A BETA FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CENTER MATRIX

Edited by:
Catherine Haras, *California State University, Los Angeles*
Margery Ginsberg, *Independent Scholar and Author*
Emily Daniell Magruder, *California State University, Office of the Chancellor*
Todd Zakrajsek, *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

"High-quality instruction has been the backbone of an American higher education system that remains the envy of the world. But how to measure effective teaching and gauge its impact on an ever more diverse population of students is vital if we are to dramatically increase the number of Americans able to earn a college degree."

—Molly Corbett Broad, president emerita, American Council on Education

A BETA FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CENTER MATRIX
BACKGROUND AND GOALS

This beta matrix derives from historical and recent perspectives on postsecondary faculty development as considered in a recent publication by the American Council on Education (ACE). The publication, *Institutional Commitment to Teaching Excellence: Assessing the Impacts and Outcomes of Faculty Development*, asserts that, although the field is young, faculty development can and does improve instruction and student learning outcomes. As catalysts for professional learning, teaching centers play a vital role in teaching excellence and cultures of teaching excellence.

To support teaching centers in this work, ACE, in consultation with a team of experienced faculty developers, created this matrix as a tool for the ongoing improvement and expansion of efforts. The matrix that follows provides an evidence-based template for new and experienced center staff to:

- Assess the current status of teaching centers and program offerings
- Communicate and compare professional standards and efforts to improve postsecondary instruction via a stable architecture for center improvement
- Deliberate current and future goals within and across campuses
- Contribute to the scholarship of postsecondary faculty development, student retention, and student learning
- Deliberate adult learning methods for inclusive and ethical learning environments
- Prioritize and potentially scale services and practices
- Advocate for funding and resources

All rubric-like matrices are works in progress and present an inherent dilemma. They are by nature reductive and simplistic because they seek to demystify the complexity of a task or set of tasks. Matrix criteria comprise characteristics that researchers and theorists consider to be essential or important and worthy of measuring. While this is by no means a prescriptive tool and is malleable according to the mission and priorities of individual campuses, the rating system and exemplars for criteria can illuminate a teaching center's continuum of quality. This is why the matrix we offer is meant to supplement rather than supplant rich, vivid, and powerful descriptions of professional development practice.

In developing this tool, our guiding principles were grounded in intrinsic motivation theory with four primary considerations: respect for directors' multiple commitments, relevance to the real work of practitioners, inquiry as a method of center and faculty improvement, and authentic evidence of ongoing improvement that can serve multiple purposes. This work is also grounded in transformation theory. This means we sought to develop a tool that could illuminate accomplishment *and* challenge assumptions about the work and potential of teaching centers. In advance, thank you for participating in this sensitive yet essential work.

The future development of the matrix will be a collaborative effort between the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network and ACE. The beta matrix is a nonproprietary and open source tool for faculty developers, and other similarlly structured academic units (e.g., service learning, academic technology, and student development offices), to adapt and use as a resource to carry out their work.

HOW TO USE THE MATRIX

Readers of the matrix will benefit from reading the ACE publication *Institutional Commitment to Teaching Excellence: Assessing the Impacts and Outcomes of Faculty Development* for context prior to using the matrix. The matrix is organized according to four standards that indicate Center development as well as institutional commitment to the work of faculty professional development at a campus: 1) Organizational Structure, 2) Center Location, 3) Resource Allocation and Infrastructure, and 4) Programs and Services. Each standard has corresponding criteria as follows:

1. Organizational Structure
   a. Institutional placement (hierarchy within the organization)
   b. Director status
   c. Director expertise and preparation
   d. Center mission, vision, and goals
   e. Institutional memory

2. Center Location
   a. Center location
   b. Space allocation
   c. Learning spaces
   d. Web presence

3. Resource Allocation and Infrastructure
   a. Center budget
   b. Staffing
   c. Planning and data collection
   d. Marketing and reputation

4. Programs and Services
   a. Programming scope
   b. Program content
   c. Reach
   d. Communities of practice

These criteria are conceptualized across a possible continuum; for each criterion, a teaching center may be "Developing," "Partially developed," or "Fully developed." To use the matrix, scroll through each standard, placing your center at one of the three column stages.

