Rassias Method Workshops for Teachings
- Description: Offer instructors an array of dynamic classroom activities that use movement, sound, rhythm and motion to help students learn
- Link: [http://rassias.dartmouth.edu/workshops/](http://rassias.dartmouth.edu/workshops/)
Rassias Method® Workshops for Teachers

The Rassias Method (RM) includes some fifty dramatic techniques that work to banish the inhibitions that can retard the acquisition of foreign languages. RM techniques hold students’ attention and foster spontaneous use of the language. Teachers’ workshops in the RM offer instructors an array of dynamic classroom activities that use movement, sound, rhythm and motion to help students learn. Workshop participants will enjoy a supportive, intensive, small group session environment as they practice applying the RM techniques to their current classroom materials. Originally developed during the advent of the Peace Corps, the techniques have been adopted by teachers worldwide.

The Rassias Method training attempts to channel your energy, enthusiasm, and activities so that they will be more productive to you and your students in the classroom and for communication skills in general. Through the techniques we present, you should be better able to create the “illusion of spontaneity” for every class with which you interact. We believe that the most effective and dramatic kind of spontaneity in the classroom is rehearsed.

Learning to communicate more effectively in face-to-face encounters, an important part of which is language learning, should not be tedious. It should be stimulating, entertaining, and to put it quite simply, fun. There must be mutual respect and cooperation between teachers and students in the learning encounter. We believe that the more we can offer through effective materials and teaching methodologies,
Emory University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 7,803

Number of Full Time Faculty: 13,375

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Resources:

Center for Faculty Development and Excellence

- Supported by Office of Provost and serves all 9 schools of Emory
- Mission: “To assist faculty at every level of the career, from junior faculty to full professor, and in lecture, tenure, and clinical tracks”
- Director: Pamela Scully
- Phone Number: 404-712-4161
- Link: http://cfde.emory.edu/index.html

Center for Academic Excellence

- Description: Center of faculty development provides opportunities for teaching & learning scholarship, assessment of specific courses & across the curriculum, & partners with other divisions across Emory
- Under Oxford College
- Director: Jeff Galle
- Phone Number: 770-784-4571
- Link: http://oxford.emory.edu/academics/centers-institutes-programs/center-for-academic-excellence/
Academic Leader Program

- **Description:** Develops the next generation of university leaders, cultivating promotion opportunities in academic affairs for current faculty members
  - Faculty members are nominated
- **Link:** [http://provost.emory.edu/faculty/promotion/academic-leadership-program.html](http://provost.emory.edu/faculty/promotion/academic-leadership-program.html)

Learning and Organizational Development Human Resources

- **Mission:** To increase an Emory’s ability to motivate, inspire and improve the performance of its people, through a variety of interventions
- **Director:** Wanda Haynes
- **Phone Number:** (404) 727-7607
- **Link:** [http://www.learningservices.emory.edu/](http://www.learningservices.emory.edu/)
Emory Learning Management System

Link: [http://www.emory.edu/elms-training/](http://www.emory.edu/elms-training/)
Harvard University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 6,700
Number of Full Time Faculty: 2,400
Number of Part Time Faculty:

Faculty of Arts and Sciences: Resources for Faculty and Researchers

- Description: Provides resources for faculty and researchers at Harvard's Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS)
- Director: Nina Zipser
- Phone Number: 617-496-9697
- Link: http://facultyresources.fas.harvard.edu/teaching

Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning

- Mission: “The Bok Center seeks to continuously improve teaching and learning at Harvard by supporting experimentation, innovation, and evidence-based practices”
- Resources: “Offers learning experiences based on extensive training and support for their teaching, experimentation and innovation in all learning environments, and rigorous assessment of effective teaching and learning practices”
- Director: Robert Lue (617-495-4164)
- Phone Number: (617) 495-4869
- Link: http://bokcenter.harvard.edu/
Teacher Education Program

- Description: A master’s program that prepares students to become transformative teacher-leaders in America’s urban public schools.
- Director: Katherine Merseth
- Link: http://www.gse.harvard.edu/masters/tep

