

# **Annual Report, Institute for Faculty Development, 2014-2015**

## **Bill Reynolds, Director of the Institute for Faculty Development**

### **Goals & Summary of Programs and Activities**

The primary goals of the IFD are to “support effective pedagogy and productive scholarship for all faculty members.” The IFD also supports faculty development related to assessment of teaching and student learning. These goals align strongly with the 2020 learning theme.

The IFD was supported with a non-salary budget for fiscal year 2015 of \$22,680, one full time Principal Clerk Typist, and one faculty with full course release on alternate assignment from teaching to direct the Institute. The faculty Director also receives the equivalent of two summer course stipends in compensation for summer work. In addition, the College supported five IFD Fellows (up from four in AY 2013-14) with either a course release or course-equivalent stipend in FY 2015.

Bill Reynolds completed the second year of a three year term as IFD Director on June 30, 2015. Primary goals for AY 2014-15 were to:

- Work closely with the Office of E-Learning to offer more faculty development-related resources online.
- Reorganize fall new faculty workshops so that a greater emphasis is placed on teaching and learning, including a focus on Essential Learning Outcomes.
- Work with new IDEA faculty liaison, Judy Vogel, and administrative liaison, Dennis Fotia, to organize and conduct IDEA interpretation sessions for key stakeholders, including new faculty, the FRC, and others.
- Work with the new Teaching Circles (provide support as requested, handle budget requests).
- Continue revamp of IFD website to make it more user-friendly and to provide a comprehensive calendar of faculty development activities, workshops, and significant dates for new faculty.

A major task that was not listed as a goal for FY 2014-15 but which was undertaken by the Director and Principal Clerk Typist was the completion of a five year review self-study, which included the completion of a self-study report, coordinating a two-day site visit from external consultant Kathryn Plank from Otterbein University, and writing a response to the report submitted by Dr. Plank. The self-study report and Dr. Plank’s site visit report were submitted to Academic Affairs in February and May, 2015, respectively, and they will be available publicly on the IFD website in late July, 2015. A “close the loop” meeting has been scheduled with the IFD Director, IFD Principal Clerk Typist, and representatives from Academic Affairs on July 21, 2015.

A description of the activities and projects undertaken by the Director is provided below. In addition, goals for FY 2016 and plans for their achievement are described.

### **Support for Faculty Development**

#### **Support for pedagogy.**

**Teaching observations.** From July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015 the Director of the IFD observed eleven classes, all of which involved pre-observation meetings, extensive note-taking during full class sessions, post-observation meetings with faculty, and completion of both informal descriptive and formal evaluative reports. All observations this AY were conducted with probationary faculty. These thorough observations

require roughly six to eight hours of time, as the IFD strives to provide both formative feedback and a highly detailed glimpse into the classroom for file readers.

***Summer Institute for the Peer Evaluation of Teaching (SIPET).*** In June the IFD Director led the fourth annual three-day summer workshop on peer observation of teaching. Five faculty members applied and were accepted for SIPET 2015: Susan Fahey (CRIM), Rick Mulvihill (CRIM), Deb Figart (ECON & EDUC), Amy Hadley (Communication Disorders), and Ron Tinsley (EDUC). Components of the training included preparatory readings on the theory and practice of peer observation; group work on peer observation, including a discussion on peer observation of online courses; the conduct of a practice observation and completion of an observation report; and discussion of how to conduct a post-observation feedback session.

Applications for SIPET 2015 fell below the allotted number of slots for participants for the second year in a row. The Provost's office provides funding for 12 faculty members to participate; there were six applicants in 2014 and five applicants in 2015. In spite of the low number, participant evaluations were positive, and the training appeared to be well-received by the participants, based on their feedback evaluations and the lively discussions that occurred in each session. I initiated a conversation with Assistant Provost for Programs & Planning, Carra Hood, about whether we should continue to offer SIPET annually if demand remains low, and we will decide whether to offer SIPET in 2016 early in AY 2015-16.

***Midterm teaching evaluations.*** Each semester the IFD Director makes a concerted effort through in-person and email communications to encourage faculty to complete mid-semester teaching evaluations. The IFD provides faculty with a survey they can use or adapt for their purposes, offers online midterm surveys through Survey Monkey, and provides a summary of survey results to those faculty who bring the forms to the IFD for processing. Some faculty may not process their data through the IFD and others may use surveys of their own design. Therefore, it is impossible to know the number of faculty who use midterm surveys. A substantial number of faculty did, however, use IFD services at the midterm in both fall 2014 and spring 2015. Sixty-seven courses were evaluated at midterm in the fall of 2014, and 54 courses were evaluated in the spring of 2014, both of which are increases from AY 2013-14. It is important to note that for all mid-term surveys that are submitted by faculty to the IFD office, the Principal Clerk Typist enters the data and provides a one page summary to the faculty member. In AY 2014-15 this amounted to data input and processing of 2884 individual student surveys. Thus, a considerable proportion of her time each October and March is devoted to this task, and faculty have consistently expressed their appreciation for the timeliness in which their summary information is returned.

Also offered for the first time by the IFD Director as an alternative to or in conjunction with midterm feedback surveys was Small Group Instructional Diagnosis, a structured interview process conducted midway through a term to ask groups of students in a given course what helps them learn in that course and how improvements could be made. SGID requires 25 – 40 minutes of class time, and participating faculty receive a summary of the feedback provided by their students. The information faculty get from SGID tends to be of greater depth and detail than what is possible from a standard mid-term feedback survey.

Dr. Reynolds conducted two SGIDs in the fall of 2014 and four in the spring of 2015. All faculty members who requested SGID found the feedback they received informative and useful, although they universally acknowledged feelings of vulnerability that resulted from turning their class over to an "outsider" who was expressly purposed with eliciting information about their teaching from students. The experiences and feedback of these "early adopters" suggest that SGID can be a quite helpful tool for professional development in teaching, but the process must be approached with sensitivity to the emotional risk faculty may feel when seeking the kind of feedback generated by SGID.

**Teaching consultations.** The Director of the IFD meets frequently with faculty for teaching consultations. Some of these take the form of helping faculty interpret student evaluations—in groups at the annual New Faculty Orientation, at the twice-a-year Adjunct workshops, and through one-on-one consultations. In 2014-2015 the Director met with approximately 13 (and two of them on multiple occasions) faculty in individual, formal meetings, about interpreting their IDEA reports and using them to build on obvious strengths and identify areas for improvement to optimize impact on teaching and learning. In addition, the Director has numerous less formal conversations with faculty and staff about how to interpret IDEA results. Also, new in AY 2014-15 Dr. Reynolds and IDEA Liaison, Judith Vogel, together held group and individual IDEA interpretation sessions with faculty. Seven faculty members met individually with either Dr. Vogel or Dr. Reynolds immediately before file construction workshops that were held in December, 2014 and January, 2015. In addition, we held a group IDEA interpretation session on September 23, 2014 that was attended by 10 faculty members. This collaboration between the IFD Director and IDEA Liaison was one of the IFD goals for 2014-15, and based on feedback from faculty about the value of these sessions, this goal was successfully met. Drs. Vogel and Reynolds plan to continue their work together in AY 2015-16, and they also plan to hold an IDEA interpretation session for the Deans in December 2015 in close proximity to file closing dates.

Other teaching consultations focus on teaching more generally—they might involve student evaluations or faculty discussing recent changes they've made to a course, changes they are considering for a future course, how to deal with students who appear to be resistant due to a teacher's gender, race, religion, or nationality, and more. For example, one faculty member who attended the 2014 Stockton Critical Thinking Institute was experiencing challenges constructing an appropriate assignment to assess students' ability to think through a discipline-specific problem, and she and I met on a number of occasions to discuss how she might achieve her goals for the project. In addition, a few of these conversations were with faculty who were considering teaching online for the first time, and several were referred to Doug Harvey, IFD Fellow for instructional technology, and staff of the Office of E-learning for additional assistance. Overall, the IFD had more than 20 of these meetings in the past year, not counting those directly related to a teaching observation or to interpreting student evaluations.

**Workshops.** Many sessions at New Faculty Orientation focus on teaching, including topics on precepting as teaching, the use of student evaluations and teaching observations at Stockton, and a review of recent college-wide assessment results and demographic data about Stockton students to help new faculty learn about the students they will teach and understand the broader systemic context in which their work occurs. Presentations from Computer Services, the Registrar, and Academic Advising prepare new faculty for posting grades, understanding the curriculum, precepting, and using technology in their teaching. A presentation from the Dean of General Studies helps faculty understand the importance of General Studies in the Stockton curriculum and prepare to participate in it. In addition, of the fourteen weekly workshops for new faculty in fall 2014, most were primarily focused on teaching.

In addition to sessions at New Faculty Orientation and during the weekly Fall New Faculty Workshops, the IFD hosted and collaborated with other offices to sponsor a number of faculty workshops during the 2014-15 academic year. During fall 2013 these included:

- A “Creative Teaching Forum” hosted by IFD Fellow, Liz Shobe
- A workshop on strategies for aiding students in critical reflection (Bill Reynolds)
- Two workshops/discussions on creative teaching approaches (Liz Shobe)
- Two file construction workshops for pre-tenure faculty (Bill Reynolds)

Additional workshops and brown bag discussions were offered throughout spring 2014:

- Creative teaching forum: Teaching Large Classes (IFD Fellows Mike Frank and Liz Shobe)

- Journal publishing brown bag (IFD Fellows Ellen Mutari and Kristin Jacobson)
- Book publishing brown bag (IFD Fellows Ellen Mutari and Kristin Jacobson)
- Trigger warnings brown bag (IFD Fellow Kristin Jacobson. Dr. Jacobson also gave an abbreviated version of this talk to the Provost's Council)
- Brown bag discussion titled "So You Want to Get a Grant: Navigating internal and external funding sources" (Lisa Rosner, Distinguished Professor of History)
- Teaching for Critical Thinking (Half-day workshop and keynote address by Gerald Nosich, IFD Annual Speaker)

Attendance at these events varied widely, but the average number of faculty participants was approximately nine, with considerably more faculty attending the lecture/discussions with Gerald Nosich. In addition, Dr. Nosich conducted a half-day advanced workshop for participants of the Stockton Critical Thinking Institute and Critical Thinking Teaching Circle on identifying and using fundamental and powerful concepts of a course. He also met for an hour with the members of the Critical Thinking Teaching Circle to discuss their use of his book *Learning to Think Things Through*.

In July, IFD Director, Bill Reynolds, along with Mark Berg (Psychology) and Jed Morfit (Art), facilitated the Stockton Critical Thinking Institute (SCTI), a summer workshop for faculty interested in infusing critical thinking content into their courses. This was the third summer The SCTI was offered, and it is funded through a 2020 Strategic Plan Grant for summer 2015 and 2016. (Participant evaluations can be found in Appendix A.)

**Teaching Circles.** The IFD (with assistance from Presidential Initiative Funding) supported five Teaching Circles during the 2014-15 academic year. In addition to engaging over 45 faculty members in regular discussions of readings and pedagogical strategies related to Circle topics, Circles reached a number of others in the Stockton community when they hosted discussions and workshops on their Circle topics, movie screenings, and other events. End of year reports and white papers from each Circle are available in Appendix B.

**Faculty development Fellows.** This year the IFD had five Fellows. Their reports are attached in Appendix C. The Fellows provided useful support to faculty as intended. They were introduced to the new faculty at an early Fall New Faculty Workshop session. Two of the Fellows (Mutari, Jacobson) applied and were accepted to continue their fellowships for a second year beginning in September, 2015. Three new Fellows, Sara Martino, Amy Ackerman, and Christine Tartaro will also come on board in the fall.

**Support for faculty as they proceed through the personnel process.** Support for faculty as they proceed through the personnel process begins before they arrive on campus with work on mentoring and includes new faculty orientation, workshops for new faculty and for adjuncts, reading and commenting on drafts of faculty first year, second year, third year, tenure, and promotion files and faculty plans, and consulting with faculty about strategies for preparing for promotion to associate or full and professor.

**Mentoring.** The IFD works with Schools and the Provost's Office to gather a list of mentors assigned to new faculty and invites the faculty and their mentors to a lunch during new faculty orientation. At that luncheon the IFD Director talked about the importance of mentoring and gave mentors and mentees a "pocket guide" for maximizing effectiveness in their respective roles. The Director also collaborated with the Deans on an out of program (OP) mentor pilot, which established a pool of mentors who were nominated by their peers to serve as out of program mentors for the faculty who came to Stockton in the fall of 2014. Many new faculty requested that they be matched with an OP mentor, but the plan remains for new faculty to be assigned an in program mentor and to maintain an OP mentor pool that they can access on an as-needed basis.

