Executive Summary

Dr. Morris established the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Task Force in September 2012 to provide her with the feasibility of a CTL at Fort Lewis College. This report is the product of work completed during the Fall 2012 term.

At Fort Lewis College, numerous teaching development activities already exist, with total funding of about $30,000: Teaching Empowerment Teams, Let’s Talk Teaching lunches, occasional workshops, development grants, and teaching awards.

The Task Force researched 66 comparison institutions: Fifty-seven (86%) of the schools had some form of CTL; nine (14%) of the institutions did not appear to have one. Models varied greatly amongst the institutions; almost all centers existed in both a physical space and had an online component. Directors were the most common position across institutions. Some were full-time staff, but at the majority of institutions the director was a faculty member with release time. Some institutions also had assistant directors fulfilling specific duties such as instructional technology experts or programming/workshop coordinators. Administrative assistants were also common. Several centers began with grant funding but most colleges integrated the ongoing costs of their centers into their regular, annual college budget.

Most centers focused on teaching development, although some included support for faculty scholarship. Activities included: individual teaching consultations; teaching workshops and seminars; teaching discussions; learning communities; faculty mentoring programs; hosting teaching resources (virtual and actual libraries); support for instructional technology/e-learning; grant money for teaching development; teaching assessment services; teaching blogs or weekly teaching tips by email; new faculty orientation; teaching awards; and supporting research on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).

Our literature review highlighted mainly case studies and anecdotal advice from those who have established CTLs at their institutions (e.g., Sorcinelli, 2002). Key points included the importance of fostering faculty buy-in and administrative support, developing clear guiding principles and related assessment, leading with strengths, and encouraging collegiality and community.

Our Task Force conducted an opinion survey of all 200 faculty at Fort Lewis College (FLC) with 45% response rates. The vast majority of responding faculty supported the establishment of a CTL at FLC. Benefits faculty reported were: a central place to locate information and host workshops, a valuable resource especially for new faculty, collegial collaboration on pedagogy and learning from each other, and commitment to improvement in teaching. The biggest obstacle faculty reported was cost and concern about what might have to be “given up” to fund a center, as well as how much faculty would use it.

The CTL Task Force thus recommends the development of a Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) to be known as “TLC@FLC” whose primary charge will be conducting activities which support and enhance faculty teaching. It is clear from the Task Force research that there are teaching resources not currently offered at FLC that a TLC can provide. A TLC would help the College provide systematic support to faculty to be innovative teachers, well-informed by the latest research on teaching and learning. The Task Force believes that the center should be focused on 1) timely responses to faculty-identified teaching development needs, 2) creative support mediums for good teaching, and 3) cross-campus collaborations.

The recommendation of the Task Force is to create a Faculty Director model for the Center who reports directly to the Provost. We came up with two viable options for identifying a Director for the center: 1) To be selected from current, tenured faculty members who are respected teachers and have solid communication and administrative skills, who would establish the TLC with the aid of a consultant; or 2) To hire an external faculty member who has experience creating a center. Total ongoing cost of operating
the TLC under choice #1 would be approximately $69,240 with $18,000-20,000 of one-time funds; under choice #2, it would be approximately $121,300, with no additional one-time costs.

Longer term, the CTL Task Force recommends that FLC investigate the opportunities to collaborate with other colleges in the region (e.g., San Juan College and Southwest Colorado Community College) in regards to teaching development. The Task Force also recommends the pursuit of establishing an endowed Directorship for the Center.
Introduction

Fort Lewis College values teaching excellence. As a small, liberal arts college, teaching and learning are the focus of all that we do. Over the past several years, dialogues regarding faculty development as teachers have been a recurring theme. Discussions have occurred at Faculty Senate meetings. Emphasis on teaching development was identified as a primary focus at the Fall 2012 Faculty Retreat. In addition, the Strategic Plan Action Items state how a focus on improved teaching could play an important role in retention and graduate rates of students. In the Winter of 2012, Faculty Senate charged the Provost, Dr. Morris, with creating a Task Force to investigate the feasibility of developing a Center for Teaching and Learning at Fort Lewis College.1

Dr. Morris established the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Task Force in September 2012 to provide her with the feasibility of a CTL at Fort Lewis College. The charge includes providing recommendations regarding structure, financials, staffing, and implementation plans. This report is the product of work completed during the Fall 2012 term.