Harvard Initiative for Learning and Teaching

- Mission: to catalyze innovation and excellence in learning and teaching at Harvard
  - Meeting the educational needs of students (both technological and pedagogical);
  - Strengthening the science of learning
- Developing a robust network at Harvard around teaching and learning innovation.
  - Director: Erin Driver-Linn
  - Phone Number: (617) 384-9033
  - Link: http://hilt.harvard.edu/

Harvard Teaching Fellows
- Description: Offers an innovative pathway into teaching for Harvard College graduates committed to careers serving high-need urban schools
- Link: https://www.gse.harvard.edu/htf

Project Zero
- Mission: Aim to help educators answer to main questions: “What does it mean to understand something? And what kinds of curricula, learning experiences, and assessment support students in developing understanding?”
- Link: http://www.pz.harvard.edu/projects/teaching-for-understanding

Graduate Teaching Certificate
- Description: Offers graduate students and teaching fellows a tangible marker of their ongoing development as teachers in higher education
- Link: http://bokcenter.harvard.edu/teaching-certificate-program

Johns Hopkins University:
Undergraduate Enrollment: 5,299

Number of Full Time Faculty: 1,500

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Center for Educational Resources

- Mission: To partner with faculty and graduate students to extend their instructional impact by connecting innovative teaching strategies and instructional technologies.
- Director: Cheryl Wagner
- Phone Number: 410.516.7181
- Link: [http://www.cer.jhu.edu/index.html](http://www.cer.jhu.edu/index.html)
Faculty Website
- Description: Website providing a number of resources to faculty (How to Make a Course Page, Teaching and Technology Resources, etc.)
- Link: https://ep.jhu.edu/faculty

Teaching Assistant Resources
- Description: Teaching Assistant Institute- Program to help train TAs
- Link: http://homewoodgrad.jhu.edu/professional-development/teaching-assistant-resources/
Teaching and Learning@Carey

- Description: Provides resources for faculty (One-on-one consults, faculty orientation etc.)
- Carey Business School Resources
- Director: Robin Seitz
- Phone Number: (410) 234-9472
- Link: [http://carey.jhu.edu/faculty-research/learning-at-carey/](http://carey.jhu.edu/faculty-research/learning-at-carey/)
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Undergraduate Enrollment: 4,527

Number of Full Time Faculty: 1,036

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Teaching and Learning Laboratory (TLL)
- Description: Promotes educational innovation & a challenging, engaging, supporting culture of learning
- Director: Janet Rankin
- Phone Number: 617-253-3371
- Link: [http://tll.mit.edu/](http://tll.mit.edu/)

Office of Digital Learning (ODL)
- Description: Resource of digital learning initiatives and online education
- Director: Sanjay Sarma
- Link: [http://odl.mit.edu/mit-faculty](http://odl.mit.edu/mit-faculty)
Curriculum and Faculty Support
- Description: Help faculty develop and coordinate curriculum & educational programming
- Director: Kathleen MacArthur
- Phone Number: 617-253-6776
- Link: http://web.mit.edu/facultysupport/programs.html

Kaufman Teaching Certificate
- Link: http://tll.mit.edu/help/kaufman-teaching-certificate-program-ktcp
Kaufman Teaching Certificate Program (KTCP)

The Kaufman Teaching Certificate Program (KTCP) was re-named in September 2014 to honor a long-time friend of the Teaching and Learning Lab, Stephen P. Kaufman. With Kaufman’s support over the last several years, this certificate program was created for MIT graduate students and postdoctoral researchers who wish to develop their teaching skills. It is designed for participants with a variety of interests and career goals: from those who wish to develop better skills to support their teaching at MIT, to those who are planning careers in academe.

Upon completion of the program requirements, participants receive a certificate and letter from the Dean for Graduate Education outlining the program and confirming completion of all program requirements. This letter can be submitted with applications for teaching positions as evidence of a commitment to the teaching enterprise.