***New Faculty Orientation.*** The IFD takes primary responsibility for New Faculty Orientation, which is hosted in collaboration with the Provost's Office. The IFD plans the agenda, contacts and confirms people on the agenda, invites faculty to NFO, plans the menu, and prepares for several significant professional development sessions led by the IFD director. (See Appendix D for the 2014 agenda.)

At new faculty orientation, many activities are designed to assist faculty in moving through the personnel process. They meet their Deans, Assistant Deans, mentors, and other important people at Stockton. They learn about the importance of their contributions to General Studies. In addition, they get an introduction to the Grants Office and a workshop on the use of teaching evaluations and observations, including a review of what they will be required to put into their files. New to NFO 2014 will be an introduction to ELOs and an extended luncheon with mentors.

***New faculty fall workshops.*** New faculty workshops occur weekly in the fall term when new faculty have a course release. The Director of the IFD plans the agenda for the workshop, schedules speakers, reserves rooms, attends and assists with discussion, assesses with surveys about speakers, takes attendance, addresses issues, and more. Most workshops have a strongly practical and pedagogical focus. However, they serve multiple uses, and two strong secondary purposes of most of the workshops are to introduce new faculty to a) Stockton culture and b) "movers and shakers" at Stockton. One session deals with academic advising, the intricacies of which can be confusing for new faculty. These kinds of sessions, as well as ones on creating your own G course and the value of service learning, communicate Stockton philosophy and indicate what other faculty and administrators may value. An average of 16 new faculty members attended sessions in the fall of 2014. (See Appendix E for the workshop schedule and a summary of the weekly evaluations.)

In the fall 2014 workshops the IFD Director increased the emphasis on pedagogy based on past feedback from new faculty. In addition, some content that had formerly been presented in a workshop was recreated in video format, providing a resource not only for new faculty but also for adjunct faculty and others in the Stockton community who might find it useful.

***Resources for adjunct faculty.*** In 2014-2015 the College continued hosting Adjunct Information Sessions before the start of each academic term (August 2014, January 2015). These workshops, organized by the IFD, HR, and the Provost's Office, include a meet and greet with the Provost, a primer on student evaluations, discussion with union representatives on the benefits of union membership, and a session on technology and teaching led by the Director of E-Learning. They also provide a forum for adjuncts to feel welcome and appreciated at Stockton. (See Appendix F for the 2014 Adjunct Information Session agenda.)

In addition, in an effort to learn more about the needs of adjunct faculty, Dr. Reynolds invited all adjunct faculty to participate in a survey that he designed and administered electronically via Survey Monkey. The survey was completed by 112 adjunct faculty members, and results were disseminated in a Day of Scholarship presentation and on the IFD website. (Slides that summarize these data are in Appendix G.) Based on the results of this survey, Dr. Reynolds will conduct workshops specifically oriented towards the needs of adjunct faculty in fall 2015 and spring 2016.

***Help with file writing.*** In 2014-2015, the Director of the IFD read drafts of or otherwise consulted on the writing of approximately 12 faculty files. Files included mostly first year and tenure files, but also some second year, third year, and promotion files. Reading and commenting on these drafts consumes a large portion Director of the IFD in January and February preceding spring file deadlines, and often involves multiple reviews of the same file as it undergoes revisions. In December 2014 and January 2015, before first year files were due, the IFD hosted workshops for faculty to assist with file construction. These sessions were attended by over 30 faculty, many of whom reported that the information was quite helpful. However,

the needs of faculty are different depending upon which review year they are in, so in the future the IFD may offer separate sessions for faculty based on where they are in the review process and collaborate more directly with Faculty Review Committee (FRC) so that there is consistency in the information that is presented to faculty.

**Support for faculty scholarship.** The IFD supports faculty scholarship, but to a lesser degree than teaching, at least in part because faculty may find disciplinary-specific support more useful in this area. However, in the last year the IFD continued to contribute to faculty scholarship through the work of the IFD Fellows and through workshops geared toward scholarship, in particular through workshops on journal publication and book publication conducted by IFD Fellows Ellen Mutari and Kristen Jacobson. Also, both IFD Fellows Mike Frank and Ellen Mutari reported assisting faculty with various aspects of their scholarship, including reviewing faculty manuscripts, reading editorial comments on submitted manuscripts, researching journal information to help faculty with the journal selection process, and assisting them with survey design, research study design, and data analysis. The IFD will continue to actively promote the services provided by these and other Fellows and work with the new Grants Director to advance faculty scholarship.

### **Other Activities**

The IFD collaborates with IR on CLA testing, which has been done annually since 2006. CLA testing is currently being done in alternate years with NSSE and 2014-2015 was a CLA year. The IFD recruited faculty volunteers in the fall who teach freshman seminar courses and who generously worked a day into their schedule for their students to meet in a computer lab and take the CLA. The IFD Principal Clerk Typist proctored all sessions, and we were able to recruit a robust sample of 130 students (100 is the CLA-recommended number). We found that it was important to invite faculty participation well before the start of the semester so that computer labs could be scheduled, and this early planning helped the fall CLA administration run fairly smoothly.

Based on the challenges in recruiting a random sample of senior students for the spring CLA described by the previous IFD Director, Heather McGovern, in her 2012-13 report, we decided to recruit seniors by soliciting faculty who teach senior seminars, capstone courses, and other courses likely to be senior-heavy. This method was effective, and we again recruited another robust sample of 124 seniors. The one unanticipated glitch in this process did not come to our awareness until after the CLA data were processed, and that was that 45 of the seniors in the sample who were transfer students did not have SAT or ACT records on file. Because the CLA uses these scores to calculate the “value added” of the students’ time at Stockton, we only have data for 79 seniors in the institutional report. If Stockton continues to conduct the CLA every other year, the issue of transfer students and SAT/ACT data will have to be taken into account during the recruitment process, especially given that more than half of Stockton seniors have transferred in to the university.

### **Five Year Review and Annual Activity Plans for 2015-16**

The IFD underwent the first five year program review in its history this year, and a substantial portion of the Director’s time and the Principal Clerk Typist’s time from December through March involved writing a self-study report and organizing for a consultant visit by Dr. Kathryn Plank, which took place on March 30 – 31, 2015. The IFD self-study, the consultant’s report, and the IFD Director’s response to the consultant’s report have all been submitted to Academic Affairs, and a “close the loop” meeting is scheduled for July 21.

Dr. Plank made two main recommendations in her report: 1) Continue to develop and expand assessment efforts to provide ongoing evidence of the impact of the IFD; and 2) Seriously examine the leadership model

and staffing of the IFD to make sure it can meet the needs of the future. Dr. Reynolds wrote a response to these recommendations that will be discussed at the “close the loop” meeting, and the results of that discussion will likely inform the activity plans for 2015-16. Therefore, the present version of the IFD annual report currently includes no new activity plans for AY 2015-16, but Dr. Reynolds expects to write an addendum that is related to Dr. Plank’s recommendations and which captures the outcomes of the “close the loop” meeting noted above.

### **Budget**

The budget of the IFD supports its activities, with the bulk of money being spent on conference travel participation, a guest speaker, and books. The budget for FY 2015 was \$22,680. Due to costs related to the consultant visit for the five year review, we requested additional money from Academic Affairs, and we were generously allotted an extra \$2800 to cover associated costs. However, through careful management of expenses in the final quarter of the fiscal year we were able to account for the consultant’s costs in our original budget, and we returned the \$2800 to Academic Affairs. Please see itemized expenses below.

<b>Items</b>	<b>Costs for 2014-2015</b>
<b>Books (IFD Library &amp; CT Institute )</b>	\$2,372.67
<b>Guest Speaker (Gerald Nosich)</b>	\$2,553.18
<b>Conferences</b>	\$4,277.73
<b>Subscription (SurveyMonkey)</b>	\$585.00
<b>Service Contract (Ricoh Copier)</b>	\$1,128.12
<b>Office Supplies</b>	\$1,001.85
<b>Catering (NFO, Brown Bags, Teaching Circles, SIPET)</b>	\$3,888.14
<b>Travel by professors</b>	\$6,503
<b><u>Grand Total of Expenditures</u></b>	<b><u>\$22,309.69</u></b>
<b>Starting Balance</b>	\$22,680.00

**Appendix A**  
(SCTI Evaluations)



**POST-WORKSHOP SURVEY**

***Please circle the response for each item that best fits with your view of the presentation. Please circle one numbered response for each statement.***

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I enjoyed the two day workshop.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	5 (10)
2	The workshop influenced my attitudes about teaching critical thinking.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (3)	5 (7)
3	The workshop increased my knowledge of critical thinking pedagogy.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (1)	5 (9)
4	The workshop made me interested in learning more about critical thinking.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (1)	5 (9)
5	The workshop was relevant to teaching in my discipline.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (2)	5 (8)
6	I intend to apply the information that was presented in my own teaching.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (2)	5 (8)
7	Overall, I would say the <b>content</b> of this workshop was excellent.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (2)	5 (8)
8	The facilitators were well organized.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (1)	5 (9)
9	The facilitators expressed their thoughts clearly.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (1)	5 (9)
10	I would recommend the Stockton Critical Thinking Institute to my peers.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	5 (10)
11	Overall, I would rate the <b>facilitators</b> as excellent.	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	5 (10)

***How has what you've learned in these two day affected your perspective on the course you plan to revise?***

Rethinking the premise and content of the course; focusing the content down to core and revising assignments- but even more so revising my own thinking about the course assumptions. Really forced me to look at how I design courses-must start implementing concepts and work from there. I was doing content first-not anymore! It has given me a better idea of how to revise the course using the F P as my starting goal. Major impact-CT will be a central paradigm through which course content will be presented and seen by students. My original perspective was that I was already doing this pretty well, but now I have much better tools to make it happen. Class discussions are going to change the most. I thought about taking a chronological approach to my course and deconstructing/reconstructing it around fundamental principles and competencies. I have explicit information about revising my course material (using the CT framework). I need to reevaluate all my content to assure that it reflects back to the FP's (after I choose them, that is). Using the "elements of thought" framework to organize class discussion and written assignment/exam questions.

**What would you have liked to learn more about?** Asserting-methods and strategies that could be tried. How to support critical thinking in online courses. Everything! Cannot get enough! Especially techniques to use with students. Content was well organized and comprehensive for time frame however. This institute was very thorough-techniques described and explained, modeled/exemplified; excellent and practical exercises made activities useful. Also well timed in summer during period of heavy course planning. Practicing –facilitating a discussion. Loved the small group work. Maybe something that encouraged me to read the books provided beforehand (I didn't). Nothing-the workshop was great as is! The logical fallacies (booklet given, but not covered). How to apply this info more specifically to what I teach, which a wish is-I realize that is out of the scope of the plans/purposes of this institute. It would have been nice to see more modeling of techniques of applying CT pedagogical strategies in concrete lessons.

**Do you have any other comments?** Excellent-should be required for all new (and old) faculty! Make all deans attend a shorter version to get them on board. Excellent institute. Very engaging and comprehensive. Looking forward to utilizing the tools in my course next semester. Also hoping to continue my own education in this area. I wonder if Ennis' test is measuring the far more complex and thorough elements of thought from Nosich (that we will be teaching). Need to have 3-4 days. I want to change all of my classes. Wonderful workshop! Very helpful. Very pleasant and engaging faculty. I fear that the Cornell will very negatively reflect my teaching of CT to my student because it looks to be so far relevant to what I teach. Not looking forward to Cornell and possible conflicts with students come CLA!!

**Appendix B**  
(Teaching Circle Reports)

## **THE CRITICAL THINKING TEACHING CIRCLE**

The final report for AY 2014-15 of the Critical Thinking Teaching Circle can be found on the Circle blog at: <https://stocktoncttc.wordpress.com/2015/06/21/hello-world/>

# **Final Report Active Learning Teaching Circle**

Transforming Undergraduate Education Using Student-Centered Learning

Karen York, Associate Professor of Biology  
and Melissa Zwick, Assistant Professor of Biology  
2015

## Overview:

This teaching circle was an outgrowth of Drs. York and Zwick's involvement in the National Academies Summer Institute on Undergraduate Science Education. We attended one of the Regional Summer Institutes at West Virginia University in 2012 as participants and returned in 2013 as facilitators. The National Academies Summer Institute (NA-SI) is a week-long immersive experience focused on transforming undergraduate education, particularly in the sciences, but the principles of student-centered, evidence-based teaching and learning are applicable to other disciplines as well.

Scientific teaching provides a framework for changing our classrooms to make them more learner-focused and our curricula in ways that more richly represent the nature and process of science. Scientific teaching is based on the educational theory, constructivism, which recognizes the need to link learning to previous knowledge, and understanding of the learner, in order for any meaningful learning to take place. This concept encompasses three core themes: active learning, assessment, and diversity. During the teaching circle, participants implemented strategies that addressed each of these themes and applied them in creating materials for their courses.

