



RUTGERS

UNIVERSITY | NEW BRUNSWICK

Task Force for the Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy Final Report and Recommendations May 2023

Executive Summary

One of the strategic priorities identified in the Rutgers-New Brunswick (RU-NB) Academic Master Plan is to increase support for effective and inclusive teaching. To pursue this priority, Chancellor-Provost Conway convened a task force in Fall 2022 to research and develop recommendations for the structure and scope of an Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy for RU-NB to support effective teaching. This task force concluded that there is a pressing need to develop a centralized institute that supports, connects, and further develops existing entities and individuals with expertise in research-informed pedagogy. The proposed institute will support instructors at all levels of their careers, provide a space for collaboration, experimentation, and community-building, and conduct and promote research on innovation in teaching and learning. In order to achieve this vision, the task force makes the following short-term recommendations:

- Hire a director to formulate the mission, vision, and goals of the Institute and to continue the research conducted by the task force toward unifying and strengthening existing programming in teaching and learning at RU-NB.
- Form an implementation committee of six to eight task force members who will comprise the hiring committee for the inaugural director, and who will serve as a liaison to existing entities on campus during the director's first year.
- Provide programming in collaboration with, and in support of, existing entities dedicated to teaching and learning at RU-NB (*Provost's Teaching Fellows, Effective Teaching Conference, Active Learning Network, Educational Developers' Network*).

These short-term foundational recommendations will then lead to long-term aspirations that include:

- Continue to build on existing incentive programs and develop new ones to recognize and showcase excellence in teaching and inclusive pedagogy.
- Create collaborative activities and spaces to create community and strengthen, and consolidate where appropriate, established programming at RU-NB.
- Support the implementation of new and emerging teaching practices and tools through programs, consultations, and workshops for instructors across RU-NB at all stages of their careers.
- Expand Institute staff to include educational developers with expertise in diverse disciplines such as science, engineering, mathematics (i.e., "STEM" fields), the arts and humanities, and social sciences, as well as expertise in educational technology, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, inclusive teaching, and other areas to be determined as needed in support of and in collaboration with RU-NB programs and departments.
- Conduct and support research in teaching, learning, and inclusive pedagogy, toward the aspiration of becoming a leader internally, with the ultimate goal to become a national and international leader among peer institutions with teaching centers.

I. Introduction

One of the strategic priorities identified in the Rutgers-New Brunswick (RU-NB) Academic Master Plan is to increase support for effective and inclusive teaching. This objective supports all four pillars of the plan: scholarly leadership, innovative research, student success, and community engagement. In conjunction with the Academic Master Plan, the University Diversity Strategic Plan highlights the promotion of inclusive scholarship and teaching as a university diversity priority. Given the decentralized nature of teaching support at Rutgers, however, there remains a need for institutional structure to provide effective expertise and guidance on these matters and create a space to acknowledge and support existing entities and individuals on campus with pedagogical expertise.

To pursue these objectives, Chancellor-Provost Conway convened a task force in Fall 2022 to research and develop recommendations for the structure and scope of an Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy for RU-NB to support effective teaching. Throughout the 2022-2023 academic year, members of the task force met with faculty, staff, and students to collect data on perceptions of teaching support at Rutgers and with representatives from peer institutions to learn about their centers and programs devoted to supporting teaching.

II. Summary of Findings

The key findings of the data collection efforts are as follows:

- Current support for teaching in RU-NB is highly decentralized, and this has led to a proliferation of underfunded programs with limited reach, duplication of effort, and confusion on the part of instructors.¹ Focus group participants described the resources that already exist as “scattered and overwhelming.” Furthermore, faculty and staff dedicated to roles supporting teaching and learning reported performing this work on a volunteer basis or for a lower rate of compensation than non-teaching-focused work.²
- Many faculty perceive that teaching is of secondary importance at RU-NB. This perception is reinforced by departmental cultures, expectations of faculty time allocations, and the lines often drawn between faculty with research-oriented positions and those with teaching-oriented positions. They find it challenging to learn about and utilize existing institutional support for their teaching, and they see a need for increased resources, programming, time, and incentives. Some faculty members even feel the institution de-incentivizes or discourages investment in teaching because they believe effective teaching is not rewarded in promotion decisions. Some

¹ For this report, *instructors* will be used to refer to all people who teach. This includes faculty of all ranks, part-time lecturers, co-adjunct teaching positions, staff who teach, postdoctoral positions with teaching responsibilities and teaching assistants.

² See Appendix B for the full report of current programs and resources for teaching available to RU-NB Faculty and Appendix C for faculty focus group responses.



faculty express a culture of silence regarding their teaching efforts because of concerns that they would be penalized for investing too much in teaching.³

- Most of our peer institutions have robust, centralized support for teaching and learning. Rutgers-New Brunswick (RU-NB) is a clear outlier among peer institutions, including the Big Ten and our aspirational peers, in lacking a campus-wide institute or center devoted to teaching and learning. These centers typically report to the provost's office, have sizable staff, and provide a variety of programming to instructors from all ranks and disciplines. Several have structures in place to recognize teaching excellence and its value to their institutions.⁴

Based on these findings, the task force sees a pressing need for developing an Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy that is widely recognized as the center of expertise of teaching in New Brunswick and that plays a leadership role in advocating for and supporting excellent, inclusive teaching and learning. Such an institute would provide expert support in the pursuit of both student and instructor success and inclusion across diverse learning and institutional contexts. Furthermore, the Institute should aspire to not only become a leader internally, but to become recognized nationally and internationally as a model for teaching excellence and innovation at peer research universities.

III. Goals for the Institute

The task force identified the following specific goals for the Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy.

Goal 1. *Create an infrastructure that makes support for teaching accessible to all instructors in New Brunswick and provides leadership in the development of a culture that values teaching as a foundation of student success and advocates for excellence in teaching across all instructional roles.*

Goal 2. *Provide support, expertise, and leadership on equity in teaching, through instructor support as well as curricular and course development.*

Goal 3. *Increase the overall level of support for teaching at RU-NB. This requires expanding existing programs and services, developing new ones, and creating an infrastructure that incentivizes and supports instructors to re-design courses, adopt innovative and inclusive pedagogical practices, and integrate experiential learning in their courses and curricula.*

Goal 4. *Consolidate existing programs and resources where appropriate to increase clarity, reduce unintentional redundancy, and leverage the funding necessary to promote sustained impact and continuous improvement.*

Goal 5. *Take a leadership role in coordinating New Brunswick-facing teaching and learning programming and services, and in communicating about these opportunities to instructors.*

³ See Appendix C for the full report of faculty and student focus group responses.

⁴ See Appendix D for the full report of peer institutions.



Goal 6. *Provide physical and virtual spaces for instructors to engage in discussions about teaching with their peers, build communities of practice, and experiment with teaching techniques and technologies.*

Goal 7. *Create opportunities and infrastructure for research on teaching; elevate the profile of such research; and support the connection of educational research to classroom practices.*

IV. Recommendations

As we embark on the establishment of a new Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy, it is essential to develop both short-term and long-term implementation plans that align with our goals and aspirations. Our overarching long-term goal is to build a robust network with existing entities, and connect with other virtual and physical spaces, dedicated to teaching, learning, and assessments (OTEAR, TLT, TRIAD, GSE, Learning Centers, the Libraries, a variety of schools and units, and others).⁵

A. Institute Governance and Staffing

- Report to the Chancellor-Provost, with an Advisory Council of instructors, staff, and students from across campus with expertise and interest in teaching innovation and inclusive pedagogy.
- Director, to be hired Fall 2023, with broad skillset and expertise in: collaborative leadership, inclusive pedagogy, course design, research-informed classroom practices, learning sciences, technology in teaching, experiential and place-based learning.
- Educational Developers with expertise in diverse disciplines such as sciences, engineering, mathematics, (e.g., STEM fields), the arts and humanities, and social sciences, as well as expertise in educational technology, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, inclusive teaching and other areas to be determined as needed.
- Administrative Coordinators, who would handle such things as event planning, communications, and marketing.
- As the institute grows, Associate Director(s) who will support the vision and mission set by the Chancellor-Provost's office, Director, and Advisory Council, informed by the university's strategic plan.

B. Institute Services and Programming

- Support for instructors at all career stages, from graduate teaching assistants, part time faculty, post-docs, to full-time faculty and staff.
- Provide a physical space or spaces designed for active learning, collaboration, and experimenting with educational technology and diverse teaching practices, in addition to space for instructors to meet with educational developers and each other.
- Provide a centralized website with a shared calendar detailing all services and programs from across campus and the University that support teaching.
- Support the implementation of new and emerging teaching practices and tools through providing programs including workshops, one-on-one consultation services, learning

⁵ Planning will be guided by the ACE-POD Matrix, Appendix E.



communities, and orientation programming. This programming must be based on research and scholarship in teaching and learning and related fields, and support all teaching contexts and modes, including varying class sizes and types.

- Conduct and support research on the innovation in teaching and learning.
- Build on existing, and develop new, incentive programs to recognize and showcase excellence in pedagogy and support instructors' own development and adoption of inclusive and innovative teaching.