If you have questions about the program after reviewing this site, please contact Leann Dobranski (leann@mit.edu) by email or by phone at x3-3371. Learn more about applying to the KTCP.

Faculty Resource Page

Link: http://web.mit.edu/faculty/teaching/index.html
Northwestern University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 8,405
Number of Full Time Faculty: 3,334
Number of Part Time Faculty:

Searle Center for Advancing Learning & Teaching
- Mission: To enhance learning and teaching at all levels of the university
- Director: Susanna Calkins
- Phone Number: 847-467-2338
- Link: http://www.northwestern.edu/searle/

Northwestern University Information Technology (NUI)
- Description: Provides technology support and teaching to faculty
- Link: http://www.it.northwestern.edu/staff/index.html
Canvas Learning Center

- Description: Interactive page with a number of resources and tutorials that teachers can utilize
- Link: https://canvas.northwestern.edu/courses/1580

Collaborative Learning and Mentoring in the Biosciences (CLIMB)

- Description: Professional development program that guides a diverse group of bioscience PhD students to develop advanced skills for collaborating, communicating and conducting research across disciplines, and to accelerate their scientific careers.
- Link: http://www.northwestern.edu/climb/
  EdTeach Teaching Fellows Program

- Link: http://lmsblog.it.northwestern.edu/2016/02/29/ed-tech-teaching-fellows-program/
  Graduate Teaching Fellows

- Description: Provides an opportunity for graduate students at Northwestern to advance their teaching and leadership skills while contributing to the pedagogical development of their peers
- Link: http://www.northwestern.edu/searle/programs-events/grad/opportunities-at-searle/graduate-teaching-fellow.html
Princeton University:
Undergraduate Enrollment: 5,275
Number of Full Time Faculty: 1,221 (Full-time and Part-time)
Number of Part Time Faculty: 148 (College Factual)

McGraw Center
- Description: Main center for teaching and learning; support teachers, graduate students, and undergraduates as they develop their teaching practices
- Encompasses a lot of different resources (Oversees TA training etc.)
- Director: Lisa Herschbach
- Phone Number: 609-258-1433
- Link: http://www.princeton.edu/mcgraw/

Princeton Writing Program
- Description: Provides teachers with resources on how to best instruct students on writing
Resources for University Faculty

What do Princeton students learn about writing as freshmen?

All Princeton students take a topic-based Writing Seminar during their first year. The seminar introduces them to the fundamentals of academic inquiry and research, including how to construct interesting problems and questions, develop an original claim, and intervene in a scholarly debate, and assess and integrate a wide variety of sources.

They also develop the habits of revision and peer review at the heart of the scholarly enterprise, meeting in writing groups and offering each other constructive feedback on drafts.

The interdisciplinary nature of the seminars gives students early exposure to disciplinary differences in reading, writing, and research practices. Students enact this learning in small-scale writing assignments that culminate in a 10-12 page research essay.

Additional Resources

- Current Writing Seminars
- A short video about student perspectives on the Writing Seminars
- More information about the Writing Seminars

How can I build on that learning to help my students develop as writers?
Stanford University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 6,994

Number of Full Time Faculty: 2,118

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning

- Description: Promotes & advance teaching and learning by leveraging digital technology to make research more accessible and supporting educational programs
- Director: John Mitchell (Vice Provost)
- Phone Number: 650-723-7280
- Link: https://vptl.stanford.edu/teaching-learning

Teaching Commons

- Description: Provides a number of different resources for teaching and learning to faculty members (articles, forums, collaborative talks)
- Director: Joan Passarelli
- Link: https://teachingcommons.stanford.edu/
Center for Teaching and Learning

- Now part of the VOTL
- Link: http://exploreddegrees.stanford.edu/undergraduateeducation/ctl/
University of Chicago:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 5,724

Number of Full Time Faculty: 2,205

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Chicago Center for Teaching
- Description: Supports all of Chicago’s instructors, graduate students, post docs, and faculty members, in developing their teaching resources
- Director: William Rando
- Phone Number: 773- 834- 4439
- Link: [http://teaching.uchicago.edu/](http://teaching.uchicago.edu/)

