Certifying Faculty in Teaching and Learning in Process Education

Facilitator: Dr. Wendy Duncan

Abstract: This panel will have leaders in Higher Education who have years of experience and expertise associated with helping faculty improve their performance in the facilitation of learning, the design of curriculum, the assessment and mentoring of learner development and the measurement and documentation of learning outcomes. Different approaches and systems for certification will be shared by different institutions and a discussion will lead to a collaborative approach for the certification of Process Educators.

Papers & Panelists:

Notes

Abstract   All Faculty members at Madison College (MATC), full time and part time, have been required to be "certified" by the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) for the past 50 years. All sixteen of the colleges have operated under these rules since the mid-1960's, including Madison Area Technical College. Every faculty member at the sixteen colleges has been required to be certified **provisionally** upon hire. All faculty members would be required to complete a series of 7 courses within the first 5-7 years of their employment. Thereafter, they would be required to complete additional credits or practical experience in their fields every 5 years to be "Recertified". The concept was originally tied to the identified need of the faculty who often had little to no experience in the classroom or in dealing with the needs of learners. They were hired to teach in technical fields because of their expertise in the subject matter. Academic faculty who came to employment in the WTCS (primarily in the Arts & Sciences) were often exempted from the courses based on their educational background and academic experience. As such, the program tended to lean heavily towards didactic technique and history with little nuance in regard to learning or the challenges learners face. Both educational technology and faculty competence in teaching were completely absent from the program design. Each year colleges were audited by the WTCS and could be financially penalized if uncertified faculty had taught courses in the past academic year. Student credits and financial aid could be in jeopardy and college Presidents could face intense pressure from the WTCS and/or board of trustee's members. Human Resources departments were charged with tracking the certification of each individual faculty member working in their institutions. Swamped with the record keeping, HR departments struggled with a program that was not within their expertise, while Deans and Associate Deans were consistently spending time tracking down faculty to ensure they complied with the system. Most of the faculty and administrators involved found this program to be cumbersome, time wasting, and insulting. As several of the 16 colleges have evolved into full fledged comprehensive community colleges WTCS certification has also changed and evolved to meet the needs of contemporary faculty members. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Madison College, along with others has worked to build professional development opportunities that go above and beyond the old WTCS certification program focusing on the needs of modern faculty and their students. Process Education played a significant role in this evolution.

Introduction

This brief paper will describe the WTCS faculty certification process, some of it's history, challenges, limitations, and recent upgrades made to bring the program into the 21st Century. Improvements have been implemented in the realms of technology, learning theory, educational psychology, and the host of learning barriers facing our current students. The infusion of Process Education and other innovations in teaching and learning have provided a way forward for the entire WTCS system to reinvent the certification process into a much leaner and more targeted method of ensuring faculty credentials are valid and current.

Madison College (MC) and WTCS Faculty Certification
History - Impact on faculty

The certification process and required classes have for many years been an extension of the basic on-boarding process for all faculty new to the WTCS colleges. Throughout the 1980's and 90's at

Madison College the process was very laborious and considered an additional burden by new faculty and senior faculty who were required to "recertify" every 5 years. The amount of time and energy necessary to complete the initial certification and to recertify every five years was a burden for faculty and administrators. The benefits of such a program could be gleaned from the learning that faculty were doing, but often were overpowered by the negative impact of the additional work required. Time spend on certification was consider time lost in the teaching and learning process. Full time faculty were monitored very closely by their academic Deans and HR offices increasing stress and pressure while working towards proficiency in their classrooms. The colleges did acknowledge the burden in differing ways. Since the mid-1990's Madison College faculty were compensated for their certification/professional development duties at approximately 10% of their over all workload. Meanwhile Part Time faculty were required to participate in the process without compensation in order to keep their teaching appointments. PT faculty certification time frames were understandably longer and less rigorous but none the less equally stressful. PT faculty who might work unusual teaching schedules, alternating semesters and/or infrequently due to the nature of their expertise, were placed in difficult situations which required attention by administrators far too frequently. During the early 2000's several leaders throughout the WTCS system began an effort to lobby for a less restrictive and more efficient system. This required all 16 colleges to work together, lobby the state legislature, and ultimately the Governor to change the certification system to what is now called the Faculty Quality Assurance System. Faculty from all 16 colleges participated along with HR reps, and other administrators associated with certification.

Certification Requirements for all WTCS Faculty – The "Magic 7"

The previous certification requirements included successful completion of the 7 courses listed below in no particular order. Affectionately called the "Magic 7" these courses came to form the backbone of our professional development curriculum at Madison College. Process Education was a partner in this as the Teaching Institute, was given credit to be counted as a Teaching Methods course. Certification also included a recording a specific number of hours of instruction which correlated with the number of semesters and credits taught during the time frame. Full Time Faculty were required to complete at least 3 courses in the first 3 years of employment, three additional courses in next 3 years and all seven courses by the 7th year of employment. PT faculty were given a less rigorous time frame to become fully certified but it was considered ineffective because PT faculty could conceivably take 15 years to complete the program. Most PT faculty only stay with the college 4-7 years. To faculty and administrators, it seemed as if these teaching skills were not considered important. Yet PT faculty were not allowed to teach if their certification lapsed. Full time faculty members who failed to successfully complete the initial sequence of courses could be placed on unpaid leave of absence until they were completed.