C. Short-Term Implementation Plan

The following objectives should be completed in academic year 2023-2024.

Summer 2023-Fall 2023

- Form an implementation committee of six to eight ITLIP Task Force members.
- Implementation committee develops position description for Institute Director, serves as search committee for Director to begin search in Summer 2023 to be completed by Fall 2023.
- Implementation committee develops position description for initial staff.

Fall 2023

- Director meets with implementation committee throughout the term.
- Director meets with existing institutes, entities and partners.
- Director develops start of strategic plan in alignment with ACE-POD matrix⁶ and in conversation with implementation committee and existing entities.
- Director formulates mission, vision, goals in collaboration with implementation committee, based on the aspirations expressed in this report as well as the university's Academic Master Plan and the Diversity Strategic Plan.
- Programming is limited mostly to supporting existing activities with additional events featuring the Director and including existing entities, as expressed in this report.
 - Oversee Provost Teaching Fellows.
 - Provide one-on-one consultations with and formative observations for instructors.
 - Develop and facilitate workshops on innovative and inclusive teaching practices.
- Search for and hire two-to-three educational developers and administrative coordinator.
 - Director will assess the need for additional educational developers and staff at the end of AY 2023-2024.
- Web presence is created, and communications are largely events-based.
- Director develops initial marketing plan and communication strategy with assistance from Admin support/Staff.

Spring 2024

- Director works with Educational Developers to further articulate mission, vision, and goals.

⁶ The ACE-POD matrix is provided in Appendix E.



RUTGERS

UNIVERSITY | NEW BRUNSWICK

- Director and Educational Developers meet with existing entities to further articulate relationship and collaboration between these entities and the Institute working toward mission-aligned collaborations or mergers.
- Director and Educational Developers further develop strategic plan including financial, budgetary planning, and a hiring plan for AY 2024-2025.

At the end of Spring 2024, the Chancellor-Provost will establish the Advisory Council consisting of faculty, staff, and students from across RU-NB. The implementation committee will then hand off its administrative responsibilities for the Institute to the Advisory Council and the Director and their team.

V. Conclusion

Fostering innovative and inclusive instruction is the cornerstone for promoting the success of our students and transforming the student experience. Instructors participating in the RU-NB Academic Master Planning process expressed the need for more instructional support for developing their teaching skills and adopting innovative and inclusive pedagogical approaches. Additionally, the survey of existing resources, input collected from instructors, staff, and students, and interviews conducted with representatives from centers for teaching at peer institutions all revealed the need for greater assistance to our instructors. To this end, the task force strongly recommends the creation of an Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Inclusive Pedagogy.

Appendix A: List of Task Force Members

Co-Chairs:

Sandra Tomlinson-Clarke, Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs

Laura Curran, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Carolyn Moehling, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Other members:

Stacey Blackwell, Senior Director, Learning Centers

Onur Bilgen, Associate Professor, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, School of Engineering

Madhavi Chakrabarty, Assistant Professor of Professional Practice, Rutgers Business School

Kimberly Cook Chennault, Associate Professor, *Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering*, School of Engineering

Rebecca Cypess, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Associate Professor, Mason Gross School of the Arts

Hebbah El-Moslimany, Learning Specialist, Learning Centers

Mary Emenike, Assistant Professor of Professional Practice, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, School of Arts and Sciences

Anita Franzione, Associate Teaching Professor, Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Alex Gatten, Instructional Designer, School of Social Work

David Goldman, Director of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, School of Arts and Sciences

Rebecca Greenbaum, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, School of Management and Labor Relations

Nicole Houser, Associate Teaching Professor, Department of English, School of Arts and Sciences

Nora Hyland, Associate Dean & Faculty Director of Teacher Education, Graduate School of Education

Samuel Jones, Assistant Dean of PTL Development in Office of Academic Affairs, Associate Professor of Teaching, School of Social Work

Ryan Kettler, Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Applied & Professional Psychology

Cameron Knight, Head of Acting, Associate Professor, Mason Gross School of the Arts

Julia Sass Rubin, Associate Dean of Academic Programs, Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

Sharon Stoerger, Assistant Dean for Programs and Assessment, School of Communication and Information

Kristen Syrett, Associate Dean, SAS Office of Undergraduate Education, Associate Professor, Linguistics and Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science (RuCCS)

Lily Todorinova, Undergraduate Experience Librarian/Open Educational Research, Rutgers Libraries-New Brunswick

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

A subcommittee gathered information on two broad categories of support for teaching 1) programs and offices that provide consultation, workshops, or training opportunities, and 2) financial incentives and awards for teaching activities. To the extent possible, information was collected on the location of the program/resource within the University structure (e.g., central, New Brunswick Chancellor-Provost office, or school-based), website URL, contact person and email, number of staff designated to the program/office, target audience or audience served, programs offered, services offered, and funding source.

Findings

Currently, there are many programs, services, and resources supporting teaching, but they are dispersed across the University and generally have a limited reach. This decentralization leads to duplication of effort and confusion amongst instructors as to where to find support. Part-time lecturers and graduate students are particularly at a disadvantage in terms of finding resources since they are often not well-integrated into faculty networks.

Decentralization and duplication have also led to inadequate funding for support for teaching. Few of the existing New Brunswick-specific programs have full-time staff, and many rely on staff who have other full-time responsibilities. Moreover, without structural incentives for instructors, participation in teaching improvement activities is limited. The small size of the programs further restricts their potential impact because not all instructors who are interested can participate. Some of the existing programs are funded by external grants, and there is often uncertainty within the process of institutionalizing those programs after the grant funding ends.

The opportunities for instructors are further limited because most programs are only offered in synchronous formats, and therefore, inaccessible to many instructors, especially graduate students and part-time lecturers. Asynchronous support is lacking.

It is also notable that although RU-NB has instructors who conduct research on teaching and learning, as well as many instructors who have training in pedagogy, the institution does not leverage their expertise effectively to broadly impact the quality of teaching across campus. In addition, because there are no physical or virtual spaces dedicated to teaching support and networking, it is difficult for instructors to talk to each other about teaching, share their knowledge, and build a community that supports a culture of excellence in teaching.

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Appendix Table B1: Programs & Services Organized by Scope of Reach

Name	Website	Contact	Contact Email/Form	# of Staff	Target Audience	Programs Offered	Services Offered	Funding Source
Central								
Teaching and Learning with Technology (Office of Instructional Design)	https://oid.rutgers.edu	William Pagan	william.pagan@rutgers.edu	13	Rutgers community	workshops, online teaching certificate, on-demand resources, RUOnlineCon	request a meeting, course design (DIY Course Design Toolkit, Remote Teaching Toolkit, video tutorials, accessibility), instructional technology, request a customized workshop	Central cost pool; revenues from services and courses
Teaching and Learning with Technology (Game Research and Immersive Design)	https://grid.rutgers.edu	Richard Anderson	form to fill out: https://grid.rutgers.edu/contact-grid ; rianders@docs.rutgers.edu	5	Rutgers community		educational game design (help the Rutgers Community build games, the games can be included into Canvas)	Central cost pool; revenues from services and courses
Office of Teaching Evaluation and Assessment Research	https://otear.rutgers.edu/	Gary Gigliotti	gag@rutgers.edu	7	Rutgers community	workshops, seminars, presentations, teaching tips, on-demand resources	consultation services: midcourse online survey, midcourse class interview, teaching portfolios, instructional technologies, general consulting	Central cost pool
DEI Learning Opportunities	What We Do Diversity Equity and Inclusion (rutgers.edu)	Enobong Branch, Sangeeta Lamba, Joan Collier		16	Rutgers community	book group, diversity education network (including training and workshops)		Central cost pool

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Name	Website	Contact	Contact Email/Form	# of Staff	Target Audience	Programs Offered	Services Offered	Funding Source
Faculty Diversity Collaborative	Faculty Diversity Collaborative - Live Diversity Equity and Inclusion (rutgers.edu)	Leadership Team: Enobong (Anna) Branch, Sangeeta (Gita) Lamba, Joan Collier		16	Rutgers Faculty	OASIS Leadership and Professional Development Program, Program for Early Career Excellence (PECE) Workshop Series, Rutgers Connection Network (RCN) Mentoring Program, AEM E-CARE (Early Career and Racial Equity) Program, AEM I-LEAD Program, Inclusive Mentorship Development		Central cost pool
NB-wide								
Academic Support Lunch and Learn	N/A	Hebbah El-Moslimany	hebbah.el-moslimany@rutgers.edu	No FT staff	target: Academic support staff; open to all	Informal discussions on various topics (e.g., peer mentorship, DEI, self-regulation, etc.), the LLs occur usually on the last Thursday of each month from 12:00-1:00pm. Each month includes a suggested reading.		
Provost's Teaching Fellows	https://newbrunswick.rutgers.edu/chance/lor-provost/faculty-affairs	Carolyn Moehling	cmoehling@echo.rutgers.edu	No FT staff	All NB faculty	Summer program to re-design some aspect of course offered during Fall semester. Group workshops and one-on-one consultations with instructional designers from across Rutgers. \$2000 research stipend.		C-P Office cost pool

