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1. Executive Summary/Identification

The Center for Faculty Innovation (CFI) promotes new modes of teaching, scholarship, and creative work that foster an integrated curriculum and more meaningful student learning. The Center nurtures connections among faculty as learners, teachers, scholars, and creative artists and supports the intellectual life of the Loyola community within the context of our unique Jesuit

Housed in the Monroe Library, the CFI includes a meeting room on the third floor, instructional technology and staff offices, and print and online library holdings. The CFI is staffed by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Melanie McKay, and the Assistant Director of Faculty Development, Liv Newman. In October, 2011, Administrative Assistant, Tarana Lawrence, was hired on a part-time basis to support the Vice Provost. Approximately 30% of her time (10 hours per week) was allocated to CFI.

The CFI offers support to faculty in the form of university-wide workshops, a Faculty Academy, individual consultations, a resource library on best practices in teaching and learning, coordination of university-wide mentoring, internal grants, and Faculty Research and Publishing Groups. The Center also administers New Faculty Orientation.

New Faculty Orientation is a two-day program held in August to acculturated new full-time faculty to Loyola. Thirty-eight new full-time faculty participated in New Faculty Orientation in 2011-12. Faculty and staff from across campus participate as facilitators, sharing pertinent information related to teaching, research, and service (see Appendix 1).

Faculty Academy is a faculty development program which trains instructors to design and teach First-Year Seminars. Fourteen faculty participated in the 2011-12 Faculty Academy (see Appendix 2).

Three Faculty Research and Publishing Groups comprising approximately 20 faculty operated throughout 2011-12.

Workshops sponsored by the Center for Faculty Innovation (CFI) use a faculty-centered model. Faculty from all the undergraduate colleges and the library have served as workshop leaders. These outstanding faculty have presented their best practices and shared ideas related to the topic being addressed. Key articles by scholars in the topical fields have been distributed at all faculty seminars. The collection and analysis of evaluations has begun this semester in a consistent way.

2. Summary and Assessment Results: Center for Faculty Innovation (CFI)

Because the CFI works exclusively with faculty, the impact of our programs on students can be only indirectly measured. We assess our effectiveness in terms of faculty satisfaction and participation. We evaluate each of our programs (New Faculty Orientation, Faculty Academy, workshops and others) using self-report participant evaluations. At the first meeting of the Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee in the fall and spring semesters the results of
survey evaluations for the preceding semester’s programs are reviewed. In addition, during that initial semester meeting, necessary changes for subsequent years of programming are discussed and incorporated into the planning process for those future programs. All Advisory Committee meeting minutes are located on the CFI intranet.

Evaluation results for the 2011-12 New Faculty Orientation indicate that new faculty are satisfied with the orientation they receive (see Appendix 1). Each session was rated on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” with the statement, “The New Faculty Orientation covered topics of importance and interest to me”. Mean scores ranged from 3.57 to 4.61. Comments included, “Very informative and helpful,” “Outstanding!,” and “Thank you for this thorough orientation.” There were two comments that requested that more unstructured time be included for informal faculty fellowship.

The 2012 Faculty Academy consisted of one week-long series of development sessions that include presentations, pair/share exercises, and discussion activities (see Appendix 2). Evaluations consist of eight questions, six of which are designed to elicit qualitative feedback (see Appendix 2). The 2012 Faculty Academy evaluations suggest that participants are highly satisfied with the program. The questions related to what was most beneficial to participants and what recommendations for improvement to the program that participants shared are of great value for planning future programs. Repeatedly, participants responded that the program was beneficial to them as they prepare to teach a first-year seminar, “The program provided me with an excellent opportunity to meet and learn from other faculty members. I appreciated the material and the resources that the seminar provided, as well as the opportunity to receive constructive criticism in a supportive environment”. Increasing the number of opportunities for professors who are teaching first-year seminars to meet informally to share ideas and best practices, more discussion about how to incorporate Ignatian pedagogy into courses, and a session on grading rubrics were recommendations made for improving Faculty Academy in future years.

At the time of the 2010-2011 Annual Report submission, results from the 2011 Faculty Academy were not yet available. These results are included in this report (see Appendix 2). 2011 Faculty Academy evaluations were utilized to develop the 2012 Faculty Academy program. Recommendations such as limiting the program length to one week in May and increasing the opportunities that faculty have to collaborate with one another as they develop assignments were incorporated into the 2012 program.

2011-12 workshop evaluations indicate high levels of satisfaction with the programs. Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see Appendix 3). Across the board, participants indicated that the programs were “beneficial to me as a teacher,” “gave me ideas for use in my classes,” and taught me “something I had not learned before” (median score range of 4-5, with one exception of a 3 for one question on the evaluation of one workshop). Compared to last year, median scores for the question “I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation” increased from a range of 2.5-4.5 to 4-5, respectively. This significant increase now matches comments made by faculty that appear repeatedly across evaluations. Faculty commented that, “Sharing ideas with my colleagues” in a way that encourages “honest discussion” is of great importance. The ability to meet face-to-face with colleagues from a variety of disciplines to
discuss topics that are relevant to their professional development is of great importance to faculty.

3. Summary of Center Achievements and Committee Service

A. Community Engagement Activities: Liv Newman established the New Orleans Faculty Development Network, a coalition of directors of faculty teaching and learning centers from seven New Orleans area two- and four-year colleges and universities (see Appendix 5). The goal of this network is to share information and resources related to faculty development. The first meeting of the Network was held in Spring 2012. Future meeting will be held bi-annually.

B. University Committee Service:
   a. Liv Newman  
      Chair, CFI Advisory Committee  
      (ED)
   b. Melanie McKay  
      Member, CFI Advisory Committee  
      Member, Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum  
      (ED)

4. Strategic Planning and Goals for AY 2011-12

Strategic planning is conducted by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Associate Director of Faculty Development in consultation with the Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee. Input into planning is derived from a variety of sources: campus-wide surveys assessing faculty needs and interests; requests from faculty members, colleges, administrative units, and/or university committees for programming support; satisfaction surveys of those participating in Center for Faculty Innovation programs.

Planning for New Faculty Orientation, Faculty Academy, and workshops is shaped by self-report participant evaluations. For example, evaluations of the Fall 2011 New Faculty Orientation indicated faculty desired more unstructured time dedicated to increasing collegiality and support. Hence, the 2012-13 New Faculty Orientation included longer luncheons without planned presentations and a cocktail hour at the end of the Orientation that allowed faculty to meet informally with one another. In addition, 2011-12 evaluation comments suggested that presentation times were too long, thus they were shortened during the 2012-13 Orientation. Faculty have indicated that they would like to attend more faculty development workshops (median=5). An increased number of opportunities for faculty to share best practices and experiences during the 2012-13 year are being planned.

All programming is developed in accordance with the Center for Faculty Innovation Strategic Plan. The Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee selected six strategic goals to focus on during 2011-12. These goals include to increasing pedagogical competency related to improving students’ critical thinking, strengthen mentoring of faculty, supporting the Common Curriculum revision, Mission and Ministry, and extraordinary faculty.

Top Strategic Goals for 2011-12

1. Develop workshops designed to improve the teaching of critical thinking through active learning.
2. Organize and fund training for a team of faculty leaders in designing assignments to improve students’ critical thinking. The team will train other faculty in assignment design and in workshop presentation.

3. Enhance mentoring programs across the university. Build on existing mentoring guidelines to create Mentoring Handbook; create and sustain program of Master Teaching Mentors to supplement one-on-one mentoring of new faculty in departments and colleges.

4. Create and present workshop on designing course criteria and proposals for new and revised Common Curriculum courses.

5. Collaborate with the Office of Mission and Ministry to offer programs on Ignatian pedagogy

6. Develop plan to offer greater university-wide support to extraordinary faculty

Assessment activities related to these goals: data gathering methods and metrics used; location of assessments.

Goal 1: Several workshops were held throughout 2011-12 that focused on improving students’ critical thinking. These included:

- Friday, September 23  Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing
- Wednesday, September 28  Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing with Dr. Mary McCay
- Wednesday, October 5  Creating Effective Research Assignments
- Wednesday, October 12  Talking about Teaching: Creating Effective Research Assignments with Malia Willey
- Friday, October 21  Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning
- Wednesday, October 26  Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning with Dr. Erin Dupuis
- Friday, March 16  Creating Critical Thinking Assignments
- Tuesday, May 15  Creating Critical Thinking Assignments

Assessment of workshops is done by utilizing self-report participant evaluations. See Appendix 3 for evaluation results for these workshops. Assessment results are located on the CFI intranet.

Goal 2: In early Spring 2012, a team of 4 faculty members attended the CLA in the Classroom training session. This team returned to campus and designed a workshop to train faculty on how to develop multi-source writing assignments that enhance critical thinking. Two workshops were held in Spring 2012.

- Friday, March 16  Creating Critical Thinking Assignments
- Tuesday, May 15  Creating Critical Thinking Assignments
Self-report participant evaluations were used to assess these workshops (see Appendix 3). Assessment results are located on the CFI intranet.

