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Goals from Academic Year 2012-13
The primary goal was to continue work from 2011-2012, while trying to increase faculty attendance at IFD sponsored events. In addition, this was the first year for the IFD Faculty Fellows (all year) and the Teaching Circles Program (spring). Finally, with Sonia Gonsalves and Bill Reynolds coming on board as a new Academic Affairs Assessment Director and a new IFD Director and with Russ Manson and Debbi Dagavarian taking over IDEA administration, much of this year was spent in coordinating hand-offs.

Goals for this year included the following:

- Focus more time and energy on outreach assistance related to program assessment. Not done as Academic Affairs Assessment position was created. I continued to assist programs with assessment upon request, but I did not reach out to programs proactively.
- Work on developing new retirement-preparedness programming (with SCOSA). I hoped this would occur through a teaching circle, but the selection committee did not select this proposal (instead suggesting a Senate Task Force or 2020 project as the sense was the need would be ongoing, not temporary). I gathered survey data to help inform next steps.
- Develop better ways to assess the IFD. Done through a survey, informed by a review of surveys done nationally.
- Increase faculty attendance at IFD hosted events. Done (good attendance at Arum guest speaker event, workshops by Fellows on Plagiarism, Turn-it-In, and Scholarship, ELL guest speaker workshop, and at summer IFD workshops on discussions and rubrics held in response to survey results).
- Work with the new Teaching Circles (provide support as requested, handle budget requests). Done.
- Work with the new Faculty Fellows, who will also comprise an IFD Advisory Council. Done.
  - Deb Figart, EDUC, Fellow serving as a Research Quality/Impact Mentor
  - Carolyn Gutierrez, Library, Fellow serving as a Resource to Help Faculty Teach to Avoid Plagiarism
  - Maritza Jauregui, HLTH, Fellow serving as a Resource to Assist Faculty with Course Design/Redesign
  - Ramya Vijaya, SOBL, Fellow serving as a Resource for Faculty Related to Quantitative Work

Coordinator Comments about Goals/Results:
The IFD hopes to continue to respond to college needs. The primary resource limitation that the IFD faces is the Director’s available time. This limitation may be substantially eased next year, as many aspects of the IFD Director job will move over to other positions: IDEA administration largely moved over for Spring 2013 and assessment responsibilities either moved over this spring (program outreach, Assessment Institute) or will move over for Fall 2013. The Institute Fellows and Teaching Circles have expanded the breadth and depth of the IFD resources. In particular, the Fellows and Circles offered a diversity of faculty development approaches and provided targeted help. Goals and notes for the future are highlighted in red throughout the report, and more important notes/summaries in bold, so readers could skim the report attending mostly to the bold and red.

Program’s Annual Activity Plans for 2013-14:
As Bill Reynolds takes over, he will develop his own goals. I would recommend that these include two or three planning meetings of people on campus active in Faculty Development per year. Regular meetings could help these people coordinate their efforts. This has become increasingly important in the last few years. Here are some of the people to consider including: Dennis Fotia, Susan Davenport, Daniel Tome, Tina Zappile, Paula Dollarhide, Mark Berg, Jed Morfit, the as-yet not hired Internationalization Specialist, Bob Heinrich, Linda Feeney, and Roberto Castillo, current IFD Faculty Fellows, representatives from active teaching circles, Beth Olsen. Then, also people charged with leading faculty development as part of their Director or Coordinator positions: First Year Seminar Coordinator, Writing Across the Curriculum and First Year Writing Coordinators, FRST
Coordinator, QUAD Coordinator, GEN Committee Chair, Director of Academic Affairs Assessment, Honors Director?

Other possibilities: Someone from the Learning Access Center? Student Affairs? A library faculty member who works more in faculty development related to helping faculty teach information literacy? Any new Coordinator of Coordinators? Chair of FRC? Faculty Senate Officer? Union Officer? Representative from SCOSA?

**Associate Provost Comments:**

---

**GOALS & SUMMARY OF MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES/SUPPORT/ACTIVITIES**

The primary goals of the IFD are to “support effective pedagogy and productive scholarship for all faculty members.” The IFD also supports faculty development related to assessment and assists with program and college assessment, especially related to student learning. These goals align strongly with the 2020 learning theme. In addition, some support of faculty/student learning aligns with the 2020 engagement theme.

The IFD was supported with a non-salary budget for fiscal year 2013 of $22,680, one full time Senior Clerk Typist, and one faculty with full course release on alternate assignment from teaching to direct the Institute. The faculty director also receives the equivalent of two summer course stipends in compensation for summer work. IFD Faculty Fellows received a course release for the academic year to work on their projects, and each of three teaching circles had up to $4,000 of support funding available. In addition, the Provost’s Office separately provided funding for faculty stipends and catering for SIPET and provided funding to replace one of the two IFD computers so that incoming Director Bill Reynolds could have a laptop with docking station, needed for the larger number of observations he will be conducting. With these resources, the IFD has supported the following goals in the last year.

**GOAL: SUPPORT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

Items in bold are new this year. Items in gray highlighting will cease being the primary responsibility of the IFD Director after June 30, 2013.

- **Support pedagogy**
  - Help faculty interpret their student evaluations, reflect upon, and revise their teaching
  - Observe faculty teaching
  - Maintain a library with up-to-date publications on pedagogy
  - Share recent publications or advice on teaching
  - Host an annual guest speaker on pedagogical or assessment topics
  - Administer, summarize data, and consult with faculty about mid-term teaching evaluations
  - Support teaching in other ways: e.g., photograph students, videotape teaching, provide access to a laptop and personal response clickers
  - Consult with faculty about pedagogy
- Plan most of the weekly fall workshops, targeting but not limited to new faculty, to focus on pedagogical issues
- Plan other workshops, some related to pedagogy
- **Help select and provide support for the teaching circles**
- Plan (with Provost Office, HR, and Computer Services) adjunct information sessions
- Collaborate with Service Learning Office, Grants Office, Advising Office, IFD Fellows, Dennis Fotia, Computer Services, and others to coordinate and offer programming

  - **Support faculty as they proceed through the personnel process**
    - Provide a two day summer orientation and weekly fall workshops for new faculty
    - Help faculty develop and revise personnel files
    - Provide guidance about conducting peer observations of teaching, as requested, with web resources, and by leading a summer institute on Peer Observation of Teaching
    - Help hold a short adjunct orientation/information workshop near the start of each term
    - Hold late fall and early spring term workshops helping first and second/third/fourth year faculty prepare to write their files
    - Provide guidance to the Provost, Deans, FRC, and faculty about interpreting the results of student evaluations, both IDEA and small class form, through workshops and one-on-one meetings
    - **Place sample file excerpts online**
    - **Draft summaries for first, second, third, and tenure year faculty placing responsibilities and deadlines in one short overview document (update in future years)**
    - **Call meeting of staff in School and Provost Offices who help put files together so that those individuals could ask questions and share best practices with one another (Fall)**

  - **Support faculty scholarship**
    - Maintain (with the Grants Office) a database of potential mentors/trainers/statisticians/editors for faculty working on research projects. Refer faculty requesting assistance accordingly
    - Plan some weekly fall workshops to focus on scholarship issues
    - Mentor faculty at all stages about scholarship plans
    - Maintain resources in the IFD library to assist faculty in writing journal articles and with other scholarship plans

---

**GOAL: SUPPORT PROGRAM AND COLLEGE ASSESSMENT**

  - **Help disseminate assessment results across campus and foster college-wide discussion of assessment**
    - Schedule and lead meetings of the Assessment Committee
    - Publish Evidence
    - **Help programs develop assessment plans**
      - Consult with programs and coordinators
    - **Serve as a Student Evaluation Liaison (Replace with Serve as Student Rating of Teaching Faculty Consult)**
      - Communicate administrative and other deadlines to faculty and staff (Fall 2012, then mostly handed over
      - Assist in determining when faculty/staff have legitimate exceptions to established policies and procedures
      - Assist in troubleshooting technological and other administrative problems
      - Prepare orders for IDEA Group Summary Reports
    - **Coordinate CLA testing (done every other year, done in 2012-2013)**
    - **Provide support for program assessment and for faculty research into areas related to pedagogy and assessment**
- Maintain a Survey Monkey account
- Create surveys (e.g. for the SFT, Writing Center, various HLTH programs, Facilities, etc.)
- Help analyze survey data
- Enter program assessment data for CRIM and other programs into Excel or SPSS
- Conduct basic statistical analysis of program assessment data
- Interpret and discuss assessment data with programs (Business)
- Proctor homegrown tests (GERO)