Teaching@TheUniversityofChicago
- Description: Provides resources and support services to faculty members
- Link: [https://training.uchicago.edu/categories.cfm?family_id=6](https://training.uchicago.edu/categories.cfm?family_id=6)
Certificate In University Teaching

- Description: Under the Chicago Center for Teaching
- Link: [https://teaching.uchicago.edu/graduate-students/certificate-in-teaching/](https://teaching.uchicago.edu/graduate-students/certificate-in-teaching/)

Certificate in University Teaching

There are many different kinds of documents required by hiring committees during the process of applying for a job. Some of them are teaching documents related to a course you have taught or hope to teach in the future. Others are reflective essays presenting your ideas on teaching to prospective colleagues. The Center’s Certificate in University Teaching documents graduate students’ professional development through the process of critically reflecting on university teaching in general and their own practices in particular.

The CCT’s series of seminars and workshops on teaching that make up a part of the Certificate in University Teaching allow job candidates learn about and compose a set of documents required by search committees. These documents should be polished and completed before the application process begins in the early fall. The process of obtaining the Certificate also, simultaneously, introduces beginning instructors to the discourse of teaching in higher education, which in turn, prepares them for interviewing with prospective colleagues.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 18,421
Number of Full Time Faculty: 3,667
Number of Part Time Faculty:

UNC Center for Faculty Excellence

- Description: Center to provide faculty members with all of the resources necessary for them to reach their goals as teachers
- Director: Molly Sutphen
- Phone Number: 919-966-4838
- Link: [http://cfe.unc.edu/](http://cfe.unc.edu/)

Today's university instructors want to excel at so many things — old things, such as building a syllabus or presenting a lecture, as well as new things, such as creating instructional videos and using classroom response systems. Through workshops, grant programs, individual and departmental consultations, faculty learning communities, evaluation support, and many other resources, the Center for Faculty Excellence helps all Carolina faculty members reach their goals as teachers.
Washington University of St. Louis

Undergraduate Enrollment: 7,439

Number of Full Time Faculty: 3,619

Number of Part Time Faculty:

The Teaching Center

- **Mission:** To improve teaching and learning by integrating pedagogy and scholarship with classroom design
- **Resources:** One of their resources is a Summer Institute on Teaching that faculty members can apply to be a part of
  - Teaching Center handles training for Teaching Assistants
- **Director:** Gina Frey
- **Phone Number:** (314) 935-6810
- **Link:** [https://teachingcenter.wustl.edu/](https://teachingcenter.wustl.edu/)

Teaching and Learning Domain Committee

- Under the Office of the CIO
- **Link:** [http://cio.wustl.edu/governance/governance-committees/teaching-learning-committee/](http://cio.wustl.edu/governance/governance-committees/teaching-learning-committee/)
Master of Arts in Education

- Link: [http://ucollege.wustl.edu/areas/education/masters](http://ucollege.wustl.edu/areas/education/masters)
Yale University:

Undergraduate Enrollment: 5,453

Number of Full Time Faculty: 4,410

Number of Part Time Faculty:

Center for Teaching and Learning

- Description: Provides resources to both students and faculty members
  - Faculty Specific Page: hosts workshops for teachers, talks, etc.
  - Director: Pilar Abuin
  - Phone Number: 203-432-5379
  - Link: http://ctl.yale.edu/

Teaching and Learning Committee

- Chair: Scott Strobel
- Link: http://yalecollege.yale.edu/faculty-staff/committees/teaching-learning-committee

Teaching Fellow Program

- Description: Graduate students are taught how to be effective teachers & grade students' work (led by faculty members)
- Link: http://gsas.yale.edu/academic-professional-development/teaching-fellow-program
Certificate in College Teaching Preparation

- Link: [http://ctl.yale.edu/teaching/professional-development/certificate-college-teaching-preparation](http://ctl.yale.edu/teaching/professional-development/certificate-college-teaching-preparation)

Certificate of College Teaching Preparation

The Certificate of College Teaching Preparation (CCTP) is an opportunity for graduate students to complete a comprehensive training program in effective college teaching. Students are responsible for keeping track of their participation in our programs. Following successful completion a notation of completion will appear on the student's transcript.

