



ANALYSIS OF CUNY CENTERS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

**Office of Academic Affairs
Karrin Wilks, University Dean for Undergraduate Studies
City University of New York**

June 15, 2011

This report was prepared with generous assistance from the CTL directors and their counterparts who provided extensive information about faculty development at CUNY and contributed to the findings and recommendations presented here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Overview of Centers.....	3
II.	Design and Delivery of CTL Offerings.....	6
III.	Assessing the Impact of CTL's and Faculty Development.....	14
IV.	Recommendations.....	16
V.	References.....	19
VI.	Appendices	
	Appendix 1: Outline of CTL Survey.....	22
	Appendix 2: CTL Survey Respondents.....	23
	Appendix 3: CTL Mission Statements.....	24
	Appendix 4: CTL Professional Development Offerings.....	27

I. Introduction and Overview of Centers

This report provides an overview of operations at CUNY colleges' Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL's), an analysis of different models of faculty development based on related literature and research, and recommendations to improve the assessment and impact of the Centers. Although CTL's are the focus of this report, a rich array of professional development activities affecting large numbers of faculty take place on campuses that do not host CTL's or take place through departments outside existing CTL's; such faculty development is beyond the scope of this report.

The overview of operations and descriptions of delivery models are based on a comprehensive survey conducted in February 2011 (see Appendix 1 for an outline of the survey). Surveys were completed by CTL Directors or other appropriate representatives from all seventeen CUNY colleges offering undergraduate education (see Appendix 2 for a list of survey respondents). Detailed information was collected about each CTL's approach to faculty development, including how offerings are designed, delivered and evaluated.

Faculty development models across the country vary according to institutional priorities, size, resources and culture. Wright (2002) described four structural variations: 1) models in which faculty development is part of another academic department or particular office; 2) single, comprehensive, campus-wide centers; 3) special purpose centers that focus narrowly, for example, on teaching/ learning technologies; and 4) multi-campus centers serving systems or consortia of colleges (p. 26). Founded in 1962, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan was the first CTL in the country and offers comprehensive services for faculty; graduate and post-doctoral students; and deans, chairs and departments (see www.crlt.umich.edu). The California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning offers a prototype for the multi-campus model, connecting centers for teaching and learning at each campus and creating networks of faculty from across the system (see www.calstate.edu/itl). Comprehensive, campus-wide CTL's exist in over twenty percent of U.S. colleges and universities, and are more likely to occur in mid-size to large institutions. (Kuhenschmidt, 2011).

CUNY CTL's are in various stages of development, and operate with diverse staffing and budget models. The majority of CUNY CTL's are fully functioning units, a few are in early stages of development or undergoing transformation, and three CUNY colleges currently do not have CTL's. In these three colleges (Baruch, Hunter and Medgar Evers), faculty development is not centralized but offered through various departments and offices. About half of the CTL's have a full-time director; six of the current directors are faculty members. Directors report to various senior positions in Academic Affairs.

CTL expenditures and revenue sources vary widely across the colleges, from operational budgets well under \$50,000 (in at least one case \$0 OTPS) to relatively large institutional investments, particularly at LaGuardia and Queens. In both these cases, grants and other external sources contribute significantly to overall resources. Six colleges allocate some portion of their CUE funding to CTL's. Approximately \$690,000 or 6.3% of CUE funds CUNY-wide were allocated to faculty development in 2009-2010, although not all of these funds supported CTL's (in some cases, funding supported faculty development in particular programs or departments).

Not surprisingly given marked differences in resource allocation, staffing models vary widely as well. The following table provides an overview of the CTL status, staffing model and revenue sources at each CUNY college as reported for 2010-2011. Staffing models tend to be fluid, adapting over time to changing needs and resources. Note also the variation in naming conventions (CETL: Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning; CAT: Center for the Advancement of Teaching; CTE: Center for Teaching Excellence; TLC: Teaching Learning Center; and as indicated).

CTL Operations Overview

<i>college /name</i>	<i>CTL status</i>	<i>staffing*</i>	<i>revenue sources+</i>
BMCC TLC	active	FT Director (admin) reports to Dean, Acad Aff additional staff: none	college
Bronx CTE	active	PT Director (faculty)* reports to Senior VP, Acad Aff staff: 2 PT	college, grants
Hostos CTL	active	PT Director (faculty- vacant) staff: 2 FT, 1 PT	college, CUE

Kingsborough CTL	active	PT Director (faculty)* reports to Associate Provost staff: 1 PT	college, CUE
LaGuardia CTL	active	FT Director (admin) reports to VP, Acad Aff staff: 23 FT, 7 PT	college, CUE, grants
Queensborough CETL	active	FT Director (admin) reports to Asst Dean, Acad Aff staff: 2 PT	college
Baruch	no center		
Brooklyn Center for Teaching	active	PT Director (faculty)* reports to Associate Provost staff: 1 PT	college
City CETL	active	FT Director (admin) reports to Interim Provost staff: 1 FT, 4 PT	college, CUE, grants
City Tech Faculty Commons	active	FT Director (admin) reports to Dean of Instruction staff: 8+ PT	college, CUE
CSI Center	early stages	PT Director (faculty)* reports to Associate Provost staff: 1 FT	college, grants
Hunter	no center		
John Jay CAT	active	FT Director (admin) reports to Associate Provost additional staff: none	college
Lehman Teaching and Learning Commons	early stages	PT Director (admin)* reports to Associate Provost additional staff: none	college, grants
Medgar Evers	no center		
Queens CTL	active	PT Director (faculty)* reports to Provost staff: 4 PT	college, CUE, grants, donors
York CETL	active	PT Director (faculty)* reports to Provost additional staff: none	college, grants