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Name	Website	Contact	Contact Email/Form	# of Staff	Target Audience	Programs Offered	Services Offered	Funding Source
Educational Developers Network				No FT staff				No funding
Teaching Excellence Network (grant-funded)	https://sites.rutgers.edu/teaching-excellence/	Mary Emenike	me293@chem.rutgers.edu	1 PT staff	All NB faculty, focus on STEM disciplines	Semester Support Groups, Summer Course Transformation Institute, GIFT	Leadership Summit, Coordinating Council, SoTL support, DBER support, consulting, research on faculty & institutional change	NSF grant
<u>Rutgers Active Learning Community</u>	https://dcs.rutgers.edu/active-learning/community	Stacey Blackwell, Mary Emenike, Dave Wyrzten, Dena Novak	stacey.blackwell@rutgers.edu ; me293@chem.rutgers.edu ; mailto:wyrzten@echo.rutgers.edu ; dena.novak@rutgers.edu	No FT staff	Rutgers community	Canvas site (modules include resources), Rutgers Active Learning Symposium, workshops	Class observations (observe active learning),	
TA Project (TAP)	https://grad.rutgers.edu/professional-development/teaching-skills/ta-project	Barbara Bender	bbender@grad.rutgers.edu	11	Rutgers teaching assistants	orientation, workshops and certificate programs, seminar courses	office hours, teaching resources, media, TA orientation (new and international orientations)	SGS (C-P cost pool)

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Name	Website	Contact	Contact Email/Form	# of Staff	Target Audience	Programs Offered	Services Offered	Funding Source
Rutgers Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (RASTL)	https://grad.rutgers.edu/professional-development/rastl	Leadership Team: Barbara Bender, Christina Bifulco, Monica Devanas, Christopher Drue, Gary Gigliotti, David Goldman			Rutgers graduate students	offers programs through the TA Project (fellows present TAP programs and seminars)		SGS (C-P cost pool)
Learning Assistant Program (through the Learning Centers)	Learning Assistant Information for Faculty Learning Centers (rutgers.edu)	Deanna Acosta	learningassistants@echo.rutgers.edu	3.25	RU-NB Faculty		Learning assistants provide embedded academic support in active learning classrooms	RU-NB Office of the Provost + Schools
School-based								
The P3 Collaboratory for Pedagogy, Professional Development, and Publicly Engaged Scholarship	P3 Collaboratory RU-Newark (rutgers.edu) www.p3.rutgers.edu/smartteaching	Taja-Nia Henderson, JD, PhD Dean, Graduate School-Newark	tajania@law.rutgers.edu		RBS faculty	Pedagogy, Professional development, grants. RBS also does the smart teaching workshops where tools, techniques etc. are shared with interested faculty		RU-Newark

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Name	Website	Contact	Contact Email/Form	# of Staff	Target Audience	Programs Offered	Services Offered	Funding Source
ACUE - Courses and Microcredentials	The Association of College and University Educators (ACUE)	RBS - (not sure if it is a part of P3 or a separate entity)	Catherine Clepper < cc1819@rutgers.edu >		RBS faculty	ACUE (The Association of College and University Educators) provides free micro credentials and courses to improve teaching skills.		RU-Newark
SSW: Academic Affairs, Online Programs, & Instructional Design								
Learning Sciences Lunch and Learn	N/A	<u>Ravit Duncan,</u> <u>Clark Chinn,</u> <u>Drew Gitomer,</u> <u>Danielle Murphy,</u> <u>Amy Adair,</u> <u>Huma Hussain-Abidi</u>	To receive announcements about the Learning Science Lunch and Learns, register through the link: http://eepurl.com/ia0YZX		target: GSE students & faculty; open to all	Lunch and Learn talks on current topics in the learning sciences, the talks occur on Wednesdays 12:00-1:00pm throughout the Fall and Spring semester, they are held in-person (GSE 124) and online (zoom link)		C-P Office cost pool
Rutgers Business School Online Teaching Workshop	no website. It is volunteered and Dr. Rudolf Leuschner, a professor at RBS runs it	Rudolf Leuschner	rleuschner@business.rutgers.edu		RBS faculty	started to share best practices and help faculty when they need help with online course development and teaching		RBS
Innovations in Undergraduate and Graduate Business Education	https://www.business.rutgers.edu/events/innovations-undergraduate-and-graduate-business-education	RBS Team	can.uslay@business.rutgers.edu		RBS faculty	conference held once every two years to focus on innovations in UG and G Business education.		RBS
SAS Office of Undergraduate Education Teaching and Learning team	https://sasoue.rutgers.edu/teaching-learning	David Goldman	dgoldman@sas.rutgers.edu	5	SAS community	workshops, Tea and Teaching, Voices of Diversity, Humanities Plus, Language Engagement Community, Faculty Learning Communities, Summer Programs	workshops, course development, consultations, strategic curriculum development program	SAS

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Name	Website	Contact	Contact Email/Form	# of Staff	Target Audience	Programs Offered	Services Offered	Funding Source
TRIAD	https://sasose.rutgers.edu/triad-coalition	Mary Emenike	mary.emenike@rutgers.edu	4	SAS STEM community	STEM Transformations using Research-based Instructional practices, Assessment and Dissemination coalition	outreach	SAS
SC&I Instructional Design and Technology Services (IDTS)	https://idts.cominfo.rutgers.edu/	Sharon Stoerger	sharon.stoerger@rutgers.edu	3	SC&I community	workshops, Inclusive Teaching Community of Practice (CoP), presentations, teaching tips, on-demand resources	request a meeting/consultation services, course design, instructional technology	SC&I
School of Nursing: Instructional Design	https://nursing.rutgers.edu/instructional-design/	Asanté Barr	asante.barr@sn.rutgers.edu	2	Rutgers School of Nursing faculty, staff, and students		consultation services, resources	SN

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Appendix Table B2: Resources Organized by Scope of Reach

Name	Contact Person	Contact Person Email	Target Audience or Audience Served	Notes
Central				
Open and Accessible Textbooks	Dee Magnoni	At NB- lily.todorinova@rutgers.edu	All RU Faculty	
Rutgers Global Grants	Johanna Bernstein	grants@global.rutgers.edu	All faculty developing global content-connections	
University Faculty Year-End Excellence Awards			All U faculty	
Inclusive Mentoring (University Equity & Inclusion)			SGS Faculty	This is a landing page for links and training video for mentorship, including a link to Individual Development Plans. There is also a separate Inclusive Mentoring under Equity and Inclusion (see next row)
Inclusive Mentoring (University Equity & Inclusion)			All U faculty	
NB-wide				
Chancellor-Provost's Awards for Faculty Excellence			All NB faculty	
Language Engagement Project 991 Challenge	Doaa Rashed/Rebecca Walkowitz	991challenge@rutgers.edu	All NB faculty teaching language/culture	
Byrne Seminar	Mark Robson/James Register	byrneseminars@rutgers.edu	All NB faculty	
IDEA Innovation Grants	DICE Office, Crystal Bedley	diversity@echo.rutgers.edu	All NB faculty	teaching-community partnerships
Interdisciplinary Honors Seminars – HC	Chuck Keeton; JD Bowers	honorsdean@sas.rutgers.edu	All full time faculty	No grant or stipend associated (?)
Interdisciplinary Honors Seminars – SAS Honors				
TEN SoTL & DBER support	Mary Emenike	me293@chem.rutgers.edu	STEM faculty	5-year award (NSF IUSE funded)
Chancellor-Provost Challenge-Academic Master Plan		nbchancellor-provostchallenge@rutgers.edu	NB faculty, staff, students	For interdisciplinary scholarship toward public impact

Appendix B: Current Programs and Resources for Teaching Available to RU-NB Faculty

Name	Contact Person	Contact Person Email	Target Audience or Audience Served	Notes
<u>School-based</u>				
Humanities Plus Grants	Alessandro Vettori	vettori@rutgers.edu	All SAS Humanities faculty	Incentive grants for pedagogical innovations in the humanities
MGSA Inclusive Teaching Grants	Rebecca Cypess	rc713@mgsa.rutgers.edu	MGSA faculty -- all ranks	up to \$2500 to revise courses to reflect the values of equity, diversity, and inclusion.
School of Social Work Fully Asynchronous Online Course Development	AD of Academic Affairs		SSW Faculty	7500 or one course release
Strategic Curriculum Development Program	David Goldman	dgoldman@sas.rutgers.edu	SAS faculty	Supports development and redevelopment/refresh of async online courses, especially ones that serve nontraditional and returning students
SAS Awards for Distinguished Contributions to Undergraduate Education	Sharon Bzostek	sbzostek@sas.rutgers.edu	SAS faculty	

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

A subcommittee of the task force was charged with conducting focus groups to solicit faculty, student, and staff perceptions and opinions regarding the level and quality of support available for teaching, learning, and pedagogy at Rutgers New Brunswick.

The instructor focus groups ranged in size from 9 to 40 instructors and included a mix of tenure track, non-tenure track, and part-time lecturers.

Focus group questions

Representatives of the task force explained the purpose of the focus groups to their respective audiences and then asked the following questions.

