Letter of Transmittal:

This report summarizes the initiatives and activities of the Academy for Teaching and Learning (ATL) during the period January, 2004 – May, 2004 and outlines ATL goals and objectives for the period June, 2004 through May, 2005.

Scott Simkins, Interim Director, Academy for Teaching and Learning
A. Executive Summary

1. Purpose and mission of the Academy for Teaching and Learning (ATL)

The mission of the Academy for Teaching and Learning is to foster enhanced student learning by promoting scholarly teaching. The Academy’s activities are aimed at

- Educating teachers about the factors that affect student learning, based on scholarly research in the learning sciences
- Increasing faculty understanding of the linkages between scholarly research on how students learn and effective teaching pedagogies
- Promoting the development of innovative teaching pedagogies that promote student learning, including the effective use of instructional technology
- Encouraging faculty and administrator use of formative assessment processes linked to student learning outcomes to continually improve teaching pedagogy and student learning
- Promoting faculty involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning, including classroom-based research, sponsored research, and scholarly activity such as presentations and journal articles.
- Bringing faculty together regularly to discuss, analyze, and share issues related to teaching and learning, in both formal and informal ways.
- Increase faculty rewards for engaging in activities that enhance student learning, lead to scholarly work promoting the scholarship of teaching and learning, and encourage assessment processes that lead to improved learning.
- Promoting faculty development that supports the successful implementation of both the FUTURES and general education revision initiatives, in particular teaching pedagogies, assessment strategies, and curricular/course reform that promotes intentional and interdisciplinary learning.

2. Broad overview of significant accomplishments

The primary objective during the January, 2004 – May, 2004 period was to develop a coherent framework and focus for the Academy for Teaching and Learning centered on a modern scholarly understanding of student learning and implications for teaching. Future ATL activities will focus on the enhancement of student learning outcomes and the promotion of teaching activities that lead to this outcome.

The ATL will lead an interdisciplinary initiative to “Focus on Learning” during the 2004-2005 academic year. Each faculty member will receive a copy of the seminal text, “How People Learn,” which in turn will be used as the basis for campus-wide faculty reading/study/discussion groups during the fall, 2005 semester. The interdisciplinary theme was introduced at the spring, 2004 FUTUREs retreat. To jump-start this initiative, the ATL organized a two-day “Focus on Learning” Teaching Institute led by Milt Hakel, a nationally-
recognized scholar in teaching and learning from Bowling Green State University, and attended by over 65 A&T faculty members, who developed posters highlighting the implementation of effective learning principles in their courses.

The ATL Summer Teaching Institute will be an annual event.

The ATL Advisory Board, made up of representatives from each of the Schools/Colleges, was put in place in April, 2004. The ATL Advisory Board will provide valuable oversight of ATL activities, advice to the Director, and important communication links to the campus community.

3. Goals for the upcoming year

The overall goals for the ATL over the 2004-2005 academic year are to:

(a) implement activities that promote the interdisciplinary theme, “Focus on Learning,” and aid in the implementation of both the FUTUREs and general education revision initiatives. In particular, ATL activities will seek to link scholarly research on student learning with pedagogical innovation, promote formative assessment activities aimed at improvement of courses, curricula, and programs, and increase faculty and student understanding of interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

(b) change the academic culture regarding teaching and learning to promote scholarly and intentional teaching and learning grounded in pedagogy that promotes student responsibility for learning, effective use of instructional technology, development of critical thinking skills, and increased emphasis on written and oral communication. The ATL will encourage greater faculty engagement in hands-on professional development through the promotion of Faculty Learning Communities and ongoing workshops and informal discussions of teaching/learning-related topics.

(c) actively promote the professional development of new faculty members. The ATL recognizes that new faculty members provide an opportunity for revitalizing the teaching/learning environment on the campus and will provide opportunities throughout the academic year for new faculty to engage in professional development, build community, and share ideas.

(d) increase awareness of the ATL and its function in ongoing professional development for faculty members. By increasing communication, visibility, and campus involvement, the ATL seeks to become a key resource for faculty seeking to improve their teaching effectiveness, for departments undergoing curricular assessment and change, and for programs undergoing development and revision.
B. Overview of the Academy for Teaching and Learning

1. Strategic comments regarding unit’s place/role in the University and Futures

The Academy for Teaching and Learning will play a key role in the successful implementation of the FUTUREs initiative and the revision of the general education core curriculum during the next two years, as well as catalyzing a more general change in the way that faculty think about teaching and learning. In particular, the ATL will provide fundamental, ongoing faculty development in the areas of teaching and learning as the university transforms itself into a “student-centered, interdisciplinary university.” Faculty will need new tools and a new vision of teaching focusing on student learning outcomes consistent with FUTUREs and general education revision for these initiatives to be truly successful. Simply declaring yourself an “interdisciplinary” university or changing curricular structure is not enough to truly transform student learning outcomes, create an environment of “intentional teaching” based on scholarly research on how people learn, or change faculty teaching practices to promote student learning.

To be transformational, faculty need to understand the factors that promote student learning, link those factors to effective teaching practices that focus on student learning outcomes, align both pedagogy and content with the goals and objectives of FUTUREs and the revised general education program, and assess learning outcomes relative to these goals and objectives, with the aim of continual improvement. For example, faculty need to understand what it means to both learn and teach in an interdisciplinary manner, develop curricula, content, and pedagogies that promote interdisciplinary teaching and learning, develop assessment strategies that help determine whether interdisciplinary objectives are being met, and use the assessment results to better align the curriculum, content, and pedagogy with stated student learning outcomes.

The Academy for Teaching and Learning will provide both encouragement and opportunities for faculty to gain the necessary tools to make this transformation to a learning-centered, interdisciplinary university through (1) the development and support of Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) related to issues central to FUTUREs and general education revision (such as interdisciplinary teaching and learning, critical thinking, effective communication, etc.); (2) hands-on workshops related to the development of innovative teaching strategies, effective use of instructional technology, development of formative classroom-based assessment processes, and teaching/learning-related research; (3) formal and informal discussions of issues related to teaching and learning – providing time for cross-disciplinary reflection on teaching and learning issues; (4) direct assistance to departments with curricular reform related to FUTUREs and general education revision goals and objectives, (5) regular communication about resources available to improve teaching and learning, as well as examples of
innovative teaching practices being undertaken by A&T faculty; (6) support for sponsored research focusing on teaching and learning; (7) public sharing of innovative and effective teaching pedagogies; (8) informal and formal mentoring of new faculty members.

2. Academy for Teaching and Learning structure

The structure of the Academy for Teaching and Learning was changed in January, 2004. Since its inception in 2001 the Director of the ATL reported directly to the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Telecommunications; however, since January, 2004, the Director of the ATL reports directly to the Provost. The ATL Advisory Board, comprised of faculty members representing each School/College, serves as a catalyst for ATL activities, provides feedback to the Director, and ensures effective communication with the rest of the university community. The organizational structure of the ATL is illustrated below.

