A CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING MATRIX

ACE® American Council on Education®

pod NETWORK

A CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING MATRIX

BACKGROUND AND GOALS

In 2017, the American Council on Education (ACE) released *A Beta Faculty Development Center Matrix* as a complementary tool to the ACE publication *Institutional Commitment to Teaching Excellence: Assessing the Impacts and Outcomes of Faculty Development* (Haras et al. 2017). The impetus for the creation of such a matrix was a chapter in this ACE publication focused on future goals and actions for faculty development. The initial contributors to the beta matrix include Catherine Haras, Emily D. Magruder, Margery Ginsberg, and Todd Zakrajsek. The ACE publication and matrix tool were made possible by a generous grant from Strada Education Network to examine and quality assure postsecondary pedagogy. Additional information about ACE's effective teaching publications, including the beta matrix tool, is available at www.acenet.edu/effectiveteaching.

This next iteration of the tool, *A Center for Teaching and Learning Matrix*, emerges from a collaboration between the POD Network and ACE. Following the release of the beta matrix tool, members of the two organizations gathered extensive feedback as part of its continuous development. Contributors to this revision include Eli-Collins Brown, Catherine Haras, Carol Hurney, Jonathan Iuzzini, Emily D. Magruder, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Steven C. Taylor, and Mary Wright. Per agreement by ACE and the POD Network, readers may utilize this document through a Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial International License.

In developing this tool, we were guided both by research and evidence-based practice in educational development, as well as four primary considerations: respect for directors' multiple commitments, relevance to the real work of practitioners, inquiry as a method of center and instructors' improvement, and authentic evidence of ongoing development that can serve multiple purposes. In addition, we sought to develop a tool that could illuminate accomplishments and challenge assumptions about the work and potential of teaching centers. In advance, thank you for participating in this challenging yet essential work. The matrix is a means for centers and academic leaders to envision their existing and potential impact on student learning, teaching practice, and the institution more broadly.

The matrix is organized so that CTLs can identify their development in 17 domains of practice across three levels that indicate institutional commitment to professional learning that leads to instructional effectiveness. To reference the work of CTLs, we use the term educational development instead of faculty development, as educational development signals how the field of faculty development is evolving to expand the breadth of work. This expanded work includes providing professional development opportunities for tenure-track and full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty, postdoctoral scholars, graduate students, teaching assistants, and administrators, and affording opportunities at the individual, departmental, college, institutional levels (Little 2014). Additionally, an increasing number of CTLs work with undergraduates, through their roles as teachers or via direct academic support. The scope of educational development can also include other aspects of the learning enterprise (e.g., instructional technology, student academic support) and faculty work (e.g., scholarly writing, mentoring, leadership development).

Please note that our use of "instructor" throughout this document is inclusive of all instructional audiences, and the use of "Center" or "CTL" is inclusive of the wide range of teaching, learning, and faculty development units on campuses.

HOW TO USE THE MATRIX

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) matrix is conceptualized across three levels, adapted from the Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (CADAD)(2011). They include:

- Beginning/Developing: an emerging level, representing evolving practice in educational development

- Proficient/Functioning: a competent level, representing skillful practice in educational development

- Accomplished/Exemplary: a desired level, representing best practices in educational development

The matrix also defines three broad domains of practice in CTLs that include: 1) Organizational Structure, 2) Resource Allocation and Infrastructure, and 3) Programs and Services. Each domain has five to six sub-domains to guide center development, practice, and assessment.

It is likely that different centers will be located in varying stages of development, but there may also be context-sensitive elements (e.g., multi-campus schools, special-focus units) that would suggest that a different structure, resource allocation, or program could also be effective. For example, it is not necessary for a CTL to be at the "Accomplished/Exemplary" level in order for it to be well-functioning center. A CTL may be effective at a "Beginning/Developing" level, yet seeking opportunities for further development. Each center will develop unique strengths based on its institutional mission, faculty profile, and student body.

