Activity #2: General Faculty Development

While Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) are a powerful vehicle for faculty development, it is not realistic to expect all faculty members to participate in them; even Miami University of Ohio, with one of the most well-developed FLC initiatives in the nation, reports reaching only one third of its faculty through learning communities. Clearly, besides FLCs, the UIW QEP will also need to include faculty development events of shorter duration and intensity.

To meet this need, the university's Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) will include three workshops on some aspect of writing pedagogy in its offerings each semester. These workshops are typically one to two hours in length. In planning workshops for the initial year, CTL will draw primarily upon previous internal survey results that suggest faculty's most important concerns in this area are supporting a diverse student body in writing texts that are clear, well-organized, and mindful of the conventions of edited standard written English. In addition, the QEP outcomes of increasing the amount of writing and multi-draft writing that students complete suggest workshops dealing with minimal marking, using peer workshops, and employing rubrics.

Working with campus partners is also important in offering effective faculty development. While the Writing and Learning Center (WLC) and CTL jointly sponsor these workshops, they will also draw upon other campus resources. For example, FYC faculty members who have recently received certification in ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teaching methods have offered to lead two workshops, and the staff in Instructional Technology will assist in other workshops. The list of Sample Workshops (Appendix 9) draws upon all of these resources. The list, which includes the titles of 12 workshops and the major learning outcomes for each, represents a starting point for planning workshops in writing instruction for the general faculty. At the roll-out presentation of the QEP in January, 2015, faculty will be asked to identify the three workshops they find most interesting; this information will also be used to plan workshops for the general faculty during the first-year of the project.

CTL will work with a QEP advisory board to plan workshops dealing with writing instruction. This board will include QEP implementation team members, an academic librarian and a member of the EAP faculty, and ultimately faculty alumni of WA. The general faculty development efforts also must address the needs of part-time faculty quite deliberately. This will be accomplished in several ways: by expanding the range of times at which face-to-face workshops are offered, by working with UIW's instructional technology office to offer online instructional modules, and by working with EAP administrators to embed within their existing faculty development days "mini-workshops" in aspects of writing instruction.

CTL workshops on writing instruction will be assessed in two ways. A few days after each workshop, participants will receive a short on-line survey with these components:

- two items for rating general satisfaction with the session,
- three or four items for rating their mastery of the workshop's learning objectives,
- one item for rating their likeliness to apply something learned in the session, and
- a space for comments.

The results from these surveys will allow CTL to adjust the content or delivery of specific future workshops as needed. Participants in the workshops on writing instruction will be surveyed again at the end of the semester. Regardless of the specific workshop(s) attended, faculty will be asked to reflect on their classroom practices regarding writing, in particular, practices that have a direct bearing on the QEP outcomes of including the amount and quality of student writing as well as the amount of multi-draft writing students produce. Participants will be asked to rate their agreement with these statements:

- I assigned more writing than I have in the past.
- I made at least one writing assignment that included multiple drafts.
- My students received at least one type of feedback before their work was graded.
- My students appeared to use the feedback in revising their work.