Northwest PULSE Post-Assessment Spring 2014

Page: Personal Information

Q1 - Untitled Question   Question ID: 100792

Text Response   ElementID: 173400

What is your name?

		Count	Percent
R001	**Text Responses (click to view)**	33	100%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	0	0%

Text Block   ElementID: 173402

Text Response   ElementID: 173401

What is the name of your institution?

		Count	Percent
R002	**Text Responses (click to view)**	33	100%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	0	0%

Page: Question Set #1

Q2 - Untitled Question   Question ID: 100791

Radio Button List   ElementID: 173390

1. Which of the following describes your institution: community college, liberal arts college, regional comprehensive university, or research university?

		Response Percent	Response Count
R003 CC		36.36%	12
LA		21.21%	7
RCU		21.21%	7
R1		21.21%	7
	Viewed Question		33
	Answered Question	100%	33
	Skipped Question	0%	0

Text Block   ElementID: 173398

Radio Button List   ElementID: 173391

2. Is your college a Minority Serving Institution, serving Native American, Hispanic and/or African American students? If unsure, see these resources: http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-minorityinst.html For example, a Hispanic Serving Institution as defined by Ed.gov has at least 25% Hispanic students, see http://www2.ed.gov/programs/idueshsi/definition.html

		Response Percent	Response Count
R004 Yes		24.24%	8
No		69.7%	23
Unsure		3.03%	1
	Viewed Question		33
	Answered Question	96.97%	32
	Skipped Question	3.03%	1

Text Block   ElementID: 173399

Text Block   ElementID: 173397

3) Please tell us more about your department:

Text Response   ElementID: 173392

A) How many total faculty?

		Count	Percent
R005	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response | ElementID: 173393

B) How many tenured faculty?

		Count	Percent
R006	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response | ElementID: 173394

C) How many non-tenure track faculty?

		Count	Percent
R007	Text Responses (click to view)	29	87.88%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	4	12.12%

Text Response | ElementID: 173395

D) Please estimate the total number of adjunct faculty in your department each year

		Count	Percent
R008	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response | ElementID: 173396

E) Are there other aspects of your faculty that you want to highlight? Please describe:

		Count	Percent
R009	Text Responses (click to view)	15	45.45%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	18	54.55%

Page: Question Set #2

Q3 - Untitled Question | Question ID: 100793

Rating Scale | ElementID: 173403

Please tell us more about yourself, your department, and your institution.

1= Not at All; 5 = Completely; NA = Not Applicable or Unknown

	1	2	3	4	5	Not Applicable	Response Count	Skipped Count
R010 To what extent do members of your department share the same values with respect to the curriculum and its mission?	0% (0)	0% (0)	33.33% (11)	**48.48%** (16)	15.15% (5)	0% (0)	96.97% (32)	3.03% (1)
R011 To what extent does your department rely on consensus-building and collective decision-making?	0% (0)	6.06% (2)	18.18% (6)	**54.55%** (18)	21.21% (7)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R012 To what extent does your department rely on centralized, hierarchical decision-making?	15.15% (5)	**57.58%** (19)	6.06% (2)	12.12% (4)	3.03% (1)	0% (0)	93.94% (31)	6.06% (2)
R013 With respect to innovation in the classroom, do you feel supported by the department to try new evidence based approaches in alignment with the recommendations of the Vision and Change report?	0% (0)	3.03% (1)	12.12% (4)	30.3% (10)	**54.55%** (18)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R014 With respect to innovation in the classroom, do you feel supported by the administration to try new evidence based approaches in alignment with the recommendations of the Vision and Change report?	0% (0)	6.06% (2)	33.33% (11)	21.21% (7)	**39.39%** (13)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)

	1	2	3	4	5	Not Applicable	Response Count	Skipped Count
R015 To what extent do you feel knowledgeable about styles of active learning?	0% (0)	6.06% (2)	30.3% (10)	**45.45%** (15)	18.18% (6)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R016 To what extent does your senior administration publicly and explicitly support evidence based educational change efforts in alignment with the recommendations of the Vision and Change report?	12.12% (4)	12.12% (4)	**36.36%** (12)	24.24% (8)	15.15% (5)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R017 To what extent do you believe that efforts to improve the student educational experience will be rewarded, e.g. tenure and promotion or annual reviews?	12.12% (4)	9.09% (3)	**30.3%** (10)	**30.3%** (10)	12.12% (4)	6.06% (2)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R018 To what extent are reluctant faculty prompted by departmental/adminstrative leadership to join the implementation of change?	15.15% (5)	**33.33%** (11)	27.27% (9)	12.12% (4)	0% (0)	12.12% (4)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R019 To what extent is responsibility for teaching "flagship" courses (e.g., introductory ones) shared among entire department?	9.09% (3)	33.33% (11)	6.06% (2)	**42.42%** (14)	9.09% (3)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R020 To what extent has curricular change been integrated throughout the introductory courses in the department's curriculum?	3.03% (1)	15.15% (5)	**42.42%** (14)	18.18% (6)	15.15% (5)	0% (0)	93.94% (31)	6.06% **(2)**
R021 To what extent has curricular change been integrated throughout the upper level courses in the department's curriculum?	0% (0)	12.12% (4)	30.3% (10)	**36.36%** (12)	9.09% (3)	12.12% (4)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R022 To what extent has the scholarly literature on learning and pedagogy informed the decisions of your department in its process of educational change?	12.12% (4)	21.21% (7)	**39.39%** (13)	18.18% (6)	9.09% (3)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R023 To what extent are your individual teaching strategies shaped by students' views?	0% (0)	21.21% (7)	**36.36%** (12)	**36.36%** (12)	3.03% (1)	3.03% (1)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R024 To what extent have students contributed to the process of defining the vision and goals of the change effort?	24.24% (8)	**36.36%** (12)	21.21% (7)	15.15% (5)	0% (0)	3.03% (1)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R025 To what extent do faculty members sense shared ownership of the educational changes?	0% (0)	27.27% (9)	**33.33%** (11)	27.27% (9)	9.09% (3)	0% (0)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R026 To what extent does it feel 'safe' in your department to suggest new innovations in pedagogy that may challenge "the way things have always been done"?	0% (0)	15.15% (5)	9.09% (3)	36.36% (12)	**39.39%** (13)	0% (0)	100% (33)	0% (0)
R027 To what extent does your understanding of your department/institution as a system inform how you decide to enact change?	3.03% (1)	3.03% (1)	30.3% (10)	**36.36%** (12)	15.15% (5)	9.09% (3)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R028 To what extent does your department use a systems perspective--such as looking at the big picture, considering multiple perspectives and multiple levers for change, and anticipating nonlinear results or unintended consequences-- when making decisions about change?	12.12% (4)	27.27% (9)	18.18% (6)	**33.33%** (11)	6.06% (2)	3.03% (1)	100% (33)	0% (0)

