



## Center for Teaching Excellence

**Annual Report: 2018-2019 Academic Year**

Courtney DeMayo Pugno, Director  
Rebecca Taylor, Instructional Technologist

## Executive Summary

This report provides an overview of the programs and events implemented by the Center for Teaching Excellence during the 2018-2019 academic year. The report is divided into sections based on the individual program being discussed, and ends with a short summary of future plans and revisions that will be undertaken in the summer of 2019.

Overall, the Center for Teaching Excellence both successful and effective in its first year. The Center met has made significant progress towards fulfilling its mission to enable and encourage student-centered success across the entire curriculum through the development and deployment of best practices in faculty teaching and student learning for all faculty. To accomplish this mission, programs were developed to accomplish each of the CTE's five goals:

CTE Goal	Supporting Program(s)
Promoting best practices and high impact practices in faculty teaching and student learning so that all faculty are able to implement those practices in their courses.	Faculty Learning Community HYPE Day Faculty Development Individual Consultations Learning Online Teaching and Learning
Integrating new faculty into the Heidelberg community of educators by providing up front orientation and ongoing mentoring for new faculty;	New Faculty Orientation New Faculty Mentoring Individual Consultations
Encouraging faculty to engage in dialogue and reflection about their teaching to promote an educational culture of continuous improvement of faculty teaching and student learning;	HYPE Day Faculty Development Individual Consultations Learning Online Teaching and Learning
Supporting institutional initiatives to improve various measures of student success (including but not limited to engagement, D/F/W rates, retention rates, 4-year and 6-year graduation rates) through faculty development.	Faculty Learning Community Academic Advising Training Learning Online Teaching and Learning Developing the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee
Fulfilling the Heidelberg core academic mission of student graduation in four years leading to a life of purpose with distinction.	Academic Advising Training HYPE Day Faculty Development Learning Online Teaching and Learning

### **Faculty Learning Community**

The Center for Teaching Excellence planned and facilitated a Faculty Learning Community in the Summer of 2018. In this FLC, seven full time faculty members revised materials for one course that they taught to first-year students. The faculty cohort met 6 times over the summer to research their topics of interest, discuss their course revisions, and workshop course materials. Course revisions were implemented in the Fall 2018 semester, and were assessed by each faculty member as part of the FLC. Each faculty member was asked to write a final report, summarizing his/her innovations, the results of those innovations, any next steps the faculty member may take, and providing recommendations for future FLCs. As compensation for their work, each participant received a \$500 stipend, paid upon completion of the Fall 2018 semester.

Faculty participants identified a common set of problems at the opening FLC meeting. These problems included poor student engagement, lack of student preparation for class sessions, and poor student performance. Faculty participants spent the remaining meetings sharing pedagogical research, discussing ideas, workshopping course revisions, and planning assessment strategies. Faculty disseminated the results of their work by writing final reports that summarized the problems, course revisions, and results. Final reports asked qualitative questions of faculty participants, which faculty answered using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evidence.

6 of the 7 FLC participants presented their work at the Faculty Research Symposium, so the results will be summarized very briefly and generally here. Final reports indicated overall positive results from the course revisions. Faculty members reported improvements in student engagement and learning in their courses and every participant either continued or planned to continue the course revisions in future semesters. Similarly, all 7 participants found the Faculty Learning Community very helpful and positive, and strongly recommended the continuation of the program in the 2019-2020 academic year. To that end, the CTE has recruited the next cohort of nine faculty members representing two academic schools.

### **New Faculty Orientation**

New Faculty Orientation was substantially revised to align Heidelberg's faculty on-boarding process with current trends in the educational development. New Faculty Orientation was reorganized to focus on active learning rather than speakers. New faculty members (both full time and adjunct) participated in an ice-breaker activity, a campus resources scavenger hunt, and extended discussions with their faculty mentors. New faculty orientation was designed to help new faculty:

1. Locate important resources for faculty on campus.
2. Begin making connections to colleagues on campus.
3. Become excited about their future at Heidelberg University.

The success of this program was assessed through a Google Form; of the 23 colleagues who attended New Faculty Orientation, 8 individuals completed the form, for a 34.7% response rate. Of those 8 respondents, 6 were full time faculty members and 2 were new part-time faculty members.