Goal 3: The “Master Teaching Mentors” program encourages early- and mid-career faculty to engage outstanding teaching faculty in one-to-one mentoring began in Spring 2012. A dinner introducing the “Master Teaching Mentors” to early- and mid-career faculty was held in the Spring 2012 semester. There is no assessment instrument for the Master Teaching Mentor program. Given that the program is still being formulated, no assessment instrument can be created yet. Once the program has developed, then an assessment tool will be devised. The Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee recommended that the “Mentoring Guidelines” currently in use continue to be utilized, as opposed to a mentoring handbook. CFI, in conjunction with the Monroe Library, has several books on mentoring available to faculty mentors and faculty mentees. A list of these resources is available on the CFI webpage.

Goal 4: The Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum decided against offering workshops on designing course criteria and learning outcomes in 2011-12.

Goal 5: CFI collaborates with Mission and Ministry by publicizing all events that faculty development programs that are offered. In addition, workshops related to Ignatian pedagogy were offered by the Center.

Friday, November 18  Ignatian Pedagogy
Wednesday, November 9  Talking about Teaching: Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education with Dr. Tom Ryan

Workshop assessments use a self-report participant evaluation (see Appendix 3). Assessment results are located on the CFI intranet.

Goal 6. During 2011-12, the CFI Advisory Committee requested that member Robert Bell, Director of Writing Across the Curriculum, spearhead an effort to regularize the status of extraordinary faculty at Loyola. He gathered a task force of extraordinary faculty members, created a survey to determine the priorities of this group, and, in conjunction with the task force drafted a proposal to provide more job security and clearer status to extraordinary faculty members. The proposal was presented to the Provost, who referred it to the Faculty Senate. The Senate convened a subcommittee to review the proposal and recommend revisions if needed.

Briefly describe the results found through assessments. Describe how assessment results were evaluated

Goal 1: Assessment of workshops using self-report participant evaluations related to developing students’ critical thinking skills through a variety of active learning techniques indicate high levels of satisfaction (median scores range from 4 to 5). Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see Appendix 3). See Appendix 3 for evaluation results for these workshops.
Goal 2: Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see Appendix 3). The median score for each question listed on the evaluation form for the Critical Thinking Assignments workshop ranged from 4-5, indicating faculty satisfaction.

Goal 3: There is no assessment instrument for the Master Teaching Mentor program. Given that the program is still being formulated, no assessment instrument can be created yet. Once the program has developed, then an assessment tool will be devised.

Goal 4: N/A

Goal 5: Evaluation results of the Ignatian pedagogy workshop indicates faculty satisfaction (median scores range from 3 to 5). Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see Appendix 3). See Appendix 3 for evaluation results for these workshops.

Goal 6: While no formal assessment has been conducted of the extraordinary task force’s work, the efforts of CFIAC member Robert Bell have pushed extraordinary faculty issues to a prominent position in Faculty Senate deliberations. Success of the effort will be measured by progress made on regularizing the status of these faculty by the end of 2012-13.

Describe how the results were used to informed programmatic enhancements (provide specific illustrations). What action plans are being implemented?

Assessment results for New Faculty Orientation, Faculty Academy, and university-wide workshops showed higher levels of participant satisfaction than assessments from 2010-11. In each of these categories, faculty expressed positive feelings about the opportunities to interact with and learn from their colleagues, to share ideas, and to contribute to ongoing conversations about teaching and learning. Based on these results, we will maintain our programs in their present structures and ensure that opportunities for faculty interchange remain at the center of our planning.

6. **Budget:**

   **2011-12 Budget**

   Salaries and Stipends $32,000, Operating $19,000

   **Budget Discussion**

   Funds allocated to CFI are spent to cover the following expenses:

   1. Assistant Director salary (50% time)
   2. Student assistant salary 12 – 14 hours per week
   3. Publicity materials (flyers, brochures)
   4. Catering for workshops, meetings and lunches
   5. Miscellaneous funds for refreshments in CFI conference room, Library 334
6. Travel to conferences for CFI staff and faculty involved in faculty development programming
7. Mini-grants to faculty with projects to enhance teaching
8. Supplies and miscellaneous

The CFI operating budget was adequate to cover 2011-12 expenses, none of which involved bringing in outside consultants. Salaries were not adequate, as the Asst Director was paid 50% time for what was in fact a full-time job. Considering the amount of work she took on, this situation was unfair. Operating funds were adequate to cover expenses, including partial funding for training of the critical thinking faculty development team (remainder of funding for this training supplied by the Common Curriculum budget).

7. Supportive documents

Appendix 1
2011 New Faculty Orientation

New Faculty Orientation Schedule:

**Thursday, August 18**

8:45 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. Jesuit Breakfast
Danna Center, Audubon Room

10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. Introduction to Policies and Procedures
Monroe Library, Multimedia I
Dr. Melanie McKay, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs
Mr. Jon Gallaway, Blackboard Manager

11:45-12 noon Break

12 noon – 12:30 p.m. LORA for Faculty and FERPA
Monroe Library, Multimedia I
Ms. Kathy Gros, Director, Registration Services

12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. Public Affairs
Monroe Library, Multimedia I
Mr. Matthew Lambert, Associate Director, Public Affairs

1:00 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. Lunch
Danna Center, Faculty and Staff Dining Room

2:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m. Service Learning
Monroe Library, Multimedia I
Ms. Kelly Brotzman, Director, Service Learning

2:45 p.m. – 3:15 p.m. International Education
Monroe Library, Multimedia I
Ms. Debbie Danna, Director, International Education

3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Break
3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
Academic Support Services  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Ms. Sarah Smith, Director, Academic Resource Center  
Ms. Brooks Zitzmann, Counselor, Counseling/Health Services  
Ms. Liz Rainey, Director, Retention/Student Success  
Mr. Robert Bell, Director, Writing Across the Curriculum

4:30 p.m.  
President’s Welcome Reception  
Monroe Library, Third Floor

Friday, August 19

8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.  
Continental Breakfast  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I

9:00 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.  
Faculty Citizenship and University Handbook  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Dr. Barbara Ewell, President, Faculty Senate

9:45 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.  
Grants  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Dr. Heidi Davis, Director, Grants and Sponsored Programs

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.  
Break

10:45 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  
Library Services  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Ms. Malia Willey, Instruction Coordinator  
Mr. Brad Petitfils, Curriculum Developer

11:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.  
Undergraduate Collaborative Research, Honors, and Fellowships  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Dr. Naomi Yavneh, Director, Honors Program

12:15 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.  
Lunch  
Monroe Library, Seminar Room 4

1:30 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.  
SACS, Common Curriculum, and First-Year Seminars  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Dr. Lydia Voigt, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
Dr. Don Hauber, Chair, Common Curriculum Committee  
Dr. Christi Sumich, Assistant Director, First-Year Experience

2:15 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Center for Faculty Innovation  
Monroe Library, Multimedia I  
Dr. Melanie McKay, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs  
Ms. Liv Newman, Assistant Director for Faculty Development
3:00 p.m.    Adjourn to Dean’s Office

New Faculty Orientation Evaluation Results:

*Thurs., Aug 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fri. Aug 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Citizenship &amp; Handbook</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Library Services</th>
<th>Research, Honors, Fellowships</th>
<th>SACS, CC, &amp; FYS</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- Outstanding! Thanks!
- More time on grants and Academic Support services, 1 hr was not enough. Overall quite useful.
- As a graduate only faculty, there were many sections that didn’t pertain to me. It may be a good idea to separate out graduate faculty when they aren’t needed.
- Very informative and helpful.
- Talk about IRB & student evaluations. Nice to break into group by college & have deans talk to their own group.
- Thank you for this thorough orientation. Perhaps provide some fruit and healthier food/refreshment options if budget allows. Also, more structured chances to interact with each other.
- Shorten PowerPoint (and all presentations). Much can be found on the website. Stick to most vital issues. Otherwise good briefing.
- Info on student/course evaluations would be good. I'm nervous about advising and would like to hear more about it.
- People tend to fill allotted time. Please consider providing less time & asking presenters to focus their presentation.
- [Library Service presentation].Mr. Petitfils was clean & to the point.
- [Undergraduate Collaborative Research, Honors, and Fellowships] Basic questions not addressed.
- Faculty/student review procedure
- [Lunch] need more protein and less carbs

Would you be interested in a mid-semester luncheon with your 2011-2012 new faculty cohorts?

- Absolutely!
- Yes
- Sure
- Yes
- Yes

Appendix 2

2012 Faculty Academy

Syllabus for May 14-18, 2012:

Learning Objectives

Be an active part of a faculty learning community engaged in continuous exploration of best practices and effective pedagogies for the first year classroom;
Plan an interdisciplinary first-year seminar that develops basic skills in critical thinking and awareness of justice and injustice;
Design assignments to achieve the approved student learning outcomes for the first-year seminar (critical thinking, compassionate engagement, oral and written communication, information literacy);
Structure a syllabus to promote active learning, student engagement, and academic rigor.