Findings

Current practices at FLC.

At Fort Lewis College, numerous teaching development activities already exist. For the past 8 years or so, Teaching Empowerment Teams (TET) have connected faculty who are focused on a particular issue and provided them funding to develop a teaching, learning or course development plan to addresses the issue. TETs are usually formed for one term and faculty are typically from one department on campus. Current funding level only allows formation of 1-2 teams per year; budget allocation is $3000/year.

“Let’s Talk Teaching” (LTT) brown bag lunches have provided numerous faculty across disciplines time to connect around varying pedagogical topics. Started only 2 years ago, LTT groups meet approximately 3-4 times per term with an average of 11 faculty attending. Currently, no funding is provided for these talks. Faculty who have participated in LTT report that they are beneficial. However, they may not provide sustained discussions between faculty and only engage a small number faculty across disciplines.

Over the past decade, some teaching workshops have been offered on campus, though these workshops have been offered only on an irregular basis. The topics of these workshops include but are not limited to: universal design, teaching in the sciences, critical thinking, and cultural competence. These have been funded by a variety of means including external grants and FLC School one-time funds.

Funding also is available for individual faculty to apply for grants which will assist in their personal teaching development. The current budget for the Faculty Development in Teaching, Innovation, Pedagogy, and Assessment (TIPA) is $7,000; however this allotment has been supplemented by one time monies by the Provost over the past several years. Over the past 5 years, an average of 21 faculty have received TIPA funding with an average $1178 disbursement per faculty member. This averages almost $25,000 per year. The Faculty Development Grants for Research and Scholarship has $10,000 available for faculty but for most this does not connect to teaching, so it is not a viable option.

Fort Lewis College offers two awards focused on good teaching each year: The New Faculty Teaching Award and the Alice Admire Outstanding Teacher Award. In addition, the Roger Peters Distinguished Professor Award is granted to a senior faculty member who has made outstanding contributions in all areas of faculty work, including teaching. These awards are currently administered through the Awards Committee, which is a Faculty Senate committee.

In addition, many faculty engage in individual and discipline specific teaching development through their own departments and professional associations throughout the year. These activities are coordinated entirely by the individual or the department.

1 The phrase Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is used throughout this document. However, this is done to relate the conceptual idea of a center versus an actual physical place. Specific recommendations about an actual center and name are made at the end of this report.
CTL investigation.
In order to evaluate whether or how a CTL might enhance the teaching development services that Fort Lewis College provides, the Task Force investigated a variety of institutions to gain information about how CTLs are structured and what resources they offer. The Task Force researched FLC official peer institutions, COPLAC schools, some aspirational schools, and eighteen schools that responded to Provost Morris’s email query to the American Conference of Academic Deans (ACAD). A total of 66 institutions were examined; for a full listing of institutions included, please see appendix B.
Fifty-seven (86%) of the schools had some form of CTL; nine (14%) of the institutions did not appear to have a CTL. Models varied greatly amongst the institutions which hosted CTLs; almost all centers existed in both a physical space and had an online component. Only two seemed to have physical only spaces and one offered only an online presence.

Staffing.
The Centers employed a wide array of staffing patterns. The size of the staff did not seem to correspond with the size of the institution, but instead corresponded to the mission and goals of the CTL. Directors were the most common position across institutions. Some directors were full-time staff, but at the majority of institutions the director was a faculty member with release time. Occasionally, the directorship was on a 3 year rotating schedule among faculty. Some institutions also had assistant directors fulfilling specific duties such as instructional technology experts or programming/workshop coordinators. Administrative assistants were also common, some being full-time for the center while others were shared with other programs/departments. In addition to these positions, many centers also had faculty committees that served an advisory function for the centers.

Functions.
Most centers focused on teaching development, although some included support for faculty scholarship. Some centers also included student support services for students such as tutoring, disability services and a writing center, and used the convergence of roles to improve services for both teachers and learners. Given the charge of our Task Force, the primary focus was limited to teaching development services. The following is a combined list of teaching development services provided by the centers from the institutions we investigated.