**SUPPORT FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

**SUPPORT FOR PEDAGOGY**

**TEACHING OBSERVATIONS**

*From July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013 the Director of the IFD observed 11 classes (one faculty member twice) (13 in 2010-2011, 10 in 2011-2012), involving taking extensive notes during a full class meeting, meeting with faculty, and writing both informal descriptive and formal evaluative reports. Observations included tenure-track, Associate, Visiting, and adjunct faculty members. These thorough observations each take the Director about one full working day as the IFD strives to provide both formative feedback and a highly detailed glimpse into the classroom for file readers.*

*This summer, the IFD led a three-day summer workshop on peer observation of teaching. In addition to online guidance provided by the IFD over the past several years, this Institute responded to faculty desire for more guidance and faculty and administrative desire for more consistency across peer observations. This year’s participants included faculty selected from a pool of fifteen applicants. Sara Martino was accepted but could not participate due to jury duty and a family illness; I recommend that her participation be deferred to next year.*

Overall, across the first two years of SIPET, thirteen applicants and six participants were from SOBL, with some strong applicants from SOWK and PSYC turned away each year in order for more programs/schools to be included. Dean Wagner, Elaine Ingulli, and Marilyn Vito leaned hard on BUSN faculty, so while in the first year there were no applicants from BUSN, this year there were four BUSN applicants and three BUSN participants. Across two years, there has been one applicant and one participant from each of the following Schools: EDUC, HLTH, and GENS. Recruiting for SIPET should continue in GENS, HLTH, and EDUC in the future. If approval for funding can be given early, calls for SIPET could go out early, perhaps even for a January session. (This funding has been through the Provost’s Office, not the IFD). There have been 3 NAMS participants and four ARHU participants. Several of the applicants from last year (who all had strong proposals) reapplied this year. I would advise next year’s selection committee to consult with me for the names of the 3 applicants who had strong applications in year one or two but who haven’t been able to participate. They might reasonably receive priority acceptance in future rounds—that decision would be up to the new selection committee, but they might best be well-informed.

Of course, disciplinary/School representation is but one of many factors related to the mission of SIPET, which is to work at the grass roots level to communicate and develop best practices in peer observation among Stockton faculty. See the reports on activity and list of participants to note additional ways in which participants represent a variety of pedagogies/programs and so might be in good positions to create and/or distribute best practices and/or offer helpful observations to a wide variety and/or large number of faculty. Keep in mind that participants have more than one year in which to share what they learned with others and have no time frame in which to complete observations—those who have not completed as many indicated they are eager to do so, but simply have not yet been asked and had scheduling work out.
1. Elizabeth Shobe, SOBL, PSYC (FRC experience, experience teaching large lectures, Q, W, first-year to senior students, seasoned mentor)

2. Patricia Reid-Merritt, SOBL, SOWK, Africana Studies (FRC experience, program hiring many new faculty, seasoned mentor, experience dealing with issues of race and gender in teaching, already observing from SOWK, EDUC, and ARHU)

3. Shanthi Rajaraman, NAMS, CHEM (experience teaching labs, experience dealing with issues of race and gender in teaching)

4. Jedediah Morfit, ARHU, ARTV (Critical Thinking Institute project, involving formative peer observation, experience teaching hands-on courses)

5. Betsy McShea, GENS, BASK/FRST (experience teaching first year and at-risk students, QUAD coordinator, experience teaching W, seasoned mentor)

6. Marissa Levy, SOBL, CRIM (graduate level and hybrid teaching experience, Q and W courses, program hiring many new faculty, lots of contact with faculty across disciplines in Coordinator of Coordinator and IRB Chair and other roles, already observing for CRIM)

7. Michael Hozik, NAMS, ENVL/GEOL (experience teaching lab and travel courses, Honors, seasoned mentor, already observing from ARHU, EDUC, and NAMS)

8. Deborah Gussman, ARHU, LITT, WGSS (experience teaching discussion, seminar courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellow</th>
<th># of obs. 2012-13</th>
<th># consultations with faculty 2012-13</th>
<th>Notes from Fellow about the impact of SIPET on them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liz Shobe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>...I learned the following methods are critical to maintaining a peer evaluation process that is perceived as valuable by faculty and evaluators of faculty files: 1) the pre-observation meeting: asking directed questions of the observees about their course goals, the goals for the class meeting, determining any particular areas of difficulty from the instructor's perspective, asking why they think they are having those difficulties and what they have done thus far to address them, asking them what they expect to learn from the observation, and informing the observee of the types of student behaviors, teacher behaviors, and classroom dynamics that I will be assessing and that I will be taking notes continuously to assess the rate and ease in which students can</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
understand and assimilate the material.

2) During the observation: Mostly, I took lecture notes as if I was a student. In doing so, I was able to note the timing of questions, the types of questions asked by students, the types, accuracy, and completeness of the answers given by the instructor, class participation, and timing of in-class activities, as well as the focus of students during lecture and in-class activities. Further, I was able to note the logistics of the classroom (e.g., availability and ease of technology, room acoustics and environmental disturbances).

3) Post-observation write-up...my participation in SIPET helped me learn to complete a professional evaluation, focusing on specific aspects of the observation and providing evidence from my observation for any opinions that I formed. The major benefit to me from my participation in SIPET was learning how to provide an evidence-based peer evaluation. As a former FRC member, peer evaluations that are free-flowing narrative with little evidence or specific detail, no matter how glowing, are more hurtful than helpful to a candidate because the file reviewer wonders if there was any educational value to the classroom experience.

4) Post-observation discussion: While there are different methods for doing this, my method is to write the assessment, send to the observee, and then discuss it with the observee in case something was not mentioned that is more important to the instructor than I had originally realized and/or to eliminate or revise any statements that can be misinterpreted.

| Pat Reid-Merritt | 3 | 1, Informal discussion in program meetings, more at program retreat |
| Shanthi Rajaraman | 1 | 5, Four individuals and with Mike Hozig led workshop for NAMS on peer observations |
to get the students interested in attempting them. ...the summer institute has provided me with new insights and new ideas, in making my classes better as well as in helping me see the less obvious but important pedagogical connections in my peers classes, when I do the observation or engage in informal discussions with them on teaching....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jed Morfit</th>
<th>1 formal personnel, plus three formative as part of the Critical Thinking Institute Project</th>
<th>2, Shared best practices at ARHU meeting and with Critical Thinking Institute participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betsy McShea</td>
<td>1 (another scheduled, but canceled by observee due to illness)</td>
<td>1, Shared best practices at GENS meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa Levy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4, 3 in program and one out of program, at a teaching circle meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hozik</td>
<td>3-4 (on field trip and so couldn’t access computer)</td>
<td>2, one individual and with Shanthi Rajamaran led workshop for NAMS on peer observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Gussman</td>
<td>0 (1 scheduled but had to be canceled)</td>
<td>2, shared best practices at ARHU and LITT meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has really informed discussion for the CRIM Adjunct Oversight Committee. In the past we did not share our observations with adjuncts and now we do. It has also helped us to shape some policies. For example, we now ask adjuncts for observation dates from weeks 3-14 of the calendar. We do not observe in the first two-three weeks of school.

I was certainly more aware of the nuances of peer observations written for other LITT faculty this year when I was reading files for promotion and tenure, and thought that most of the letters I read were very thorough and professional. I was observed by another LITT faculty member for my own file this year, and felt more comfortable with the process having participated in the Institute.

2013

1. Christine Tartaro, SOBL, CRIM (graduate level and online teaching experience, Q and W courses, program hiring many new faculty, already observing for CRIM, HLTH)

2. Ellen Mutari, SOBL, ECON, WGSS (experience as a faculty member in GENS and SOBL, teaching Q and W courses, dealing with issues of gender in teaching, FRST experience, seasoned mentor, already observing for ECON, GENS, and HIST)
3. Judy Vogel, NAMS, MATH, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (online and hybrid teaching, seasoned mentor, already observing for CHEM, EDUC)
4. Bill Reynolds, SOBL, SOWK (Critical Thinking Institute project, including formative peer observation, incoming IFD Director, program hiring many new faculty)
5. Amy Ackerman, EDUC, MAIT (online and hybrid teaching, five year review experience)
6. Gorica Majstorovic, ARHU, LANG, LACS (seasoned mentor, already observing LANG and GENS)
7. Kory Olson, ARHU, LANG
8. Sara Martino, SOBL, PSYC, WGSS (W and Q teaching, taught in CRIM, hybrid, online experience, experience dealing with issues of gender in teaching, coordinator of Women in Academics Teaching Circle)
9. Tara Crowell, HLTH, PUBH (experience in ARHU and HLTH, online and hybrid teaching)
10. Brian Tyrrell, BUSN, BUSN (grad teaching, seasoned mentor)
11. Aakash Taneja, BUSN, CSIS
12. Michael Scales, BUSN, HTMS (service learning, hybrid, online, seasoned mentor)

As a result of this year’s SIPET, where participants used video of teaching available online instead of observing a volunteer Stockton colleague, we can post sample write-ups in several different formats on the IFD website. In addition, participants generally agreed with last year’s on major points, e.g., that checklists or rubrics were useful to remind them of things to observe, but would be problematic to use given that it would be hard to align them with Stockton’s standards of excellence in teaching as those are currently written. This year’s participants read a few different articles, one of which suggested that observers record something that they learned about teaching from the observation, when that occurs, and several observers found that intriguing. They also practiced different ways of taking notes to suggest to colleagues.