**Benefits**

The certificate is not a summative evaluation of your teaching; rather, it provides a record of your participation in teaching activities and your reflections on those experiences. Graduate students use the CCTP guidelines to organize and
V. Overview of Qualitative Interviews with Staff and Administrators at Peer Universities

Eleven phone interviews were conducted by Michael Munger with staff, faculty, and administrators at some selected "peer" institutions. These interviews were strictly confidential, and the identities of the universities will not be reported here. The results were collected simply as a means of providing information about some of the difficulties, and promises, of centers and other resources in serving faculty needs.

Here are some (redacted, edited to preserve anonymity) comments:

- “At [Name of University] we are trying to hire someone whom we think we fix all of our teaching and learning problems—and we actually call the position ‘the unicorn.’ As damning as that may sound about the state of affairs here, I promise there’s more to say about the subject.”
- “Everyone at [Name of University] says, ‘My office door is open.’ And everyone’s cv is online. Research is collaborative. But our classroom doors are all closed. No one knows anything about their colleagues’ teaching interests, skills, or techniques. Everything about teaching happens in a vacuum.”
- "There is a complicated relationship, and maybe even tension, between causing change and creating community. The existing connections that faculty use depend on the old way of doing things. It took several years when we established [new approach] to rebuild those communities and trust by faculty."
- "The approach we took was to start with a full external review, with an inventory of what different units did and how it was working. Then we established workshops around different levels of teaching and technology learning by faculty, and visited faculty meetings in different departments with programs tailored to different disciplines. Our best advertisement was word of mouth and faculty recruiting other faculty. At this point about 1/3 of all faculty and 1/3 of all PhD students have attended at least one of our [modules] on teaching.
- "The most frequently downloaded item on our website is the information on summative and formative course evaluations. Our most well attended events are those convened to discuss “hot button” issues as they relate to teaching and learning. For example, “What Ferguson means for teaching at [University]” and “Disrupting Bias in the Classroom.” Our most well attended regular event is the [seminar about science pedagogy], a monthly discussion that faculty, grad students and postdocs from STEM departments attend."
- "There are really three missions: (1) preparing graduate students to be TAs and preparing them for careers as teachers, (2) helping young faculty get oriented and helping older faculty retool, and (3) acting as a matching service between things faculty want to do (even if they don't know it, in some cases!) and the technology or other tools that will allow them to do it."
- [What do you lack that would be most helpful?] "A dedicated communications person. We want people inside and outside [University] to know about the incredible things that faculty and students are doing with teaching and learning—but our only venue for publicity is the [University news services]. They’ve been great about covering cool classes, but we need to
do much more. Our website is pretty conventional and text heavy, and we don’t have anyone dedicated to keeping it fresh and creating content for it. This problem is not unique to [Center] as a quick scan of the [University] website will reveal.

- [What do you lack that would be most helpful?] "We need actual, real support from the Deans and other administration. The problem is that the work of [Center] seems like a substitute for involvement by the administration. It's never an emphasis from the Dean; we need someone in charge to say, "Hey, this is important! Look at what is happening here!"

- [What do you lack that would be most helpful?] "An integrated center can't work unless there is at least one staff member who can help with course design, technology, and pedagogy. More would be better. But at least one person must be interested in, and capable of, integrating the parts.

Organizational Structures

Two basic structures, neither of them always satisfactory. The integrated center tries to join the pedagogical and technological functions, but few faculty or staff have the expertise or experience to bridge very effectively.

Integrated Centers

The alternative allows specialization, and there staff and faculty who can work well in this setting within the units. But then the problem is that there is little coordination, and there may be competition for resources that does not translate well into services for the actual faculty in the classrooms.

Collaborative Centers