1. **Individual teaching consultations**: At many colleges, a center has master teachers available who faculty can invite to observe their classroom and provide some constructive feedback. Faculty may also merely solicit advice on specific problems from these experts.

2. **Teaching workshops and seminars**: A standard function of centers is to provide teaching workshops. The workshops vary in length and content. Some colleges provide short (one hour) teaching workshops on a very regular basis (e.g., monthly). Some colleges also provide longer two-day workshops or week-long institutes (often in the summer).

3. **Teaching discussions**: Many centers organize informal teaching discussions, similar to the *Let's Talk Teaching* discussions at Fort Lewis College. One interesting variation of this is a “book club” approach. Faculty will get together to discuss a particular book on teaching. Some of the colleges have the discussions over brown-bag lunch, while others have the funds for catered lunches, or catered wine and cheese events.

4. **Learning communities**: Many centers have programs encouraging a group of faculty to get together to explore a particular teaching topic. These programs are often similar to the Fort Lewis College Teaching Empowerment Teams.
5. **Faculty mentoring programs:** Some centers organize formal mentoring programs, pairing newer faculty with veteran teachers as mentors, and providing a formal framework to enhance and support that mentoring relationship.

6. **Resources:** Many centers serve as a clearinghouse of information, making teaching resources more readily available to faculty through a physical library of books, online links, special library web pages, and even podcasts and webinars on a teaching topics.

7. **Support for instructional technology/e-learning:** Many centers include staff who are focused on providing support for faculty in the use of instructional technology.

8. **Grant money for teaching development:** Many centers offer grant money to faculty to pay for travel to teaching conferences or to purchase materials to enhance their teaching.

9. **Teaching assessment services:** Sometimes centers provide support to departments in designing their teaching assessment tools, as well as in interpreting and responding to their results.²

10. **Teaching blogs or weekly teaching tips by email:** Since faculty are often too busy to attend workshops and trainings regularly, increasingly centers find ways of providing teaching support and tips in quickly-consumable forms, such as blogs or email messages.

11. **New faculty orientation:** In many places, centers take responsibility for new faculty orientation.

12. **Teaching Awards:** In many places, centers take responsibility for rewarding good teaching through teaching awards.

13. **Partner Exchange Program:** University of Mary Washington has a partner exchange program, in which a team of two faculty members each get one course release. For their release time, they each become a student in the other faculty member’s course.

14. **Student fellows:** At one college, advanced students partner with a faculty member. The student would observe what is and is not working in a class.

15. **Supporting research on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL):** St. Olaf’s College used grant funds to create SoTL research teams. A faculty member would apply to be a center “associate” by proposing a SoTL research project. The chosen associate would then select a team of five faculty members who would work together with the associate on a project over the course of one year. The final product of the work was to be an article

²Because centers are generally focused on providing formative feedback on teaching, rather than evaluative, there is some disagreement among center directors about how much centers should be involved in the formal assessment programs.
appropriate for publication in a SoTL journal. The leader would receive release time and all the members of the team would receive stipends.

**Funding.**
Details about center funding were difficult to ascertain for many of the institutions; most information was gained from phone calls directly to each center director. Several institutions began their centers with grant funding (Mellon Foundation, Danforth, Archibald Bush, National Science Foundation), with progression to established general fund allocations. One college had a specific endowment for the center. Most colleges integrated the ongoing costs of their centers into their regular, annual college budget.

**Literature review.**
The Task Force also conducted a literature review of publications on CTLs in college and university settings. We focused on 15 articles that seemed relevant to our charge. After reading these articles, we summarized each and narrowed our attention to six, the findings and conclusions of which we discuss here. First, each of the articles we examined discussed the relevance of CTLs to college campuses. Similarly, the literature is also awash in articles which discuss the role of CTLs, as well as best practices of effective centers.

Ewing and Sorcinelli (2004) suggest that CTLs can:
1. Play a key role in creating a culture that values and rewards teaching.
2. Facilitate networking, connecting instructors with common interests across disciplines.
3. Support faculty by providing services related to best teaching/learning practices.