Recognizing that CTLs play a vital role in promoting excellence in teaching and developing a culture that values and rewards teaching (Condon et al. 2016; Haras et al. 2017), the matrix provides an evidence-based template for CTL directors and staff to:

- Use as a frame for goal-setting, strategic planning, prioritizing and scaling efforts, benchmarking, self-study, program review, and/or reflection

- Assess the current status of a CTL and program offerings to positively impact teaching practice and student learning outcomes

- Engage academic leaders in conversations about expectations and impact and advocate for funding and resources aligned with expectations

- Contribute to innovations, best practices, and research on educational development, student retention, and student learning

We encourage use of the matrix by provosts, deans, and other academic leaders to:

- Develop a new CTL aligned with institutional mission and structure, which contributes to meeting the institution's teaching and learning goals

- Support an existing CTL for the purpose of highlighting the importance of teaching and learning and assessing whether additional resources, a more appropriate organizational structure, and/or changes to center location would advance institutional priorities

- Assess the role and impact of the CTL within the broader institutional context, with consideration of mission, continuous improvement, strategic planning, and accreditation

In all instances, to use the matrix, for each domain/sub-domain, circle the cell that most closely approximates the current state of your CTL or efforts. It is our hope that the matrix be used to assess relative strengths and opportunities, to allow developers to think about or reflect on their work with the intent to learn from their experience, and to demonstrate to institutional leaders the value of CTLs and the need for mindful commitment.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The organizational structure of the teaching and learning center (Center, or CTL) reveals institutional commitment to educational development, teaching, and student learning.

	BEGINNING/DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT/FUNCTIONING	ACCOMPLISHED/EXEMPLARY
MISSION, VISION, AND GOALS	Center is crafting a mission, vision, and goals, and it is making a first attempt at aligning with campus priorities. CTL is in the process of writing a strategic plan. Center does not yet have an assessment plan and procedures for documenting and measuring effectiveness.	Center has an articulated mission, vision, and goals, but goals may need to be better aligned with institutional mission and connected to campus priorities. Center has a strategic plan and initial process for documenting and measuring effectiveness.	Center has an articulated mission that is connected to its institution's strategic plan and priorities, key goals that align with mission, activities that enable the Center to reach these goals, and a comprehensive evaluation plan.
LEADERSHIP	Center leadership role is emerging for institutional type, e.g., part-time director, minimal release time for small college director, new in position. Center is researching and identifying qualifications, experience, and competencies for a faculty developer position, and makes evident the incumbent should demonstrate a commitment to diversity and inclusion.	Center leadership role is appropriate for institutional type, e.g., full-time director or release time for small college director; there is low turnover (average term of service at least three years). Initial qualities for a leadership position are developed. This includes a concerted effort and commitment to diversity and inclusion when considering candidates with the requisite qualifications, experience, and competencies aligned with the position. There is a concerted effort to reduce staff turnover.	Center leadership role is appropriate for institutional type, e.g., full-time, mid- to high-level unit leader. There is a very clear commitment to equity-minded leadership when considering qualifications, experience, and competencies. There is a low rate of turnover. If director appointment is temporary and rotating, term is long enough for achievement of goals. Director is consulted on plans and included on key committees involving teaching improvement and student success.
STAFF EXPERTISE AND PREPARATION	Director/staff may be recognized for teaching excellence. Director/staff may be new to academic leadership and/or educational development.	Director has some experience managing an academic center or program. Director/staff have some background or experience that directly impacts educational development or student learning.	Director has considerable management and supervisory experience in higher education administration (including in a CTL context). Director/staff have substantial educational training or documented work experience in educational development and student learning. Director/staff engage in ongoing professional development.
INSTITUTIONAL PLACEMENT	A formal center and/or an individual charged with responsibility for educational development is emergent.	A formal center and/or an individual charged with responsibility for educational development has been identified. Center is one of several campus units that support instructors; director has implicit (unwritten) access to chief academic officers; director may report to a unit outside of central academic administration.	Center is the principal educational development unit on campus. Director has a direct reporting line to a chief academic officer and explicit access to central academic administrators, e.g., provost, dean.
COLLABOR-ATIONS	Center is in initial stages of identifying mission-aligned collaborations or mergers.	Center is cultivating mission-aligned collaborations or mergers (instructional technology unit is a common partner but CTL may network with other units). Services across units need better coordination or integration. CTL director/staff have limited influence on selection of instructional technologies, learning spaces, and resources that support teaching and learning.	Center works extensively with mission-aligned collaborating units or departments to provide coordinated, integrated, or embedded services. (Common partners include instructional technology unit, departments/colleges, and/or library. Other partner units may include student academic support, assessment, writing, diversity and inclusion, community service learning, or graduate school.) CTL may co-locate, integrate, or closely collaborate with other units, e.g., instructional technology. CTL director/staff are involved in decisions that influence selection of instructional technologies/learning spaces/resources that support teaching and learning.
OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND ARCHIVES	Center is developing guidelines for organization's operation and creating mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (e.g., records of programming, assessment activities).	Center has some guidelines for organizational operation; mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming, assessment activities) are in place. Records may be in paper or digital format.	Center has robust guidelines and procedures for organizational operation. Mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming, assessment activities) are in place and chart impact over time. Records are digitally organized, archived, and regularly updated.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The degree to which an institution funds and locates teaching development, and the ways in which a CTL designs programming for the campus, indicates its centrality. Depending upon institutional mission, size, and Carnegie classification, some of these elements (like staffing) may be aspirational, or outside of Center scope.