* FT: full-time, PT: part-time; *in all cases, PT Directors have other college responsibilities that result in a FT position*; faculty receive 25-50% reassigned time for directing Centers; the job responsibilities of additional staff vary widely by college; some additional staff are students and/or recent graduates + grants can include funds from multiple sources (e.g., federal, foundation, CUNY)

Another aspect of institutional support for CTL's is the space available for staff and activities, and the extent to which location and facilities provide access to services as well as a visible presence on campus. At some colleges, the CTL has sufficient staff

offices, meeting and classroom space, and adequate access to computer labs. At other colleges, the CTL has limited or no access to such facilities. Some CTL's are intentionally co-located with other departments, for example, with the E-Learning Center at BMCC and with General Education at Queens. While not co-located, City College offers workshops presented by other departments, including institutional research, student affairs and assessment. At Bronx, the freshman learning community program is housed within the CTL, which serves as a laboratory for faculty collaboration and experimentation. City Tech's CTL is envisioned as a one-stop resource center for faculty services, co-locating institutional research and assessment, general education, grants support and professional development. Co-locating or partnering with other critical institutional functions expands the scope of CTL services to support broad strategic goals and priorities, and can establish the CTL as central to organizational change (Baron, 2006; Latta, 2009; Schroeder, 2011).

II. Design and Delivery of CTL Offerings

While there is much operational variation across CUNY CTL's, the collective mission statements convey a common purpose to promote what Lehman terms "excellence and innovation in teaching and learning" particularly through collaboration among faculty "across disciplines and departments" as stated by Kingsborough (see Appendix 3 for a complete list of CTL mission statements). This reflects a national shift over the past several decades from viewing faculty development primarily in terms of support for individuals' discipline-based scholarship to focusing on pedagogy, curriculum and student outcomes for targeted groups of faculty (Ouellett, 2010; Schroeder, 2011).

Sorcinelli (2002) proposed ten principles of good practice in creating and sustaining faculty development centers, the common thread among them being an emphasis on faculty ownership of and involvement in all aspects of the CTL. At CUNY, twelve of fourteen CTL's have faculty advisory committees, ranging in size from six to twenty-six and with assorted means of determining membership. At Brooklyn, members are elected. At Hostos, appointments are made by the Provost. At Queens, the Senate's Committee on Teaching Excellence and Evaluation serves as the CTL advisory. In most cases, advisory members are volunteers. BMCC, Bronx, Hostos, Kingsborough, and City

Tech have structures that provide representation from all departments or disciplines.

Faculty advisories play a key role in determining who designs and delivers CTL offerings, thus in who participates in the offerings as well. The following table provides an overview of the professional development design and delivery approach of each CTL as reported for fall 2010.

CTL Professional Development Design and Delivery

<i>college</i>	<i>who designs*</i>	<i>who delivers*</i>	<i>who participates+</i>
BMCC	F: 100%	F: 70% S: 20% C:10%	80% FTF 10% ADJ 10% S
Bronx	F: 95% S: 4% C: 1%	F: 95% S: 4% C: 1%	90% FTF 10% ADJ
Brooklyn	S: 50% C: 50%	F: 60% S: 40%	90% FTF 10% ADJ
City	F: 10% S: 90%	F: 10% S: 90%	45% FTF 35% ADJ 25% S
Hostos	F: 90% S: 10%	F: 95% C: 5%	90% FTF 10% S
John Jay	S: 100%	S: 100%	50% FTF 50% ADJ
Kingsborough	F: 40% S: 50% C: 10%	F: 80% S: 10% C: 10%	70% FTF 30% ADJ
LaGuardia	F/S teams: 100%	F/S teams: 100%	60% FTF 20% ADJ 20% S
Lehman	F: 20% S: 80%	F: 20% S: 80%	80% FTF 20% ADJ
NYCCT	F: 40% S: 50% C: 10%	F: 30% S: 60% C: 10%	80% FTF 10% ADJ 10% S
Queens	F: 30% S: 70%	F: 30% S: 60% C: 10%	60% FTF 30% ADJ 10% S
Queensborough	F: 50% S: 50%	F: 50% S: 40% C: 10%	60% FTF 20% ADJ 20% S

Staten Island	F: 70% S: 30%	F: 30% S: 70%	50% FTF 50% ADJ
York	F: 90% S: 10%	F: 90% S: 10%	80% FTF 10% ADJ 10% S

* percentages of all offerings: F= faculty, S= CTL/ college staff, C= consultants/ others
+ percentages of total participation: FTF= full-time faculty, ADJ= adjunct faculty, S= staff

In 2010-2011, CTL’s CUNY-wide served approximately 2500 full-time faculty, 850 adjunct faculty and 650 staff. Across CTL’s, the majority of participants were full-time faculty. This poses a challenge given the critical role of adjunct faculty in improving student learning outcomes overall and particularly in developmental and introductory courses. There is broad recognition nationally of the need to fully integrate adjunct faculty into professional and organizational development (see Nuhfer, Blodgett, Fleisher and Griffin, 2010). Such integration also is an expectation of regional accrediting agencies. For Middle States, “The greater the dependence on [adjunct faculty], the greater is the institutional responsibility to provide orientation, oversight, evaluation, professional development, and opportunities for integration into the life of the institution” (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, p. 38).

