

CHALK

TEACHING & FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

PROMISING SYLLABUS	2
STUDENT MOTIVATION AND COURSE DESIGN	4
GRANT SPOTLIGHT: MARGARET GOODMAN	6
LILLY MIDCAREER CONFERENCE: AN UPDATE	7
QUEST & QUESTION 2011: JOHN RITTER	7
FDB SPRING PROGRAM SCHEDULE	8
2010-11 FDB GRANT DEADLINES	9
SPRING FACULTY READING GROUPS	9
FOUNDERS RECEPTIONS	10
TEAGLE GRANT: STRUCTURING FACULTY WORK	11
FACULTY RETREAT 2011 RETROSPECTIVE	12

[Welcome to the First Issue]

Ty Buckman (English), Faculty Development Administrator
Molly Wood (History), Faculty Development Board Chair

This is the inaugural issue of *Chalk: Teaching & Faculty Development*. The Faculty Development Board has discussed finding a format to share its work with the campus community for many years and it took the hard work of a number of people to make this issue possible. We hope that you find much to use in these pages and we invite your suggestions and comments as we look forward to our next issue in September, 2011.



[Why Another Publication?]

Ty Buckman

It is a fair question. At a time when the web has lowered the threshold for 'publication' beneath the level of complete sentences, one cannot fault the overwhelmed reader who wants justification before being burdened with more prose.

I have for many years been impressed by the *Learning and Teaching Center Newsletter* published twice each year by my faculty development colleagues at the University of Dayton, not only for the content it provides, but for the way that it grounds the Center's development efforts in time and space, giving shape and purpose and coherence to their various initiatives and marking the Center's progress. I hope that *Chalk* will serve a similar purpose at Wittenberg.

Beyond its usefulness to the program, though, *Chalk's* main purpose is to reach two overlapping audiences. First, it will keep Wittenberg faculty informed of faculty development programs and resources available to them on our campus and in the region. Second, it will provide a venue for the sharing of small college teaching and advising innovations with the broader community of teaching scholars. These goals may be disaggregated in subsequent issues of *Chalk*, but this first issue contains examples of both kinds of content. We welcome your thoughts on this first issue as well as your ideas for future topics and themes, and we thank you for reading this far.

[The Promising Syllabus]

Ray Dudek (Chemistry) (rdudek@wittenberg.edu)

The syllabus is often one of the last items prepared when scrambling to start the semester. All too commonly, the syllabus from the previous offering of the course is copied with the dates altered and maybe a few policies revised. Yet the syllabus is usually the first course document that students will see and thus can set the tone for the entire semester. So why not develop a syllabus that not only contains all the necessary information, but also works to stimulate deeper student learning and foster an air of enthusiasm?

To this end, Ken Bain, author of *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Harvard UP, 2004), recommends using what he calls “A Promising Syllabus”. This is not a syllabus format that he developed in his own classes, but rather a composite based upon versions of syllabi he collected from effective teachers across the country. In a promising syllabus, the focus of the document is removed from a list of requirements and placed onto student development. So instead of starting with a list of rules, a syllabus might instead open with a story or question that will foster interest in the course.

There are three main parts of a promising syllabus. First, highlight the promises or opportunities offered to students in the course. What kinds of questions will the course help students answer? What kind of intellectual, physical, emotional, or social abilities will it help them develop? Here, the focus is on the students and their learning outcomes. This section is often in the form of a few questions, or a story, and is typically written in a less formal style to captivate the students’ interest and offer them an ‘invitation’ to what the class has to offer. The first of the three parts allows for the greatest flexibility and creativity in adapting the promising syllabus to different courses and disciplines.

Second, a promising syllabus should explain to students what they will do to realize those promises. What are the learning activities (e.g., assignments, readings, etc.) that will be utilized in the course? Again, rather than use a list of demanding requirements, this section can be written to convey to students a sense of control of their education. If the professor is flexible enough and the nature of the course allows for it, students can fulfill the course goals outside of the normal class framework, giving them a further sense of ownership in their education.

Third, this syllabus should begin “a dialogue in which both students and instructors [explore] how to understand learning.” How can students access their own learning, and how does that match with the instructor’s assessment?

In composing a promising syllabus, instructors should think about what might encourage a student to achieve the learning goals that are set out for the class and try to instill a sense of passion and wonder that will motivate students. Examples of each section follow.

Examples

The first example in each section comes from The Promising Syllabus by The Center for Teaching Excellence and Advancing University Learning at New York University, where Ken Bain serves as Director. The second example I developed for my Chemistry 100: Chemistry of Art class.