Page: Question Set #3

Q4 - Untitled Question   Question ID: 100796

Rating Scale   ElementID: 173421

Please tell us more about your experience with the NW PULSE Community of Practice.

1= Not at All; 5 = Completely; NA = Not Applicable or Unknown

	1	2	3	4	5	Not Applicable	Response Count	Skipped Count

R029 To what extent are the goals of the community of practice clearly defined?	0% (0)	24.24% (8)	18.18% (6)	**33.33%** (11)	12.12% (4)	9.09% (3)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R030 To what extent do you believe that the community of practice will make a difference for you in effecting change in your department?	3.03% (1)	15.15% (5)	24.24% (8)	**45.45%** (15)	6.06% (2)	3.03% (1)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R031 To what extent are the activities and concerns of the community of practice relevant to you?	0% (0)	9.09% (3)	24.24% (8)	**30.3%** (10)	**30.3%** (10)	3.03% (1)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R032 To what extent is information on community of practice activities easily accessible?	3.03% (1)	21.21% (7)	**30.3%** (10)	24.24% (8)	9.09% (3)	3.03% (1)	90.91% (30)	9.09% **(3)**
R033 To what extent do you have a sense of ownership in the community of practice?	3.03% (1)	30.3% (10)	**36.36%** (12)	21.21% (7)	3.03% (1)	3.03% (1)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R034 To what extent are your experiences and expertise being tapped in the community or practice?	12.12% (4)	**30.3%** (10)	24.24% (8)	18.18% (6)	3.03% (1)	9.09% (3)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R035 To what extent is the network succeeding in facilitating communication among community of practice members?	6.06% (2)	30.3% (10)	**45.45%** (15)	6.06% (2)	3.03% (1)	6.06% (2)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R036 To what extent do you feel motivated (energized, engaged, supported?) by the community of practice?	3.03% (1)	12.12% (4)	**33.33%** (11)	**33.33%** (11)	9.09% (3)	6.06% (2)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R037 To what extent does the community of practice engender passion for prompting educational change?	3.03% (1)	18.18% (6)	27.27% (9)	**33.33%** (11)	12.12% (4)	3.03% (1)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R038 To what extent do you feel part of a larger effort through the community of practice to improve undergraduate biology education?	0% (0)	21.21% (7)	**24.24%** (8)	**24.24%** (8)	21.21% (7)	3.03% (1)	93.94% (31)	6.06% **(2)**
R039 To what extent is the community of practice helping you to make connections with like-minded individuals?	3.03% (1)	12.12% (4)	**33.33%** (11)	30.3% (10)	15.15% (5)	3.03% (1)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**
R040 To what extent is the community of practice succeeding in creating opportunities of interaction to foster pedagogical change and self-reflection?	3.03% (1)	15.15% (5)	24.24% (8)	**36.36%** (12)	9.09% (3)	9.09% (3)	96.97% (32)	3.03% **(1)**

Page: Question Set #4

Q5 - Untitled Question Question ID: 100794

Text Response ElementID: 173404

A) What is the value of the community of practice to you?

		Count	Percent
R041	Text Responses (click to view)	26	78.79%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	7	21.21%

Text Response ElementID: 173405

B) What proportion of the faculty is currently involved with the effort to move your department towards the recommendations in the Vision and Change Report?

		Count	Percent
R042	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response ElementID: 173406

C) Since your participation in the October engagement event, what changes have occurred in your department/institution?

		Count	Percent
R043	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%

		Count	Percent
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response   ElementID: 173407

D) How is the formal reward system taking account of those engaged in improving the undergraduate educational experience?

		Count	Percent
R044	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response   ElementID: 173408

E) What is the nature of the rewards expected by faculty engaged in reform and change?

		Count	Percent
R045	Text Responses (click to view)	31	93.94%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	2	6.06%

Text Response   ElementID: 173415

F) What is the role of senior administrators and the chair in prompting change?

		Count	Percent
R046	Text Responses (click to view)	31	93.94%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	2	6.06%

Text Response   ElementID: 173416

G) What was the process leading to the educational change in your department?

		Count	Percent
R047	Text Responses (click to view)	31	93.94%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	2	6.06%

Text Response   ElementID: 173417

H) How and how often does your department evaluate its curriculum?

		Count	Percent
R048	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response   ElementID: 173418

I) How are these curricular changes documented or made public, e.g. internal reports, accreditation reports, or other?

		Count	Percent
R049	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Response   ElementID: 173419

J) To what extent do you feel burn-out with respect to effecting educational change?

		Count	Percent
R050	Text Responses (click to view)	32	96.97%
	Viewed Question	33	
	Skipped Question	1	3.03%

Text Responses

Q5 - Untitled Question   [question top]

A) What is the value of the community of practice to you?   [return to element]

It means to me that there are other like-minded faculty who are thinking about implementing change and could can act as a sounding board for ideas.

I think it will be helpful if we can get all faculty on board

I have a place that I can search and find individuals that may already an activity that fits a particular goal. I like knowing that I don't have to re-

invent the wheel any time that I want to implement something new.

Community of practice is of limited value to me. I teach at a small branch campus and I am the only biology faculty here. My interaction with the community of practice is through the web.