Most CUNY CTL’s report efforts to increase offerings for and participation by adjunct faculty. As indicated in the table below, half of the CTL’s already provide special orientation sessions for adjuncts. Also reflected below are the variations in how CTL offerings are structured. The following table provides an overview of the delivery models employed by the colleges, ranging from stand-alone workshops to year-long project-based activities. Notable given CUNY’s focus on increasing the role of technology in teaching and learning is that few of the offerings are delivered online. Of the fourteen CTL’s, five reported delivering 100% of offerings face-to-face, and another six delivered over 90% of offerings face-to-face. Only CSI delivered more than 20% of CTL offerings online.

CTL Delivery Models: 2010-2011

	BMCC	Bronx	Bklyn	City	Hostos	John Jay	KBCC	LGCC	Lehman	NYCCT	Queens	QBCC	CSI	York
Stand-alone workshops/seminars	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Programs that require semester-long commitment of participants	X	X		X				X	X			X	X	X
Programs that require year-long commitment of participants		X	X	X	X			X			X	X	X	X
Discussion groups	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Special sessions for adjunct faculty		X	X		X	X				X	X	X		
Orientation for new faculty		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Individual consultations	X		X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Offer mini-grants/ financial support for projects			X		X		X	X			X	X	X	X
Conferences					X			X			X	X		

Note: Table indicates services offered by CTL's. Some services are offered through other departments, including on campuses that do not host CTL's.

Several of the models above provide for sustained collaboration, inquiry and experimentation among faculty. The LaGuardia Center for Teaching and Learning offers seminars that require an application and a commitment to active participation over a period of a semester or a year. Participants are compensated, either through stipends or reassigned time. Seminar topics are linked to institutional priorities and designed to help faculty: address key issues of pedagogy and practice, use web 2.0 technologies and LaGuardia's e-portfolio system, and work together to build student success. Seminar topics for 2011-2012 include quantitative literacy, critical thinking and oral communication across the curriculum; hybrid course development; the art of advising; rethinking the capstone experience; and writing in the disciplines. In all cases, faculty develop instructional strategies to apply in the classroom, in some cases redesigning a course in the fall semester, piloting the redesign in the spring and assessing impact thereafter. The Center also offers a year-long New Faculty Colloquium for all new full-time faculty.

In addition to LaGuardia and as indicated in the table above, seven other CTL's offer mini-grants or other financial support for targeted projects, often through an RFP process. Queensborough has developed a cohort-based model that requires participants to submit an application to attend workshops that explore pedagogical models and then develop instructional and assessment materials for specific courses. Recent cohorts have focused on designing technology-integrated instruction and assessment, conducting pedagogical research, and integrating service learning into targeted courses. Queens uses an RFP process to support and expand undergraduate research, and this year funded seventeen projects in which undergraduates and faculty collaborated in research or other scholarly or creative work.

Another mechanism for sustained collaboration and inquiry is the Faculty Interest Group (FIG) model used at Kingsborough, York and other CTL's. In FIG's, faculty from across disciplines meet over an extended period to explore common interests, and share concerns and best practices. At Kingsborough, the FIG is the primary structure for CTL activity. There, FIG topics are defined by faculty, and FIG meetings are facilitated by faculty (who often receive compensation for their coordinating role). Current FIG topics at Kingsborough include civic and global engagement, contemplative practices, strategies for success with ESL students, STEM, teaching toolbox, and urban studies. In a similar structure, Hostos offered a year-long investigation of the impact of technology on teaching and learning. A volunteer group of faculty and staff shared experiences, met with students, reviewed data from other CUNY campuses, explored uses of e-portfolios, and brought in guest speakers. Evaluation of the model is underway.

Several CTL's offer professional development institutes. City Tech has been offering a summer institute on learning communities for the past ten years. Most recently, the four-day event provided a forum to develop new instructional techniques and to bring together many college-wide initiatives, including writing across the disciplines, use of technology in the classroom, tutoring and support from the learning center, and development of critical thinking skills. Queensborough offers service learning institutes to support faculty in integrating community and service learning projects into specific courses. A virtual resource center brings together faculty, community partners, and students.

Determining CTL offerings requires balancing multiple and sometimes competing interests. There are faculty needs as self-defined and those determined by other sources (e.g., institutional research or experts in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment). There are needs common across faculty, such as increasing effectiveness with teaching/ learning technologies and outcomes assessment, and there are needs unique to particular stages in faculty career development (Selden, 2006). Some see different needs for full-time faculty than there are for adjunct faculty (Nuhfer, Blodgett, Fleisher and Griffin, 2010). One study identified the essential faculty development programs for research-intensive universities, including individual consultations, university-wide orientation for new faculty and university-wide workshops on selected topics (Pchenitchnaia and Cole, 2010). A critical question is the extent to which focus should be placed on the individual; particular courses, disciplines or departments; or the institution (Diamond, 2002; Sorcinelli, 2010).

Ten CUNY CTL's have conducted formal needs assessments, primarily through faculty surveys. Faculty typically rank their interest in a range of possible workshop topics, and indicate their preference regarding logistical and structural options. A recent survey at BMCC further asked faculty to self-assess "level of preparedness" relative to various teaching styles, such as lecture, team-teaching and problem-based learning. Other common means of defining offerings include focus groups, analysis of institutional data, observations, use of student feedback and ongoing work with faculty advisories as described earlier. Felten, Little, Ortquist-Ahrens and Reder (2011) suggested establishing guiding principles for determining CTL offerings, in their view that planning should be: people-focused (with all stakeholders in mind, students first and foremost), context-specific (taking into account student demographics, institutional priorities, and specific learning challenges), and evidence-driven (drawing on scholarship about student success and institutional data related to teaching, learning and programming).