Similarly, Bakutes (1998) “examine[d] the impetus behind” the trend to create faculty development centers and also the "initiatives implemented by these centers." As she suggests, faculty development centers can serve a range of purposes beyond just helping faculty enhance their teaching skills. These include: conducting faculty and graduate assistant orientations, providing support with educational technology, and publishing newsletters.

In deciding on the role of a CTL at a college or university, Sorcinelli (2002), a long time faculty developer with experience establishing two centers, recommends asking the following questions early in the development stage:
- What should be the key goals of the center?
- What staff, faculty, and administrative issues need to be addressed in developing a center?
- What teaching, learning, and faculty development issues would individuals most like to explore with colleagues?
- What are the institution’s biggest assets in developing a center?
- What are the biggest challenges to making things work?

Despite the nuance of a specific campus culture, Sorcinelli (2002) suggests that institutions starting a CTL employ ten principles to ensure success and campus-wide buy in. These include working to:

1. **Enlist multiple stakeholders in the CTL by listening to all perspectives.** A CTL stands a better chance of success if it is “designed in direct response to the concerns of all constituencies – faculty, TAs, administrators, and students” (p. 11).

2. **Ensure effective program leadership and management.** Smaller institutions have used a model of one faculty member on release time. Regardless of the institution, it is imperative that the CTL be visible and accessible, which is more likely to occur with a dedicated program leader or administrator.

3. **Emphasize faculty ownership in the CTL.** Here, Sorcinelli cites two studies that indicate faculty development programs are most successful when there’s strong faculty ownership and involvement. Put differently, faculty ownership ensures CTL remains responsive to faculty needs. For instance, while a director might oversee and guide initiatives, the final product must be faculty inspired. One strategy to help ensure faculty ownership is to establish an advisory committee.

4. **Cultivate administrative commitment.** Ideally, administration should provide chief monetary support for staffing and programs. Moreover, participation by senior administrators can lend
credibility and enhance visibility and “by naming [CTL] activities as important [to the] values of the institution” (p. 13). While many college campuses agree that teaching is important, there is not always consensus on the value of teaching. Most “might agree that teaching is important, but campus constituencies must also believe that teaching is valued” (p. 14). In this way, Sorcinelli points out that “academic officers play crucial role in indicating value of teaching” (p. 14).

5. **Develop guiding principles, clear goals, and assessment procedures.** Sorcinelli suggests CTLs draft statements indicating guiding principles “or the basis for faculty development activities, a definition of faculty or teaching development” (p. 15) and the center’s goals, which should be communicated through brochures, a unit plan, and annual report.

6. **Strategically place the center within the organizational structure.** Here, institutions with successful CTLs place director in a direct reporting line to the top. Sorcinelli also implores institutions to fund core functions with hard money and says CTLs can be started with modest funding, but that “improving teaching costs money” (p. 17).

7. **Offer a range of opportunities, but lead with strengths.** “Studies show that faculty have different needs at different stages of their careers,” she notes (p. 18). With this in mind, centers should create a wide menu of programs that meet “differing needs and as encompass many faculty as possible” (p. 18). Some of the common and “well-regarded activities” (p. 18) of CTLs include providing consultation services, campus-wide workshops and informal seminars on teaching and learning issues, special programs for new and probationary faculty (such as orientation programs and early feedback on teaching), special programs for senior faculty (such as what she calls “master teacher” workshops), and programs targeted to specific disciplines, departments, and colleges (such as program assessments and leadership development workshops).

8. **Encourage collegiality and community.** Studies suggest that faculty members “need each other’s support and that many … express their desire to work with colleagues within and outside their disciplines” (p. 19). Hence, CTLs should leverage and capitalize on this desire.

9. **Create collaborative systems of support.** By this, Sorcinelli means that CTLs rarely find the resources to serve every faculty development need. As a result, CTLs should find ways to join “forces with others rather than” work alone (p. 20).

10. **Provide measures of recognition and rewards.** Colleges with successful faculty development programs provide incentive for participation, such as release time. Relatedly, successful CTLs find ways to acknowledge the faculty that contribute to their center.

