

**SYSTEMIC, SPECIALIZED AND SUSTAINED:  
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY  
INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING AND TEACHING PLAN TASK FORCE**

JUNE 2011

Prepared by:

Dennis Sumara, Chair, Institutional Teaching and Learning Plan Task Force &  
Professor and Dean, Faculty of Education

## CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Orienting Statements</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Vision	3
1.2	Values and Principles	3
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Conceptual Framework: Systemic, Specialized and Sustained</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Systemic	4
2.2	Specialized	4
2.3	Sustained	5
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Aims and Priorities</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Foci and Implementation	6
3.2	Primary Aim	6
3.3	Priorities	6
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Goals and Actions</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4.1	Leadership and Governance	7
4.2	Teaching and Learning Support	8
4.3	Evaluation and Accountability	9
4.4	Student Experience	10
4.5	Learning Environments	11
4.6	Program Planning	12
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>13</b>
	Appendix A. Task force Terms of reference	13
	Appendix B. Background and Process	15
	Appendix C. Overview of Earlier Teaching and Learning Plans	16
	Appendix D. Summary of Existing Support for Teaching and Learning	19
	Appendix E. Findings from Consultation and Commissioned Research	23
	Appendix F. Analysis of Findings from Consultation, Document Review and Commissioned Research	27
	Appendix G. Centre for Leadership in Teaching and Learning	29
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Recommended Timelines for Implementation</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>33</b>

## 1.0 ORIENTING STATEMENTS

### 1.1 VISION

At the University of Calgary, our formal responsibilities for teaching and learning will be research informed, research active and goal oriented, enabled by systemic institutional structures, specialized teaching knowledge, and sustained professional support.

### 1.2 VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

The University of Calgary's *Academic Foundations: Principles to Guide University Planning* sets out the values by which the Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning are governed:

In all that we do, the University of Calgary is committed to the values of integrity and respect, which underlie the academic principles for our University: student success; excellence in research, scholarship and creative ability; interdisciplinary education and research; and return to community.”

The Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning develops its priorities, goals, objectives and action recommendations from these values and principles.

## 2.0 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: SYSTEMIC, SPECIALIZED AND SUSTAINED

### 2.1 SYSTEMIC

In *Academic Foundations: Principles to Guide University Planning*,<sup>i</sup> the University of Calgary is described as

a resilient, responsive and adaptable institution built on a strong foundation of partnerships, coalitions and networks that operate in common purpose to create a fully participating learning society.

(p. 7)

Embedded in this self-description is an acknowledgment that the University is a learning organization – that is, not simply an institution responsible for generating and disseminating knowledge, but an evolving system that is constantly adapting to the conditions around it.

There has been considerable research into the structures and dynamics of all learning organizations,<sup>ii</sup> culminating in the development of several focused principles that inform the recommendations in this document. In particular, and echoing the above description of the University of Calgary, the growing literature on learning systems highlights such distinctions as mechanical efficiencies vs. systemic complexities, centralized control vs. participatory governance, and pre-determined ends vs. emergent outcomes.

The latter elements in these distinctions are integral to this document. For example, as will be elaborated in the pages that follow, the recommendations presented are not articulated in terms of top-down directives, centralized authority, and predictable results, but instead are framed more tentatively in the language of *mutual affect*, *shared decisions*, and *ongoing adaptation*. For that reason, this document is not conceived as a comprehensive plan for implementation but as an integrated framework of goals and actions to be enacted across academic units and support offices within a distributed governance and leadership model.

In terms of the matter at the heart of this document – that is, student and faculty success – a systemic framing distributes responsibility across all persons, units and offices in the University. The *Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning* is oriented by the assumption that the character and potential of the University of Calgary arise in the ongoing interactions of diverse experts. Therefore, all teaching staff of the University community are called to exercise and extend their specialist knowledge in the collective project of educating “our students to appreciate the complexities of the natural and human worlds in which they live and to prepare them to engage actively, thoughtfully and productively both in their careers and as citizens of their communities” (*Academic Foundations*, p. 7).

### 2.2 SPECIALIZED

Specific to the matter of student achievement and success, research into the factors and circumstances that can influence learning has confirmed one important finding: Controlling for almost every factor that can be manipulated by the institution – including, for example, class size, per-pupil funding, time per class, curriculum, instructional resources, and access to technology – only one proves to have a large impact: the expertise of the teacher.<sup>iii</sup>

Considerable progress has been made into understanding some of the qualities and competencies that contribute to expert teaching. For example, teachers with a deep knowledge of how people think and learn – individually and collectively – are able to support higher levels of conceptual understanding in their students.<sup>iv</sup> As well, teacher expectation, as expressed through the tasks that are set and the feedback that is given, helps to determine whether the learning that occurs is deep or superficial.<sup>v</sup> On this count, a key element in successful teaching is the capacity to set flexible and appropriately challenging tasks for learners.

Teachers' specialized disciplinary knowledge also is an important consideration. This matter is perhaps the most vigorously developing research areas in current studies of teaching and learning. One of the important realizations emerging in this research is that specialized knowledge for teaching is not a simple matter of "more of" or "deeper than" student knowledge. Rather, expert teachers' understandings of a subject area revolve around "the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations – in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others."<sup>vi</sup> This knowledge is complex, extensive, developed over many years, and enabled by structured collaborative engagements with other teachers.<sup>vii</sup> Many recommendations in this report are oriented to offering the support necessary for the identification, development, and mastery of specialized teaching expertise.

### 2.3 SUSTAINED

Another consistent finding of educational change research is that systemic transformations require sustained, deliberate support across all levels of the learning organization. In particular, while access to expert advice, focused workshops, and similar offerings are important, enduring transformations to teaching require institutional commitments to ongoing support, a culture of collaboration, and an ethos of continuous growth.<sup>viii</sup>

The *Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning* contextualizes various principles of teaching and learning in contemporary social and cultural worlds, taking into consideration, for example, changes in workplaces, civic life, technology, and the environment. Awareness of continuous social transformations within and outside the university compels an attitude of sustained attention and a commitment to sustained support. Such attitudes and commitments infuse the recommendations in this document. The *Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning* at the University of Calgary is intended to foster an approach to teaching and learning support that is robust and comprehensive, but also one that can be readily adapted to new circumstances, challenges, and opportunities.

By creating a systemic, specialized, and sustained approach to teaching and learning development and support, one that is committed to ensuring success for all students, the University of Calgary will be able to achieve the vision and priorities expressed in the *Academic Foundations* and, in so doing, will become an international leader in research and practice in teaching and learning in higher education. In adopting a systemic, specialized and sustained approach that is research informed, research active and goal oriented, the University of Calgary will offer a cohesive support system for students and for academic staff that is built on a strong culture of expertise in teaching and learning.

## 3.0 AIMS AND PRIORITIES

### 3.1 FOCI AND IMPLEMENTATION

The recommendations in the *Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning* are organized into goals and actions in each of six major areas:

- Leadership and Governance
- Teaching and Learning Support
- Evaluation and Accountability
- Student Experience
- Learning Environments
- Program Planning

Included in this document are recommended implementation timelines for the goal and actions in each focus area. It is expected that in the first year (2011-2012) leadership from the Provost's Office will be established to enable the development of implementation plans for the recommended goals and actions. Other goals and actions will commence once the more specific implementation and strategic plans are developed. While implementation of all goals and some actions will commence early in the five-year period of the plan, it is expected that full implementation of all recommended actions will not be completed until 2015-2016.