Based on research in cognitive, developmental and social psychology and written specifically for college faculty, Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, and Norman (2010) proposed seven principles of learning and a set of pedagogical strategies based on each. The principles address critical variables in skills and knowledge acquisition such as the role of prior knowledge, motivation, feedback and teaching/ learning climate. Their

research identified recurring themes among the proposed teaching strategies, for example, “collecting data about students, modeling expert practice, scaffolding complex tasks, and being explicit about objectives and expectations” (p. 217). McKeachie (2010) likewise put forth a set of evidence-based pedagogies for the college classroom, including reading as active learning, feedback, group-based learning, experiential learning, case-based and problem-based learning, high-stakes vs. low-stakes writing, and self-regulated learning.

The menu of CTL offerings across CUNY reflects a foundation in evidence about how people learn and how to increase teaching effectiveness (for a complete list of offerings by college, see Appendix 4: CTL Professional Development Offerings). Ten of fourteen CTL’s continue to provide opportunities for faculty to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL), following CUNY’s multi-year participation in the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Central to SOTL is support for faculty to address critical questions that arise from their own teaching and from what it means for students to learn deeply within a particular discipline. The desired result is to transform curricula and pedagogies to foster long-lasting student learning (Hutchings, 2000). A critical challenge to sustaining SOTL is to integrate the systematic investigation of student learning into the ongoing routines of faculty and departments. Faculty workload, marginalization of teaching-related scholarship, and lack of recognition and rewards are significant barriers.

Goto and Cerqueira (2009) suggested that “learning communities provide a programmatic analog that helps us predict conditions in which SOTL is likely to thrive” (p. 264). Similarly, the Carnegie Foundation now supports “networked improvement communities” (Bryk, Gomez and Grunow, 2010), the planning and delivery model behind the national Statway project to redefine developmental mathematics in order to significantly improve student success rates. Networked improvement communities provide for highly structured, cross-functional, cross-institutional inquiry that asks “what works, when, for whom and under what sets of circumstances?” (p. 24). The model aims to develop a more effective educational research and development infrastructure to address complex teaching and learning problems of broad significance.

CUNY’s mission, diversity, size and scope create a unique capacity for collaboration across colleges and disciplines to improve undergraduate education on a

large scale, not only for CUNY students but to provide models for transformation across the country. LaGuardia’s Making Connections National Resource Center has emerged as a leader in such work (see www.lagcc.cuny.edu/connections). Grants from FIPSE and Title V currently support two major projects: Connect to Learning, designed to strengthen e-portfolio pedagogies on multiple campuses and generate a national model of best practice; and Making Transfer Connections, designed to strengthen transfer partnerships linking five CUNY campuses (Queens, Lehman, Queensborough, Bronx and LaGuardia).

Linking CTL activities to institutional priorities provides a mechanism for establishing and sustaining faculty learning communities that are focused on specific pedagogies or student outcomes. Especially when addressing teaching and learning problems that call for systemic change, creating structures for sustained inquiry, innovation and assessment is essential. The table below provides an overview of how CTL’s are targeting current offerings at specific institutional priorities.

CTL Offerings: Strategic Focus

	Improving outcomes in specific disciplines	Improving outcomes in specific departments	Improving outcomes in specific courses	Improving outcomes for targeted populations	Improving outcomes in remedial courses	Improving outcomes in general education
BMCC						
Bronx	X		X	X	X	X
Brooklyn						
City						X
Hostos						X
John Jay						
KBCC			X	X		X
LaGuardia	X	X			X	X
Lehman	X	X	X			X
NYCCT	X	X	X	X	X	X
Queens						
QBCC	X			X	X	X
CSI	X	X	X			X
York	X	X	X	X		

Note: table indicates focus of 2010-2011 CTL offerings only; other departments/ offices may provide similar focus

III. Assessing the Impact of CTL's and Faculty Development

Sorcinelli and Stanley (2011) described three components of CTL program assessment: needs assessment, continuous assessment (of particular activities), and evidence of impact on faculty members, departments and the entire institution. They stressed the need for multiple sources of data, both quantitative and qualitative, and multiple points of data collection such as end-of-program questionnaires, follow-up surveys, focus groups and interviews, and participant “stories” of pedagogical, curricular and assessment changes resulting from faculty development. As indicated earlier, CUNY CTL's conduct needs assessments primarily through faculty surveys, sometimes supplemented by other data collection and analysis strategies such as focus groups and existing institutional research on student learning outcomes. It is common for CUNY CTL's to employ satisfaction surveys or questionnaires immediately after workshops; findings are typically used to inform planning for future offerings. Queensborough recently surveyed faculty about CTL activities and followed up with focus groups of various types of faculty, including those who had never participated in CTL activities.

Outside and inside CUNY, surveys also are used to evaluate satisfaction and impact well after workshops or other interventions have been completed. Jacobson, Wulff, Grooters, Edwards and Freisem (2009) surveyed all faculty five years after using consulting services at the University of Washington's Center for Instructional Development to examine longitudinal changes in teaching practices. While acknowledging the lack of documented evidence of the reported changes in teaching behavior, the analysis revealed long-term effects on faculty members' perceptions about effective teaching. In spring 2010, York conducted an on-line survey to analyze the impact of CTL workshop participation on faculty teaching attitudes and practices. Among the findings: A large majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that participation in CTL workshops increased their awareness of new teaching approaches, of resources for improving teaching, and of the scholarly literature on teaching and learning. Further, over half of the respondents reported employing new teaching strategies as a result of CTL workshops.