ATL Advisory Board

In April, 2004 the Director of the ATL asked each Dean to recommend a faculty member from her/his School/College to serve on the ATL Advisory Board. The ATL advisory board supports the activities of the ATL by:

- offering advice/suggestions to the Director on ATL center direction, initiatives, and activities.
- participating in and leading/directing ATL activities.
- promoting communication among faculty, staff, administrators, and the ATL Director regarding ATL initiatives and activities, and more broadly, in matters relating to teaching and learning.
- providing advice on university-wide initiatives, policies, and procedures that affect teaching and learning.
- acting as ambassadors for the ATL and the teaching and learning mission of the university.

Overall, the ATL Advisory Board serves in an advisory role, but provides valuable input into the decision-making process of the ATL director.

The ATL Advisory Board members for 2004-2005 are:
ATL Administrative Assistant

In February, 2004 an Administrative Assistant, Tamara Goode was hired to assist the ATL Director with day-to-day tasks associated with the ATL. This assistant is shared half-time with Mary Mims, Special Assistant to the Provost.

C. Progress toward Key Goals (January, 2004 through May, 2004)

Goal 1: Develop redefined focus and structure for ATL rooted in the science of learning

A quick review of the past year’s ATL annual report illustrates the disjointed nature of efforts to improve teaching and learning at North Carolina A&T State University. The ATL has supported fragmented attempts to promote learning, develop innovative pedagogies, and implement instructional technology, but there has been little systematic effort to unify these initiatives to promote a campus-wide transformation of teaching and learning. Over the past five months I have begun the process of developing a more integrated and coherent framework for ATL activities that (1) grounds ATL initiatives in scholarly research on student learning and effective teaching pedagogies, (2) encourages faculty to engage in scholarly dialogue and research about teaching and learning principles, teaching practices, and pedagogical innovation, and (3) promotes the sharing of ideas about effective teaching and learning throughout the university.

Indicators of progress toward goal:

• I was accepted to participate in an AAC&U conference, “What Faculty and Administrators Need to Know About How People Learn,” at the University of Maryland in February, 2004. My project for that conference was to develop a coherent organizational plan for the Academy of Teaching and Learning consistent with research results gained from the learning sciences on how people learn. I was awarded a “third-place” prize in participant voting for developing a final poster illustrating the best integration of learning principles in a campus project. The structure developed provides a principled foundation for ATL activities and initiatives.
• Sharing of ATL goals and objectives at Academic Affairs weekly meeting, March, 2004.

• I will be participating in a Faculty Learning Communities (FLC) New Developers Conference at Miami University of Ohio in June to gain hands-on experience in developing faculty learning communities from Milt Cox, one of the original developers of this concept. FLCs are small interdisciplinary groups of faculty that meet regularly over the course of the academic year to systematically research, discuss, and share ideas focused on a particular topic or issue related to teaching and learning in an effort to build community, conduct background research on teaching/learning topics, promote ongoing faculty development, and serve as a campus resource. Typically, FLCs are formed at the start of an academic year based on faculty preferences and remain together for the entire year, and sometimes beyond. Toward the end of a semester or year, FLCs provide workshops and presentations for the wider university community. In this way, FLCs become a catalyst for enhanced faculty development and improved teaching and learning for the entire university.

Goal 2: Initiate ATL activities

In addition to creating a new philosophical foundation for the Academy for Teaching and Learning, I began to implement activities during the spring semester consistent with that new outlook. Full implementation of ATL activities will begin during the 2004-2005 school year.

• Formation of a Blackboard Users’ Group – working with Rodney Harrigan and his staff, I began a monthly meeting of IT staff and faculty users to discuss ongoing challenges and formulate proactive solutions related to the use of Blackboard for teaching and learning (March, 2004).

• Planning and implementation of ATL Summer Institute, “Focus on Learning” – bringing together 65-70 faculty and support staff from across campus to explore issues related to learning, teaching, and assessment. The two-day workshop was led by Professor Milt Hakel, Ohio Board of Regents’ Eminent Scholar and faculty member at Bowling Green State University, and included the development of participant posters highlighting innovative classroom activities consistent with learning principles developed during the workshop (May, 2004).

• School of Arts and Sciences workshop on “Redesigning Large Enrollment Courses” – Sallie Ives, UNC-Charlotte and Dot Clayton, East Carolina University presented College of Arts and Sciences faculty with information on the UNC TLT (Teaching and Learning with Technology) initiative on redesigning large-enrollment courses (April, 2004). This discussion led the History Department at A&T to undertake a summer project examining a substantial course redesign for HIST 101 under the guidance of Scott Simkins (May and June, 2004).
• **HIST 101 Course Redesign** – ATL is financially supporting four faculty members in the History department to redesign the HIST 101 course to increase student learning, reduce costs, find creative solutions for future enrollment increases, and increase interdisciplinarity. I am meeting with this group weekly during May and June, 2004 to guide the redesign process. The redesign process will be a model for other departments to follow. In addition, the course is being redesigned with the new general education learning objectives in mind and will be a pilot course in the new structure during the spring, 2005 semester.

• **Discussions with collaborating units, including ITT, sponsored research, and the graduate school** – early in the spring semester (2004) I initiated discussions with each of these units to better understand how we can work together to promote the effective use of instructional technology, increased faculty involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning, and improved training for graduate teaching assistants.

**Goal 3: Select ATL Advisory Board**

In April, 2004, a full ATL advisory board, with representatives from each School/College, was developed. I met with this group twice before the end of the school year to outline responsibilities, expectations, and future plans. We will meet three times per semester.

**D. Most Significant Accomplishments**

1. **Learning**

   • Development of “Focus on Learning” interdisciplinary theme for 2004-2005 academic year
     - Copies of the seminal book, “How People Learn,” have been ordered for every faculty member. This book will become the focus of faculty reading groups during the fall, 2004 semester
     - Presentation at FUTUREs retreat introducing the interdisciplinary theme – May, 2004
     - Activities throughout the 2004-2005 academic year, including workshops, faculty learning communities, and reading groups will focus on the theme of learning and implications for effective teaching

   • Development and implementation of ATL Summer Teaching Institute, “Focus on Learning,” with 65-70 faculty members participating – May, 2004

   • Development of Blackboard Users Group to improve communication between faculty and information technology staff – March, 2004

   • Development of new ATL structure, mission, and goals rooted in research on learning; selection of ATL Advisory Board

   • Purchase of teaching resources from National Teaching and Learning Forum, The Teaching Professor, and Professional and Organizational Development (POD) organization; to be made available to faculty via the web (to be stored
on the Bluford Library web server and accessible directly from the publishers via a web link from the ATL web site). These resources will be available mid-summer, 2004.