Overall, the revisions to New Faculty Orientation were successful, though there is still room for improvement. The data from the Google Form is listed below. All responses were recorded on a Likert scale, with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 5 being “strongly agree”.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Mean</b>
I felt welcomed by all members of the faculty and staff	5.0
I feel comfortable with my new colleagues	4.5
I would like to have lunch or coffee with at least one colleague I met at orientation.	4.5
I feel comfortable finding my way around campus.	4.5
I know how to contact my faculty mentor.	5.0
I feel comfortable contacting my faculty mentor for information or advice.	5.0
I feel better prepared to start teaching my courses as a result of attending orientation.	4.25
I understand what is expected of me as a new faculty member at Heidelberg University.	4.25
I am excited to be a member of the Heidelberg University faculty.	4.875

In addition to the Likert Scale questions, new faculty members were asked several open-ended questions to solicit suggestions for future improvements. These questions provided tangible suggestions that will be incorporated in the Orientation program for the 2019-2020 academic year. These include:

1. Including a common acronyms used around campus in the welcome packet provided to new faculty members
2. Dividing up the day to cover fewer topics.
3. Creating a New Faculty Member Canvas course to share information and provide some orientation before new faculty orientation.
4. Creating an optional follow-up workshop day for faculty members (new and returning) that will focus exclusively on preparing courses and teaching.

### **New Faculty Mentoring**

To accompany the revisions to New Faculty Orientation, New Faculty Mentoring was also revised for the 2018-2019 academic year based on research and best practices in mentoring programs.

Changes to the New Faculty Mentoring Program included the following:

1. Dividing new faculty members into small, interdisciplinary groups of 3-4 people.
2. Creation of a common mentoring syllabus and schedule
3. Adoption of a “just in time” model for disseminating information to new faculty members.
4. Increased emphasis on teaching, through the adoption of developmental observations by mentors.
5. Use of both small-group sessions and large-group sessions.

The New Faculty Mentoring program was assessed through a survey, distributed to new faculty members on March 21 (the last large group meeting). 8 of the 13 full-time new faculty members responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 61.54%. The survey asked the following quantitative questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree):

Question	Mean
The New Faculty Mentoring Program provided me with helpful information about my responsibilities as a faculty member.	4.625
The New Faculty Mentoring lunch meetings (on HYPE Days) were a good use of my time.	4.75
My mentor was a helpful resource during my first year as a member of the Heidelberg faculty	4.125
I felt comfortable talking to my mentor about concerns or questions I had during my first year.	4.25
My mentor's classroom observation of my teaching provided helpful feedback on my teaching.	3.8
The other members of my mentoring group were helpful resources during my first year as a member of the Heidelberg faculty.	4.0
My New Faculty Mentoring group helped me connect with people outside my academic department.	4.625
New Faculty Mentoring helped me feel like I am an important part of the Heidelberg community.	4.25
New Faculty Mentoring helped me make connections with colleagues outside my department.	4.75

Qualitative questions were also asked to solicit areas for improvement. These questions provided several very helpful suggestions, but also indicated areas of uncertainty or dissatisfaction outside the CTE's control or purview, including the criteria for tenure/conversion to tenure and the lack of a master calendar.

Overall, faculty responses indicated that the New Faculty Mentoring program was successful, but still requires improvement. To improve the program, the CTE will implement the following changes:

1. Shrink the size of the mentoring groups to 2-3 faculty members, rather than 3-4. This will allow mentors to focus more specifically.
2. Provide mandatory training for all mentors. The three questions related to mentors, when evaluated in combination with the open ended responses, indicated that some mentors were more active and hands-on with their groups than others. New faculty members with more

active mentors reported higher rates of comfort with their mentors, found their mentors more helpful, and found the teaching observations more valuable than those with less active mentors.

3. Revise the schedule of topics based on feedback from faculty members hired and onboarded in the 2018-2019 academic year.
4. Incorporate social events into the mentoring program.