Assessing the impact of faculty development on teaching and learning is a highly complex undertaking that requires data collection and analysis of behavioral and

cognitive change as evidenced by pedagogy and curriculum, short-term and longer-term student learning outcomes, and, ultimately, organizational culture as it relates to the value placed on teaching, learning and evidence. In a National Institute for Learning Outcomes Occasional Paper on “opening doors to faculty involvement in assessment,” Hutchins (2010) asserted that by “bringing faculty together around such evidence, facilitating constructive conversations about its meaning and implications, setting local efforts in the context of a larger body of research” teaching centers “strengthen the growing sense of community around pedagogy and a shared commitment to evidence” (p. 14). In this broader view, faculty development is a key mechanism for organizational and cultural change, and is most effective when tightly aligned with institutional planning and assessment (Baron, 2006; Latta, 2009; Schroeder, 2011).

LaGuardia’s CTL works with institutional research to collect data on all pedagogy-focused seminars for formative and summative evaluation. Faculty surveys; faculty documentation of innovative practice; student surveys (including the Community College Survey of Student Engagement); and student outcomes such as attrition, course pass rates, pass rates on standardized examinations, and next-semester retention are analyzed to inform institutional policy and practice. As an example, Project Quantum Leap (PQL) adapted the nationally recognized Project SENCER approach of teaching science and higher-level mathematics in “compelling contexts” to LaGuardia’s basic skills mathematics classes. The CTL supports faculty adoption of student-centered pedagogies such as group work, discovery method, questioning techniques and problem-based learning. In the most recent analysis, the exit rate from remediation for students taking elementary algebra (MAT96) using the PQL methodology was 26.9% higher than the exit rate for comparison courses (where exit requires passing the course and the COMPASS exam). Based on these positive results, roughly one-third of the sections of MAT96 were taught using the PQL methodology in spring 2011, and the College plans to expand the approach to all sections over the next three years.

A growing body of literature speaks to the potential benefits of engaging students in the study of teaching and learning. In faculty-centered inquiry, questions posed about “what works” are analyzed from the teacher’s perspective. In student-centered inquiry, the questions posed are from the learner’s perspective— what works or doesn’t for

particular students in a particular discipline and context (Hutchins, 2000; Manor, Bloch-Shulman, Flannery and Felten, 2010). In both cases, a specific teaching problem might be the focus of scholarly inquiry, but in the student-centered approach, students are active collaborators in the research. Some promising results have been documented when integrating student voices into all phases of a course redesign process, including what kinds of curricular and pedagogical changes are needed for a particular course as well as assessing the impact of those changes (Delpish, Darby, Holmes, Knight-McKenna, Mihans, King and Felten, 2010).

Some CUNY CTL advisory boards have student membership, and other CTL's are partnering with academic support services to gather information from the students' perspective, for example, by analyzing teaching/ learning issues identified in learning labs or tutoring sessions relative to a particular course. Bronx students in freshman learning communities present digital stories at the end of the semester, which serve as a tool for student engagement, the demonstration of learning outcomes and program evaluation. Queens includes students in the review of applications for undergraduate research projects, and has established a student advisory board to provide input on the development of service learning projects. Across CUNY, student surveys and focus groups are common means of involving students in program planning and evaluation.

IV. Recommendations

Recognizing the importance of faculty development reflecting the unique culture and needs of an institution, this report is not intended to recommend any standardization or centralization of CTL operations. At the same time, there is agreement among CTL directors that CUNY has not fully leveraged the collective resources of the system relative to faculty development. Despite significant operational variation, common goals and challenges exist across all CTL's, including:

- sustaining high levels of faculty engagement in ongoing development activities;
- increasing participation among adjunct faculty;
- expanding the use of effective online teaching and learning tools;

- increasing research on teaching and learning that provides evidence of effective curriculum, instruction and assessment;
- evaluating the impact of CTL offerings on pedagogy and student outcomes; and
- ensuring adequate resources for high impact offerings and strategic faculty development.

The degree to which these challenges affect operations differs across Centers. For example, half of the CTL's offer some form of compensation to faculty for participating in Center activities— stipends and/or reassigned time— which provides an effective incentive for engagement. In all cases, CTL directors see value in continuing to share expertise and effective strategies across Centers to strengthen faculty development and student success throughout the University.

A vigorous and well-resourced CTL makes visible an institutional commitment to faculty development and the high value placed on improving teaching and learning. An effective CTL relies on the integration of faculty development with institutional planning and assessment, focusing CTL programs on institutional priorities, particularly those related to improving student learning outcomes. An effective CTL is thus a mechanism for both individual and organizational development, and an essential component of systemic change. The following recommendations are based on the analysis of CUNY CTL's and related literature and research, and aim to improve the impact of CUNY CTL's both individually and collectively.

Design Faculty Development Offerings to Address Specific Institutional Priorities

1. Strengthen the use of data to inform CTL offerings.
2. Expand targeted, longer-term and cohort faculty development models that include rigorous evaluation of impact.
3. Ensure adequate professional development for adjuncts.
4. Increase the role of students in the study of teaching and learning, particularly in analyzing and redesigning courses with high failure and withdrawal rates.

