

**Coulter Faculty Commons Review  
Western Carolina University**

**Report**

**Submitted by**

**Bruce Kelley, Ph.D., The University of South Dakota  
Janet Rice McCoy, Ph.D., Morehead State University  
Brian Gastle, Ph.D., Western Carolina University**

**I. Introduction**

The external program review for WCU's Coulter Faculty Commons was led by Bruce Kelley, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning and Associate Professor of Music at the University of South Dakota; Janet Rice McCoy, Interim Director of the Center for Leadership and Professional Development at Morehead State University and Associate Professor of Communication; and Brian Gastle, Professor of English at Western Carolina University.

**Description of visit length**

The Coulter Faculty Commons (CFC) Review began with a dinner meeting of the review team on Sunday, March 3, 2013, and continued with interviews and work sessions through mid-afternoon, Tuesday, March 5, 2013. A copy of the team's schedule is contained in Appendix A.

**Summary and description of meetings conducted by the review team**

The review team met with numerous constituencies during the evaluation of the CFC, including:

- Senior administrators from Academic Affairs (Note: Contrary to the printed schedule, the Provost was not available and was represented at the meetings by Associate Provost Carol Burton).
- Laura Cruz, Director of CFC.
- Members of other academic support units including Information Technology, Undergraduate Studies, Continuing Education, Writing and Learning Commons, and Student Affairs.
- Deans and Directors.
- Members of CFC Staff.
- Members of Faculty.
- Members of e-Learning Community.

The review team used a similar protocol for each meeting:

- Introduction of the review team.
- Introduction of each participant.
- Each participant was asked to give a brief description of how s/he interacts with the CFC and its staff.
- Each participant was asked to describe the strengths of the CFC.

- Each participant was asked to describe, from their perspective, the challenges facing the CFC.
- Each participant was asked to make observations about opportunities for improvement or change in regards to the CFC.
- Each participant was asked to share any final comments.

Throughout each interview, members of the review team asked questions and sought clarifications from participants. Each review team member took notes, and these notes were integrated into this report. One concern noted by the review team was that although almost 35% of the services the CFC provides are to students, no student groups were included in this review process.

## II. Analysis of Program

### Primary functions of the unit

The vision statement of the Coulter Faculty Commons sets an extraordinarily high goal—to be the “vanguard of instructional and professional development in higher education.” Their mission statement is also well-defined. It identifies both the how and who for reaching this vision. The strategy of the CFC is to provide “collaborative, innovative, and confidential support for faculty, staff, and programs in the pursuit of instructional and professional excellence.” The unit’s guiding principles further define who is served by identifying the CFC as an advocate for “faculty, instructional staff, graduate students, programs and other academic units.”

It is important to note undergraduate students were not mentioned as a *direct* recipient of services in the vision statement, mission statement, strategic directions, or guiding principles of the CFC. Undergraduate students were directly mentioned as receiving “limited service” in the *Administrative Program Review: Coulter Faculty Commons* (Spring 2013, pg. 6). Furthermore, students benefit directly whenever the CFC helps faculty “to do what they do better” (pg. 10).

The CFC adopted a new set of strategic directions in Spring 2013 including:

1. To promote transformative practices in teaching, scholarship, instructional technology, and student development.
2. To leverage partnerships, both on and off campus, to support the academic mission of the university.
3. To provide frameworks for supporting innovative, distinctive, and responsive pedagogy.
4. To advocate for effective integration on instructional, professional, and organizational practices.

This move has expanded the strategic scope of the CFC while also aligning it with an emerging trend to integrate organizational development into the field of faculty development as discussed by Schroeder in *Coming In from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change* (2011).

The review team identified strategic planning is an integral part of the CFC's success. When taken together, the statements listed above guide the strategic planning process for the Center.

The CFC also strategically supports the institutional mission of WCU at all levels—from individual instructional faculty to institutional initiatives. The provision of confidential support to reflect on and enhance teaching was frequently mentioned by both CFC personnel and those they serve as one of the most important functions of the Center. Faculty in particular identified the Small Group Analysis process as especially useful since it provides student feedback during the semester while there was still time to make mid-course corrections. Other faculty mentioned they appreciated the opportunity to reflect on their teaching by co-authoring journal articles with Coulter staff, particularly Director Laura Cruz.