- Consultant work with faculty from the History department revising the HIST 101 course – May-June, 2004
- Collaboration with North Carolina Association for Teaching Center Directors (ATCD) and UNC Teaching and Learning with Technology (UNC TLT) Collaboratory. Meeting with teaching center directors across the UNC system and maintaining our relationship with the UNC TLT Collaboratory.
  Appointed as the NC A&T representative to the UNC TLT Board, May, 2004.
- Relocate ATL office to 313 Dowdy

2. Discovery

a. Research Awards

Proposal submitted:

- National Science Foundation proposal, CCLI-A&I, "Implications of STEM Discipline Research for Instructional Innovation and Assessment in Economic Education" (CCLI-DUE 0411037), with Dr. Mark Maier, Glendale Community College (CA), submitted December, 2003 (currently responding to follow-up questions from NSF DUE program director).
  $187,523

b. Scholarly Productivity

- Final project report submitted to the National Science Foundation for grant DUE 0088303, "Collaborative Research: Developing and Implementing Just-in-Time-Teaching (JiTT) Techniques in the Principles of Economics Course," (with Mark Maier, Glendale Community College), May, 2004

Manuscripts submitted:

- “Factors Affecting the Location of Payday Lending and Traditional Banking Services in North Carolina,” submitted to Review of Regional Studies, May, 2004 (with Mark Burkey, NC A&T State University, Dept. of Economics and Transportation/Logistics)

Work in Progress
• “Just-in-Time Teaching Across the Academy: Diverse Applications, Similar Experiences,” with Evelyn Patterson and Mark Maier for the *Journal of College Science Teaching*
• “Just-in-Time Teaching (JiTT) in Economics: A Case Study,” with Mark Maier for the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) – Economics, University of Bristol, UK
• “Just-in-Time Teaching (JiTT) in Economics,” with Mark Maier for the *Social Science Computing Review*
• Working with Gregor Novak and Evelyn Patterson on National Science Foundation-funded (> $1 million) Digital Library project (JiTTEcon); contributing extensive set of JiTTEcon resources for use by other professors via the JiTTDL web portal (project will make JiTT resources publicly available in a wide variety of disciplines; we are one of three lead-off disciplines included in the JiTTDL library)
• Development of JiTTEcon web site supporting recent NSF-funded project (with Mark Maier)

c. Professional growth and development

**Participation in Meetings/Conferences**

• UNC TLT Collaborative, Large Enrollment Course Redesign, Office of the President, University of North Carolina, February, 2004
• AAHE, “What Faculty and Administrators Need to Know About Learning,” University of Maryland, February, 2004
• UNC TLT Collaborative, Annual Meeting, Charlotte, NC, March, 2004
• AAC&U Assessment Conference, Long Beach, CA, March, 2004
• AAC&U General Education Institute, Newport, RI, May, 2004

**Professional Presentations**

• Iowa Economists Annual Meeting (invited), Iowa State University, May, 2004
• National Science Foundation CCLI Conference (invited), “Invention and Impact: Building Excellence in Undergraduate STEM Education,” April, 2004
• AAC&U General Education Institute, One of five schools (out of 31 invited to the Institute) invited to present an overview of the general education revision process at North Carolina A&T State University to the AAC&U attendees
3. Engagement

Service to the University

- Executive Committee, General Education Core Curriculum Review Committee
  - Monthly meetings of both the executive committee and general committee
  - Development of mission statement, guiding principles, and revised learning objectives for general education curriculum
  - Town Hall meetings in each School/College for input on general education learning objectives (fall, 2003); endorsement of revised learning objectives in each School/College (spring, 2004)
  - Maintenance of comprehensive general education web site, including up-to-date minutes of all meetings
  - Development of application narrative for AAC&U General Education Institute; participation in AAC&U General Education Institute (5-member team from NC A&T) at Salve Regina University, Newport, RI (May, 2004)
  - Participation in AAC&U assessment conference, Long Beach, CA (March, 2004)
  - Development of revised General Education developmental curriculum model, governance structure, and assessment plan

- Member, Learning Communities Committee
  - Working with Learning Communities Committee to promote consistency with revised general education curriculum

Service to the Community

- Lead volunteer, 4th Saturday, Potter’s House Soup Kitchen, Greensboro Urban Ministry
- Volunteer teaching, freshman Civics course, Western Guilford High School
- Treasurer, Western Guilford High School Band Boosters
- Church volunteer, various ministries, St. Paul the Apostle Catholic Church

E. Goals for the Upcoming Academic Year

1. New/Revised Programs – Short Term Horizon

   - Focus on New Faculty Program – aimed at encouraging and sustaining community-building, development of innovative and effective teaching pedagogy, and research linked to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Planned ATL-led activities include:
Extensive new faculty orientation during the week prior to the start of the fall semester; orientation will include opportunities for new faculty to obtain email accounts, parking permits, introduction to Blackboard and Criterion, funded research opportunities, revised general education structure, library resources, instructional technology, and other services enabling new faculty to “hit the ground running.”

Follow-up workshops with more extensive information on interest areas included in initial orientation

Monthly New Faculty luncheons, with guest speaker leading discussion of topics related to new faculty concerns and institutional mission

“Innovative Teaching” poster fair early in fall semester highlighting innovative teaching practices of current faculty; to introduce new faculty to effective teaching pedagogies, use of instructional technology, and assessment techniques

Workshops on development of teaching portfolios, including teaching philosophies, samples of instructor and student work, and plans for faculty development; purpose is to increase awareness of intentional teaching practices among new faculty and serve as a catalyst to develop innovative teaching practices

• Development of Interdisciplinary Theme: Focus On Learning

Transform the campus teaching environment by focusing on meeting institutional needs related to FUTUREs and the general education revision process, developing a culture of intentional teaching linked to learning science research, increasing faculty engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning, and increasing the “publicness” of scholarly teaching.

Implementation of campus-wide reading groups based on common text, “How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School,” during fall, 2004 semester

Campus-wide workshop on “How People Learn: Lessons Learned,” at conclusion of fall, 2004 semester to reflect on implications for teaching

Follow-up reading groups during spring, 2005 semester using additional teaching/learning-related texts and linkages to themes of interdisciplinary learning, critical thinking, and communication, especially in first-year courses

End-of-academic year workshop/celebration of “Focus on Learning” – including nationally-recognized workshop leader linked to learning sciences and teaching pedagogy (e.g. Dianne Halpern, currently president of the Am. Psychological Association).
• Increasing faculty engagement in the teaching/learning process

Increase faculty participation in ongoing, sustained faculty development activities with the goal of increasing student learning outcomes, enhancing teaching pedagogy, effectively implementing instructional technology, and increasing participation in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

  o Development of Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) – groups of 5-10 faculty members researching scholarly literature on topics related to institutional mission (FUTURES, general education revision), teaching pedagogy, assessment of learning outcome, instructional technology, and other issues of interest to the campus; FLC members will lead ATL workshops at end of the semester and participate in end-of-year showcase of FLC work.