Faculty:

1. Culturally, what role does teaching hold in your department?
2. When you or your colleagues consider changing what or how you teach, where do you go for help, guidance, or assistance?
3. Take a minute to think about the following types of professional development opportunities or supports related to teaching, learning, and pedagogy. How useful do you believe these would be to your teaching?
 - a. One-on-one consultations with teaching specialists
 - i. Would you find it useful to have department/discipline-specific teaching specialists?
 - b. Faculty workshops or orientations that cover topics like inclusive pedagogy, innovative teaching methods, etc.
 - c. Guidance on how to research or publish about teaching (e.g., how to write case studies)
 - d. Learning communities that provide support and share resources regarding teaching
 - e. Extended seminars that introduce and help to implement a teaching strategy over time
4. What would you say is the greatest challenge to getting support for teaching at Rutgers?
5. Do you have any other thoughts or suggestions about how support for teaching could be improved at Rutgers?

Students:

1. Think about a current or past course that maximized your overall learning potential. What did your professor do that improved your ability to learn?
 - a. For those professors who do a particularly good job teaching, why do you think they are so effective?
 - b. For those professors who are not as great at teaching, what do you sense may be preventing them from being more effective in the classroom?
2. What aspects of teaching and learning at Rutgers would you like to see change or evolve into the future?
3. What aspects of teaching and learning at Rutgers do you want to see stay the same into the future?

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

4. By a show of hands, have any of you had an internship or applied learning experience? For these students, can you tell us about the ways in which your learning in the classroom effectively transferred to an applied context? What made it easy or difficult to transfer classroom learning to an applied context?
5. What have your professors done that has made you feel comfortable participating and engaging during class time and/or with your peers? Was there anything your professors have done (or not done) that made you feel uncomfortable or unwilling to participate?

Findings

Key Findings from Faculty Focus Groups

- Many participants expressed pride in, and dedication to, teaching. But there was general agreement across all focus groups that teaching is, institutionally, of secondary importance. Participants commonly described this as manifesting in a prioritization of research over teaching, and in teaching faculty being under-utilized and (in some cases) under-valued.
- Participants in every focus group identified **ways that Rutgers could start to give teaching more institutional importance**, focusing in particular on **incentives, time, and resources**.
- Participants **currently make use of a diverse array of local, institutional, and outside resources to support their teaching**. Many participants said they find it challenging to learn about available resources or opportunities.
- Participants expressed **interest in a wide range of resources, programming, and support services** that could be provided, supported, or facilitated by an Institute, with a particular interest in disciplinary experts and one-on-one consultations.

Key Findings from Student Focus Groups

- Students identified **challenges within the broader Rutgers systems** (rather than within the classroom) **as hindrances to their learning** (e.g., bussing, courses not transferring to major, poor advising).
- Students seem to view **hands on, experiential learning opportunities as especially useful** to their long-term development and success in their future careers.
- Students want instructors to be more **flexible and to adapt their teaching styles and class procedures in response to student needs**.
- Students expressed that they learn more effectively when **the course material and delivery are relatable** to their current lives.

Summary of key takeaways from faculty focus groups:

Many participants expressed pride in, and dedication to, teaching. But there was general agreement across all focus groups that **teaching is, institutionally, of secondary importance**. Participants commonly described this as manifesting in **a prioritization of research over teaching**, and in **teaching faculty⁷ being under-utilized and (in some cases) under-valued**.

⁷ We follow participants in several groups in using “teaching faculty” or “teaching professor” to refer to this group, rather than the “NTT” label, which labels teaching faculty by reference to what they are not rather than by reference to their essential teaching role.

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

- Research and teaching:
 - *Some people have to hide how much they put into teaching, because the culture says this isn't how to be.*
 - *We're not given the opportunity to take some things off of our plate so that we can put these things onto our plate...it's all considered sort of pro bono.*
 - *Even in a department that values teaching...I never lose sight of the fact that I work at a research university, and the only way for me to get promoted is to focus on my research, and so at the end of the day it comes back to sort of pro bono work, or my conviction that doing something extra for my students is the right thing to do, but at the same time undermines my professional trajectory at Rutgers.*
 - *As someone who has published extensively in the realm of pedagogy...this is not counted towards promotion.*
 - *I'm writing a textbook. I haven't bothered telling anybody in my department. They don't care. They won't care. They won't care. They'll view it as another bad idea, because you know that energy could be devoted to getting an NIH grant or something.*
 - A participant in one group articulated an alternative way that the relationship between research and teaching could be viewed: *Teaching is fundamental to a person's research. Teaching is a living model of one's research.*
- Teaching faculty:
 - *When I started teaching as a teaching professor, I thought it would be much more interactive, and I find out that it's a lonely profession.*
 - *I'm a teaching professor, I've been teaching at Rutgers since 1980...we have never been invited to faculty meetings....I don't think that's because of a bias towards teaching professors, I think they just don't know what to do to improve the teaching.*
 - *I am also teaching faculty, I'm new at this...really, teaching never comes up at faculty meetings, pretty much ever, except during COVID.*
 - *Teaching is not valued. The expertise of those who teach not valued. Those whose primary position is to teach are not valued.*
 - *A Dean said we want...to incentivize tenure-track faculty to teach in the courses because we want world-class teachers in our courses. In this meeting, there were quite a number of NTT faculty, who, I feel rightly, felt slighted by that. ...things like that can really impact the morale of people who are doing the teaching.*
 - There was general agreement across many groups that **teaching faculty are focused on teaching**. In several groups, participants described teaching faculty as highly motivated and valued experts on teaching.
 - Some teaching-faculty participants reported that their departments seem to clearly value teaching faculty; others did not feel supported.
 - **Teaching-faculty participants in multiple groups described challenges** including: a lack of job security with limited contracts; overreliance on SIRS to evaluate teaching; lacking the authority to make changes; fears about backlash or being outcast from their unit in response to efforts to innovate; and not being included or valued in their departments.

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

Participants in every focus group identified **ways that Rutgers could start to give teaching more institutional importance**, focusing in particular on **incentives, time, and resources**.

- Participants in multiple groups emphasized that just creating an Institute offering voluntary programming, without addressing these deeper issues, would not have much impact.
- Participants in several groups mentioned **peer observation or evaluation of teaching** as an early-stage practice with promise for shifting culture.
- Many participants suggested **strategies for incentivizing faculty to focus on teaching**:
 - Provide monetary incentives for work improving courses, creating new courses, creating new online courses, etc.
 - Create a teaching-focused tenure track to give teaching faculty the same status and academic freedom as tenure/tenure-track faculty.
 - Recognize scholarly work related to teaching in promotion, tenure, and review processes.
 - Evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty, even full and distinguished professors, on their teaching.
 - Provide funding for teaching similar to the way Rutgers provides funding for research.
 - Weight teaching and research equally when it comes to promotion and tenure reviews.
- **Participants in every group cited a lack of time as a significant barrier to faculty engagement with teaching.** Participants recommended strategies to address this, including:
 - Course releases to work on significant teaching improvement projects.
 - Summer workshops, compensated or otherwise incentivized.
 - Participate in extended programs that prompt you to set aside dedicated time on your calendar to actually implement ideas.
 - Provide the time to allow instructors to develop, trial, and revise teaching strategies and course designs. As one participant put it:
 - *In order to improve education, it's not going to happen in one semester, right? It's going to take some time and you're gonna try something new and you may see how it works...I feel like it's not just resources and how they have to be spent but also a bit of a long term commitment...I think of it like a startup.*
- Participants in several groups mentioned **specific ways Rutgers could improve support for teaching**:
 - **Reinstate small teaching grants** supporting activities like class excursions and guest speakers, which existed until approximately 5 years ago. Participants in one group emphasized that equity issues arise when these sorts of activities are unfunded.
 - Participants in multiple groups expressed a strong desire for more **active learning classrooms** (or at least retrofitted existing classrooms with furniture conducive to collaborative learning) on all campuses. People got used to using active learning classrooms, but now cannot get into those rooms.
 - Provide appropriate technology in proprietary spaces (ones that aren't supported by central instructional technology units).
 - Have a department faculty retreat focused on teaching.
 - Model this on industry's support for professional development. Coaching, for instance, doesn't take much time: 1–2 hours every 1–2 weeks.

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

- Participants in one focus group described **optimism** that the culture and institutional focus is beginning to shift in their school:
 - *Junior faculty have tended to take advantage of progressive teaching approaches in the classroom most consistently, but there are also some senior faculty who have put in lots of work in curricular development. That work is being rewarded now as junior faculty come up for reappointment and promotion. It's not taking away from their research.*
 - *The messaging from the school/university is that 'we assume your teaching is good enough, and what really matters is research/outside activity.' Now that culture is starting to shift within [our school].*
 - *When she was a junior faculty member, one respondent didn't feel like there was any emphasis on teaching in the tenure process. That culture is starting to change: Before last year, [our school] never had peer evaluation of teaching, and now it's being implemented/expected. Some faculty members resist or resent this.*

Participants **currently make use of a diverse array of local, institutional, and outside resources to support their teaching**. Many participants said they find it challenging to learn about available resources or opportunities.