The community of practice serves as a great resource for finding information/resources when we're looking for them. Right after the workshop in October, there was still a lot of communication with others in the community, but as the time has gone on, that has waned a bit. I was part of the Metacognition discussions in the late Fall, but haven't been able to participate this spring (if they've still been having the meetings). The nicest part is to know that we don't have to reinvent things ourselves; there are other groups of people facing similar challenges and trying to implement similar changes. We know we can call on others' experiences to help guide our own changes.

not sure yet

Provide likeminded individuals to help motivate change and find new ways to enact change in small steps.

Learning about what others do in their classrooms is invaluable.

As a reality check to see if we are in the ballpark with other institutions' practices. Availability of tools from the website.

Knowing that there are like-minded educators that care deeply about what they do and are willing to share good ideas and practices.

Meeting with other college faculty to discuss teaching science is highly useful but the amount of time we have to do so is limited.

I get energized after meeting with my communities of practice. Everyone needs to know they are supported by a wider community when implementing change.

They are a group with whom I can share ideas.

Connecting with others trying to make similar changes to their department's teaching as we are.

Knowing that a growing group of dedicated biology educators are organizing and sharing ideas for improvement is very valuable to me.

Access to information. And the workshop in October was great! It really motivated us.

The value of community is I can get ideas from others.

Helps support and validate what we are doing. It's not just us alone making these changes

I feel supported by the fact that other schools are also making changes to their curriculum and courses to improve undergraduate biology education. Although I admit I have not taken advantage of the community as much as I would have liked to over the past semester.

Encourages discussion at our institution.

Provides a set of objective to work toward.

Revising ancient ways of teaching biology

This community is very valuable to me, but I have limited time to engage with them because of other demands on my time related to running a large research group.

It is very helpful in terms of motivation to make changes, and to provide benchmarks to push change along; the changes we hope to make simply wouldn't happen without this community. It is also very helpful to have contacts with whom we can discuss issues/problems/challenges. Finally, the community is helpful in less tangible ways. For example, as we hire part-time lecturers (i.e. for 1 or 2 courses) I trust the recommendations of the members of this community in deciding whom to hire.

Fosters cohesiveness, shared objectives, and common approaches to teaching key course content.

Ummm… I don't remember exactly what the community of practice is, so clearly I'm not valuing it enough (or I'm just too tired at the end of this really hard academic year)

B) What proportion of the faculty is currently involved with the effort to move your department towards the recommendations in the Vision and Change Report?

All faculty are involved in annual discussions to improve curricula and student success.

All tenured and tenure track faculty, and some (25%) non-tenure track (term) faculty. Adjuncts, 0%

There are just 4 of us that are really working on this but the rest of the department is interested they just don't have the time.

1/4

7/40

50%

2 out of 13

One-half

About 3/4 of the faculty are involved/engaged in the changes. Almost all have participated in the discussions, but some do not seem to think change is needed or applicable to their courses.

25%

15%

10%

No resistance, various levels of energy toward this.

80%

Most of our faculty are involved in this effort, but there are few that are not engaged and they are clear that they do not want to become engaged.

25-30% We are facing some retirements and anticipate being able to replace some (but not all) of these. Out of six full-time faculty, one is partially retired (fully retired by June 2015) and two others anticipate retiring within 4 years. This gives us an exciting possibility to infuse new energy and remold responsibilities and directions for the Biology discipline.

<20%

Entire department.

All but one of our biology faculty

1/7

I think everyone is on board, however the majority of the dept. is do not work actively on implementing the changes. We had and going to have a retreat and every dept. member involved in that.

90%

95% - we are very lucky to have developed a culture of teaching and learning where almost all of our faculty work to improve student learning and student success.

All faculty members participated in drafting learning objectives for introductory biology. Four of the faculty (out of 12) who attended the workshop are refining the objectives and will lead the spring department retreat.

4/19

The majority of the faculty who teach in our program.

50%

1/2

~20%

Three out of 6 biologists are directly involved. (One member of our department of 7 is not involved with Biology.) We have tried to publicize the V&C recommendations, but the other three faculty are very busy developing courses, and have not always had time to integrate the recommendations into their pedagogy.

30%

a third or so

C) Since your participation in the October engagement event, what changes have occurred in your department/institution?   [return to element]

Drafted $2.8 million STEM proposal to be submitted to Dept. of Education
Additional funding requests to YVCC administration for equipment and lab tech support
Held life science workday to discuss policies and course content

We have revised our entire curriculum, the paperwork is on it's way through the system and we expect to implement the new curriculum beginning in Fall 2015.

Time has really been an issue for us. One of our full time faculty went down to part time going into retirement and 2 others took a quarter off for personal reason. This has left very little time for working on implementing changes but we are still engaged in the conversations.

Faculty have become aware of V & C. Few additional faculty have become involved.

My department head a faculty retreat where half a day was focused on curriculum and teaching for the first time in at least 21 years. We've started talking about teaching. All of the NTTF faculty attended (these faculty teach most of the 200-level introductory majors courses and 100-level non-majors courses). Twenty out of 30 tenured and tenure track faculty attended. Most of the conversation is focused on how/when students are able to start biology courses and what content biology majors are learning in pre-requisite courses. We also had a section about a student-centered classroom. Reaction from faculty was quite mixed. Some faculty thought that it was great that we were taking time to talk about teaching. Other faculty thought that it was a waste of time because they don't believe that active learning works 1) for their content, 2) for their students, or 3) because they would have hated doing active learning and that must be the same for our students.

It was sort of a strange group because it included 2 members who wrote the "Workshop Biology" Udovic (2002) paper and then other folks who are terrified of teaching--or maybe that they're terrified of not doing a good job at teaching or being told that what they're doing is not the best way to teach.

Out of the retreat an ad-hoc committee including tenure track and NTTF faculty has been developed to explore our curriculum and make

recommendations about pre-requisites. Conversations about V&C recommendations are only happening at the periphery of this discussion--but conversations about V&C are happening! I am on that committee and intend to continue to infuse the conversation with something about V&C if we can get away from a focus on how many chemistry and physics courses a student needs.

We have greatly improved our approach to our center piece senior thesis.