Faculty who entered employment with the colleges could be exempted from a particular course if they had evidence in their vita that they had completed a similar course. Courses were originally offered via HR and taught by professors at University campuses around the state. In the late 1990's WTCS gave permission to each college to sanction their own local courses facilitated by qualified faculty in their colleges. In 2004's this gave Madison College the opportunity to create a series of locally facilitated courses tailored to the needs of our faculty. The courses were offered on a random calendar throughout the year.

Subsequent to this Madison College created what we called the **Learning Academy** which offered the courses in a week long boot-camp format based on the design of the Learning to Learn Camp for students. The first year we offered three courses and each year we added one or two others until we ultimately offered the entire catalogue of required courses. Faculty were grouped into Courses (analogous to Communities in L2L) and then within the courses into teams as in PE. This Learning Academy ultimately became the premier professional development experience of the season. Initially

the faculty who staffed the Learning to Learn Camp came from three courses in the Learning Academy; Teaching Methods provided facilitators, Educational Psychology/Guidance and Counseling provided Mentors, and Educational Evaluation (Ironically) provided Assessors. This move presaged the creation of Madison Colleges' Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in 2006. CETL began to offer all 7 of the courses each term: fall, winter, summer. At times additional sections would be added to provide for the demand. Ultimately the courses were being offered at 5-7 different times throughout the semester in face to face, online, and hybrid modes. Learning Academy continues to this day in a revised format.

Curriculum and Course Construction (40 Hours)
Technical and Adult Education in the WTCS (40 Hours)
Teaching Methods (40 Hours)
Educational Psychology (40 Hours)
Educational Evaluation (40 Hours)
Guidance and Counseling (40 Hours)
Educational Diversity (40 Hours)

Faculty Quality Assurance System (FQAS)

In 2016 the WTCS and Madison College launched the FQAS and began to transition all current faculty into the new system. This new system was created by the Wisconsin Technical College System and went into effect on July 1, 2015. While FQAS contains a common set of competencies, performance standards, and guidelines for all WTCS colleges, this new system provides each college with the opportunity to define its own expectations of professional development to align with the college's goals and mission.

FQAS focuses on quality instruction throughout the WTCS by creating a comprehensive system that looks at the entirety of an educator's career including recruitment, selection, hiring, onboarding, mentoring, professional development, and performance evaluation. The FQAS is comprised of two parts: Initial Requirements and Continuing Professional Development

Initial Requirements:

Teaching Methods & Technology (12 hrs.) Prepares educators to plan and facilitate learning.

Student Success & Behavior Management (20 hrs.) Prepares educators to promote and develop a culture of continuing student success and persistence and to effectively manage the learning environment.

Course Design & Assessment (20 hrs.) Introduces educators to performance-based instructional design and assessment.

Embracing Diversity (12 hrs.) Prepares educators to create an inclusive and effective learning environment to meet the needs of diverse student populations.

Data & Evidence Analysis (3 hrs.) Explores a variety of data analysis tools used for evidence based decision making and program involvement.

FQAS Initial Timeline:

- New full-time faculty must complete all experiences within the first three years of hire date.
- Full-time faculty who had not completed the old Magic 7 must complete all experiences by Fall 2018.
- New part-time faculty must complete all experiences within the first five years of hire date.
- Part-time faculty who had not completed the old Magic 7 must complete all experiences by Fall 2020.

Continuing Professional Development:

Experiences related to:

- Student Success

- Content Area Expertise

- Instructional Effectiveness

- College and Strategic Interests

Timeline:

- Full-time faculty must complete at least one experience in each of the four categories every year.

- Part-time faculty must complete at least one experience in each of the four categories every three years.

Conclusions

While the long journey of the Magic 7 was an eventful and contentious journey over almost 50 years, the events of the late 1990's and 2000's provided a great deal of opportunity to gather faculty for meaningful investigation, examination, reflection, and discussion about teaching and learning. The system did provide a framework for us to build a highly effective professional development unit within the college and push forward dozens of innovations in teaching and designing courses that foster students and faculty as self-growers and owners of their learning. Through Teaching Institutes, Learning to Learn Camp, Assessment Workshops and more Process Education has been by the side of Madison College for almost 20 years.

The legacy of the WTCS Certification System is what Madison College, CETL and Pacific Crest have created which is hailed by educators around the state of Wisconsin, the WTCS, and Madison College faculty. It has truly become a system that benefits faculty and students with it's focus directly on Student Success and growth.