The CFC also supports WCU's institutional initiatives such as the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for re-accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The CFC actively supports the QEP by providing logistical assistance and by promoting a campus climate that embraces Boyer's model for scholarship. While infrequently mentioned directly, those interviewed positively cited a number of CFC-sponsored activities that are directly related to the QEP, including the eBriefcase initiative, SOTL events, and the Provost's Scholars Program. More importantly, the CFC is supporting the QEP by creating a safe place where faculty members believe they can receive instructional training and non-judgmental feedback to support their teaching.

The CFC also plays an important system-wide role in WCU's response to the UNC Tomorrow Report. Areas of note include:

- Implementing the Boyer model of scholarship campus-wide through professional development opportunities focusing on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the Scholarship of Engagement.
- Increasing the quality of educational programs by providing direct support for Blackboard across various learning modalities including face-to-face, hybrid, and on-line courses.

The CFC is aligned directly with the WCU mission through its support of excellence in teaching, learning, scholarship, instructional technology, and professional development. The CFC is exploring possible directions and initiatives to align with WCU's 2020 Strategic Plan currently under development. Potentially, the CFC will be a leader in:

- Providing professional development for employees including orientation, annual updates, and the campus leadership academy (Goal 4.2).
- Supporting scholarship and creative activities including appropriate and adequate institutional infrastructure (Goal 4.4).

The CFC is also uniquely positioned to partner on various WCU 2020 Strategic Plan goals due to its solid reputation for accomplishing tasks in a timely and professional manner while working across traditional institutional boundaries. The CFC could partner on goals such as delivering high quality academic programs, providing opportunities for interdisciplinary connections,

advocating for increased quality of teaching, providing opportunities for pedagogical innovation, and recognizing and celebrating professional achievements.

The CFC has identified other areas in their draft response to the WCU 2020 Strategic Plan where they could serve as a partner or contributor. As the university's new strategic plan is implemented, the CFC will need to be cautious so "mission creep" is avoided. Both the reviewers and those interviewed are concerned mission creep will dilute the effectiveness of the Center while simultaneously burning out the staff.

The primary unit functions, as identified in both the CFC Self-Study and by the interviews conducted during the site visit, are appropriate for faculty and staff who are the CFC's primary constituents. In addition, WCU's student body benefits from the CFC's steadfast support of instructional excellence. The CFC is operating in accordance with the "Ethical Guidelines for Educational Developers" established by their governing professional body, the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (see [http://www.podnetwork.org/faculty\\_development/ethicalguidelines.htm](http://www.podnetwork.org/faculty_development/ethicalguidelines.htm)).

### **Programming and services**

Within the last five years, the CFC was re-organized into three teams focusing on: (1) Scholarly Integration; (2) the Learning Management System; and (3) Digital Media and the Faculty Sandbox. Administrative, secretarial, and event planning personnel support these function-based teams. In addition, there is one Faculty Fellow who serves as editor of *MountainRise*, a bi-annual electronic journal dedicated to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

These functional teams, along with administrative and support personnel, work collaboratively to support the CFC's various constituencies and programs. The 2011-12 CFC Annual report lists six strategic goals (p. 3) guiding the programming and services the CFC offers:

- To advance research and innovation in Teaching and Learning.
- To expand faculty development to enhance student learning.
- To expand the role of the CFC as a central resource for support and information for all faculty both on and off campus.
- To facilitate the effectiveness and efficiency of technology in teaching and learning.
- To provide support or facilitate events and opportunities for collaboration and conversation among faculty and students.
- To support the successful implementation and fulfillment of University missions, goals, and objectives.

The programs and services have been evaluated in light of these strategic goals. The reviewers find the CFC advances research and innovation in teaching and learning by providing professional development opportunities related to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the Boyer model, including programming to support the QEP, UNC Tomorrow, and potentially the WCU 2020 Strategic Plan. The CFC has assessment tools in place to analyze faculty satisfaction with the Center's offerings including perceived impact on teaching. Assessment strategies are needed, however, to explore how professional development for faculty enhances

student learning. The CFC does facilitate conversations between faculty and students related to learning through the Small Group Analysis process. While time intensive, this assessment tool is highly valued by the instructional staff.