Case studies are also cited in the CTL literature. Dunwoody, Westcott, Drews, and Hosler (2012), for instance, provide a case study of a faculty-driven, cost-effective center at a small private liberal arts college (of approximately 1600 students), which was created with relatively little expense. In addition, Peters, Schodt, and Walczak (2008), make a larger, more comprehensive case for liberal arts colleges participating in national scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) initiatives, “based on faculty ownership, a focus on general education, and some emerging rules of engagement.” They go on to argue that “a cohort of faculty engaged in SoTL is critical to shifting institutional culture from one in which ‘good teaching’ is expected and rewarded to one where vibrant conversations about learning are grounded in why and how this learning takes place. This cohort can provide local, credible models for how others might begin to think in new ways about teaching” (p. 70-71).

The committee found that CTLs can range from modest to well-funded, and from having a focused mission to having a broad one integrated with many other campus missions. As Sorcinelli (2002) points out, one campus’ CTL model might not fit another’s, and a campus’ CTL must align with the culture of the institution. To that end, the committee surveyed the FLC faculty to get an overview of its needs and desires.

**Survey of FLC faculty.**

The Task Force developed an online survey to gain more information from current FLC faculty regarding their views on a possible Center for Teaching and Learning. The link to the survey was emailed out to approximately 200 faculty; the survey was open for 2 weeks and several reminder emails were sent out. Ninety faculty completed the survey, yielding a 45% response rate. Of the respondents, approximately 75% have been at Fort Lewis College six years or more. Over 50% are associate or full
The Task Force believes that the center should be focused on 1) timely responses to faculty-identified teaching development needs, 2) creative support mediums for good teaching, and 3) cross-campus collaborations.

First, energies of the center must be focused on faculty-driven requests; it is essential that faculty have a sense of ownership in the direction the center takes on teaching initiatives. Making quick response to faculty needs will help create the faculty-focused center. Second, it is important for the Center to develop multiple methodologies for meeting faculty needs. Faculty feedback indicates that the Center should offer resources that are not currently provided on campus such as a formal mentorship program for faculty, regular short teaching workshops, individual teaching consultations, and a library of teaching resources including books, articles, videos and web links on teaching. In addition, the Center should take over existing teaching programs, such as the Teaching Empowerment Teams and “Let’s Talk Teaching” discussions, and work to enhance them. Another key focus will be for the Director to work with the eLearning Director to provide important technology-related training for faculty, as this was highly ranked by responding faculty in our survey.

Third, the Center should focus on using its services to create a sustained cross-discipline discussion regarding teaching and learning. The Task Force believes a sustained cross-campus conversation about teaching will enhance the faculty’s ability to connect more with students, increase learning and retention, as well as improve the campus climate for many professors.

The Task Force wants to emphasize that the function of the center needs to be formative, rather than evaluative. That is, the Center should focus on providing faculty with the resources they need to develop their teaching. The Center should not serve the role of providing feedback connected to evaluation for promotion and tenure. The Center must be viewed as non-threatening, non-punitive, safe place for faculty to learn and grow as teachers.

**CTL organizational structure.**

The recommendation of the Task Force is to create a Faculty Director model for the Center who reports directly to the Provost. The Director would receive 50% release time during the academic year for administration duties. The Task Force recommends that the Director receive a supplemental...
contract/stipend for work conducted over the summer. Responsibilities of the Director which support the need for 50% release time are: continual review and updating of materials for center website ensuring ease of use for faculty, coordinating numerous short discussions (e.g., Let's Talk Teaching) throughout the year; facilitating ongoing workshops throughout the term focused on implementing substantial pedagogical changes such as universal design, flipped classroom, backward design and culturally responsive teaching; consulting with individual faculty regarding personal teaching development; personal learning activities as Director, and coordinating faculty mentorship programs which include training faculty mentors, connecting mentors and mentees, and assessing effectiveness of overall program.

The Task Force recommends the development of an advisory group for the Center. This advisory group should be a Faculty committee with representatives from each school (maximum of 5 total) as well as ex officio members from disability services, the Council of Learning Support Programs, the eLearning Director, and Assessment Director. Another ex officio member should be identified which would inform the group regarding teaching and learning concerns related to the College’s Native American students (e.g., Native American Center personnel). The primary charge of this committee would be to advise the Director on the development of support initiatives as well as conducting assessment on the effectiveness of the Center’s activities; the person would submit findings to the Faculty Senate. The Task Force strongly recommends that work on this committee receive significant consideration for the faculty member’s service requirements.