• Increasing use of formative assessment linked to learning outcomes and focused on course and program improvement

  This particular goal is directly linked to revision of the general education program; the focus is on development a culture of assessment focusing on enhanced learning outcomes.

  o Workshops and Faculty Learning Communities used to introduce use of rubrics for assessment of course/program objectives, with the aim of improved student learning; involve faculty in development of rubrics for formative assessment as a means of changing the aim of assessment from program evaluation to program improvement.
  o ATL assistance with the development of rubrics for formative assessment of general education student learning outcomes, departmental program learning outcomes, and course learning outcomes

• Creating a scholarly view of ongoing faculty development, including increased reward for teaching/learning-related activities

An important aim of the Academy for Teaching and Learning is to develop an environment where active faculty development related to teaching and learning is promoted, encouraged, and rewarded on a sustained basis. The ATL will carry out this aim through a variety of activities, including:
Teaching/learning workshops

- Visiting national experts leading workshops on teaching/learning-related topics (2 per semester). Potential line-up for 2004-2005:
  - Richard Felder (active learning)
  - Peggy Maki (assessment for improvement)
  - Terry Rhodes (interdisciplinary learning)
  - Robert Leamnson (first-year learning)
- Regular workshops led by NC A&T faculty; in particular, faculty participating in Faculty Learning Communities
- New Faculty Luncheons (monthly) focused a specific topic related to new faculty concerns/issues and campus initiatives (FUTURES and general education revision)
- Informal “brown bag” luncheon series – monthly campus-wide gathering of faculty discussing a teaching/learning-related topic, in particular topics related to FUTURES and general education revision.
- Development of additional faculty teaching awards for junior faculty and adjunct faculty; criteria developed and selection carried out by ATL Advisory Board
- Enhanced “Teacher of the Year” award process managed by ATL Advisory Board, including greater publicity for the award, public display of teaching philosophies on ATL website, more explicit linkage of teaching pedagogy and research on teaching/learning, and public display of teaching portfolio
- Public showcase of innovative teaching pedagogies (beginning of year) aimed specifically at highlighting effective teaching practices for new faculty
- End-of-year public showcase of the work of Faculty Learning Communities, including poster session, panel presentations, dinner, and sign-up for following year’s Faculty Learning Communities
- ATL financial support for departmental speakers/workshop leaders focusing on teaching/learning
- ATL hands-on developmental support for departments undertaking curricular changes
- Development of teaching/learning equivalent of the “Aggie Compact” focusing on student and faculty responsibilities for teaching/learning – initial development occurred during hands-on activities related to the May, 2004 “Focus on Learning” workshop; next steps will involve student groups developing learning expectations and then merging student and faculty expectations to produce an “Academic Aggie Compact – a campus commitment to scholarly learning and teaching.”
o Increased ATL involvement (with ATL Advisory Board) in development of teaching position advertisements that highlight the increased focus of intentional teaching linked to student learning outcomes, especially for faculty hired to teach general education courses.

o Development of comprehensive ATL web site and regular ATL newsletter to increase communication about teaching resources available to faculty

o Increase faculty awareness of teaching/learning resources available online via university subscriptions: Teaching Professor, National Teaching and Learning Forum, and Professional Organizational Development (POD)

o Development of web-based central workshop site for registration/reminders related to ATL workshops

o Increased faculty training in use of technology – working with Pat Chatt to increase training offerings in software use and use of course management software (Blackboard)

o ATL direction of an annual University Teaching Awards banquet celebrating teaching award winners from each School/College and the work of the ATL Advisory Board (spring).

2. New/Revised Programs – Longer-Term Horizon

• Enhance faculty reward structure for evidence of scholarly teaching – increase faculty awareness of the scholarship of teaching and learning, encourage funded research of teaching/learning projects, require explicit teaching portfolios as part of tenure/promotion package, increase understanding among new faculty of how to incorporate research interests in teaching. Overall, make the reward for demonstrable innovation and effective teaching explicit and intentional. ATL Advisory Board will be used to generate ideas on further developing this idea.

• Develop ATL Scholars program – provide summer support for development of innovative teaching pedagogies, assessment projects, curricular revision, as the basis for carrying out institutional mission and promoting external funding for teaching/learning-related projects.

3. Personal Development

Continual improvement in the ATL is aided through ongoing professional development of the Director. I plan to attend three professional conferences related to teaching/learning during the fall, 2004 semester.

• International Society for The Scholarship Of Teaching and Learning Conference, The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Perspectives, Intersections, and Directions, October, 2004. I plan to present a paper on Just-in-Time Teaching at this conference.
• 2004 Annual Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) Conference, *Culture, Communication, and Créativité*, November, 2004. This is one of two “must-attend” national conferences specifically for faculty developers in higher education.

• 24th Annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, *Creating Community for Teaching and Learning*, November, 2004. This is the other “must attend” national conference designed specifically for faculty developers in higher education.

4. Key indicators of progress

Many of the activities listed above in section E.1 (New/Revised Programs – Short Term) are new, so actual numbers of faculty involved is one baseline measure of progress that will be used to measure success. However, simply measuring numbers of faculty participating in workshops, Faculty Learning Communities, and other ATL activities does not fully measure the impact of ATL activities in meeting ATL objectives, in particular that of changing the campus environment and faculty attitudes regarding teaching/learning.

I will also be collecting qualitative data on ways in which ATL activities have influenced curricular change, innovative teaching practices, use of instructional technology, intentional linkages to general education and FUTURES objectives, increased understanding and implementation of interdisciplinary teaching, and overall changes in views toward teaching and learning. Such qualitative data will be especially useful from faculty participating in Faculty Learning Communities. I plan to use a pre/post framework to document changes in faculty knowledge, understanding, and implementation of innovative teaching practices and their linkage to scholarly research on student learning. One expected outcome is that there will be a greater intentionality in teaching across campus and a greater alignment of course goals and objectives with FUTUREs and general education objectives and the associated pedagogy and assessment methods used to promote this alignment.

If successful, ATL activities will result in noticeable changes in both the quantity and quality of initiatives aimed at improving student learning and teaching effectiveness. This type of improvement will be visible in new courses being developed, experiments with interdisciplinary and team-based teaching, increased classroom-based research on student learning, and the development of innovative assessment practices, such as the use of student portfolios. In addition, case studies can be used to document changes that occur over time - in teaching pedagogy, curricular design, assessment activities, and alignment with overall learning objectives. Focus groups, especially those involving new faculty members, will also provide useful formative feedback for improving ATL services for new faculty members and meeting their continuing needs as they develop professionally.
Overall, a variety of formative assessment techniques will be necessary to measure the impact and success of ATL initiatives and to suggest improvements in future ATL activities. While raw numbers provide some measure of program impact, more “micro-level” assessment data is needed to determine how effective ATL activities are in changing faculty teaching behavior and student learning outcomes. The development of this type of quantitative and qualitative assessment data will be an important ATL priority during the 2004-2005 academic year.

APPENDICES (provided as separate files)

The Appendices include three supporting documents: (1) the Department of Economics and Transportation/Logistics mid-year report, covering my professional activity from July, 2003 through December, 2003, and (2) AAC&U General Education Institute Application Narrative and Final Project Report, which highlights activities related to the General Education Core Curriculum and Review Committee during the 2003-2004 academic year and presents goals and objectives for the 2004-2005 academic year.
Faculty Questionnaire  
Department of Economics and Transportation/Logistics  
North Carolina A&T State University  

Covering the Period: January, 2003 - January, 2004  
Dr. Scott Simkins

1. **a. Grants Received During the Period**

   None

2. **b. Continuing Grants**

   National Science Foundation Project, *Collaborative Research: Developing and Implementing Just-in-Time-Teaching (JiTT) Techniques in the Principles of Economics Course* (with co-PI Mark Maier, Glendale Community College, Glendale, CA)  
   Project Period: April, 2001 – November, 2003

   Just-in-Time-Teaching (JiTT) techniques were used in my Principles of Macroeconomics courses during the spring, 2003 and fall, 2003 semesters. Assessment of learning outcomes was undertaken during the spring, 2003 semester and a web site with supporting materials for professors who want to implement JiTT techniques in their courses is currently being completed.