The evidence collected by the external review team supports the self-study and confirms the CFC's role as a central resource for support and information for the vast majority of WCU faculty. Faculty and staff we interviewed believed technology training through the Faculty Sandbox and support for Blackboard was especially useful. Faculty in our interviews often mentioned specific staff members by name and identified how they had gone above and beyond the call of duty. An area of concern, however, was mentioned when discussing the Faculty Sandbox. Sometimes the faculty who learned new software in the Sandbox did not have the same software version or necessary hardware available to duplicate the technology in their home department. The lack of standardization of software across campus was identified as a challenge impacting productivity.

In summary, we find the CFC offers a broad range of programming fully supporting the strategic goals listed above. The demand for CFC services has grown steadily over the past five years. The percentage of faculty who avail themselves of services provided by the CFC is impressive. Reaching 94% of the total faculty is well above national standards. The growth in the number of undergraduates using CFC services is positive generally speaking, but the reviewers did have concerns about how service to the primary constituents—the faculty—might be threatened by the growth in undergraduate service. At this time, the increasing service to undergraduate students seems to be slightly outside the goals of the unit.

### **Planning and assessment strategies**

Primary methods of assessment include event tracking through the Cherwell ticket system, customer service surveys, event assessment and an annual survey of faculty and other clients. It appears faculty and staff members participating in CFC activities have ample opportunities to assess the Center. These assessments show the CFC is being used as a resource by a large majority of the faculty, and faculty and other clients rate the CFC programs and services as effective. These data partially document that the services and programs are having the intended effect, but the reviewers recommend developing a series of outcomes-based measures to begin drawing a more direct link between participation in CFC activities and the effects listed in the vision statement, mission statement, strategic directions, and guiding principles.

### **III. Analysis of Staff**

#### **Qualifications**

The CFC is staffed by highly qualified professionals who hold the requisite credentials and skills and who are highly active professionally in areas related to the program's focus. Analysis of the staff is complicated somewhat by the diverse nature of the unit—some staff are associated primarily with pedagogy and scholarship support while other staff are associated primarily with technology support.

### **Director and Office Staff**

1. The CFC is led by Dr. *Laura Cruz*. Dr. Cruz is a tenured Associate Professor in the Department of History. Apart from her numerous publications in European history, Dr. Cruz is very active in the field of teaching and learning and faculty support, presenting at conferences and publishing on topics ranging from peer review of SOTL to the integration of pedagogical technologies.
2. Annette Parris, Office Manager/Event Planner, has been an administrative assistant at WCU since 2006 and was previously an office manager in the private sector for three years.

### **Pedagogy/Scholarship Staff**

3. *Dr. Robert Crow*, Coordinator of Instructional Development and Assessment, serves as the leader of the scholarship and teaching support personnel. Dr. Crow possesses a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology & Research and periodically teaches Educational Psychology for WCU's Department of Psychology. He has co-authored or authored numerous essays in peer-reviewed forums devoted to online teaching and learning.
4. *Freya Kinner*, Instructional Developer, possesses a M.A. in Educational Psychology and is ABD in Educational Research and Evaluation Methodology. She has several years of experience working with research projects in the sciences, social sciences, and education.
5. *Dr. Lee Crayton*, Research Support Specialist, holds a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice and maintains an active research agenda in Criminal Justice and Criminology. His prior experience includes grant-related projects and research technologies that are part of his duties at the CFC.

### **IT / LMS**

6. *Sue Grider*, Learning Management System Manager, holds a M.A. in Instructional Technology with several years of IT experience including LMS support and data management.
7. Jason Ottie, LMS Tier 2 Support Specialist/Project Manager, holds a B.A. in Information Science and is completing a M.A. in Educational Media. He maintains multiple software and hardware proficiencies, and he has received awards for his creative use of technology.
8. John Hawes, LMS Tier 1 Support Specialist, holds a B.A. with concentrations in Management, English and Computer Information Systems. He is working towards a M.A. degree in Space Studies and has several years of military experience in technology-related areas.