Part 1, Example 1: In the 1970’s and 80’s, former Senator William Proxmire awarded what he called the “Golden Fleece” Award, a sarcastic recognition of what he thought were projects that wasted public funds. Some of the recipients of this dubious honor were scientists whose studies appeared to the senator to be examinations of ridiculously small questions that had no value. Was Senator Proxmire justified in his criticism? What do research scientists do? Why do they sometimes spend years studying extremely small questions? What kind of research takes place at this university? Is it worthwhile? Some projects funded with public dollars may be ridiculous, while other strange sounding endeavors may actually have enormous value. How do you tell the difference?

[The Promising Syllabus, continued]

Part 1, Example 2: The next time you walk into a museum you will be able to understand the composition of the art on a molecular level. You know the difference between pigments, paints, and dyes. You will be able to explain why some dyes wash off your clothing easily and why others leave a more permanent stain. The perception of color and the interaction of light onto the artwork and then your eye will be realized, as well as how colors mix and their properties on an atomic scale. The origins of sunsets, rainbows, and why the sky is blue will become known. You will also learn how cameras function, and the science of processing film. While your skills creating art may not increase, your understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of art should grow by the conclusion of the semester.

Part 2, Example 1: To take charge of your own education, you must be willing to read. We will provide you with some reading material that you will read, analyze and think about between each class. We will distribute this material to you electronically. You will also pursue a topic of special interest to you and write a paper about that topic. The writing of the paper will help you refine your thinking and understanding. If you do not learn to communicate in words, you cannot formulate fully developed thoughts and will instead live by the vague impressions and emotions that often substitute for ideas.

Part 2, Example 2: A portion of the course will be spent in the lab with you performing 4 different experiments (approximately one per month). You will be working with others to collect and then interpret the data involved in that experiment. The experiments you perform will relate directly to the class material, and should provide a helpful connection to the concepts you learn and their application in the worlds of science and art.

Part 3, Example 1: We want to help you think about and understand your own learning and thinking so that you can better take charge of that learning. In the course of the semester, by the end of the semester, you should be able to assess your own work and make an argument about where you are in your learning (remember, an argument is not just conclusions but evidence offered in support of conclusions). Here are some guidelines for the self-assessment that will help you make that argument.

Part 3, Example 2: In successfully completing the class, students will be able to demonstrate the following skills:

- Identify the properties of light, and numerically relate wavelength, frequency and energy.
- Perform basic statistical analysis on collected data, and interpret the results of the analysis.
- Understand how light interacts with matter, and give examples from everyday life.
- Recognize atomic properties from the periodic table of elements, and know the different parts of atoms.
- Balance chemical reactions and give quantitative yields of a chemical reaction.
- Understand both the additive and subtractive mixing of either light or paint, and how to predict the outcome of each type of mixing using a color wheel.
- Differentiate between different types molecular interactions and give details about which chemical bonds form between various molecules.
- Invoke your knowledge of chemistry in examining dyes, paints, and pigments.
- Know how a camera works and what is the science involved in producing both a conventional photographic print and a digital image.
- Appreciate art on a new level.

[Ed: Ray Dudek began working with Bain's book as a participant in a faculty book discussion group in Fall 2008 led by Steve Broidy (Education) and Margaret Goodman (Biology).]

[On Student Motivation and Course Design: A Conceptual Toolbox]

Ty Buckman (tbuckman@wittenberg.edu)

Consider the predicament of the inelegantly styled ‘faculty developer’. Most university faculty have received little if any formal training in pedagogy or course design. Once they have embarked upon an academic career, they will uniformly report that they do not have time to devote to learning about teaching because they are too busy teaching new courses (‘trying to stay one week ahead of their students’) while simultaneously establishing a pattern of professional achievement that will result in tenure. When these faculty finally have the time to spend developing and improving their teaching and course design skills, their courses are already designed and their pedagogical practices established, and progress through the major stages of their career – tenure and promotion in rank -- have depended upon their earlier, largely self-taught efforts at becoming effective teachers. In perhaps the crowing irony, senior faculty have the most time to devote to course design and pedagogical experimentation, just when in our system there is little incentive to do so, or even formal recognition for growth and improvement in these areas.

Consider the same situation from the perspective of a faculty member. (You probably already have.) Few if any of us have the time or the inclination to delve into the discipline of education – to the extent that the relevant mix of developmental, behavioral, and cognitive psychology, communication, and philosophy, can be considered a single discipline – in light of the demands of maintaining our academic specialization. Further, the application of theories and practices from those other fields into our own involves so much negotiation and reinterpretation that faculty cannot be sure in advance that the process will yield a better result than the untutored efforts they make based on common sense and having observed the practices of their own teachers. Thus, partly for practical reasons, partly as a defensive response to the nagging sense that we probably should know more about the actual research devoted to the professional practice for which most of us receive the bulk of our paychecks, we often dismiss the usefulness of even research-based approaches to higher education pedagogy tout court.