3. **c. Grants Applied For During the Period**

   National Science Foundation, *Implications of STEM Discipline Research for Instructional Innovation and Assessment in Economic Education*, (with co-PI Mark Maier, Glendale Community College, Glendale, CA)  
   Amount: $187,523

2. **Publications**

   None during 2003

3. **Presentations at Meetings/Workshops**


   (2) Invited speaker, *Developing and Implementing Just-in-Time Teaching in the Principles of Macroeconomics Course*, American Economic Association Annual Southeast Regional Economic Education Conference (Univ. of Richmond and UNC-Wilmington, sponsors), October, 2003, Wrightsville Beach, NC

4. Professional Meetings Attended:

See list of presentations in 3. above; in addition,

- NASDAQ IEM*IDEA Securities Market Conference, University of Iowa, April, 2003

5. Committee Assignments/University Service

a. University Level

- General Education Core Curriculum Review Committee, February, 2002 – present; Executive Committee, June, 2003 – present: carrying out general education core curriculum review and revision; led eight town hall meetings during fall, 2003 semester to solicit feedback on draft learning objectives.
- NCAT Learning Communities Ad Hoc Committee (Janice Brewington, Chair), Fall, 2002 – present
- Operating Board member, NCAT Academy of Teaching and Learning, Fall, 2000 – May, 2003: responsible for development and implementation of Academy of Teaching and Learning activities at NCAT.
- Faculty Advisor, Reginald Wilkerson, NCAT Ron McNair Scholars Summer Research Program, Summer, 2003: overseeing research on payday lending in NC (with Dr. Mark Burkey)

b. School of Business and Economics

- Teaching Collaboratory Co-Leader (with Larry Morse and Japhet Nkonge), Fall, 1998 – Fall, 2003

(c. Department of Economics and Transportation/Logistics

- Faculty Advisor, Economics Club, 1995 – 2001
- Textbook Selection Committee, 1995 – Fall, 2003
- Juanita Tate Essay Committee, 1995 – Fall, 2003
- Economics and Transportation/Logistics Department Web Site: Developed and maintain the Economics and Transportation/Logistics Web site, which includes
course and curriculum information, faculty information, career opportunities, economics-related web links, and the departmental Working Paper series. Fall, 1999 – Spring, 2004

6. Public Service

- CROP Walk (Walk for Hunger) participant, Greensboro, NC (1989 – present)
- Team Leader and Volunteer (monthly) for Potter's House, Greensboro Urban Ministry, Greensboro, NC (1992 – present)
- Coordinator, World Marriage Day Celebration, St. Paul the Apostle Catholic Church, Greensboro, NC (1996 – present)

7. Use of Teaching Aids

Extensive use of web resources for course management, content material, grade access, exercises, and Just-in-Time Teaching pedagogy. See last year’s report for examples.

8. Professional Organizations

American Economic Association

9. Impact of Research on the Department

Not currently applicable. No students have been hired for research projects I am involved in.

10. Other Professional Activities of Interest:

a. Professional Service

- American Economic Association Summer Program and Minority Scholarships, University of Colorado-Denver (2003)/Duke University (2004) and North Carolina A&T State University: selection of program participants
- Facilitated economic experiments conducted by Catherine Eckel (Virginia Tech) and Rick Wilson (Rice University) using NCAT economics students during April, 2003 and October, 2003.

b. Additional Public Service Activities

c. Honors and Awards

d. Other Presentations not Covered in Previous Sections

- Blackboard/Pedagogy Teaching Workshops (co-led with Dr. Lisa Gueldenzoph), NCAT School of Business and Economics, September, 2003: series of three weekly workshops focusing on use of Blackboard course management system for teaching

e. Reviewer: Journals and Research Grant Proposals
f. **Textbook and Web-related Activities**

- Directed the development of the Web site for *Principles of Economics* text by Robert Frank and Ben Bernanke (2003). Focus is on active-learning applications using the Web, including interactive graphing exercises and MathTutor applets.
- Web-site liaison - National Economic Association (NEA) and NCAT. I regularly post updates on the Web site received from the NEA Web coordinator.
- **ECONlinks Web Site.** I continue to revise and update the ECONlinks Web site, an annotated and selective list of links to Web resources I developed for Principles-level students in economics. More than 150 sites around the country (and internationally) have links to this site and it continues to attract widespread attention. This site is indexed in Bill Goffe’s *Resources for Economists*, the most comprehensive and widely recognized index of economics resources on the Web. The site was also featured in the July 2, 1998 and March 22, 2001 issues of the *Scout Report for Business and Economics*, an NSF-sponsored bi-weekly report on useful business and economics-related Web resources. The site averages about 45-50 “hits” per day (nearly all outside NCAT). Since October, 1999 the site has had over 37,000 visitors. [Online] [http://www.ncat.edu/~simkinss/econlinks.html](http://www.ncat.edu/~simkinss/econlinks.html)


g. **Current research activities**

- “Using Just-in-Time Teaching Techniques in the Principles of Economics Course: A Case Study,” for submission to Economics Centre of the Learning and Teaching Support Network, a United Kingdom-funded web resource site providing resources to college-level instructors of economics.
- “Harold Hotelling and the Theory of Depreciation” (with Bill Cooper, Accounting), a research piece describing economist Harold Hotelling’s work in the area of depreciation and its relationship to modern accounting depreciation standards.
- “Payday Lending in North Carolina: A Spatial Analysis” (with Mark Burkey), an extension of the McNair Scholar research done with Reggie Wilkerson in summer, 2003.
Application Narrative
AAC&U Institute on General Education, May 21-26, Newport Rhode Island
North Carolina A&T State University

Introduction

The general education curriculum review committee at North Carolina A&T State University (NCA&T) is at an important juncture in its review and revision of the general education core curriculum. After spending the last year reviewing the current general education curriculum structure at NCA&T and developing a core set of general education learning objectives to guide the revision process, we hope to be able to use the AAC&U Institute on General Education to focus our attention on three critical components of the revision process: (1) the development of a formal structure for the revised general education core curriculum, (2) the formulation of assessment criteria for both individual courses and the overall program, and (3) the development of alternative governance structures for the general education program that are consistent with the tradition and history of our institution and that will ensure that the general education program achieves the learning objectives that are set out for it.

History of the General Education Review/Revision Process at North Carolina A&T State University

1. Background

The General Education Core Curriculum Review Committee (GECCRC) at North Carolina A&T State University (NCA&T) was formed by the Provost during the spring semester of 2002 to review NCA&T's current general education program (whose structure was developed more than twenty years ago) and recommend revisions based on a survey of “general education best practices” of universities around the country. The GECCRC initially included thirteen faculty representatives representing the seven academic schools and colleges at the university; since then the committee has expanded to seventeen members, with representatives from the library and student affairs being added to the group. The group meets once a month to report on committee activities and plan future action.