### 3.2 PRIMARY AIM

By 2016, the University of Calgary will have implemented a well-developed and resourced integrated teaching and learning plan that supports ongoing research into teaching and learning in higher education, professional development for all teaching staff, and engaging and challenging learning experiences for all students.

### 3.3 PRIORITIES

For Senior Academic Administration:

- Define, support and reward teaching and research supervision expertise.
- Support and enable the development of expert teaching practices.
- Integrate structures and resources to support expert teaching and engaged learning.
- Offer intellectually engaging and challenging outcomes-based programs for all students.

For Academic Staff:

- Use research-informed teaching and research supervision practices.
- Provide intellectually engaging and challenging learning experiences for students.
- Develop teaching expertise through ongoing professional development activities.

- Assist students to develop expertise and leadership in their chosen fields of study.

#### 4.1 LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

##### FROM THE RESEARCH

For educational change to be effective, it is critical to assign leadership responsibilities for initiatives that are of strategic priority to the institution. Governance of systemic initiatives should be structured with a system-wide and fully integrated model through which the initiatives can be effectively implemented, measured and sustained.<sup>ix</sup>

##### GOAL

At the University of Calgary, we will further develop and improve structures and environments supporting teaching and learning by creating a strongly connected governance system to support the work of teaching staff and the learning of students.

##### ACTIONS

Ensure integrated governance and administration of matters related to teaching and learning by

- making an academic appointment in the Provost's Office to provide leadership to the teaching and learning portfolio;
- creating a University of Calgary Teaching and Learning Committee to be chaired by the individual appointed to lead the teaching and learning portfolio, with membership that includes representation from student associations, faculties and schools, and support and service units;
- creating teaching and learning committees within all major academic units of the university, with one delegate from each appointed to the university-wide teaching and learning committee;
- recruiting or appointing an academic Director for the *Centre for Leadership in Teaching and Learning*; and
- targeting financial resources to support personnel and other costs associated with creating and sustaining the University of Calgary teaching and learning support system.

##### RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Goals and Actions		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Leadership and Governance</b>	a T&L Leadership Appointment					
	b UofC T&L Committee					
	c Unit T&L Committees					
	d Appoint Director of CLTL					
	e Target financial resources					

## 4.2 TEACHING AND LEARNING SUPPORT

### FROM THE RESEARCH

Expert university teachers actively work on their teaching through various forms of professional development. Of particular importance is participation in research-informed and research-active professional learning communities of peers.<sup>x</sup>

### GOAL

At the University of Calgary, we will ensure high quality, expert teaching and undergraduate/graduate research supervision through the creation of a comprehensive and disciplinary-area focused research network.

### ACTIONS

Enhance and support the development of teaching expertise by

- creating a support network for teaching and learning, with a major unit called the *Centre for Leadership in Teaching and Learning*;
- creating a centrally funded and administered *Teaching and Learning Research Professor Program* with appointments in every faculty and school;
- creating an *Institute for Research in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* that is integrated into the *Centre for Leadership in Teaching and Learning*;
- appointing/recruiting *Teaching and Learning Research Professors* who will be cross-appointed to a faculty/school and to the *Institute for Research in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*;
- creating a graduate program in the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* within the *Institute for Research in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.

### RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Goals and Actions	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Teaching and Learning Support</b>	a Support network for CLTL				
	b T&L Research Professor Program				
	c Institute for Research in T&L				
	d Appoint/recruit T&L Professors				
	e Develop graduate program				



### 4.3 EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

#### FROM THE RESEARCH

Student achievement and success improve when integrated approaches to program planning, teaching and assessment are explicitly linked to both informal and formal evaluations of teaching quality. Both formative and summative course and program evaluations are essential to creating robust learning environments for all undergraduate and graduate students.<sup>xi</sup>

#### GOAL

At the University of Calgary, we will develop and implement a comprehensive system of course and program evaluation that provides rapid and focused feedback to support teaching and learning experiences and outcomes.

#### ACTIONS

Demonstrate that excellence in teaching and research supervision is expected and valued by

- collecting and using data on teaching and learning to inform teaching and supervision practice, program development, and program quality;
- supporting teaching staff to develop research-informed teaching and supervision practices;
- developing and implementing policies and rigorous and transparent processes to support, guide and evaluate teaching and research supervision expertise;
- extending evaluation of teaching to include evidence of engagement in professional development activities to support the development of teaching and supervisory practice; and
- applying consistently merit promotion and tenure guidelines that emphasize the importance and value of effective teaching and student supervision.

#### RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Goals and Actions	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Evaluation and Accountability</b>	a Collect data on T&L				
	b Research-informed practices				
	c Develop policies				
	d Extend evaluation				
	e Rigorously apply guidelines				

## 4.4 STUDENT EXPERIENCE

### FROM THE RESEARCH

Students who are actively engaged in integrated, expertly taught, and strongly supported learning environments demonstrate higher levels of success. When high impact activities such as active and collaborative learning, high levels of academic challenge, and enriching co-curricular and community activities are integrated into all aspects of undergraduate and graduate education both academic achievement and overall satisfaction with the university experience increase.<sup>xii</sup>

### GOAL

At the University of Calgary, we will provide for students transparent, coordinated, and readily accessible support structures.

### ACTIONS

Distinguish the University of Calgary student learning experience by:

- developing explicit student outcome goals for all undergraduate and graduate programs;
- targeting resources to expand co-curricular, service, community and experiential learning;
- creating and supporting more opportunities for undergraduate students to engage in an applied and/or research active learning component;
- creating and supporting planned and well-coordinated first-year experiences for all students; and
- creating more obvious and accessible pathways to academic achievement that are clearly communicated to and available for every student.

### RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Goals and Actions	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Student Experience</b>	a Program goals				
	b Expand co-curricular				
	c Undergrad research				
	d Coordinated experiences				
	e Accessible pathways				

## 4.5 LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

### FROM THE RESEARCH

Institutions that prioritize student success are guided by strategic planning that considers on-campus, community-based and online learning environments in programs and in the professional development of teaching. When these networks of support are effectively integrated into teaching and learning activities, students and academic staff experience and demonstrate greater success.<sup>xiii</sup>

### GOAL

At the University of Calgary, our efforts to enhance teaching and learning environments will be strategic, coordinated and appropriately resourced.

### ACTIONS

Enhance teaching and learning environments by

- developing and implementing a university-wide strategic plan for instructional space improvement;
- developing and implementing a strategic plan for information and communication technologies to enrich existing on-campus and distance course experiences;
- developing and implementing a strategic plan for the university and for every faculty or school to further develop community-based partnerships leading to an expansion of the overall teaching and learning environment;
- creating the position *Coordinator of Technology for Teaching and Learning* to lead existing and new initiatives in technology use in teaching and learning; and
- increasing amount of funds centrally and in every faculty/school for consistent and ongoing infrastructure support for teaching and learning environments.

### RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Goals and Actions		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Learning Environment</b>	a Instructional space plan					
	b ICT plan					
	c Community partnership plan					
	d Technology for teaching coordinator					
	e Infrastructure development					

## 4.6 PROGRAM PLANNING

### FROM THE RESEARCH

Institutions that report high levels of student satisfaction, retention/completion rates, and high levels of student academic achievement prioritize integrated program planning and approval processes. As well, attention is paid to requiring ongoing evaluation of all academic programs, with data being used to continually inform course and program improvement.<sup>xiv</sup>

### GOAL

At the University of Calgary, we will ensure that structures and procedures around program development and implementation are streamlined, coordinated, and monitored.

### ACTIONS

Enhance academic program planning approval and implementation by

- setting university-wide strategic priorities for academic program decisions and enrollment;
- improving processes and policies within faculties and schools to support student progress through programs;
- streamlining existing systems for curriculum planning and approval;
- aligning services within faculties and schools and across campus to support new program initiation and the implementation of ongoing program developments; and
- developing and implementing a process within the unit review process for the systematic evaluation of all undergraduate and graduate academic programs.

### RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Goals and Actions	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Program Planning</b>					
a Set academic priorities					
b Student progress support					
c Curriculum planning and approval					
d Program development processes					
e Develop program review process					

## 5.0 APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A. TASK FORCE TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### Mandate

The University of Calgary is a research-intensive institution committed to supporting and encouraging all forms of scholarship in a rich teaching and learning environment, and a robust Institutional Teaching and learning Plan is essential to ensuring the continuous improvement of this environment. Accordingly, the mandate of the Teaching and learning Plan Task Force is to develop, for eventual consideration and endorsement by the General Faculties' Council (GFC), an Institutional Teaching and learning Plan that will inform and guide the University's actions and investments in support of teaching and learning and thereby deepen our commitment to the principles espoused in *Academic Foundations*.

#### Goals

The University of Calgary Teaching and learning Plan will provide guidance for all academic and learning support units as they undertake the planning of teaching and learning activities. The plan will emphasize what is expected in teaching and learning, specifying ways in which these expectations might be achieved. Finally, the plan will provide an academic framework to guide future consideration of infrastructure, resource and policy decisions related to teaching and learning.

#### Scope of the Task Force's Responsibilities

The Task Force will outline

- a vision for teaching and learning at the University of Calgary;
- priorities aligned with those core values;
- principles to guide the implementation of the vision and priorities;
- existing impediments to student success and teaching effectiveness;
- opportunities to enhance teaching and learning at the University of Calgary;
- goals and key performance indicators, targets and responsibilities to measure our progress in improving the teaching and learning environment; and
- recommendations for infrastructure, resource and policy requirements to ensure the successful implementation of identified goals.

#### Process

The Task Force will

- review recent research on teaching and learning that will inform an academic framework for teaching and learning and provide a rigorous underpinning for both the recommendations of the Task Force and the future planning in support of those recommendations;
- review existing institutional structures, processes and data that are pertinent to undergraduate and graduate teaching and learning environments and experiences;
- consult widely with academic and support staff, students and members from the external community to develop an understanding of the range of existing opinions and experiences on matters related to teaching and learning at the University of Calgary;

- consult with those who have expertise in various matters related to individual, collective and institutional learning processes and practices to identify more clearly the range of possibilities to which the University of Calgary might aspire; and
- engage with academic and learning support units during the development of the recommended plan.

### **Timeline**

February-May: internal and external consultation; review of relevant research literature and other available relevant data

June-September: initial development of the plan; internal and external review of, and consultation on, drafts of the plan

October-November: initial presentations of the plan at the University Planning Committee (UPC) and GFC (for discussion); further development of the plan; second presentations of the plan at UPC and GFC (for approval)

### **Institutional Teaching and Learning Plan Task Force Membership**

Task Force Chair: Dennis Sumara (Dean, Faculty of Education)

Task Force Members: Kelly Goss (Graduate Students' Association)

Ayodeji Jeje (Associate Dean, Teaching and Learning, Schulich School of Engineering; Chair, Learning and Instructional Development Subcommittee of the Academic Program Committee)

Meg Martin (Vice-President, Academic, Students' Union)

Clem Martini (Faculty of Fine Arts; Chair, Teaching and Learning Funding Committee)

Leanne Morrow (Libraries and Cultural Resources)

Leslie Reid (Faculty of Science; Tamaratt Teaching Professor in Geoscience)

Ann Tierney (Vice-Provost, Students)

Support: Theresa Abel (Provost's Office)

## APPENDIX B. BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

The University of Calgary is a research-intensive institution committed to supporting and encouraging all forms of scholarship in a rich teaching and learning environment. A robust Institutional Teaching and Learning Plan is essential to ensuring the continuous improvement of this environment. Accordingly, the mandate of the Institutional Teaching and Learning Plan (ILTP) Task Force is to develop, for eventual consideration and endorsement by the General Faculties' Council (GFC), an Institutional Teaching and Learning Plan. The intent of this plan is to inform and guide the University's actions and investments in support of teaching and learning and thereby deepens our commitment to student and faculty success.

The ILTP Task Force commenced its work in March of 2010. Meeting every other week, the Task Force reviewed existing documents related to teaching and learning at the University of Calgary, invited presentations from administrators and faculty members with experience and/or expertise in areas relevant to the committee's work, and commissioned research that would inform the committee's decisions.

Three town hall meetings were held in May of 2010 two at Main Campus and one at Foothills Campus. In addition, the Task Force Chair attended meetings of both the Undergraduate Students' Legislative Council and the Graduate Representative Council to provide information about the committee's work and also to seek advice from students. The chair and several members of the committee also attended a round table event hosted by the Students' Union.

In order to develop a stronger understanding of faculty members' experiences and perceptions of teaching and learning at the University of Calgary, the committee commissioned a research study, which was completed in June of 2010. Approved by the Research Ethics Board in April, this research used an online survey and focus group and individual interviews to collect data on faculty members' perspectives. As well, the committee commissioned a literature review on recent research on teaching and learning development in higher education. Both of these documents are available on the Provost's website.

The Task Force held two full-day and three half-day meetings to review and analyze the information and data collected, to review models of teaching professional development being used at benchmark universities, and to develop a set of priorities, goals, actions and recommendations for the University of Calgary Teaching and Learning Plan.

Task Force members prepared a early version of the report with consultation with stakeholder groups occurring as necessary. A draft version of the Task Force Report was mounted on the Provost's website for community response in early December 2010 until January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011. Three town hall meetings were held to discuss the draft report, with comments and recommendations recorded. During this period, the Chair of the Task Force also met with various faculty and student groups, committees and councils. Comments and suggestions from the online consultation and all of the town hall and other meetings were considered in the final revision of the Report.

### APPENDIX C. OVERVIEW OF EARLIER TEACHING AND LEARNING PLANS

Following is a summary of plans and initiatives concerned with teaching and learning that have been developed since 1995.