To go a step further, even if faculty had the time and interest to undertake a systematic exploration of the relevant higher education research, I strongly suspect that most of us would balk at the prospect. Academics typically do not want to watch someone else solve problems for them. We want to hold the tools in our hands and adapt them to our own purposes. However, I have become convinced that we should not lament this trait as a collective failing of our guild, but instead acknowledge its usefulness, even celebrate its potential to be for us an efficient way to learn, an approach that leads to productive failure and helpful mistakes and starts early the process of transfer or adaptation that would have to take place regardless of how carefully we observed the experience of others.

One way of authorizing this process is to enable teacher scholars to assemble ‘conceptual toolboxes’. In other words, overworked faculty should be encouraged to take an *instrumentalist* approach to the literature on teaching and learning: to lift suggestive or useful ideas out of context, to build and continuously develop their own approach to teaching based on their own strengths and weaknesses as a teacher, to gauge for themselves the particular demands that learning their discipline places upon their students. It is probably true that most of our teaching awards recognize the innate ability some faculty have to communicate to, and connect in a personal way with, students, but I believe that the greatest potential for improvement in teaching comes from just this sort of pedagogical dilettantism, or inspired trial and error.

Marilla Svinicki’s book, *Learning and Motivation in the Postsecondary Classroom*, is itself an illustration of the ‘conceptual toolbox’ principle. Svinicki, a psychologist by training and a faculty developer by profession, writes: “The purpose of this book is to bring the findings and theories of educational psychology to the rest of the higher education community, those who teach at all the postsecondary educational institutions and have not had a resource to help them do much to adopt a scholarly approach to understanding their students’ learning problems” (viii). She adds in hopeful tones: “I believe that once they see how much is known and can be done with that knowledge, faculty will eagerly take it in and apply it to their own classes” (viii).

To illustrate how faculty can “take it in and apply it,” I will provide two examples of concepts that Svinicki explains in her book and her ideas for applying them in the classroom, and then conclude with a set of concepts that the reader is encouraged to discover more about by exploring Svinicki’s book on her own.

Self-Efficacy: ‘Self-efficacy,’ Svinicki explains, is “an individual’s belief that he or she is capable of succeeding in a given task or area” (206). Although, in my view, self-efficacy may be regarded as a species of self esteem, because it is focused on the ability to perform a task or succeed in a challenge, it does not convey the same stultifying self-satisfaction or stasis that some of us have noticed in a generation of students raised in a primary

[On Student Motivation and Course Design, continued]

school environment that fostered self esteem as a goal independent of other factors. Svinicki observes, “What is important about the concept of self-efficacy is that it produces different behaviors in learners. [...] If you are self-efficacious, you are more willing to try new things, less concerned about making errors, more willing to assume that a little additional effort is all that you need to succeed” (207). She notes that a faculty member who teaches with self-efficacy in mind could adopt particular strategies: “When we plan in some initial successes, focus our feedback on progress made, give the students some control over their activities, and communicate high expectations and our confidence in the students’ ability to reach them, we are encouraging students to believe in their own ability to accomplish whatever we set before them” (207). Most of us probably practice most of these, but fewer have thought about them as interrelated.

Goal Orientation: Svinicki summarizes a body of research that suggests “that there are different general types of goals that lead to different learner behaviors” (165). She divides those goals into “learning goals” and “performance goals”: “When an individual is oriented toward learning goals, he or she wants to learn a new skill or content no matter what has to be done to reach the goal. The purpose is to master the skill eventually, even if there are wrong turns on the road” (165). Performance goals, by contrast, depend upon “demonstrating competency in comparison with others...to show how well you can perform the skill rather than how much more you can learn about it” (165). To foster learning or ‘mastery’ goals in her students, an instructor could begin by “focusing assignments and evaluation on the improvement of skills rather than comparison with other students”(205). Also, Svinicki notes that “having students work on topics that they are inherently interested in is more likely to result in mastery goals” (205). Finally, and perhaps most crucially, “taking a diagnostic perspective on feedback, focusing on how to improve rather than on what was wrong, tells students that an instructor is more interested in their learning than in evaluating their abilities” (205).

[Svinicki’s book is available in Thomas Library, and the Faculty Development Board has several copies to lend. Thanks to Dave Finster for help with an early draft of this material. –TFB]

Chalk p. 5 February 2011

[OTHER CONCEPTS AND APPLICATIONS]

Metacognition: “being aware of one’s own thought processes.” “One way to encourage this is to have students reflect on their thinking after they have attempted to use information to solve a problem” (34). Examples: math instructors requiring students to show their work; writing instructors having students critique their own writing; coaches having athletes watch themselves on video to improve performance.