Starting in 2001, the university also developed a strategic vision plan, “Uncompromising Excellence: Blueprint for the Future” (FUTURES), that refocused the university’s efforts on developing an “interdisciplinary learning and research university.” Revision of the general education core curriculum is a critical component in this process and is explicitly included in the FUTURES goals and objectives. In particular, in addition to developing students’ broad intellectual skills and introducing students to various methods of inquiry, the revised general education core curriculum is viewed as providing students with opportunities for “visionary and distinctive interdisciplinary learning, discovery, and engagement.”
2. Commitment to an Open, Transparent Process

We believe that the general education review and revision process should be open and transparent. We encourage full participation in the process by inviting all faculty to participate in our monthly GECCR meetings and by posting all meeting minutes, presentations, documents, and reports to a regularly-updated general education web site (http://www.ncat.edu/~simkinss/gened/). In addition, we seek campus-wide faculty input on important general education-related issues via open Town Hall meetings. For example, as noted below, we used a series of Town Hall meetings to solicit feedback from faculty regarding general education learning objectives during the fall, 2003 semester.

3. Review of NCAT General Education Program – Spring, 2002

During spring, 2002 the GECCRC undertook a comprehensive review of NCA&T's current General Education program, including comparisons with peer institutions, surveys of faculty, student transcript reviews, and student focus groups. Our review summary, completed in June, 2002 is available at http://www.ncat.edu/~simkinss/gened/GECCR_C_rpt_06_02.pdf, and includes a variety of recommendations on content, assessment, and governance of the general education program. During the fall semester of 2002, external consultants from the University of Minnesota and NC State University visited campus to review the General Education program and provided the Committee with a report of their findings. The GECCRC responded to the external reviewers' recommendations in spring of 2003 and also developed an initial draft of general education objectives and expected outcomes.


A five-person GECCRC Executive Committee was formed in summer, 2003 to begin developing a detailed General Education Review and Revision Action Plan, including a timeline. This committee developed a draft of broad general education learning objectives that were shared with faculty at the start of the fall, 2003 semester and were discussed in a series of General Education Town Hall Meetings in October, 2003. Faculty feedback at these meetings was used to generate a revised set of learning objectives in January, 2004. The revised version of the learning objectives also draws heavily from Chapter 3, “The Learning Students Need for the 21st Century,” of the AAC&U Greater Expectations report. The GECCRC also developed a “preamble” for these learning objectives that highlights the purpose of general education at NCA&T and provides a set of “guiding principles” for the program (available at www.ncat.edu/~simkinss/gened/preamble.pdf).

5. Current and Future Foci – Structure, Assessment, and Governance

The GECCRC is currently (spring, 2004) seeking endorsement of the revised general education learning objectives from each of the schools/colleges in the university and will forward these objectives for approval by the faculty senate by April, 2003. At the same
time, the GECCRC is initiating discussions on issues of structure, assessment, and governance of the general education program as we move to the revision phase of the general education review/revision process. Over the next twelve months we hope to (1) put in place a formal revised general education program, (2) develop assessment criteria for general education courses and the overall program, and (3) determine a governance structure for the general education program that is consistent with the history, tradition, and mission of the university.

6. Timeline

An annotated timeline for future general education review/revision activities is provided below:

Spring and Summer, 2004
Endorsement of general education learning objectives by schools/colleges
Approval of general education learning objectives by faculty senate
Develop preliminary assessment strategy for general education program
Develop preliminary policies for inclusion of courses in general education curriculum
Draft alternative structures for general education curriculum (e.g. thematic clusters, credit hours, goals and objectives)
Draft alternative structures for general education institutional governance

Fall, 2004
General education structure, assessment criteria and governance model finalized and presented to faculty for review and feedback via Town Hall meetings
Ongoing revision of structure, assessment criteria, and governance model
Initial development of pilot courses for general education program

Spring, 2005
School/college and senate approval of general education structure
School/college and senate approval of general education governance model
Initial pilot courses offered
Continuing development of pilot courses for general education program

Summer, 2005
Implementation of general education governance model
Post-course assessment of pilot courses from spring, 2005
Revision of general education policies and procedures based on assessment of pilot courses
Departmental development of new general education courses

Fall, 2005
Second round of pilot courses offered
Approval of first round of general education courses for general education curriculum
Begin testing of course and program assessment process
Faculty learning groups meet to discuss implementation of general education curriculum

Spring, 2006
Analysis of course and program assessment data from fall, 2005
Continuing development of general education courses based on fall, 2005 experience
Revision in course assessment policies and procedures based on fall, 2005 experience
Faculty learning groups meet to discuss implementation of general education curriculum

Fall, 2006
Full implementation of new general education curriculum
Ongoing assessment of general education courses and overall program

7. Summary

The GECCRC has completed its review of the general education core curriculum and has begun the job of developing revisions to that curriculum based on a core set of learning objectives. During the next twelve months the GECCRC will tackle fundamental issues of general education structure, assessment, and governance. We want to think about these issues carefully at this point in order to save both time and energy, as well as avoid backtracking, in the implementation phase of the project.

NCA&T Team Goals for the AAC&U Institute on General Education

As noted earlier, the NCA&T GECCRC is at a critical juncture in the general education core curriculum revision/implementation process. We believe that the AAC&U Institute on General Education will provide an invaluable opportunity for our team to focus its energy on three related issues - structure, assessment, and governance - that will drive the next stage of the general education revision process. In addition to providing a concentrated period of time free of other academic commitments and distractions, the Institute will give us the opportunity to benefit from the insights and feedback of a distinguished panel of institute faculty, as well as other participants who are also in the midst of curricular review and revision. Our goals for the Institute are summarized below.

Goal 1: Develop a Preliminary General Education Program Structure

At this point we have developed (and shared with faculty) a core set of general education learning objectives and “guiding principles” for the program, but have not yet developed a formal structure for the general education curriculum. Our next step is to develop alternative scenarios for making these learning objectives operational. In particular, we intend to focus on answers to the following questions:

• How should the general education curriculum be structured to achieve the learning objectives we have developed?
• What alternatives can we develop to replace the current “distribution requirement” framework?
• What types of thematic clusters of courses make sense, given our learning objectives, the mission of the university, and the FUTURES strategic vision?
• How can the general education curriculum address uneven student preparation for the general education core curriculum?
• How can we develop a general education curriculum that ensures interdisciplinary learning and critical thinking?
• How many credit hours can be devoted to general education?
• How can we ensure the development of general education learning objectives into the major?

Institute Action: By the end of the Institute we plan to develop at least two alternative general education curriculum structures that address these questions. The resulting alternative structures will be shared with the GECCRC and faculty during the summer and fall, 2004.

Goal 2: Develop General Education Course and Program Assessment Plans

The general education learning objectives were developed with an eye toward course and program development and assessment. We intend to use these learning objectives to provide faculty and departments with a guide for course development for the revised general education curriculum. Our plan is to “wipe the slate clean” in terms of the current set of courses that satisfy general education distribution requirements and have departments “make the case” for including particular courses in the revised general education curriculum based on how well these courses satisfy the general education program’s learning objectives.

We plan to develop guidelines for admitting courses into the general education program, which in turn will be used to assess the success of these courses. Courses will be assessed on a rotating schedule (every 3-5 years) to make sure they are meeting the general education learning objectives they were developed to satisfy. Courses that are not meeting those objectives will need to be revised and go through a “readmission” process similar to the admission process for new courses. Thus, we need to develop clear, concise rules for how courses will be admitted into the program, reviewed, and assessed, based on the core learning objectives we have already formulated.