In October of 1998, following several years of consultation, GFC approved the “University of Calgary Undergraduate Curriculum: A Framework and Process for Redesign.” Developed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Redesign Team, this plan identified a curriculum framework to be used for the redesign of all undergraduate programs on campus. The framework is organized with seven features:

1. a clearly identifiable field of study
2. a defined interdisciplinary component
3. an international component
4. an experiential learning component relevant to program objectives
5. provision for broad and extended faculty-student interaction at the program level
6. integration of research
7. an explicit program syllabus, which sets out in advance the knowledge and skills to be acquired in a program of study

This curriculum framework was designed to create more cross-faculty/program uniformity and consistency in teaching and learning in order to develop the eight core competencies that would characterize all University of Calgary graduates:

1. critical and creative thinking
2. analysis of problems
3. effective oral and written communication
4. gathering and organizing information
5. logical calculation, mathematical ability
6. abstract reasoning and its applications
7. insight and intuition in generating knowledge
8. interpretive and assessment skills

Eighteen recommendations for implementation by 2004 were made, most of which were to be coordinated through the Academic Program Committee (APC), with support from the “Learning Commons” (now known as the Teaching and Learning Centre) and from the recommended “Office of Curriculum Redesign,” to be located in the Learning Commons (with a Director who would be a member of APC). The primary aim of all 18 recommendations was to support a university-wide redesign of all undergraduate curricula, in order to better serve learner needs for the knowledge era.

Most of recommendations that were to be coordinated through APC and the Learning Commons were not implemented. The few that were undertaken were not implemented consistently or fully. A “coordinator” (not director) for Curriculum Redesign was appointed in 1998, but no administrative structure or redesign activities were set up in the Learning Commons. (Approval of the document by GFC meant little.) However, another group of four individuals outside of the Learning Commons was set up to run a new initiative – “Enhancing Undergraduate Learners’



Experience (EULE) in a Research University.” The scope prescribed for EULE involved borrowing from prior initiatives on Curriculum Redesign, Direct Entry, Advising, and Inquiry-based Learning.

A few of the recommendations refer to directing, supporting and recognizing faculty and staff engaged in redesign. An office of “Learning Enhancement and Professional Development” (LEPD) was created in the Learning Commons. As the inaugural coordinator stated, its purpose was “to help create and maintain a collegiate environment where faculty and graduate teaching assistants may improve professional skills as teachers and learners.” Some of the activities such as conducting teaching workshops for faculty and TAs are being carried out by TLC, even though LEPD has ceased to exist. The “fellowship” program created (for 20 faculty, students and staff) was terminated quickly on the basis of its costs, and there were issues of control and determination of outcomes.

In 2003, the Learning and Instructional Development Sub-Committee (LIDS) of APC developed an Institutional Learning Plan to support the *Raising our Sights* Academic Framework document. Developed explicitly around the Boyer Commission Report’s recommendation that university teaching and learning become more focused on developing skills of analysis, evaluation and synthesis, the plan is developed around the premise that the University of Calgary is a “learning-centred” university. Elaborating on the University Planning Committee’s (UPC) 2001 decision to support “inquiry-based learning” at the University of Calgary, the 2003 Learning Plan emphasizes the importance of supporting activities that are “problem or question driven, typically has a small-group feature, includes critical discourse, is frequently multi-disciplinary, and incorporates research methods such as information gathering and synthesis of ideas.” The document states that “Inquiry-based learning should be seen, not as a new direction, but as a new and more inclusive vocabulary that situates the goals of the curriculum redesign process in the context of communities of inquiry.” Four Learning Plan Goals are provided:

1. That inquiry-based learning approaches be at the centre of the undergraduate learning experience.
2. That environments be provided that are accessible, welcoming and effective in facilitating communities of inquiry.
3. That leadership and support for teaching and learning, and for curriculum innovation be enhanced through professional development, technology development, research and an appropriate reward system.
4. That quality, interactive online learning experiences be created and integrated into the campus experience where appropriate.

In 2004, Vice-President Academic and Provost Ron Bond established the Inquiry Learning Action Group (ILAG) whose role was to assist the university’s ongoing curriculum redesign efforts by developing a short and long-term plan for promoting greater implementation of Inquiry Learning at the University of Calgary. Despite the work that EULE (Enhancing the Undergraduate Learning Experience) and curriculum redesign committees had done, ILAG felt it lacked sufficient information specifically on the challenges and successes of implementing inquiry learning. In 2006, the Provost Ron Bond requested that members of ILAG conduct research on the state of inquiry learning at the University of Calgary. Under the supervision of three faculty members (Dr. T. Smith, Dr. P. Rangachari and Dr. D. Caswell), two undergraduate research assistants spent approximately 16 months (May 2005 to September 2006) gathering information about how administrators, instructors, undergraduate students and recent alumni of the University of Calgary community perceive inquiry-based learning. The report concluded that:

1. Our university as a whole is still not quite sure what inquiry learning means, and sometimes wonders whether it is a “fad” that will be dropped in a few years.
2. Our administrators, instructors, and students express a strong value for inquiry learning when they understand what it means and how it has been effective in their own teaching and learning experience.
3. A majority of administrators, Inquiry instructors, and students feel that inquiry learning could and should be implemented at the lower levels of study (i.e. 1st and 2nd year).
4. Every group surveyed expressed time and resource limitations, frustrations and concerns that need to be addressed in order to improve the quality and level of integration of inquiry learning methods.

In 2005, the LIDS committee developed another document entitled “Assessing Achievement and Ensuring Excellence in Teaching and Learning.” This document states that the University of Calgary must commit to “promoting a culture that values teaching and learning and to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning across faculties.” Once again, the Seven Features of Curriculum Redesign and the Core Competencies are outlined as priorities for the university. Guided by those principles and core competencies, it is stated in this document that the assessment of teaching and learning at the University of Calgary will:

1. Consider the seven features of curriculum and the core competences in assessing individual teaching, the quality of courses and curricula, and the success of students’ learning.
2. Assess the full range of teaching activities – inside and outside the classroom – undertaken by individuals and units.
3. Consider evidence from a variety of different instruments and sources, including but not limited to assessment by students.
4. Recognize teaching as a creative, intellectual, and research-based activity equal in importance to research.
5. Encourage innovative teaching – which includes, but is not limited to, inquiry-based teaching and learning, community-based teaching and inter- and multi-disciplinary teaching.

The document offers recommendations for how units/faculties should develop institutional teaching and learning standards and how these should be used to assess the teaching and learning environment, the performance of individual faculty members, the success of courses and programs, and the overall effectiveness of innovative teaching and learning.

In 2008-2009, the document *Academic Foundations: Principles to Guide University Planning* was developed and approved. The document prioritizes education and students success: “Education, research, scholarship and creative activity are core activities of the university of Calgary.” The document states that several other supporting documents would be created to further elaborate and support the principles stated in *Academic Foundations*, one of which will be the Institutional Teaching and learning Plan.

The ILTP Task Force was impressed by the quality and the breadth of initiatives completed and undertaken, and used all of these to inform their deliberations and final recommendations made in this report.

## APPENDIX D. SUMMARY OF EXISTING SUPPORT FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

This section includes an overview of current structures and activities supporting teaching and learning, and a summary of what the Task Force learned during the consultation period.

### Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC)

At the present time, the Teaching and Learning Centre provides primary central support for teaching and learning development. It offers a variety of services including certificates, workshops and consulting associated with developing expertise in teaching (including some designed specifically for graduate students), course (re)design and development, assistance with technology integration as well as facilities and support for conferencing and video production. In the 2009/10 academic year the TLC's programs served over 1000 clients. Participant satisfaction data on programs have been consistently well over 90%. Over the past few years, the TLC has been as active as possible with the current policy and resources allocated to the model of professional development it serves.

### Academic Units

Academic units provide a variety of teaching supports and services. Some faculties/schools have been very proactive in conducting research on their own teaching and learning situations – assigning leadership to teaching and learning, and developing robust policies, procedures and practices to support teaching and learning.

### Support Offices

Support for students is currently being provided through a variety of different offices led by the Vice-Provost Students. Included in those services are Academic Advising and program planning support for students

- Orientation and Transition Support
- Learning Support Services including writing support, tutoring, exam preparation, leadership programming, and mentoring programs (now provided under the auspices of the Student Success Centre)
- Programs to support Community Service Learning and Community Engagement opportunities for students and to support faculty in offering service learning components in their classes
- The Native Centre programs, supporting aboriginal learners including an access program to assist students with the transition to university studies
- Services for students with disabilities
- Career Services
- Residence Services providing living and learning communities on campus for undergraduate and graduate students
- Financial aid, bursary and scholarship programs
- Health and Counseling Services
- Bookstore

- Specialized support for international students and services for students seeking to enrich their studies with international exchanges

### **Faculty of Graduate Studies**

Graduate students are eligible for most of the services listed in the section above. In addition to these, the Faculty of Graduate Studies offers workshops for graduate students applying for external funding and maintains a database of funding information (Awards, Scholarships, Bursaries). It also helps graduate students link with professional skills development programs offered on and off campus. Individual graduate programs offer discipline-specific professional development programs, and in some instances, subsidize students' enrolment in effective writings and English for Academic Purposes programs.

Graduate student education relies heavily on the direct interaction between a student and her or his supervisor. The Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS) offers a Supervisory Workshop to help new supervisors become familiar with resources available to them and their students. These resources relate to: information on intellectual property rights, professional skill development, career services, conflict resolution, and issues related to harassment. Supervisors are also made aware of the multitude of information available on the FGS web site, including: handbooks, award and scholarship database, forms, policies and procedures. It is intended that these workshops will help new supervisors interact in a positive and productive manner with their graduate students.

### **Libraries and Cultural Resources (LCR)**

This includes the University Library, Archives and Special Collections, The Nickle Arts Museum, and The University of Calgary Press. Together, these units play a role in providing support for teaching and learning on campus. Subject experts throughout LCR units offer instruction and research support for students, faculty and staff of the University. In 2011 all units will come together in the Taylor Family Digital Library. This new space will offer books and online resources, a large Learning Commons, student workrooms, film and audio rooms, editing and recording suites, multimedia labs, quiet study areas, and seminar, consultation space for independent and collaborative learning and academic growth, and various other forms of student service and support.

### **Programs for Undergraduate Research Experience (PURE) Awards**

PURE was implemented in 2006, and is designed to offer undergraduate students an opportunity to conduct research alongside University of Calgary researchers. These awards give undergraduate students the chance to learn how to write research proposals, seek research funding, undertake or participate in substantive projects, learn discipline-specific skills, and report research results. The Teaching and Learning Funding Committee invites applications each year for awards covering 8 or 16 weeks of full-time research during the summer. These awards are meant to benefit students at any stage of their program, encouraging undergraduates to consider applying for graduate studies and undertake careers in research and teaching.

### **Quality Money**

Quality Money is a unique partnership between the Students' Union (SU), the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) and the University of Calgary. Each year the SU is provided with approximately \$1.5 million and the GSA with \$300 thousand from the University of Calgary

Board of Governors to invest in projects that will enhance the overall student experience (amounts are based on student enrollment). Unique to the program is that project ideas come from students and other members of the campus community. The SU invites Quality Money proposals each fall semester from students, faculty and other members of the campus community. The major stipulation of these proposals is that the project or initiative must contribute to enhancing the overall student experience.

### **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Action Team**

In 2008, under the leadership of Ann Tierney (Vice Provost, Students), the NSSE Action Team was struck, the mandate of which is to focus awareness on and communicate results of NSSE to the campus community. In 2009, the NSSE Action Team conducted a comprehensive Inventory of Student Engagement and Success in order to better understand the current situation at the University of Calgary. With this information, it also developed recommendations for ways in which the university might improve conditions and practices that would lead to higher levels of student engagement and satisfaction. These currently exist in the form of a draft three-year action plan for student engagement, with actions recommended in four areas: Teaching and Learning Environment, Program Design and Planning, Academic Advising/Learning Support, and Enriching and Active Co-Curricular Experiences.

The NSSE Action Team provides regular reports to Deans summarizing survey results from the students in their respective faculties. This past year (2009-1010), the NSSE Action Team participated in the NSSE National Project resulting in the production of comparative results by Faculty with each of the G-13 universities in Canada. These reports assist Faculties in determining the areas that most need to be addressed to improve student engagement including curriculum design, class offerings, assessment practices, and experiential learning activities.

### **Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey**

The CGPSS was conducted at the University of Calgary as part of a national administration of the survey in Winter 2007, and again in Winter term 2010. The response rate at the University of Calgary was 42% in 2007, and 45% in 2010. Although the results have not been publicized as have those of NSSE, they have been brought to the attention of graduate programs in two direct ways. First, the average rating of a program (on five summary measures) by its students constitutes 30% of the calculation for the distribution of graduate student support funds. Second, individual meetings have been held with each program by the Dean and relevant associate dean of FGS to discuss these summary measures and to set the program up for receiving the detailed responses from their program when there have been sufficient respondents.

### **Project Engage**

In the fall of 2010, Provost Alan Harrison initiated Project Engage, a pilot program with two goals: to provide professional development in teaching for faculty of first-year courses and to improve student engagement in these courses. To accomplish this, a group of faculty is evaluating and redesigning aspects of their courses with the support of human and financial resources. There are 11 faculty members from Arts and Science participating in this project; the first cohort (C1) began in January 2010, and the second cohort (C2) in September 2010. Phase I of the project focuses on assessing current engagement practices, which involves collecting data

from faculty and students through classroom observations, surveys and interviews. In Phase II, participants view the results of the data and redesign an aspect of their course with provided resources and support over an 8-month period using an evidence-based approach. The redesigned component of the course will be implemented and data collected when the course is taught again using the same instruments as in Phase I. Additional data will be collected through interviews and surveys of Senior Administration (Deans and Chairs of participating faculty) throughout the project. A full report of the project, including an analysis of the pilot and recommendations, will be made available in 2012.

**Conclusion**

The ILTP Task Force has noted the range and the quality of services provided by various departments at the University. Together, these services and initiatives represent a significant commitment by the University of Calgary to support the academic experiences of both undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the professional development of academic staff. However, the Task Force also noticed that these services and initiatives exist in a fragmented, poorly integrated system and, therefore, the net effects are not as significant as they could or should be.