For each dimension, circle the cell that most closely approximates the current state of your faculty development center or efforts. Once completed, you may notice patterns, e.g., certain standards may show strongly, while others need further attention. It is likely that different centers will demonstrate various stages of robustness. All centers continue to develop unique strengths based upon their institutional mission and faculty bodies. It is our hope that this template be used to globally assess relative strengths and opportunities, while demonstrating to the institution the value of faculty development centers, and the need for mindful commitment.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The organizational structure of the teaching and learning center (Center, or CTL), including location in the campus hierarchy and director status, reveals institutional commitment to faculty development (FD) and teaching. Some of these criteria may be aspirational or currently outside of the scope of the Center.

	DEVELOPING	PARTIALLY DEVELOPED	FULLY DEVELOPED
INSTITUTIONAL PLACEMENT	A formal center and/or an academic leader with responsibility for faculty development is emerging.	Center is one of several faculty development units on campus with a director and implicit (unwritten) access to central academic administration; director may report to a separate unit.	Center is the foremost faculty development unit on campus with explicit access to central academic administration and a direct reporting line.
DIRECTOR STATUS	Center leadership role is inappropriate for institutional type, e.g., part time in large university; high turnover (average term of service less than three years). Lacks metrics around faculty/developer qualifications, experience, and competencies.	Center leadership role appropriate for institutional type, e.g., full-time administrative leader who comes from the faculty, or generous release time for small college director; low turnover (average term of service greater than three years). Initial metrics around faculty/developer qualifications, experience, competencies, and rate of turnover factor into Center leadership.	Center leadership role fully appropriate for institutional type, e.g., full-time, mid- to high-level administrative leader. Director is consulted in plans involving academic improvement and student success, and included on high-level committees and processes such as accreditation. Well-developed metrics for faculty/developer qualifications, experience, competencies, and rate of turnover are in place.
DIRECTOR EXPERTISE AND PREPARATION	Director lacks administrative experience managing a center. Director may be recognized for teaching excellence but has no background in disciplines or scholarship that directly impact faculty development and student learning, (e.g., adult learning, curriculum design, diversity and inclusion, educational research, instructional improvement, leadership development, learning science, technology-enhanced learning, organizational development in higher education; postsecondary access and participation).	Director has prior experience managing an academic center or program and is recognized for teaching excellence; has some background in disciplines or scholarship that directly impact faculty development or student learning (e.g., adult learning, curriculum design, diversity and inclusion, educational research, instructional improvement, leadership development, learning science, technology-enhanced learning, organizational development in higher education, postsecondary access and participation).	Director has extensive experience in higher education administration (or has helped run a CTL) and is recognized for teaching excellence. Director has background in disciplines or scholarship that directly impact faculty development and student learning and continues to receive professional development in these areas (e.g., adult learning, curriculum design, diversity and inclusion, educational research, instructional improvement, leadership development, learning science, technology-enhanced learning, organizational development in higher education; postsecondary access and participation).
CENTER MISSION, VISION, AND GOALS	Center does not yet have mission, vision, or goals; or these are not in alignment with campus priorities, a strategic plan of activities to enable the Center to reach these goals, or an assessment plan and procedures for documenting and measuring effectiveness.	Center has articulated mission, vision, and goals; goals may not be in alignment with campus priorities. Insufficient attention to alignment of goals with mission and/or an assessment plan and procedures for documenting and measuring effectiveness.	Center has an articulated mission relevant to campus priorities, key goals that align with mission, a strategic plan of activities that enable the Center to reach these goals, and a comprehensive assessment plan and procedures for documenting and measuring effectiveness. Evidence that Center participates outside of its own confines, responding to institutional need and enhancing the visibility/centrality of teaching on campus.
INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY	Center has no guidelines for organizational operation and no printed or published materials are in place; mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming and assessment activities) are unavailable. Paper records are not archived for easy reference.	Center has guidelines for organizational operation; mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming and assessment activities) are in place. Records may be in paper or digital format.	Center has robust guidelines for organizational operation; mechanisms for transmitting institutional memory (records of past programming and assessment activities) are in place and chart growth. Records are digitally organized, archived, and regularly updated.