	BEGINNING/DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT/FUNCTIONING	ACCOMPLISHED/EXEMPLARY
BUDGET	Funding for the Center is largely in the form of support for specific events or programs.	Center has appropriate institutional budget, although it may fluctuate from year to year. Budget may encompass both programming and personnel costs, although personnel may be part of central administration budget. Funds are available to support the professional development of some Center staff. Budget may be supplemented by cost-sharing with other units, one-time campus allocations, or external grants.	Center budget is funded proportional to campus mission, vision, and strategic direction. Budget absorbs rates of fluctuation from year to year and allows for long-term planning, staffing, and growth. Budget encompasses programming, personnel costs, services (e.g., food, outside speakers), and supplies. Funds are available to support the professional development of all Center staff. Budget is supplemented by cost-sharing with other units or one-time campus allocations. Budget is sufficient without external sources of funds but CTL may hold a gift fund, secure external grants, or partner on grants.
LOCATION & SPACE	Center utilizes space that may be shared among multiple institutional units. Center staff may be housed in a location separate from where programming and services are offered.	The Center has dedicated space and can be located without difficulty. There is adequate office space for staff; access to a classroom, lab, and spaces for meetings, programs, and events. Center space is inviting and adequately resourced but design may not meet current demand/need and/or reflect pedagogical principles and practices.	CTL is in a location that is easily found and accessible, with ample office space for staff. May include a workspace for instructors. CTL has dedicated classroom, lab, and meeting/event space. Center space is welcoming, engaging, and resource rich. CTL features new spaces or repurposes existing space configured with technology. Pedagogical principles and practices drive space design, including educational technology implementation.
STAFFING	CTL may be led by a faculty committee (some with release/reassigned time) or by an individual administrator, faculty or staff member who may be less than full time. The committee/individual charged with leading the CTL is beginning to develop a background in the field of faculty/educational development. CTL struggles to meet requests.	CTL has an individual charged with supporting educational development. Center staff includes a director, although may be less than full-time. Staffing is relatively lean. At least one member of the CTL staff has a background in the field of educational development. Requests from faculty may exceed the staff's capacity.	Center has a dedicated staff that includes a full-time director who may also hold other titles. Staffing is substantial and may include a program coordinator, associate or assistant director, instructional/technology consultant, faculty associate, postdoc, graduate student or undergraduate assistant, full- or part-time. Multiple members of CTL staff have backgrounds in educational development. Staff is able to meet most or all requests for services and is sufficient to meet operational needs (e.g., publicity, archiving).
ONLINE RESOURCES	Center's website is in development or is established with basic information about Center's location, contact information, and schedule of events. Center staff are considering how/whether to provide instructional resources online.	Center may extend its reach via web pages that are current and easily navigable; some instructional resources and program materials may be available online.	Center significantly extends its reach via a dynamic online presence. Web pages are current and easily navigable. Instructional resources and program materials are online and may include asynchronous programming (webinars), electronic newsletters, blogs, and links to other print and visual materials.
COMMUN-ICATION & REPUTATION	Center staff is developing a marketing plan. Communication is largely event-based and is accomplished through flyers, word of mouth, and emails. CTL is developing a needs assessment to better understand the diverse interests of faculty across departments, career stages, and appointment types.	Regular communication is offered to the campus (e.g., via email, newsletter, or social media). CTL is beginning to develop a reputation for providing programs responsive to instructor/constituencies' needs. Some departments/appointment types may be overrepresented in attendance, while others may be underrepresented. Programming may be perceived as for certain departments/appointment types only, e.g., humanities, tenure-track faculty.	CTL provides proactive and timely outreach via email, newsletters, social media engagement, and "on the road" events. Center has strong reputation for programs highly responsive to identified needs and increases awareness on campus through promotional materials. Programming is well attended and perceived as open and available to all.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Teaching and learning centers develop evidence-based, mission-dependent programming based upon instructor, student, and campus need. While the domains below may be context-specific, relationships and community remain key indicators of Center viability.