## APPENDIX E. FINDINGS FROM CONSULTATION AND COMMISSIONED RESEARCH

### Views Expressed at Town Hall and other Meetings

Information was gathered from academic staff, undergraduate and graduate students at meetings of their councils, through their attendance at several town hall meetings, and through their representatives on the ILTP Task Force. It suggests that while there are pockets of innovation and excellence in teaching and learning at the University of Calgary, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the teaching and learning situation.

From **undergraduate students**, there continue to be concerns about:

- the quality of first and second year courses
- the availability of courses and course sections
- the confusing layers of program rules and regulations that make degree completion unnecessarily complicated
- the difficulties of accessing interdisciplinary programs
- the poor classroom conditions
- the emphasis on large-group lecture/final exam formats and,
- the overall lack of a strong sense of University of Calgary community

Undergraduate students also were concerned that new technologies and approaches to teaching and learning supported by these technologies are not being well used, that opportunities for co-curricular and service learning are not always easy to access, and that research experience has not been consistently made available across the undergraduate programs.

From **graduate students**, concerns were expressed about:

- the unevenness of supervision/mentoring
- the difference in quality among their graduate course experiences
- the challenges by some students of finding strong research situations in which to apprentice and,
- the availability of consistent funding support

Graduate students expressed appreciation for the teaching support services offered by the TLC, but also stated that there were not enough of these provided, and that in addition to those general supports, they would appreciate teaching mentoring that is more specific to their discipline.

From **academic staff**, there were a number of concerns expressed including:

- lack of an obvious and coherent strategy to support teaching and learning
- perceived preparedness of students entering the University of Calgary
- perceived de-valuing of teaching activities in a research-intensive environment
- fragmentation and lack of connection across various undergraduate programs
- the lack of vision about what drives the university and what we are aiming for our students to achieve

- a lack of scholarly and research attention to teaching and learning activities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels
- a lack of accountability for poor performance in teaching
- an overall lack of vision for what might constitute an outstanding teaching and learning environment and,
- too few opportunities for undergraduate students to be involved in research activities

Faculty members who attended town hall meetings expressed overall dissatisfaction with teaching and learning support at the University of Calgary.

### **ALUMNI PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING**

An online survey sent to alumni of the university showed that, overall, alumni agreed that teaching expertise at the University enhanced their learning experience. Of the 42 respondents, 40 percent agreed that the quality of teaching is above average and 69 percent said they would recommend or consider the University of Calgary for further education. In response to the question “What was the most satisfying aspect of your learning experience at the University of Calgary?” most respondents cited instructors or supervisors who had an impact on their learning experience, classes they enjoyed, group study opportunities, and personal interaction with instructors and other students. When asked, “What do you perceive to be the unique attributes of graduates from the U of C?” the majority of respondents said there was nothing unique, they couldn’t think of anything or they didn’t know. The majority of alumni that responded (62 percent) were uncertain as to the current educational mission of the University.

Although this survey was only able to capture a very small sample and, therefore, cannot be considered as strong evidence to support decisions made in the future regarding teaching and learning, the Task Force felt it was important to communicate the opinions that were expressed by those who responded to the survey.

### **FACULTY MEMBERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING**

Research was commissioned by the Task Force to explore the University of Calgary faculty members’ perceptions of:

- teaching and learning
- motivations to engage with teaching
- reward structures
- professional development requirements to enhance teaching and learning

This research was a mixed method study using an online questionnaire and a semi-structured interview schedule for focus groups of faculty members. All faculties were invited to participate in either or both of the data collection processes. There were 231 valid questionnaire responses and 50 focus group participants. All of the university faculties were involved in the data collection including those at satellite campuses. There was representation from all academic streams and ranks, with tenured and non-tenured faculty represented.

#### **Teaching and Learning**

Almost all faculty members perceived being a good university teacher as important. There was considerable goodwill expressed by all faculty members towards teaching and assisting students



to learn. However, teaching was not perceived as being as important as research activities. A prevailing view was that good teaching correlated with having a doctoral qualification in their research discipline. Linked to the perceptions of the importance of having deep disciplinary knowledge was the view that teaching in the disciplines was unique and the teaching strategies were generally non-transferable across subject areas. Many were able to articulate a range of teaching strategies used to engage students. In many cases these were designed to be meaningful and applicable to real life contexts. Communication skills were cited as necessary for effective teaching, for example, good presentation skills, explanation skills, and providing explicit expectations and clarity for assessment tasks. Organization and preparation skills were also deemed essential. The barriers to good teaching were reported as:

- large classes
- lack of time to both teach and conduct research
- lack of time to reflect and implement changes to courses
- lack of reward or recognition for effective teaching practice
- lack of professional development and lack of appropriate or useful data from the student feedback instrument.

### **Motivation to Engage with Teaching**

This was highly variable. Almost all faculty members reported the importance of having a passion for the subject. Many held a strong sense of professional responsibility towards building and reinforcing their profession. Many deeply cared for students and wanted their students to be successful, although some were critical of the quality of students entering the university.

Factors that de-motivated faculty included high teaching workloads, especially with marking and grading assessments. Managerial or administrative restrictions were also challenging with concerns expressed regarding the poor quality of classrooms and teaching infrastructure including frustration with Information communication technology (ICT) resources and services.

### **Perceptions of Reward Structures**

Recognition and rewards for teaching was a contentious theme. Recognition and rewards were described as different and equally important to respondents. Recognition was associated with effective teaching being acknowledged by leaders and sometimes peers. Rewards were linked with teaching prizes and promotion.

The prevailing view was that both were neglected in this university. There was the perception that research was rewarded whereas teaching was marginalized and only came under scrutiny when there were problems. Confusion existed about what prizes were available and the criteria against which teachers were measured. Prizes that appeared to measure 'instructor popularity' were deemed less desirable than those employing 'effective teaching' criteria. Many wanted a review of the promotional criteria so that teaching and research were given equal priority. Additionally, some wanted a similar promotional progression for instructors to that of the professorial levels so that the teaching duties of instructors would have the same recognition as the teaching and research duties of professors.

### **Professional Development**

Professional development was a contested topic in this research. Pedagogical professional development was reported as only necessary for inexperienced instructors. There appeared to be confusion about what constituted a 'teaching qualification' with many reporting their

doctoral level qualification in the discipline as a teaching qualification. Additionally, some indicated that engagement in a workshop or short course was equivalent to a formal teaching qualification.

There were polarized views about the centralized Teaching and Learning Centre. These ranged from overt appreciation for their work and views that they supplied an essential service to faculty members, to criticism of the lack of specificity of topics, lack of flexibility in timing of courses, and concerns with the overriding emphasis on technology-facilitated learning.

Undertaking professional development was reported as not rewarded or recognized in the university. There was overt endorsement for faculty or school-based teaching-related professional development activities, as these were perceived to be more focused and relevant to teaching of the discipline. Faculty/school-based professional development was perceived as promoting greater flexibility of timing of sessions, greater specificity of teaching strategies applicable to the discipline, and enabling mentoring and reciprocal collegial coaching. A number of faculty members indicated they needed professional development on how to integrate into their courses professional skills for example, critical and creative thinking and written communication. Assessment was identified as a problematic aspect that needed to be included in professional development offerings.