MIDTERM TEACHING EVALUATIONS

The IFD sends email before midterm each fall and spring semester encouraging faculty to conduct midterm evaluations. The IFD provides a form that faculty may use if they wish. Some faculty members (4 in 2012-2013; 5 in 2011-2012) schedule meetings with the Director to discuss their student feedback. Many faculty members bring the raw forms to the IFD office, which compiles quantitative results and qualitative comments, producing a one to two page summary. The chart below summarizes survey data (201 respondents) related to midterm feedback.

Nearly 60% of faculty respondents (119 of 201 respondents) indicated they collect midterm feedback from students. Basically, the services of the IFD in providing a form, reminding faculty to collect feedback, and providing links to additional resources are useful, but more needs to be done to get faculty to consult with others about the results, given that research strongly suggests that only when consultations occur do student ratings of teaching (as one imperfect measure of teaching effectiveness) improve.
Faculty members use midterm feedback to improve their teaching in a variety of ways, and perhaps not surprisingly, faculty members who use midterm feedback appear to use it to guide reflection and revision. However, the number one use of midterm feedback is not for change but for discussion with students.
TEACHING CONSULTATIONS

The Director of the IFD meets with faculty in teaching consultations. Some of these take the form of helping faculty interpret student evaluations—in groups at the annual New Faculty Orientation, at the twice-a-year Adjunct workshops, in a session for new faculty in the fall weekly workshops to which other faculty and staff are invited, for the Deans, for the FRC, and through one-on-one consultations. In 2012-2013, the Director met with eleven (19 in 2011-2012 and 15 in 2010-2011) faculty members in individual, formal meetings, about interpreting their IDEA reports (and these usually also become meetings about improving their teaching or building on their already abundant pedagogical strengths). In addition, the Director has numerous less formal conversations with faculty and staff about how to interpret IDEA results. Because in 2011-2012, the Director led formal sessions with the FRC and Deans and all faculty on interpreting student evaluations as a result of a call for more training from the Faculty Senate Task Force revisiting the decision to move to IDEA and peer observations, this year I instead used emailed resources and reminders for the Deans and FRC given that so many of the same people were in both groups this year. I recommend that next year a new session be held for each group, given new Deans and new FRC members since the last formal sessions.

Other teaching consultations focus on teaching more generally—they might involve student evaluations or they might involve faculty discussing recent changes they’ve made to a course, changes they are considering for a future course, how to deal with students who appear to be resistant due to a teacher’s gender, race, religion, or nationality, and more. The Director of the IFD had more than 23 of these meetings in 2012-2013 (more
than 25 in 2011-2012), not counting those directly related to a teaching observation or to interpreting student evaluations.

IFD services used, according to the survey, show similar proportions as in my internal tracking data. See below, the number of respondents indicating they’ve used any of these services in the past five years:

Open-ended comments were mainly positive, with two exceptions:

- IFD assisted in summarizing survey results
- I need to consult on balancing service commitments!
- Did not know any of these were offered to adjuncts.
- I have frequently consulted with my program chair.
- Very helpful.
- Heather has been an invaluable resource in helping me understand the IDEA results, how to identify areas to work on, and specific ideas for improving outcomes.
- Assistance with data entry for assessment projects.
- Totally unaware that all this assistance was available
- E-mail commentary on methodology for, and applicability of, the SET instrument for science lab courses taught in multiple sections.
- Mid-term evaluations

The two negative comments both referred to the same problem—difficulty of adjunct faculty in making appointments. I regret that two faculty gave up after trying several times to schedule with me, but it is true that some faculty have such limited on-campus presence that it is challenging to arrange a time to meet with them. It is also true that my own schedule limited how quickly and frequently I could be available to meet late in the evening or on a weekend, although I conducted observations and consultations multiple times in the evening and
several times on weekends, and if faculty return email/phone calls and scheduling is impossible then I always also offer to talk to them by phone at a more convenient time. I am fairly certain one of these respondents was unlucky enough to have to be rescheduled twice due to conflicts on my end—illness and a meeting called by the Provost. I can especially understand that person’s frustration, which is justified: “Tried to get help with consultation to interpret end-of-term student evaluations but IFD staff did not seem overly interested in trying to find a time to meet with me that would work with my adjunct schedule,” and “I attempted to use the above services but the IFD staff were two busy and markedly disinterested in setting up an appointment with me to interpret my evaluations. After 3 attempts I got too busy with other things and gave up. I’m an adjunct and I can’t be on campus when I’m not teaching.” Unfortunately, I foresee that scheduling will only become more challenging as Stockton has more faculty teaching at various geographic locations. In retrospect, I suspect that it would have helped to offer Skype or other ways of having consultations that do not require people to be in the same place at the same time as I do not think it is reasonable for any Director to accommodate the very narrow availability options that some faculty have. At the same time, that limited availability may be very legitimate, and those faculty members also need and deserve access to support.

SHARING NEW PEDAGOGICAL INFORMATION WITH FACULTY
The IFD also notes and shares information related to pedagogy. The IFD website links to articles from the Chronicle of Higher Education and other sources on pedagogy and the Director sends targeted emails to faculty, or, more rarely, to the whole college community. The Director follows the Chronicle and other blogs, websites, and journals on pedagogy, teaching, and higher education in order to be up-to-date.

In addition, the IFD maintains a library with publications on issues related to pedagogy (see Appendix C for recently purchased books).

CIRCLES
This year the IFD put out a call and provided basic support for three teaching circles funded through 2020 funds. See the separately attached 2020 report and Circle Reports for a summary and recommendations.

FELLOWS
This year the IFD had four Fellows. Their reports are attached in Appendix F¹. The Fellows provided useful support to faculty as intended. There are a few minor issues to be worked out—for instance, there are two summer months with no Fellow providing statistical assistance, this year it was impossible for the Fellows to ever meet as a group due to incompatible schedules, and one fellow received no “customers,” despite marketing her services to groups like the new faculty. Therefore, she changed the focus of her project to a more white-paper type guide than the individual one-on-one assistance initially proposed. The Fellows should be even more successful next year given that the call went out in a more timely fashion, which allowed them to be identified and plan for course release (if desired). They can perhaps best be marketed at Fall Faculty Conference.

WORKSHOPS
Many portions of faculty development at New Faculty Orientation focus on teaching, including sessions on use of student evaluations and teaching observations at Stockton and a review of recent college-wide assessment results and demographic data about Stockton students to help new faculty know who they would teach and understand the larger pedagogical context in which they will teach. Presentations from Computer Services, the Registrar, and Academic Advising prepare new faculty for posting grades, understanding the curriculum, precepting, and using technology in their teaching. A presentation from the Dean of General Studies and Chair of the General Studies Committee helps faculty understand the importance of General Studies in the Stockton curriculum and

¹ Maritza Juaregui’s is not attached as it isn’t due until June 30; she is producing a white paper guide to developing a new course that can be on the IFD website for use by faculty at their convenience. The other Fellows all submitted their reports much earlier than required.
prepare to participate in it. In addition, of the thirteen weekly workshops for new faculty in fall 2012 (one was canceled due to super-storm Sandy), eight were primarily focused on teaching.

