Program Review of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development

Michigan State University

Review Team

Ann E. Austin, Chair
Professor, Higher Adult, and Lifelong Education
Michigan State University

Steve Abel
Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Bucke Professor of Pharmacy Practice
Purdue University

David Langley
Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
University of Minnesota

November 11, 2013

Program Review of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development

Michigan State University

November 11, 2013

Review Team: Ann E. Austin (Chair), Steve Abel, and David Langley

Background

Michigan State University (MSU) invited Steve Abel (Purdue), Ann Austin (Michigan State), and David Langley (University of Minnesota) to conduct a program review of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development (F&OD) in September 2013. The last program review had been conducted in 2003. Ann Austin served as a member of the 2003 review team and was designated as chair for the current review team.

The team received a summary overview of the planned review in August 2013. This overview articulated details related to the previous review and provided a synopsis of resources for reviewers. The invitation for the review requested assessment of the work of F&OD to date, as well as feedback to help F&OD shape its future.

F&OD provided an in-depth orientation to its comprehensive program of faculty and organizational development for the team. The orientation for the review team began with a narrated PowerPoint describing the multiple programs and services offered through F&OD. In addition to the narrated PowerPoint, reviewers received a comprehensive notebook pertaining to programs and services to be evaluated during the program review. Specifically, the shared content included the following:

- Chapter 1: Introduction. *An overview of F&OD, the rationale for a program review at this time, action items since the 2003 review (with outcomes), and a history of changes in higher education at MSU and in F&OD leadership and staff since the previous review. This section concluded with a summary of accomplishments, challenges, and a vision for the future.*

- Chapter 2: F&OD Mission Statement

- Chapter 3: What Evidence Exists that F&OD is Fulfilling its Current Mission? *Detailed information and evidence concerning the effectiveness of F&OD in meeting its current mission.*

- Chapter 4: Challenges and Opportunities. *Summary of challenges and opportunities with a specific emphasis on budget, staff, space, and new directions. This section concluded with specific recommendations for resources to support additional staff, technology, instructional grants, expanded Faculty Learning Communities and Leadership Learning*

Communities, a Fellowship cohort program promoting interdisciplinary teaching and learning, and space.

- Chapter 5, Appendices reflective of F&OD Programs and Services. *Descriptions of F&OD programs and services such as orientation, faculty and instructional development programs, organizational and leadership development programs, community building and scholarship resources. Resources accessed through D2L supplemented the information included in this chapter.*

- Chapter 6: Program Introduction and PowerPoint (previously mentioned). *Slides corresponding to the narrative PowerPoint overview of F&OD.*

- Chapter 7: Table of Contents leading Reviewers toward Supplemental Information contained in the D2L website. *A table of contents for the program review.*

- Chapter 8, Program Review Materials. *The review schedule and other details related to the on-campus review process.*

The initial charge to the F&OD Program review team was provided by Theodore H. (Terry) Curry II, Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources, MSU. Responses to the following questions were requested:

1. What is/should be the mission and strategic direction of F&OD at MSU looking forward over the next decade given:
    a. The vision, direction, and priorities of the University
    b. The expected budget climate
    c. Current and future trends and demands for peer research intensive public universities

2. How is F&OD positioned to succeed over the next decade? Please consider:
    a. Its performance versus mission over the past decade
    b. Its structure, size and staffing
    c. Its programming – faculty, leadership, and organizational development
    d. Its accomplishments – and areas in need of improvement

3. What does the MSU Provost need to know to best support F&OD so that it can effectively support the academic mission of the University?

The charge was further clarified through discussions at the start of the on-campus team visit with Terry Curry as well as with Interim Provost June Youatt. These conversations conveyed a clear message that the review process should evoke creative and innovative assessment resulting in recommendations reflecting the opportunity to envision and develop new models and roles for F&OD.

While preparing for the review process, the review team met by telephone and email to discuss the process, team members' roles and responsibilities, and issues of particular interest. Through this interactive process, the following was accomplished:

- Development of questions to guide interviews with senior leadership, "users" of F&OD programs and services, early career faculty, and F&OD staff.