References

CETL web page at: https://facstaff.madisoncollege.edu/in/faculty-quality-assurance-system

WTCS FQAS design documents, 2014-2016

Notes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

POSITION
PAPER
BIG IDEA

SYMPOSIUM:

PE Certification for Naturalistic Transformation in Teaching/Learning

Author: Steve Beyerlein (University of Idaho)

CERTIFYING FACULTY IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN PROCESS EDUCATION

Faculty development is often conceived as a package of targeted, time-bound experiences that bring about a sea change in beliefs/attitudes about teaching/learning (i.e. the way of being of a process educator) that over time are presumed to lead to changes in teaching/learning practices (i.e. various methodologies) that result in desirable changes that are evidenced by measurable learning outcomes (i.e. discipline specific competencies, movement in proficiency of life-long learning skills, reflection on experiences/actions, accomplishments, and integrated performance in authentic situations). The chain of causality that underlies this change model is not supported by the professional development literature (Guskey, 2001). A more naturalistic model begins with exploration/experimentation with and refinement of new teaching/learning practices that are then validated by personal awareness of one's capacity to produce improved learning outcomes (Guskey, 2001). What is discovered as best practices are reified and sustained by a teaching/learning mindset that is aligned with teaching/learning practices that are personally perceived to work. Ongoing transformation of beliefs/attitudes occurs in a virtuous cycle of reflective practice that proceeds from knowledge of new practices, to classroom exploration, to observation of next generation outcomes, and finally to an evolved belief system that stimulates that next round of transformation. Teaching/learning certification rightfully involves faculty development experiences and checklists of competency, movement, experience, achievement, and integrated performance outcomes, but it has the danger of becoming a paper chase with significant non-value added activity if it does not properly support naturalistic professional activity within the annual teaching/learning cycle.

Process educators understand the spiral nature of teaching/learning transformation by attending a Teaching Institute as a first-level intervention, followed by peer coaching in a personal teaching assignment as a second-level intervention, and participation in a community of Process Education scholars as a third-level intervention. The long-term impact of these interventions could be enhanced by an annual, peer-coached protocol that begins with a professional development plan (Hurd, 2007) and that is reinforced by a targeted annual addition to a professional portfolio that documents locally meaningful instructional teaching/learning problems selected for study, reflects on elements in the educational literature that informs solutions to these problems, details curriculum design and facilitation processes that address these problems, analyzes resulting educational outcomes, and articulates changes in one's educational philosophy.

In the area of Process Education certification, the challenge that lies before us is to prescribe structure and assessment for value-added professional activity that occurs after a new faculty development experience. If properly done, this will synergize with annual position and annual evaluation events as well as serve as an engine for greater scholarly activity in the second discipline of teaching/learning. While we have designed many faculty development handbooks, designed many engaging faculty development activities, and we have collaborated in creating educational research products such as the *Faculty Guidebook* and the *International Journal of Process Education*, we have only developed isolated professional tools for the 'curriculum' of daily faculty/administrator responsibilities and reporting. In short, this is a good time for us to create 'post-event' materials that can support, interrogate, and certify changes resulting from specific faculty development events.

We might consider the DMAIC methodology that is used in many business and engineering organizations as a tool for sustaining continuous improvement (American Society for Quality, 2016). A variety of DMAIC templates and report formats can be found online.

- **Define** institutionally relevant and also personally compelling problems along with performance criteria and desired outcomes.

- **Measure** process and product attributes directly related to the desired outcomes.

- **Analyze** available materials and methods that can illuminate root causes of the problem and be applied to impact measurable outcomes.

- **Improve** current state conditions through leadership in participant-centered and outcome-centered facilitation along with self-assessment.

- **Control** through timely refinement of process documentation, articulation of lessons learned as well as changes in personal philosophy, and stakeholder communication.

The educational workplace is a dynamic environment that involves interaction between educators, learners, and program stakeholders. Within departments, colleges, and institutions as well as across professional teaching/learning communities we need to seek ways to share case studies about our teaching/learning journey that can be easily parsed, leveraged, and celebrated. PE certification should serve this end rather than just be a resume-builder. A follow-up IJPE edition to the 25th Anniversary edition that focuses on individual educator case studies as well as institutional journeys would be an ideal context for advancing PE certification while serving a community need.

References

Thomas Guskey (2002) "Professional Development and Teacher Change", Teachers and Teaching, Volume 8, Number 3, pp 381-391.

Betty Hurd (2007) "Annual Professional Growth Plan", module 1.3.7 from 4th Edition of *Faculty Guidebook: Comprehensive Tool for Improving Faculty Performance*, published by Pacific Crest.

American Society for Quality (accessed 2016) "The DMAIC Process", http://asq.org/learn-about-quality/six-sigma/overview/dmaic.html.

Introduction

Facilitating a Learning to Learn and Self-growth experience for college students is significantly more challenging than most courses that faculty usually teach. The recognition of this challenge and the skill set that the facilitator must have is laid out systematically in the Profile of a Quality Learning to Learn Facilitator. The profile is laid out by process area with clear expectations and descriptions of how to meet these expectations. This profile is the target of the online Teaching Institute's outcomes documented with its competencies, movement, experience, and integrated performance that will be used for the certification process. This profile is used for assessing faculty performance during the professional development and documenting faculty performance during their evaluation during an actual learning to learn camp.

Profile of a Quality Learning to Learn Facilitator

A Learning to Learn Facilitator is a:

Teacher who uses learner-centered approaches; builds rapport with learners; cultivates productive learning communities; helps learners prepare learning plans; helps learners meet their intended outcomes; and embeds assessment throughout every learning experience to increase learning effectiveness.