This year, the IFD Director continued to collaborate with Mary Ann Trail to create and run workshops on using clickers in the classroom—focused less on using the technology and more on the pedagogy of how and why one might use response systems in the classroom to engage students and/or collect data. Because last year, the IFD’s spring workshops on pedagogy—two panel discussions on experiential learning and one on backwards course design went well but were lightly attended, this year I used a new strategy of partnering with other groups and of much more aggressive marketing. For instance, before Richard Arum’s visit I sent out reminders to come check out the book, provocative quotations, and links to book reviews representing different perspectives on his book. In May, the IFD co-sponsored workshop presenters on English Language Learners and invited faculty through Education, Writing, the Learning Access Center, and other more likely to be interested groups—there were also multiple nursing faculty in attendance, and faculty and staff from across disciplines. The collaborations with presentations by the Fellows also brought in more people. We also partnered with the Service Learning Office to purchase a Magna Seminar that can be used multiple times by the IFD and Service Learning Office to introduce faculty to important concepts in Service and other engaged learning. Finally, I had record attendance (ran out of chairs!) at a summer workshop on discussion techniques and strong attendance at one on rubrics, both held in response to the results of the IFD survey.

The IFD survey indicates that many faculty members are participating in various formal, internal, faculty development offerings. Boot camp has the largest participation, which makes sense given that it occurs most frequently and with the greatest variety of scheduling offerings (see chart below). The most frequently attended during term events are also Computer Services training, followed by Advising Brown bags, both of which also share characteristics of repeating frequently.

![Chart showing number of respondents per category indicating participation in summer internal professional development opportunities in the last five years.](chart.png)
Survey respondents who did not participate indicate the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>In-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not priorities for me in the past three years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling conflicts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I applied but wasn’t accepted/I was not eligible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn’t aware of these opportunities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also asked participants to comment on how any summer or in-term professional development opportunities had affected them. One hundred and fourteen survey respondents wrote in comments. Representative (not comprehensive) -positive comments from the IFD survey in response to the question about the impact of any internal professional development opportunities are listed below. Note that some refer to IFD sponsored events and others do not—in many cases it is difficult to know (advising development through brown bags or new faculty weekly workshops? Rubrics through the Assessment or Writing Institute? E-portfolio through Assessment or E-Portfolio?) I emailed more comprehensive feedback to those responsible for various development opportunities, and IFD sponsored items are underlined below:

- Extremely useful - especially the writing workshop and the boot camp - writing workshop because I worked on objectives for each assignment AND there were many, many practical examples and models of things (activities, exercises, rubrics) I could take back to the classroom with me as well as the pedagogical theory behind it. Technology training because it gave me new tools and timesavers and sometimes models I could use.
- **The Teaching Circle has enabled me to work with colleagues who I respect.**
- I have improved my precepting in a constantly changing environment, improved my knowledge of technology, purchased more tech devices and improved my teaching style.
- The technology camps helped me incorporate more technology in the classroom and the FRST session made me decide to teach a freshman only course.
- Writing workshop led me to begin using rubrics regularly in my courses. Advising Brown Bag talk on autism made me more aware of accommodation issues.
- I will help operationalize an e-portfolio assessment for one of the minors.
- **Great impact on my understanding of how to lead class discussion and how to advise effectively.**
- Revision of writing rubrics, revision of writing assignments; Improved usage (depth & breadth) of Blackboard, iPad & other technology in the classroom; learning Prezi (after seeing in WP Appetizers)
- The workshop on critical thinking reinforced how I teach CT in the classroom. The assessment workshops also helped me think about rubrics and the tech workshop was helpful in figuring out Blackbeast--I mean Blackboard.
• I just became a member of the Urban Education Teaching Circle this year under leadership of Darryl Cleveland. It is reassuring to have an opportunity to meet and discuss articles and research that pertain to urban education, and plan for how to help Stockton students gain expertise in this area.

• Have worked with colleagues on program assessment two summers in a row. This has changed my thinking from "what am I teaching?" to "what are they learning?" and provides a framework to try new teaching approaches and have a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of it.

Scheduling conflicts appear to be one of the problems to overcome. In addition to the table above, open-ended comments to a question about how the IFD could better assist indicated overwhelmingly that the number one area for improvement for IFD services is in making them more accessible, especially outside the typical work day for adjunct faculty. Suggestions mainly revolved around the timing of scheduled events and/or communicating them in a comprehensive calendar (11 of 38 comments, many of the rest of which were to say that the IFD is already doing a great job or they had no suggestions). This year, the IFD had more events taped and shared on Stockton’s You Tube, which may help. We also scheduled some events at times more friendly for adjunct faculty (e.g., the Provost’s Office and IFD scheduled the Adjunct Information Sessions later in the day).

Analysis of the themes that emerged across comments related specific information about Boot Camp (6), Writing (9), and Assessment (8), among others. Faculty indicated that the development helped them be more efficient (5), prepare files (3), showed models and methods (8), provided an orientation to Stockton (3), helped with teaching online/hybrid classes (8), showed practical examples (5), helped them reflect (7), helped them work with colleagues (12), or helped them use technology (37). One heartening piece of news: the biggest category, that with the most frequent comments, was that of 50 respondent comments related to improving pedagogy.

Summer workshops, either intensive Institutes or boot camp like training, remain some of the most effective training mechanisms, judging by comments. However, comments also refer positively to shorter workshops and training. In contrast, the annual IFD guest speakers have relatively little impact, both in terms of number of people reached and impact on those individuals. Those respondents who did attend the annual guest speaker events (54 separate individuals, or about one fourth of respondents) report most frequently that the guest lectures had negligible effect on them (16 comments), but some report that they reinforced their existing beliefs (5), helped them rethink (9), improved their dedication to asking students to read/writing (7), or were thought provoking (13). A sample statement about reinforcing existing beliefs: “The Arum speech reinforced my skepticism about the push toward MOOCs and other on line ventures.” The five most heavy-impact statements are as follow, and one much like it: Arum had an impact on teaching. Made me re-evaluate the amount of reading and writing I assign; two much like this: “I have revisited what I want for learning outcomes, and better ways to assess that learning through essay questions that require incorporating key concepts into responses,” and “Kamenetz added greatly to my awareness of alternatives to the traditional classroom experience and I have been a subscriber to Straighter Line since that lecture. I have always taught in an interactive rather than lecture mode as a way to engage students.”
Several questions asked for feedback about professional development that faculty would like to receive. I’ve already shared this feedback with relevant people involved with faculty development. The top two categories (Critical thinking and Writing) are areas in which Stockton has been providing professional development for the last several years through a variety of mechanisms. Despite that, faculty members are still hungry for more help in teaching effectively in these critical areas.

The second survey question about areas in which to provide more training included surprising results. Faculty particularly desire help related to student participation and listening. As a result, I led a summer workshop
on promoting effective discussion that was one of the best attended I’ve had at Stockton.

A separate question asked faculty about areas of assistance related to assessing student learning. Results there were not surprising to me—faculty would like yet more assistance in developing rubrics and authentic assessment, among other areas. We had already ordered more rubric books for the IFD library due to their popularity and demand for assistance in that areas across almost every Assessment Institute and several Writing Institutes.
Another surprising finding was in response to a question about scholarly support. Namely, the number one area in which faculty want assistance is in writing a scholarly article. The chart below speaks to the need for a Fellow doing work in scholarship, as Deb Figart has done the last year and will continue to do next year. I have shared this information with her already to inform her plans for her fellowship next year.
Related to retirement, about 10% of respondents indicated that they plan to retire in the next five years, and another 13% that they might. Dave Burdick and Christine Ferri have done a great deal of planning related to potential assistance through SCOSA, and I have already shared this data with them. They might try to do this through a teaching circle or a Faculty Fellow position, among other possibilities.
SUPPORT FOR FACULTY AS THEY PROCEED THROUGH THE PERSONNEL PROCESS

Support for faculty as they proceed through the personnel process begins before they arrive on campus with work on mentoring and includes new faculty orientation, workshops for new faculty and for adjuncts, reading and commenting on drafts of faculty first year, second year, third year, tenure, and promotion files and plans, and consulting with faculty about strategies for preparing for promotion to associate or full.

MENTORING

The IFD works with Schools and the Provost’s Office to gather a list of mentors assigned to new faculty and invites the faculty and their mentors to a lunch during new faculty orientation. With the invitation to mentors in 2010, 2011, and 2012, the IFD included a letter thanking mentors and reminding them of helpful things they might do for their mentees and gave mentors a copy of a book on mentoring as a guide. Last summer the mentor luncheon invitations came out jointly from the IFD Coordinator and the Provost and I asked mentors to find a Program member to substitute for them at lunch if they could not attend, and these measures were successful in improving the mentor/mentee lunch as new faculty nearly all had mentees or colleagues in attendance.