### **Digital Media / Faculty Sandbox Staff**

9. Jason Melvin, Digital Media Specialist, holds a B.A. of Music in Commercial and Electronic Music with a concentration in the Recording Arts, a minor in Digital Communications Engineering Technology, and Apple Final Cut Pro 7 Level One

Certification. His past experience includes several publically deployed digital media pieces.

10. Johnny Penley, Instructional Training Specialist, holds a M.A. in English, has worked on video and media projects, and has taught for WCU during the integration of the eBriefcase. Of all the IT/LMS support staff, Mr. Melvin is the only one without educational credentials directly related to IT, but his education and training are sufficient and appropriate given his duties as support specialist for areas such as social media, eBriefcase and website maintenance.

### **Related Personnel**

11. Mark Mattheis, Faculty Fellow for Publications.
12. Kristina Hargett, Graduate Student Assistant.

### **Resources and support**

Institutional support for the CFC is strong. The staff is evaluated regularly using the university's standard performance evaluation model, a rigorous evaluation of project work, professional development goal setting, and input from other campus constituencies. The CFC staff is evaluated on these four sets of criteria two times per year.

The review team received feedback from some CFC staff that perceived salary inequity among the staff has created some tension. Most of the IT staff salaries are noticeably higher than other salaries in the unit, and the review team agreed that difference stems from the nature of market demand and disciplinary area. Most IT staff at WCU are already paid below market rates, as are most administrative and support staff. While the review team would certainly recommend competitive salaries across the board, CFC staff salaries do not appear to be inordinately differentiated given those market and institutional forces.

Given the IT support focus of the CFC, its technological resources are adequate but problematic. There is no refresh process in place to ensure the Center maintains current software and hardware versions to support all programs and faculty equally across campus. Again, this problem does not appear to be peculiar to the CFC at WCU—rather it is systemic throughout higher education.

### **Professional activity and service**

One of the strongest aspects of the CFC is its significant contributions to the field of teaching and learning. In particular, Dr. Cruz and Dr. Crow have published in reputable venues (*International HETL Review, Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, etc.*) and presented at notable conferences (HETL, POD, ISSOTL, SRFIDC, UNC TLT, ADEC, etc.)

Virtually all staff members appear to be participating in professional development opportunities at a level relatively uncommon among other support units at WCU. This level of engagement

appears to derive from the climate of professional development the CFC fosters as part of its institutional mission.

The staff also regularly participates in university service at multiple levels, from IT committees, to academic department support, to search committees. As stated elsewhere in this review document, the review committee was somewhat concerned the staff and the unit generally may be participating in too much of this type of university service beyond the confines of their institutional mission. For example, the recent Budget 101 training developed by the CFC represents significant university service, yet it has little to do with the CFC's primary mission focus to support teaching and learning.

#### **IV. Analysis of Operational Facilities and Budget**

##### **Facilities**

The CFC is located in Hunter Library with a main set of office space for staff cubicles, supplemental rooms for media development and meetings, and the Faculty Sandbox for direct implementation of faculty training and support. These facilities are adequate for the mission of the CFC, but pose some issues for its efficacy.

First, the staff are committed to privacy when working with faculty clients. Seeking support for teaching and learning can be traumatic for faculty, and this privacy is essential if the CFC is to maintain strong faculty relationships. Most support staff offices are open cubicles co-located adjacent to colleague cubicles thus making such privacy difficult at best. The CFC does have access to one closed room that could be available for client meetings. Currently though, that room is being used for storage. Enclosed office space for all CFC staff would certainly be appropriate and advisable, but perhaps not feasible given the current issues relating to space across campus.

Furthermore, the staff admitted to feeling somewhat marginalized by the geographic location of their space. While the Library offers an appropriate environment for the CFC, it is no longer central on campus, especially as WCU grows more and more towards the Millennial Campus. This very issue drove the Writing and Learning Commons to move to Belk in order to be more central, and more available, to student constituencies. A similar move might benefit the CFC, however the review team did not receive any significant feedback from faculty or other constituents that the location of the CFC was inordinately difficult to access, precluded participation in CFC events, or kept them from utilizing CFC services.