- Conveys individually his/her very strong belief in each community member's potential for success and gets these learners to believe in themselves
- Provides numerous learning experiences and opportunities for learners to do the learning for themselves - individually and in teams
- Constantly focuses on higher levels of learning through critical thinking versus just teaching to a test through memorizing a large base of information
- Have students teach each other through writing to learn and intra-group and inter-group communications

Facilitator who inventories and monitors collective needs; helps synthesize a clear set of outcomes; focuses on process rather than content; shares ownership in making decisions; and constantly strives for improved quality by strengthening the process.

- Facilitates an enriched learning environment using the methodology for producing a quality learning environment
- Obtains a strong shared commitment to learner success
- Creates an adventurous risk taking culture where temporary failure is rewarded
- Assesses and mentors everyone's performance to advance assessment practice to elevate self-growth everywhere
- Takes on the responsibility for the performance and success of every student
- Prepares a facilitation plan for each learning experience
- Facilitates with improvisation when necessary

Assessor who focuses on the assessee's needs; collaboratively designs an assessment process; stays focused on chosen design through careful observation; analyzes the data for meaning; uses interactive feedback to solidify strengths; offers clear action plans; shares insights to produce significant understanding without being judgmental.

- Implements a continuous quality assessment system that also has students document their growth
- Gives quality feedback to grow the performance of every student and learning team
- Assesses students self-assessments
- Assesses products before evaluating the products

Measurer who identifies critical qualities; creates performance criteria; identifies best items to measure; effectively times when and how to measure with appropriate accuracy and precision.

- Measures the level of performance of each of their students at the beginning and at the end of the course
- Uses a set of performance measures for helping students know where they are and use this data in the assessment process

Mentor who enters into a defined relationship with respect for the potential of the mentee; plays the role of coach and advisor by helping establish the mentee's personal goals; identifies activities and means to grow performance to achieve the desired results within a specific time period.

- Carries out tough love – holding students accountable for their commitments given very difficult personal circumstances
- Continuously models a set of productive professional behaviors that students will emulate
- Shares personal experiences and results of previous stories of students' successes
- Connects with students and expresses caring in a productive and meaningful way by putting students' interests first
- Provides constructive interventions when learners struggle with specific learning skills
- Uses emotional toughness (strong affective skill set) to challenge students to move outside their comfort zone
- Appropriately raises the bar to challenge students

Servant Leader who cultivates a clear vision of a desired future and ably shares through understandable stories; develops plans others can follow and models behavior for others while conveying belief in their ability and helping them succeed in realizing this vision.

- Continuously models a set of productive behaviors that students can emulate
- Uses a language of success that produces the envisioned environment of productive growth

Problem Solver who ably identifies and defines problems frequently not seen by others; identifies issues and clarifies assumptions necessary to solve the problem; and effectively closes the gap between expectations and reality by using previous solutions to build upon past successes.

- Extends extra effort to reach out to students who are having difficulties
- Brings back students into the process who have chosen to quit, leave or withdraw from the challenging experience by helping the student to address their personal factors that are their barriers to success
- Diagnoses and collaborates with students to design a growth plan to address their key learning issues

Self-Grower who consistently self-assesses in order to self-mentor one's own performance and growth while increasingly challenging oneself and mentoring others.

- Publicly models self-assessment for students
- Consistently self-assess their own performance each day and at the end of each term
- Continually improves in increasing the percentage of students who are successful and also increasing the growth of these successful students

Collaborator who values the synergy of relationships and teams; plays a variety of roles effectively while helping others perform their roles effectively; compromises self for the betterment of all.

- Supports other Learning to Learn Facilitators in their efforts
- Peer coaches (Assessor) at least two activities during the term

Future Advancement

An analytical rubric will be developed in the future to measure the growth in faculty performance similar to the analytical rubric that is currently used to measure the growth of students during the Learning to Learn Camp progress towards the Profile of a Quality Collegiate Learner.

POSITION
PAPER
BIG IDEA

The COMPLEETE Proposal

Author: Tris Utschig (Georgia Tech)

SYMPOSIUM: CERTIFYING FACULTY IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN PROCESS EDUCATION

Engineering and engineering technology departments have a long history of adapting to changing societal needs so that their graduates will possess relevant skills and knowledge vital to potential employers. In parallel with the changing curriculum, there has also been a long-standing call to strengthen engineering and technology educators' capabilities and preparation to perform the task of educating students. This latter call, however, has remained virtually unanswered for more than a century. While many faculty are dedicated to becoming outstanding educators, the general assumption is that holding a PhD in a core technical area is sufficient to be qualified as an academic educator. This no longer holds true (and perhaps never did).