Mentoring remains one of the biggest complaints of new faculty—some are very happy with their mentors, and others are dismissed (or in some cases not even acknowledged) by their mentors. Discussions with the Assistant
Deans in Spring 2012 led to more consistent selection of mentors in and out of program for all new faculty members for Fall 2012, but some Schools chose not to select multiple mentors. Naturally, all assigned mentors will not work out. However, more might be done to foster good mentorship, even if that is simply making sure that reluctant mentors are not recruited. The new File Advisors might help as essentially many new faculty members can now have 3 points of contact (two mentors and the File Advisors). Some Schools, notably HLTH, also worked to address a shortage of mentors by assigning more out of program/out of School mentors.

NEW FACULTY ORIENTATION
The IFD takes primary responsibility for New Faculty Orientation, which is hosted in collaboration with the Provost’s Office. The IFD plans the agenda, contacts and confirms people on the agenda, plans the menu, and prepares for several significant professional development sessions led by the IFD director, and invites faculty to NFO. See the agenda for 2013, Appendix A.

At new faculty orientation, many activities are designed to assist faculty in moving through the personnel process. They meet their Deans, Assistant Deans, mentors, and other important people at Stockton. They learn about the importance of their contributions to General Studies. In addition, they get an introduction to the Grants Office and a workshop on the use of teaching evaluations and observations, including a review of what they will be required to put into their files. Feedback from New Faculty Orientation has been positive. Last year appeared to be the best agenda yet in meeting goals without overwhelming the new faculty too much.

NEW FACULTY WORKSHOPS
Weekly new faculty workshops occur in the fall term when new faculty have a course release and are scheduled around a common meeting time. The Director of the IFD plans the agenda for the workshop, schedules speakers, reserves rooms, attends and assists with discussion, assesses with surveys about speakers, takes attendance, addresses issues, and more. Most workshops have a strongly practical and pedagogical focus. However, they serve multiple uses, and two strong secondary purposes of most of the workshops are to introduce new faculty to a) Stockton culture and b) “movers and shakers” at Stockton. At least two sessions deal with academic advising. These kinds of sessions, as well as one on creating your own G course, last year led by Rodger Jackson, communicate Stockton philosophy and indicate what other faculty and administrators may value. See the 2012 workshops (Appendix D). Last year, around 18 new faculty members typically attended, not all tenure track. I was careful to communicate to non-tenure track faculty who attended that attending was their choice and that attending or not would have no effect on their future at Stockton, so they should use their own judgment regarding managing their time. The SFT really did not want me to invite non-tenure track, but full-time, faculty given that they are not getting a course release, but I did so anyway, while carefully emphasizing to them (I sent an additional email, in fact, to clarify) that they were not required to attend and that their attending would not help them get a tenure track position, and might, in fact, harm them if it diverted their time and energy. However, I invited them and many chose to attend because NOT attending can also have a negative impact on those who begin as Visiting and then are hired as full-time faculty and move over to be in their second or third year on tenure track. It is a complex situation with no clear (to me) moral “right” path, so the best I could do was to exercise my own judgment and let professionals make their own decisions about what would work for them. We do have attendance records and so Bill Reynolds can continue, if all agree, the past practice of NOT requiring now-tenure-track faculty to attend sessions they attended the year before, although they should be receiving the course release to do so the fall after they convert to tenure-track.

The workshops are each assessed with a survey, and the workshop schedule is adjusted each year. The feedback from this year was very positive, suggesting that changes made over the last several years have largely addressed minor concerns about timing (wanting more topics covered in September). One problem is that these are not available for mid-year hires until the following fall. Given the difficulties faced by mid-year hires, I
personally would recommend that we avoid mid-year hires. However, the incoming IFD Director and I, in discussion with Bess Kathrins, agreed that at the least midyear hires might be invited both to the Adjunct Information Sessions and a meeting with the IFD Director in order to provide some guidance. When I met with midyear hires this spring, I think they found it helpful. They also were overwhelmed as they did not fully realize how much they needed to do in how short a time before meeting with me.

RESOURCES FOR ADJUNCTS
In 2012-2013 the College continued the Adjunct Information Sessions which began in Fall 2010 and had one before the start of each academic term. This workshop, organized by the IFD, HR, and the Provost’s Office, includes a meet and greet with the Provost, information from the Registrar, a primer on student evaluations, discussion with union representatives on the benefits of union membership, and a full session on technology and teaching led by the Director of Computer Services. They also provide a forum for adjuncts to feel welcome and appreciated at Stockton. In August 2012 and January of 2013 we hosted sessions in the afternoon and evening that allowed us to differentiate the experience for repeat attendees and offer sessions at times that might work well for more adjunct faculty members. In addition, we had sessions videotaped so that they could be shared online. A suggestion for the future might be to host sessions which people can attend virtually from off-site. See agenda, Appendix B.

HELP WITH FILE WRITING
In 2011-2012, the Director of the IFD read drafts of or otherwise consulted on the writing of 32 faculty files, c.v.’s, and other file related materials (compares to 32 in 2010-2011 and 30 in 2010-2011). Files included mostly first year and tenure files, but also some second year, third year, and promotion files. Reading and commenting on these drafts consumes the bulk of the time of the Director of the IFD in January and February preceding spring file deadlines. This year I hosted meetings for first year, second year, third year, and tenure files in December. Separate meetings for each group worked well. The most frequent advice: connect to the college and program standards and provide support for what you say about teaching excellence, service, and scholarship. Many faculty members need assistance in knowing how to create evidence-based narratives about their own work. Many faculty members also need assistance with organizing what they say, particularly as they enter years 3 and 4 and have multiple versions of faculty plans, multiple personnel letters, and the college and program standards, plus their own strengths and weaknesses, to juggle in one text.

SUPPORT FOR FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP
The IFD supports faculty scholarship to a degree, although most faculty members find disciplinary-specific support more useful. Nonetheless, in the last year the IFD continued past attempts to support faculty scholarship by including sessions with the Grants Office both in New Faculty Orientation and in the weekly fall workshops and by including a session on the IRB in the fall workshops. In addition, the IFD maintains, with the Grants Office, a database (Survey Monkey results) of potential mentors/trainers/statisticians/editors for faculty members working on research projects so that both offices can better match faculty members with needs (How do I use NVIVO? Construct a survey? Make a poster presentation?) with faculty members willing and able to assist them. The IFD uses that database to match faculty members looking for help with NVIVO, SPSS, editing help, and more. The Director of the IFD also consults with faculty members individually on issues related to scholarship or service, (about three consultations this year and five the year before—more met with the Faculty Fellow for Scholarship this year).

Because of dual roles as the Director of the IFD and as a GENS rep. to the RPD committee, the Director of the IFD also read and commented on many drafts of RPD proposals.
SUPPORT PROGRAM AND COLLEGE ASSESSMENT

While important facets of the IFD are orienting and mentoring new faculty members and helping all faculty members hone their teaching and communicate clearly about it, an equally important aspect is helping plan, implement, and report on assessment of student learning at the college. One way to do this is to host an annual guest speaker. This year’s speaker, Dr. Richard Arum, spoke about student learning in critical thinking and how well students performed post-graduation as related to their growth in critical thinking in college. He participated in a Q and A lunch and then gave a fairly well attended speech. These smaller events inspired many participating staff and faculty members to read his book. Partnering with the Senate to have the guest speaker at a Senate meeting helped with attendance.

HELP DISSEMINATE ASSESSMENT RESULTS ACROSS CAMPUS AND FOSTER COLLEGE-WIDE DISCUSSION OF ASSESSMENT

INTERPRET AND DISSEMINATE RESULTS OF NSSE, CLA, AND OTHER SURVEYS AND TESTS WITH FACULTY

The IFD collaborates with IR to help interpret results of NSSE, CLA, and other surveys and tests with faculty members. One venue for this is through the Assessment Committee, a group of faculty members from across Schools, which met 4 times last year to examine and discuss NSEE results, share program assessment updates (QUAD, LITT), and discuss the possibility of software to help organize assessment data and information. In addition, the IFD publishes the internal newsletter Evidence. This year’s issues included reports on NSEE, LITT Curriculum mapping, and more. The Assessment Committee and Evidence are intended to help keep faculty members at-large informed about assessment efforts across the college and in other programs. Issues of Evidence for this year are available on the IFD website.

HELP PROGRAMS DEVELOP ASSESSMENT PLANS

CONSULT WITH PROGRAMS AND COORDINATORS

Since July 1, 2012, the Director of the IFD has had about fifteen (up from eleven each of the last two years) meetings with programs or coordinators about assessment plans (not counting work done with participants in last year or this year’s Assessment Institute). Some of this work (i.e., with Honors or the new MA in American Studies), involved asking questions and listening to identify issues/areas of interest where programs might first focus their assessment efforts or suggesting changes to current assessment efforts that programs find unsatisfactory. Much of it this year related to writing or interpreting surveys. Also, some related to program use of NSSE and CLA data by Business. The IFD also provides reading material online or from the IFD library or purchased from the IFD budget to assist programs and provide hands-on help developing learning outcomes, plans, surveys, etc.