We have completed our project, creating a self-evaluation of teaching for adjunct faculty

Department proposed an undergraduate research course to be offered in the summer session.

We have rewritten our departmental goals and objectives, as well as goals and objectives for ourselves as faculty. We are working on revising out introductory courses now.

more conversation about improving the curriculum, and the learning goals

I started a biology instruction techniques group, we have implemented new curriculum, we have a need interdepartmental grant looking at institutional change that is building communities of practice within our institution, we have designed a new zoology major, we are making an new introductory course designed entirely on the Vision and chagne that will serve non-life science Science majors and applied life science majors on-line.

A dialog has been initiated to talk about Vision and Change and the recommendations.

We've recognized the need to build scientific method and evolution into all classes (e.g. A&P where it is not traditionally taught).

We've been talking across disciplines about the need for more computer modeling and simulation, although no implementation yet.

We have had a department-wide discussion (retreat) focused on integrating vision and change concepts and skills in the biology curriculum. We have adopted a new introductory biology textbook and have had departmental discussions on the text. We have planned and received funding for two summer workshops: one for implementing use of the new textbook and one for writing assessment.

Discussions during Dept. meetings
Spring faculty retreat to discuss assessment and implementation of Vision and Change
Participation in an Assessment workshop where we designed a writing assessment workshop
Grant for writing assessment workshop
Adoption of new textbook based on Vision and change concepts
Faculty workshop on implementing vision and change in introductory courses

The budget crisis hit. Sections were cut from this year's schedule and lower targets given for next year's schedule. One full-time faculty (out of 5) is on leave this term due to the death of his spouse. Those of us left (three fully committed people) are feeling overworked (but potentially powerful change agents).

We have hired on a couple of new tenure-track faculty. I was the successful candidate in one of the searches. Because of this search, I have been completely disengaged from the department for the last five months.

Shared goals and objectives, move to create a more integrated curriculum. Intro courses revision in progress.

Many were underway anyway; however we have composed and instituted a self-evaluation form with a focus on active learning methods. We have created course shekels for our highly enrolled courses with suggested active learning exercises and prerecorded lecture for flipping the class room. We are also doing a trial of a 200 level independent research class for our biology major

Faculty have discussed learning outcomes and assessment strategies that are emphasized in the vision and change report.

External review. Major field test for graduating biology majors. Ongoing discussion about curriculum.

We have had discussions at faculty meetings. We have down classroom surveys on metacognition. We have changes of the ways we teach.

We've held a curriculum meeting with all of our faculty. We also recently had a site visit for the PULSE Pilot Certification.

Department had a winter retreat to discuss goals from the workshop, drafted and discussed learning objectives for introductory biology, and scheduled a spring retreat to plan for reforming intro bio curriculum.

Discussions and work through rubric

More discussion on how to better integrate QR onto our K-16 curriculum. More discussion on how to ASSESS the core concepts and competencies in V&C. We have developed an online platform for discussion and collaboration.

Strying to determine community of practice by surveying faculty at this point.

We have revised our approach to senior thesis

A major event was a full day department-wide retreat, the morning of which was devoted to introducing concepts from V&C and discussing our curriculum.

Fewer than I would have liked. I explicitly used the V&C core concepts in my course, emphasizing them and having students reflect on how the course addressed the concepts. Other changes are yet to be instituted.

We are holding a meeting to review our curriculum (tomorrow!) and the V&C concepts and competencies will be part of that effort.

Very few. Lack effect administrative support, and faculty hard to convince their efforst will be meaningful, and of real benefit. Not confident that the administration will follow through in any meaningful way to support recommended changes, or provide/encourage long-term support.

we had our first ever external review.

We assessed our seniors for the first time.

We had a departmental retreat to discuss our vision and mission, as well as V&C alligned intro bio learning objctives

We discussed capstone learning objectives.

We have a retreat scheduled to discuss a curriculum overhaul

D) How is the formal reward system taking account of those engaged in improving the undergraduate educational experience? [return to element]

Satisfactorily

Service is part of the expectation. The person who is leading the curriculum revision is already tenured, but probably will go up for promotion next year. We will find out how the curriculum work is valued at that time. Many of the people involved are already fully promoted, which may have contributed to their willingness to try a new approach.

There is no formal reward system.

No formal or specific reward system, only broad institution goals/themes support this goal.

I don't think it really does.

I don't know

We receive Professional Accrual Units (PAU)s for our involvement in PULSE, which eventually gets applied to our base salary

I am not aware of any college reward system based on improving undergraduate education.

We have not done anything with the formal reward system.

It is not, as far as I know

There are teaching awards at the college and university level and our department does peer review of teaching and includes a teaching and curriculum development aspect to the promotion and tenure process.

For the most part it's not.

We don't have a formal reward system.

Participation is noted in formal evaluations and teaching is a key component of formal evaluation.

Faculty evaluate other faculty in the Dept. and this will be a part of our future assessment.

It is not being rewarded. There is no incentive to participate in change activities other than intrinsic motivation.

Curriculum development is a component of the tenure/promotion process.

0, in fact the non tenured faculty are concerned how these changes will impact their evaluations.

It isn't.

No formal reward system exists.

excellence in teaching is an important aspect of our evaluation, however the interpretation of what excellence means is not clear. There is no written document stating that improving undergraduate education is part of it.

What formal reward system? I do not understand this question.

One of our key faculty who just went up for full professor told me that the college T&P committee had more positive comments about his participation in teaching our introductory course than they did on the rest oof his job description, most notably his research program.

I do not believe these activities are accounted for by our current process of tenure and promotion.

Recognized in tenure and promotion process. Recognized in the hiring of adjunct into tenure tract position.

Faculty who teach in our program have received many teaching awards this past year.

We do not have a help developed reward system.

I don't know

We have an externally funded Science Literacy program that is a hub for transforming science education and is well regarded and to some extent supported by our administration.

One faculty member was promoted in part for designing the Bio curriculum, which includes a prominent research requirement, as well as a "Biology and Society" requirement. So, there is explicit recognition of curricular efforts. It remains to be seen how large a role pedagogical innovation plays as our Assistant Professors go up for tenure.