In order to address this issue of certified teaching preparation for instructors in higher education, a number of models have been proposed and/or implemented in other parts of the world (Europe, Australia, Asia) [1]. Although they do not provide certification, there are also a number of professional development programs in the US addressing similar content to these international models. *One program under development is the COMPLEETE concept (COMPetencies in Learning for Engineering and Engineering Technology Educators)* originally initiated under the name "SPEED" in 2008. COMPLEETE is an initiative for a national program to build and recognize educator excellence in engineering and engineering technology at three levels, and it addresses three critical elements needed for any successful US program seeking to establish excellence in engineering education through professional qualification (and recognition) of faculty teaching in higher education. Building on concepts well grounded in the literature, the critical elements are: (1) support by a nationally respected society or academy (American Society for Engineering Education, or ASEE), (2) utilization of qualifying criteria or standards at several levels, and (3) flexibility in implementation across a variety of university administrative structures and cultures. [2, 3]

In 2012, Utschig, Schaefer, and Visco proposed an introductory level teaching and learning curriculum for the ASEE COMPLEETE program and compared it with curricula from nine well-established existing programs [4]. The curriculum is built around six basic area of competence, see Table 1.

TABLE I.   CORE COMPETENCY AREAS

Area	Title
1	learning theory
2	student development
3	instructional design
4	instructional facilitation methods

Area	Title
5	assessing and providing feedback
6	instructional technology
7	reflective practice

In comparing COMPLEETE to other programs, assignments for a level of agreement for the "comparison curriculum" were made by ranking the relative frequency of the presence of each numbered content item and applying the matching scale defined at right:

X = Not present in "comparison curriculum"

1 = Present by inference, or as subtopic of a major area

2 = present as a major aspect of the "comparison curriculum"

Ratings were first conducted independently by three raters, who then underwent two rounds of discussion to come to closer agreement. Averages from rating process are shown in Table 2.

TABLE II. CURRICULUM COMPARISON

COMPLEETE Core Module	STEMES	EXCEED	Pacific Crest	NETI	U-Michigan	Northern Illinois	CIRTL Delta Program	UK HE Certificate	IGIP
learning theory	1	1	2	1.7	2	2	2	2	2
student development	1	1	2	0.7	1	1.3	2	2	1
instructional design	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
instructional facilitation methods	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
assessing and providing feedback	2	1.7	2	1	1	2	1	2	1
instructional technology	1	1	2	1	X	X	2	2	2
reflective practice	1	X	1	X	0.3	1	2	2	1
TOTAL	**9**	**8.7**	**13**	**7.3**	**7.3**	**10**	**13**	**14**	**11**
Program length	Three or more days, all at once	Six days, all at once	One year or more, spread out	Three days, all at once	Two or more semesters, consecutive or spread out	Three to five days, all at once	Two or more semesters, consecutive or spread out	Usually three consecutive semesters	Self-paced, usually one or more years

The basic framework to establish the COMPLEETE program has been proposed twice to NSF. However, the proposals were not funded. The current focus for the COMPLEETE project is to work through the existing European Society for Engineering Pedagogy (IGIP) ING.PAED program reviewed above, in partnership with ASEE. The ING.PAED program addresses all COMPLEETE criteria and has an existing curriculum and infrastructure to support certification efforts. This work began in 2014, and continues today with efforts to raise awareness of the proposed COMPLEETE program and generate support from members of ASEE. A third annual workshop addressing the program at the ASEE Annual Conference is occurring in parallel with the current PE conference.

References

1. D. Schaefer, T.T. Utschig, *A Review of Professional Qualification, Development, and Recognition for Faculty Teaching in Higher Education around the World*, Proceedings, American Society for Engineering Education Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, June 22-25, 2008.

2. D. Schaefer, D.P. Visco, T.T. Utschig, J.P. Mohsen, N.L. Fortenberry, M. Prince, and C. Finelli, *SPEED – An ASEE Initiative for a Nationally Recognized Development Program for Engineering Educators*, ASEE Southeastern Section Annual Conference 2010, April 18-20, 2010.

3. D.P. Visco, D. Schaefer, T.T. Utschig, J.P. Mohsen, N.L. Fortenberry, M. Prince, and C. Finelli, *Preparing for Participation in SPEED: An ASEE Initiative for a Nationally Recognized Development Program for Engineering Educators*, American Society for Engineering Education Conference, Louisville, KY, June 20-23, 2010.

4. T.T. Utschig, D. Schaefer, and D.P. Visco, Jr., *A Proposed Teaching and Learning Curriculum for COMPLEETE Based on Current National Trends*, Frontiers in Education Conference, Seattle, WA, October 3-6, 2012.

POSITION
PAPER
BIG IDEA

CPD/SLN/OLIS Certificate Programs Framework (2010)

Author: Lisa Raposo (SUNY Center for Professional Development)

SYMPOSIUM: CERTIFYING FACULTY IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN PROCESS EDUCATION

a. **Certificate Program Owner** (Who is the entity on the program side who will be responsible for the final approval of the certificate and will be responsible for any updates or changes to the content – for example, "SLN/CPD/OLIS/DOODLE, etc.")

b. **Description of the target audience for the program** *(Who should enroll in this program?)*

   i. What are their titles?

   ii. In what types of organizations do they work

   iii. What roles do they play in their organizations?

c. **Program Description**

   i. **Rationale** (Why is this certificate program needed and what functional responsibilities will be able to be supported if someone completes this program?)