## Specific Outcomes:

The goals of the teaching circle were to allow each of the participants to:

- Practice a variety of teaching strategies through workshops, small group work, and presentations.
- Work with a partner (critical friend) to create teaching material for their spring 2015 course that implements these strategies.
- Begin to shift the focus from content and teaching to outcomes and learning.
- Practice the principles of scientific teaching.

## Schedule:

The Active Learning Teaching Circle included four components: pre workshop assignments, two half day workshops, three sharing sessions, and assignment of a "critical friend".

### 1) Pre Workshop Assignments

Beginning in November, 2014 teaching circle participants were given three pre-workshop assignments to complete. The assignments asked participants to read or watch material that focused on student centered active learning and asked them to reflect on this material in relation to their courses. Participants then posted their reflections in discussion threads in Blackboard.

### 2) Two Half Day Workshops (January 14 and 15, 8:30 am to 12:00 pm)

These workshops were designed to introduce participants to innovations and research on undergraduate education. To illustrate active learning, participants experienced the principles of scientific teaching. These sessions were designed to be interactive and model the strategies that were

being introduced. Resources from National Academies Summer Institute were adapted for the mini-workshops and provided to each of the participants in hard copy (binder of resources) or posted to Blackboard (PowerPoints, additional readings).

### 3) Sharing Sessions

To encourage discussion of what worked, what didn't work, and to share our experiences with active-learning with all participants, there were three sharing sessions held during the spring 2015 semester (March 3, 17, April 30). Three dates and time were announced in the initial call for participants so they could be put into participants' calendars in advance. When one of the dates needed to change due to a conflict later in the semester, we noticed it was extremely difficult to find a day and time when everyone could attend. At each sharing session two or three volunteers shared some activities that they had used in their classes and described their experiences with active-learning with the other circle participants.

### 4) Critical Friend

Each participant was assigned a "critical friend" to provide support for incorporating the teaching circle strategies into each participant's courses. This encouraged ongoing conversation about the implementation of these teaching strategies, and allow for the cross-fertilization of ideas.

### Participants:

Our call for participants went out to the entire faculty body in early October and we quickly filled the seven available spaces with faculty from different programs in the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the School of Health Sciences.

Table 1. List of participants

Faculty	Program	School
Matthew Bonnan	Biology	NAMS
Colleen Brust	Biology	NAMS
Elizabeth Lacey	Marine Science	NAMS
Elizabeth Pollock	Chemistry	NAMS
Rose Scaffidi	Nursing	HLTH
Catherine Tredick	Environmental Science	NAMS
Joe Trout	Physics	NAMS

Figure 1 Photo of participants



### Budget:

The funding provided by the teaching circle was used for participant stipends, to provide a light breakfast during the workshops, and to provide the book *Scientific Teaching* by Handelsman, Miller and Pfund for each participant.

Table 2. Itemized estimated and actual budget

		Estimated	Actual
Books and Supplies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials for each participant</li> <li>• Scientific Teaching Handelsman, Miller and Pfund</li> </ul>	\$180.00	\$210.00
Food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continental breakfast</li> <li>• 2 days x 9 people</li> </ul>	\$120.00	\$127.62
Stipends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two half-day workshops for up to 7 participants and 2 facilitators</li> <li>• 9 x 2 @ \$150.00</li> </ul>	\$2700.00	\$2700.00
<b>Total</b>		\$3000.00	\$3037.62

### Assessment of Outcomes:

We designed a survey (based on National Academy Summer Institute resources) to assess the effectiveness of the teaching circle. Participants were surveyed before the workshops (pre-survey), directly after the workshops (post-survey 1), and again at the end of the semester after the sharing sessions and implementation period (post-survey 2). We plan to survey again in a year. Surveys were approved by the Stockton University Institutional Review Board.

Participants were asked to rate their skills and knowledge of:

- Evidence-based teaching (Scientific teaching)
- Structuring class time to include activities that engage students in their own learning (Active learning)
- Considering learning goals in the design of activities for the class (Backward design)
- Measuring student learning and teaching effectiveness during the learning process (Formative assessment)
- Developing assessments to reflect learning goals (Alignment)
- Employing diversity-aware teaching strategies (Diversity)

Table 3. Results on knowledge and skills of scientific teaching principles

	% Ranking Very High (5) or Above Average (4)		
	Pre-Survey	Post-Survey 1	Post-Survey 2
Scientific teaching	71	86	100
Active learning	57	71	100
Backward design	57	71	100
Formative assessment	29	71	86
Alignment	43	71	86
Diversity	0	14	57

Many of the participants were familiar with the concepts and principles of scientific teaching, but their ranking of their skills and knowledge of these principles increase after the workshop and again after the period of implementation in their own courses coupled with sharing sessions (Table 3).

One of the goals of active learning is to reduce the amount of time that students are passively listening to lecture and to encourage incorporation of more active learning strategies. Our participants reported spending an average 62% of class time lecturing on the pre-survey. That average was reduced to 49% of

class time at the end of the spring 2015 semester (post-survey 2), and only one participant did not report a decrease in this aspect of their teaching.

To investigate further incorporation of active learning into the participants courses, the survey listed a number of different specific active learning strategies (problem-based learning, case studies, clickers (audience-response systems), think-pair-share, role-playing, open dialogue and debate among students, problem-solving using real data, group discussion, brainstorm, focused-listing, minute paper, concept maps) and asked participants to rate whether they “had used” or “had not used” this strategy in their courses. In the pre-survey there were six strategies that were utilized by more than half of our participants, by the final survey that was increased to nine different strategies that were utilized by 70% or more of our participants. Thus, on average, our participants reported an increase use of a wider variety of active learning strategies after participation in the teaching circle.

We also asked participants to report the extent to which they used ten different scientific teaching strategies in class. After the teaching circle, a greater percentage of the participants reported using five of the strategies more frequently. These strategies addressed: common misconceptions, prior knowledge, real-time feedback, peer-instruction and peer-collaboration (Table 4).

Table 4. Frequency of using different scientific teaching strategies in class. Strategies highlighted in green showed an increase between pre-survey and post-survey 2

Active Learning Strategies	% Ranking Always (5) or Very Often (4)	
	Pre-Survey	Post - Survey 2
Explicitly state your learning goals for the lecture or unit.	57	57
Align your learning goals with assessments.	57	57
Engage students with common misconceptions.	14	43
Determine what students already know on the topic before presenting the material.	14	29
Allow for feedback “in real time” through use of clickers, peer instruction, in class activity and processing.	57	86
Present material in several formats (verbal, pictorial, simulation, animation, quantitative).	86	86
Ask students to (listen, write, label, discuss, interpret, graph, hypothesize)	71	71
Invite your students to explain an idea to each other.	14	57
Reward student for effort and not just inherent ability.	57	43
Invite collaboration between students when introduced to a new concept.	57	86

Participants were asked about perceived obstacles in adopting different active learning teaching strategies after participating in the workshop. Immediately following the workshop participants viewed not being able to cover the required core material as a major obstacle (57.1% of participants). This concern increased (71.4% of participants) by the end of the semester (Table 5). At the end of the



semester (post-survey 2) more participants found developing effective class activities to be an obstacle along with worrying about the participation of shy students (Table 5).

Table 5. A selection of situations that participants foresaw or found to be obstacles in implementing the teaching practices presented in the teaching circle.

Potential Obstacles	% of participants responding	
	Post-Survey 1	Post-Survey 2
I do not have enough time to prepare class materials.	42.9	28.6
I worry that we will not be able to cover the required core material.	57.1	71.4
I do not have easy access to clickers (or other personal response systems).	42.9	28.6
My efforts in teaching could be misconstrued as reduced efforts in research and hurt my career.	14.3	42.9
I have a hard time coming up with effective class activities.	28.6	57.1
I am concerned for my students, who are shy, may feel uncomfortable with group work.	42.9	42.9
I worried about additional classroom management needed to keep students focused and engaged during active learning.	42.9	14.3

In contrast participants reported a number of benefits to implementing active learning strategies into their classrooms. All participants indicated that having an active learning classroom was more fun for them by the end of the semester (Table 6).

Table 6. A selection of situations that participants foresaw or found to be benefits in implementing the teaching practices presented in the teaching circle.

Potential Benefits	% of participants responding	
	Post-Survey 1	Post-Survey 2
I am able to cover the material.	28.6	57.1
My colleagues (peers) are supportive.	71.4	85.7
My colleagues (senior) are supportive.	28.6	28.6
I feel more comfortable implementing these teaching strategies into my courses.	57.1	85.7
Having an active classroom is more fun for me.	85.7	100
I am getting to know my students better.	57.1	85.7

Open-ended questions at the end of post-survey 2 revealed concerns of some participants well as the positive impact the circle had on many of the participants.

- I loved this teaching circle and would like to participate in another, similar circle
- Enjoyed it immensely and got a lot out of it! We should continue to have monthly/semesterly meetings!!
- I have learned a lot. Even though I have evidence that my fears are unfounded, I still worry about them. I still do active learning, but I still worry about how they are received. For example, I worry that people will think that I am being lazy by not lecturing.
- I'm new to teaching, and I love having a method to use to plan my lessons.
- Loved it. Lots of practical ideas that I can implement. I really appreciate the feedback from the other faculty, and the encouragement I received.

- This has been transformative to my teaching -- I don't know how I would ever go back to what I used to do. It simply wouldn't feel as fulfilling.

### Summary:

In summary the Active Learning Teaching Circle was a benefit to the facilitators and participants. Our assessment indicated it had positive effect in sharing a variety of active learning principles and strategies. The teaching circle provided informal opportunities for facilitators and participants to share with colleagues their success and failures in the classroom, and an opportunity just to talk about teaching. Additional support was provided in a more formal way by combining the peer observation of teaching with the implementation of active learning in the classroom. Karen York observed the two different participants in their classrooms, and this provided additional formative and summative feedback on the implementation of these strategies.

We plan to survey the participants again in November 2015, to document the continued integration of active learning into the participants' courses over time and to monitor the persistence of specific benefits of the circle. Participation in the circle together has resulted in new connections between faculty, some of whom we did not know or interact with regularly prior to the circle. Thus the teaching circle provides an ongoing support group for the implementation of active learning strategies and enables the continued informal sharing of ideas around teaching and learning.

## Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle Report

A Current State of Affairs Regarding Sexual Violence Initiatives at Stockton University:

A Report from the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle

Written by Erin O'Hanlon  
Adjunct Faculty, ARHU  
Teaching Circle Member

Submitted jointly with Elisa von Joeden-Forgey and Betsy Erbaugh  
Teaching Circle Co-Coordinators

June 15, 2015

## Introduction

Through a Project 2020 Initiative that has been in place since 2012, the Stockton University faculty have been invited to implement Teaching Circles focused on sensitive topics, often areas of interest that are highly relevant to the campus community as a whole.

In Spring 2014, two members of the Stockton community, Elisa von Joeden-Forgey and Elizabeth Erbaugh, successfully proposed and implemented a Teaching Circle on Sexual and Gender-Based Violence. This was indeed a timely proposal -- on September 19, 2014, President Obama launched the [“It’s On Us,” Campaign to End Sexual Violence](#). In January of 2014, the White House had created a Task Force on Sexual Assault and the [Not Alone](#) website, a repository of extensive and information-filled documents. This website and the Task Force’s April 2014 report include model policies, best practice procedures for campus climate surveys, and technical assistance documents to guide college and university campuses.

The Teaching Circle convened faculty from across the disciplines and asked critical questions about the state of resources at Stockton related to sexual and gender-based violence: What resources do faculty have for engaging issues of sexual violence in the classroom, from the interpersonal to transnational contexts? What do victims of sexual violence experience on college campuses and at Stockton specifically? How do violence and its aftermath impact students’ education? What structures are currently in place that support or impede educational access for survivors? What prevention and response mechanisms are in place at multiple levels at Stockton? How can the faculty, staff and administration of the campus work together to be part of the solution in ensuring that gender-based violence is handled both inside and outside of the classroom in sensitive, critically engaging and meaningful ways?

To that end, this report will help to give a “snapshot” of resources currently in place on the Stockton campus, outline where the main challenges lie within this area of engagement, and briefly list some recommendations, with the end goal of ultimately making Stockton University a cultural and educational environment that offers a comprehensive approach to students and their lived experiences and perceptions around sexual violence on and off the campus.