	BEGINNING/DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT/FUNCTIONING	ACCOMPLISHED/EXEMPLARY
SCOPE	Programs and services are responsive to the expressed needs of some CTL constituencies but are not fully aligned with Center mission and goals. Programs are limited in variety and ability to scale.	Programs and services are responsive to expressed needs of many/all CTL constituencies and are aligned with mission and goals. Programming may not be scalable, or largely targets a particular career stage, appointment type, or disciplinary area.	Programs and services are responsive to and advance needs and initiatives as defined by the institution, are aligned with CTL mission and goals, and are grounded in literature on teaching, learning, and educational development. A diverse array of programs is designed to reach broad campus constituencies.
TARGET AUDIENCE	Center programs and services target individual instructors, including those with contingent appointments, post-doctoral fellows, or graduate students (as applicable for the institution).	Plus: Center programs and services target cohorts that represent instructors at similar career milestones (e.g., new faculty), roles (e.g., non-tenure-track faculty), common interests or responsibilities (e.g., teaching crucial gateway courses, or teaching multicultural content), or those from the same academic department or program.	Plus: Center collaborates with other centers, or disseminates to a wider audience beyond the institution, through online resources, programs, and scholarly communications (e.g., presentations and publications).
CONTENT	CTL programs address course design, topics in teaching effectiveness, and/or use of specific technologies.	Plus: CTL programs address curriculum and learner-centered design that is inclusive of all students, motivating and effective learning activities and assignments for culturally diverse classrooms, and fair and equitable assessment.	Plus: CTL offers a programmatic approach that provides a continuous professional development model for instructors as learners, offering targeted, motivating and inclusive instruction that supports faculty growth. Programming addresses a strategic campus need, e.g., increasing graduation rates among all student groups, developing faculty leadership.
APPROACH	CTL programs and services disseminate content related to teaching and support implementation mainly through one-time workshops, individual consultations, and self-help resources (e.g., online). Center may rely heavily on outsourced programming sources.	Plus: Center offers an array of original programs (e.g., individual consultation with feedback, discipline-specific/customized workshops or seminars in a series, communities of practice, institutes/retreats) that disseminate content related to teaching and strongly support implementation.	Plus: Center offers longitudinal programming designed according to principles of adult learning. Center offers an array of original programs and curricular opportunities (e.g., courses, certificates) that disseminate content related to a range of educational development needs. CTL strongly supports implementation and encourages reflective practice (e.g., retreats, grants to support scholarly approaches to teaching and learning, curriculum projects, conference travel).
REACH[1]	Depending upon campus mission and size, CTL reaches a small fraction of instructors. Participation is not representative of appointment types, career stages, departments/colleges. CTL thinks strategically about how to incentivize participation, e.g., how to reach faculty with part-time or contingent appointments for whom developmental activities are not included as part of regular faculty work.	CTL reach is growing. Participation is somewhat representative of appointment types, career stages, departments/colleges. Center is able to offer modest incentives to select constituencies to encourage and recognize engagement in CTL initiatives.	Depending upon campus size and mission, CTL reaches a critical mass of instructors. Participation is strategically distributed across appointment types, career stages, and departments/colleges to serve critical institutional initiatives. Incentives for instructors, especially those for whom developmental activities are not part of their regular workload, might include stipends to offset additional time commitments, paid course release time, conference registrations, or leadership opportunities to impact teaching culture, policies, and procedures.
IMPACT	Center collects data on the numbers of participants using services and self-reports of program value, usefulness, and satisfaction. Data are used for planning, resource allocation, and to inform and enhance programs and services.	Plus: Center collects evidence of program outcomes, which may include measurements of the impact on participants' teaching beliefs/attitudes, implementation of teaching practices, adoption of reflective strategies, and direct/indirect diffusion of effective practice. Center uses this evidence to improve program design.	Plus: Center collects evidence of program outcomes on student learning and/or institutional culture of teaching. Center engages in the scholarship of educational development that can inform and enhance the CTL's programs and services through presentations and publications.