- Many participants said that they go first to individual colleagues or departmental officers (e.g., undergraduate directors).
- Some participants described drawing on colleagues outside of Rutgers, resources provided by other groups and institutions, and education research.
- Participants listed a diverse range of Rutgers programs and offices that they have found useful; a partial list includes: school-based course or pedagogy development programs; instructional technology or IT support; school-based offices for pedagogical support; the ACUE teaching course offered as a pilot to Rutgers faculty several years ago (several participants described the course as valuable, but said they ran out of time to complete it); the Active Learning Community and the Active Learning Symposium; the learning assistant program; the Provost's Teaching Fellows program; librarians; and the TEN course transformation summer institute.
- Many participants indicated that **finding out about resources or opportunities is challenging**:
 - *I would not have found that group unless I was copied on an email.*
 - *I got an email...which many of my NTT colleagues in the department, who would have loved to join that course, deleted, but I read.*
 - *There are too many different entry points and lots of resources, and it's hard to imagine adding more workshops and documents. The resources that already exist are scattered and overwhelming.*
 - *You know, I don't know exactly where to go and I've been ad hoc-ing [improvements to my teaching] for 20 years.*

Participants expressed **interest in a wide range of resources, programming, and support services** that could be provided, supported, or facilitated by an Institute, with a particular interest in disciplinary experts and one-on-one consultations.

- There was **particular interest in disciplinary experts and one-on-one consultations**.

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

- Participants commonly named several features that they thought were particularly important to one-on-one consultations: disciplinary knowledge; trust; building relationships; and taking a collaborative, not top-down, approach.
 - *Could I trust this person? Are they going to just be telling me what to do, or collaborating with me?*
- Participants in several groups identified teaching experts (including individual in their departments and staff in local or central offices) with whom they had formed close consultative relationships.
- Many participants felt that **broad workshops or webinars provide relatively superficial support** that is not time-efficient and doesn't speak to the specifics of their discipline or teaching needs. At the same time, a few participants described coming away from a workshop excited to change their course or try a new technique.
- Participants had **mixed views of more extended programs like seminars or learning communities**. Some participants liked these ideas, especially the prospect of building community around teaching or taking extended time to implement a major change. But many expressed concerns about the time commitment involved.
- Participants in one group mentioned the importance of TA training for graduate students, with some expressing uncertainty about whether TAs actually participate in the TA training offered by the School of Graduate Studies.
- Participants in several groups volunteered **specific areas** they would like to see support for, including culturally responsive pedagogy (mentioned in several groups); trauma-informed pedagogy; decolonial pedagogy; and the use of a theater group to model, and help faculty prepare to implement, teaching strategies.

Students were asked questions pertaining to:

1. Courses that delivered superior learning.
2. Courses that did not maximize learning.
3. Ways in which students would like teaching/learning to evolve.
4. The transfer of learning from the classroom to internships or applied work experiences.
5. Comfort level engaging in courses.

Students identified the following as facilitating their learning.

- Student-led discussions—students teaching other students.
- Professors who prioritize learning over grades/outcomes.
- Professors who allow students to learn from their mistakes.
 - Resubmitting incorrect answers on an exam/assignment.
- Professors who are passionate about the subject material, willing to share in conversations, and relatable to the students.
- Course material, lectures, and discussions that are relevant to student's lives and "real world" contexts.
- Use of multi-media to enhance interestingness of classes
- Assignment support such as:
 - Pre-assignments that build up to the main assignment

Appendix C: Feedback from Faculty and Student Focus Groups

- Study guides
- Review days before exams
- Flexible—change class based on students' needs
- Incorporation of multiple ways of teaching to accommodate multiple ways of learning

Students identified the following as hindering their learning potential.

- Poor advising
- Courses not transferring to majors
- Unclear course titles (titles that are too similar across Rutgers)
- Buses making students late for courses
- Classes that occur too late at night for effective learning
- Professors:
 - Inflexible
 - Not interactive
 - Rush through material
 - Not conversational
 - Read from slides

Rutgers may consider evolving by:

- Offering a tutoring system
- Making the same classes uniform across multiple professors
- Better advising—more on par with community colleges
- Flexible grading policies
- Increase experiential learning opportunities
- Include field trips
- Job shadowing

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

A subcommittee was charged with investigating teaching and learning initiatives at peer and aspirant peer institutions. Members conducted a review of websites of extant teaching and learning centers at 26 peer and aspirant peer institutions, including all BTAA institutions and many Ivy League institutions. Data collection focused on the following areas: services (what is being offered); faculty incentives for engagement with the centers; substantive focus or signature programs/initiatives; who is served by the centers; staffing and reporting lines; relationships with other institutional or campus units. Due to the idiosyncratic nature of the websites, it was not always possible to collect information on all of these areas for a given institution. However, the data collected provides an informative overview of teaching and learning centers at peer and aspirant peer institutions.

Based on these initial findings, the subcommittee conducted informational interviews in during Spring 2023 with select peers with institutional structures that are most similar to Rutgers-NB. These included: Cornell University, Indiana University-Bloomington, Penn State, and University of Maryland-College Park. The goals for these interviews were to garner additional details about service and programming and to learn more about their organizational structures and finances.

Findings

Service scope: Centers typically provide 1) pedagogical training, which can include individual sessions, workshop series, orientations for new faculty, certificate programs, and conferences; 2) training and assistance with course/instructional design and curriculum development; 3) teaching observations for individual faculty; 4) oversight of teaching evaluations; 5) assistance with assessment development and learning outcomes; 6) assistance with and partnership with faculty on research/Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL); 7) management of learning communities; 8) consulting with departments on curricular reforms; 9) consulting with faculty on teaching portfolios; 10) Curating resources (newsletters, articles, etc.) on teaching and learning.

Who is served: These centers typically appear to support all instructors; all full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, post-docs, and graduate students/TAs. A few have programs to support undergraduate teaching fellows.

Incentives for Faculty: The centers incentivize faculty participation through multiple fellows' programs, teaching-related grants, awards, and support for SoTL.

Substantive focus and Signature programs: Substantive focuses typically include fundamental college teaching; inclusive pedagogy; DEI focus; evidence-based pedagogy; active learning; STEM specific initiatives; online/digital pedagogy; and teaching for well-being. Signature programs include a learning lab where courses are tested with undergraduate fellows (Harvard); Equity and Inclusion in STEM introductory courses (Purdue).

Staffing and Reporting Lines: The centers appear to range from as small as 9 to over 50. Center directors appear to report to the provost's office (to the faculty or academic affairs type office), although this is difficult to ascertain in multiple cases; one is a joint endeavor between the Provost's office and university IT (Indiana-Bloomington).

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Relationship to Campus Units: Centers generally provide support to units as requested and may develop unit-specific workshops or programming; some assign liaisons to schools or units; one Center is a joint endeavor between the Provost’s office and university IT (Indiana-Bloomington).

Appendix Table D1

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Brown University</p> <p>The Harriet W. Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning (The Sheridan Center)</p>	<p>https://www.brown.edu/sheridan/sheridan-center</p>	<p>Assessment (from individual courses, pedagogy, departmental curriculum); certificates in teaching and course design; consultation for faculty and departments; teaching orientation;</p>	<p>Head is AP---over 20 staff</p>	<p>awards; grants</p>		<p>support to units; liaisons with units; assigned fellows; teaching consultants</p>
<p>Carnegie Mellon</p> <p>Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence & Educational Innovation</p>	<p>https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/index.html</p>	<p>course and syllabus design support, technology support, teaching and learning assessment, solutions to teaching problems, support to faculty and graduate students.</p>	<p>looks like a team of 22. broken into teams of, assessment team, technology enhanced learning team, teaching consultant team, administrative team,</p>		<p>the Simon initiative, future faculty program</p>	<p>listed as a 'hub for CMU faculty and technology enhanced teaching' as well as a 'global resource'</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Columbia University Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://ctl.columbia.edu</p>	<p>Center for teaching and Learning supports all Columbia Faculty with workshops, online learning, consultations, seminars, observations and teaching orientation.</p>	<p>ED, staff, advisor board, senior faculty teaching scholars.</p>		<p>Ask a Student - undergraduate student to partner with and bring them into the conversations about teaching and learning with faculty.</p>	<p>For the entire Columbia University but some resources anyone can access.</p>
<p>Cornell University Center for Teaching Innovation</p>	<p>https://teaching.cornell.edu</p>	<p>Teaching & Learning in the diverse classroom; Assessment & Evaluation; Course design; consultation; technology resources; Drop-in</p>	<p>Vice Provost for academic innovation Executive Director; Managing Director; Associate Directors (4); Senior Instructional Designer Instructional Designer (6?) Other supports.</p>	<p>Grants and teaching awards \$5, to \$20,000</p>	<p>Active Learning Institute Any Person, Man Stories; MOOC</p>	<p>Works across disciplines, ranks, schools, departments colleges, faculty staff, students</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Dartmouth College</p> <p>Center for the Advancement of Learning</p>	<p>https://dcal.dartmouth.edu</p>	<p>consultation on course design; curricular and program review; course evaluations; experiential learning; digital and online learning including program development, marketing etc. ; training (online and other) for new faculty; other faculty development</p>	<p>Multiple staff; faculty director; reporting lines not clear</p>	<p>Grants; fellows program</p>		<p>unclear</p>
<p>Harvard University</p> <p>The Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://bokcenter.harvard.edu</p>	<p>course design; pedagogy; assessment; online/digital; fellow for undergrad, grad and faculty; trainings; teaching conference</p>	<p>Multiple staff and faculty</p>	<p>faculty affiliates;</p>	<p>learning lab (test new interventions/practices); over 200 fellow</p>	<p>Consult with departments as requested</p>
<p>Harvard University</p> <p>Initiative for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://hilt.harvard.edu</p>					
<p>Harvard University</p> <p>Global Health Education and Learning Incubator at Harvard University</p>	<p>https://gheli.harvard.edu</p>			<p>faculty fellows/grants</p>		