This report is by no means exhaustive, as the responses of colleges and universities, especially Stockton, are undergoing rapid change. Even as this report is written, policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct on campus are being revised and redistributed. Rather, this report acts as a moment in time to capture the emerging responses -- both formal and informal -- to

this issue, and to highlight related faculty concerns and areas of expertise. It also serves to continue a dialogue on campus about the challenges that the university continues to face.

### **Setting the Stage -- Understanding the Current Stakeholders**

As a whole, the members of the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle are deeply committed to being effective and intentional in the examination of the impact of sexual misconduct on students' learning and lives. We also are a group of people committed to direct action and to leveraging our voices to be part of the force that shapes how the campus supports and responds to a climate that takes seriously the impact of sexual violence. Consequently, the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle members, indirectly representing the faculty body, are key stakeholders.

However, Stockton University is an organic community that is consistently responding and reacting to changes in the higher education setting. This report would be remiss if it did not also include additional key stakeholders such as the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity, including its staff and Chief Officer for Institutional Diversity and Equity, Valerie Hayes. Dr. Hayes joined the Stockton community in January 2015 after the retirement of the previous Chief Officer, and immediately hit the ground running where sexual misconduct was concerned.

The Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity manages all Title IX complaints, as well as policy and procedures adopted by the university about issues like sexual misconduct and interpersonal violence, including dating and domestic violence, stalking and gender/sexual orientation-based discrimination and harassment.

The majority of coordination at Stockton has come out of a presidential task force called the Title IX Practitioners Group, organized and facilitated by Dr. Hayes, Chief Diversity and Equity Officer, since January 2015. It includes a cross collaboration of staff, mainly from the Division of Student Affairs. This is appropriate, as Student Affairs has been the division primarily focused on Title IX compliance and response.

Since the Practitioner Group's inception in January 2015, Assistant Title IX Coordinators have been named and trained. Title IX Investigators (called upon to investigate Title IX allegations) have been named and trained. An essential task on which the Group has worked diligently and is nearing completion is the gathering and reviewing of all Stockton University materials related to Title IX and compiling them into a Guide, aptly called the Title IX Resource Guide. Previously, there were several versions of procedures and informational brochures available on Stockton's website, some of which contradicted one another. The Group, under the leadership of Dr. Hayes, Amy Jones, and their respective offices, have assessed where the university is with respect to policy and procedure, information dissemination, and training and education. Great strides have been made in 6 months.

In addition, the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities has long engaged in creating a responsive campus. It is currently led by Director Amy Jones, who began her career at

Stockton only a few months before Dr. Hayes, in October 2014. This office is primarily responsible for responding to the 17 Violations of the Code of Conduct on campus, as well as overseeing the Campus Hearing Board process (the campus adjudication process that would apply to most allegations of student sexual misconduct). While the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities has for many years been responsible for adjudicating complaints of sexual misconduct, Ms. Jones brings from her previous institutions a vast collection of experience and knowledge that supports national standards and best practices on a college campus[EF1] .

The Campus Police have had transitions in leadership within the past year, and have been led on an interim basis on more than one occasion by Acting Chief Cindy Parker. Acting Chief Parker and the Stockton police officers are actively engaged in policy and procedure development through such forums as the Title IX Practitioners Group. The Title IX Practitioners Group is a presidentially appointed group of faculty and staff who either have specialized knowledge about Title IX or deal with Title IX compliance as part of their primary job responsibilities.

The Campus Police role is currently transitioning from lead investigators of sexual misconduct charges on campus (regardless of criminal complaints filed) to focusing on sexual misconduct and interpersonal violence-related crimes[EF3] . This change has brought Stockton into compliance with national best practices – in the [2011 Dear Colleague Letter from The Office for Civil Rights](#), it was recommended that campus police not be used in initial investigations or lead investigators of Title IX cases. There are instances when victims do not want police involvement, and not every investigation rises to the level of a crime, but may be a violation of a Code of Conduct. This was reiterated in the [2014 Dear Colleague Letter](#). Changes and shifts in the field are closely followed by the Stockton Police Department in pursuit of campus safety.

The Women's, Gender and Sexuality Center was formed in Fall, 2014 after a combined push from students and faculty. The initiative was led by Associate Professor of Literature Kristin Jacobson, and Stockton was one of the last institutions in the state to create a Center focused on issues of marginalization based on gender and sexuality. Laurie Dutton was named as the Director of the Center in March 2015 and tasked with focusing on both intervention and primary prevention. On many college campuses, this center acts as the central programming arm of the campus where sexual misconduct is concerned. In addition, it is a safe space for students to explore their options in a confidential setting.

There are additional committed offices and individuals on campus who are fully invested in being allies to a movement to prevent sexual and gender-based violence. The Office of Service-Learning, the Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program, the Wellness Center, Residential Housing, Athletics, and the Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs are all engaged in some level of response to sexual misconduct on campus. The Faculty Senate supported and approved the call for a Women's, Gender and Sexuality Center on campus.

While there are many supportive entities on campus, there is not necessarily a fully coordinated effort to respond to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence on campus. In addition, the core focus

of this work is on sexual misconduct; other critical issues, such as dating and domestic violence, stalking, and gender-based discrimination and harassment, particularly around community members who identify gender-non-conforming, tend to receive less attention.

### **Current Approaches -- Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Prevention**

Within the community-based Gender-Based Violence Movement, tertiary prevention is defined as intervention (response to a situation once a community norm has been violated -- for example, crisis response advocates, hotlines and sexual assault medical exams are all tertiary prevention) and secondary prevention is considered development and preparation for tertiary response systems (putting policy and procedures in place, risk reduction education, training crisis response advocates and conducting assessment of the tertiary responses or campus climate).

Primary response, however, is about preventing normative violations before they ever happen. This can take a variety of iterations -- prosocial poster campaigns that focus on consent, direct education about respect and gender equity, campus wide bystander intervention campaigns like [Green Dot](#) or [Scream Theater](#), developed from the [Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance Office of Rutgers-New Brunswick](#). Primary prevention focuses on changing campus cultures (including micro-cultures like Greek Life members and athletics) to have a deep intolerance of sexual misconduct. Educating first-year students about [The Red Zone](#) (the first six weeks when a first year student lives on campus, and considered to be a high risk period of occurrences of sexual misconduct, binge drinking and experimentation) is not primary prevention but rather secondary prevention. This type of education is risk reduction. Primary prevention would be working to actively change the climate of the campus to make these “typical” freshman activities unacceptable.

[Best practice](#) from the [Center for Disease Control and Prevention](#) is to have a balanced approach on college and university campuses, with equal parts primary and secondary prevention, and robust systems in place for tertiary intervention. These prevention strategies should not just occur to one population on campus, but instead should target students, staff, faculty, administrators and community members who engage with college and university programs both on and off campus. They should also occur across the [Spectrum of Prevention](#), a national tool used to show depth and breadth of prevention work. For example, the levels of prevention include strengthening individual knowledge and skills at the most basic level, promoting community education, educating providers at the third level, fostering coalitions and networks, changing organizational practices, and finally influencing policy and legislation at the highest level of prevention. All of these efforts should be highly coordinated within a targeted community.

On the Division of Academic Affairs side, Sonia Gonsalves, Director of Academic Assessment in the Provost's Office, is leading a group composed primarily of faculty to finalize an assessment instrument, with the goal of conducting a Campus Climate Survey. President Obama's initiative held up as an example the Campus Climate Survey conducted by Rutgers-New Brunswick as a

national model, and this has been used as the basis of the tool. Implementation and roll-out are currently being carefully considered, as well as whether this will be targeted to students only, or will include faculty and staff (Title IX is applicable to all three populations).

The Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle has focused its time and energy on the impact of sexual misconduct on students and learning, and on developing and improving faculty contributions to violence prevention and response. Trigger warnings have been discussed, as well as faculty's responses to disclosures in the academic setting. Much reading and review of the Presidential initiative has been discussed, with an eye to assessment of the initiatives on campus. There has also been discussion around faculty safety in the classroom, as well as how much information faculty has about its role in creating a safe and responsive campus. The Circle also held two highly successful campus events: a screening and discussion of *The Hunting Ground*, a film that addresses campus response (or lack thereof) to sexual violence, presented to a standing-room-only crowd on April 15, 2015, and a training attended by over 40 students, faculty and staff on LGBTQ identities presented by the Mazzone Center, with an emphasis in transgender inclusion (see more details below). In addition, members of the Circle are contributing to the development of a new, in-house, campus-wide online training on Title IX for students, faculty and staff under the leadership of the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity.

Still, there is much work to do.

### **Consistent Challenges and Recommendations for Future Action**

Education of the faculty has been collectively deemed inadequate by the members of the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle, particularly with respect to student disclosures of experiences of violence, either in private, in class discussion or in written coursework. Understanding potential responses and responsibilities upon disclosure is an area that urgently requires attention and clear guidelines. It is unclear as to whether faculty are fully aware of what resources are available on and off campus, and what options and considerations are advisable when students disclose experiences of, or participation in, violence. This report and the new Title IX training program in development are meant to address some of the gaps.

For example, if a student discloses a recent suspected act of sexual misconduct involving another student to a Resident Assistant or Housing staff member, it must be automatically reported to the Title IX Coordinator, in this instance, Dr. Hayes. An investigation would then ensue. There are several locations and individuals who can receive a disclosure in confidentiality and not be mandated to report it, including clergy and Wellness Center and Health Services staff; **faculty, however, are not in that category.** This includes licensed psychologists, social workers and other trained service professionals who are acting as faculty at the time of the disclosure. Essentially, upon the initiation of a disclosure, faculty may want to consider offering those confidential options first, with a warning about the mandated requirements associated with reporting violence to a faculty member.



Additional needs assessment is necessary to determine whether faculty and staff are aware of the mandatory reporting requirement, but anecdotally it appears that many are unaware on the Stockton campus. As this Teaching Circle enters into its second year, heightening this awareness and sharing skills for responding to student disclosures of violence will be an area of additional consideration and focus.

In previous years, students were offered sexual assault response services from a community-based organization and the local rape crisis center, the Women's Center of Atlantic County. This arrangement posed several problems as not all of the options on campus were known to the advocates from the Women's Center, and there was an informational "disconnect" about how the campus hearing board process worked or whether it was an option to support victims through the process.

In the past four years, the Wellness Center, in conjunction with The Women's Center of Atlantic County, has trained and managed on-campus advocates to respond to sexual violence, dating and domestic violence, and stalking. These "Osprey Advocates," as they are called, who volunteer to be on-call and available for immediate response, are specially trained to offer victims options that are specific to Stockton. More resources are needed to expand and publicize these efforts.

Education within the faculty and staff community as well as the student body is essential. Primary, secondary and tertiary prevention are all needed as mandates to ensure a campus focused on safety, educational access and creating a climate of mutual respect. Much effort has been made since Spring 2014 on raising awareness of these issues on campus and initiating a dialogue around the roles and responsibilities of the institution. In April 2015 (also Sexual Assault Awareness Month across the country), the Teaching Circle hosted a viewing and facilitated a discussion about the documentary [The Hunting Ground](#). The response was overwhelming, with almost every seat in the space taken, and students sitting on the floor.

The film details the stories of several victims at campuses across the country who tell similar stories of injustice and struggle after experiencing sexual assault. It also tells the story of student activists who work to educate and advocate locally and nationally for justice for survivors on college campuses. [KnowYourIX](#), a website created as part of a survivor-run, educational campaign, firmly supports students to be change agents in their personal lives and on campus and to understand the Title IX rights and responsibilities.

It is clear that sexual misconduct on campus and gender-based violence are no longer the issue for a select number of faculty and students. When NotAlone.org debuted, the United States Department of Education -- Office for Civil Rights (OCR) released a list of approximately [55 institutions](#) that were currently under investigation for poorly or inappropriately handling Title IX cases. In March, 2015, that list had grown to over [100 schools](#). It is essential that any campus, Stockton included, be proactive in a fully coordinated effort to respond, educate and create systems that are based on best practices. Equal attention must be paid to students, faculty,

staff and community members who visit the campus to ensure that it remains an area that is safe and that sexual violations and violence -- physical and otherwise -- are not tolerated.

## **Moving Forward**

The Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle has a unique opportunity. Able to provide access to faculty (including through needs assessment and evaluation of effective endeavors), the Teaching Circle sits at the center of an Academic Affairs response to how sexual misconduct impacts the lives and learning of Stockton University students.

Some of the larger questions moving forward include: Do faculty understand their responsibilities when disclosures of violence occur in a student's writings/reflections, or within the classroom, or there is a suspicion that a student's academic abilities have been impacted by trauma? Is faculty aware of all the resources available on and off campus? Do faculty consistently provide trigger warnings -- in writing and out loud -- about materials that might send a student into a mental health crisis based on unresolved trauma? Do faculty who care deeply about educating and responding to gender-based violence on campus and in the community understand where they can become engaged to be part of the solution? Do students understand their rights and responsibilities under Title IX and The Clery Act, a law in place that mandates reporting requirements? What role does faculty play in supporting that understanding and in protecting students' rights?