Existing FLC activities which should be housed under and coordinated by the Center include the administration of Teaching Empowerment Teams (TET) and the Teaching, Innovation, Pedagogy, and Assessment grants for faculty, currently organized through the Dean’s Council and Faculty Development College Committee respectively. The Task Force recommends that the TETs be completely under the auspices of the Director and the advisory committee while the TIPA grants be coordinated through the Director, but the current committee will continue to evaluate faculty proposals in this regard. Additionally, all faculty teaching awards such as the New Faculty, Alice Admire, and the Roger Peters Distinguished Faculty should be coordinated through the center.

The Task Force believes that the center should include both a physical and online components which will allow the center to provide a wide range of services. The physical space will allow for personal connection for both individuals and groups of faculty to work. This area should also be a place for housing reference materials and technology items for use by any and all faculty. Although the Task Force believes the center should be centrally located on campus, no current space is readily available. An identified and currently available space which could work well for a center is Noble 288 the old office for the Dean of AHSS.

The Task Force came up with two viable options for identifying a Director for the center. These options are provided here in no particular order, as the Task Force members wanted the Faculty of FLC to determine which option they would prefer.

**Option A: Internal Hire.**

The Director should be selected from current, tenured faculty members who are respected teachers and have solid communication and administrative skills. The Task Force recommends that a selection process for the Director be established and advertised extensively across campus to ensure all potential, qualified individuals have opportunity to be considered for this position.

A benefit of this model is that the Director would have an understanding of the campus culture at Fort Lewis. Because the Director would be selected from current personnel, the center would be immediately connected to the faculty, thus increasing faculty ownership.

An identified limitation of this model is that current faculty have limited to no experience in developing or running a center. The Task Force believes that without such knowledge, it could be difficult to get a center up and responsive in a timely manner. To remedy this, the Task Force recommends hiring a consultant to work with the director and advisory committee for the first six to twelve months.

Another limitation to this model is the potential access to adjunct faculty possessing the needed qualifications to replace (teach the courses of) the faculty selected as Director. Depending upon who is selected as the Director, his/her area of specialty may not be available in local educators within the Durango area.

The ongoing financials of this model include adjunct monies to replace teaching responsibilities for the Director, summer stipend, and operating costs. Estimating 50% release time and the classes being taught be the highest degreeed person (emeritus faculty at $1020/credit hour), the personnel cost would be
$12,240 per year. An additional stipend of 1 month salary (est. $7000) is requested for summer projects, workshops, and institutes the Director would be developing and facilitating.

The Task Force recommends budget allocation of $20,000 to begin for Center operations and personnel development. Based upon financial allocations from other centers and other identified areas specific to Fort Lewis, a tentative budget was developed: $10,000 for attendance of a group of ~4 faculty members to attend a teaching development related conference each year; $2000 for center personnel development; monies for workshops and external speakers $5,000; $1,000 for books, subscriptions, and memberships; $2,000 for office supplies, copying, etc. This $20,000 would be new allocations for the center. The center’s overall budget would be approximately $50,000 when adding in the $27,000 for faculty grants for teaching development (TIPA) and Teaching Empowerment Teams (TETs) and $3000 for faculty awards which are already allocated in the Fort Lewis College budget.

In addition, there would be a one-time cost of hiring a consultant. To help us determine the cost for a consultant, and the kinds of services they might offer, we posted a question to the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education LISTSERV, which about 15 people – many of whom run CTLs and/or consult on faculty development issues – responded to. Cost-wise, most suggested budgeting somewhere between $1000-3500/day (plus expenses) for on-campus visits. For a year-long consulting relationship, two advised allocating upwards of $18,000-20,000 for a consultant. In terms of services consultants could provide, respondents talked about how consultants have been used to execute a range of things, from helping to implement a faculty needs survey (designed jointly between the consultant, center director, and advisory committee) to providing a list of common resources used by CTLs (e.g., books, videos, software) to advising on a professional development plan for the director and staff. In addition, many respondents to our query expressed interest in being considered for this role, while others recommended we contact specific individuals.