Readings (on Blackboard)

*Provided to you by the Center for Faculty Innovation


Monday, May 14

Readings:
Ishler, “Laying the Foundation for General Education: The Role of First-Year and Short Seminars”
Erickson, Peters, Strommer, “Intellectual Development in College”
Erickson & Strommer, “Inside the First-Year Classroom”
Tewksbury and Macdonald, “A Practical Strategy for Designing Effective and Innovative Courses”

8:45 – 9:00 a.m. Coffee and Pastries
9:00 – 9:15 a.m. Welcome and Introductions
9:15 – 9:45 a.m. The Faculty Academy: Learning Outcomes
First-Year Seminar (FYS) Student Learning Outcomes and Course Criteria
Dr. Melanie McKay, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Dr. Christi Sumich, Associate Director, First-Year Seminars

9:45 – 10:15 a.m. First-Year Student: Who Are They and How Do We Teach Them?
Dr. Melanie McKay, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs
Loyola’s student population
High/School vs. College
Cognitive development

10:15 – 10:45 a.m. Jesuit Values and Justice
Dr. Mark Fernandez, History Department

10:45 – 11:00 a.m. Break

11:00 a.m. – 12 noon Outcomes Based Course Design
Ms. Liv Newman, Associate Director for Faculty Development

Homework: Begin developing assignments for helping students to meet the FYS student learning outcomes

Tuesday, May 15

Readings:
Bean, “Introduction”
Erikson, Peters, Strommer, “Knowing, Thinking, and Learning How to Learn”
Kloss, “A Nudge is Best”

8:45 – 9:00 a.m. Coffee and pastries

9:00 – 10:30 a.m. Teaching Critical Thinking (CT)
Dr. Melanie McKay, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Defining CT for Ourselves and Our Students
Exercises to Promote CT

Fact vs. Inference Exercises
Thesis Statement Exercises
Logical Fallacies
Structuring a FY Seminar Syllabus
Critical Reading
Pacing
Frequent and varied writing assignments with feedback and revision

10:30 – 10:45 a.m. “Beyond Classroom Walls”
Ms. Heather Roundtree, Director of Co-Curricular Programs

10:45 – 11:00 a.m. Break
11:00 – 12 noon Writing and CT: Writing to Learn
Dr. Robert Bell, Director, Writing Across the Curriculum
Bloom’s Pyramid
John Bean, *Engaging Ideas*
Assignments that build writing skills
Segmented assignments
Ascending the pyramid
Reflective writing and position papers

12 noon – 1:00 p.m. Lunch

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Creating Critical Thinking Assignments
Dr. Don Hauber and Dr. Marcus Kondkar

Homework: Continue drafting CT writing assignments

Wednesday, May 16

8:45 – 9:00 a.m. Coffee and pastries

9:00 – 10:00 a.m. Pair/Share ideas for writing assignments

10:00 – 10:30 a.m. Active Learning and Inquiry Based Learning
Dr. Erin Dupuis

Wednesday, May 16, continued

10:30 – 10:45 a.m. Break

10:45 – 11:00 a.m. Working with Library Liaisons
Ms. Laurie Phillips

11:00 a.m. – 12 noon Assignments to stimulate writing, discussion, and oral communication
Dr. Mary McCay and Mr. Brad Petitfils
Blogs
Wikis
Video Scripts
Presentations with PowerPoint and Prezi

Homework: Draft syllabus

Thursday, May 17

8:45 - 9:00 a.m. Coffee and pastries

9:00 – 12 noon Present CT writing assignments
2012 Faculty Academy Evaluation Results:

1. **What were the strengths of the program?**

The program provided me with an excellent opportunity to meet and learn from other faculty members. I appreciated the material and the resources that the seminar provided, as well as the opportunity to receive constructive criticism in a supportive environment.

The main strength was that the objectives of the first-year program were laid out in very clear way.

The organizations, the sharing of ideas, and the beginning sessions from Melanie about the purpose of FY sems. The supplementary reading materials are quite useful. And of course the camaraderie!

Developing friendships with other faculty members in different disciplines. This will be helpful both personally, and for the FYS (guest speakers, working through class issues, etc.).

The wealth of information and the diversity of voices offered different points of view.

Very well organized, relevant to course construction and mission goals. Good speakers. Interesting template for the courses we are to teach. Fraternity.

I found the early readings to be very eye-opening (and related classroom time, like with Robert Bell, Brad Petitfils). I also loved the assignment and syllabus feedback sessions

Energy! New ideas! Sharing ideas. Support system.

(1) Invigorating discussions on pedagogical topics; (2) opportunities to meet and collaborate with colleagues across multiple disciplines; (3) developmental feedback on my assignments and syllabus

2. **Which sessions were the most valuable to you?**

<p>| May 14 Faculty Academy Learning Objectives, Melanie McKay | 30.0% |
| May 14 First Year Students, Melanie McKay                | 50.0% |
| May 14 Jesuit Values and Justice, Mark Fernandez         | 30.0% |
| May 14 Outcomes Based Course Design, Liv Newman          | 30.0% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Teaching Critical Thinking, Melanie McKay</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Structuring a FY Sem Syllabus, Melanie McKay</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Writing and CT, Robert Bell</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Creating CT Assignments, Don Hauber &amp; Marcus Kondkar</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Active Learning, Erin Dupuis</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Library Liaisons, Laurie Phillips</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Assignments to Stimulate Student Engagement, Brad Petitfils</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>Presenting CT Assignments</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Presenting Syllabi</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which readings were of the greatest interest and benefit to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors/Title</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bean, John C. 2001. Engaging Ideas: The Professor’s Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom.</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Bette LaSere and Diane Weltner Strommer. 1991. “Inside the First Year Classroom” in Teaching College Freshmen.</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Bette LaSere, Calvin P. Peters, and Diane Weltner Strommer. 2006. “Knowing, Understanding, Thinking, and Learning How to Learn: The Goals of First Year Instruction.”</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Bette LaSere, Calvin P. Peters, and Diane Weltner Strommer. 2006. “Intellectual Development in College”</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishler, Jennifer L. Crissman. 2003. “Laying the Foundation for General Education: The Role of the First-Year Seminar.”</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kloss, Robert. J. 2004. “A Nudge is Best: Helping Students Through the Perry Scheme of Intellectual Development.”</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewksbury, Barbara J. and R. Heather Macdonald. 2007. “A Practical Strategy for Designing Effective and Innovative Courses”</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Over the course of the Academy, do you feel that you have been sufficiently prepared and informed about the purpose of the First-Year Seminar?**

I do.

Yes.

Yes. I know see that FY sems are more about preparing students to learn at a university level than they are about the subject matter.

Yes. I understand that the course is not so much about relaying content, but about fostering critical thinking skills. I understand the issues I will be presented with in teaching FY students.

Yes, and by extension, common curriculum courses as well major classes for first and second year students.

I had no idea what I was getting into. The writing assignment and syllabi presentations were especially beneficial. I am now able to reflect on the utility of the information presented in the course.

Yes

Yes!

Yes.

5. **Do you believe that you have the tools and resources to integrate Jesuit values, interdisciplinary, topics, writing, and discussion into your First-Year Seminar?**

I feel like I have access to those resources. The materials that we received and the things that we learned and shared together are really just a nudge for me to go off and find more specific resources on my own.

Yes, the various sessions were very helpful in doing these things.

All except interdisciplinary. That's still a little vague.

Yes, although the only one that I'm a bit unclear on how to teach is Jesuit values. That could be developed a bit more in the Faculty Academy.

Yes, I have already written several critical thinking exercises for the summer CC course and the fall majors course.

Yes. The handouts, sessions, blackboard posts are excellent resources for the writing component. I am inspired by the range and depth of topics my fellow FYS faculty presented. Your support system (including Library) is vital to success in this program.
Yes. All of these dimensions were sufficiently covered over the course of the week.

Yes. The readings, presentations, and discussions prepared us. Having access to faculty in other disciplines helps as well.

Yes.

6. With regards to teaching and the First-Year Seminar, how can the Faculty Academy improve to meet your particular needs?

In conjunction with the faculty academy, I would organize a large informal social gathering of all of the professors who are currently teaching or have taught a first-year seminar. I seem to get my best ideas while listening to the experiences of a wide range of professors, preferably in an unstructured setting.

Not sure; it was very helpful.

Everyone kept talking about grading rubrics - perhaps a session on those would be useful. More actual exercises, for example, the afternoon session on creating CT assignments would have been much more useful if we had actually done one.

It met my needs for the FYS.

Perhaps more exercises in the integration of Jesuit values in the syllabus.

Perhaps a pre survey. What is your discipline? Why are you teaching your chosen subject? What is your preferred delivery system? It may make the pedagogy sessions more relevant.