LEAD THE ANNUAL INTENSIVE SUMMER ASSESSMENT INSTITUTE

Due to waiting for over a year for the Union and administration to negotiate an agreement regarding stipends for the Assessment Institute (and following my having been severely taken to task by the union last year for having so frequently paid stipends that had not been negotiated), there was no time to advertise for and hold an Assessment Institute before June 30. Therefore, this task officially has been handed over to Sonia Gonsalves who plans to hold one in late summer, and for whom I saved $8,500 in funding to help cover the costs. The Assessment Institute has been held annually for six years: four times with a general focus on helping faculty members/programs with assessment plans and twice with a focus on developing CLA-like performance tasks for
use both pedagogically and for assessment of student learning. **There have been 110 participants (about 52 after correcting for repeat participants) in the Assessment Institute from 2007-2012.**

**COORDINATE CLA TESTING**

The IFD collaborates with IR on CLA testing, which has been done annually since 2006. CLA testing is currently being done in alternate years with NSSE and 2012-2013 was a CLA year. I recruited faculty volunteers in the fall who generously worked a day into their syllabi for their students to meet in a computer lab and take the CLA. Nancy Monticello proctored, for the most part. We had only two snags: one class had a very low turn-out rate, near the end of the testing window, so our sample had a few fewer students than desirable, and we learned that it is nearly impossible at this time to reserve a computer lab for a class of more than 20 students on a Tuesday or Thursday, so future CLA administrators should keep that in mind when recruiting faculty volunteers. Unfortunately, as students are allowed up to 90 minutes to take the CLA, scheduling MWF classes is also problematic.

This spring, we experimented with a random sample. I used a random number generator to select a 300 student sample from a list provided by IR (250 randomly sampled, plus 50 additional randomly sampled males). I invited them by Stockton email to take the CLA. That yielded about 15 completed student tests. I sent multiple reminders with different messages and subject lines and I emailed faculty members in whose classes about 120 of those students were enrolled, which yielded two additional students (given the labor involved, I stopped there). Then, I invited all seniors to take the test through email and the portal. Finally, when we still had less than half of the 100 students needed, I recruited faculty volunteers with senior-heavy classes to give me class time. Others offered extra credit, but that and a $10.00 Wawa gift card yielded only about three students).

This year was the first year the institution has used an incentive for the CLA, in the form of $10.00 Wawa gift cards for each student, provided by IR. Students seemed grateful to receive the gift cards. Knowing students would receive them made faculty members feel better about volunteering them, although I think they all would have volunteered anyway. We can compare the data to see if students spent more time on task or if there were other differences.

**I do not recommend trying random sampling again.** It was very labor intensive for me and for Nancy Monticello, who was individually scheduling students and proctoring. It also burdened all seniors and many faculty members with email and required numerous computer lab reservations that took up Computer Services staff time and took labs offline. And, in the end, to get our 100 students, we had to take the faculty volunteers we could get and so may have ended up with a less representative sample (by major, due to two Psych classes) than we normally get recruiting faculty members in December.

**SERVE AS A STUDENT RATING LIASON**

This year, Russ Manson took over much of the administrative work related to this task. He and Debbi Dagavarian (taking over from Peter Baratta) came on board in the fall. Although I still had 8 IDEA administrative meetings, I had more time in the spring for other faculty development work.

At the end of the term, most faculty members administer student ratings of teaching. Two years ago, the union and administration desired to centralize more decision-making about student rating of teaching which gave the IFD Director a large amount of work related to student rating administration (see past annual reports for a detailed discussion). Work has included the following:

- Communicate administrative and other deadlines to faculty members and staff (can assist but no longer primary responsibility of IFD)
- Assist in determining when faculty members/staff have legitimate exceptions to established policies and procedures (continues on a consulting basis)
• Assist in troubleshooting technological and other administrative problems (no longer)
• Order Group Summary Reports and help programs interpret them (continues)
• Conduct internal research using local IDEA results (e.g., conducting analysis of differences among response rate and type at Stockton when using different forms (online or paper) for different kinds of classes (traditional, hybrid, and online) (no longer)

The workload lessened this spring due to Russ Manson taking over as a Faculty IDEA Liaison. The workload was larger in the fall as we made several changes to the system and as it took more time to train Russ Manson and Debbi Dagavarian than it would have to continue to work with Peter. The Director estimates that in 2010-2011, work on this aspect of the job consumed about 1/3 of the Director’s time. In 2011-2012, that share shrunk to perhaps more like 10-15% of the Director’s time. In Fall 2012, it took perhaps 20% of the Director’s time, but only 5% or so in Spring 2013.

The IFD orders and helps interpret group summaries for programs. Ordering summaries takes local staff time because IDEA no longer records course acronyms for classes using the paper IDEA form. In addition, the IFD usually helps analyze the group summaries for programs.

PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND FOR FACULTY RESEARCH INTO AREAS RELATED TO PEDAGOGY AND ASSESSMENT

The IFD also provides other support for assessment and teaching, including the following services:

• Maintain a Survey Monkey account and other research software (NVIVO, SPSS)
• Create surveys (e.g. for First Year Seminars, the Writing Center, and the SFT)
• Help analyze survey data
• Enter program assessment data for CRIM, BASK, QUAD, Writing, and other programs into Excel or SPSS
• Conduct basic statistical analysis of program assessment data
• Interpret and discuss assessment data with programs
• Purchase, proctor, and help interpret results of standardized tests

The Director of the IFD also serves on multiple committees due to the position, including serving on a First Year committee chaired by Tom Grites, meeting with the Institutional Research Council, meeting with Dean’s Council, chairing an ELO, and chairing an API.

IFD SURVEY

After conducting a search and comparison of national and international surveys used by Faculty Developers to gather feedback about their services and centers, I developed a survey and sent it to faculty members online. There were 201 respondents, or a response rate of about 34% (using IR’s data of 597 total faculty members counting adjunct and full-time faculty members and staff, TA’s, etc.). This is the number of respondents after I deleted any respondents who had not completed anything past the demographics of the survey or who were sorted out by the demographic questions. The faculty members were fairly representative of the College, with the exception of a larger number of GENS faculty respondents, possibly because more of them know the current Director as it is her home School—especially may account for so many GENS adjuncts. See Appendix E for demographic data from the survey.

BUDGET

The budget of the IFD supports its activities, with the bulk of money being spent on conference travel and participation, a guest speaker, and the Assessment Institute.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Institute, faculty stipends</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speaker (honorarium, travel)</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>2,105 (no</td>
<td>2,021.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>honorarium,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but hotel,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>travel costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speaker catering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Critical exam, COMM</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Institute conference, registration, travel and hotel for</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather McGovern and Diane Holtzman in 2011. Travel and hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and hotel, Dennis Fotia and Heather McGovern in 2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Developers Conference (POD) in Seattle, WA, travel,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration, and hotel for Heather to attend a pre-conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop and the conference (where she led a session)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Reynolds to IDEA Train the Trainer Conference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier rental</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Writing Across the Curriculum conference, registration,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel and hotel for Heather McGovern for reporting on WAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Evidence at print shop</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>0 (all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electronic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment institute, catering</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning institute, stipends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning institute, catering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners workshops (2, morning all EDUC faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members invited, afternoon all faculty members invited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners workshops, catering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shala Mills, catering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning webinar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty orientation, catering</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books (teaching and assessment for IFD)</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies (pens, post-its, tabbed dividers, nametags, dry</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erase markers, copier toner, printer cartridges, copy paper,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stationery, envelopes, etc.) for IFD use, workshops, NFO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering, SIPET</td>
<td>246.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laptop computer and docking station for IFD Office for Bill Reynolds 0 0 1842
Portable projector for use in IFD Office, F227, by Bill Reynolds 0 0 472
Zoomerang/Survey Monkey subscription 350 350 350
Welcome gifts for new faculty members 280 1102 0
Remainder of IFD budget spent by Assessment Director for books for Assessment Institute at FY end Approx. $298

| 22,680 | 19,488 | 22,680 |

APPENDIX A: NEW FACULTY ORIENTATION AGENDA, 2012

2012 New Faculty Orientation

Monday, August 20th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>CC MR-5*</td>
<td>Breakfast and Welcome, President, Provost, Deans, Assistant Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>Faculty Development: Getting to Know Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>F-114</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>F-114</td>
<td>Computer Services, Director for Computer Services, Linda Feeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>F-114</td>
<td>e-Classroom Basics, Director of Academic Computing and IT Support Services, Bob Heinrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>CC BOT**</td>
<td>School Lunch, President, Provost, Deans, Assistant Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>General Education, History and Philosophy, Dean Jan Colijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>General Education, Processes and Procedures, General Studies Committee Chair and GEN Convenor, Carra Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>CC Hallway</td>
<td>Meet with ABP Vendors and HR catch-up with Program Assistant Administrator, Johana DeJesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>Grants Office, Director, Beth Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>Faculty Development: Prepping for the semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>President’s Welcome Reception at President and Mrs. Saatkamp’s home (directions will be provided)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MR-5 = Campus Center, Meeting Room #5;  ** BOT = Campus Center, Board of Trustees Room