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Harvard University (Graduate School of Education)</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Lab</p>	<p>https://tll.gse.harvard.edu</p>	<p>consult with faculty members and on course design, inclusive teaching techniques, leveraging instructional technology, assessing student learning; help faculty create, implement, and evaluate innovative teaching techniques, allowing them to tailor their instruction; incorporate research principles and proven best practices into our design and consultation practices, and we collect evidence to inform continuous improvement of learning experiences</p>	<p>A director with extensive pedagogy and design expertise, faculty leads, the oversight of the Associate Dean for Learning and Teaching. The Associate Dean for Planning and Outreach supports product development and dissemination efforts.</p>	<p>unclear</p>	<p>online courses, educational leadership</p>	<p>Harvard Graduate School of Education, collaborates with other teaching centers across the university</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Harvard University (Kennedy School)</p> <p>Strengthening Learning and Teaching Excellence (SLATE)</p>	<p>https://www.hks.harvard.edu/more/about-us/leadership-administration/academic-deans-office/slate</p>		<p>Postdoctoral fellows and graduate fellows participate in instructional design and curriculum development. Members of the TLL work closely with Gutman Library, Programs in Professional Education (PPE), the Harvard Education Publishing Group (HEPG), and the Usable Knowledge project to provide services to faculty members and programs through the full life cycle of needs analysis, design, production, and delivery.</p>			

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Indiana University – Bloomington</p> <p>Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://citl.indiana.edu</p>	<p>Program assessment; course development; course observation; course review; digital/online support</p>	<p>over 10 staff-A partnership between the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and University Information Technology Services; departmental workshops; program for doc students etc.</p>	<p>awards; grants</p>	<p>learning communities</p>	<p>this is a partnership btw provost and university IT</p>
<p>Johns Hopkins University</p> <p>Center for Teaching Excellence and Innovation</p>	<p>https://cte.jhu.edu</p>	<p>Teaching Academy (A professional development program for graduate students and post-doctoral fellows that prepares future faculty for teaching), Workshops, Faculty Lunch & Learns, Grants to support pedagogy, Faculty classroom exchanges, Blog, Print article series, equipment loaning, support with instructional tools and technology</p>	<p>Associate Dean and Director, two Associate Directors, Senior Instructional Technologist, Senior Instructional Designer, Pedagogy and Curriculum Design Specialist, Teacher Support Specialist, Digital Solutions Designer, Blended Learning Consultant, Project Manager, Program Coordinator/Administrative Manager</p>	<p>Instructional Enhancement Grant Program; The Instructional Enhancement Grant Program is a mini-grant initiative that enables faculty to partner with technology savvy students to develop resources that enhance pedagogy, increase or facilitate access to course content, encourage active learning, promote critical thinking, or support student collaboration</p>	<p>Instructional Enhancement Grant Program, Teaching Academy, CTEI grants, Faculty Exchanges</p>	<p>Unclear</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Michigan State University</p> <p>Center for Teaching and Learning Innovation</p>	<p>https://teachingcenter.msu.edu</p>	<p>consultation; curriculum and course design; OPM/academic entrepreneurship</p>	<p>9 staff--looks like director who reports up through provost</p>	<p>Grants</p>		<p>Unclear</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Northwestern University</p> <p>Searle Center for Advancing Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://www.northwestern.edu/searle/</p>	<p>one-on-one consultations about teaching, classroom observations, feedback on teaching; workshops and other department programming; Excellence in Teaching Alliance working group (seems like an FLC)</p>	<p>Faculty Advisory Board, Director, Senior Associate Director, Associate Director, Inclusive Learning Communities, Assistant Director of Equitable Assessment, Assistant Director of Foundations in Learning & Teaching, Assistant Director, Interdisciplinary Connections, Assistant Director of Engaged Learning and Strategic Initiatives, Assessment Assistant, Project Administrator, Inclusive Teaching, Program Coordinator, Center Manager</p>	<p>year-long Searle Fellows program (the center's flagship faculty development program)</p>	<p>Searle Fellows program; Excellence in Teaching Alliance working group (seems like an FLC); University-wide Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Forum (LTAF) sponsored by the Office of the Provost, in collaboration with the University Assessment/Accreditation Council; new faculty workshop at start of AY</p>	<p>Unclear</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>NYU Center for Faculty Advancement</p>	<p>https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/teaching-and-learning-resources/faculty-advancement.html</p>	<p>Support for faculty over the lifecycle of one's academic career/ It is NYU's team from the Provost that supports teaching innovations and excellence. They offer consultations, observations and teachtalks & workshops.</p>	<p>Center for Faculty Advancement under the Vice Provost for Faculty Development</p>	<p>Program, Networks, Early Career Faculty Institute, Faculty Cluster, etc.</p>	<p>Pathway Programs that foster continued support and development for students traversing their academic career and the iTLAB for using extended and virtual realities technologies in the classroom.</p>	<p>For the entire NYU community</p>
<p>NYU Steinhardt Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/departments/teaching-and-learning</p>	<p>This is a department in Steinhardt that provides specific certificates in teaching,</p>	<p>Full faculty and staff and research area</p>	<p>Did not see any unless someone wants to get the specific certificate</p>	<p>Cannot tell</p>	<p>It is part of the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development</p>
<p>Penn State Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence</p>	<p>http://www.schreyer-institute.psu.edu</p>	<p>Individual and Dept. consultations. Course design and planning, teaching and assessment strategies, course evaluation, evaluation for educational grants</p>		<p>Internal Grants, External Grant Support, Teaching Awards</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>?</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Princeton University The McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://mcgraw.princeton.edu</p>	<p>written resources, models, consultation, funding, provides highly equipped teaching labs, resources and guidance on all aspects of course design, confidential individual consultations and teaching assessments, group-based sessions and workshops, teaching-related program evaluations and scholarship on teaching.</p>	<p>Directors, assistant and associate directors, coordinators</p>	<p>Internal grants for innovations, digital teaching, inclusive teaching</p>	<p>Room Research, Inclusive and Equitable Teaching</p>	<p>Office of the Dean of the College</p>
<p>Purdue Center for Instructional Excellence</p>	<p>https://www.purdue.edu/cie/</p>	<p>advances and promotes transformative, evidence-based instruction for academic success at Purdue and beyond.</p>	<p>Director, Assoc Director, PostDocs, Staff</p>	<p>Teaching Awards, Scholarship, Teaching Resources, Global Learning,</p>	<p>Sloan Equity and Inclusion in STEM Introductory Courses (SEISMIC)</p>	<p>Under the direction of the Office of the Provost</p>
<p>Yale University Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://poorvucenter.yale.edu</p>	<p>Support faculty teaching, helps students learn, advise teaching fellows, explain educational technology</p>	<p>Executive Director (x2), Vice Pres and provost for Global Strategy</p>			