Expand Cross-College Inquiry into Effective Teaching/ Learning Strategies

5. Explore the development of new cross-college “networked improvement communities” aimed at complex teaching and learning problems common across the University or among several colleges (such as improving outcomes in specific developmental and gateway courses).
6. Explore the creation of a CUNY journal of teaching and learning.
7. Improve the use of web-based tools, including the CUNY Academic Commons, to address individual and collective goals.

Continue to Improve the Quality and Cost Effectiveness of CTL Operations

8. Maintain and strengthen the central role of faculty in CTL operations.
9. Develop CUNY CTL program evaluation models linked to specific purposes and structures (e.g., evaluating a single workshop vs. evaluating a year-long seminar vs. developing overall CTL performance indicators).
10. Encourage and support CTL's in seeking grant and other funding, including cross-campus funding opportunities.
11. Strengthen collaboration across CTL's to identify common needs and issues, to share tools and resources related to promising practice, and to gain efficiencies in areas of shared interest (such as better serving adjunct faculty and increasing faculty development offerings online).

References*

- Ambrose, S., Bridges, M., Lovett, M., DiPietro, M. & Norman, M. (2010). *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Baron, L. (2006). The Advantages of a Reciprocal Relationship between Faculty Development and Organizational Development in Higher Education. In S. Chadwick-Blossey (Ed.), *To Improve the Academy: Volume 24* (pp. 29-43). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Bryk, A., Gomez, L. & Grunow, A. (2010). *Getting Ideas into Action: Building Networked Improvement Communities in Education*. Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>.
- Delpish, A., Darby, A., Holmes, A, Knight-McKenna, M. Mihans, R., King, C., & Felten, P.. (2010). Equalizing Voices: Student-Faculty Partnership in Course Design. In C. Werder and M. Otis (Eds.), *Engaging Student Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning* (pp. 96-113). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Diamond, R. M. (2002). Faculty, instructional, and organizational development: Options and choices. In K.H. Gillespie (Ed.), *A Guide to Faculty Development: Practical Advice, Examples and Resources* (pp. 2-8). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Felten, P., Little, D., Ortquist-Ahrens, L. & Reder, M. (2011). Linking Faculty Development with Global Learning and Student Success. Presentation at AAC&U LEAP Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, January 26-28.
- Goto, S. T. & Cerqueira, A. (2009). Promoting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Community Colleges. In L.B. Nilson (Ed.) *To Improve the Academy: Volume 27* (pp. 249-266). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hutchings, P. 2000. Approaching the Scholarship of Teaching.” In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (pp. 1-10). Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.
- Hutchings, Pat. 2010. *Opening Doors to Faculty Involvement in Assessment*. National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment Occasional Paper Series April 2010. Champaign, IL: National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org>.
- Jacobson, W., Wulff, D., Grooters, S., Edwards, P., & Freisem, K. (2009). Reported Long-Term Value and Effects of Teaching Center Consultations. In L.B. Nilson

- (Ed.) *To Improve the Academy: Volume 27* (pp. 223-246). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhlenschmidt, S. (2011). Distribution and Penetration of Teaching-Learning Development Units in Higher Education: Implications for Strategic Planning and Research. In J.E. Miller (Ed.) *To Improve the Academy: Volume 29* (pp. 274-287). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Latta, G. F. (2009). Maturation of Organizational Development: Using Cultural Analysis to Facilitate Change. In L.B. Nilson (Ed.) *To Improve the Academy: Volume 27* (pp. 32-71). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Manor, C., Bloch-Shulman, S., Flannery, K., & Felten, P. (2010). Foundations of Student-Faculty Partnership in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. In C. Werder and M. Otis (Eds.), *Engaging Student Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning* (pp. 3-15). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- McKeachie, W. J. & Svinicki, M. (2010). *McKeachie's Teaching Tips* (13th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2009). *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation*. Philadelphia, PA: Middle States Commission on Higher Education.
- Nuhfer, E., Blodgett, M., Fleisher, S. and Griffin, J. (2010). Supporting non-tenure faculty with time- and cost-effective faculty development. In K.J. Gillespie and D.L. Robertson (Eds.) *A Guide to Faculty Development: Second Edition* (pp.107-126). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ouellett, M. (2010). Overview of Faculty Development: History and Choices. In K.J. Gillespie and D.L. Robertson (Eds.) *A Guide to Faculty Development: Second Edition* (pp. 3-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pchenitchnaia, L. & Cole, B.R. (2010). Essential Faculty Development Programs for Teaching and Learning Centers in Research-Extensive Universities.” In K.J. Gillespie and D.L. Robertson (Eds.) *A Guide to Faculty Development: Second Edition* (pp. 287-308). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schroeder, C. (2011). *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Role in Institutional Change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Seldin, P. (2006). Tailoring Faculty Development Programs to Faculty Career Stages. In S. Chadwick-Blossey (Ed.), *To Improve the Academy: Volume 24* (pp.137-146). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Sorcinelli, M.D. (2002). Ten Principles of Good Practice in Creating and Sustaining Teaching and Learning Centers. In K.H. Gillespie (Ed.), *A Guide to Faculty Development: Practical Advice, Examples and Resources* (pp. 9-23). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Sorcinelli, M.D. & Stanley, C. (2011). *Using Assessment to Become a Non-negotiable Asset*. In *Why Faculty Development Matters: Assessing Impact*. Jossey-Bass and POD Network webinar: May 6, 2011.