### **Technology Trainings**

The Center for Teaching Excellence planned and executed a variety of technology trainings in the 2018-2019 year. The trainings covered both Canvas and general technology integration. To prepare the faculty for our new Learning Management System, Canvas, a faculty manual was created along with an interactive Canvas page to learn the basics of using Canvas. 116 discrete users have interacted with the Canvas page at least once. The CTE also hosted a Canvas 101 session during the Opening Faculty Workshop on August 16th. Faculty self identified into two groups, one that was more comfortable with a self-guided introduction and one group that wanted a more direct introduction. Before both the fall and spring semesters, Canvas Drop In hours were scheduled. This gave faculty designated work time to get their courses set up in a central location so their questions could be answered. 25 people attended in the fall and 5 attended in the spring. The CTE also partnered with CNIT to host an onsite Canvas trainer. Through a faculty survey, the CTE identified the top needs and wants of the faculty for the trainer to address. 19 attended the trainings with the Canvas representative.

In addition to Canvas training, the CTE hosted a variety of technology integration workshops throughout the year. We kicked off our technology integration series with the September HYPE plenary session on when and how to integrate technology using the TPACK and SAMR models. That afternoon, we hosted three sessions on technology integration: flipping your class (8 attendees), encouraging student engagement (5 attendees), and formative assessment (6 attendees). The next portion of the series was a Tech Slam. This program had 9 presenters share their favorite technology tool or trick in 3-5 minutes, and approximately 20 people attended. We had around 20 attendees. This session was very successful, resulting in a second Tech Slam planned April 17, 2019, at which 8 people demonstrated technology and an additional five attended the session. Technology tools demonstrated at the Tech Slams include:

<b>September Tech Slam</b>	<b>April Tech Slam</b>
Canvas Discussion Boards	Plickers
Kahoot	EdPuzzle
Google Drive & Maps	Canvas Collaborations
Canvas ARC	Nearpod
Chem 101	Wheel Decide
Blogs in Canvas	Padlet

EdPuzzle	Google Maps
Socrative	
Chrome Extensions	

Other technology-related sessions included a technology idea share, a co-teaching demonstration, and a co-teaching debrief. These sessions were sparsely attended and will need to be rethought for future programming.

Session data was collected for the September HYPE sessions using the following quantitative questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree):

Session Title	Question	Mean
Kickoff Session	“This session helped me better understand when to use technology in my classes.”	4.04
	“This session helped me to better understand how to use technology more effectively in my classes.”	4.27
	“I thought the examples given by Rebecca were helpful in understanding the SAMR levels.”	4.33
	“I thought the case studies were a good opportunity to better explore the SAMR levels.”	4.5
	“This session was useful for me.”	4.5
Using Technology for Formative Assessment	“This workshop introduced me to at least one new tool to use for formative assessment.”	5
	“After this workshop, I am more likely to use tech for formative assessments in my class.”	4.8
	“This workshop gave me at least one new idea to implement in my classes.”	5
	“I would recommend this workshop to a colleague.”	5
Using Technology to Encourage Student Engagement	“This workshop helped me consider new ways of using technology for student engagement.”	4.8
	“This workshop gave me at least one new idea to implement in my classes”	5
	“I would recommend this workshop to a colleague.”	4.8
Using Technology to Flip Your	“This workshop introduced me to at least one new tool to use to flip my class.”	5

Class	“After this workshop, I am more likely to flip my class.”	4.6
	“This workshop gave me at least one new idea to implement in my classes.”	4.8
	“I would recommend this workshop to a colleague.”	5

Overall the feedback solicited was supportive. Technology sessions can still be improved for next year. Plans for next year include:

1. Engage a small group of invested faculty to work on technology integration. This will allow for a deeper dive into using technology for teaching. Allow that group to help determine what programming to offer for the full faculty.
2. Continue offering helpful sessions such as Tech Slams and other programs.

### **HYPE Day Faculty Development**

The Center for Teaching Excellence took over responsibility for planning and implementing HYPE Day Faculty Development Sessions. To make sure that HYPE Day programs meet the needs of the faculty and better reflected faculty interests, the CTE conducted a faculty interest survey at the opening (August) workshop. Because three topics tied at 21 faculty votes (21st Century Learner, External Community, First Generation Students), the Faculty Development Committee was consulted on the final topic. FDC selected the 21st Century Learner. However, because the January HYPE Day was canceled due to weather, so this topic was not addressed in the HYPE Day programs. Each HYPE Day Faculty Development Program was opened with a morning plenary session that addressed one of the faculty-selected topics, and then followed up with afternoon break out sessions.