Institute Action: By the end of the Institute we plan to develop a “rubric” for course development and assessment, as well as policy rules for the general education course admission/readmission, review, and assessment processes.

In addition, over the next six months our team will begin to tackle the difficult issue of overall general education program assessment. At this point we have not begun discussing how assessment will occur at the program level to ensure that students that finish the general education core curriculum achieve the program’s learning goals and objectives. Part of the reason we have not addressed this issue is that we have not determined the governance structure for the overall program. This issue is addressed in the next section.
Goal 3: Develop a Coherent General Education Governance Structure

The current general education core curriculum has little formal oversight or accountability outside of course grades; students simply earn a prescribed number of credit hours with passing grades across a number of functional areas. External consultants that reviewed our general education program cited this lack of intentional institutional oversight as a weakness in our program and suggested that we consider an independent “General College” structure to implement a revised general education curriculum.

We are currently beginning to informally review a variety of alternative governance structures but have not yet formally addressed this issue in our committee. The selection of a general education governance structure is intimately tied to the issue of program assessment and accountability; we plan to develop an assessment strategy that is both consistent with the ultimate governance structure selected and that will ensure the achievement of overall general education program goals and objectives.

Institute Action: By the end of the Institute we plan to develop at least two alternative governance scenarios to share with the Chancellor, Provost, GECCRC, and the overall faculty in summer and fall, 2004.

Institute Action: By the end of the Institute we plan to outline common program assessment strategies and specific processes related to each of the governance scenarios developed during the Institute.

Benefits of Participation in the AAC&U Institute on General Education

Our team is made up of faculty members and administrators from across the university who are important players in the NCA&T general education review/revision process. Two members of the GECCRC executive committee will attend – a faculty member from sociology and a faculty member from the economics department who is currently serving as the interim director of the university’s teaching and learning center – as well as two faculty members from key departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (English and math) and one faculty member from agriculture and environmental sciences. All team members are members of the GECCRC. Participation in the AAC&U Institute on General Education has the full support of the Provost and Chancellor.

While these members have been meeting monthly (with the rest of the GECCRC) for the past year and a half, the Institute will allow the team to jump-start the revision phase of our review/revision process by developing action plans that will be brought back to the full committee for review and revision before sharing with the general faculty during fall, 2004. The opportunity to spend a concentrated time on the three broad issues described above will save valuable development time and help us maintain our ambitious timeline. Often the summer months are “lost” to projects like curricular reform but we cannot afford to lose any time; we are committed to steady progress as outlined above and the
Institute will provide us with high quality focused time and access to experts in general education reform that is hard to replicate on campus. We hope to gain from the Institute faculty, as well as other participants in the workshop, deeper insights about our own general education revision process and helpful suggestions on how to promote faculty buy-in, ongoing assessment of learning outcomes, and the development of a culture of interdisciplinary learning and teaching.

At the same time, we believe that the progress that we have made in our own general education review/revision process will provide valuable insights for other teams who may be just beginning their own general education curricular review. For example, we believe that the open, participatory nature of our review process has helped to promote a healthy campus-wide discussion of teaching and learning issues related to general education and energized faculty to think about innovative solutions to institutional challenges such as students underprepared to engage in general education coursework, growing enrollment and class sizes in freshman and sophomore classes, use of adjunct faculty to teach general education courses, and the role of general education in professional degree programs such as engineering and business. In addition, the review process has sparked campus discussions on the role of ethics, race/ethnicity, and healthy lifestyles in a general education curriculum. Overall, we hope to be able to share stories of our own success in laying the groundwork for meaningful curricular reform, as well as gain from the experiences of others. We look forward with anticipation to participating in the AAC&U Institute on General Education in May.
At the time of our application to participate in the AAC&U Institute on General Education was submitted (February, 2004) our team had defined three specific goals to be accomplished: (1) develop a preliminary general education program structure; (2) develop general education course and program assessment plans; and (3) develop a coherent general education governance structure. In the time between our application and attendance at the Institute in May we made substantial progress on two of the three goals: we had developed a preliminary general education program structure patterned after Portland State University’s University Studies program and identified a governance structure incorporating a University Studies Dean and a Faculty Roundtable to assess course inclusion and program assessment. Therefore, we modified our Institute work plan to focus on issues related to goal number two: (a) developing fully defined learning objectives consistent with the four primary “pillars” of our preliminary revised general education structure and the revised learning objectives endorsed by the faculty in spring, 2004; (b) developing performance indicators to measure what students are learning; and (c) developing rubrics to measure how well students are meeting the prescribed objectives.

Action Items from Institute Work and Consultation with Institute Faculty

As noted above, our focus during the Institute was on refining our understanding of the assessment component of the revised general education program. In addition, as a result of consultations with Institute faculty, we developed an extensive list of “action items” that will ensure widespread diffusion of Institute-related ideas on our home campus and that will enable us to move forward thoughtfully, intentionally, and efficiently in the next phase of our general education review and revision process: development and implementation of a new general education curriculum.

1. Adjustments to our conceptual model of general education. Based on our Institute consultation with Terry Rhodes of Portland State University, we refined our understanding of the Portland State University general education model in two key areas: (1) the nature of the freshman and sophomore-level inquiry courses, and (2) the rubrics used to assessment movement of students developmentally throughout the general education curriculum. Terry noted the key feature of the freshman-level inquiry courses in particular. Students take three theme-linked courses that meet for a full year, with additional academic support provided by upper-level students. Faculty teaching these courses work closely together to provide a true interdisciplinary (as opposed to multi-disciplinary) learning experience for students. Terry also explained how rubrics are used to assess students’ developmental progress in the key knowledge areas that form the pillars of the Portland State University model. A single rubric is used in each knowledge area and students are expected to perform at different levels within this rubric at different points of their academic development. For example, in a numerical writing rubric ranging from 1 (ineffective writing) to 5 (highly effective writing) (with appropriate, explicit performance indicators), a student might be expected to perform at a “2” level by the end of the first year, at a “3” level by the end of the second year, and at a “5” level by the time they graduate. This type of rubric highlights the developmental nature of the learning process across a student’s academic
career and promotes continuous improvement throughout the curriculum, including into the major.

Action Item 1: begin to share the revised general education curriculum structure and assessment plan with all stakeholders this summer (administrators), at the start of school year (Faculty-Staff Institute), and continuing at the start of the academic school year (new and returning faculty).

Action Item 2: Focus on ways of increasing the interdisciplinary emphasis of our proposed general education program – and align with current FUTUREs initiative to remake the university as a “student-centered, interdisciplinary university.”

Action Item 3: Identify and consult with faculty members who would be willing to develop theme-based, interdisciplinary, linked courses at the freshman level, with an emphasis on communication skills. Provide course release or stipends to reward these faculty for being “first movers.” Publicize their successes.