No meaningful adminstrative rewards/benefits for science faculty efforts in this area at present.

Not in any special way, though we can report on these activities in our annual review and in our tenure/promotion packages.

E) What is the nature of the rewards expected by faculty engaged in reform and change? [return to element]

Occasional moonlight contracts.

That the work is valued at various levels throughout the institution, and should be one of the building blocks for promotion.

I don't know. Personally I do not really expect or need an external reward for doing my job better.

?

In my specific position, I hope that it's taken into account, but I don't think most faculty really care.

Perhaps a teaching award.

I have no expectation of monetary reward. Any reward would be through student feedback along the lines of taking the class proved valuable. Not an immediate evaluation of the class but rather a later realization that the class was beneficial.

I believe faculty expect improved student learning outcomes, especially as they apply to scientific process. I believe faculty think this will improve their classroom/teaching experience and students will be more engaged.

recognition by department head on annual review

Teaching awards are not specific for this but range from $500 to $1000 per year. There are also development awards that I believe are $5000. My department also support change financially in some ways depending on the course and the instructor.

There is talk of recognition through the P&T process but there's nothing solid in place.

n/a

More effective teaching of our students. This benefits the students and the faculty teaching courses that build on each other.

Knowing they did a job and make learning science a more engaging and rewarding experience for our students.

See above.

Those of us engaged are either constantly looking to improve our curriculum or new to the full-time position. Our rewards are classes that feel fulfilling and collegial support.

Tenure/promotion/raises

Satisfaction with a better learning and scholarly environment/process for our students.

Self satisfaction of doing a job we live well

Unknown

None are expected. (Other than better prepared students.)

N/A

They hope teaching matters, and it does for the most part, but there are still stodgy faculty in our departments who don't value their efforts.

I don't anticipate any rewards in merit or otherwise. This seems to be a self-motivated change.

Recognition for tenure and promotion process. Potential for merit for full professors. And sense of important job being addressed.

Recognition.

See D

I don't know

This is regarded as "service" in evaluation of promotion and salary raises.

Faculty recognize that new pedagogy takes time and effort. At a minimum, they expect that that time commitment - which takes time away from research efforts - will be recognized as being important to the program and to the institution. It will not be enough by itself; faculty recognize that.

#1 - simple recognition of faculty demonstrating sincere efforts to improve programs, enhance instruction, etc. No real tangible rewards (pay increases, etc.) at present.

??

F) What is the role of senior administrators and the chair in prompting change? [return to element]

Little

The chair encourages the faculty, but does not try to impose a new way of doing things. Also, probably crucially, course releases are allowed for substantial curriculum work, which has moved the process forward.

None.

?

Senior administrators in our college are focused on reforming general education courses across the curriculum and not focused specifically on what's happening in biology

Not much

They can suggest.

The chair has been active in calling meetings, setting the agenda for meetings, and leading the meetings. Senior administrators have not been involved.

great, critical in providing the environment and encouraging the conversation

Our chair and assistant chair are very forward thinking to the end. They have promoting best teaching practices in many ways.

They have to put their money where their mouth is and actually have substantive rewards for change.

We're all on board.

The chair has been a key advocate for change. The university's senior administrators provide support, both monetary and moral.

As chair of the dept. I have worked with two other faculty members to engage other faculty in assessment and implementation of Vision and Change concepts and goals. The administration has been supportive when asked.

Our Science dean (equivalent to a chair for the Science department) is active in AAC&U and traveled to San Diego in early November. She participated in a preconference PULSE workshop. She is aware and supportive, but mostly ineffectual. I am not convinced she understands the sub-discipline nature of biology (we cannot effectively teach every course in a broad set of offerings). While supportive, I am also not convinced that she understands the nature of undergraduate research.

The senior administrators are now focused on effecting change in the first year experience to help students be better students.

The chair is very involved and active. The administrators are absent.

Allows it, will sometimes give a slightly load to accommodate us working on something

The dean is encouraging discussion and expecting feedback. The biology program does not have a chair or lead.

The chair is doing a great job leading the efforts. There is support from administration, mainly in the form of encouragement.

The chair and Dean went to the pulse meeting and have been instrumental at encouraging dialog at our faculty meetings.

We have huge support for this from administration which is really important for balancing our the few stodgy faculty.

The department chair is one of the PULSE team leaders. Senior administration is supportive of improving biology education, but there are limited (if any) funds available.

Mostly faculty driving - university going through general education reform. Supported by administration but no tangible financial support for departments involved in teaching new courses

Their role is significant and they are all in strong support of the changes we are trying to make.

bascially supportive of interested faculty

minimal. This is a bottom up movement.

The chair is supportive of these efforts. The administration is largely hands off on curricular matters.

I see my role as rewarding efforts for change in annual reviews, and in making teaching assignments. (Though, with a faculty as small as ours, there is not much flexibility in reaching assignments.) I wish to have Intro courses taught by faculty willing to implement the V&C recommendations. As faculty come up for tenure, I expect to advocate forcefully for those who have spent time innovating in the classroom.

Not involved in any consistent meaningful way.

Senior administrators (e.g., dean, director) support changes in concept, though resources are a real issue.

As chair, I am pushing forward and prioritizing these changes, including assessment and the curriculum redesign.

G) What was the process leading to the educational change in your department? [return to element]

Frequent discussions.

Some of the younger tenured faculty realized that our approach was not as successful for the students as it could be, and the departmental structure changed from a department with a chair to a department with a director that had more authority, allowing us to choose to change and allowing the time (through course releases and retreats) to work on that change.

Faculty decide to change how/what we teach and we share those changes with each other.

Don't believe as a department we have achieved educational change. However, the V&C goals have been incorporated into our department's strategic plan.

After attending the NW PULSE meeting in October , we met with representatives or our curriculum committee and department chair. We decided that our biology faculty retreat should include information about what students are learning. We tried to frame that both within the course requirements that students must take. We also provided an opportunity for faculty to place their courses along a continuum of V&C recommendations. We encountered GREAT resistance to asking faculty to take the PULSE rubrics so we had to modify the information so we could get the basics out to faculty as to whether V&C topics are introduced, practiced or reinforced in different courses.