<b>HYPE Day</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
September	Technology Integration	Rebecca Taylor
October	SoTL	Laura Cruz (guest speaker)
November	Accessibility	Douglas Stoll
February	Privilege	Elizabeth Welch (guest speaker)
March	Active Learning	Amy Berger

To evaluate the effectiveness of the program as a whole, the faculty were surveyed at the end of the academic year on a Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). 39 faculty members completed the survey, and the results of that survey demonstrate that HYPE Day faculty development is generally valued by the faculty but needs to be revised to better serve the faculty’s needs.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Mean</b>
HYPE Day faculty development provided me with valuable information	3.97
I will/did implement at least one thing I learned from HYPE Day faculty development into my work with students.	4.0



The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on teaching with technology showed me ways to integrate technology into my teaching.	3.81
The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on teaching with technology helped me in my work with students.	3.53
The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on the Scholarship of Teaching and learning encouraged me to engage with SoTL.	3.35
The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on SoTL helped me in my work with students.	3.31
The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on teaching students with disabilities helped me understand what disabilities are in an academic setting.	4.13
The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on teaching students with disabilities helped me in my work with students.	3.97
The HYPE Day Faculty Development sessions on privilege helped me recognize my own privilege/	3.46
The HYPE Day faculty development sessions on privilege helped me in my work with students.	3.30
I will use one active learning strategy I learned in the HYPE Day faculty development sessions on active learning.	4.24
HYPE Day faculty development was a good use of my time.	3.81

Overall, the results of the faculty survey on HYPE Day faculty development indicate that the faculty are somewhat satisfied with the programming offered. However, the current structure of HYPE Day faculty development (with each date addressing a single topic) does not align with the most effective strategies or approaches in educational development. Therefore, the CTE has worked in consultation with the Faculty Development Committee to substantially revise HYPE Day faculty development. This revision includes the following changes:

1. Faculty will identify questions or topics interest, and then self-select into working groups of 5-6 on those topics. Each group will identify the goals of their working group, create a list materials necessary to conduct their work, and identify a tangible take-away based on the work they do.
2. Sample questions, based on conversations with faculty *could* include:
  - a. How do I make my courses for accessible for students with disabilities?
  - b. How do I implement high quality peer reviews in my class?
  - c. What active learning strategies are best suited for my course and how can I use them most effectively?
  - d. How can I make my class more inclusive for students who possess marginalized identities?
  - e. What can HU do to create safer spaces for LGBTQ+ students?

- f. What are best practices for faculty teaching clinical courses and how can I implement them?
  - g. Can we create a rubric for high quality writing in the sciences?
  - h. How can I use technology more effectively in my teaching?
  - i. What are the characteristics of effective writing prompts, and how can I implement them?
  - j. How can I best integrate academic support into my course?
  - k. How can I become a better academic advisor?
  - l. How can I best teach first generation students?
  - m. How can I better achieve work/life balance as a faculty member here?
3. The product of this work *may* include revised course materials, guide books or resources for faculty colleagues, recommendations for policy revisions, etc.
  4. Faculty will spend HYPE Day mornings working with their small groups. The CTE Director and Instructional Technologist will provide support to all faculty as needed in this process.
  5. Faculty working groups will present back to the full faculty in January.

This modification to HYPE Day faculty development is informed by several components. The first is the research into educational development that shows that individual workshops do not produce substantial growth and change among participants. Rather, cohort-based or extended programs have higher success rates. Additionally, the Faculty Learning Community had a high rate of success, so the revisions to HYPE Day faculty development are an attempt to scale up aspects of that program and make it applicable to the full faculty. Finally, the HYPE Day Faculty Development feedback surveys contained a section for suggestions for improvement; multiple faculty members reported wanting more variety, the opportunity to select what they wanted to do or learn, more opportunities to collaborate with colleagues, and the opportunity to work in smaller groups. The program revisions described above accommodate all of these suggestions and implement the suggestions for improvement provided by faculty members.