I wouldn't mind a more technical session devoted to using electronic media (how to set up blogs, wikis, how to do Prezis, etc)

Give the class one day to breathe after commencement. Doubling up two sessions would make up the time.

Increase the amount of time that we work in pairs or small groups to develop ideas or provide feedback to one another. Decrease the amount of time spent listening to other professors detail their assignments and syllabus.

7. We will have at least two more meetings during the semester you are teaching: one at the beginning of the semester and a lunch meeting midway through the semester to discuss “what’s working and what’s not”. Are there topics that you would like to have addressed during the ‘start of the semester’ meeting?

I am always interested in the students. I would like to hear other professors' impressions of their students and the dynamics at work in their seminars.

Maybe the grading rubrics could be a part of that one.
Not that I can think of right now.

Examples of specific exercises and how the students responded. It would be interesting to be included these discussions.

'What's working and what's not' is a great reality check. To see the same Fac Acad participants' real outcomes would be invaluable.

I can't think of any at this time

Attendance.

Perhaps the topic of engaging students from outside our discipline / the students who didn't select the course or don't want to be there.

8. Please list any other comments below. Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

I appreciate that the facilitators of the academy were willing to be critical of our ideas; it seems that sometimes during faculty training, there isn't enough of that.

I think one of the most valuable components is the sharing of ideas that occurred when we shared our assignments and our syllabi. I also think that you should be even stricter with the readings and discussions of the readings. Perhaps fewer presentations and more discussions on the readings. Seemed too much like an orientation - what's available at Loyola - and not enough focus on how FY sems are different from other classes.

Thank you! I feel much more connected to Loyola now, and I understand the purpose of the FYS. I was nervous to be presenting to and critiqued by my colleagues, but it was a very welcoming and comfortable experience. Thanks for all of the food and coffee!

The cognitive psychology component was very effective in understanding why the students think and response as they do.

Healthy food was a life saver!

Thank you! This was a great workshop!

2011 Faculty Academy Evaluation Results

What were the strengths of the program?

I think the times when we shared our own work and workedshopped our assignments were the most useful.

It was a great opportunity to discuss pedagogy and learn from colleagues...a great way to expand one's teaching resources and help keep one from getting stagnant.
First of all, I think that the program allowed professors to get in touch and share their academic interests. It also offered the opportunity to revise interesting documents helping to put in perspective our work as faculty during the FYS. I personally appreciated the hypothetical situations discussed. For me, they were revealing of the characteristics of the students we will have to work with.

Having the opportunity to interact with the faculty teaching the courses.

discussed issues of teaching that are not talked about in other venues

The 4-day seminar was very beneficial, and the speakers were great. I was only at the seminar due to my sabbatical. Including the Jesuit Identity into the program is important.

Facilitators seemed genuinely interested in supporting faculty. I also enjoyed the more hands-on activities and brainstorming with my peers.

Forward thinking. Offered practical tips. Allowed folks from across disciplines to present ideas, experiences.

Well-organized, thoughtful presentations, good readings, real team spirit

Learning about each other's pedagogy. Having time set aside to assess one's strengths and weaknesses regarding teaching, methods, materials, etc.

**Over the course of the semester and the Academy, do you feel that you have been sufficiently prepared and informed about the purpose of the First-Year Seminar?**

Definitely.

Certainly

Yes. I personally appreciate the effort made to present the problems we will all face as faculty.

n/a

Yes

Yes

Yes

Absolutely

Yes, absolutely

Yes
Do you believe that you have the tools and resources to integrate Jesuit values, interdisciplinary topics, writing, and discussion into your first-year seminar? Please explain.

Yes.

Yes

I have a vision of what my class must be and what I'd like to teach my students. I come from a Jesuit university in Latin America (Andrés Bello Catholic University, Venezuela) and our priority subject there is inequality and poverty. I actually spent three years developing research about the representation of poverty in the Venezuelan press. Previously, while doing my PhD, I analyzed salsa music as a representation form of the Puerto Rican minority in New York city and the US and as a key political symbol for Latinos everywhere. So I spend my whole academic life reflecting on subjects naturally connected with the Ignatian ideals. However, my challenge now is creating efficient methods to communicate these academic interests according to the protocols and demands of a new human and intellectual environment.

Yes. The Academy has done a great job of highlighting some of the critical resources on campus that can be incorporated in the First Year Seminars. I have especially appreciated Robert's presentation on critical thinking and writing. It might be nice, though, to have some discussion - beyond the presentation of the syllabus - about the particular seminars that are being taught.

Yes, we covered a lot of topics and if I did have questions in the future, I now know who to turn to for help

Yes, Fred Kramer was a great speaker to point me in new directions

Yes, though I think that Jesuit values are shown through example, not taught. These values should not come from a talking head but from the overall culture of Loyola. Critical thinking, of course, should be a part of every classroom. Jesuit values, however, trickle down from above. When they don't, it shows. Do we provide adequate, affordable health insurance for housekeeping staff? Do we offer our adjunct professors good compensation and an excellent work environment? This is where we teach values.

Yes. I had some tools before, and now I know how to better utilize these given the level of the student. I also think I better understand my subject matter given my clearer understanding of the goals of the course.

Yes, because the academy caused me to think through in detail the importance of these elements and what strategies and class activities would most promote these goals. I also benefitted from additional discussions with Fred Kammer and Robert Bell who very generously gave of their time to discuss my concerns.

Yes. I think the May 16th sessions best prepared me for this. I have also attended other sessions on Jesuit values.
With regards to teaching and the First-Year Seminar, how can the Faculty Academy improve to meet your particular needs?

Think more interactive sessions are better. Too many lectures from folks who didn't seem to be very good teachers themselves, at least from the presentations they gave at the workshops.

More of a focus on the nuts and bolts: how to get funding to bring in speakers; how to do field trips. This was really overlooked this year. Also, maybe a bit of attention could be paid to what First-year Seminars do across the country (and what the First Year Experience organization is all about -- for some people, this can also be a professional development opportunity; ie: presenting at their conference, etc). Overall, Faculty Academy is well designed and I do not really think much needs to be added.

Fostering the celebration of these meetings every year and presenting concrete cases of interaction between professors and students. I also think that the Faculty is very useful to help create a spirit of camaraderie among participants.

Spend less time on the abstract behavior of students (cognitive development, etc.) and more time on course development (assignments, readings, etc.)

Could use some training on new technologies such as iClicker and Blackboard issues that might help the freshmen who have not used Blackboard

More hands-on classroom activities. Guidance on student work load. Some classes seemed to rigorous for first year students. How much work is too much, too little?

Better organize the BB pages by day or "topic". Make all materials available on BB. Better explain on the front end how students are placed in courses, as well as the administration end-scheduling, course release from department.

I wonder if some segment might be devoted to the special concerns of faculty who are teaching freshmen for the first time or who haven't in many years taught freshmen.

I would suggest limiting it to the one week at the end of the semester. The gaps between the earlier sessions affected retention of the information. I think something on grading rubrics for papers, presentations, and other assignments would have been very useful.

We will have at least two more meetings during the semester you are teaching: one at the beginning of the semester and a lunch meeting midway through the semester to discuss “what’s working and what’s not.” Are there topics that you would like to have addressed during the 'start of the semester' meeting?

Maybe a quick overview of the freshman class. And what new services are being added to address such a large class.
By now, I cannot think of nothing concrete. I prefer waiting up until the moment I will be teaching my FYS to propose an issue.

Not sure

Creative assignments that have worked for professors.

What this current entering class looks like (descriptives).

Can't think of any right now but will submit any that I do think of in the next few weeks.

Grading rubrics.

Please list any other comments below. Thank you for taking time to complete this survey!

Thank you!

This was a great experience, and I am really glad to be a part of it. Often, professors are thrown into teaching after a strong and lengthy focus on research in their doctoral program. This helped redefine what it means to be an instructor. Thanks!

Great job. Learned to focus on needs for these students

Yummy treats!!! Maybe start at 930. Some of us evening folks don't have early morning practice!

All in all, the academy was one of the most productive faculty development exercises I have participated in at Loyola, and I really thank and congratulate all who were involved in it for a splendid job.

I would suggest emphasizing discussions, sharing methods, asking each other questions, etc. and avoiding lecturing at the participants (except maybe in the technology-related sessions). Some of the most useful sessions came in the last week, when we presented syllabi, or saw demonstrations of successful blogging techniques, and the likes. Overall, I really benefitted from the experience.