Overall, faculty members expressed considerable goodwill towards teaching and learning within the university but were concerned that the emphasis on research quality and output was having a deleterious impact on teaching priorities. Concerns about teaching quality were reported in terms of impacting institutional reputation, the professionalism of graduates, and levels of motivation of teaching faculty. There were calls for leadership to be demonstrated at all levels of the organization to reward, recognize and support teaching and learning activities in relation to services, classroom activities, and professional development.

**APPENDIX F. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS FROM CONSULTATION, DOCUMENT REVIEW AND COMMISSIONED  
RESEARCH**

- **At the present time, the governance and administration of activities associated with teaching and learning are distributed across service and academic units, with responsibility and accountability for maintaining excellence in teaching and learning left largely to the discretion of Deans, Associate Deans and Department Heads.** There is little evidence that the recommendations of previous plans (see Appendix C Overview of Earlier Plans) have been implemented in any systematic way within units or across the faculty. While there have been significant developments in teaching and learning improvement within individual units, these activities are very inconsistent across units, are not well known across units, and are not as well supported as they should be.
- **That there has been innovation with regard to teaching and learning in faculties/units, despite the absence of coordinated leadership and well-connected support systems, demonstrates the importance of such initiatives.** As demonstrated in the literature review commissioned by the Task Force, teaching expertise is best developed over one's career within the context of a scholarly discipline. Although there are some teaching skills/techniques that generalize across disciplines, these cannot be the only ones supported or developed within a university setting. As research has shown, student success and excellence in teaching must be supported by a variety of teaching methodologies that are learned and developed within the context of specific disciplines.
- **The support provided by the TLC needs to be more discipline-specific, more easily accessed in local teaching environments, and more clearly connected to an obvious vision and strategy for teaching and research into teaching development.** The data collected from the commissioned research and the town hall meetings strongly suggest that the current model of teaching professional development and learning support is not effective, nor is it sustainable. At present, it exists as an isolated "island" of support that is not well known, well connected, or well used. This is not interpreted as a critique of existing leadership or academic and staff support efforts but, instead, as a systemic failure to integrate teaching and learning support across the university.
- **The existing university-wide governance and administration of teaching development and support is fragmented and ineffective with no obvious leadership to oversee the many interrelated aspects of teaching development, performance and evaluation.** The Learning and Instructional Design Sub-Committee (LIDS) of the Academic Program Committee cannot, in its current form, provide the leadership required to develop and maintain a comprehensive, robust and sustainable teaching and learning environment at the University of Calgary. This is not a critical commentary on the existing leadership or membership on LIDS; instead it points to a failure to more fully integrate leadership for teaching and learning at all levels of the university. (It is important to note that LIDS was originally struck to serve as a steering committee for the Teaching and Learning Centre and, therefore, should not have been viewed as providing comprehensive oversight of teaching and learning for the entire university.)

- **While there is some financial support for instructional innovation and improvement provided by the Teaching and Learning Funding Committee, the projects they have supported in the past are not well known.** In part, these worthy and often very productive initiatives have failed to make a systemic impact on teaching, largely because the projects were not integrated into a teaching and learning policy and process strategy. In particular, the absence of an accountability framework used to provide guidelines for evaluating and benchmarking the outcomes and evidence linked to the projects meant that data gathering and reporting on initiatives either did not occur, or were not done systematically using an evidence-based, outcomes oriented process. Over the past two years the current “Project Engage” has been initiated to address some of these concerns (see page 6 for more details on Project Engage).
- **The University as a whole cannot claim to be showing leadership in developing a research-informed culture of teaching and learning excellence.** Some faculties have made resource and personnel commitments to the enhancement of teaching and learning, have implemented processes for developing evidence-based approaches to planning and improving teaching, and have revised performance evaluation guidelines to emphasize the importance of good teaching. However, the commitment to teaching excellence and development is not consistent or systematically done across campus.
- **There has not been a strong culture supporting student success and excellence in teaching and learning at the University of Calgary. The Task Force continually encountered what can best be described as a ‘culture of blame.’** Accountability for poorer than expected results on matters such as student retention, graduation rates, faculty member involvement in teaching professional development and so on, were frequently applied to those other than the person or persons commenting. It was common to hear that “students are not prepared,” “administrators are not supportive,” and “faculty members aren’t interested in teaching.” While there is considerable interest in creating excellence in teaching and learning expressed by students, administrators and faculty members, these were usually stated or qualified as personal belief and/or practice statements, rather than values held strongly by the University of Calgary.
- **Although there is not an obvious and well-established culture of supporting student success and excellence in learning, there is one that is emerging.** Recent initiatives in some faculties, student services, and the Provost’s Office has heightened awareness of the importance of promoting student success and excellence in teaching within an academic environment that supports research and strong intellectual engagement. Data suggest that although the changes are subtle, there are known effects. For example, from 2007 to 2010 there was an increase from 82% to 86% in the first to second year student retention rate.

In order for the University of Calgary to improve the existing teaching and learning situation, it will need to make stronger and more consistent commitments to student and faculty success and engagement, with the understanding that achieving this goal requires an integrated system-wide approach to supporting teaching and learning. Strategies must be informed by research and the processes of teaching and learning must be research informed, research active, and outcomes based.

## APPENDIX G. CENTRE FOR LEADERSHIP IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

The mandate of *Centre for Leadership in Teaching and Learning* (CLTL) is to provide world-class research-active and research-informed teaching and learning support for the University of Calgary. As well, through the Teaching and Learning Research Institute, CLTL will develop an international reputation for its discipline-specific and interdisciplinary research on all matters of teaching and learning in higher education.

The *Centre for Leadership in Teaching in Learning* will be the first of its kind in Canada to offer a systematic and sustained research active and research informed approach to higher education teaching and learning. By integrating a networked unit comprised of disciplinary experts conducting research in the scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education with a unit providing teaching expertise development support the CLTL will enable the University of Calgary to directly link its research and educational mandates.

It is recommended that the CLTL be developed with three inter-dependent units: *Teaching Development Unit (TDU)* *Research Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (RI-SoTL)* and the *Educational Technology Unit (ED-Tech)*. Each unit has a distinct mandate but works collaboratively with the other units. Each unit offers programs and services that support teaching and conduct research and evaluation on their projects and programs.

The CLTL should be centrally located on the University of Calgary campus and situated closely to student service units.

The CLTL must have a permanent operating budget to support the staff and programs offered. It should not be required to operate in a cost-recovery mode.

### MANDATE FOR THE CLTL

1. Provide teaching development programs and workshops that use best practices and research findings on how people learn.
2. Work collaboratively with senior administration, faculties, departments, libraries and other units to offer programs and services that support the *Integrated Framework for Teaching and learning*.
3. Conduct research on and support the evaluation of academic unit and/or discipline specific professional development programs.
4. Review and contribute research in the field of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
5. Provide Educational Technology support for undergraduate and graduate teaching across campus.

## **ACTIVITIES OF THE TEACHING DEVELOPMENT UNIT (TDU)**

The faculty members who work with this unit develop and offer programs, workshops and evaluation services for all faculty, staff and graduate students across campus. They also are responsible for the administration and evaluation of funds for Teaching Development / Course Enhancement Projects (i.e. TLFC funds\* for Course Enhancement). Faculty members within this unit also conduct research and evaluation on professional development programs in conjunction with the Research Institute.