##### **Budget**

We believe the CFC has an adequate budget to fulfill its mission, although a full picture of the budget allocation is difficult to discern given the bifurcated nature of salaries (with some deriving from Academic Affairs and some from IT) and the various disciplinary standards involved.

Like most units, the bulk of the CFC's budget is devoted to salaries: a total of \$833,312 for the current (12-13) academic year. Of that total, 42% (\$350,632) is derived from IT in support of the integrative nature of the CFC (especially BB/LMS support) and 58% is derived from non-IT funds. This ratio has remained similar for the three years for which data was provided (47% / 53% for AY 11-12 and 44% / 56% for AY 10-11). These numbers suggest a great deal of support is being provided for the pedagogy/research mission of the CFC, although given the nature of instructional technologies it is perhaps unwise to disaggregate those two aspects of the CFC.

The CFC's operating budget has ranged from approximately \$38,200 to \$45,500, with a current allocation of \$43,000. This budget is dedicated primarily to event and program support. Smaller portions of the budget support staff professional development (conference registration and travel), search costs (four searches in 2012), office supplies, equipment and software. The support for staff professional development is commendable.

Of particular note are the cost-cutting measures the CFC has implemented recently to address budgetary constraints at the institution. Several faculty fellows, a digital media support position (RIF), and the Associate Director were all eliminated. The faculty we interviewed believed these were positive cost-cutting measures given the fiscal climate. The reviewers regularly received feedback from constituents that further cuts to the CFC budget would lead to the elimination of resources currently utilized by faculty across campus.

A cursory review of other faculty support centers (including integrated centers with IT support within the center) and other units on campus suggests the CFC is very well funded both for personnel (number of staff) and operating budget.

## **V. Summary of CFC's Strengths and Areas for Improvement**

### **General impression of the CFC**

The CFC is broadly respected by faculty, staff and administration, and has a reputation for timely, quality work. The reviewers heard repeatedly the CFC was a unit that accomplished numerous tasks and responsibilities well. The staff of the CFC has a reputation for welcoming all who seek out their services, and finding solutions for just about any problem faculty might have. Their "WRAP" model of collaborative support clearly creates an atmosphere of openness and support.

In general, we find the CFC:

- offers a series of quality programs and services supporting its core mission;
- is ably led by a highly qualified administrator;
- is staffed by professionals who adhere to professional standards of integrity and who deliver highly-regarded programs and services;
- maintains adequate facilities and budget for *current* needs;
- faces challenges that are common to many faculty development centers; and
- faces a few challenges appearing to be unique to WCU.

We examine both the strengths and the challenges (areas for improvement) below, but our general impression is the CFC is operating at a high level of both effectiveness and efficiency, and is providing invaluable (and irreplaceable) services for WCU.

### **Overall areas of strengths**

The CFC has many areas of strength. A few of these strengths actually create additional challenges, which are described below. First, and most importantly, the Center serves its core constituency well. Faculty uniformly praised the work of the Center, and programs that were mentioned multiple times include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Summer Institute
- Research Assistance
- Blackboard Training
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Workshops
- Course Design Workshops

The most important resource the Center provides, however, are the one-on-one interactions with WCU's faculty. Faculty particularly value the CFC's "just in time" training that helps them resolve specific issues or needs as those concerns arise. Faculty trust the CFC, and see it as distinct from other administrative units, even those to which it reports and/or is closely linked. The CFC is viewed as one of the few university resources catering specifically to their needs.

The CFC is seen as a highly effective unit, not just by the faculty, but by administration as well. A variety of administrative units (IT, Undergraduate Studies, Continuing Education, the Writing and Learning Commons, Academic Affairs and the Chancellor's office, for example) utilize the CFC because of their ability to accomplish a variety of tasks well. Many of these units view the CFC as an important component of their own strategic goals. The Center plays an integral role, for example in providing training for and evaluation of the QEP. The CFC's ability to effectively collaborate with other units was mentioned numerous times, as was their ability to connect otherwise disparate units.

The CFC has strong processes in place to measure demand for services. The Cherwell ticket system provides a useful source of data on IT-related services, and the Involvement Database tracks non-IT related services. Other forms of assessment measure satisfaction with CFC programs and services, and the data indicate that the CFC is reaching a significant portion of WCU's faculty, and a large numbers of staff (particularly instructional staff), graduate students, and undergraduate students.