Appendix 3
2011-2012 Workshops

Workshop Schedule:
( ) indicate number of participants
Fall 2011
Friday, September 16       Internal Grants Information Session (20)
Friday, September 23       Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing (14)
Wednesday, September 28    Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing with Dr. Mary McCay (N/A)
Wednesday, October 5       Creating Effective Research Assignments (9)
Wednesday, October 12  | Talking about Teaching: Creating Effective Research Assignments with Malia Willey (N/A)
Friday, October 14  | Proposing First-Year Seminars (5)
Friday, October 21  | Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning (14)
Wednesday, October 26 | Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning with Dr. Erin Dupuis (N/A)
Friday, November 18 | Ignatian Pedagogy (17)
Wednesday, November 9 | Talking about Teaching: Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education with Dr. Tom Ryan (N/A)

Spring 2012
Friday, January 13 | Tech Savvy Soiree (16)
Wednesday, February 1 | Developing a Teaching Portfolio (17)
Friday, February 3 | Master Teaching Mentor Dinner for Recently Hired Faculty (29)
Tuesday, February 28 | Academic Integrity: Stopping Plagiarism Before it Happens (11)
Wednesday, February 29 | Academic Integrity: To Cheat or Not To Cheat (9)
Friday, March 2 | Righting the Cart: What To Do Once Cheating Occurs (7)
Friday, March 16 | Creating Critical Thinking Assignments (16)
Tuesday, May 15 | Creating Critical Thinking Assignments (23)

Workshop Evaluation Instrument (Sample):

Please respond to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.

1  2  3  4  5

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.

1  2  3  4  5

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.

1  2  3  4  5

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.

1  2  3  4  5

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.

1  2  3  4  5
What was most valuable?

Suggestions for changes:

Additional comments:

Thank you for participating.

Workshop Evaluation Results:

Fall 2011
Friday, September 16 Internal Grants Information Session

No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as an information session for how to prepare internal grants.

Friday, September 23 Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing

Total Number of Respondents: 12

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.
   Mean=4.25 Median=4

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.
   Mean=4.17 Median=4

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.
   Mean=4.17 Median=4.5

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.
   Mean=3.92 Median=4

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.
   Mean=4.75 Median=5

Comments:
What was the most valuable?
The actual read discuss/write discuss exercise
Practical applicability of critical thinking to all Mass Comm. classes
Suggestions, working in groups
Controversy of it all; articles to critique
Mary McCay’s enthusiasm and clarity
Structured, organized, but at the same time engaging for the participants
Other people have similar problems
A different way to approach issues
I liked the way Mary engaged us all, it was a great way to put us in the place of our students and to remind us of their point of view.
Discussing ideas with colleagues
Specific exercises

Suggestions for changes:
Enjoyed the analysis, but would like more time to hear or talk about the exercise in different disciplines
Have faculty introduce themselves and say what department they are in (I am new).
It was helpful as is!

Additional comments:
Love hearing teaching methods of our top teachers
Glad I came. Snacks appreciated. Mary McCay appreciated.
Great food & drink
Thanks!
I wish the assignment was more general. I don’t know how I would use it.

Wednesday, September 28  Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing with Dr. Mary McCay
No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Wednesday, October 5  Creating Effective Research Assignments

Total Number of Respondents: 8

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.
   Mean= 4.25   Median=4

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.
   Mean= 4.25   Median=4

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.
   Mean=4.5   Median=4

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.
   Mean= 3.875   Median=4

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.
   Mean= 4.125   Median=4
Comments:
What was most valuable?
Alternative to research papers
Best practices and exploratory research assignment alternatives to cover and see some examples to these.
Assignment alternatives
Ideas concerning what could be offered but often is not (e.g. strategies for avoiding plagiarism)
Handout
Discussion was very structured and clear. Very useful.

Suggestions for changes:
Slow down! Your information is good and helpful.
Nice job

Additional comments:
Thanks Brian and Malia!
I was intrigued by the screen capture software mentioned

Wednesday, October 12	Talking about Teaching: Creating Effective Research Assignments with Malia Willey

No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Friday, October 14	Proposing First-Year Seminars

No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as an information session for how to prepare proposals for first-year seminars.

Friday, October 21	Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning

Total Number of Respondents: 10

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.
   Mean=4.6 Median=5

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.
   Mean=4.8 Median=5

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.
   Mean=4.7 Median=5

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.
   Mean=4.8 Median=5

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.
Mean= 4.8    Median=5

Comments:
What was most valuable?
Hearing what other faculty are doing, teaching inventory
Specific, clear suggestions on how to engage students in active learning
Simple technique
New methods to engage students
University of Iowa teaching inventory
Different strategies for active learning
Suggestions for keeping them engaged
Suggestions for classroom actions to take

Suggestions for changes:
Maybe practice some of those techniques in class
Have us do something to illustrate the points

Additional comments:
Thank you
Great job. Very helpful. Thank you.
Thanks! These seminars are great!
Thanks. Good summary

Wednesday, October 26      Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning with Dr. Erin Dupuis

No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Friday, November 18        Ignatian Pedagogy

Total Number of Respondents: 6

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.
   Mean= 4.2    Median=4

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.
   Mean=3.2    Median=3

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.
   Mean=4.3    Median=4

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.
   Mean= 4.3    Median=4.5

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.
Mean= 4.5     Median=4.5

Comments:
What was most valuable?
Moderator, J. Sebastian
The discussion of the issue of retention vs. critical thinking
Honest discussion

Suggestions for changes:
None

Additional comments:
None

Wednesday, November 9       Talking about Teaching: Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education
with Dr. Tom Ryan

No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering
of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Spring 2012

Friday, January 13          Tech Savvy Soiree

Number of Respondents: 12

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.
   Mean= 4.5     Median=5

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.
   Mean=4.5     Median=5

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.
   Mean= 4.8     Median=5

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom
   experiences and best practices.
   Mean= 4.4     Median=5

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.
   Mean= 4.9     Median=5

Comments:
What was most valuable?
“Learning a practical new technology that might make my life easier”
“I was introduced to an alternative to powerpoint.”
“Explanation + practice.”
“New tech”
“Demonstration”
“The whole presentation was great. Probably the most beneficial so far because it is sooo practical and I have been wanting to learn but scared to try myself.”
“Access to software and account”
“Exposure to this new presentation option.”
“Brian did a great job”
“Learning how it can be applied in class.”
“Brian is so great and fun to listen to”

Suggestions for changes:
“None!!!”
“None”
“More hands on for dummies.”
“Follow up in greater detail.”
“I suggest a walk-through with instructions since we are all first-time users.”

Additional comments:
“Thanks for putting this together!”
“The program does not do what I need for Music but Brian did a great job.”
“Thank you”
“Great presentation!”
“Excellent!”
“Thanks, Brian!”
“Great session!”

Wednesday, February 1 Developing a Teaching Portfolio

Total Number of Respondents=13

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a faculty member.
   Mean= 4.4   Median=5

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in preparing for tenure/annual review.
   Mean=4.6   Median=5

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.
   Mean= 4.2   Median=4

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.
   Mean= 4.6   Median=5

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.
   Mean= 4.9   Median=5

Comments:
What was most valuable?
Listening to how other colleges deal with promotion and tenure.
Seeing as a whole university policy and procedures and learning from other colleges.
Open discussion
Watching and listening to Mary
Comparisons between different schools was enlightening
Getting a sense of the scope of the review
Including mentoring/research into my teaching narrative
Specifics on what to include in a portfolio
Realizing things are very different across colleges and I need to get info from college reps.
This was very helpful. Thanks!
HUNS document, fact that we should include teaching materials from previous teaching

Suggestions for changes:
Have a session for those going up for full professor.
Criteria standardized for tenure between colleges
If you’re offering a list, make it a checklist – a to-do list
Help with CSS reviews!
Excellent
Having college-specific workshops
Unanswered question – how to incorporate advising

Additional comments:
Thank you
Thanks!
The timing was great, as 4th year review is right around the corner
Thank you!!

Friday, February 3 Master Teaching Mentor Dinner for Recently Hired Faculty
No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Tuesday, February 28 Academic Integrity: Stopping Plagiarism Before it Happens
No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Wednesday, February 29 Academic Integrity: To Cheat or Not To Cheat
No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.

Friday, March 2 Righting the Cart: What To Do Once Cheating Occurs
No evaluation was administered for this workshop because it was designed as informal gathering of faculty to discuss issues and concerns related to the workshop topic.
Friday, March 16  

Creating Critical Thinking Assignments

Total Number of Respondents: 7

1. This seminar was beneficial to me as a teacher.  
   Mean= 4.3    Median=4

2. This seminar gave me ideas for use in my classes.  
   Mean= 4.0    Median=4.5

3. I learned something that I had not considered before.  
   Mean=4.4    Median=5

4. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the conversation by sharing my own classroom experiences and best practices.  
   Mean= 3.9    Median=4

5. I am interested in attending future workshops.  
   Mean= 4.7    Median=5

Comments:  
What was most valuable?  
New ideas  
Examples of critical thinking exercises  
Framework introduced for critical thinking

Suggestions for changes:  
Maybe an additional contribution to provide examples of how Loyola professors could relay.  
More graphics

Additional comments:  
None

Tuesday, May 15  

Creating Critical Thinking Assignments

This workshop was evaluated as part of Faculty Academy since it was designed as a required component of Faculty Academy (see Appendix 2).