At Stockton University, we have several courses, in Criminal Justice, Social Work, General Studies and other programs that address sexual misconduct and interpersonal violence directly. What role do these classes play in raising general awareness on campus around these issues? There is an internal cadre of faculty and staff with specialized knowledge in law, trauma and recovery, prevention theory -- how can they be appropriately utilized to further the goals of the campus? Finally, a significant number of faculty, staff and students are interested in facilitating change and movement around gender-based violence that occurs both on and off campus. How can the benefits of these assets be fully realized?

In conclusion, while there has been rapid growth and attention paid to issues of sexual and gender-based violence on the Stockton campus within the last 6 months, there is still a great opportunity to fully coordinate and access resources. Especially in consideration of the national conversation around campus sexual misconduct, cultivating effective, collaborative responses to the questions and concerns above is not merely a recommendation from the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Teaching Circle, but an imperative that must be addressed.

## **Teaching Circle on Integrating Global Education in the Classroom Report**

In Spring 2014, the Director of the Institute of Faculty Development initiated a Call for proposals for Teaching Circles. Dr. Janice Joseph successfully submitted a proposal for the Teaching Circle (Circle) titled *Integrating Global Education in the Classroom*. The purpose of this teaching circle was to bring together a group of colleagues to discuss global education in the classroom.

This Circle was important because in an increasingly interdependent world, it is vital that universities produce students who are equipped to understand and integrate into this new world. The process of globalizing education begins in the classroom. It was, therefore, important for faculty members to come together to discuss and share teaching methods, strategies, and techniques used to globalize the classroom. In addition, this topic is consistent with Stockton University's 2020 *2020 Strategic Initiatives – Global Perspectives*.

### **Participants**

The Circle consisted of a diverse number of faculty members. It included Dr. Sonia Gonsalves, Psychology; Dr. Arnaldo Cordero-Roman, Spanish; Dr. Guia Calicdan-Apostle, Social Work; Dr. Ramya Vijaya, Economics; Reza Ghorashi, Economics; Dr. Melaku Lakew, Economics; Dr. Gorica Majstorovic, Spanish; Dr. Nora Palugod, Business; Dr. Amy Yingyi Situ-liu, Criminal Justice; Professor Arleen Gonzalez, Criminal Justice; Dr. Tait Chirenje, Environmental Studies; and Dr. Janice Joseph, Criminal Justice, the main facilitator.

The composition of the Circle was critical to its success. The diversity of faculty in terms of discipline, race/ethnicity, gender, place of birth, and international experiences created a rich and lively dialogue between the members. Most of the members were motivated to participate in the Circle because of their personal interest in global issues that has developed through their

personal and professional experiences in the United States. In addition, their exposure to different cultures, abroad or in the United States, has influenced their approach to global education, and motivated them to participate in the Circle. Moreover, many of the members of the Circle are also members of the Global Studies Minor at Stockton. In general, the Circle attracted highly knowledgeable and competence participants.

### **Circle Activities**

Members met six times from September 2014 through April 2015. Throughout the year, they discussed the following topics: the advantages and benefits of global education in the classroom, experiences of teaching global education and the challenges, perspectives on global education, and successful strategies used to globalize the classroom/course, with emphasis on the use of technology. Meetings consisted of guided discussions and several participants took the responsibility for different aspects of the Circle. Members initiated issues and questions about global education that are of interest to them and four members took the initiative to lead the group discussions.

For the final session in April 2015, the members of the Circle invited Dr. Susan Buck Sutton, Ph.D., Senior Advisor for International Initiatives in the Office of the President at Bryn Mawr College to speak to the group. She is past President of the Association of International Education Administrators and past Chair of the International Education Leadership unit of NAFSA (Association of International Educators). She has served on boards for the Institute for International Education and the International Association of Universities, and is current Chair of the Internationalization Collaborative of the American Council of Education. With this outstanding background, Dr. Sutton was dynamic, engaging, and provided members of the group

with practical guidelines that could be utilized in the classroom. Several members of the group expressed an interest in inviting Dr. Sutton back to speak to them.

As an integral component of the Circle, Dr. Janice Joseph attended the NAFSA: Association of International Educator’s conference titled “New Horizons in International Education” and was held in Boston, May 24-29, 2015. NAFSA is the largest non-profit association in the world that is dedicated to international education and exchange. It has 10,000 members from more than 3,500 institutions in over 150 countries. Their members include administrators, advisors, instructors, students, advocates, volunteers, and those committed to international education. The information that Dr. Joseph has acquired from the conference will be disseminated to members of the Circle. (A summary of the highlights of the conference is attached).

A summary of the Circle’s Activities is described below in Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Teaching circle activities (September 2014–May 2015)**

Date	Activities	Outcome
September 2014	Teaching circle meeting	<p>Introductions and General discussion of global education.</p> <p>The Facilitator provided an overview of what a teaching circle. She then discussed the goals and specifics, such as meeting schedule, leadership, topics/themes etc., of this particular teaching circle.</p> <p>- The Facilitator made a power-point presentation outlining the goals and purposes of the circle. The members present briefly discussed (with power-point presentation), the importance, advantages and benefits of global education in the classroom.</p>
October 2014	Teaching Circle	Experiences of teaching global

	Meeting	<p>education in the classroom and the challenges.</p> <p>Circle members discussed strategies they have used to globalize the classroom. These were submitted to members ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>The discussion focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• current/past practices and strategies that you have that used to globalize your courses</li> <li>• practices/strategies which have proven to be effective.</li> <li>• New strategies emerging from discussion.</li> </ul>
December 2014	Teaching Circle Meeting	<p>Perspectives on global education (in the classroom).</p> <p>Members were given a couple of articles to read. In preparation for this meeting, the main article, however, was about Griffith University in Australia on good guide to internationalizing the curriculum. It consisted of several suggestions and recommendations about globalizing/internationalizing a course/classroom.</p> <p>Based on the information in that article, the group was able to gain insights into how that institution had globalize its' courses/classroom.</p>
January 2015	Teaching Circle Meeting	<p>Strategies used in Globalizing the Classroom with emphasis on the use of technology.</p> <p>The focus was on the technologies used to internationalize the classroom/curriculum.</p> <p>Two articles were sent to members to read prior to the meeting.</p>
March 2015	Teaching Circle	This was an open discussion. The

	Meeting	group discussed the details of the proposed Summer 2016 Retreat for colleagues from different Schools.
April 2015	Guest Speaker	Dr. Susan Buck Sutton, Ph.D., Senior Advisor for International Initiatives in the Office of the President at Bryn Mawr College t
May 2015	NAFSA: NAFSA: Association of International Educator 2015 Conference, Boston, MA	Dr. Janice Joseph attended the conference on behalf of the Circle.

There were very few difficulties encountered during the sessions. Occasionally, one or two members could not attend the meetings because of prior commitment. In general, the members were well prepared for the meetings. They read the materials that had been assigned for each meeting. Exchange of ideas and reading materials by email prior to meetings facilitated discussions and suggestions. Recognizing that this is a cross-disciplinary circle, members gained an appreciation for the differences in perspective on the issue of global education.

### **Plans for the Future**

The members of the Circle have expressed concerns about the lack of involvement in global education in the classroom by the several faculty members from some disciplines. Circle members, therefore, have decided to form a core group of faculty mentor-leaders to support those colleagues who are interested in utilizing global education in the classroom. To achieve this goal, members of the Circle have agreed to organize a Summer Retreat in 2016. The tentative objective is to have a retreat for the six academic schools (at Stockton) focusing on globalizing the classroom/curriculum. The Circle members plan to submit a proposal to the 2020 *Strategic*

*Initiatives – Global Perspectives* for financial support to host this retreat. Dr. Ramya Vijaya has agreed to take the leading role in this worthwhile endeavor.

In addition, all the members have indicated their interest in continuing the Circle's work during the academic year 2015-2016. Reasons included the need for continued professional growth by acquiring practical information on how to globalize their individual courses, outreach to other faculty (the Retreat), dissemination of information on global education to colleagues, and a desire to compile a manual on how to globalize the classroom.

### **Summary**

The overall success of the Circle is measured by members' participation rate through attendance and preparation for meetings. Faculty participation in this Circle offers evidence of ongoing interest in global education. The Circle enabled the group to network and interact with colleagues who share an interest in the same specific pedagogical issue – global education in the classroom. Participants were able to discover new pedagogical knowledge and share teaching experiences with each other. The Circle also served as a community builder across disciplines. All of the members of the Circle strongly agreed that their ideas and contributions were valued by other members and that participation as a Circle member increased their understanding and knowledge of global education in the classroom. Finally, every university/college needs faculty members who are engaged in the academic and professional life of the institution and a Circle like this one is one of the most effective way to encourage that kind of engagement.

Several members commented that they were proud to be a part of this Circle which they believed was productive and rewarding. The members would like to express their gratitude to the Institute of Faculty Development and the administration for making this Circle possible.





**Appendix C**  
(IFD Fellow Reports)

Report on Activities  
Ellen Mutari, Fellow  
Institute for Faculty Development  
2014-2015

This was my first year serving as an IFD Fellow responsible for assisting faculty conceptualize and publish their research. Since I am also serving on the Research & Professional Development Committee, I found that there was a good synergy between these two roles.

In order to make faculty aware of my “services,” I was briefly introduced to the new faculty early in the semester. During the Spring 2015 term, Kristin Jacobson and I led two brown bag sessions that were open to all faculty:

**January 28<sup>th</sup>: Disseminating Your Research: Tips on Publishing Journal Articles**

Ellen Mutari (Economics) and Kristin Jacobson (Literature)

This workshop will provide an inside look at how journal editors and referees review article manuscript submissions. We will offer practical tips on how to have your manuscript taken seriously and how to respond to a “revise and resubmit” letter. Time will be left for Q&A.

**March 4<sup>th</sup>: Disseminating Your Research: Tips on Publishing Books**

Kristin Jacobson (Literature) and Ellen Mutari (Economics)

This workshop will provide lessons from the facilitators' experiences getting scholarly books published and refereeing manuscript proposals for publishers. We will review the different types nonfiction books (monographs, anthologies, textbooks), how to evaluate the reputation of publishers, and the elements of a strong book proposal. Time will be left for Q&A.

For the first presentation, we updated Deb Figart’s PowerPoint on publishing journal articles. For the second presentation, we collaborated on developing a new PowerPoint presentation. [Both were made available on the IFD website](#) for people who missed the presentation. Those attending asked many questions and were also able to give each other advice. Kristin and I plan to offer these brown bag sessions again next year.

I also assisted six individual faculty during the academic year. The topics included: (1) conceptualizing the focus for a scholarly article with a faculty member who had not ever written one previously but had extensive research; (2) strategizing with a faculty member about how to respond to referee reports from a journal and resubmit the manuscript; (3) review of publisher’s response to book proposal (the book was later accepted); and assisting faculty who had come to the brown bags by reviewing their R&PD proposals.

I also had the pleasure of attending a lunch meeting of IFD Fellows with Kathryn Plank, the Self Study Consultant for the IFD, during her site visit.

For the 2015-2016 academic year, I hope to build on the work I did this year and that more faculty realize that they can meet with me and/or ask me questions. I am hoping to have more interaction with the new faculty sooner. In addition to repeating the brown bags with Kristin, I have talked with Bill Reynolds about offering a brown bag (to be led by Oliver Cooke and me) on teaching about economic inequality. This is to support Stockton’s participation in the AASC&U initiative on economic inequality.

**From:** [Jacobson, Kristin](#)  
**To:** [Reynolds, William](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Report-Jacobson  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 26, 2015 3:41:54 PM

---

Please find my report below, if you need any additional information, please let me know.

IFD Activities 2014/2015-Kristin J. Jacobson

#### Individual Faculty Meetings/Mentoring

I've formally met with (via email or face-to-face) five faculty over the course of the academic year. I met with four faculty members about scholarship/publication questions (more than once with two faculty members), I met with one person about program assessment, and one new faculty member about various topics but mostly about planning service.

At the beginning of the fall term I also reached out to all deans to let them know about my availability to mentor faculty and programs about assessment and to ask them to please announce at the Fall Faculty Conference school meeting the information about me to their faculty.

I conducted three peer teaching observations for a new faculty members (one in the fall and two in the spring) and visited the course for new faculty in the fall. (I was asked to do a fourth teaching observation, but was unable to match my availability with the deadline to complete the observation. I referred the faculty member to the Institute to find another reviewer.)