Scaffolding: “The term refers to the supports that an instructor gives to learners while they are in the process of developing their skills...” [...] For example, when an instructor simplifies a problem by removing complicating factors, he is scaffolding the students’ problem-solving abilities” (76).

Transfer: “Most instructors want students to be able to use the information in situations where they have to figure out the correct answer, not just recognize it from before. The psychological term for this ... is transfer” (99). Positive transfer: “those situations in which learning new information is helped by what was learned in the past. For example, the skills involved in catching one kind of ball are similar to those used in catching a different kind of ball.” Negative transfer: previous learning that “interferes with new learning.” See also, near/far and low road/high road transfer (100-06).

Case-Based Reasoning: “Instead of having a set of abstract schema as the basis for memory, learners have experienced-based cases that encompass all the integrated details that occur in real life” (108).

Cognitive Apprenticeship Model: “The learner (apprentice) watches a model (the master) engage in the behavior to be learned. The learner is allowed to participate in the behavior to the extent possible until he or she becomes proficient, all the while receiving feedback” (62-3). “In the cognitive apprenticeship, you are learning a mental skill that cannot be readily observed. As a result, the instruction must be modified somewhat to make the invisible visible. The thinking processes need to be made observable by having the model think aloud” (66).

[How Margaret Goodman Spent Her Summer Vacation]

By Teresa Coda ('11) and Rebecca Price ('13)

One week of Dr. Margaret Goodman's 2010 summer break was spent in Santa Fe, New Mexico. She was not baking in the desert sun, but learning to write about science for a general audience in an oasis: the Santa Fe Writing Institute. This trip was funded by a Faculty Growth Grant and allowed Dr. Goodman to expand her training and develop a new way of looking at her field.

Goodman attended Erskine College, a small liberal arts school in South Carolina, not that different from Wittenberg, where she received her undergraduate degree in Biology and Math in 1985. She then earned a PhD from Stanford, completed one year of Postdoctoral work at Yale, and a two-year postdoctoral appointment at Washington University in St. Louis. While in St. Louis, Goodman taught microbiology at Maryville University, and upon finishing this, taught for one year at South Carolina's Furman University. Around this time, Wittenberg entered the picture as she applied for tenure track teaching jobs; she had been a sabbatical substitute at Furman.

Wittenberg appealed to Dr. Goodman for a variety of reasons. She received positive reports about the strength of Wittenberg's Biology Department from various individuals during her application process, and she herself was much impressed by the people she met at Wittenberg and by the chair of the department. She took the job and has been working at Wittenberg ever since. Currently she is a Professor of Biology and the director of the Biochemistry/Molecular Biology Department. She teaches core courses for each discipline and has also taught in the WittSem and University Honors programs. Furthermore, she works with students on research projects, including creating computer based models that are then used in lower level classes.

In addition to her extensive scientific background, Goodman was also nearly an English minor – just two classes short – during her undergraduate studies. That being said, she already had an interest in writing when an online advertisement for the Santa Fe Writing Institute grabbed her attention.

Having served on the Faculty Development Board for several years, she had participated in the process of reviewing Faculty Growth Grant proposals from other professors at Wittenberg. Knowing that the grant existed and having an interest in the Santa Fe Writing Institute, Goodman decided to put the two together.

She applied for and received the grant, and was able to spend a week of her summer at the Santa Fe Writing Institute. The SFWI was designed and is run by two science writers, Sandra Blackeslee and George Johnson; attending were other professors like herself, as well as active science writers from the *New York Times*, *National Geographic*, and *Slate*. The program consisted of informational seminars for everyone and workshops for smaller groups, in which participants wrote and critiqued each other's work. From her experiences at SFWI, Goodman was able to really see the difference between writing for her peers and for a general audience, which allowed her to discover fresh approaches to explaining complex material to students.

"Technical scientific writing has a different style," she notes. "It makes assumptions. In general writing you need to provide additional context, which makes you rethink ways to make the information clear in general language, not just in scientific terms. Thinking this way makes me better equipped to explain to students so that they can make the same shift."

To her surprise, she learned the most from professional science writers who did not share her extensive background in the field.

"I would watch them learning new material in areas that are quite technical. The questions they asked to turn what they were working on into a good piece was really helpful to see. They created an architecture out of completely new information."

Upon returning to Wittenberg, Goodman was eager to encourage her students to think like the writers she met at the seminar; building a framework for new information is tremendously beneficial for comprehending difficult concepts. Goodman explains, "We can teach students how to make this architecture, a framework to organize the information so that it makes coherent, self-consistent sense."