Total ongoing cost of operating the Center under this model would be approximately $69,240 with $18,000-20,000 of one-time funds.

**Option B: External Hire.**

An additional model for selecting a Director would be to hire an external faculty member who has experience creating a center. This person would be hired through a faculty line in a specific department, but would have 50% administrative release time to run the Center. Task Force members liked this model as an ‘expert’ in faculty development could increase the ability of the center to be successful earlier. A home department for the director would need to be identified; this department would only receive assistance with teaching a few classes a year because of the administration release time allocated for this position.

The cost for this Director would be approximately $65,000 (includes salary and benefits based upon 2012-2013 new hire levels for faculty), plus $6300 for summer stipend. The remaining ongoing budget allocations would be the same ($50,000) for operating costs as outlined under option A.

Total ongoing cost of operating the Center under this model would be approximately $121,300. No additional one-time costs have been identified under this model.

**Recommendations for Long-Term Goals**

The Task Force recommends the institution to investigate the opportunities to collaborate with the other colleges in the region (e.g., San Juan College and Southwest Colorado Community College) in regards to teaching development. A cross institution initiative which enhances teaching for all regional stake holders will benefit Fort Lewis College by reducing costs and improving collaboration with other local colleges. The Task Force believes this collaboration could be pursued after the on-campus Center and processes are running strong.

The Task Force also recommends the pursuit of establishing an endowed Directorship for the Center. This would allow more flexibility in distribution of funds to other areas such as increasing faculty lines or increasing the Center budget to help even more faculty across campus.
Appendix A

Task Force Members
- Mimi Wheatwind, Library
- Jennifer Stollman, History
- Pam Smith, Mathematics
- Sarah Roberts-Cady, Philosophy
- Suzanne Null, Teacher Education
- Carrie Meyer (Chair), Athletic Training
- Mika Kusar, Business
- Dian Jenkins, Disability Services
- Lee Frazer, Adventure Education
- Nancy Cardona, English
- Brian Burke, Psychology
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Lists of Schools Researched

(1) 11 peer institutions
   a. Adams State College
   b. California state University- Monterey Bay
   c. Cameron University – OK
   d. Colorado State University – Pueblo
   e. East Central University- OK
   f. Midwestern State University- TX
   g. Southeastern Oklahoma State University
   h. Southwestern Oklahoma
   i. Texas A & MM University- Commerce
   j. University of Alaska, Fairbanks
   k. Colorado Mesa State University

(2) 27 COPLAC schools (see www.coplac.org)

(3) 10 aspirational:
   a. Indiana University Kokomo’s CTL
   b. Derek Bok Center, Harvard
   c. Harriet W. Sheridan Center, Brown
   d. Rutger’s CTL
   e. Center for Teaching and Learning, Stanford
   f. Institute for Teaching and Learning, University of Sydney
   g. Teaching Resource Center, University of Virginia
   h. Guilford College
   i. Carlton College

(4) 18 Schools that responded to Barbara Morris’ ACAD query:
   a. Otterbein
   b. Gustavus Adolphus College
   c. Rockhurst University
   d. Roanoke College
   e. St. Olaf College
   f. Macalester College
   g. IU South Bend
   h. Kenyon College
   i. Ithaca College
   j. Davidson
   k. Hobart and William Smith
   l. Grand Valley State University
   m. Susquehanna University
   n. Pace University
   o. Muhlenberg
   p. Vassar
   q. Oklahoma City University
   r. St. Edward’s
   s. Daemen College
Appendix C

Faculty Survey Results

Center for Teaching and Learning Survey

CTL Task Force, 2012

*90+ total faculty responses

OVERALL FLC FACULTY OPINION (Q8):

66% of FLC faculty support establishing the CTL with 17% neutral and 17% opposed.