Tuesday, August 21st

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>Breakfast and Campus Safety, Chief Glenn Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>Student Affairs, Associate Vice President Dee McNeely-Greene; Dean of Students, Pedro Santana; Director of Counseling and Health Services, Frances Bottone; Interim Director for Residential Life, Denise O’Neill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>CC MR-5</td>
<td>Ethics and Affirmative Action, Assistant to President, Affirmative Action and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Three computers in the IFD office were all long out of warranty. One was barely functional. The Provost’s Office replaced the desktop used by Nancy Monticello. The IFD paid for a laptop and docking station for use by Bill Reynolds, and the desktop used by Heather McGovern during her tenure was retained to be a third computer for use in proctoring CLA and other assessment tests, by IFD Fellows, student workers, or others.
APPENDIX B: ADJUNCT WORKSHOP AGENDA, FALL 2012, SPRING 2013

Fall 2012 Adjunct Information Session Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>New Adjuncts</th>
<th>Veteran Adjuncts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Greetings (F-121)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>• F-114</td>
<td>• F-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Computer Services with Linda Feeney</td>
<td>IFD 3:30 – 3:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar: 3:45-3:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eileen re other sites: 3:55-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- HR (4:00 – 4:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SFT (4:30 – 5:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Group Dinner in Upper E-Wing: including all adjuncts, President (if available); Provost and senior staff; all guest presenters; Deans and Assistant Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 7:30 pm</td>
<td>• F-121</td>
<td>• F-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SFT (6:00 – 6:30)</td>
<td>- Computer Services with Linda Feeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HR (6:30 – 7:00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Registrar: 7-7:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Eileen re other sites (7:10-7:15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IFD (7:15 – 7:30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring 2013 Adjunct Orientation overall agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>New Adjunct Faculty members</th>
<th>Returning Adjunct Faculty members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Greetings &amp; Refreshments <em>(Campus Center - Event Room)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Institute for Faculty Development, Human Resources, Stockton Federation of Teachers <em>(Campus Center - MR-5)</em></td>
<td>Computer Services Session <em>(F-114)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Group Dinner: Instructors, Deans, Assistant Deans, Administrators <em>(Campus Center - Event Room)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Computer Services Session <em>(F-114)</em></td>
<td>Institute for Faculty Development, Human Resources, Stockton Federation of Teachers <em>(Campus Center - MR-5)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C: IFD BOOKS, NEW

Due to rubric books being some of the most popular checked out of the IFD library
Two copies: From Standards to Rubrics in Six Steps (Third Edition)
Author: Kathleen B. Burke
Publisher: Corwin
Date: 2011

Three copies: Introduction to Rubrics: An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback and Promote Student Learning (Second Edition)
Authors: Dannelle D. Stevens and Antonia J. Levi
Publisher: Stylus
Date: 2013

Other
Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia
Edited by: Gabriella Gutierrez Muhs, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. Gonzalez, Angela P. Harris
Publisher: The University Press of Colorado
Date: 2012

Reconceptualising Feedback in Higher Education
Edited by: Stephen Merry, Margaret Price, David Carless, Maddalena Taras
Publisher: Routledge
Date: 2013
APPENDIX D: NEW FACULTY WORKSHOPS, 2012

Unless otherwise noted, we will meet on Wednesdays from 9:55-11:10 in F120

9/5: Working with Students: Nuts and Bolts Fran Bottone, Director of Counseling and Health Services; Denise O’Neil, Interim Director of Residential Life; Pam Cross, Coordinator of the Writing Center; Luis Peña, Coordinator of the Math Center

Fran and Denise will discuss important issues, which may include the following and more: what to do when students disclose sexual assault to you, what to do with students who have learning or other disabilities, and what to do with disruptive students. Then, Pam and Luis will introduce you to the resources offered to your students by the Academic Tutoring Centers. They will especially focus on how you can help students use the centers most effectively.

9/12: Converting Classes from Your Discipline to G Courses Rodger L. Jackson, Associate Professor of Philosophy/Religion, meet Maritza Juaregui, Faculty Institute Fellow focusing on assisting faculty members with course design

Everyone who teaches at Stockton is required to contribute at least one "G" course each year, and most of us need to come up with two. However, many of us have never taught an explicitly interdisciplinary course before coming to Stockton. Furthermore, many of us come from disciplines which have strict guidelines about what counts as the appropriate kinds of texts, and assignments for our particular fields. Both of these factors create serious challenges for the new faculty member. Yet, it is often the case that the courses we thought of as being strictly within our own discipline can provide a great foundation for an interdisciplinary "G" course. I'll describe my experiences in this process and pass along some advice about how to utilize your old courses to create a new "G" course.

9/19: Resources for You and Your Students: The Library, Accent Modification Mary Ann Trail, Interim Director of the Library; Lois Spitzer, Assistant Professor of Teacher Education

Mary Ann Trail will introduce you to resources that the library offers for you and your students. She will especially focus on how you can work with the library to help students develop information literacy skills. Lois Spitzer will discuss with you a new Accent Modification Service offered to students and faculty members (on a voluntary basis).

9/25: Shala Smith, Teaching about Global Challenges, 4:30-5:50 (Outside speaker event)

9/26: What Can the Grants Office Do for You? Beth Olsen, Director of Grants Development, Grants; Jillian Cawley, Assistant Director of Grants Development

An information sharing workshop to answer your questions: how to get started on project development, what pockets of money are available at the College, where to find support, and what can be done before tenure?

10/3: The Institutional Review Board: Its Role and Yours, Marissa Levy, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice

You will learn about the IRB at Stockton, including basics about how and when to request IRB approval.

10/10: Developing Students’ Skills across the Curriculum: Stockton's Writing and Quantitative Requirements Betsy McShea, Associate Professor of Developmental Mathematics, Quad Coordinator; Penny Dugan, Professor of Writing, W2 Coordinator

Students learn both by studying skills discretely and by applying them in new contexts. In this session we'll explore how Stockton's W and Q requirements strive to give students both kinds of learning opportunities. We’ll also provide an overview of these similar requirements, explain how to apply for Q or W status for your classes, and answer questions.
10/17: The Advising Syllabus Paula Dollarhide, Associate Director of Academic Advising and faculty guests, meet Carolyn Gutierrez, Faculty Institute Fellow

As preceptors, we want our students to make meaningful course and life decisions as they create their own education. We set lofty goals for our students, yet students are mostly concerned with navigating the many degree requirements, college policies, schedules, and other obstacles. In this workshop you’ll learn how to coach students through the process of crafting their education by using an advising syllabus. You’ll see how setting expectations in your advising relationship can provide exciting opportunities for teaching. Sample advising syllabi will be shared.

10/24: Navigating the Registration Process - Preceptorial Advising Days at Stockton Cindy McCloskey, Assistant Director of Academic Advising. Meet in computer lab, D019.

Academic Advisors from The Center for Academic Advising will give tips on how to help students on preceptorial advising days. We’ll have an overview of curriculum and requirements, tips for online searching for classes, important dates and policies, and how to interpret the online degree audit, CAPP. There will also be time for your questions.

10/31: Canceled, Sandy

11/7: Canceled due to rescheduled preceptees after Sandy

11/14: Student Development and Service Learning Len Farber, Director of Student Development; Daniel Tome, Coordinator of Service Learning; Reva Curry, Executive Director, Stockton Center for Community Engagement

Len will discuss the role of Student Development and offer suggestions for how to engage your students and help them connect aspects of college and classroom life. Daniel will introduce you to the philosophy behind Service Learning and brief you on the support services offered to faculty members by the college. Reva will introduce the services offered by the Stockton Center for Community Engagement.