Goodman, knowing that her participation in the SFWI has benefited her ability to teach in a way that makes difficult material more comprehensible to students, is a huge proponent of the Faculty Growth Grant. It's an outside-the-box grant, one that she considers a "useful avenue to develop in ways that really do allow growth, not just along the same trajectory that you have been trained."

[The Lilly Midcareer Conference: An Update]

By Tammy Proctor (History) (tproctor@wittenberg.edu)

For one weekend in September 2010, a group of eighteen mid-career academics from eight institutions met at Wittenberg to participate in a Lilly Regional Conference entitled: "Wanting Something More: Reflecting Upon the Callings of Mid-Career Faculty." Each participant received a small stipend to help offset travel costs and to buy books for the workshop. The institutions represented included a broad mix of size, mission, and religious affiliation: Wittenberg University, Denison University, Cedarville University, Xavier University, Illinois College, Wilmington College, Wooster (GLCA observer), and Valparaiso University. The variety of institutional backgrounds really enriched the conversations and allowed for sharing of strategies and ideas.

The two co-organizers had asked participants to assume responsibility for the facilitation of a particular session connected to the themes, issues, and questions that informed our workshop. Much to our delight, participants took seriously the opportunities embedded in our invitation to share their insights and experiences related to the opportunities and challenges mid-career faculty face. A second positive observation is that while the Saturday work day was chock-full of information and related activities, the plan for the day was appropriately structured around short breaks for snacks and longer times for breakfast, lunch, and dinner which helped to promote a sense of shared community among the participants. Many engaging and candid conversations took place outside the structured workshop sessions, therein ensuring the workshop provided participants not only with information but also with a foundation of which to sustain collegial relationships.

Given the enthusiasm of most participants for the workshop and its focus, we plan to continue the initiative into 2011 in the following ways:

November 2010 – distribute a "matrix of progress" to the participants, allowing them to track progress on their planned initiatives. Since each school was asked to take away an idea that could be implemented at their institutions, we hope to facilitate that progress with regular reporting and accountability to the other participants.

March 26, 2011 – hold a follow-up half-day conference at Denison University (using the leftover Lilly monies to facilitate travel, especially for the people who are farthest away). This will be a chance to report and share ideas on our initiatives, but we also envision this as an opportunity to plan for a publication.

Summer 2011 – publication of results of the initiatives in a special issue of *Chalk: Teaching and Faculty Development*.

Chalk p. 7 February 2011

[Quest and Question 2011: John Ritter on the Creek]

Q & Q 2011 returns to Season's Bistro on Sunday, February 20, 6-10 pm, with John Ritter (Geology) presenting on the subject: "Learn a Man a River": The Changing Nature of Buck Creek." The evening will also feature a Survey of Faculty Research — a showcase and bibliography of faculty professional work undertaken in the last five years. The women of Alpha Delta Pi will provide childcare for the children of faculty in attendance. All faculty are invited to this evening devoted to good food, good conversation, and the celebration of the professional work of their colleagues.

[Spring 2011 FDB Program Schedule]

FDB Collegiality Hour: **Friday, January 14**, 4:30 – 6 pm, Mela Urban Bistro (*FDB supplies group appetizers for this gathering*)

Founders Reception: STEM Teacher Training Grant, Gina Post (Education) and Kathleen Reinsel (Biology) **Thursday, January 20**, 4-5:15 pm, Founders Pub (*Appetizers provided, cash bar*).

Faculty Retreat: 2011 Wittenberg University Faculty Retreat, **Tuesday, January 25**, 8 am - 6 pm, Clark County Heritage Center

FDB Faculty Workload Roundtable: "Faculty Work and Deep Learning: Preliminary Results from the Teagle Grant" (Ken Bladh (Geology); Jeff Ankrom (Economics); Miguel Martinez-Saenz (Philosophy)), **Thursday, February 17**, 4-5:20 pm, Li Room (*Refreshments provided*)

2011 Quest & Question Dinner: Featuring: John Ritter, Professor of Geology: "Learn a Man a River": The Changing Nature of Buck Creek," and the Survey of Faculty Research, **Sunday, February 20**, 6-10 pm, Seasons Bistro (*Advance registration required; off-site childcare provided*)

FDB Vocation Roundtable: "Are You a Professional Teacher?" (Rob Baker (Poli Sci), Shelley Chan (Languages), Pete Hanson (Chemistry), Don Reed (Philosophy)), **Wednesday, February 23**, 4:10-5:30 pm, Li Room (*Refreshments provided*)

FDB Lunch: (Co-sponsored with Human Resources), How the University Works: The Career Center, **Thursday, February 24, 12 – 1 pm**, Shouplin 105 (*Free for Witt faculty and staff*)