I don't think we've really had educational change. I think we've had a glimpse at the larger national conversation about biology teaching. I do think that there's something important about this first step of raising the pulse…but it's only been raised a little bit.

it is pushed by Stella, Abby and a bit by me. We have another person who will be a hard worker in improving things but she is on sabbatical.

A meeting with other faculty interested in undergraduate research experiences lead to the proposal to formalize a course offering. This proposal is being evaluated by the college level curriculum committee.

We began with the V&C rubrics. All faculty were largely in agreement about the strengths and weaknesses of our program. From there we were able to identify the areas we want to improve and are devising strategies to implement that change.

Strong leadership from head and director of the program

This is a slow process in a department with primarily research faculty in it. However, we have 3 cohorts of individuals in our department that have attended the HHMI summer institute for scientific teaching. Our GTAs receive a pedagogical training in association with our introductory course that stimulates a lot of thinking about how we teach. Our assistant chair is very forward thinking in education and uses best practices in his course as an example and has changed is course from a 300 level to a capstone style course due to the active learning gains he achieved. There is a cohort of instructors that discuss and implement best practices in our introductory course that stimulate a certain expectation from our upper division courses.

Attending the NW PULSE and asking my department chair if I could briefly summarize the meeting at a faculty meeting.

Discussions during department meetings.

Discussion with faculty, staff, and students as a whole. Work groups of a subset of the faculty also bring ideas and change increments to the faculty.

After the fall workshop it involved engaging faculty in Dept. meetings and retreats. The administration has supported these efforts with professional development funds.

A small group of us are interested in improving our classes. We support each other. Poor examples of teaching are coming to our attention and we would like to bring the majority of our classes up to college-level instruction.

Usually a person (read senior faculty) or group points out that something should be looked at and it becomes an item of discussion for our faculty meetings.

PULSE workshop, series of meetings and assignments lead by our team who attended PULSE.

Faculty led

Very little has been accomplished this year.

We are in the middle of it. We want to serve our students better and have them better prepared for after college life, whether that's graduate school, or professional school or job market. We also want them to have a less restricted path/more choices and for underprepared students have a better chance to close the gap.

We went to the Pulse meeting in Seattle.

we've been transforming our program for about 12 years, so the work we're doing with V&C and PULSE fits right in, and provides more resources to guide our discussiosn (rubrics).

I am new to the department so I don't know the entire process. I do know that this is motivated in part by an external review of the department.

Discussions and work through rubric

Meeting with the majority of our faculty to get them on board. Deciding upon a topic to focus our assessment efforts and establishing a platform for collaboration within and across levels.

inidividual faculty and stragetic planning.

About half the faculty are pushing from the bottom

The success of the Science Literacy Program in conjunction with faculty participation with V&C events led to our Departmental retreat and further planned changes. The biggest problem we identified is with coordinating with other departments if we want to change our introductory course.

It is just starting. We have a small group (have I said that before?) several of whom are interested in change; that makes it much easier.

Made aware of process by Dean, who asked for volunteers.

The change hasn't happened much yet.

H) How and how often does your department evaluate its curriculum?   [return to element]

annually

We have an annual assessment plan and report, but other than that, not much.

Formal evaluations are rare but we do talk about how and what we should change and some of the time it actually gets changed (other times we just talk)

Not formally since I have been employed here. I am finishing my third year of employment.

Not often. I think it goes through the curriculum committee which includes at least 1 faculty who does not "believe in active learning." Holding a faculty meeting to talk about teaching and curriculum is highly, highly unusual.

evry 3-4 years and it h as been 5

every three years, we have to revise our course outcomes, and every 5? years we have to review out program level outcomes. Next year we will be reviewing our program level outcomes again, and we will be taking the core competencies and core concepts from Vision and Change into account.

We have a meeting generally once a year to discuss course content of the courses taught by multiple faculty. These courses are the human A&P sequence that includes a prerequisite cell biology and two quarters of A&P. We aim for consistency in these courses. The content of broad introductory courses (non-major) is not evaluated at the department level. I am not involved in the full-year sequential majors biology course so I do not about this course.

About every 3-4 years we seem to make some changes. Usually this has been prompted by our work load issues and meeting the needs of the students or evaluating if the curriculum is working as we intended it to. We also have been motivated by wanting to improve our involvement of students in undergraduate research and so have considered ways to get that in our curriculum.

maybe every 5 years, to 10 years

This is changing as our department changes. we have an assessment for our biology degree that we evaluate yearly. We are implementing a similar assessment for our zoology degree. We are also starting some longitudinal tracking of our students.

Once a year, typically after the administration of a student survey.

No set schedule. Most often it happens when one of us wants to revamp a class or introduce a new one.

Officially, every five years; however, the department evaluates aspects of the curriculum continually.

Every five years.

When we hire new full-time faculty we take advantage of new eyes on current curriculum. New classes are proposed and must go through a review process so we take the opportunity to review curriculum then (including transferring courses from in-seat to on-line).

Evaluation is ongoing. Usually a part of the degree or degree option is evaluated and, if deemed necessary, modified.

Every 3-4 years.

On a three year cycle

Once every 7 years or so, it seems....

We try to work on it as frequently as possible. We hoped to discuss curricular issues at every dept meeting, but we did not succeed, as there were many other issues to deal with. We had a retreat after Fall semester discussing curriculum and will have another one at the end of Spring semester when we hope to finalize our new curriculum.

We do an internal evaluation to ensure that we are aligned with the state at least every 3 years. We do informal assessments yearly.

every year throuhg program assessment work

We are in the process of changing our curriculum, beginning with intro biology.

Would like to say yearly - more like every three years. Through committee work.

Annually.

Rarely

Once every three years.

Starting this year, we plan to hold yearly retreats on this topic.

Our curriculum was first approved in 2010. We are evaluating it again this year, 2014.

About every three years.

