Notes from psychology

There are nine faculty present. 4 are cohort 2, 5 are cohort 1

What we know:

Cohort 2

- We are to examine course design…. And less about teaching
- I recognize the 3-year timeline, the dashboard, and our task was to improve experience. The details of how is still out there. How do we know what is working?
- This caused us to discuss with colleagues our assumptions for what our students ought to know….
- Concerned about faculty buy-in…
- What do you do with faculty who see themselves as gatekeepers exclusively vs. gateways to success?
- How do we manage this amidst all the competing initiatives across the institution?
- How do lecturers who are doing the work approach tenured faculty with the idea of change?

Cohort 1

- We too were anxious the appearance of yet another initiative, but we have found that it is important that messaging be carefully constructed, that the message is not coming from any one person, rather the initiative comes from an institutional need to improve practice.
- Somehow you must avoid the message that this is a punitive exercise.
- The reason we are doing this is so that we might discover what we might do, not so that someone else could tell us what to do.
- We found the process unclear at first but with the loading of data and the work with KPI's it became more approachable and useful.
- You can engage this work in a pilot format and then you can broaden the work as appropriate.
- We avoided applying this to everyone because we wanted to access those first who were open to possibilities, folks who were open to reflection and growth.

What we want to learn:

- We found that SLO work ought to be common. We also found that we need to learn more about developing accurate assessment of SLO.
- How do we address the textbook (affordable) for all sections? How to navigate common selections
- It is about building consensus but what do you do with select faculty who refuse to join in the work?
- How to scale out this work from local group to the larger group
- Leadership matters to the implementation
- Local culture is to be addressed because it matters. Local defined as program-level or departmental-level

- How might change be enacted beyond just the course design? In other words, there are recommendations at both the local-levels and university-levels.

Questions to answer:
- Given DFWI, what other measures/assessments might be useful for our understanding of student performance, student learning?
- What do we do with faculty who refuse to participate?
- How might teaching circles encourage conversation and collaboration?
- To what extent should the portal data be shared broadly?
- How do we sustain, scale, the work and what happens beyond year 3?
- Does the absence of DFWI mean a course should not be examined?
- Help us to know how to support change that extends beyond just instructor responsibility.