FDB Teaching Roundtable: "Artists Teaching Artists" (Scott Dooley (Art), D'Arcy Fallon (English), Mac MacClelland (English), Jessica McCormack (Music), Steve Reynolds (Theatre), David Schubert (Music), **Monday, February 28**, 4:10-5:30 pm, Li Room (*Refreshments provided*)

FDB Collegiality Hour: **Thursday, March 3**, 4:30 – 6 pm, Simon Kenton Inn (*FDB supplies group appetizers for this gathering*)

FDB Roundtable: "Half of My Job Is Answering E-Mail": Communication Challenges / Communication Solutions (Rick Mickool (Chief Information Officer), Jennifer Oldstone-Moore (Religion), Jerry Pankhurst (Sociology), Jeremiah Williams (Physics)), **Thursday, March 17**, 3:50-5:20, Li Room

FDB 'End of Advising Week' Collegiality Hour: **Friday, March 25**, 4:30 – 6 pm, home of Rob Baker and Mary Jo Groves, 818 N. Fountain Avenue (*Refreshments provided*)

FDB Teaching Workshop: "Three Principles and Nine Strategies for the 'Bimodal' Classroom" (Ty Buckman (English), Elizabeth George (Physics)), **Wednesday, April 6**, 4:10-5:40 pm, Location TBA

SOCHE Teaching Conference: "Teaching Chemistry in the 21st Century" (co-sponsored by Wittenberg and SOCHE; organized by Dave Finster (Chemistry)), **Thursday, April 7**, Wittenberg campus (*Registration is limited*)

FDB Best Practices Reception: Academic Support Showcase, Assignment Swap, and Wine Tasting, **Thursday, April 14**, 4:00-5:30 pm, Springfield Center for the Arts

FDB Collegiality Hour: **Friday, May 6**, 4:30 – 6 pm, Cecil and Lime Cafe (*FDB supplies group appetizers*)

Summer Writing Camp: (Co-sponsored with the Writing Center), **Monday, May 16- Friday May 20**, 8:30 am – 4:30 pm, at the Writing Center (*Open to faculty and staff by application; registration is limited.*)

[2010-11 FDB Grant Deadlines]

Grant	Fall 2010	Spring 2011
Professional Enrichment Grants	Friday, Oct 18	Monday, Mar 14
New Course Grants	Friday, Oct 18	Monday, Mar 14
Course Revision Grants	Friday, Oct 18	Monday, Mar 14
Faculty Aides Program	Friday, Oct 18	Monday, Mar 14
Faculty Growth Grant	—	Friday, Feb 11
Redirection Grants	No fixed deadlines.	No fixed deadlines.
FRF Research Grant (\$1,500)	Friday, Oct 18	Friday, Mar 25
FRF Project Grant (\$3,000)	—	Friday, Feb 11
Matthies Award	—	Friday, Mar 25

Note: For a description of each grant and the relevant application process and criteria, see the Faculty Manual: http://www5.wittenberg.edu/academics/faculty_manual/support_services/development_board.html

Chalk p. 9 February 2011

[Spring Semester Faculty Reading Groups]

Spring 2011 will feature two faculty reading groups on campus. The first is the continuation of the regular new faculty fall reading group based on Robert Boice's *Advice for New Faculty: Nihil Nimus*.

The second reading group is open to all faculty and will extend the conversation begun at the 2011 Faculty Retreat around Jeffrey Buller's book, *The Essential College Professor: A Practical Guide to an Academic Career*. Buller observes that, "College professors are expected to perform a large number of tasks for which they receive little or no training," and he promises to help faculty think through many of the responsibilities that have become embedded in the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. The discussions will be organized and led by Sheryl Cunningham (Communication), Adam Parker (Math/Comp Sci), and Margaret Goodman (Biology), who will announce the meeting dates and times in a general invitation to the faculty early in February. Buller's book will be available for participating faculty to purchase in the bookstore at a greatly reduced price. Please email one of the discussion leaders if you would like more information.

In addition to these FDB-sponsored reading groups, Pastor Andy Tune leads a Faith and Learning reading group that is open to interested faculty.

[Founders Receptions Honor Milestones in Professional Activity]

By Ty Buckman

The Faculty Development Board has for many years helped the campus learn about and celebrate the rich variety of professional achievements of the Wittenberg faculty, most notably through the Quest and Question Dinner early each spring semester, although many faculty have also lamented the practical limitations of focusing on the work of only one colleague each academic year. In April 2010, Tammy Proctor invited the FDB to co-sponsor a reception in the Founders Pub with the History Department to honor the publication of Amy Livingstone's new book, *Out of Love for My Kin: Aristocratic Family Life in the Lands of the Loire, 1000-1200*. The event was a great success as Amy had the chance to talk about her research with faculty and students over hors d'oeuvres and beverages in an informal campus setting.