Appendix 4  

Extraordinary Faculty Survey Results and Proposal

Extraordinary Faculty Survey Results:

Administered in May 2011 to all full-time members of the extraordinary faculty. Of the 61 surveys we sent out, 46 surveys were completed for a response rate of 80%. The survey included questions about the respondent's employment history and current and past responsibilities at Loyola as well as
questions regarding each respondent’s opinions about the current working and employment conditions for extraordinary faculty and possible changes to those conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HuNS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at Loyola</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visting Ass't</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Prof</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have contractual responsibilities with Loyola other than teaching?
Yes                                   17       37.0
No                                     29       63.0

- Center Director
- Gallery Director
- Administrative and support in WAC
- Committees, accreditation responsibilities, research, service, and grants
- I direct the foreign language lab
- administrative
- help fundraising
- director of freshmen English
- committee work
- I do everything that is expected of a tenure track faculty member: excellence in teaching, research, publications, service to the department, college, and community. I also carry a full advising load.
- course reduction for ENGL internships
- Production Manager
- But I am treated as though I do! I am the only extraordinary person in my department who is responsible for a committee, and I am responsible for the upcoming accreditation of the DNP program. Where are all the tenured and tenure track faculty????? Why aren’t one of them responsible for this, along with all of the extra work involved in this???

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes per Sem</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Hrs/Wk*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*How many hours do you spend in the classroom?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of teaching, do you or have you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developed new courses</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team taught</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught first-year seminars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught upper-level courses</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught online</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught honors courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught summer school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilized service learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- whatever the department needs
- organized visiting artists lectures and workshops
- taught Summer Bridge classes
- teach graduate courses
- taught practicums and developing new honors courses
- honors workshops, independent studies, academic area coordinator
- thesis & independent studies
- independent studies and honors thesis supervision
- we do not have first year seminars nor honors courses in my department. I have developed three of the new courses for the new DNP program, and I revised 1/3 of the HCSM masters courses using the CADE process
- graduate level courses on a regular basis

Other than teaching, do you or have you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formally advised students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended conferences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presented at conferences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied for internal grants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received internal grants</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied for external grants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received external grants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
obtained course releases 10 21.7
held administrative responsibilities 17 37.0
served on departmental committees 28 60.9
service on university committees 21 45.7
published or departmental equivalent 27 58.7
none of the above 2 4.3

46 100.0

- organized exhibitions of local, national, and international artists. Arranged educational tours and publications of these exhibitions
- I’ve held administrative responsibilities at other universities before coming to Loyola
- director student gallery, junior review coordinator
- Clinical practice
- Up until this year I have had a caseload of 75-80 students to advise. We are required to attend conference, in fact we are signed up for them as are all departmental faculty without being asked. I have presented at conferences on behalf of Loyola, without even being compensated for my expenses.
- faculty advisor for 2 student groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30-34,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35-39,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40-44,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45-49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-54,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55-59,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you interested in long-term employment at Loyola?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you interested in entering into a traditional tenure-line position?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I do not have my doctoral degree, and, in order to achieve that goal, would have to leave my full-time position at Loyola New Orleans, so I am (understandably) not eligible for tenure-track. If it were possible to be considered with my degree (which is largely considered terminal in my field) I would most certainly be interested.
- I interviewed for a tenure line (chair) position, but the dean thwarted the search midstream and I was offered this position.
- If the criteria we[re] based primarily on current contractual expectations
- If I were a younger person I might be interested. When I first arrived at Loyola I was full of energy and ready to be fully engaged in the University and academic community. The workload has been challenging my creativity and on not being able as extraordinary faculty in 2002-2008 to fully participate in such grants, committees, erodes a person’s enthusiasm about academica.
- As extraordinary faculty I do teaching, research, and service as though I were ordinary faculty. So I’m not interested if changing to ordinary faculty to be eligible for tenure means losing years of service and starting over.
There is a great deal of pressure to publish research (sometimes useless) which I have no desire to pursue at this point.

Maybe, if they fix the pay scale for the tenure line and several senior faculty retire. The whole system is so antiquated and out of wack [sic], I don’t know if I’d dip my toe in.

That would be great, if the tenure-line position was in my speciality—creative writing—but not if it was just for teaching composition.

I applied for a tenure track spot and was not given it, although I felt those hired in have not performed their job as well as I have performed mine. Actually on hire I was told there were no tenure track openings, and then someone was hired a semester later, who had never even taught nursing courses, while I had taught for some 9 years, and had a much better resume than she had in terms of publications, grants, etc. I think there were other issues at play that caused this to happen, you know politics...

Perhaps the terminology is “Clinical” Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you be interested in some alternative to traditional tenure (for example, a seniority system without tenure, “teaching tenure,” etc.)?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraordinary Faculty Proposal:

Date: November 4, 2011

From: Robert Bell, Department of English, HNS
Alice Kornovich, Department of Languages, HNS
Sue Mennino, Department of Sociology, CSS

For the members of the Extraordinary Faculty Task Force

Valerie Andrews, School of Mass Communication, CSS
Barbara Brainard, Visual Arts, CMFA
Patrick Gendusa, Theatre Arts & Dance, CMFA
Jean Meyer, COB
Karen Reichard, Director, Women’s Resource Center & FY seminar instructor

To: Melanie McKay
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Re: Proposal to Revise Extraordinary Faculty Employment Conditions

The purpose of this report is to bring together information and to recommend measures that will improve the situation of extraordinary faculty all the colleges of the university. Loyola University has an extraordinary faculty that is active, talented, and devoted to the university and its students. Members often teach work-intensive courses and carry out duties that are crucial to the daily operation of the institution. In the spirit of strengthening Loyola, we are making some proposals to improve the status of this faculty and to deal with extraordinary-faculty issues in fair and appropriate ways.

Over the course of the past year, several projects have been undertaken in order to improve the working conditions of the full-time extraordinary faculty at Loyola. These include 1) a survey of extraordinary faculty across all colleges administered in May 2011 to gather information, 2) a motion put forth in the College Assembly of HNS and unanimously passed to ask for greater salary equity for extraordinary faculty across the colleges and 3) a pilot project recently initiated in the English Department to offer longer-term employment to extraordinary faculty and reflect some seniority.

1) Extraordinary Faculty Survey Summary

(For full results see Appendix A)

The Extraordinary Faculty

In May 2011, we administered an online survey to all full-time members of the extraordinary faculty. Of the 61 surveys we sent out, 46 surveys were completed for a response rate of 80%. The survey included questions about the respondent’s employment history and current and past responsibilities at Loyola as well as questions regarding each respondent’s opinions about the current working and employment conditions for extraordinary faculty and possible changes to those conditions.

Nearly half of the respondents are from the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences; the fewest number came from the College of Business. Most have been teaching at Loyola for more than three years, and eight respondents have been at Loyola for over 10 years. Perhaps not surprisingly, most teach 4-5 classes per semester. Overall, the vast majority (82.7%) of the respondents are satisfied with their experience at Loyola. Though half of the respondents reported being interested in a tenure-track position here at Loyola, just over three-quarters reported an interest in some kind of alternative position, particularly one with more job security than they currently have.

A substantial proportion (80.4%) have taught upper-level courses. A few (8.7%) have even taught honors courses. The data illustrate that extraordinary faculty members are engaged in teaching, participating in optional teaching-related activities that benefit Loyola and their fellow ordinary faculty members. For example, the vast majority (91.3%) have developed new courses. Several have also taught first-year seminars (13%), team taught (37%), or used service learning in their courses (32.6%). Three of the extraordinary faculty members reported supervising independent studies; two reported teaching graduate-level courses.

In addition to teaching, the data show that extraordinary faculty members are also engaged in service and scholarship, activities typically associated primarily with ordinary faculty. Service activities include advising students in a formal capacity (52.2%), serving on departmental committees (60.9%), serving on university committees (45.7%), and a variety of other service activities, for example, serving as a faculty advisor for student groups and organizing exhibitions. Scholarship activities include presenting at conferences (56.5%), publishing (58.7%), obtaining both internal (28.3%) and external (21.7%) grants and course releases (21.7%), and even holding administrative responsibilities (37%).
**Advantages of being an Extraordinary Faculty Member**

We asked the respondents about the most notable advantages of being an extraordinary faculty member at Loyola. Though the most commonly reported advantage was “none,” several of the faculty reported that, in general, the working conditions and the students at Loyola are better than other local universities, but this seemed to be at least somewhat dependent on the actual department. For example, one respondent cited the “Willingness of my particular department to grant course releases…” and another stated,” “I feel included in my department. I like my colleagues and work environment.” Others mentioned specific pressures that ordinary faculty face and voiced relief at being exempt from the responsibilities carried by ordinary faculty, specifically the pressure to publish, expectation of committee work, and being involved in university politics. Having less pressure than ordinary faculty also means extraordinary faculty have more flexibility, more time for family, and can concentrate on teaching.