No formal evaluations happen with any regularity--it's all ad hoc, and not data based, and not connected to assessments--it's a mess, in my opinion.

l) How are these curricular changes documented or made public, e.g. internal reports, accreditation reports, or other? [return to element]

periodically

We plan to present our efforts in the form of posters at education sessions at national disciplinary meetings, as we accumulate data over the next

several years.

No

?

The ad-hoc committee will draft a report of pre-requisite requirements recommendations to the department head. I don't know what happens next.

some accreditation reports and internal reports

internal reports, accreditation reports. posted to our curricunet

New courses approved by curriculum committee and the college president. Courses published in catalog. Changes to course content or teaching approach are not documented to my knowledge.

Changes are documented through program review (internal reports) and accreditation reports.

Have to be approved and appear in faculty meeting minutes; appears in annual report of department

There are internal reports and accreditation reports. Our biology major assessment is often presented at campus and across the country as a model of program level assessment.

Internal reports to the faculty.

Accreditation reports. The institution is moving toward a more comprehensive process, but no implementation yet.

Curricular changes are documented through formal five-year curriculum reviews to the university curriculum committee, course modifications also are documented through the curriculum committee. The curriculum, its modifications and assessments, are reported through accreditation documents. Funded curricular change activities are reported to funding entities. Curricular discussions are reported through minutes, documents on the internal network, and on the departmental site.

They will be part of accreditation reports, year end reports, and reports from faculty development grants.

Stakeholder meetings held for new or substantially revised classes are public with prescribed timelines for materials review and discussion. Minor course revisions usually stay with the instructor's records, shared if asked.

The changes have to be approved by the department and the appropriate university committees. Aside from that, I don't know.

Accreditation reports.

Internal reports

Reviewed through the Curriculum and Standards committee and published in Common Course syllabi

Right now it's only minutes of our dept. meetings. We discussed the need for curricular changes in our report for the external reviewers.

We create internal reports and have accreditation reports.

reports to deans and program assessment officers on campus

I am not sure how our changes will be documented.

Internal and accreditation reports

They have not been made public at this point.

accreditation reports

All of the above

some coverage of science literacy program

They have not been made public. There are no internal reports to speak of. Faculty implementing change have noted these changes on their Annual Activity Reports.

Worked through with faculty, then okayed by Dean, and then run through painstaking detailed evaualion before sanctioning by C&S committee.

n/a

J) To what extent do you feel burn-out with respect to effecting educational change?   [return to element]

Little sense of burn-out because the institution is supportive to faculty ideas.

Not at all, yet.

Not really although other administrative chores often burn me out and take up time that I should be dedicating to this.

I am feeling a bit discouraged with the lack of interest in other faculty.

Oh this is a loaded question! I think that within a community of practice of faculty who are engaged and interested in learning about teaching and resources for creating student centered classrooms I can feel energized. However, my community of practice includes grads, undergrads, faculty,

and postdocs from across the sciences --it takes a whole village to get that energizing!

Within the biology department, I find it incredibly frustrating that the only way to present a conversation about national recommendations for improving undergraduate education is to appeal to people's egos. The conversation has to ben more, "here are some ideas about teaching that some of you may have thought about…and you're all doing a great job with teaching…but here are some new ideas…and maybe, perhaps, you might consider thinking about how you could think about incorporating some of these ideas, but not of course if it takes away from your content and of course not if you don't think that there's anyone in the class who learns like you because you don't like active learning." I wish it were accepted here readily to say, "here's some really good research about how we can better reach a broader diversity of students. We'd like to support you in learning some new teaching strategies and trying them out in the classroom."

That's probably not fair to many of the faculty who are somewhere in between. They're interested in learning about new ideas, but don't have the time or the rewards to improve their teaching.

There is a certain set of faculty who look down on the research on science education. My guess is that they haven't explored it, haven't had a chance to try it out and/or feel uncomfortable in settings where they are asked to engage in active learning.

So the short answer to this question is it depends. Thinking big picture of all faculty I find it overwhelming. Focusing on engaged faculty, graduate students, and postdocs who are hungry to learn about teaching and try out new ideas--that's fun and makes the effort worthwhile.

None with the three and probably 4 involved.

There is never enough time :)

None. I am striving to improve student success and my satisfaction in teaching. If I get burned out, then neither can occur.

With the day to day demands of the semester, it is difficult to maintain momentum to change the curriculum. We've made pretty good progress and hopefully will continue to do so over the summer.

not at all. Problem is finding or having time to do this

TODAY, I feel very burnt out. Most days, I feel excited and energized about this process.

It comes and goes. I get energized by some meeting or interaction with a colleague but then get frustrated by the incredible difficulties in making curricular changes. I can make changes in my own class but those goes largely unrecognized.

None, but I do feel some guilt about not "keeping up" with my PULSE responsibilities.

Especially this time of year (April) the faculty, staff, and students are feeling the time crunch of the end of the semester. We still plug away at change but it is tougher to get things accomplished. Most of the faculty are on board with effecting educational change.

At this point I feel we have discussed it a lot, but we are looking forward to making the changes in our courses.

I make the argument that we should always be changing in the May American Biology Teacher journal. So from that perspective, I anticipate I will continue to change until I retire out of the classroom. I am fully aware of the national call-for-change efforts and realize Vision and Change is the current document but new ones will emerge. I feel like I am in the wave of change agents just behind the Early Adaptors. But we will never agree upon content or delivery methods within biology. Our field changes too much for that.

I do not. Given my recent hiatus from departmental activity and my new (starting in fall) status as tenure-track, I am actually looking forward to effecting change.

Certainly tiring this time of year but it will be exciting in the fall to give some new things a shot.

Frustration with the slow movers or less engaged.

Time is valuable and it is hard to keep working on improving our class-which is a slow process- while teaching heavy loads.

Currently - significant.

Well, this is the end of the semester, and I feel burned out in every aspect.

I think that we are effecting educational change with every student we move to a four year school. I am not burned-out.

it comes at times, but things like PULSE help reinvigorate us!

I think this is a good time for our department to make some changes. We have several new faculty and a consensus that we would like to reform our biology curriculum.