Wright, D. (2002). Program Types and Prototypes. In K.H. Gillespie (Ed.) *A Guide to Faculty Development: Practical Advice, Examples and Resources* (pp. 24-34). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company

* For a comprehensive list of publications on faculty development see: End Bibliography, *A Guide to Faculty Development (2nd edition), 2010*. Kay Gillespie, Douglas L. Robertson, and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Available at: www.podnetwork.org/publications/pdf/Bibliographydone418.pdf

Appendix 1: Outline Of CTL Survey

1. Current status of Center
2. Mission/goals
3. Services offered (fall 2010 snapshot)
 - workshops/seminars/trainings/discussion groups/mentoring programs/conferences
 - # offered, total # served
 - services available online
4. Professional development design/approach
 - design and delivery of offerings (paid/ voluntary)
 - content focus
 - length of training (individual sessions, semester-long, year-long)
 - audience (adjunct faculty, full-time faculty, open, cohort)
5. Staffing/governance
 - titles and FTE status of CTL staff
 - role of faculty
 - advisory committee
 - reporting structure for CTL
6. Facilities/space
 - access to offices, conference rooms, classrooms, computer labs
 - co-location with other departments (i.e., grants support, academic affairs)
7. Other functions
 - faculty awards
 - faculty surveys
 - others
8. Evaluation
 - methods of assessing outcomes
 - findings
 - use of findings
 - record keeping (names of faculty receiving services)
9. Communication with faculty
 - website, email listserv, newsletter, other
10. Budget (2010-11)
 - total and amount from CUE, grants, institution

Appendix 2: CTL Survey Respondents

College	Name	Title
Baruch	Dennis Slavin	Associate Provost and Assistant Vice President
BMCC	Victoria Mondelli	Director, Teaching and Learning Center
Bronx	Harriet Shenkman	Director, Center for Teaching Excellence; Director, First-Year Learning Community; Professor, Education
Brooklyn	Danny Kopec	Director, Center for Teaching; Professor, Computer Science
City	Bruce Rosenbloom	Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Hostos	Sarah Brennan	Assistant Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Hunter	Annemarie Nicols-Grinenko	Senior Advisor for Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost
John Jay	Meghan Duffy	Director, Center for the Advancement of Teaching
Kingsborough	Janine Graziano-King	Director, Center for Teaching and Learning; Associate Professor, English
LaGuardia	Bret Eynon	Assistant Dean for Teaching and Learning
Lehman	Gina Rae Foster	Director, Lehman Teaching and Learning Commons
Medgar Evers	Claudia Schrader	Assistant Provost
NYCCT	Julia Jordan	Acting Director of Faculty Commons
Queens	Eva Fernández	Director, Center for Teaching and Learning; Associate Professor, Linguistics and Communication Disorders
Queensborough	Meg Tarafdar	Associate Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Staten Island	William Bernhardt	Director, Faculty Development Center; Associate Professor, English
York	Debra Swoboda	Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning; Associate Professor, Psychology

Appendix 3: CTL Mission Statements

BMCC	<p>The Center serves as a resource and a forum for activities and dialogue to maximize the collective potential of faculty and staff to achieve excellence in teaching, learning, and scholarship. We recognize that the promotion of wellness among faculty and staff contributes to a strong foundation for excellence in our professional lives.</p>
Bronx	<p>Our mission is to support an ever-expanding community of faculty, staff and administrators dedicated to learning about learning. The Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) offers a variety of opportunities in the instructional and professional development areas, including one-time workshops, individual clinics, customized department workshops, semester-long seminars, special events, and summer institutes. The CTE has several major goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to foster growth in individual teaching capacities throughout a faculty member’s professional career 2. to develop communities of practice around teaching and learning challenges and opportunities 3. to support interdisciplinary and cross-campus collaboration 4. to guide academic and career departments in exploring goals, objectives and teaching proficiencies 5. to foster a campus environment where learning about learning is a central, valued and ongoing process <p>The CTE Advisory Board, with members drawn from every discipline and area of the college, determines the needs of our center and supports a diversity of collaborative efforts, including working with neighboring colleges.</p>
Brooklyn	<p>The mission of the Brooklyn College Center for Teaching is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and experiences about the theory and practice of effective teaching, to foster a debate on curriculum and pedagogy in our community, and to promote the dissemination of scholarship of teaching and learning. As a clearinghouse for resources and a site for faculty development, the Center for Teaching promotes innovative and creative methods and techniques that directly affect the lives of students.</p>
City	<p>CETL supports the college’s mission to improve teaching and learning in all subject disciplines. We engage in ongoing discussion of policies and strategies regarding best practices for teaching, learning, technology, grants writing and research, scholarship and assessment. By engaging faculty, students and staff as partners in the educational process, we can better achieve the goal of helping our diverse students achieve at the highest levels possible. The overall spirit of the Center revolves around a collegial community of full and part-time faculty devoted to advancing their scholarship in their respective disciplines and improving the craft of teaching. Our Center encourages this process while fostering the “community of learners” at CCNY. We host a variety of workshops and events throughout the year to engage, inspire and inform faculty.</p>