### **Programs, Workshops and Services of the TDU**

#### ***Programs***

- Teaching Certificate Program
- Instructional Skills Workshop
- Scholarly Teaching Program (Action Research Model)
- Peer Review of Teaching Program
- Teaching Mentorship Program
- Course Enhancement Program

#### ***Workshops***

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How People Learn and Implications for Instruction</li> <li>• Effective Student Mentoring</li> <li>• Evaluating Course Effectiveness</li> <li>• Preparing a Teaching Dossier</li> <li>• Developing a Course Portfolio</li> <li>• Best Practices in Assessment of Student Learning</li> <li>• Developing Assessment Rubrics</li> <li>• Conducting Class Assessment</li> <li>• Developing Course Learning Outcomes</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a Course Conceptual Framework</li> <li>• Managing Classroom Activities in Large Classes</li> <li>• Assessment in Large Classes</li> <li>• Inquiry Learning</li> <li>• Inquiry Learning in Large Classes</li> <li>• Student Misconceptions and Learning</li> <li>• Effective Student Supervision</li> <li>• Special Topics</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

#### ***Services***

- Teaching Award Preparation (Killam, 3M, etc.)
- Awarding and administering teaching and learning innovation funds
- Program and course evaluation (in conjunction with the RI-SOTL)

#### ***Research***

- Conduct research on professional development programs offered by the unit

### **ACTIVITIES OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE (RI-SOTL)**

Researchers affiliated with the Institute will conduct and support ongoing research with University Teaching Professors and affiliated Instructors / Professors from Faculties across campus.

#### ***Research Focus***

- Develop and conduct research programs that investigate teaching and learning in higher education
- Support graduate education through research projects
- Invited Scholars Program (SOTL Scholar in Resident Program)

#### ***Research and Evaluation Support\****

- Course and Program Evaluation
- Research Design Support (Ethics Applications, Research Design, Data Collection)
- Classroom data collection support
- Teaching Dossier Evaluation
- These programs could be done collaboratively with the TD Unit

### **ACTIVITIES OF THE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES UNIT**

The Educational Technology (ED-Tech) personnel will provide support for the use of technology in the classroom and course. ED-Tech staff will also offer workshops on educational technologies and be involved with workshops offered through the TD unit.

#### ***Workshops***

- Clicker Technology
- Podcasting
- Using Virtual Teaching Spaces
- Blackboard Support

#### ***Research and Support***

- Conduct research projects on effectiveness of educational technology projects
- Support Teaching Enhancement Projects, TD workshops / programs and Research Institute projects
- Creating and maintaining an online repository of teaching resources and materials developed with support of the CLTL

## 6.0 RECOMMENDED TIMELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Goals and Actions		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
<b>Leadership and Governance</b>	a T&L Leadership Appointment					
	b UofC T&L Committee					
	c Unit T&L Committees					
	d Appoint Director of CLTL					
	e Target financial resources					
<b>Teaching and Learning Support</b>	a Support network for CLTL					
	b T&L Research Professor Program					
	c Institute for Research in T&L					
	d Appoint/recruit T&L Professors					
	e Develop graduate program					
<b>Evaluation and Accountability</b>	a Collect data on T&L					
	b Research-informed practices					
	c Develop policies					
	d Extend evaluation					
	e Rigorously apply guidelines					
<b>Student Experience</b>	a Program goals					
	b Expand co-curricular					
	c Undergrad research					
	d Coordinated experiences					
	e Accessible pathways					
<b>Learning Environment</b>	a Instructional space plan					
	b ICT plan					
	c Community partnership plan					
	d Technology for teaching coordinator					
	e Infrastructure development					
<b>Program Planning</b>	a Set academic priorities					
	b Student progress support					
	c Curriculum planning and approval					
	d Program development processes					
	e Develop program review process					



## 7.0 ENDNOTES

- 
- <sup>i</sup> University of Calgary (2009) *Academic Foundations: Principles to Guide University Planning*. Calgary, AB: University of Calgary.
- <sup>ii</sup> Fusarelli, L. D. (2002) Tightly coupled policy in loosely coupled systems: institutional capacity and organizational change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(6), 561–575; Lewin, R. & Regine, B. (2000) *Weaving complexity and business: engaging the soul at work*. New York: Texere; Morrison, K. (2002) *School leadership and complexity theory*. London: RoutledgeFalmer; O’Day, J. (2002) Complexity, accountability, and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 293–329; Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000) *Schools that learn: a fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Doubleday.
- <sup>iii</sup> See, e.g. Hattie, J. (2009) *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*, New York: Routledge; Rivkin, S., Hanushek, E., & Kain, J. (2005) Teachers, schools and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458.
- <sup>iv</sup> P. Cobb, E. Yackel, T. Wood, “Interaction and learning in mathematics classroom situations,” *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 23 (1992); M. L. Franke, T. P. Carpenter, L. Levi, E. Fennema, “Capturing teachers’ generative change: a follow-up study of professional development in mathematics,” *American Educational Research Journal*, 38 (2001).
- <sup>v</sup> Dweck, C. (2007) *Mindset: the new psychology of success*. New York: Ballantine
- <sup>vi</sup> Shulman, L.S. (1986) Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14, p. 9.
- <sup>vii</sup> See, e.g., Davis, B., & Renert, M. (2009) Mathematics-for-teaching as shared dynamic participation. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 29(3), 37–43.
- <sup>viii</sup> See, e.g., Fullan, M. (2010) *All systems go: the change imperative for whole system reform*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- <sup>ix</sup> Hargreaves, A. & Shirley, D. (2009). *The fourth way: The inspiring future for educational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; Senge, P.M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday; Fullan, M. & Scott, G. (Eds.) (2009). *Turnaround leadership for higher education*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- <sup>x</sup> Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). London: Routledge Falmer; J. Christensen Hughes & J. Mighty (Eds.) (2010), *Taking stock: Research and Learning in Higher Education*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press; R. Blackwell & P. Blackmore (Eds) (2000). *Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- ~~The experience in higher education. Buckingham: Open University Press.~~
- <sup>xii</sup> Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, Z.F. (1991). Applying the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; Kinzie, J. Kuh, G., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating Conditions That Matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; Prosser, M., & Barrie, S.C. (2000). Using a student-focused learning perspective to strategically align academic development with institutional quality assurance. In R. Blackwell & P. Blackmore (Eds.), *Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education* (pp. 195-202). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- <sup>xiii</sup> Garrison, D.R. & Vaughan, N.D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, guidelines*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons; S. Scott & K.C. Dixon (Eds.) *The globalised university: Trends and development in teaching and learning*. Perth: Black Swan Press; J. Christensen Hughes & J. Mighty (Eds.) (2010). *Taking Stock: Research on teaching and learning in higher education*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill and Queen’s University Press.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Scott, S., & Dixon, K.C. (2009). Partners in a learning organization: A student-focused model of professional development. *Educational Forum*, 73(3), 240-255; Senge, P.M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday; Trigwell, I. (2010). Teaching and learning: A relational view. In J. Christensen Hughes & J. Mighty (Eds.), *Taking Stock: Research on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 115 – 128). Montreal and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen’s University Press.