Towards the end of this year - with 5 promotions, 3 faculty/staff hires, new collective bargaining agreement requiring overhaul of policies and procedures - VERY high burn out level. Look forward to getting back on track

Have not reached that point.

somewhat.

A lot

I feel extremely over extended and realistically my passion lies with my research and with mentoring my graduate students, but I am committed to the broader goals of V&C.

Educational change is energizing, not enervating. The other parts of the job lead to burnout, and to too little effort put toward educational change.

Totally. No continuing support from adminintration. No encouragement to improve or enhance, update programs, curiculum. No meaningful benefits or "rewards" for faculty efforts put forth. Collectively these realities make it very hard to get sincere faculty input and thoughtful effots. Faculty collectively cynical with regard to admininstrative intent in collecting data such as this. Seem to think just paperwork, checking boxes, filling paperwork quotas. Given these limitations however, I have been able to collect some meaningful data and comments from faculty, and find genuine enthusiam among faculty members in wanting to do the best job possible in educating studetns. Based on many conversations over the past year with many faculty (including biology, other life and health sciences, math, AG, tech, humanities) I have found that a profound sense of admininstrative disconnect, lack of initiative, and lack of appreciation/value of the central role of their faculty is the major limitation, hindrance to meaningful and effective implementation of instructional enhancement strategies and sustaining faculty motivation and creative energies.

I feel overwhelmed by the magnitude of the variety of changes--just working on a curriculum redesign or an external review or implementing assessment would be enough, but I also have 3-5 searches per year and pressing facilities issues that also demand lots of time. As much as burnout I have trouble figuring out how to move forward on multiple fronts while still accomplishing anything.

Q1 - Untitled Question   [question top]

What is your name?   [return to element]

| Matthew Loeser |
| Sarah Gerken |
| Christine Andrews |
| Ruth Kirkpatrick |
| Elly Vandegrift |
| Rickd Douglass |
| Kristen Harrison |
| Stephen Kenny |
| Jennifer Geiger |
| Greg Brown |
| Stacey Kiser |
| Lori Kayes |
| Linda Bruslind |
| Ken Carloni |
| Alyce DeMarais |
| Joel Elliott |
| Luis Matos |
| Pattie S Green |
| Sam Alvey |
| Gyorgyi Nyerges |
| Ami Erickson |
| Joanne Richards |
| Mark Lyford |
| Katie Clark |
| Gary blevins |
| Brianna Wright |
| Margaret O'Connell |
| Karen Guillemin |
| Rick Douglass |
| Robin O'Quinn |
| Marc Servetnick |
| Daniel Bergey |

stacey halern

| What is the name of your institution? | [return to element] |

Yakima Valley Community College

University of Alaska, Anchorage

Lane Community College

Spokane Falls Community College

University of Oregon

Montana Tech

Tacoma Community College

Yakima Valley Community College

Carroll College

university of wyomig

Lane Community College

Oregon State University

Oregon State University

Umpqua Community College

University of Puget Sound

University of Puget Sound

Eastern Washington University

Tacoma Community College

Carroll College

Pacific University

NWCCD

Umpqua Community College

University of Wyoming

Pacific University

Spokane Falls CC

University of Wyoming

Eastern Washington University

University of Oregon

Montana Tech

Eastern Washington University

Univ of Washington Bothell

Northwest Wyoming Community College District (Sheridan and Gillette colleges)

pacific univ

| Q2 - Untitled Question | [question top] |

| A) How many total faculty? | [return to element] |

12

22

18

12

40

5 tenure track, a lab director and lab teacher

13

6

7.75

18

15

40

18

12

18

18

20

7 full time

8

11

7

Science Department has 13 faculty 7 full time 6 part-time

about 25 faculty teachign our courses

12

10

19

45

6

20

7

6

12

B) How many tenured faculty?   [return to element]

7

12

we do not have a tenure system but we have 6 Full Time Contracted Faculty

6

30

6

11

6

5

13

6

35
15
7
12
12
10
5
5
6
2
7 full time
17
7
6
13 (3 now as of this spring)
30
5
16
2
4
8

C) How many non-tenure track faculty?   [return to element]

5
6
10
1
2
0
1
5
0
5
3
0
4
4
3
none full time
0
3

1

6 part time

8

4

0

2

10

2

4

2

3

D) Please estimate the total number of adjunct faculty in your department each year [return to element]

5

10

12 adjunct (9 with seniority)

6

5

2-3

around 40?

2

1

0

9

5

14

5

2

2

3

20

1

2-3

3

6 part time

1

3

4

3

5

3

2-4

10
3
2

E) Are there other aspects of your faculty that you want to highlight? Please describe: [return to element]

I included full-time tenured and adjunct faculty in my 12 faculty total to answer 3)A) above.
Two of us do significant amounts of research
We have 2 categories. Those in tenure/tenure-track, and then academic professionals that are on 6-year contracts.
With budget cuts our adjunct numbers are quickly being reduced. Our contract provides part-time instructors seniority rights to assignments.
Tight-knit and collaborative.
The non-tenure track faculty number includes 3 full-time visitors.
We have a laboratory coordinator and a 3/4 time instructor position also. My data is only for the biology program as starting this spring we will be split off as our own department.
NWCDD is a two campus district with Life Science offered on both campuses. Sheridan has 5 full-time biology instructors and Gillette has 2.
We are a community college serving a rural area of Oregon with high unemployment and many of our students are the FIRST in their families to seek any post-high school education. Our faculty is dedicated to enriching the lives of these students and encouraging them to seek more education.
faculty come form a variety of different departments because we have a program, not a department, that services life sciences majors across all UW colleges
We are not a department but have faculty from 3 colleges from across campus who teach our courses.
Most faculty are research active.
We are small but growing. One more tenure-track Assistant Professor will be on board next year (starting Fall 2014) and we expect to hire 1-2 more faculty in AY 2014-15. As we grow, we expect that the number of adjuncts will go down.
Wide range of expertise. PhD research backgrounds (4); previous high school teachers (1); Biology/Ag-related business (2)
one-third of the faculty retired in the past 2 years

Report generated at 3:13:16 PM, Friday, May 02, 2014