I currently mentor two tenure-track faculty members (one in EDUC and another in GENS). While I had these mentoring roles prior to my IFD fellowship, I find the IFD fellow program supports and enhances my role as a mentor. In the fall my program has asked me to mentor our new Literature program faculty member.

#### Publication

I was able to attend one of the teaching circle meetings, which provided me with the opportunity to write a blog post on trigger warnings as part of my work as an IFD fellow:

<https://blogs.stockton.edu/genderbasedviolence/2015/01/23/trigger-happy-pedagogy/>.

#### Presentations

In the fall term I did two presentations on trigger warnings: a brownbag for the faculty (the assessment, which was positive overall, completed by those attending was submitted to the IFD office), and I also visited the Provost's Council to present on the topic for administration.

I worked with Ellen Mutari to give two presentations in the spring term: one on journal publication and another on book publication. Both of these presentations were also well attended and faculty were appreciative. In one case, advice given during the process, which included advice about how to respond to mixed reader reports, resulted in a successful book contract. In another case, I have been working with a faculty member in the humanities to refine his book proposal before sending it to publishers.

Both of these contacts were made as a result of doing the faculty brownbags with Ellen Mutari. As a result, Ellen Mutari and I plan to repeat these brownbags next year.

## Plans for Next Year

In addition to repeating the two publishing brownbags (and perhaps opening them to graduate students, too) and continuing my individual mentoring activities, I am interested in experimenting with more or less formal routes to work with faculty individually: I would be happy, for example, to conduct another brown bag or to schedule special “drop in” hours (during a payday Friday?). Topics could be open or specific—for example, drop-in hours to chat about publication or reader reports or program assessment planning. Perhaps there are ways that I can assist with assessment planning/development for IFD, given the suggestions in the recent five-year review report.

I welcome suggestions how to continue to expand and enhance my outreach to faculty as well as represent key issues for faculty to the administration.

Kristin J. Jacobson

Associate Professor of American Literature, American Studies, and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Stockton University

609/626-5581 (office)

<https://blogs.stockton.edu/kristinjjacobson/>

Vice President, Development

Society for the Study of American Women Writers

<http://ssawwnew.wordpress.com/>

---

**From:** <Reynolds>, William <[William.Reynolds@stockton.edu](mailto:William.Reynolds@stockton.edu)>

**Date:** Wednesday, May 20, 2015 at 1:21 PM

**To:** "Martino, Sara" <[Sara.Martino@stockton.edu](mailto:Sara.Martino@stockton.edu)>, Kristin Jacobson <[Kristin.Jacobson@stockton.edu](mailto:Kristin.Jacobson@stockton.edu)>, "Mutari, Ellen" <[Ellen.Mutari@stockton.edu](mailto:Ellen.Mutari@stockton.edu)>, "Frank, Mike" <[Mike.Frank@stockton.edu](mailto:Mike.Frank@stockton.edu)>, "Harvey, Douglas" <[Douglas.Harvey@stockton.edu](mailto:Douglas.Harvey@stockton.edu)>, "Shobe, Elizabeth" <[Elizabeth.Shobe@stockton.edu](mailto:Elizabeth.Shobe@stockton.edu)>

**Subject:** FW: Report

Hi, All,

The consultant for the IFD 5 year review just sent her report, and I thought you might be interested in checking it out. I have to write a response in preparation for a “closing the loop” meeting with Academic Affairs, so if you have any thoughts about how I might respond, please pass them along.

On another note, I have to submit the IFD annual report by June 30 (that’s right, another f@#\$ing report), so it would be helpful if you all could submit your Fellow reports by mid-June. These basically consist of a summary of your activities for AY 2014-15, including your impressions about (and evidence for) the impact of your work. Also, if you are continuing on for a second year it would be helpful if you could include a statement of plans or ideas you have for your AY 2015-16 work. For those of you at the end of your two years, I’d appreciate it if you could briefly reflect on the experience of being an IFD Fellow and make suggestions about how the IFD (and University in

From: Harvey, Douglas  
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 10:32 PM  
To: Reynolds, William  
Subject: RE: Report

My experiences as an IFD Fellow have been valuable, giving me the chance to interact with colleagues from around the campus. During my two years as the Fellow for Instructional Technology I have:

1. Attended the Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) conference with Dr. JY Zhou. Brought back ideas and strategies for developing curriculum that leverages technology to make international connections. Some of those ideas have made their way into the planning of faculty in the School of Education.
2. Served as a mentor to School of Education faculty as they redesign their graduate courses for online delivery.
3. Discussed ways to use social media with faculty involved with teaching circles for Women in Academia.
4. Continued drafting findings from research into peer observation of online teaching, with a paper and suggestions for an observation protocol expected to be completed in summer 2015.
5. Discussed ideas on teaching of critical thinking in online environments with faculty in the Critical Thinking Institute. This has led to a presentation at the 35th International Critical Thinking and Teaching Reform conference this coming July in Berkeley, CA.

While the Fellows program was valuable for me, I did find it hard to carve out a space within the range of technology support programs at Stockton. I believe it was hard to help faculty differentiate between my expertise (pedagogy) and the expertise offered by the Office of e-Learning and Computer Services. It may be the case that in the case of the Technology Fellow, the IFD may want to coordinate efforts with e-Learning and Computer Services to insure that the Fellow is providing expertise in a more targeted manner, one that enhances rather than competes with the work of others at the institution.

That said, I felt the IFD Fellows program creates a unique safe space for faculty to discuss their ideas about teaching and technology, and that is itself enough to justify continuing to provide a specific expert on instructional technology.

**From:** [Frank, Mike](#)  
**To:** [Reynolds, William](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Report  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 27, 2015 10:59:00 AM

---

I met with 12 faculty members and some administrative personnel. Some of the meeting were quick consultations while others involved a good deal of time analyzing numerical information using SPSS. Several have resulted in publications for the faculty member. I also helped a member of our administration with a successful dissertation defense.

I think it is vital to meet with new faculty in September so data related problems can be addressed before the work is done. I think this is vital because sometimes good ideas are lost in muddly technique. One project involved a questionnaire that was coded as alphabetic rather than numeric. I had to convert the entire file! Unnecessary and inconvenient. One faculty member has managed a large grant and I assist in data analysis. All and all a very satisfying job!

---

**From:** Reynolds, William  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 20, 2015 1:21 PM  
**To:** Martino, Sara; Jacobson, Kristin; Mutari, Ellen; Frank, Mike; Harvey, Douglas; Shobe, Elizabeth  
**Subject:** FW: Report

Hi, All,

The consultant for the IFD 5 year review just sent her report, and I thought you might be interested in checking it out. I have to write a response in preparation for a "closing the loop" meeting with Academic Affairs, so if you have any thoughts about how I might respond, please pass them along.

On another note, I have to submit the IFD annual report by June 30 (that's right, another f@#\$ing report), so it would be helpful if you all could submit your Fellow reports by mid-June. These basically consist of a summary of your activities for AY 2014-15, including your impressions about (and evidence for) the impact of your work. Also, if you are continuing on for a second year it would be helpful if you could include a statement of plans or ideas you have for your AY 2015-16 work. For those of you at the end of your two years, I'd appreciate it if you could briefly reflect on the experience of being an IFD Fellow and make suggestions about how the IFD (and University in general) can further improve the Fellows program.

Thanks a lot,

Bill

Bill Reynolds, PhD, LCSW  
Associate Professor of Social Work  
Director, Institute for Faculty Development  
Stockton University  
101 Vera King Farris Drive  
Galloway, NJ 08205  
Phone: 609-652-4356

**Appendix D**  
(New Faculty Orientation Agenda)



# The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

## 2014 New Faculty Orientation

### Tuesday, August 26

Time	Room	Activity
8:30 a.m.	BOT Room*	Breakfast and Welcome: President, Provost, Deans, Assistant Deans
9:00 a.m.	MR-5*	Faculty Development: Getting to Know Stockton
10:15 a.m.		Break
10:30 a.m.	F-114	Computer Services: Linda Feeney, Director of E-Learning e-Classroom Basics: Bob Heinrich, Director of Academic Computing & ITS Library Services: Joe Toth, Director of Library Services
12:00 p.m.	BOT Room	Lunch with President, Provost, Deans, and Assistant Deans
1:00 p.m.	MR-5	General Education: Robert Gregg, Dean, School of General Studies; and Elizabeth Pollock, GENS Convenor
1:30 p.m.	MR-5	Service Learning: Daniel Fidalgo Tomé, Assistant Director of Service-Learning
2:00 p.m.	Hallway	Meet with "Alternate Benefit Provider" Vendors; Human Resources "catch up" with Johanna DeJesus, Certifying Officer of Health Benefits and Pensions
2:30 p.m.	MR-5	Grants Office: Lia Bairaktaris, Assistant Director, Grants Development
3:00 p.m.	MR-5	Faculty Development: Prepping for the semester
4:00 p.m.		Adjourn
4:30 p.m.		President's Welcome Reception at President and Mrs. Saatkamp's home <i>(Invitation and directions will be provided under separate cover)</i>

### Wednesday, August 27

Time	Room	Activity
8:30 a.m.	BOT Room	Breakfast and Campus Safety
9:00 a.m.	MR-5*	Student Affairs: Dee McNeely-Greene, Associate Vice President; Pedro Santana, Dean of Students; and Stephen Davis, Associate Dean of Students and Interim Director of Counseling & Health Services
9:45 a.m.	MR-5	Ethics and Affirmative Action: Diane Epps, Interim Chief Officer for Institutional Diversity and Equity
10:15 a.m.		Break
10:30 a.m.	MR-5	Faculty Development: Evaluation of Teaching
12:00 p.m.	BOT Room	Lunch with Mentors
1:30 p.m.	MR-5	Advising and Precepting: Paula Dollarhide, Associate Director, Academic Advising
2:30 p.m.	MR-5	Registrar: Joe LoSasso, Registrar
3:00 p.m.		Break
3:15 p.m.	MR-5	Faculty Senate: Rodger Jackson, President
3:30 p.m.	MR-5	Stockton Federation of Teachers: Anne Pomeroy, President, SFT; and Sue Burrows, SFT Office Manager
4:00 p.m.		Adjourn

\*Board of Trustees (BOT) Room and Meeting Room 5 (MR-5) are located on the first floor of the College's Campus Center

*New faculty should go to Student Records, CC-103 (2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Campus Center) on Tuesday or Wednesday for photo ID cards if they have completed their HR paperwork. New faculty members should contact Margot Alten ([Margot.Alden@stockton.edu](mailto:Margot.Alden@stockton.edu)) in Graphics about photos for the online directory.*

**Appendix E**  
(2014 New Faculty Workshop Agenda and Evaluations)

# New Faculty Workshops, 2014

## Weekly workshops, Fall 2014

Unless otherwise noted, we will meet on Wednesdays from 9:55-11:10 in D120

### **9/3: Introduction to IFD workshops and IFD Fellows**

Bill Reynolds, Associate Professor of Social Work; Director, IFD

### **9/10: Fostering Deep Learning I**

Bill Reynolds, Associate Professor of Social Work; Director, IFD

### **9/17: Fostering Deep Learning II**

Bill Reynolds, Associate Professor of Social Work; Director, IFD

### **9/24: Fostering Deep Learning III**

Meg White, Assistant Professor of Education

Asking essential questions.

### **10/1: Academic Honesty (*Includes online content from Tom Grites and Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities*)**

Tom Grites; Bill Reynolds

### **10/8: The Pedagogy of Community Engagement (or Service Learning)**

Daniel Tome, Assistant Director of Service Learning; Merydawilda Colon, Interim Director, Stockton Center for Community Engagement

### **10/15: The Nuts and Bolts of Precepting/Navigating the Registration Process (F222) (*Online content: Paula Dollarhide, The Advising Syllabus*)**

Cynthia McCloskey, Associate Director of Academic Advising and faculty guests

Academic Advisors from The Center for Academic Advising will give tips on how to help students on preceptorial advising days. We'll have an overview of curriculum and requirements, tips for online searching for classes, important dates and policies, and how to interpret the online degree audit, CAPP. There will also be time for your questions.

### **10/22: Critical Thinking I**

Bill Reynolds

### **10/29: Critical Thinking II**

Sara Martino and Bill Reynolds—Affect and CT

### **11/5: Preceptorial advising day, NO WORKSHOP**

### **11/12: Integrating ELOs into your classes**

Susan Cydis, Assistant Professor of Education.