CENTER LOCATION

The teaching and learning center's location—its "real estate" on campus—may indicate institutional commitment to teaching and learning. Depending upon the size of the campus, not all criteria may be relevant, or may be outside the scope of the institution.

	DEVELOPING	PARTIALLY DEVELOPED	FULLY DEVELOPED
CENTER LOCATION	Remotely located or hard to find on campus.	Not centrally located but on campus and easily accessible.	Centrally located and easily accessible on campus.
SPACE ALLOCATION	Adequate office space for staff; CTL may lack dedicated training resources, such as a classroom, lab, or meeting space.	Adequate office space for staff. CTL has easy access to a classroom, lab, and meeting spaces, although the space environment may lack resources. A space that not all faculty may use.	Ample space for staffing and teaching. CTL has dedicated classrooms and labs for exclusive use. A space that all faculty can use, including those with contingent appointments.
LEARNING SPACES	Center space is uninviting, poorly designed, or resource poor. Redesign is not possible or is unfunded.	Center space is inviting and adequately resourced but not designed to meet current demand/need. New space is not possible or does not reflect pedagogical principles and practices.	Center space is welcoming, engaging, and resource-rich. CTL features new spaces or repurposes existing space with technology. Pedagogical principles and practices drive learning space design, including educational technology implementation.
WEB PRESENCE	Center does not extend its reach online. Hard-to-find and periodically updated web pages provide basic information about location and programs.	Center extends its reach via web pages that are current and easily navigable; instructional and program materials may/may not be available online.	Center significantly extends its reach via a dynamic online presence. Web pages are easily navigable and robust, and instructional and program materials are online, including asynchronous programming (webinars).

RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The degree to which the institution funds and awards teaching resources, as well as the way in which the CTL plans programming for the campus, indicates Center development. Depending upon institutional mission, size, and Carnegie classification, these criteria (like staffing) may be aspirational, or outside of Center scope.

	DEVELOPING	PARTIALLY DEVELOPED	FULLY DEVELOPED
CENTER BUDGET	No budget or determining an appropriate budget. No funds for programming beyond personnel costs. Dependent upon external funding sources such as grants.	Center budget may fluctuate from year to year. Funding for personnel and programming varies and uncertainty hampers long-term planning. Funding may depend upon external sources such as institutional grants, but CTL lacks an endowment (dependable source of external funding).	Center budget is funded proportional to campus mission, vision, and strategic direction, absorbing rates of fluctuation from year-to-year and allowing for long term planning, staffing, and growth. Funding is sufficient without the need for external funding or CTL has an endowment; director secures grants or partners on grants.
STAFFING	Ratio of CTL staff to FTE is not appropriate to faculty numbers (including faculty with contingent appointments). Center lacks a full-time director or dedicated staff or may be direct as overload without compensation.	Ratio of CTL staff to FTE is appropriate to faculty numbers (including faculty with contingent appointments). Center work is often dependent upon the director, including student employees and contingent labor (consultants).	Ratio of CTL staff to FTE is generous and able to meet all who request services (including faculty with contingent appointments). Center is not dependent upon any one person and could function regardless; staffing is adequate to meet and create demand for services, including student employees and contingent labor (consultants).
PLANNING AND DATA COLLECTION	Director creates plans in isolation, without input of key campus stakeholders; programming is focused on director's strength and interests, which may or may not align with campus need. Data collection captures attendance and/or satisfaction.	Director gathers input from campus stakeholders. Programming largely aligns with campus need. Data collection includes attendance/satisfaction, plus evidence of changes in teaching practice.	Director gathers input from a faculty advisory. Programming aligns with campus strategic plan and is based on needs assessment. Center collects/analyzes/integrates data that provide evidence of change and direct/indirect diffusion of effective practices. Center self-assesses on a regular cycle.
INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	Center operates independently of instructional technology unit(s) and does not collaborate. Center has no influence on selection of instructional technologies impacting teaching.	Center collaborates with instructional technology unit(s); services do not integrate; Center has limited influence on selection of instructional technologies impacting teaching.	Center works closely with technology units to provide integrated or embedded service; may absorb or co-locate with instructional technology units; Center influences selection of instructional technologies impacting teaching.
MARKETING AND REPUTATION	Occasional or uneven outreach to the campus. Center lacks a reputation for providing programs responsive to faculty need. Programming may be under-attended or seen as remedial.	Regular communication to the campus via email, newsletter, or social media. Center may have an uneven reputation for providing programs responsive to faculty needs. Programming may be under-attended or perceived as for tenure-track faculty only.	Proactive and timely outreach via email, newsletters, social media engagement, and "on the road" events. Center has strong reputation for programs highly responsive to faculty need; Center develops brand and marketing collateral. Programming is well attended and perceived of as open and available to all, including faculty with contingent appointments.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Teaching and learning centers develop unique, mission-dependent programming based upon faculty, student, and campus need. While the criteria below are dependent—and some criteria are aspirational—engagement and community remain key indicators of Center viability.