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>The Ohio State University</p> <p>Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://drakeinstitute.osu.edu</p>	<p>Instruction, research, Instructional Redesign Teaching Endorsements New Faculty FIT Program Curriculum Design Course Design Institute Consultations Using Feedback to Improve Teaching</p> <p>Research and Implementation Grant Program SoTL and DBER Learning Community SoTL/DBER Conferences at OSU</p>	<p>Directors, Staff</p>	<p>Teaching and Research Grants,</p>		<p>?</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>University of Illinois Center for Innovation in Teaching & Learning</p>	<p>https://citl.illinois.edu</p>	<p>CITL assists faculty who are teaching in all modalities. This collection of short articles covers topics ranging from effective teaching and course design strategies to tips for increasing engagement, thinking creatively about assessment, and supporting student learning. Provide teachers and students with all the supports needed for teaching and learning</p>	<p>Director reports to Provost. 80 people; faculty and full range of support staff</p>	<p>Not clear</p>	<p>Undetermined. However, the following are featured: Data Analytics; Instructional Spaces & Technology</p>	<p>Works across disciplines, ranks, schools, departments colleges, faculty staff, students</p>
<p>University of Iowa Office of Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology</p>	<p>https://teach.its.uiowa.edu/organizations/center-teaching</p>	<p>advocate for effective, evidence-based, reflective teaching, a leader in faculty professional development, and a collaborative partner in sparking and shaping conversations about higher education on campus and beyond.</p>	<p>27 people. Director, technical people, Instructional technicians</p>	<p>Unclear</p>	<p>Data Analytics; Instructional Spaces & Technology. 4CAST The Campus Academic Strategies and Technology Conference (4CAST), connects UI instructors across disciplinary boundaries to discuss trending technologies in higher education.</p>	<p>Works across disciplines, schools, and programs. Available to university constituents</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>University of Maryland</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Transformation Center</p>	<p>https://tltc.umd.edu</p>	<p>graduate orientation to teaching, graduate teaching and learning program, teaching resources, workshops, learning communities, feedback on teaching, technological support, consultations, assessing teaching portfolios, teaching resources</p>	<p>Assistant Vice President for Academic Technology and Innovation, Associate Director of Learning Experience, Director of Research, Assistant Director of Faculty Programs, Senior Faculty Specialist, Assistant Vice President for Academic Technology and Innovation, Collaborative Learning Coordinator, Senior Education Development Specialist, two Learning Experience Designers, Administrative Assistant</p>	<p>teaching and learning grants</p>	<p>graduate orientation to teaching, graduate teaching and learning program, teaching resources, workshops, learning communities, feedback on teaching, technological support, consultations, assessing teaching portfolios, teaching resources</p>	<p>unclear</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</p> <p>Center for Research on Teaching & Learning</p>	<p>https://crlt.umich.edu</p>	<p>Grants for teaching, Seminars, Workshops, New Faculty orientation, New Faculty teaching academies, consultations, Faculty Mentoring, Transforming Large Foundational Courses, Customized Workshops and Retreats, Leadership Training, Training, Assessment and Evaluation; plus Resources</p>	<p>Faculty Advisory Board; Senior Leadership Team: Executive Director, Artistic Director of the CRLT Theatre Program, Director of the Foundational Course Initiative, Chief of Staff and Director of Operations and Events, Business Administrator, Managing Director for Educational Development and Assessment Services, Director of Center for Research on Learning and Teaching in Engineering Consulting and Assessment Staff: Managing Director for Educational Development and Assessment Services, Associate Director, Assistant Director with Focus on Biological, Physical, and Health Sciences, Associate Director with Focus on</p>	<p>Teaching Awards; Provost's Teaching Innovation Award; Grants for Teaching: Instructional Development Fund, Lecturers' Professional Development Fund, Faculty Development Fund, Fund for the Improvement of Teaching (\$500-up to \$10,000)</p>		<p>unclear</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
			Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and Interim Coordinator of DEI Initiatives, two Associate Directors, two Assistant Directors, Assessment Specialist, Instructional Consultant, Instructional Consultant: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Associate Director and Director of CRLT China Programs Project, Event, & Administrative Staff (N=9) CRLT Players Theatre Program Team (N=3) CRLT in Engineering Team (N=8) Foundational Course Initiative (N=12)			

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>University of Minnesota Center for Educational Innovation</p>	<p>https://cei.umn.edu</p>	<p>course and program design; partner for research on SoTL; robust instructional design, digital pedagogy; student evaluation; trainings</p>	<p>Provost office--large staff, co-directors,</p>	<p>Fellows programs</p>		<p>Available across the system/campuses; liaisons assigned to each unit/dept</p>
<p>University of Nebraska – Lincoln Center for Transformative Teaching</p>	<p>https://teaching.unl.edu</p>	<p>Consultation for curricular design and assessment; inclusive pedagogy; conference; ongoing training; peer review of teaching and portfolio development; learning communities; ID</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>fellowships; seed grants</p>	<p>Portfolio development and peer course review</p>	<p>Ids are assigned to each school</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>University of Pennsylvania</p> <p>Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://wwwctl.upenn.edu</p>	<p>specific initiatives to improve teaching, including encouraging structured active learning, inclusive and equitable teaching, and using technology effectively in teaching; both individual consultations and group discussions among instructors; partners with schools and departments to provide programs relevant for their instructors and their specific teaching contexts.</p>	<p>director and associate directors</p>	<p>community service grants, course enrichment grants, grants for arts innovation; teaching awards; teaching showcase site</p>	<p>a large number of programs, perhaps not identified as signature</p>	<p>unclear</p>
<p>University of Pittsburgh</p> <p>University Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://teaching.pitt.edu</p>	<p>training and workshops as well as certificate programs ranging from canvas training to EDI, on line course and technology development and teaching assessment, as well as faculty learning communities and consultations,</p>	<p>Team/staff of 64 with various focuses. Interim Executive director, Michael Bridges</p>	<p>None listed</p>	<p>diversity institute, New TA orientation,</p>	

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>University of Wisconsin – Madison</p> <p>Center for Teaching, Learning, & Mentoring</p>	<p>https://ctlm.wisc.edu</p>	<p>presentations, courses, self-guided resources, searchable database, models, workshops, special events, newsletter, quick response</p>	<p>Director, Associate Directors, Instructional Designers, Teaching & Learning Specialists</p>	<p>\$5k to support community-based learning</p>	<p>Create media, design a course, deepen your skills, explore active learning classrooms, get one-on-one support, partner</p>	<p>Division for Teaching & Learning</p>
<p>Virginia Tech</p> <p>Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://teaching.vt.edu/</p>	<p>ALOT... Programs: Book Clubs, Dridge Experience Program, Project-Based Learning, Teaching Certificates, Workshops; Services: Mid-Sem. Feedback, One-on-One Consulting, Program Consulting, Teaching Observations, Teaching Philosophy Statements; Grants & Awards: many...Teaching as Research: Conference of Hi. Ed. Pedagogy; Program-level Focus Group Facilitation; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Support; Conferences; Grants and Awards, Etc.</p>	<p>Directors, Staff, Grad Assistant</p>	<p>Many Grants and Awards: Academy of Teaching, Diggs Teaching Scholars, Exemplary Department Award, Excellence in Teaching Awards. Faculty Teaching Group Grants; Instructional Grants; Teaching Scholar Award for Large Class Teaching; Teaching Scholar Award for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; Teaching Scholar Award for Project-Based Learning;</p>		<p>UNDER Undergraduate Academic Affairs</p>

Appendix D: Teaching and Learning Centers at Peer Institutions

Name	Website	Services	Staffing	Incentives	Signature Programs	Relationship to Units
<p>Yale University</p> <p>Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>https://poorvucenter.yale.edu</p>	<p>Support faculty teaching, helps students learn, advise teaching fellows, explain educational technology</p>	<p>Executive Director (x2), Vice Pres and provost for Global Strategy</p>			

Appendix E: ACE-POD Matrix

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The organizational structure of the teaching and learning center (Center, or CTL) reveals institutional commitment to educational development, teaching, and student learning.

	BEGINNING/DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT/FUNCTIONING	ACCOMPLISHED/EXEMPLARY
MISSION, VISION, AND GOALS	Center is crafting a mission, vision, and goals, and it is making a first attempt at aligning with campus priorities. CTL is in the process of writing a strategic plan. Center does not yet have an assessment plan and procedures for documenting and measuring effectiveness.	Center has an articulated mission, vision, and goals, but goals may need to be better aligned with institutional mission and connected to campus priorities. Center has a strategic plan and initial process for documenting and measuring effectiveness.	Center has an articulated mission that is connected to its institution's strategic plan and priorities, key goals that align with mission, activities that enable the Center to reach these goals, and a comprehensive evaluation plan.
LEADERSHIP	Center leadership role is emerging for institutional type, e.g., part-time director, minimal release time for small college director, new in position. Center is researching and identifying qualifications, experience, and competencies for a faculty developer position, and makes evident the incumbent should demonstrate a commitment to diversity and inclusion.	Center leadership role is appropriate for institutional type, e.g., full-time director or release time for small college director; there is low turnover (average term of service at least three years). Initial qualities for a leadership position are developed. This includes a concerted effort and commitment to diversity and inclusion when considering candidates with the requisite qualifications, experience, and competencies aligned with the position. There is a concerted effort to reduce staff turnover.	Center leadership role is appropriate for institutional type, e.g., full-time, mid- to high-level unit leader. There is a very clear commitment to equity-minded leadership when considering qualifications, experience, and competencies. There is a low rate of turnover. If director appointment is temporary and rotating, term is long enough for achievement of goals. Director is consulted on plans and included on key committees involving teaching improvement and student success.
STAFF EXPERTISE AND PREPARATION	Director/staff may be recognized for teaching excellence. Director/staff may be new to academic leadership and/or educational development.	Director has some experience managing an academic center or program. Director/staff have some background or experience that directly impacts educational development or student learning.	Director has considerable management and supervisory experience in higher education administration (including in a CTL context). Director/staff have substantial educational training or documented work experience in educational development and student learning. Director/staff engage in ongoing professional development.
INSTITUTIONAL PLACEMENT	A formal center and/or an individual charged with responsibility for educational development is emergent.	A formal center and/or an individual charged with responsibility for educational development has been identified. Center is one of several campus units that support instructors; director has implicit (unwritten) access to chief academic officers; director may report to a unit outside of central academic administration.	Center is the principal educational development unit on campus. Director has a direct reporting line to a chief academic officer and explicit access to central academic administrators, e.g., provost, dean.
COLLABORATIONS	Center is in initial stages of identifying mission-aligned collaborations or mergers.	Center is cultivating mission-aligned collaborations or mergers (instructional technology unit is a common partner but CTL may network with other units). Services across units need better coordination or integration. CTL director/staff have limited influence on selection of instructional technologies, learning spaces, and resources that support teaching and learning.	Center works extensively with mission-aligned collaborating units or departments to provide coordinated, integrated, or embedded services. (Common partners include instructional technology unit, departments/colleges, and/or library. Other partner units may include student academic support, assessment, writing, diversity and inclusion, community service learning, or graduate school.) CTL may co-locate, integrate, or closely collaborate with other units, e.g., instructional technology. CTL director/staff are involved in decisions that influence selection of instructional technologies/learning spaces/resources that support teaching and learning.
OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND ARCHIVES	Center is developing guidelines for organization's operation and creating mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (e.g., records of programming, assessment activities).	Center has some guidelines for organizational operation; mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming, assessment activities) are in place. Records may be in paper or digital format.	Center has robust guidelines and procedures for organizational operation. Mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming, assessment activities) are in place and chart impact over time. Records are digitally organized, archived, and regularly updated.