   ii. **Learning Outcomes to be Accomplished** (What will people who complete the certificate program be able to do – for example, "lead a distance learning program and organization")

d. **Prerequisite Knowledge** (are there any prerequisite skills or knowledge needed to be successful in completing this program?)

e. **Courses that would be developed through a series of learning activities** (seminars, workshops, etc.)

   i. **Course 1** – Person responsible for developing

      1. **Learning activity 1**

      2. **Learning activity 2**

      3. **Etc.**

      4. **Delivery mode** (F2F, Online, Blended)

   ii. **Course 2** – Person responsible for developing

      1. **Learning activity 1**

      2. **Learning activity 2**

      3. **Etc.**

      4. **Delivery mode** (F2F, Online, Blended)

   iii. **Course 3** – Person responsible for developing

      1. **Learning activity 1**

      2. **Learning activity 2**

      3. **Etc.**

      4. **Delivery mode** (F2F, Online, Blended)

    iv.   **Course 4 –** Person responsible for developing

    v.   **Etc.**

f.   **Program Completion Requirements** (Does there need to be any assessment of learning outcomes or is there a capstone requirement to award a certificate, or is the certificate awarded solely based on program attendance?)

Certifying Faculty Development: A competency-based, community-driven approach

At the State University of New York (SUNY) Center for Professional Development, we have developed several competency-based, certificate programs for faculty and staff in the areas of teaching, learning, and assessment.   The hallmark of our program development is the way in which we are engaging communities of practice across our campuses to determine where programs are needed, to define the competencies required for faculty and staff to be effective in the specified roles, and to determine what the instructional activities are to achieve competencies. Through this approach, we have also been able to identify areas of expertise throughout the 64-campus state university system and utilize internal SUNY experts in the development and instruction of offerings.

This paper describes the rationale behind our program, the processes and steps taken to assess the professional development needs of our target audiences, and the approach to engaging stakeholder communities in program development, delivery, and assessment.

CPD Mission

The SUNY CPD is a collaborative central resource for the SUNY community providing access to high quality professional development opportunities focused on the latest trends and established best practices in higher education to enhance the capability of SUNY faculty and staff and increase SUNY's competitive advantage.

The CPD is charged with developing programs, training, and services to key target audiences on its member campuses and across the SUNY community. Key target audiences include:

- Campus leadership and administration
- Faculty and instructional support staff
- Technical staff

CPD activities facilitate community building, collaboration and networking across the campuses. It seeks to leverage SUNY resources for the benefit of the system.

The SUNY System is made up of 64 campuses ranging from community colleges and technical schools to comprehensive and research universities. Campuses offer varying degrees of professional development, some having well-established departments where others have no staff assigned to these efforts.   Across the system, there are many communities of practice (CoPs) that exist to support faculty and staff in roles that are common on all of the campuses. The degree to which SUNY CoPs provide professional development for their members varies greatly and manifests itself in the sharing of information and hosting of annual conferences.

While CPD programs have always increased awareness and understanding, participation did not ensure competency development nor a demonstrated improvement in performance.   Certificate programs ensure a clear, systemized path for community professional development.

Approach to Program Development

Through connections and outreach efforts, CPD used SUNY communities of practice and community leaders to determine highest priority professional development needs (roles and emphasis of programs), provide input for curriculum development, and participate in ongoing program assessment and new development

CPD Program Developers facilitated conversations with communities to identify programs for roles with common and recurring professional development needs across the system to leverage development and delivery

for maximum impact

Developers emphasize competency-based program development to increase expectation of impact on performance and placed priority on use of experts within SUNY for instruction to realize benefits of "Systemness" by encouraging mentoring and collaboration that will benefit the individual, their campus, and SUNY. SUNY program developers worked with CoP to identify what competencies are necessary to be an exemplary performer in that particular role.

Such activities were often new to SUNY CoP, and in response, CPD created a common program development template to guide and promotes the development of core competencies and an outcome-driven curriculum and assessment, while allowing for flexibility to account for the unique aspects of each SUNY CoP as appropriate

Program Development Framework

The SUNY CPD framework for program development at the certificate level that is used with each CoP and takes them step by step through a consistent process to ensure that there is emphasis placed on early identification of learning objectives, competency development, customization for the community in delivery and format, and regular assessment both at the course and program level. The program completion requirements for each certificate were determined to show competency development. CoP outlined learning activities and outcomes. Assessments were created on deliverables that showed performance or mastery of concepts and skill. In the case of the Teaching and Learning Certificate, the CoP identified a capstone requirement in order to be awarded the certificate.

Implementation Considerations

Engagement and communication with SUNY CoPs have changed the relationship of professional development within SUNY, bringing our internal SUNY experts into the role of mentor and allowing our program developers to be more efficient and effective in their efforts at scaling programs to meet varying system needs. We continue to refine our efforts, engaging new communities as needs are identified as strategic priorities to the system.

Bibliography

Scalo, K.A., & Bray, S. (2002, February), *A Model for Distance Learning Course Development Promoting Interactivity,* Conference for Industry and Education Collaboration Proceedings, Sarasota, FL.