11/15 Annual “Student, Faculty and Staff Dinner.” Students are encouraged to ask a faculty member, but you are also encouraged to invite your class.

11/21: (day before Thanksgiving, so plan accordingly): Behind the Scenes in Journal Publishing Deb Figart, Professor of Education and Economics, Faculty Institute Fellow

Have you ever wondered what goes on behind the scenes when you submit a paper to a journal? What are editors looking for? What are referees looking for? What is the difference between double-blind, single-blind, and no-blind reviews? How can you improve your odds of acceptance?

11/28: Teaching the New Student: FRST and Transfer Students GT Lenard, Associate Professor of Writing and Director of First Year Seminars; Frank Cerreto, Professor of Mathematics, Coordinator of the FRST Program; Tom Grites, Assistant to the Provost.

We will explain the FRST program, first year seminars, and transfer seminars and talk about teaching the new student.

12/5: Best Practices in Distance Education Dennis Fotia, Assistant Director of Distance Education

This workshop will examine best practices in distance education and online learning. Topics will include effective online pedagogy, online communication, and the importance of interactivity, faculty presence, response time, and more.

12/12: Writing your First Year File
APPENDIX F: FELLOW REPORTS

To: Heather McGovern, Director, Institute for Faculty Development
Subject: Fellowship Report
Date: April 2013

I would like to express my gratitude to the Institute for providing me the opportunity and support to further my project on plagiarism prevention. This report documents what was accomplished during my fellowship.

Outline

- Roundtable Discussion on using Turnitin.com – October 16, 2012
- Instructors Workshop – January 17, 2013
- Recorded and archived Instructors’ Workshop. (Links will be available soon)
- Presented two class sessions on Academic Honesty (Fall & Spring semester)
- Held individual faculty consultations on setting up Turnitin
- Created Subject Research Guides on Turnitin
- Created “Best Practices for Avoiding Plagiarism” guide

Details

Organized a discussion panel on legal and pedagogical uses of Turnitin on October 16, 2012. Contributing panel members included Ron Caplan, Associate Professor of Public Health, Debbi Dagavarian, Assistant Provost, Melissa Hager, General Counsel. Audrey Latourette, Distinguished Professor of Business Law and Marissa Levy, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice. The lively and informative session was attended by over 25 faculty and teaching staff.

Co-presented a two-part workshop with Dr. Marissa Levy on Jan 17, 2013 on using Turnitin’s Originality Check (Turnitin’s Plagiarism prevention/detection service) and Turnitin’s GradeMark service (on improving students’ writing and faculty feedback). The workshop was attended by twenty faculty.

The archived versions of the presentations below will be linked and available soon.

Turnitin Instructor Presentation, part 1
Turnitin Instructor Presentation, part 2
Advanced Turnitin Session (Using GradeMark)

Assisted seven instructors in setting up their classes and assignments in Turnitin


Created online guides to using plagiarism detection/deterrent service, Turnitin.com available on the Library homepage.

Turnitin Instructor Guide  http://libguides.stockton.edu/turnitin-instructors
Turnitin Student Guide  http://libguides.stockton.edu/turnitin-students

Invited to give two in-class presentations on academic honesty and plagiarism.
I served as the IFD resource person for faculty who need support for quantitative work. I am pleased to report that it was a very fruitful year. I was able to work with several faculty members on a range of very interesting quantitative research projects. From my experience it is clear that there is a great demand for assistance with quantitative work. I commend the IFD for creating this much needed resource and would definitely recommend that this program be continued. I am also grateful that I had the opportunity to do this. It allowed me to read and expand my knowledge on some new methodologies and enabled me to think about explaining and applying quantitative models in new ways.

In my original IFD Fellows application I had proposed to create learning exercises for SPSS to be used by faculty in their teaching in the event that there was not a great demand from faculty for help with their research projects. However since the amount of faculty requiring support for their research work was unexpected high, I did not have any time to work on the SPSS exercises. Below is the list of faculty I met with this year along with a brief description of the projects.

Jessica Fleck: Discussions over email and in person about appropriate methodology (Logistic Regression versus Discriminant Analysis for her research project.

Mary Lou Galantino: Discussions over email and in person about correlation analysis

Priti Haria: Initial discussions in person and over email about the potential methods and models for education related dataset

Preet Chhatwal: Reviewed paper submitted to journal and offered comments on statistical methodology

Jessica Bonnan-White: In person discussion of appropriate anova methodology for study related to peace and conflict resolution

James Avery: In person discussions about panel data techniques for research on inequality and voting patterns. Review of results post-discussion.

Robert Marisco: Email and in person discussion and explanation about appropriate research design and anova methodology for an upcoming research project

Jane Bokunewicz: Email, phone and in person meetings. Explanations about suitable statistical methods for dissertation research and review of results in fall 2012. Explanation of regression methodology in spring 2013 for research work supported by the Levenson Institute of Gaming.

Mary Padden: Meet to discuss appropriate methodology for research project.
Dr. Deb Figart, IFD Faculty Fellow: Scholarly Activity Fellow, Summary of Activities, 2012-2013

In my 2012-2013 application to serve as an IFD Fellow, I proposed to be a research mentor and named my specific fellowship as “Scholarly Activity Fellow.” In the proposal, I anticipated that I would prepare 1 – 2 general presentations (with PowerPoint slides available through the IFD) on writing refereed journal articles and understanding the editorial process. I also anticipated discussing how to serve as a successful referee, a prerequisite for being invited to join an editorial board. Secondly, I proposed that in addition to the general presentations, the research mentor would need to devote time to meet with faculty colleagues one-on-one to help guide them based on their individual discipline and situation(s). I listed some topics that I would be able to cover as a research mentor:

- How to select an appropriate journal (“fit”) and what to know about a journal before submitting
- Preparing the best manuscript for review: style guidelines, length, grammar, etc.
- Understanding peer review: double- vs. single-blind, editorial board review vs. outside review, etc.
- Understanding the editorial process: “desk” rejections by the editor, selection of reviewers, timing of reviews, backlog prior to publication
- Interpreting the contents of a letter from the editor, especially a “revise and resubmit” letter (there are various kinds), and how to respond to the referees and the editor
- Researching the quality of a journal, and understanding alternate measures of quality, e.g. rankings and acceptance rates; how to gauge the “impact” of a journal article, e.g. citations
- If writing a book chapter, how to ascertain if it is peer reviewed and guides to assessing the quality of the book and the publisher
- If invited to be a referee, how to write a an effective referee report

It was a pleasure to be selected and to serve as the Scholarly Activity Fellow in 2012-2013. I accomplished what I proposed. Specifically:

- I delivered a new faculty workshop on November 21, 2012. The workshop was open to all faculty and we had an over-flowing room of roughly 28 faculty in attendance. The topic was just as I proposed: getting published in refereed journals and negotiating the editorial process. The presentation was followed by a lively Question & Answer session. The list of revised post-Hurricane Sandy workshops in on the IFD website at http://intraweb.stockton.edu/eyos/page.cfm?siteID=187&pageID=4. In addition, the IFD had this presentation videotaped and has made a CD available for faculty.
- In order to have a more, long-term and sustainable document to help faculty through the journal selection and editorial process, I spent numerous hours drafting and polishing a White Paper titled “Journal Citation Indexes and Journal Quality”, published on the IFD website at http://intraweb.stockton.edu/evos/infactdev/content/docs/Journal%20Citation%20Indexes%20and%20Journal%20Quality.pdf. I gave a very brief summary of the White Paper at a Deans’ Council meeting and answered any questions. IFD Director Heather McGovern notified the faculty about where to locate it online and urged my faculty colleagues to review it.
- As anticipated, I met one-on-one in face-to-face meetings (n = 7) with faculty about their research, and followed up with email. The topics we discussed in 2012-2013 meetings included: how to read referee reports and editor cover letters after the first submission (tailored to faculty individual letters and cases); how to divide up research in various parts for various journals and book chapters; how to look up scholarly impact factors as well as journal quality for specific journals (tailored to individual faculty in their discipline); how to write a cover letter back to the editor after revising a manuscript; single versus co-authorship; editing a journal special issue; and how to approach a publisher about writing a scholarly book. I kept a Logbook of my meetings and shared the Logbook at the conclusion of my fellowship with IFD Director Heather McGovern. Heather and I had two discussions about whether to report the names of the faculty colleagues who met with me and sought guidance. We decided that my Logbook would be retained by the IFD so as not to either privilege or penalize faculty who did meet with me, or, in the reverse, those who chose not to take up this service.