Several of us who attended came away convinced of the potential for Founders to be a common space for faculty and students to share in developing the sort of co-curricular activities that can enhance the academic climate on a small campus. Since the reception for Amy Livingstone, the FDB and the academic departments involved have co-sponsored four other Founders Receptions and invited all faculty, staff, and students to the events. If you know of a colleague who has recently won a major grant, completed a substantial research project, or received a notable award, please contact the FDB about hosting an on-campus reception in their honor.

FOUNDERS RECEPTIONS 2010-11

Amy Livingstone (History), publication of: *Out of Love for My Kin: Aristocratic Family Life in the Lands of the Loire, 1000-1200* (Cornell UP), April 14, 2010

Tammy Proctor (History), publication of: *Civilians in a World at War, 1914-1918* (New York UP), September 13, 2010

Jeremiah Williams (Physics), in recognition of: National Science Foundation Major Research Instrument Award (Tomographic Particle Imagery Velocimetry system (\$264,699)); and NSF Career Award (Investigation of the Thermal and Transport Properties of a Dusty Plasma (\$409,633)), October 11, 2010

Dave Finster (Chemistry), publication of: *Laboratory Safety for Chemistry Students*, with Robert H. Hill (Wiley), November 3, 2010

Gina Post (Education) and **Kathy Reinsel** (Biology), in recognition of: National Science Foundation STEM Teacher Training Grant \$1.17 million, January 20, 2011

[Summer Writing Camp 2011]

Mike Mattison (Writing Center) (mmattison@wittenberg.edu)

In the summer of 2010, eleven faculty and staff gathered in the Wittenberg Writing Center for a writing camp. Sponsored by the Faculty Development Board, the Writing Program, and the Writing Center, the camp was designed to give its participants five uninterrupted days of writing time. Over the week, participants wrote more than 60,000 words and revised over 200 pages. They worked on conference presentations, on academic articles, on novels, and on white papers. Said one participant, "It was a great opportunity to work closely with other faculty as scholars, rather than only as teachers. Overall, this is one of the best experiences that I've had at Wittenberg." Said another, "Never have I accomplished so much at one time."

Given the response to last year's camp, we will offer another one this summer. The 2011 Writing Camp will run from Monday, May 16th through Friday, May 20th, from 8:30 to 4:30 each day, and we ask that each participant commit to the five full days—part of the benefit of the camp is to be able to work surrounded by others who are also focused on a writing task. Camp members will meet and work in the Writing Center; a morning snack, lunch, and an afternoon snack will be provided (along with coffee). In other words, we supply the space and the food, and we take away the distractions. Participants write.

Space is limited, so there will be an application process again this year. Look for those applications shortly. And, if you have questions beforehand, please send an email or stop by the Writing Center on the first floor of Hollenbeck Hall.

[Structuring Faculty Work Toward Student Learning]

In May of 2009, the Teagle Foundation awarded a grant to Wittenberg and six other colleges and universities in the Midwestern Alliance for Learning in the Liberal Arts (MALLA) to seek an answer to a central question: "How would we re-imagine faculty work if we were to structure it explicitly around student learning?" With Professor of Geology and former Provost Ken Bladh as author and principal investigator for the grant, Wittenberg, Alma College, Augustana College, Gustavus Adolphus College, Illinois Wesleyan University, Luther College, and Washington & Jefferson College received \$149,000 over four years to "implement and assess the consequences on faculty work of a variety of 'high-impact practices' that reflect progressively more radical approaches to changing faculty work.

Over the last year and a half, faculty representing a cross section of disciplines on the seven campuses have engaged in a conversation on the 'high impact experiences' – as identified by educational researcher George Kuh -- and the consequences of these approaches on their work. These student experiences (e.g. participation in a learning community, research with a faculty member, study abroad, practicum, internship, field experience, or a culminating senior capstone experience) have been shown to advance 'deep learning' - especially integrative and reflective learning, and self-reported gains in general education and personal social development. Grant participants met at Illinois Wesleyan University in October of 2009 and Luther College in June of 2010 to review these findings, plan pilot courses or experiences on each campus, to test the level of engagement, and to begin to document implications on faculty work. Wittenberg participants at one or more of these meetings included Ken Bladh, Jeff Ankrum (Economics), Miguel Martinez-Saenz (Philosophy), Ty Buckman (English), Stephanie Little (Psychology), Rick Incorvati (English), Sheryl Cunningham (Communication), Michael Mattison (Writing Center Director), and Steve Bogaerts (Math/Comp Sci).