Scalzo, K. A., & Raposo, L. M. (2013, June), *Community-driven, Competency-based Certificate Programs for Professional Development* Paper presented at 2013 ASEE Annual Conference, Atlanta, Georgia. https://peer.asee.org/19320

Notes

POSITION
PAPER
BIG IDEA

Formally Credentialing Faculty Through a Masters in Medical Education Degree Program

Author: Mark Terrell (Lake Erie College of Osteopathic Medicine)

SYMPOSIUM: CERTIFYING FACULTY IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN PROCESS EDUCATION

The three-legged stool that underpins the academic life of the professoriate, namely teaching, research, and service, reflects the main responsibilities of faculty in academic institutions. An additional leg that is arguably needed to further support the professional life of the academic is faculty professional development. This additional leg would add strength and stability to the professoriate and those who are most committed to teaching should be its strongest champions.

Faculty professional development plays a critical role in the ongoing growth of educators. It promotes improved instructional concepts and educational processes through application of theory, research, and peer collaboration; enhances learning outcomes in students and program graduates; interprofessionally connects faculty across disciplines, schools, and departments;, and increases faculty motivation for the educational mission.

Most faculty development, despite its importance in higher education, tends to be provided through a distributed service with the occasional seminar or workshop. In some cases, faculty development may be housed in a centralized location in a teaching and learning center, offering seminars and workshops on general educational practice. In either case, the professional development is often disjointed and most faculty won't receive recognition or be rewarded of their participation in professional development activities. In addition, most faculty are subject knowledge experts in their respective fields who advance knowledge through research and scholarly activity while teaching takes a back seat as faculty compete for promotion and/or tenure. Although many faculty have moderate to heavy teaching loads in teaching-centered universities or academic positions, very few have received formalized training in *how* to educate. Most have learned how to teach by teaching the way they were taught or by using some trial and error methods with modest results. With accreditation standards tightening, administration expecting more from faculty, and students demanding excellent teachers, a real need exists for professional development in education and a need exists to identify those educators who have been formally trained in the process of educational practice.

A mechanism to formalize training in the practice of education and to credential faculty as educational scholars or experts is a master's degree in the field of education. The Lake Erie College of Osteopathic Medicine (LECOM) is a health professions college offering degrees in medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and several graduate programs. In 2006, LECOM implemented a Master of Science in Medical Education program to meet the needs of training faculty in educational practice and to certify these faculty as educational scholars. The need for improved faculty training was based on the premise that with better trained faculty in teaching, this will in turn, yield better trained graduates who will have enhanced knowledge, skills, and behaviors to advance the next generation of health care. The Program was developed because "anyone with a responsibility for educating students should be skilled and well informed about education – as preparing these learners to provide safe, humane and effective health care for the members of our society is a heavy responsibility (Distlehorst, 2000) and that a poor surgeon hurts one patient at a time while a poor educator hurts 250 patients each time (Boyer, 1990).

Outcomes from the LECOM Masters in Medical Education program include developing strong educational knowledge, skills, and behaviors in educational specialists, scholars, and master educators who are well equipped to train the next generation of learners and who can advance the field of education through teaching, leadership, and research. The Program is delivered entirely through distance education to provide the temporal and spatial flexibility needed by busy professionals. Students develop content expertise in pedagogical knowledge supporting teaching; develop mastery in the skills of teaching, leadership, and the scholarship of teaching and learning; and develop positive behaviors of educational competence that demonstrate a commitment to excellence in education, professionalism, and continuous quality improvement. Faculty that complete the Program have served in academic and clinical leadership position, mentoring for junior faculty, lead education-related committees, plan and implement new educational programs and curricula, assist in institutional accreditation, and conduct educational research.

The Master's Program provides a strong emphasis in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). SoTL engages faculty in designing, conducting, and publishing research on teaching and learning. SoTL emphasizes that teaching is

a serious intellectual activity that can be both deeply personal and highly collegial. In SoTL, the work of the classroom becomes a site for inquiry, asking and answering questions about students' learning in ways that can improve one's own classroom and also advance the larger profession of teaching (Huber and Hutchings, 2005). Other teaching-related terms including SoTL, scholarly teaching, and routine teaching can be differentiated by three partially-overlapping circles. Routine teaching is the most basic level and occurs when faculty teach the way they were taught, teaching the same way each time with little to no reflection on how to improve their teaching skills. Scholarly teaching is a subset of educators who are informed in teaching where they improve their teaching through reflection, analysis of student and peer evaluations, and by reading the pedagogical literature. They evolve their teaching practice to simply improve the learning outcomes of their students. SoTL educators are a subset of scholarly teachers who go a step further. They collect data on their innovations and disseminate/publish their findings to improve educational practice beyond their classroom walls. The Masters Program provides the necessary training to develop the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and behaviors of a teacher scholar, and develops the research skills found in SoTL, thus supporting faculty work in the highest educational endeavor.