### **11/19: Converting Classes from Your Discipline to G Courses**

Rodger L. Jackson, Associate Professor of Philosophy/Religion

Everyone who teaches at Stockton is required to contribute at least one "G" course each year, and most of us need to come up with two. However, many of us have never taught an explicitly interdisciplinary course before coming to Stockton. Furthermore, many of us come from disciplines which have strict guidelines about what counts as the appropriate kinds of texts, and assignments for our particular fields. Both of these factors create serious challenges for the new faculty member. Yet, it is often the case that the courses we thought of as being strictly within our own discipline can provide a great foundation for an interdisciplinary "G" course. I'll describe my experiences in this process and pass along some advice about how to utilize your old courses to create a new "G" course.

### **11/26 (day before Thanksgiving, so plan accordingly): Best Practices in E-Learning**

Dennis Fotia, Assistant Director of Distance Education; Susan Davenport, Vice-Provost for E-Learning

This workshop will examine best practices in distance education and online learning. Topics will include effective online pedagogy, online communication, and the importance of interactivity, faculty presence, response time, and more.

### **12/3: Feedback session**

## **CONTENT THAT IS NOW AVAILABLE ONLINE**

### ***Resources for You and Your Students: The Library, Accent Modification (Available online)***

*David Lechner, Director of the Library; Lois Spitzer, Associate Professor of Teacher Education*

*David Lechner will introduce you to resources that the library offers for you and your students.*

*He will especially focus on how you can work with the library to help students develop information literacy skills. Lois Spitzer will discuss with you accent modification services that are offered through the Speech and Hearing Clinic to students and faculty (on a voluntary basis) and other language support services at Stockton.*

### ***The Institutional Review Board: Its Role and Yours (Available online)***

*Marisa Levy, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice*

*You will learn about the IRB at Stockton, including basics about how and when to request IRB approval.*

### ***The Advising Syllabus, Paula Dollarhide,***

*As preceptors, we want our students to make meaningful course and life decisions as they create their own education. We set lofty goals for our students, yet students are mostly concerned with navigating the many degree requirements, college policies, schedules, and other obstacles. In this workshop you'll learn how to coach students through the process of crafting their education by using an advising syllabus. You'll see how setting expectations in your*

*advising relationship can provide exciting opportunities for teaching. Sample advising syllabi will be shared.*

**COMING ONLINE SOON**

Pam Cross & Luis Pena: The Writing Center and the Math Center

Heather McGovern & Betsy McShea: W and Q attributes

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Bill Reynolds

**Date:** 9/03/14

**Workshop title:** Intro to IFD workshops and IFD Fellows

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

- |   |       |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.   | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 2 | (4) 19 |
| 2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively. | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 2 | (4) 19 |
| 3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.                   | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 1 | (4) 20 |
| 4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.               | (1) 1 | (2) 1 | (3) 7 | (4) 13 |
| 5. I already knew the majority of the material.           | (1) 2 | (2) 4 | (3) 9 | (4) 7  |
| 6. I learned something to make this worth my time.        | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 4 | (4) 17 |
| 7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.           | (1) 1 | (2) 1 | (3) 7 | (4) 13 |
| 8. I would recommend this workshop.                       | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 4 | (4) 17 |
| 9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.        | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 0 | (4) 21 |
| 10. I would recommend this topic be used again.           | (1) 1 | (2) 1 | (3) 1 | (4) 19 |

**Comments:** Hopefully later in series, we will talk about teaching students with really high aptitudes in the same class as some who are struggling. I love that CT was presented day 1. This reflects the need for instructors to integrate deeper learning developmentally in a progression from 1<sup>st</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> year students. I took away a different way to think about my syllabus. Nice work! It is interesting that some of these concepts are in my course plan/syllabi without my realizing why I put them there-more to split the 75

minute period-avoid having to talk at them for that long. I appreciate covering topics related to teaching and learning how to better educate students. It is awesome that the IFD offers these topics to newly hired professors and is emphasizing the teaching process and thinking about student learning. I appreciated that both Fellows visited to discuss the support they can provide for us (creative teaching & quantitative research). Topic of high stakes assignments was very helpful. Deep vs. surface learning was new way of conceptualizing material. I have been reading the Bain book, but it was nice to have it reviewed again. I appreciated the think-pair-share demo. Excellent examples and classroom learning techniques. Faculty development speakers were very helpful. Applied examples in the workshop are helpful—think, pair, share is a great example that was used today. Lecture style is not as helpful in terms of building our toolbox. Awesome work, Bill! Possibly keep it under an hour?

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Bill Reynolds

**Date:** 9/10/14

**Workshop title:** Fostering Deep Learning I

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 20
-------	-------	-------	--------

2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 19
-------	-------	-------	--------

3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 20
-------	-------	-------	--------

4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 7	(4) 14
-------	-------	-------	--------

5. I already knew the majority of the material.

(1) 1	(2) 9	(3) 11	(4) 0
-------	-------	--------	-------

6. I learned something to make this worth my time.

(1) 0	(2) 1	(3) 6	(4) 14
-------	-------	-------	--------

7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.

(1) 0	(2) 1	(3) 4	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

8. I would recommend this workshop.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 19
-------	-------	-------	--------

9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 20
-------	-------	-------	--------

10. I would recommend this topic be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 1	(3) 1	(4) 19
-------	-------	-------	--------

**Comments:** Great session-I liked the discussions and time to think about how we've applied the deep learning in our courses so far. Excellent integration of outside newspapers and books. I enjoy being able to use these resources and recommend them to other students and faculty on our team. Nice work, Bill! More time for discussions of challenges and surprises would be great! Very helpful. Thank you for some of the ideas last session on how to get the class more interactive (writing down thoughts on paper, then discussion with the person next to them)...put it to use in the first class and it helped! So far, this experience has been stimulating and very though provoking. Looking forward to it.



# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Bill Reynolds

**Date:** 9/17/14

**Workshop title:** Fostering Deep Learning II

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

- |   |       |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 2 | (4) 15 |
| 2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively. | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 14 |
| 3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.                   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 0 | (4) 17 |
| 4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.               | (1) 0 | (2) 1 | (3) 3 | (4) 13 |
| 5. I already knew the majority of the material.           | (1) 2 | (2) 6 | (3) 7 | (4) 2  |
| 6. I learned something to make this worth my time.        | (1) 0 | (2) 1 | (3) 5 | (4) 11 |
| 7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.           | (1) 0 | (2) 1 | (3) 4 | (4) 12 |
| 8. I would recommend this workshop.                       | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 6 | (4) 11 |
| 9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.        | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 1 | (4) 16 |
| 10. I would recommend this topic be used again.           | (1) 1 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 13 |

**Comments:** Nice work, Bill! Excellent presentation that added to my understanding and approach to this critical area of inquiry. I liked the discussion format and CT questions posed. I have been using some of these question at faculty meetings to prompt a paradigm shift in my program. Kudos, Bill. The discussion parts of how to apply concepts to the classroom are very helpful. The discussion –with groups & then the entire cohort was effective and useful! It would be helpful to have the PP’s after class-great ideas. A tough topic to grasp. Great group discussion. Amazing work, Bill. O.K. to switch it up, though.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Daniel Tome & Merydawida Colon

**Date:** 9/24/14

**Workshop title:** The Pedagogy of Community Engagement (or Service Learning)

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 4	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively.

(1) 0	(2) 2	(3) 2	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.

(1) 0	(2) 1	(3) 2	(4) 17
-------	-------	-------	--------

4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.

(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 6	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

5. I already knew the majority of the material.

(1) 4	(2) 12	(3) 3	(4) 1
-------	--------	-------	-------

6. I learned something to make this worth my time.

(1) 0	(2) 3	(3) 6	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.

(1) 0	(2) 2	(3) 11	(4) 7
-------	-------	--------	-------

8. I would recommend this workshop.

(1) 1	(2) 1	(3) 4	(4) 14
-------	-------	-------	--------

9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 2	(3) 3	(4) 15
-------	-------	-------	--------

10. I would recommend this topic be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 1	(3) 5	(4) 14
-------	-------	-------	--------

**Comments:** Both presenters were very good at explaining what the ideas are and making it relevant to me. Thank you for sharing aspects of service learning. It allowed me to think differently about ways it could be incorporated into course work. I have much to reflect on-especially some ideas that could take root and grow. Great presentation and example of how new faculty can get involved. This is a necessary pedagogy for all faculty and students. Excellent information. Loved the candor of the speakers. Great workshop. In future classes-would love to hear info related to strategies for teaching-i.e.

facilitating group work, etc. Longer Q&A would have helped. I had a hard time following Merydawilda's narrative. Did not seem structured, in a linear format. Lecture format was a bit dull-more activity, hands-on needed, although it was informative.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Tom Grites

**Date:** 10/01/14

**Workshop title:** Academic Honesty

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

- |   |       |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 16 |
| 2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively. | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 4 | (4) 15 |
| 3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.                   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 16 |
| 4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.               | (1) 0 | (2) 2 | (3) 3 | (4) 14 |
| 5. I already knew the majority of the material.           | (1) 0 | (2) 9 | (3) 6 | (4) 4  |
| 6. I learned something to make this worth my time.        | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 7 | (4) 12 |
| 7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.           | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 5 | (4) 14 |
| 8. I would recommend this workshop.                       | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 6 | (4) 13 |
| 9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.        | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 4 | (4) 15 |
| 10. I would recommend this topic be used again.           | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 4 | (4) 15 |

**Comments:** I enjoyed the discussion on strategies to encourage self-efficiency. Would love to hear some examples of various academic dishonesty situations and how they were handled/the outcomes. Good discussions! Great session-very helpful! Great topics. I especially appreciated your discussion (Bill's discussion) about the link between academic dishonesty procedures and good teaching and assessments and the structure of the learning experiences and environment.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Meg White

**Date:** 10/08/14

**Workshop title:** What the Best Teachers Do III

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

- |   |       |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 0 | (4) 18 |
| 2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively. | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 0 | (4) 18 |
| 3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.                   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 0 | (4) 18 |
| 4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.               | (1) 0 | (2) 1 | (3) 0 | (4) 17 |
| 5. I already knew the majority of the material.           | (1) 3 | (2) 4 | (3) 5 | (4) 6  |
| 6. I learned something to make this worth my time.        | (1) 1 | (2) 1 | (3) 1 | (4) 15 |
| 7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.           | (1) 0 | (2) 1 | (3) 0 | (4) 17 |
| 8. I would recommend this workshop.                       | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 1 | (4) 17 |
| 9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.        | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 0 | (4) 18 |
| 10. I would recommend this topic be used again.           | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 1 | (4) 17 |

**Comments:** This is a fabulous workshop idea, Bill. Meg-you rock! I enjoyed your personality and humor that was infused within critical content for newly hired professors to learn and apply. Meg was very informative and loved her style. I would like to see the rest of the presentation that she didn't get to. Great class, thank you! More lectures about ways to teach are very helpful! Great workshop! So dynamic, interesting and practical. Such an important topic that is an important part of successful teaching at all levels. Well done! Continue enlightening teachers! Meg was outstanding and dynamic. I would recommend Dr. White continue to provide this session. I would request her to present this

to my faculty program! Helpful to have this info and ideas to be able to use and incorporate. Some techniques I have used without realizing they were recommended ideas (so good to know I'm on the right track). Great workshop filled with examples. The color of the slides was a bit dark. Meg is a wonderful, engaging presenter. I learned a lot of usable techniques and information in 1 hour. I learned about my no heads up policy. I will change the way I use the quizzes in my class.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter:** Cynthia McCloskey

**Date:** 10-15-14

**Workshop title:** The Nuts and Bolts of Precepting/Navigating the Registration Process

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 3	(4) 10
-------	-------	-------	--------

2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively.