### **Individual Consultations**

Based on the practices of other comparably staffed teaching centers, reviewed during the planning and development of the Center for Teaching Excellence in the 2018-2019 academic year, the Center for Teaching Excellence offered a variety of individual consultation services in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<b>Consultation Type</b>	<b>Number of Consultations</b>
Developmental Observation of Teaching	5
Mid Semester Course Check In	3
IDEA Student Survey Consultation	15
Individual Teaching Consultation	11
Canvas Consultation	70

Technology Consultation	8
Departmental/Committee Technology Consultation	8
Other	5
<b>Total Number of Consultations Conducted</b>	<b>125</b>

The impact of individual consultations were assessed through a Google form, which was sent to each faculty member who had an individual or small group consultation. The form consisted of a Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and one open-ended question. However, this form wasn't circulated until March, and not all faculty who had a consultation were sent the survey, which resulted in a very low response rate. 16 faculty members who had consultations completed the form, for an overall return rate of 12.8%. The data gathered, however, was quite positive and indicate that the faculty who had individual consultations found those consultations very valuable.

Question	Mean
The CTE staff member who conducted my consultation or observation listened to my concerns and issues.	5.0
The CTE staff member who conducted my consultation or observation brainstormed solutions for my concerns and issues with me.	4.9375
The developmental observation or consultation provided information or feedback regarding my issues or concerns.	4.9375
The developmental consultation or observation provided me with at least one idea for how I can improve.	4.9375
I will implement at least one suggestion from my consultation or observation.	4.9375
I would recommend a consultation or observation to my colleagues.	4.9375

The form also contained an open ended question asking for suggestions for improvement. Responses were unanimously positive about the value of the individualized consultations, but did also provide some helpful suggestions for how to improve the consultations. Moving forward, the CTE will modify the consultations slightly:

1. The feedback survey will be distributed to all faculty who have a consultation within 48 of that consultation. This should help improve response rates.
2. The CTE will offer additional consultations or drop in sessions at the 4-week, 8-week, and 12-week mark during the semester (based on a faculty member suggestion)
3. The CTE director will meet with each new faculty member individually to help them set up their IDEA forms during their first semester of teaching (based on a faculty member suggestion), in addition to offering individual IDEA results consultations in January.

4. The CTE director will encourage all new faculty members to have a developmental observation of teaching or a mid-semester course check in, conducted during their first semester of teaching (based on a faculty member suggestion).

### **IDEA Student Survey Implementation and Training**

The CTE has taken primary responsibility for the implementation of the wholly online IDEA Student Surveys. Because the fall of 2018 was the first semester Heidelberg adopted the online IDEA forms, CTE staff spent substantial time learning the IDEA system and setting up the online forms. To support faculty adoption of the online IDEA forms, the CTE provided several supports to faculty, including:

1. Creation of quick guides for IDEA, including:
  - a. IDEA Survey Set Up
  - b. Custom Questions
  - c. Adding IDEA to Canvas
  - d. Using the IDEA Feedback Tool
2. Offer IDEA Survey Set Up Drop In Hours
3. Presentation on how to interpret IDEA Results (January workshop)
4. Offer Individualized IDEA Survey Consultations
  - a. Set Up Consultations
  - b. Results Interpretation Consultation

Feedback on these efforts was solicited through a Google Form and the New Faculty Mentoring survey, which was sent to those who had an individual IDEA consultation. Both feedback forms indicate that IDEA consultation and services were helpful to faculty members who utilized them.

Overall, these efforts resulted in a 38.84% institution-wide response rate to the IDEA Student Survey. Because IDEA Student Surveys are still active for the Spring 2019 semester, no data on this semester's response rates is currently available.

### **Academic Advising Training (In Partnership with the Owen Center)**

The CTE partnered with the Owen Center to provide academic advising training to all faculty in the 2018-2019 academic year.

Academic advising training consisted of the following programs/events:

1. Campus-wide DegreeWorks trainings. Trainings were scheduled for each academic department based on faculty availability, as well as a training session scheduled as part of New Faculty Mentoring. Of the approximately 70 full time faculty members, 46 attended and completed the departmental DegreeWorks training; 13 faculty members completed the training session offered as part of New Faculty Mentoring.
2. Small-group discussion on how to use 8-week and 12-week appraisals for advising. This session, held in Hoernemann Refectory, was attended by 8 faculty members, and the discussion meandered from using appraisals in advising scenarios to a general discussion of

advising and then to a general discussion of teaching. These discussions were fruitful, but did not necessarily result in any tangible takeaway for participants.