- Development of an inclusive table summarizing F&OD programs and services, including details on target audiences, dates established, and current status (active or inactive) which was reviewed and updated by Dr. Deborah DeZure, Assistant Provost for F&OD.

- Comprehensive, independent assessment by each member of the review team of the background materials provided for the review, including online resources available via D2L.

On the evening of September 22, the review team participated in a dinner meeting with Terry Curry to set the stage for the onsite process. Following dinner, team members met as a group to discuss strategy and logistics relating to the process itself. (The agenda for the site visit is available in Appendix A.)

On September 23 and 24, the review team met with individuals and groups including senior institutional administrators, faculty and administrators who had participated in programs offered by F&OD, deans and chairs who have members of their units who have participated in F&OD programs and who themselves have participated in programs, individuals serving as Faculty Excellence Advocates in the Colleges, the staff and student employees of F&OD, the F&OD Advisory Board, and a sample of faculty members who have chosen not to participate in the offerings of F&OD. (See the interview protocols in Appendix B.) Dr. DeZure had assisted the review team by extending invitations prior to the visit to the many individuals across campus who have been involved in F&OD programs or who serve in other relevant roles. While those interviewed were initially contacted by the F&OD Office, they were assured, at the start of each interview and focus group, that their comments would be considered confidential and that all results would be reported in aggregate form (with the exception of the comments from the President and Provost about the priorities of the University, made in the context of their official roles). Some faculty members and administrators had indicated they would be away from campus on the scheduled site visit days. They were sent an electronic survey form and invited to return it prior to the visit, which a number did.

The review team met on the evening of Monday, September 23, to review and discuss emerging themes and to begin to highlight points to share in the debriefing scheduled as the last appointment of the site visit. The team met again on Tuesday morning, September 24 to further refine the initial observations and points to share at the debriefing later that day.

During the three weeks after the site visit, the team conducted interviews by teleconference with several senior institutional leaders who were not on campus during the site visit days. At least two members of the review team were involved in each of these calls. The team also worked closely in the weeks after the site visit to prepare this report, which represents the team's collaborative perspectives.

Each member of the team thoroughly examined the extensive self-study materials and was actively engaged in the on-campus visit and all additional work involving analysis, consultation, and writing. The team also accepted the invitation with an understanding that thoughtful program reviews include analyses of the accomplishments of the unit under study, responses to

the specific review questions posed, and the responsibility to provide perspectives and suggestions for how the unit can build on its work to move productively into the future.

The report is organized in several sections:

- An overview of the achievements of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development. This overview discusses noteworthy accomplishments of the office and also highlights specific features of selected programs. Detailed analyses of attendance and summaries of program evaluations of users' perspectives which have been conducted by F&OD are available in the extensive self-study prepared by the Office.

- Discussion of the changing context in which F&OD conducts its work. This analysis outlines contextual factors that impact options, opportunities, and challenges about the future of F&OD.

- Discussion of key opportunities and challenges facing F&OD, followed by recommendations and action steps. This section highlights issues that the leadership of F&OD, as well as the senior leadership of the university, should consider in looking forward. We then present a set of recommendations along with specific suggested action steps.

Achievements of Faculty and Organizational Development

In addition to the extensive self-study document that outlined the accomplishments of F&OD, our interview protocol allowed us to probe respondents about the contributions F&OD has made to achieve University priorities. Particular strengths and benefits of various programs and services were requested in every interview.

There was remarkable consistency in the evidence we uncovered, and it is noteworthy that the program reviewers independently arrived at the same conclusions during the interview process. We filter and organize our comments in relation to six criteria of success, described below. These six criteria were used for over 20 years at a sister university in the CIC as a tool for examining program success. While these criteria were not specified prior to F&OD's work on the self-study report, they were familiar to one member of the committee, and we felt they were a useful way to organize our discussion of the accomplishments of F&OD for the current review process. Following the chart below, we discuss in detail each of these criteria in relation to F&OD.

Criteria for Success	F&OD programs and services:
1. Centrality to Mission/Priorities of MSU	are more highly valued if they contribute significantly to the core mission of Michigan State University. This criterion involves the alignment of F&OD with the University's teaching mission and with priorities/goals established by MSU administration that would be the natural province of the portfolio of F&OD.