Notes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A Research University View

Author: S. Raj Chaudhury (Auburn University)

Faculty and graduate student professional development are crucial pillars to any sustained attempt at introducing research based paradigm shifts into higher education instruction. At Auburn University, the Preparing Future Faculty program has been running successfully for over twelve years in providing doctoral students who are interested in academic positions with the tools to succeed in aspects of their jobs which are not covered in typical research preparation programs. In addition, newly hired faculty at Auburn can enroll into a year-long program, the New Faculty Scholars, which provides them support for growth during the entire academic year. The theme that runs through both programs is that of continuous self growth and improvement - essentially putting these advanced academics into situations to enable them to recognize their ability to improve performance through seeking assessment. A new dimension that is currently being added to the overall professional development landscape for instructional staff at Auburn is a 'Learning to Teach Online' course offered through the Office of the Provost. Any instructor of record (mainline faculty or advanced graduate students) have the opportunity to complete the self-paced course and gain confidence in their knowledge and skills of how to create an online course that draws upon instructional practices based on validated principles of learning.

Preparing Future Faculty:

The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program was modeled after the national PFF movement (Council of Graduate Schools, 2002, 2003). The program was launched at Auburn University in 2005. The goal is to prepare future faculty to meet the challenges of the 21st century by increasing Auburn University graduate student readiness to assume faculty roles, helping graduate students understand the expectations and functional realities of faculty life, developing wider institutional and personal networks, and making graduate study even more responsive to disciplinary and professional needs. Through an annual recruitment and selection process, graduate students enrolled in terminal degree programs, who are in an appropriate professional stage, participate in two semester long seminar style courses (1 graduate credit each). A series of readings, class discussions and exercises provide students opportunities to learn about the structure of US higher education (especially important for international students), preparation of teaching philosophy and research statements for academic jobs and the necessary tools for their roles as teachers, research advisors, grant seekers and governance committee members. Most relevant to this Process Education panel are several sessions of the course that are devoted to educational assessment, backward design and interactive teaching techniques. Each student prepares and presents a 'micro-teaching' lesson to their PFF peers (usually 8-10 minutes long). Peers then provide written feedback to the presenter immediately upon conclusion of the lesson. The lessons are video recorded and made available to each student for them to reflect upon with the peer review comments in hand. They also have the opportunity to engage an instructional consultant for further feedback on their lesson in order to improve future performance. The 2 credits earned by students in the PFF program can be applied towards a 12 credit Graduate Certificate in College and University Teaching that has been available at Auburn through the College of Education since 2011. Two required course taught in the College of Education (the Professoriate, Seminar in College Teaching) are supplemented with an elective of the student's choice and a supervised teaching practicum that has to be approved by the certificate coordinator. Ideally the elective course would involve discipline specific pedagogy - for instance the summer 2015 course offered in the Physics department on 'Teaching of University Physics' specifically for those with at least an undergraduate degree in Physics. Enrollment in PFF has remained steady at

40+ since 2012. Over 20 students from disciplines as varied as English, Computer Science and Pharmacy have sought out the teaching Certificate since its inception. It appears on the student transcript as an additional credential.

New Faculty Scholars:

At any university, some faculty start their position fresh from a doctoral program with little prior experience, while others move from a different institution and need to adjust to the local cultural context. A cohort based program for new faculty has been in place since 2004 at Auburn University. Each year between 25 and 30 entering faculty members (full time tenure track or lecturers) are nominated by their department heads to participate in the New Faculty Scholars program. This cohort based program starts with a day long academic orientation in which all new faculty participate and ends with a day long retreat at the end of the spring semester in which faculty start the process of building their promotion and tenure portfolio. Of particular interest to this panel will be the requirement for faculty to engage in a formative teaching assessment exercise at mid-semester, known as SGIF - Small Group Interactive Feedback session. At the invitation of the instructor, a teaching consultant visits the class and gathers feedback from students about various aspects of the teaching and learning environment. After the instructor leaves, students work in groups and record on paper their responses to three questions: "What is going well in this class?", "Do you have specific suggestions that could improve your learning" and "Other comments about the class environment". After recording their group answers, the consultant leads the entire class in a discussion about various positive and challenging aspects of the course. The entire process usually takes 25-30 minutes. Student feedback sheets are then typed up (to make handwriting anonymous) and the instructor and consultant schedule a follow up debriefing. As part of this qualitative process, the instructor is encouraged to share the outcome of the SGIF with their students - to share aspects of course and assignment design that might not be apparent to students and share how they would adopt some feasible suggestions made by the students. At Auburn, typically 30-40 such consultations are done per semester and the feedback from faculty and students have been consistently positive. It is a form of external peer review that aligns perfectly with Process Education principles. Many faculty seek out the SGIF process well beyond the initial teaching stages.

Learning to Teach Online:

Finally, Auburn University is developing a self-paced course for instructors new to online teaching. No formal certification will be associated with the completion of the course but it will be offered as a resource for those faculty seeking to embark on this pathway. It is also anticipated that the course could evolve into a 1 credit graduate course that could be coupled with the 2 credits available through PFF and thus form a 3-credit package that could be applied towards the Certificate in College and University Teaching.

Much of the work described here has taken place at the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning at Auburn University (http://wp.auburn.edu/biggio). Under new leadership since Fall 2014, it is possible some of these historically successful programs may undergo changes in the future.