QUESTION AVERAGE: 3.72/5.00 (1=Strongly Oppose to 5=Strongly Support)
QUESTION ITEM AVERAGES - Short workshops: 3.78/5.00
  Conferences: 3.55/5.00
  New Faculty workshops: 3.36/5.00
  Universal Design Training: 3.37/5.00
  Award-Winning Teachers on Teaching: 3.39/5.00
  Culturally responsive workshops: 3.67/5.00
(1=Strongly Oppose to 5=Strongly Support)
QUESTION ITEM AVERAGES - Faculty Retreats: 3.35/5.00
   Information Clearinghouse: 3.63/5.00
   Regular Faculty Hours: 3.58/5.00
   Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Teams: 3.47/5.00
   (1=Strongly Oppose to 5=Strongly Support)
How useful would each teacher development collaboration component below be to you?

- An information clearinghouse with anecdotes, videos, and links on effective teaching and learning.
- A regular time and place for faculty to get together informally.
- Faculty retreats on teaching-related issues.
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) research teams.

Number of Faculty
QUESTION ITEM AVERAGES - Physical Space: 3.26/5.00
Technology Training: 3.65/5.00
Virtual Space: 3.40/5.00
Teaching Blogs or Emails: 3.09/5.00
Teaching-related Webinars: 3.01/5.00
(1=Strongly Oppose to 5=Strongly Support)
How useful would each technology-related teacher development component below be to you?

- **Faculty training on the use of teaching technology (scanning, video...)**
  - Definitely Not Useful: 10
  - Not Useful: 5
  - Neutral: 15
  - Useful: 20
  - Very Useful: 25

- **Teaching blogs and weekly teaching tips sent via email**
  - Definitely Not Useful: 15
  - Not Useful: 10
  - Neutral: 20
  - Useful: 25
  - Very Useful: 30

- **A physical space with computers and the latest teaching technology to...**
  - Definitely Not Useful: 10
  - Not Useful: 5
  - Neutral: 15
  - Useful: 20
  - Very Useful: 25

- **A virtual (online) space to share teaching ideas and post syllabi and...**
  - Definitely Not Useful: 5
  - Not Useful: 10
  - Neutral: 15
  - Useful: 20
  - Very Useful: 25

- **Teaching-related webinars**
  - Definitely Not Useful: 15
  - Not Useful: 10
  - Neutral: 20
  - Useful: 25
  - Very Useful: 30
QUESTION ITEM AVERAGES - Classroom Observations: 3.38/5.00
   Individual course-design assistance: 3.42/5.00
   Mentorship Program: 3.35/5.00
   Training of Teaching Assistants: 3.30/5.00
   (1=Strongly Oppose to 5=Strongly Support)
Q5. Benefits and Obstacles to establishing a CTL at FLC

BENEFIT SUMMARY:

- Central place to locate information and host workshops related to teaching development
- Valuable resource, especially for new Faculty
- Collegial collaboration on pedagogy and learning from each other; commitment to and improvement in teaching
- FLC becoming what we hope to be—a small college dedicated to teaching and learning

OBSTACLE SUMMARY:

- Cost/What are we giving up (e.g., faculty lines) to get a CTL?
- Time/to what extent most people would even use the CTL
- Attitude/some faculty are against CTL, resent anyone from other disciplines helping them teach
- We already have many teaching-related resources available on or off campus

Q6. What other services would you find useful in developing your teaching at FLC?

- Reduced teaching load
- Smaller classes
- Workshops by outside experts
- Reflective practice groups that meet regularly (TETs)
- Better technology and e-learning training
- An improved course management system (e.g., Blackboard)

Q7. What teaching development resources do you already use (at FLC or elsewhere)?

- FLC Brown Bags (Let's Talk Teaching)
- Webinars or blogs from non-FLC resources (discipline specific)
- FLC Teaching Empowerment Teams (TETs)
- Journals and conferences in my field
- Informal consultation with colleagues
- Moodle
Who took this survey (90 total responses, which is almost half the faculty)?

NOTE: There were no significant correlations between time at FLC and opinion on any item of the CTL survey except for the mentoring program; faculty who have been at FLC longer were less likely to support the need for faculty to be matched with mentors who would assist in their teaching development \( (r = -.28, p = .009) \).
NOTE: There were no significant correlations between school and opinion on any item of the CTL survey, although only 4 faculty members who responded to the survey identified themselves as being from SOBA.
NOTE: There were no significant correlations between role and opinion on any item of the CTL survey.
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