(1) 0	(2) 1	(3) 5	(4) 7
-------	-------	-------	-------

3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 4	(4) 9
-------	-------	-------	-------

4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 4	(4) 9
-------	-------	-------	-------

5. I already knew the majority of the material.

(1) 5	(2) 3	(3) 3	(4) 2
-------	-------	-------	-------

6. I learned something to make this worth my time.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 3	(4) 10
-------	-------	-------	--------

7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

8. I would recommend this workshop.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 3	(4) 10
-------	-------	-------	--------

10. I would recommend this topic be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

**Comments:** Since I teach grad students and my preceptees are grad students, I would like some material in this vein. Yes, do this topic again! Sooner in semester! I would have appreciated a slightly more linear style.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Bill Reynolds

**Date:** 10-22-14

**Workshop title:** Critical Thinking I

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 12
-------	-------	-------	--------

2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 13
-------	-------	-------	--------

3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 13
-------	-------	-------	--------

4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

5. I already knew the majority of the material.

(1) 1	(2) 5	(3) 4	(4) 3
-------	-------	-------	-------

6. I learned something to make this worth my time.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 5	(4) 8
-------	-------	-------	-------

7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

8. I would recommend this workshop.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 12
-------	-------	-------	--------

10. I would recommend this topic be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 11
-------	-------	-------	--------

**Comments: Great modeling of CT concepts. Another excellent session! Examples of how we can foster more CT? How can we assess this in our classes?**



# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Bill Reynolds & Sara Martino

**Date:** 10/29/14

**Workshop title:** Critical Thinking II

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

- |   |       |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 2 | (4) 14 |
| 2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively. | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 13 |
| 3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.                   | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 2 | (4) 14 |
| 4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.               | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 13 |
| 5. I already knew the majority of the material.           | (1) 2 | (2) 6 | (3) 6 | (4) 2  |
| 6. I learned something to make this worth my time.        | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 5 | (4) 11 |
| 7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.           | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 4 | (4) 12 |
| 8. I would recommend this workshop.                       | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 13 |
| 9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.        | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 2 | (4) 14 |
| 10. I would recommend this topic be used again.           | (1) 0 | (2) 0 | (3) 3 | (4) 13 |

**Comments:** Great presentation. Sara did a great job of making a connection that I hadn't considered. This is something I will use to better understand my students and what potential hurdles to thinking/understanding are present in my classroom. That was an awesome talk by Sara-especially the discussion on the process of teaching emphasizing critical thinking. Thanks for helping me look at things from a slightly different perspective.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter:** Susan Cydis

**Date:** 11/12/14

**Workshop title:** Integrating ELOs into your Classes

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

- |  |         |         |         |          |
|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| 1. The presenter explained & met the workshop goals.   | (1) (0) | (2) (0) | (3) (5) | (4) (8)  |
| 2. The presenter presented material/ideas effectively. | (1) (0) | (2) (2) | (3) (2) | (4) (9)  |
| 3. The presenter were well prepared.                   | (1) (0) | (2) (0) | (3) (3) | (4) (10) |
| 4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.            | (1) (2) | (2) (1) | (3) (4) | (4) (6)  |
| 5. I already knew the majority of the material.        | (1) (3) | (2) (7) | (3) (1) | (4) (2)  |
| 6. I learned something to make this worth my time.     | (1) (1) | (2) (2) | (3) (4) | (4) (6)  |
| 7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.        | (1) (0) | (2) (1) | (3) (5) | (4) (7)  |
| 8. I would recommend this workshop.                    | (1) (0) | (2) (3) | (3) (2) | (4) (8)  |
| 9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.     | (1) (0) | (2) (0) | (3) (5) | (4) (8)  |
| 10. I would recommend this topic be used again.        | (1) (0) | (2) (0) | (3) (5) | (4) (8)  |

**Comments:** The examples of ELO significant learning experiences and business E-portfolio ideas were great to see. Effective presentation style to hear from the 3 speakers. This was a great workshop for newly hired faculty as we are thinking of designing future courses and knowing the past, current and future direction of the college. Would love to have some additional resources to go to for student assessment and engagement. I did not think the topic was introduced with a big-picture overview of the topic and what the presentation will be about and why ELOs are important, where they came from, why we are doing them. Presentation jumped straight into details.

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Rodger Jackson

**Date:** 11/19/14

**Workshop title:** Converting Classes from Your Discipline to G Courses

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 14
-------	-------	-------	--------

4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 15
-------	-------	-------	--------

5. I already knew the majority of the material.

(1) 4	(2) 5	(3) 2	(4) 5
-------	-------	-------	-------

6. I learned something to make this worth my time.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 4	(4) 12
-------	-------	-------	--------

7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 3	(4) 13
-------	-------	-------	--------

8. I would recommend this workshop.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 15
-------	-------	-------	--------

9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

10. I would recommend this topic be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 16
-------	-------	-------	--------

**Comments: Great job! Given 13d, not sure I will ever be teaching a G. Rodger really clarified the information about G courses and the process to get courses approved. He is an excellent presenter! Great and entertaining presentation! Informative and useful! Helpful information and advice for faculty! Thank you for everything. Great discussion. As a Stockton Liba grad, I know much of the GS background, but it helps to review!**

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

**Presenter(s):** Dennis Fotia and Susan Davenport

**Date:** 11/26/14

**Workshop title:** Best Practices in E-Learning

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. The presenter(s) explained & met the workshop goals.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 6
-------	-------	-------	-------

2. The presenter(s) presented material/ideas effectively.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 6
-------	-------	-------	-------

3. The presenter(s) were well prepared.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 6
-------	-------	-------	-------

4. I enjoyed the presentation style/format.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 5
-------	-------	-------	-------

5. I already knew the majority of the material.

(1) 3	(2) 0	(3) 3	(4) 0
-------	-------	-------	-------

6. I learned something to make this worth my time.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 4
-------	-------	-------	-------

7. I will be able to apply what I have learned.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 2	(4) 4
-------	-------	-------	-------

8. I would recommend this workshop.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 1	(4) 5
-------	-------	-------	-------

9. I would recommend this presenter be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 6
-------	-------	-------	-------

10. I would recommend this topic be used again.

(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 0	(4) 6
-------	-------	-------	-------

**Comments: None.**

**Appendix F**  
(Adjunct Information Session Invitation)



Office of the Provost

Ph: 609.652.4514  
Fax: 609.626.5509

101 Vera King Farris Drive  
Galloway NJ 08205  
[www.stockton.edu](http://www.stockton.edu)

THE RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

## Fall 2014 Adjunct Faculty Information Session & Dinner

The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey welcomes all new and returning adjunct faculty to join us for our Fall 2014 adjunct faculty information session & dinner on **Thursday, August 28<sup>th</sup>**, beginning at 3:00 p.m. in the *Campus Center Event Room*.

We have scheduled activities for both **new** and **returning** adjunct faculty. If you have previously attended an information session, we hope you will join us for a new set of activities, designed especially for you.

**Please RSVP by Monday, August 25<sup>th</sup> to:** Jessica Maguire at 609-626-3513 or [Jessica.maguire@stockton.edu](mailto:Jessica.maguire@stockton.edu).

TIME	NEW ADJUNCT FACULTY	RETURNING ADJUNCT FACULTY
3:00 p.m.	<b>Greetings &amp; Refreshments</b> ( <i>Campus Center - Event Room</i> )	
3:30 p.m.	Institute for Faculty Development, Human Resources, Stockton Federation of Teachers ( <i>Campus Center – BOT Room</i> )	E-Learning, Computer Services, & Library ( <i>F-114</i> )
5:00 p.m.	<b>Group Dinner: Instructors, Deans, Assistant Deans, Faculty Guests, Administrators</b> ( <i>Campus Center - Event Room</i> )	
6:00 p.m.	E-Learning, Computer Services, & Library ( <i>F-114</i> )	Institute for Faculty Development, Human Resources, Stockton Federation of Teachers ( <i>Campus Center – BOT Room</i> )

We look forward to seeing you on August 28<sup>th</sup>!

*Harvey Kesselman*

Harvey Kesselman  
Provost & Executive Vice President

*William Reynolds*

William Reynolds  
Director, Institute for Faculty Development; and  
Associate Professor of Social Work, School of  
Social and Behavioral Studies

**Appendix G**  
(Adjunct Survey Results Slides)

# What Do Our Adjuncts Think? Results of the Adjunct Survey

Bill Reynolds

Associate Professor of Social Work

Director, Institute for Faculty Development

Presented at the 2015 Stockton University Day of Scholarship (Wednesday, March 25)



# Adjunct Instructor Survey

- Purpose
  - Assess the professional development needs of adjuncts
  - Provide them the opportunity to offer feedback about their overall experience at the University
- Content
  - Fixed response questions on types of PD opportunities they would use
  - Fixed response questions on program involvement
  - Open-ended questions
    - Additional PD they would like
    - Challenges they experience
    - Advice they would give to in-coming adjuncts

# Adjunct & Full-Time Courses Taught per School, Spring 2015

SPRING 2015				% of Total	
	Adjuncts	Full-time	Total	Adjuncts	Full-time
AH	78	201	279	28.0%	72.0%
BU	58	167	225	25.8%	74.2%
ED	56	61	117	47.9%	52.1%
GS	78	56	134	58.2%	41.8%
HS	66	133	199	33.2%	66.8%
NM	70	377	447	15.7%	84.3%
SB	95	225	320	29.7%	70.3%
Total	501	1,220	1,721	29.1%	70.9%

# Table 1: Demographics (N = 112)

Ethnicity		N (percent)
	Hispanic or Latino	3 (2.73%)
	Not Hispanic or Latino	96 (87.27%)
	Prefer not to answer	11 (10.00%)
Race		
	American Indian/Alaska Native	0 (0.00%)
	Asian	2 (1.82%)
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0 (0.00%)
	Black or African American	6 (5.45%)
	White	93 (84.55%)
	More Than One Race	0 (0.00%)
	Prefer not to answer	9 (8.18%)
Gender		
	Female	57 (50.89%)
	Male	52 (46.43%)
	Transgender	0 (0.00%)
	Prefer not to answer	3 (2.68%)

# Table 2: Teaching Experience

Teaching at college level		N (percent)
	1-3 years	25 (22.52%)
	4-6 years	23 (20.72%)
	7-11 years	19 (17.12%)
	12-20 years	22 (19.82%)
	Over 20 years	22 (19.82%)
	TOTAL	111
Teaching at Stockton		
	0-1 year	20 (17.70%)
	2-4 years	37 (32.74%)
	5-10 years	35 (30.97%)
	11-19 years	12 (10.62%)
	20-30 years	6 (5.31%)
	More than 30 years	3 (2.65%)
	TOTAL	113

**Table 3: Desirable times for professional development activities (I would be likely to attend)**

8:30 am – 5:00 pm, weekday		N (percent)
	strongly agree	29 (25.66%)
	agree	42 (37.17%)
	disagree	21 (18.58%)
	strongly disagree	21 (18.58%)
5:00 pm – 8:00 pm, weekday		N (percent)
	strongly agree	26 (21.85%)
	agree	58 (48.74%)
	disagree	19 (15.97%)
	strongly disagree	16 (13.45%)
Weekend day		N (percent)
	strongly agree	20 (16.81%)
	agree	51 (42.86%)
	disagree	26 (21.85%)
	strongly disagree	22 (18.49%)

## Table 4: Level of agreement about likelihood of participating in consultations

Type of consultation	Strongly agree/Agree N* (percent)
Teaching strategies and methods	91 (86%)
Assessing teaching effectiveness	85 (81%)
Interpreting IDEA student evaluations of teaching	77 (73%)
Applying results from IDEA student evaluations to improve teaching	76 (74%)
Teaching challenges	86 (83%)
Other teaching issues I'm experiencing	73 (72%)

\*N ranged from 102 – 106

## Table 5: Level of agreement about likelihood of participating in workshops

Type of workshop	Strongly agree/Agree N* (percent)
Service learning	54 (54%)
Turnitin.com	61 (62%)
Critical thinking	82 (82%)
Methods and strategies for achieving First Year Seminar goals	48 (48%)
Incorporating ELOs into courses	77 (78%)
Converting existing course to online format	51 (52%)
Creating new online course	59 (60%)
Computer Services “boot camp” training	72 (73%)
A topic not listed	28 (34%)

\*N ranged from 83 – 100

## Table 6: Level of agreement about interest in mentoring and Program activities

Mentoring or Program activity	Strongly agree/Agree N* (percent)
Mentoring by FT faculty member	44 (42%)
Invited to Program meeting	60 (60%)
Invited to other Program function	54 (53%)
Would attend Program meetings if invited	92 (90%)
Would attend other Program functions if invited	88 (84%)
*N ranged from 100 – 105	



# Qualitative Feedback: Inclusion and community connectedness

- Challenge:
  - “Not feeling connected to the other faculty.”
  - “Going it alone, no contact with other faculty members.”
- Advice:
  - “Connect to your students and full time faculty...They offer the greatest insights to improving instruction.”
  - “Become a part of your department ‘family’-attend payday parties and meet other adjuncts.”

# Qualitative Feedback: Mentoring and collaboration

- Only 35 percent of survey respondents agreed that they are interested in being mentored by a FT faculty member.
- However, qualitative responses about mentoring emphasize its value:
  - “Find at least one person in your department who can serve as mentor or "go-to" person for support.”
  - “Work collaboratively with other instructors in your department.”
  - “Work closely with your Program Coordinator and Assistant Dean.”

# Conclusions

- Adjunct faculty are experienced and interested in availing themselves of professional development opportunities .
- They are most interested in consultations on teaching strategies, challenges, and assessing effectiveness.
- They report being most likely to participate in workshops on critical thinking, computer training, and ELOs.
- They would like to feel more connected the programs in which they teach.
- A minority (42 percent) reported an interest in being mentored by a FT faculty member, but qualitative feedback emphasized the value of mentoring.