	DEVELOPING	PARTIALLY DEVELOPED	FULLY DEVELOPED
PROGRAMMING SCOPE	Center offers a collection of one-time workshops unaligned to its mission and goals; may rely heavily on outsourced programming that does not match the needs, interests, and capacities of faculty across appointment types. Programming is not scalable (not all faculty can be served).	Center offers original programming aligned with CTL mission and goals that often matches the needs, interests, and capacities of faculty across appointment types. Programming may not be scalable or largely targets tenure-track faculty.	Center offers original and cumulative curriculum driven by CTL mission/goals; provides multiple points of entry, access, and modes of learning across appointment types, with mechanisms for placement according to interest/need. Programming scales to all faculty, including those with contingent appointments, and is designed to reach broad campus constituencies.
PROGRAM CONTENT	Course design and/or topics in teaching effectiveness and use of specific technologies.	*Plus*: Curriculum and learner-centered design, e.g., inclusive, motivating, and effective learning activities and assignments for culturally diverse classrooms, fair and equitable assessment.	*Plus*: Programmatic approach that provides a continuous professional development model for faculty as learners, offering motivating and productive instruction that supports faculty growth. Programming addresses a strategic campus need, e.g., increasing graduation rates among all student groups. Ongoing assessment of implementation and planned program outcomes.
REACH	Depending upon campus mission and size, less than 10% of instructional faculty, including those with contingent appointments or graduate students; unevenly distributed across appointment type and department/college.	Depending upon campus mission and size, between 10% and 20% of instructional faculty, including those with contingent appointments or graduate students; may be unevenly distributed across appointment type and department/college.	Depending upon campus size and mission, a minimum of 20% of instructional faculty, including those with contingent appointments, or graduate students, strategically distributed across appointment type and department. CTL reaches departments at the program level and attracts teams.
COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE	Self-help, 1:1 consultations, blogs where members of the community discuss ideas, experiences, innovations, challenges, and research about teaching and learning with an emphasis on reaching tenure-track faculty; peer-support network is developing.	*Plus*: Faculty learning communities and/or other learning platforms and strategies that support reflective practice, instructional design and improvement, reciprocal peer support such as study groups and blogs; course and curriculum development.	*Plus*: Cohorts or communities of practice build trust and shared responsibility for student success. They are dedicated to diversity and inclusion, curricular reform, instructional improvement, reflective practice, or SoTL, available through online, F2F, and blended modalities. *All* faculty, including those with contingent appointments, are welcome at the Center. Faculty feel they are "part of something" when they participate.