The CFC has a strong strategic vision and ambitious goals to be at the vanguard of instructional, professional, and organizational development. They are deeply committed to Schroeder's (2010) assertion that faculty development centers should act as institutional change agents. The CFC strives to play a central role in the effective integration of instructional, professional, and organizational practice, and will play an increasingly central role at WCU as the culture and pedagogical processes of higher education change in response to new and disruptive

technologies. The CFC is committed to supporting WCU's strategic vision as well, and has developed a thorough response to the WCU 2020 Strategic Plan.

Finally, the staff of the CFC is extraordinarily productive professionally. They have compiled an impressive list of publications, professional presentations, and service to national organizations.

### **Overall areas of improvement.**

The review team noted a number of areas of concern/improvement. Improvement in some of these areas is within the scope and capabilities of the CFC itself, others are beyond the immediate control of the Center.

*Mission creep/evolution.* Almost every constituency we talked with mentioned the expanding role of the CFC as an area of concern. The ability of the CFC staff to accomplish a variety of tasks well has made them the "go to" unit even for projects not tied directly to their core mission. Faculty are concerned the expanding role might make the Center less responsive to their needs and administrators are concerned greater responsibilities will incur greater costs and degrade current services. A number of people interviewed indicated a concern that staff are or soon will be stretched beyond their ability to effectively respond.

The CFC draft response to the 2020 Strategic Plan, for example, indicates a number of objectives where the CFC is listed as a "contributor", but where we feel they may actually take on the primary workload. Examples would be Initiatives 1.1.6, 1.2.5, and 4.2.4. To clarify, we are not advocating for an increased role, but are concerned the CFC may gradually take on a higher level of responsibility through mission evolution. We recognize the strategic vision of the CFC as an area of strength, but at the same time are concerned expanded responsibilities may detract from the quality of their work and their central mission to improve faculty teaching and student learning.

*Formalized lines of responsibility regarding IT and Academic Affairs.* The collaboration and mutual support of the CFC by both Academic Affairs and IT is seen as a general strength by the review team, but lines of communication and reporting seem blurred. There is confusion in areas such as who specifically reviews the Director's performance and how potential conflicts between IT and Academic Affairs should be resolved. No formal outline of role responsibility seems to exist, so for the protection of the Center, we recommend these lines of communication, reporting, and responsibility be more formally codified. The partnership between Academic Affairs, IT and the CFC currently works well because of existing personal relationships. The review team is concerned a change in leadership in any one of those areas might be disruptive and could leave the CFC vulnerable. We are also concerned the Director is asked to spend a significant amount of her time in leadership meetings with IT, but seems to have fewer opportunities to interact with leadership in Academic Affairs.

*Staff equity and workload.* The CFC staff appear to work well together and collaborate internally to quickly and effectively meet faculty, staff, and student needs. They are unequally compensated due to the IT/Academic Affairs split, and this has created some tension. This is a difficult issue, driven by marketplace values, yet it represents a potential fault line that may

threaten unit cohesiveness. The reviewers are also concerned about the workload of the staff. The productivity of the staff is impressive, but several constituencies voiced concerns the Director and staff may be attempting too much, and are concerned about staff morale and burnout.

*Technology standardization.* The decentralized nature of technology implementation at WCU complicates technology training. Programs that work at the CFC may not work in home departments, and the CFC is sometimes asked to provide support for programs that only a few faculty wish to use, and for which there may be better (and more standard) alternatives. This creates a very confusing environment for both the faculty and the CFC staff, and increases the complexity of individual technology training.

*Outcomes-based measures of assessment.* The core mission of the CFC is to provide collaborative, innovative, and confidential support for faculty, staff, and programs in the pursuit of instructional and professional excellence. Current measures of assessment, however, are limited by the kinds of data they generate. All faculty development programs face this challenge. It is difficult, if not impossible, to directly tie faculty development programs to improved student learning. The institution has data, however, that might enable the CFC to develop a broader and deeper understanding of their potential impact. Access to COACHE and aggregate SAI data, for example, may enable the CFC to better measure the effectiveness and impact of their services and programming. Individual faculty who use the Center may be willing to provide written permission for the Center to use their SAI data for the sole purpose of CFC improvement.