Appendix E: ACE-POD Matrix

RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The degree to which an institution funds and locates teaching development, and the ways in which a CTL designs programming for the campus, indicates its centrality. Depending upon institutional mission, size, and Carnegie classification, some of these elements (like staffing) may be aspirational, or outside of Center scope.

	BEGINNING/DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT/FUNCTIONING	ACCOMPLISHED/EXEMPLARY
BUDGET	Funding for the Center is largely in the form of support for specific events or programs.	Center has appropriate institutional budget, although it may fluctuate from year to year. Budget may encompass both programming and personnel costs, although personnel may be part of central administration budget. Funds are available to support the professional development of some Center staff. Budget may be supplemented by cost-sharing with other units, one-time campus allocations, or external grants.	Center budget is funded proportional to campus mission, vision, and strategic direction. Budget absorbs rates of fluctuation from year to year and allows for long-term planning, staffing, and growth. Budget encompasses programming, personnel costs, services (e.g., food, outside speakers), and supplies. Funds are available to support the professional development of all Center staff. Budget is supplemented by cost-sharing with other units or one-time campus allocations. Budget is sufficient without external sources of funds but CTL may hold a gift fund, secure external grants, or partner on grants.
LOCATION & SPACE	Center utilizes space that may be shared among multiple institutional units. Center staff may be housed in a location separate from where programming and services are offered.	The Center has dedicated space and can be located without difficulty. There is adequate office space for staff; access to a classroom, lab, and spaces for meetings, programs, and events. Center space is inviting and adequately resourced but design may not meet current demand/need and/or reflect pedagogical principles and practices.	CTL is in a location that is easily found and accessible, with ample office space for staff. May include a workspace for instructors. CTL has dedicated classroom, lab, and meeting/event space. Center space is welcoming, engaging, and resource rich. CTL features new spaces or repurposes existing space configured with technology. Pedagogical principles and practices drive space design, including educational technology implementation.
STAFFING	CTL may be led by a faculty committee (some with release/reassigned time) or by an individual administrator, faculty or staff member who may be less than full time. The committee/individual charged with leading the CTL is beginning to develop a background in the field of faculty/educational development. CTL struggles to meet requests.	CTL has an individual charged with supporting educational development. Center staff includes a director, although may be less than full-time. Staffing is relatively lean. At least one member of the CTL staff has a background in the field of educational development. Requests from faculty may exceed the staff's capacity.	Center has a dedicated staff that includes a full-time director who may also hold other titles. Staffing is substantial and may include a program coordinator, associate or assistant director, instructional/technology consultant, faculty associate, postdoc, graduate student or undergraduate assistant, full- or part-time. Multiple members of CTL staff have backgrounds in educational development. Staff is able to meet most or all requests for services and is sufficient to meet operational needs (e.g., publicity, archiving).
ONLINE RESOURCES	Center's website is in development or is established with basic information about Center's location, contact information, and schedule of events. Center staff are considering how/whether to provide instructional resources online.	Center may extend its reach via web pages that are current and easily navigable; some instructional resources and program materials may be available online.	Center significantly extends its reach via a dynamic online presence. Web pages are current and easily navigable. Instructional resources and program materials are online and may include asynchronous programming (webinars), electronic newsletters, blogs, and links to other print and visual materials.
COMMUNICATION & REPUTATION	Center staff is developing a marketing plan. Communication is largely event-based and is accomplished through flyers, word of mouth, and emails. CTL is developing a needs assessment to better understand the diverse interests of faculty across departments, career stages, and appointment types.	Regular communication is offered to the campus (e.g., via email, newsletter, or social media). CTL is beginning to develop a reputation for providing programs responsive to instructor/constituencies' needs. Some departments/appointment types may be overrepresented in attendance, while others may be underrepresented. Programming may be perceived as for certain departments/appointment types only, e.g., humanities, tenure-track faculty.	CTL provides proactive and timely outreach via email, newsletters, social media engagement, and "on the road" events. Center has strong reputation for programs highly responsive to identified needs and increases awareness on campus through promotional materials. Programming is well attended and perceived as open and available to all.

Appendix E: ACE-POD Matrix

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Teaching and learning centers develop evidence-based, mission-dependent programming based upon instructor, student, and campus need. While the domains below may be context-specific, relationships and community remain key indicators of Center viability.

	BEGINNING/DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT/FUNCTIONING	ACCOMPLISHED/EXEMPLARY
SCOPE	Programs and services are responsive to the expressed needs of some CTL constituencies but are not fully aligned with Center mission and goals. Programs are limited in variety and ability to scale.	Programs and services are responsive to expressed needs of many/all CTL constituencies and are aligned with mission and goals. Programming may not be scalable, or largely targets a particular career stage, appointment type, or disciplinary area.	Programs and services are responsive to and advance needs and initiatives as defined by the institution, are aligned with CTL mission and goals, and are grounded in literature on teaching, learning, and educational development. A diverse array of programs is designed to reach broad campus constituencies.
TARGET AUDIENCE	Center programs and services target individual instructors, including those with contingent appointments, post-doctoral fellows, or graduate students (as applicable for the institution).	Plus: Center programs and services target cohorts that represent instructors at similar career milestones (e.g., new faculty), roles (e.g., non-tenure-track faculty), common interests or responsibilities (e.g., teaching crucial gateway courses, or teaching multicultural content), or those from the same academic department or program.	Plus: Center collaborates with other centers, or disseminates to a wider audience beyond the institution, through online resources, programs, and scholarly communications (e.g., presentations and publications).
CONTENT	CTL programs address course design, topics in teaching effectiveness, and/or use of specific technologies.	Plus: CTL programs address curriculum and learner-centered design that is inclusive of all students, motivating and effective learning activities and assignments for culturally diverse classrooms, and fair and equitable assessment.	Plus: CTL offers a programmatic approach that provides a continuous professional development model for instructors as learners, offering targeted, motivating and inclusive instruction that supports faculty growth. Programming addresses a strategic campus need, e.g., increasing graduation rates among all student groups, developing faculty leadership.
APPROACH	CTL programs and services disseminate content related to teaching and support implementation mainly through one-time workshops, individual consultations, and self-help resources (e.g., online). Center may rely heavily on outsourced programming sources.	Plus: Center offers an array of original programs (e.g., individual consultation with feedback, discipline-specific/customized workshops or seminars in a series, communities of practice, institutes/retreats) that disseminate content related to teaching and strongly support implementation.	Plus: Center offers longitudinal programming designed according to principles of adult learning. Center offers an array of original programs and curricular opportunities (e.g., courses, certificates) that disseminate content related to a range of educational development needs. CTL strongly supports implementation and encourages reflective practice (e.g., retreats, grants to support scholarly approaches to teaching and learning, curriculum projects, conference travel).
REACH ¹	Depending upon campus mission and size, CTL reaches a small fraction of instructors. Participation is not representative of appointment types, career stages, departments/colleges. CTL thinks strategically about how to incentivize participation, e.g., how to reach faculty with part-time or contingent appointments for whom developmental activities are not included as part of regular faculty work.	CTL reach is growing. Participation is somewhat representative of appointment types, career stages, departments/colleges. Center is able to offer modest incentives to select constituencies to encourage and recognize engagement in CTL initiatives.	Depending upon campus size and mission, CTL reaches a critical mass of instructors. Participation is strategically distributed across appointment types, career stages, and departments/colleges to serve critical institutional initiatives. Incentives for instructors, especially those for whom developmental activities are not part of their regular workload, might include stipends to offset additional time commitments, paid course release time, conference registrations, or leadership opportunities to impact teaching culture, policies, and procedures.
IMPACT	Center collects data on the numbers of participants using services and self-reports of program value, usefulness, and satisfaction. Data are used for planning, resource allocation, and to inform and enhance programs and services.	Plus: Center collects evidence of program outcomes, which may include measurements of the impact on participants' teaching beliefs/attitudes, implementation of teaching practices, adoption of reflective strategies, and direct/indirect diffusion of effective practice. Center uses this evidence to improve program design.	Plus: Center collects evidence of program outcomes on student learning and/or institutional culture of teaching. Center engages in the scholarship of educational development that can inform and enhance the CTL's programs and services through presentations and publications.