**Disadvantages of being an Extraordinary Faculty Member**

When asked about the most notable disadvantages of being an extraordinary faculty member, the most common responses were, by far, concentrated on the year-to-year contracts and the resulting job insecurity. Of the 38 respondents who answered this question, nearly one-third (12) specifically mentioned job insecurity. The respondents expressed this disadvantage in a number of ways: “The short-term contracts and associated lack of stability can make one very nervous,” “The year-to-year anxiety of contract renewal,” “The insecurity that comes with being unsure if I’ll have a job next year,” “lack of job security,” “lack of security in obtaining a contract,” and “lack of a clear future” are representative responses.

In addition to the lack of security, respondents also reported that the lack of support for research activities as a disadvantage, particularly the inability to take sabbaticals. This lack of support was described as being especially unfair when the expectation for scholarship was on a par with ordinary faculty. “No research leave with research expectations” and “Lack of sabbatical opportunity (yet I am expected to do research)” were the explanations used by two of the respondents.

Another disadvantage mentioned fairly commonly by the respondents was being treated as a “second class citizen” by members of the ordinary faculty, e.g., “being undervalued as a professional colleague” and “often disdained” by the administration.

**Discrepancies**

There seems to be some notable differences between ordinary and extraordinary faculty in the availability of some research related support, although it is unclear whether these differences exist at the college level or the department/school level. For example, as reported earlier, nearly one-quarter (21.7%) of the respondents reported having obtained course releases, yet several mentioned the unavailability of course releases as a distinct disadvantage to extraordinary faculty. Similarly, several mentioned the limited access to internal grants as a disadvantage, though just over a quarter (28.3%) had actually obtained one. Two respondents are even under the impression that extraordinary faculty are not eligible at all for internal grants. One respondent also mentioned unavailability of travel funds, though a majority (73.9%) had attended a conference.

Many of the respondents also seem to be under the impression that extraordinary faculty are “woefully underpaid” compared to ordinary faculty, using terms such as “low salaries,” “underpaid,” “less money,” and “low pay”. One respondent reported, “…I’m still paid the same as my first year.” These comments are an interesting contrast to the reported income distribution shown in Table 1. Half of the extraordinary faculty have salaries between $35,000 and $50,000, but 30.4% have salaries about $60,000.
Suggestions

Several expressed appreciation that this survey happened at all. A few expressed cynicism about both the survey and about the tenure system in general, arguing that it promotes a two-class faculty.

Many made suggestions, though, about what Loyola might do to improve the conditions for extraordinary faculty. When asked to comment on a type of alternative faculty position, 29 offered suggestions. Some seemed to want to eliminate extraordinary faculty altogether, suggesting that the benefits and requirements be equal to those of ordinary faculty. Most of the other comments were supportive of some sort of teaching tenure, with a length of service requirement and demonstrated teaching proficiency. In return, faculty would receive multiyear (usually 3-5) contracts that are automatically renewable based on performance reviews. One person also mentioned incorporating protected seniority. Other suggestions included requiring extraordinary faculty to participate in department or university service, such as advising students and limited committee work.

2) College of Humanities and Natural Sciences Motion

On December 9, 2010, the College Assembly for the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences unanimously passed the following motion:

Preamble

Loyola University subscribes to the ideal of the “cura personalis,” the education of the whole person, which instills in students a sense of responsibility to act justly for their fellow human beings and to work to create a more just and humane world. Ideals are only as credible as the actions that accompany them, and it is damaging to a university if, in managing its own affairs, it does not heed the very principles with which it seeks to advertise itself to the public.

An institution with an avowed concern for the value and dignity inherent in each person must demonstrate this in its dealings with its extraordinary faculty. There is widespread inequality in the compensation of extraordinary faculty across the colleges. Many of the most work-intensive courses in the university are taught by the extraordinary faculty, and unfair compensation conveys the message that their efforts are little valued.

To address this situation, the following motion is proposed….

Motion

We move that the university act to establish salary equity for extraordinary faculty across the colleges, both for the base salaries of new hires and for the salary range of longer-term employees.

The motion was amended to include equalization of teaching loads as well.

3) English Department Pilot Program

The English Department of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences has initiated a pilot project for improving the working conditions of extraordinary faculty. When fully implemented, this project will permit full-time extraordinary faculty members who have taught at Loyola for three consecutive years to apply for a three-year binding contract with a course reduction to a 3 / 4 teaching load and some additional advising duties. At the end of the three-year contract, the faculty member may apply for a renewable five-year binding contract with a 5% salary increase. Applications for both these longer-term
contracts are pending approval, but the university attorney, Gita Bolt, has prepared a contract to be issued by the Provost as part of the hiring process for these kinds of extraordinary faculty positions. This is a significant improvement to extraordinary faculty members. (See Appendix B for the English Department proposal and Appendix C for the attorney letter).

**Task Force Proposals**

Loyola University can address some of the most pressing concerns of the extraordinary faculty by introducing some measures to increase the stability of their employment and to reward experience and performance over time. The issue that undoubtedly causes the most concern is the one-year contracts; such contracts create disadvantaged situations in the extreme when compared to every other kind of job. The university could remedy this by adapting a model similar to one that the English Department is piloting. For example, after three consecutive one-year contracts, an extraordinary faculty member would be offered a position with a three-year contract, a reduced teaching load, and an increase in the base salary (separate from the yearly merit raises available to all extraordinary faculty). Upon the successful completion of a three-year contract and positive evaluations, the faculty member would then regularly be issued three-year contracts.

We propose that the university move to create a new classification scheme for all non-ordinary faculty and that individual departments establish expectations for extraordinary and senior extraordinary regarding teaching, scholarship, and service, which will be the criteria for merit evaluations.

- **Adjunct.** Hired on a per course basis. No time limit.
- **Lecturer.** Hired full-time on an annual basis; the only responsibility is a 4/4 teaching load. May be re-hired for a maximum of three years. This type of faculty may be necessary when permanent faculty are on sabbatical, for example.
- **Extraordinary.** Hired full-time with a contract of 3 years, subject to a satisfactory performance review and budget availability. Making a 3-year commitment to this type of faculty member may attract a higher quality of applicant, similar to a terminal post-doc appointment. Such faculty may be unwilling to relocate for just a one-year visiting position and may or may not be interested in a long-term relationship with Loyola.
  
  NOTE: We suggest that the national search be waived and replaced by a departmental review for those faculty who have been at Loyola for more than 3 years already.

- **Senior Extraordinary.** Available to those extraordinary faculty whose 3-year contract is expiring. Full-time with an automatically renewable contract, subject to satisfactory annual performance reviews and budget availability. In addition, we propose the following upon attaining this rank:
  1. an increase in base salary (separate from any merit increases),
  2. the same opportunities as ordinary faculty regarding committee membership, grants, and leaves, including but not limited to sabbatical leaves, academic leaves, course releases, research study rooms in Monroe library, Marquette fellowships, and leave of absence without pay,
  3. included with ordinary faculty in any salary equity adjustments,
  4. a firm commitment to retain these proven, senior extraordinary faculty in cases where a reduction in employment is absolutely necessary,

In addition, we propose that the university undertake measures to obtain salary equity across the colleges of the university.

Finally, we propose that the university establish a university-wide award for outstanding Senior Extraordinary Faculty, similar to the *Dux Academicus* award for ordinary faculty. We feel that this would begin to address the “second-class citizen” treatment of extraordinary faculty.
Appendix A

Loyola Extraordinary Faculty Survey

Administered in May 2011 to all full-time members of the extraordinary faculty. Of the 61 surveys we sent out, 46 surveys were completed for a response rate of 80%. The survey included questions about the respondent’s employment history and current and past responsibilities at Loyola as well as questions regarding each respondent’s opinions about the current working and employment conditions for extraordinary faculty and possible changes to those conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HuNS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at Loyola</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsting Ass't</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Prof</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

46 100.0

---

Do you have contractual responsibilities with Loyola other than teaching?

Yes  17  37.0
No   29  63.0

- Center Director
- Gallery Director
- Administrative and support in WAC
- Committees, accreditation responsibilities, research, service, and grants
- I direct the foreign language lab
- administrative
- help fundraising
- director of freshmen English
- committee work
- I do everything that is expected of a tenure track faculty member: excellence in teaching, research, publications, service to the department, college, and community. I also carry a full advising load.
- course reduction for ENGL internships
- Production Manager
- But I am treated as though I do! I am the only extraordinary person in my department who is responsible for a committee, and I am responsible for the upcoming accreditation of the DNP program. Where are all the tenured and tenure track faculty????? Why aren’t one of them responsible for this, along with all of the extra work involved in this???