*Facilities.* The constituencies we met with expressed a variety of opinions about the quality and location of the space in which the CFC is located. There was a clear consensus the facilities could be improved, but less agreement on what improvements were needed. Faculty members believe proximity to the Center is an advantage, and faculty on the Millennial Campus report it is more difficult to access the Center's resources. The facilities of the CFC will need to be closely evaluated as the campus grows and the responsibilities of the CFC change. One issue that may need to be addressed is the lack of a private consultation space. Faculty who visit the Center's main office area may feel uneasy about the confidentiality of their conversations. There may be space in the current office configuration that could be repurposed as a consultation room to address this concern.

## **VI. Summary of Recommendations**

- Maintain the CFC's commitment to faculty development and to the improvement of teaching and student learning. It is the core strength of the unit.
- Carefully examine mission evolution in light of the first point. Certain responsibilities the CFC currently maintains, such as digital media support, confidential faculty P&T advisement, grant writing support, non-teaching support for graduate students, and media production unrelated to the Center's mission may need to be shifted to another campus unit.
- Formalize the relationship between the CFC, Academic Affairs, and IT including clarification of the role the CFC plays for each.

- Provide the CFC Director with greater access to Academic Affairs leadership meetings, and carefully balance the amount of time spent in IT leadership meetings.
- Provide the CFC with institutional data that can help them develop outcomes-based measures of assessment. We particularly recommend the CFC collaborate with the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to gain access to aggregate (not individual) data from the SEI.
- Create a dedicated consultation space within the CTL office that offers complete confidentiality.

Appendix A: Schedule for Campus Visit, CFC

**Administrative Program Review**

**for Coulter Faculty Commons - Campus Visit**

**March 3-5, 2013 – DRAFT 26-Feb-13**

**{Review Team Members – External Reviewers: Dr. Bruce Kelley (Chair) & Dr. Janet McCoy;  
Internal Reviewer: Dr. Brian Gastle}**

| <b>DATE/TIME</b>                    | <b>ACTIVITY</b>   | <b>LOCATION</b>   | <b>Conf.</b> |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| <b>Sunday, March 3<sup>rd</sup></b> |   |   |              |
| 3:49 PM                             | Dr. Bruce Kelley arriving at Asheville Regional Airport aboard United Airlines, Flight # 5290.  | Dr. Laura Cruz will meet Dr. Kelley at the airport and drive him to the WCU Campus.                             |              |
| 5:00 PM                             | Dr. Janet McCoy driving to campus from Morehead, KY   | Drs. Cruz and Kelley will meet Dr. McCoy on the WCU Campus then Dr. Cruz will escort the group to Madison Hall. |              |
| Sunday Evening                      | Dinner – External Reviewers   |   |              |
| <b>Monday, March 4<sup>th</sup></b> |   |   |              |
| 6:30 – 7:30 AM                      | Breakfast – External Reviewers  |   |              |
| 7:30 – 8:15 AM                      | Meeting with Review Team & Dr. Angela Brenton (Provost).  | 424 Stillwell   | 1/16/13      |
| 8:15 – 9:00 AM                      | Meeting with Review Team & Mark Lord, Interim Associate Provost.  | 424 Stillwell   | 1/16/13      |
| 9:05 – 9:55 AM                      | Meeting with Review Team & Dr. Laura Cruz (Director and Associate Professor of History) & Tour of CFC Facilities.   | 424 Stillwell   | 1/16/13      |
| 9:55 – 10:10 AM                     | Break   | 424 Stillwell   |              |
| 10:10 – 11:00 AM                    | Meeting with Review Team & Selected University Partners: William Frady (IT/Instructional Technology); Anna McFadden (IT/Academic Governance); Glenda Hensley (Undergraduate Studies/First Year Experience); Susan Fouts (Continuing Education); Chesney Reich (Writing & Learning Commons); Mike Corell (Student Affairs/Leadership). | 424 Stillwell   | 1/16/13      |
| 11:15 AM – 12:05 PM                 | Meeting with Review Team & Select Administrators: Carol Burton (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies); Richard Starnes (Interim Dean College of Arts & Sciences & Professor of History); Darrell Parker (Dean, College of Business); Judy Neubrander (Director, School of Nursing).  | 424 Stillwell   | 2/1/13       |