Hostos	The Center is dedicated to promoting and supporting teaching and learning at all levels. The Center seeks to create an enhanced and effective learning environment in which students and faculty from diverse backgrounds all learn and excel. The Center believes that learning is a lifelong process and that teachers are learners, too. Through open and ongoing dialogue and collaborative efforts designed to improve student learning, the Center provides teachers with the resources and opportunities that support excellence in teaching.
John Jay	Making Teaching Visible and Valued The Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) at John Jay College of Criminal Justice is a catalyst for encouraging creative collaborations among faculty members interested in exploring innovative approaches to pedagogy in higher education. CAT fosters the continuing education and professional development of the John Jay faculty by sponsoring seminars, workshops and training programs that focus on the practice and scholarship of teaching and that help build a sense of community. Our goal is to make teaching visible and valued.
Kingsborough	The mission of KCTL is to support Kingsborough faculty in their efforts to: Foster student learning through the exploration of innovative, student-centered pedagogies; Conduct research and scholarship on teaching and learning and in their disciplines; Collaborate with faculty across disciplines and departments.
LaGuardia	The LaGuardia Center for Teaching and Learning is a hub for professional innovation, reflection, collaboration and transformation. Engaging the collective expertise of LaGuardia faculty and colleagues across the U.S., the Center provides professional development opportunities that support effective, student-centered pedagogies and scholarly approaches to teaching. Through workshops, forums, mini conferences, informal discussions and sustained seminars, faculty develop innovative strategies for examining and advancing student learning. Activities explore a spectrum of pedagogical topics: integrative learning, basic skills education in mathematics, learning communities, inquiry learning, effective uses of digital technologies, critical literacies, the scholarship of teaching and learning, holistic assessment, and ePortfolio. Building capacities across the college, our mission is to promote a dynamic, supportive culture of learning for students and faculty at the college and beyond.
Lehman	The mission of the Lehman Teaching & Learning Commons is to foster relationships in teaching and learning activities between Lehman College faculty, students, and staff and to provide a virtual and physical space for developing projects related to excellence and innovation in teaching and learning.
NYCCT	Faculty Commons, A Center for Teaching, Learning, Scholarship and Service coordinates all professional development, grants and assessment activities of faculty at New York City College of Technology. Faculty Commons adopts a programmatic approach to professional development and operates as a faculty resource and think tank where members collaborate on a variety of projects to shape curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. In accordance with the College goals and strategic plan and with support from CUNY, the Office of the Provost, the College Council and the Professional Development Advisory Council, Faculty Commons will strive to improve and promote the quality and excellence of faculty at New York City College of Technology.

Queens	<p>Our central mission is to recognize, promote, and sustain the quality of teaching and learning at Queens College. We support this collective effort by providing faculty with opportunities to discuss and learn about all aspects of teaching and learning, assessment, and the curriculum.</p>
Queensborough	<p>The mission of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) is to inspire and enable faculty to enhance teaching potential and effectiveness such that students are more likely to achieve the desired learning outcomes. Using a collaborative approach, building on faculty strengths, focusing on the tasks of instruction and learning, and bringing faculty in contact with excellent instructional practices and technology, CETL supports a campus culture that recognizes and values faculty role. Through a variety of activities and services, CETL provides environments for faculty to come together to share teaching experiences and expertise. Promulgating a collaborative, problem solving approach to the art and science of teaching, CETL supports faculty and staff who utilize both proven traditional and progressive student-centered learning approaches.</p>
Staten Island	<p>The Center (approval of name change in progress) brings together the programming and resources previously provided by the Center for Excellence in Learning Technologies (CELT) and the Center for Teaching and Learning at The College of Staten Island (CSI). As CSI's major faculty development initiative, the Delphi Center provides leadership, training and ongoing support for new grant-funded instructional programs (ePortfolio, Hybrid Initiative), the Blackboard Course Management System (for web-enhanced, hybrid and fully asynchronous courses), and innovation in pedagogy and the use of media and instructional technology. In addition, it will provide a space for faculty development workshops, seminars and informal contacts between faculty across a very broad spectrum of activities. As depicted in its developing logo and identity, The Center serves to support and promote Faculty Innovation, Professional Development, and Community.</p>
York	<p>The mission of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) is to promote excellence in teaching practices through a wide range of professional development activities. The Center acts as a catalyst and clearinghouse to cultivate knowledge and practice of learning-centered pedagogies through open dialogue, collaboration, assessment, and faculty research and scholarship on teaching and learning. The CETL encourages faculty to participate in disciplinary and national conversations about teaching, student learning, and professional development by providing faculty with resources, opportunities, and forums that facilitate the exchange of ideas and expertise about teaching and learning.</p>

Appendix 4: CTL Professional Development Offerings

	BMCC	Bronx	Bklyn	City	Hostos	John Jay	KBCC	LGCC	Lehman	NYCCT	Queens	QBCC	CSI	York
Specific pedagogical techniques	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Specific high-impact practices		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cognition/theories of learning						X	X		X					X
Classroom management	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X
Support for learning communities		X	X			X	X	X	X	X			X	
Support for first-year experience		X	X	X		X		X	X				X	
WAC/WID (general)	X	X	X	X		X		X		X			X	X
WAC/WID certification	X	X						X						
Course design/redesign	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Program design/redesign			X	X				X	X	X			X	
Assessment of student learning	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Program evaluation								X		X				
Facilitating undergraduate research										X	X		X	X
Scholarship of teaching	X		X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Support for research/scholarship/publication	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X				X
Grant writing	X		X	X			X		X	X		X		
Leadership development								X	X					
Student advising	X	X	X	X	X			X			X			X
Employee wellness				X			X		X					
Teaching web-enhanced courses	X			X			X	X			X	X	X	
Teaching hybrid courses	X			X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Teaching online courses	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Blackboard				X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X
E-portfolios							X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Web 2.0 tools				X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Specific software applications	X			X					X		X	X	X	X

Note: Table indicates services offered by CTL's. Some services are offered through other departments, including on campuses that do not host CTL's