The primary focus of the project this year is to understand to what extent the definitions of faculty work enable or restrain the use of 'high-impact' pedagogical practices and the attainment of assessable student learning outcomes on the campuses. We will be using student and faculty surveys designed for this study and the results of the HERI Faculty survey to explore questions like those included in the 'Questions for Investigation' list below.

Some faculty volunteers on each campus administered the student survey in Fall and J-term courses that they believe include deep learning experiences. Those results are being reviewed and evaluated confidentially for work implications and best practices. A similar opportunity to join this research project will occur in the spring. Early in June of this year, some participants from the seven colleges will meet at Alma College to examine the results and consequences of the wealth of survey information gathered on our campuses so far on the nature of faculty work associated with deep learning environments. Please contact Ken Bladh if you are interested in participating in the local course surveys or summer meeting at Alma College.

QUESTIONS FOR INVESTIGATION THIS YEAR

Which of the items on the inventory of learning environments have the promise of being transformative on the nature of faculty work? For example, do well-implemented learning communities and service learning projects transfer some traditional faculty work to student peers and mentors in the first case or community partners in the second without negative effects on student learning or faculty satisfaction? Do group conferences and peer review of writing reduce the work load of faculty without negative consequences on quality or satisfaction?

What can instructors willingly give up to "make room" for the development and implementation of deep learning teaching options?

How could co-curricular activities be incorporated in a way that helps with deep learning? Can we increase deep learning and redistribute faculty work by factoring in co-curricular activities (student work-study, athletics, etc) that we haven't considered yet in this project?

[Faculty Retreat 2011 Retrospective]

Ty Buckman

On January 25th, 2011, the Wittenberg faculty held their annual Faculty Retreat at the Heritage Center of Clark County. The retreat was organized by the Faculty Development Board and planned by a Faculty Retreat Organizing Committee that included David Schubert (Music), Molly Wood (History), Roberta Linder (Education), Jeremiah Williams (Physics), Gina Post (Education), Ty Buckman (English), Margaret Goodman (Biology), Scot Hinson (English), Kristin Cline (Chemistry), Ken Irwin (Library), Andy Scholl (Geography), and chaired by Tammy Proctor (History). The retreat featured four concurrent sessions: "Team-Teaching and the Liberal Arts," "Teaching Poorly-Prepared Students," "Students and Mental Health," and "Faculty Workload and New Programs." In the afternoon Wendy Smisek, Assistant Director of the Career Center, led participants in a consideration of the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator and a work-preference quiz from Jeffrey Buller's book, *The Essential College Professor*. Faculty then broke into 'Career Stage Discussion' groups, followed in the later afternoon by a series of 'Work and Values Roundtables' at which faculty answered questions briefly before moving on to another discussion. Among the roundtable prompting questions: What should be the faculty role in the admissions process? What does it mean to be a good department chair? What resonates most in Wittenberg's mission? What are some ways Wittenberg could address questions of diversity?

The retreat concluded with an informal reception across the street from the Heritage Center at Mela Urban Bistro, where two faculty were honored for their service to the Wittenberg and Springfield communities. **Doug Andrews** (Math / Comp Sci) received an award from the Faculty Development Board for his contributions to the Wittenberg community through "eleven years of service in organizing the Wittenberg Triathlon" and contributing "to the health and wellness of the University's students, faculty, staff, and alums." **Adam Parker** (Math / Comp Sci) was recognized for his contributions to the greater Springfield community for his work as "organizer of the Science Saturday Program, an initiative that has brought hundreds of young people to our campus to learn about science and the excitement of discovery."

Chalk p. 12 February 2011

Chalk: Teaching and Faculty Development is published biannually by the Wittenberg University Faculty Development Board for the faculty of Wittenberg University and the broader community of teacher scholars.

Editor: Ty Buckman

Student Assistants: Teresa Coda ('11), Rebecca Price ('13)

2010-11 Faculty Development Board: Chair, Molly Wood (History), Kristin Cline (Chemistry), Ken Irwin (Library), Roberta Linder (Education), Dan McInnis (Art), Andrew Scholl (Geography)

Comments? Email tbuckman@wittenberg.edu, or write: Ty Buckman, Department of English, Wittenberg University, Springfield, OH 45501.

[The editor would like to thank David Wright, Director of Curriculum Innovation and E-Learning at the University of Dayton and Sean Creighton, Executive Director of SOCHE for their wise counsel; Provost Emeritus Ken Bladh for his support of faculty development at Wittenberg; Professors David Finster and Margaret Goodman for their exemplary commitment to excellence in undergraduate education, and Jody Rambo for her help in designing the cover page of *Chalk*. –TFBJ]

© 2011 Wittenberg University. Any part of this publication may be reproduced without permission for educational purposes.