**Administrative Program Review**  
**for Coulter Faculty Commons - Campus Visit**

**March 3-5, 2013 – DRAFT 26-Feb-13**

**{Review Team Members – External Reviewers: Dr. Bruce Kelley (Chair) & Dr. Janet McCoy;  
 Internal Reviewer: Dr. Brian Gastle}**

| <u>DATE/TIME</u>                            | <u>ACTIVITY</u>   | <u>LOCATION</u> | <u>Conf.</u> |
|---|---|-----------------|--------------|
| 12:05 - 1:25 PM                             | Lunch Meeting – Review Team & Gene Loflin, Associate Provost at A-B Tech.   | Lulu's in Sylva |              |
| 1:25 - 2:15 PM                              | Meeting with Review Team, CFC Staff (minus Director): Lee Crayton (Faculty Research Support Specialist); Robert Crow (Instructional Developer); Sue Grider (Coordinator Of Technology); John Hawes (Tech Support Analyst); Freya Kinner (Instructional Developer); Jason Melvin (Tech Support Analyst); Jason Ottie (Tech Support Analyst); John Penley (Tech Support Analyst). | 424 Stillwell   | 1/22/13      |
| 2:30 - 3:20 PM                              | Meeting with Review Team & Craig Fowler, CIO  | 424 Stillwell   | 2/7/13       |
| 3:35 – 4:25 PM                              | Meeting with Review Team & Select Faculty Clients (Professional Development Focus): Elizabeth McRae (History); Bruce Henderson (Psychology); April Tallant (Health Sciences); Tom Salzman (Stage & Screen); Michael Smith (Kimmel School); Andrew Adams (Music).  | 424 Stillwell   | 2/7/13       |
| 4:30 – 5:00 PM<br>6:00 PM                   | Brief Work Meeting – Review team only<br>Dinner Break – External Reviewers  | 424 Stillwell   | 2/7/13       |
| <b><u>Tuesday, March 5<sup>th</sup></u></b> |   |                 |              |
| 7:00 – 8:00 AM                              | Breakfast – External Reviewers  |                 |              |
| 8:00 – 9:15 AM                              | Meeting with Review Team & Select Faculty Clients (E-Learning Focus): Regis Gilman (Interim Dean, Educational Outreach); Baxter Williams (School of Teaching and Learning); Cathy Gris (Human Services); Vittal Anantamula (College of Business); George Ford (Kimmel School); Jon Marvel (Management); Carrie Merritt (Criminology).   | 424 Stillwell   | 2/7/13       |
| 9:15 AM – 11:00 AM                          | Work Meeting – Review team only (Note: Dr. Gastle will be teaching his class from 9:30 – 10:45, but will re-join the group for the lunch meeting @ 11:00).  | 424 Stillwell   | 2/7/13       |
| 11:00 AM – 12:30 PM                         | Lunch Meeting with Review Team & Melissa Wargo, David Onder.  | TBD             | 1/22/13      |
| 12:30 PM – 1:30 PM                          | Exit Meeting with Cruz, Lord, Fowler,   | 424 Stillwell   | 1/17/13      |

**Administrative Program Review**

**for Coulter Faculty Commons - Campus Visit**

**March 3-5, 2013 – DRAFT 26-Feb-13**

**{Review Team Members – External Reviewers: Dr. Bruce Kelley (Chair) & Dr. Janet McCoy;  
Internal Reviewer: Dr. Brian Gastle}**

| <b><u>DATE/TIME</u></b> | <b><u>ACTIVITY</u></b>   | <b><u>LOCATION</u></b>                                 | <b><u>Conf.</u></b> |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------|
|                         | Wargo, Onder & Review Team.  |  |                     |
| 2:00 PM                 | Dr. Kelley & Dr. McCoy return home.  | Lee Crayton will drive Dr. Kelley back to the airport. |                     |
| 4:14 PM                 | Dr. Kelley departing Asheville Regional Airport aboard United Airlines, Flight # 5290. |  |                     |

**DRAFT**