3. Creation of an online (Canvas) advising course as a resource for faculty. As of April 9, 2019, 20 individual faculty members have logged into the Canvas course and viewed some of the materials available there.
4. The development of materials to support faculty advising regarding the HYPE program. These materials were developed as part of the online Canvas course, but tested in a small group advising training session, with overall positive feedback from the faculty participants.

Of the academic advising trainings offered, DegreeWorks trainings were the most successful. DegreeWorks trainings had the highest rate of participation and also the clearest, most tangible application. Moving forward, the CTE will continue to collaborate with the Owen Center to best support faculty advising, and will actively promote more hands-on advising training.

### **Learning Online Teaching and Learning**

To support faculty who currently teach online courses or are considering teaching online courses in the future, the Center for Teaching Excellence assembled a small group of faculty to research best practices in online pedagogy and develop training materials for faculty who want to teach online courses. This team, consisting of Lucy Biederman, Karen Estridge, Rebecca Taylor, and Courtney DeMayo Pugno, spent the spring semester researching online pedagogy and building a Canvas course to teach faculty how to teach online.

The Canvas course, titled “Learning Online Teaching and Learning” will be available for faculty learners starting in the summer of 2019. The course models best practices in online pedagogy and has faculty learners building components of their own online classes as they complete the course. Faculty learners will complete the 7-week class in cohorts of 5-10 once the course is made available to faculty.

### **Development of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee**

The Center for Teaching Excellence staff has played a significant role in the development of the college’s Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. Over the course of the 2018-2019 academic year, the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Working Group (consisting of Cherrelle Gardner, Dohee Kim-Appel, Douglas Stoll, Ellen Nagy, Rebecca Taylor, and Courtney DeMayo Pugno) developed a proposal for the creation of a formal DEIC, which is currently under review with the Senior Leadership Team.

To support efforts to promote a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive community, the CTE organized several programs. These programs included Safe Zone Training (conducted at the January workshop) and two HYPE Day Faculty Development Sessions: one on Teaching Students with Disabilities, and one on Privilege.

### **Other Programs/Events**

The Center for Teaching Excellence also held other programs or events that do not fit into any of the categories identified above. These programs include:

1. Hosting an AAC&U Webinar viewing on Classroom Techniques that promote student success.
2. Hosting adjunct conversation hours in the fall semester, during which time part time faculty could come to the CTE and discuss any questions or concerns they had.
3. Collaborating with the Faculty Development Committee to plan and execute the August and January Faculty Development workshops.
4. Hosting a working dinner on mentoring student research and writing, facilitated by the Student Research Conference Keynote Speaker, Julie Reynolds.

These programs were of varying success, partly because the model of a singular workshop is generally ineffective in promoting growth and change among faculty members. Adjunct conversation hours were the least successful, and poorest attended of these programs. The AAC&U Webinar was well attended, for example, but there was little follow up by participants, as this program was held during the summer of 2018.

### **Future Plans, 2019-2020 Academic Year**

The CTE begun planning programs for the 2019-2020 academic year. These programs include:

1. Summer 2019 Programs.
  - a. Faculty Learning Community - nine faculty members have volunteered to participate in the 2019 cohort for the course revision faculty learning community. This group will work through the same process as the 2018 cohort, and will report back on their results either in a Faculty Research Symposium presentation or in a Faculty Forum.
  - b. SoTL Faculty Learning Community - twelve faculty members have volunteered to participate in a Faculty Learning Community based on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Each member of the SoTL FLC will design a research project in the summer and then implement that project in the fall. The results these projects will be shared with the campus, and (ideally) be presented at conferences, or written up for publication.
  - c. Revision to existing programs - the CTE Director and Instructional Technologist will spend much of this summer revising existing CTE programs. Revisions will be made to the following programs:
    - i. New Faculty Orientation (discussed above)
    - ii. New Faculty Mentoring (discussed above)
    - iii. HYPE Day Faculty Development (discussed above)
    - iv. Development of a more robust and thorough assessment plan
2. 2019-2020 Academic Year Programs
  - a. Implementation of revised New Faculty Orientation
  - b. Implementation of Revised New Faculty Mentoring
  - c. Implementation of Revised HYPE Day Faculty Development
  - d. Implementation of assessment plan

- e. Development and implementation of college-wide educational development program for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (in partnership with DEIC)
- f. Individual Consultations