### Classes per Sem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes per Sem</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 100.0

### Contact Hrs/Wk*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Hrs/Wk*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
How many hours do you spend in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In terms of teaching, do you or have you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developed new courses</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team taught</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught first-year seminars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught upper-level courses</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught online</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught honors courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught summer school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilized service learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- whatever the department needs
- organized visiting artists lectures and workshops
- taught Summer Bridge classes
- teach graduate courses
- taught practicums and developing new honors courses
- honors workshops, independent studies, academic area coordinator
- thesis & independent studies
- independent studies and honors thesis supervision
- we do not have first year seminars nor honors courses in my department. I have developed three of the new courses for the new DNP program, and I revised 1/3 of the HCSM masters courses using the CADE process
• graduate level courses on a regular basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formally advised students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended conferences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presented at conferences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied for internal grants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received internal grants</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied for external grants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received external grants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtained course releases</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>held administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>served on departmental committees</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service on university committees</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>published or departmental equivalent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• organized exhibitions of local, national, and international artists. Arranged educational tours and publications of these exhibitions
• I’ve held administrative responsibilities at other universities before coming to Loyola
• director student gallery, junior review coordinator
• Clinical practice
• Up until this year I have had a caseload of 75-80 students to advise. We are required to attend conference, in fact we are signed up for them as are all departmental faculty without being asked. I have presented at conferences on behalf of Loyola, without even being compensated for my expenses.
• faculty advisor for 2 student groups
### Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30-34,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35-39,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40-44,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45-49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-54,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55-59,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Are you interested in long-term employment at Loyola?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Are you interested in entering into a traditional tenure-line position?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I do not have my doctoral degree, and, in order to achieve that goal, would have to leave my full-time position at Loyola New Orleans, so I am (understandably) not eligible for tenure-track. If it were possible to be considered with my degree (which is largely considered terminal in my field) I would most certainly be interested.
- I interviewed for a tenure line (chair) position, but the dean thwarted the search midstream and I was offered this position.
- If the criteria were based primarily on current contractual expectations
- If I were a younger person I might be interested. When I first arrived at Loyola I was full of energy and ready to be fully engaged in the University and academic community. The workload has been challenging my creativity and on not being able as extraordinary faculty in 2002-2008 to fully participate in such grants, committees, erodes a person’s enthusiasm about academica.
• As extraordinary faculty I do teaching, research, and service as though I were ordinary faculty. So I’m not interested if changing to ordinary faculty to be eligible for tenure means losing years of service and starting over.
• There is a great deal of pressure to publish research (sometimes useless) which I have no desire to pursue at this point.
• Maybe, if they fix the pay scale for the tenure line and several senior faculty retire. The whole system is so antiquated and out of wack [sic], I don’t know if I’d dip my toe in.
• That would be great, if the tenure-line position was in my speciality—creative writing—but not if it was just for teaching composition.
• I applied for a tenure track spot and was not given it, although I felt those hired in have not performed their job as well as I have performed mine. Actually on hire I was told there were no tenure track openings, and then someone was hired a semester later, who had never even taught nursing courses, while I had taught for some 9 years, and had a much better resume than she had in terms of publications, grants, etc. I think there were other issues at play that caused this to happen, you know politics...
• Perhaps the terminology is “Clinical” Professor

---

Would you be interested in some alternative to traditional tenure (for example, a seniority system without tenure, “teaching tenure,” etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Pilot Project for Improving Extraordinary Faculty Working Conditions in the English Department, Loyola University New Orleans

This initiative was prompted by the 2011 External Review of the English Department, and passed unanimously by the faculty at the English Department meeting on September 15, 2011.

This document is not intended to supplant the Department’s existing Protocol or attend to matters of extraordinary faculty hiring or re-hiring, or extraordinary faculty review procedures. However, the document does seek to address staffing issues involving extraordinary faculty members teaching courses for which they are not appropriately compensated.

I

Full-time extraordinary faculty members who have taught in their fields of expertise at Loyola for three continuous years, and who have received at least four course observations (conducted by four different ordinary faculty members, with each observation supported by a letter), may apply to be considered for a three-year binding contract with a course reduction to a 3/4 teaching load. Applications will include the instructor’s CV, a list of courses the instructor has taught at Loyola, and a letter of intent stating the instructor’s field of expertise and qualifications. Applications will be reviewed by the ordinary faculty, and must be approved by the Dean. Full-time extraordinary faculty members on three-year contracts will be expected to advise five general humanities students each academic year.

II

At the end of a full-time extraordinary faculty member’s three-year contract, the instructor, having demonstrated consistent teaching in their field of expertise, may apply to be considered for a renewable five-year binding contract (at a 3/4 teaching load) with a 5% percent salary increase. Applications will include the instructor’s CV, a list of courses the instructor has taught at Loyola, and a letter of intent stating the instructor’s field of expertise and qualifications. Applications will be reviewed by the ordinary faculty, and must be approved by the Dean. Full-time extraordinary faculty members on five-year contracts will be expected to advise ten general humanities students each academic year.

Notes

Extraordinary faculty can choose to remain on single year-to-year contracts, with the understanding that they will remain teaching a 4/4 load, and that these years do not accumulate toward course releases, rank, or promotion.

All full-time extraordinary faculty members are considered for merit-based salary-increases each year, regardless of their contract status.

Appendix C-Contract prepared by Gita Bolt

Date

Name (Prefix First Init Last, Sufx)

College – Department

Loyola University New Orleans

Dear Name (Prefix Last):
I am pleased to inform you that your full-time appointment as described below has been approved.

College and/or Department: College – Department
Rank: Title:
Salary: $amount
Period of Employment: Contract Period

You are working at Loyola University New Orleans in an extraordinary, non-tenure track position, governed by the Faculty Handbook promulgated by the authority of the Board of Trustees. Your years of service do not accrue toward tenure. This is a one (1) year agreement with two one-year automatic renewals contingent upon the faculty member’s receipt of a positive rating on his/her annual evaluation, and the faculty member’s continued compliance with University policy, state, and federal law.

Loyola shall now be liable for any delay in, or failure of, its performance of any of its obligations under this Agreement if such delay or failure is caused by events beyond the reasonable control of the University, including but not limited to any acts of God.

This contract is valid only if signed and received by me within thirty calendar days of the date of this offer. Please indicate your acceptance by signing and returning the original and one copy. The additional copy is for your files. Faculty members shall be covered by the University fringe benefit program. This contract contains the entire agreement between the University and the faculty member.

Sincerely yours,

Edward J. Kvet
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

___________________________________________
Faculty Member and Date
### Appendix 5
**New Orleans Faculty Development Network**

**Members:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Center Title</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delgado Community College</td>
<td>Office of Faculty and Staff Development</td>
<td>Angela D. Breckenridge</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard University</td>
<td>Center for Teaching, Learning, and Academic Technology</td>
<td>Dr. Phillis Worthy Dawkins</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard University, cont'd</td>
<td>Center for Teaching, Learning, and Academic Technology</td>
<td>Dr. Steve Buddington</td>
<td>Co-Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard University, cont'd</td>
<td>Center for Teaching, Learning, and Academic Technology</td>
<td>Dr. Eartha Johnson</td>
<td>Co-Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University at New Orleans</td>
<td>CETL</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Ralph</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University New Orleans</td>
<td>Center for Faculty Innovation</td>
<td>Ms. Liv Newman</td>
<td>Associate Director for Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Dr. Susann Lusnia</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Toni Weiss</td>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>Center for the Advancement of Teaching</td>
<td>Dr. Elizabeth Yost Hammer</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inaugural Meeting Agenda:

Monday, April 16, 2012

I. Welcome and introductions

II. Share your Center’s goals and programs

III. Discuss ideas for future endeavors

from Mike Ralph:
- Ongoing networking sessions (monthly or semester based)
- A refereed journal on Changes in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (or alternately “New Directions in Teaching & Learning”)
- An annual regional conference on “New Directions in Teaching & Learning”

IV. Schedule next meeting for Fall 2012

Appendix 6

Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee

Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salutation</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>WAC Director &amp; Instructor</td>
<td>Writing Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>PT/EXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Higginson</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Jesuit Center</td>
<td>Jesuit Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>McCay</td>
<td>Director, Walker Percy Center</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>HUNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>McKay</td>
<td>Vice Provost Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>CFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Liv</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Asst. Dir. of Faculty Dvlpt.</td>
<td>Center for Faculty Innovation</td>
<td>CFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Theatre Arts and Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Petitfils</td>
<td>Curriculum Developer</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Reichard</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Women's Resource Center</td>
<td>WRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Mass Communications</td>
<td>CSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Professor/Director</td>
<td>Loyola Institute for Ministry</td>
<td>Grad. Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Malia</td>
<td>Willey</td>
<td>Instruction Coordinator</td>
<td>Monroe Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutation</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>WAC Director &amp; Instructor</td>
<td>Writing Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>PT/EXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Brotzman</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Jesuit Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>McCay</td>
<td>Director, Walker Percy Center</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>HUNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>McKay</td>
<td>Vice Provost Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>CFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Liv</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Asst. Dir. of Faculty Development</td>
<td>Center for Faculty Innovation</td>
<td>CFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Theatre Arts and Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Petitfils</td>
<td>Curriculum Developer</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Malia</td>
<td>Willey</td>
<td>Instruction Coordinator</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Professor/Director</td>
<td>Loyola Institute for Ministry</td>
<td>Grad. Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>