2. Clarity on role of rubrics in general education program assessment. In consultations with Peggy Maki and Barbara Wright, we achieved greater clarity on the role of performance indicators and rubrics in assessing program-level goals and objectives and were provided with a number of real-world rubrics used by colleges and universities around the U.S. The issue of developing rubrics to assess learning outcomes of the revised general education program was the central focus of our team at the Institute; in particular, determining how to effectively craft, implement, and utilize performance indicators and rubrics to provide information to departments on what is expected of course proposals submitted for inclusion in the general education program, to provide guidance to the proposed Faculty Roundtable in how to assess these proposals, and to provide a basis for assessing the performance of general education courses after the new curriculum structure is implemented.

Action item 1: begin to develop performance indicators and rubrics for one of the four knowledge areas in our preliminary general education model, as a model for further development by the Faculty Roundtable group.

Action item 2: develop a plan to use faculty committees headed by members of the proposed Faculty Roundtable (along with students, graduates, and other stakeholders) to develop rubrics for the three remaining knowledge areas in our preliminary general education model.

Action item 3: begin to develop a handout that will outline a process for departments to use when proposing courses for inclusion in the revised general education program – a process that requires departments to link course goals to the general education program goals and provide an effective assessment plan that focuses on generating information that can be used to improve student learning outcomes over time.

3. Departmental implications/roles in general education revision. Following AAC&U president Carol Schneider’s advice, we plan to meet with all departments on campus to promote continuing faculty discussion of the revised general education program and their role in this program. We must emphasize that general education belongs to everyone. Based on work by Peggy Maki, we will also encourage departments to begin to develop assessment “maps” to link departmental goals and objectives to course content and pedagogy, as well as general education proficiencies, in an effort to uncover gaps in academic preparation and outcomes, with the aim of continuous improvement.
Action item 1: In September, visit each department to continue discussions about the implications of general education revision for their department and alignment of departmental goals and objectives, as well as assessment practices, with those of general education.

Action item 2: Develop heuristic program “map” to illustrate developmental linkages within the general education program, from “introduction,” to “reinforcement,” to “emphasis” of learning objectives within the program, throughout the four developmental levels in our proposed general education program.

4. Incremental approach to general education program rollout. Discussions with Institute consultants, in particular Terry Rhodes, reinforced our understanding that an incremental approach to implementing the revised general education program is the most effective way to provide focus to the process and promote an intentional, thoughtful, and manageable rollout of the program, while allowing faculty to adjust to the new structure in course design, pedagogy, and assessment.

Action item 1: Make Provost aware of the need for an incremental approach, beginning with freshman-level courses, and seek her approval.
Action item 2: Focus initial assessment efforts on one knowledge area (out of four) in our proposed general education model (most likely communication or critical thinking).

5. Need for increased faculty development. There is a clear recognition of the need for increased faculty development to (1) encourage the development of innovative, interdisciplinary courses consistent with the goals and objectives of the general education program, (2) educate faculty on the role of assessment as a tool for formative feedback and improvement of learning outcomes, (3) promote the use of structured, collaborative, active-learning-based teaching pedagogies. The director of the Academy for Teaching and Learning is currently working with faculty on redesigning general education courses and will be leading faculty in a number of hands-on initiatives during the 2004-05 academic year aimed at preparing faculty to actively participate in the implementation of the revised general education curriculum beginning in fall, 2005. ATL activities will especially target new faculty members and those teaching freshman and sophomore-level courses and will focus on how students learn and effective teaching strategies to promote that learning.

Action item 1: development of faculty reading groups centered on the text, “How People Learn,” with implications for general education program development, implementation, and assessment, along with associated discussion groups.
Action item 2: new faculty orientation linked to general education program revision
Action item 3: work with faculty on developing linked interdisciplinary-themed courses
Action item 4: offering workshops by visiting scholars and A&T faculty in the areas of teaching, learning, and assessment of learning.
Action item 5: develop set of interdisciplinary, ongoing faculty learning communities focused on issues related to general education revision, including effective pedagogy, assessment of learning outcomes, interdisciplinary learning, etc. Use faculty from these faculty learning communities to lead campus workshops and discussions on their specific topic.
6. **Mid-year administrators’ general education retreat.** Administrators need to understand how the revised general education program, governance structure, and assessment will affect Schools/Colleges, departments, and allocation of resources. We propose a one day working retreat to engage administrators in an initial dialogue on these issues.

*Action item: plan for a mid-year (December or January) administrator retreat including Deans, department heads, the Provost, the Chancellor, Admissions staff, Center for Student Success staff, the Registrar, and Student Affairs staff.*

7. **Continuous Communication.** In addition to visiting individual departments, we plan to hold a series of Town Hall meetings to share the revised general education structure, governance, and assessment model. In addition, it would be beneficial for us to begin distributing a regular (bi-monthly?) general education newsletter highlighting progress in the general education revision, implementation, and assessment process.

*Action item 1: hold Town Hall meetings in early fall outlining revised general education structure, governance, and assessment.*  
*Action item 2: begin publishing a regular general education newsletter informing faculty and administrators of progress in the general education revision process.*

8. **Development of clear timeline and tasks.** Given the need to implement the revised general education model in fall, 2005, it is imperative that we outline a timeline of tasks that will ensure meeting that deadline.

*Action item: develop detailed outline of specific tasks and dates for implementation of revised general education model by fall, 2005.*

9. **Participation in job description for Dean of University Studies and new faculty teaching in the general education program.** It is imperative that the person hired for the new Dean of University Studies position (1) be familiar with and advocate current general education reform efforts currently underway in the United States focusing on intentional learning and the teaching methods and curricular structures that promote this type of learning; (2) be familiar with and advocate assessment processes that promote continuous improvement linked to the general education learning objectives, (3) work collaboratively with other Deans to promote an intentional, developmental learning process throughout the curriculum, and (4) be devoted full-time to the implementation, monitoring, assessment, and improvement of the general education curriculum. The GECCRC should be involved in the development of job descriptions for both the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and new faculty members who will be teaching in the revised general education program.

*Action item: develop a job description for the new Dean of Undergraduate Studies position, participate in the hiring process, and work with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to develop job descriptions for new faculty hired in the College who will be teaching general education courses.*
10. Prepare for new team of campus leaders to attend AAC&U conference on assessment and General Education Institute *next year* to provide continuity in the general education revision process and include more faculty in the revision process. Possibly include non-faculty representatives to participate along with faculty.

*Action item: ensure Faculty Roundtable group (to be formed in September as faculty representatives from each of the Schools/Colleges) participation in AAC&U sponsored conferences. Develop narrative application outlining progress made on action items from this year’s Institute, assess current and future needs, and develop an action plan for continuing the general education implementation and assessment process in the following year (2005-2006).*

11. Plan and implement a campus-wide *Focus on Learning Day*” to highlight faculty initiatives linked to general education revision, course development, pedagogical innovation, student learning outcomes, experiential learning initiatives, etc. We would like to include a panel of AAC&U General Education Institute faculty to lead a high-impact event showcasing multiple facets of general education revision. This would provide a culminating experience for NC A&T’s year-long theme of “Focus on Learning” in 2004-2005, an initiative led by the campus teaching and learning center, and allow the team attending the Institute this summer to evaluate the progress made since the Institute.

*Action item: contact Institute faculty regarding potential participation in this activity and plan ways of showcasing NC A&T faculty work related to the theme of the event. Make this an annual event.*