---

1 The field of educational development would benefit from more research on what constitutes ample "reach," but Bishop and Keehn's (2015) study of 171 institutions suggests that estimated reach varies by institution type, ranging from 12–49 percent of full-time faculty, 17–34 percent of part-time faculty, 0–25 percent of graduate students, and 5–37 percent of undergraduates. Other proposed guidelines include a move past a threshold of 15–16 percent of instructors, to scale beyond innovators/early adopters or past "token status" (Kanter 1977; Rogers 1962).

REFERENCES

Bishop, MJ, and Anne Keehn. 2015. *Leading Academic Change: An Early Market Scan of Leading-Edge Postsecondary Academic Innovation Centers*. William Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation. Baltimore: University of Maryland. http://www.usmd.edu/cai/sites/default/files/LeadingAcademicChangeProjectReport.pdf.

Condon, William, Ellen R. Iverson, Cathryn A. Manduca, Carol Rutz, and Gudrun Willett. 2016. *Faculty Development and Student Learning: Assessing the Connections*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (CADAD). 2011. *Benchmarking Performance of Academic Development Units in Australian Universities*. https://www.caullt.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Benchmarking_Report.pdf.

Haras, Catherine, Steven C. Taylor, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, and Linda von Hoene, eds. 2017. *Institutional Commitment to Teaching Excellence: Assessing the Impacts and Outcomes of Faculty Development*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Institutional-Commitment-to-Teaching-Excellence.pdf.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Little, Deandra. 2014. "Reflections on the State of the Scholarship of Educational Development." *To Improve the Academy* 33 (1): 1–13.

Rogers, Everett M. 1962. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Beach, Andrea L., Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Ann E. Austin, and Jaclyn K. Rivard. 2016. *Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence: Current Practices, Future Imperatives*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Borrego, Maura, and Charles Henderson. 2014. "Increasing the Use of Evidence-Based Teaching in STEM Higher Education: A Comparison of Eight Change Strategies." *Journal of Engineering Education* 103 (2): 220–252.

Cook, Constance E., and Matthew Kaplan, eds. 2011. *Advancing the Culture of Teaching on Campus: How a Teaching Center Can Make a Difference*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Ellis, Donna E., Stephanie T.L. Chu, Celia Popovic, Carol Rolheiser, Suzanne Le-May Sheffield, Peter Wolf, and W. Alan Wright. 2018. *Centre Reviews: Strategies for Success.* Educational Development Guide Series, No. 3. Ottawa, Canada: Educational Developers Caucus. https://www.stlhe.ca/affiliated-groups/educational-developers-caucus/guides.

POD Network. 2018. "Defining What Matters: Guidelines for Comprehensive Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Evaluation." https://podnetwork.org.

Schroeder, Connie M., ed. 2010. *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Wright, Mary, Cassandra Volpe Horii, Peter Felten, Mary Deane Sorcinelli, and Matt Kaplan. 2018. "Faculty Development Improves Teaching and Learning." *POD Speaks* 2 (2018): 1–5. https://podnetwork.org/content/uploads/POD-Speaks-Issue-2_Jan2018-1.pdf.

Wright, Mary C., Debra Rudder Lohe, Tershia Pinder-Grover, and Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens. 2018. "The Four Rs: Guiding CTLs with Responsiveness, Relationships, Resources, and Research." *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development* 37 (2): 271–286.