2. Quality and Impact	should meet standards of high quality and noticeable impact on University functioning. Evidence of success should be persuasive and plausible in relation to data that faculty development and teaching centers typically accumulate.
3. Distinctiveness and Comparative Advantage	should demonstrate that they have characteristics that make them an exceptional and unique strength for MSU. Innovation is a key driver of success in this criterion. In addition, while national standards of success for teaching centers do not exist, evidence of comparability in programming with peers should be elicited.
4. Enhancement of Academic Partnerships	should be organized to promote and facilitate synergies across academic units and leverage the capacities of support units (e.g., technology) that naturally align with faculty development and teaching centers.
5. Demand	should demonstrate high demand for the suite of offerings available for faculty, staff, and administrators. Demand is a natural result of a unit that has developed comprehensive services appealing to a wide segment of the academic community.
6. Efficiency and Leveraging of Resources	should demonstrate efficiency in their operation. Success in this realm is associated with both good use of financial resources and robust workloads for staff assigned to the unit.

Criteria 1: Centrality to Mission/Priorities of MSU

Effective institutional centers focused on faculty and organizational development must ensure they are responsive to the emerging needs of the university. The evidence is strong that F&OD has fulfilled its mission to provide a comprehensive array of professional development opportunities for faculty members, academic staff, and academic administrators. In particular, F&OD has addressed the multiple missions of the University and the needs of faculty members and administrators across the span of their careers. Based on the self-study document and our observations, we conclude also that F&OD has done much to align itself with the stated priorities of MSU within the broad umbrella outlined in *Bolder by Design*. Specifically, the self-study provides convincing evidence that F&OD programs and initiatives contribute to the *Bolder by Design* priorities of Enhancing the Student Experience, Expanding International Reach, and Advancing the Culture of High Performance. F&OD's mission statement and practices also involve a wide array of faculty members and administrative leaders at the University, a goal for any high-performing organization that expects its workforce to be in a constant state of renewal.

Later in this report we offer suggestions for ways in which F&OD can deepen and refine its attention to the mission and priorities of the University as it plans for its future. Regular strategic discussions that address the balance between faculty/instructional development and organizational development will keep F&OD on the cusp of new priorities articulated by the MSU administration and should be part of ongoing planning.

With impressive consistency, participants and institutional leaders acknowledge the exceptionally high quality and impact of the programs F&OD offers, the wide spectrum of important issues addressed, and the value added for individuals who have participated. A significant number of those interviewed commented on the portfolio of programs, citing the range, scope, and robustness of the programs and services, the responsiveness to requests from senior administrators, deans, chairs, and individual faculty members, and the willingness of the unit to work with a wide array of constituency groups. Those interviewed offered many comments about the consistent high quality of F&OD programs and services.

Signature programs abound in F&OD, and a number have a long history of success and impact. For example, the Lilly Teaching Fellows Program now has 24 years of program participants (approximately 150 MSU faculty) who have been rigorously exposed to the scholarship of teaching and learning and have deepened their pedagogical skills accordingly. The consistent report from former Lillies, Chairs, and Deans is that those who have had this experience are resource people and "change agents" within their departments, colleges and the broader university. Former Lilly Fellows participate in an on-going network with others who have had the experience, and they often function as university citizens as well as formal or informal leaders in their colleges. These individuals often mentioned that Dr. DeZure stays in touch with them, recommends them for other opportunities, and serves as an ongoing mentor.

Those who have participated in the Adams Academy are as enthusiastic in their praise for the opportunity and its impact as are the former Lilly Fellows. Adams Fellows speak of the strong message the program conveys regarding the importance of fixed-term faculty members to the mission of the University. As one former Adams Fellow explained, the experience "gives you a sense of empowerment, which is important because you sometimes feel that you are a second-class citizen in your college… it gives you colleagues, possibilities, collaborations." Participants frequently commented that the Adams Fellowship gave them confidence and validation in their teaching and work and a sense of being appreciated within the University community.

One noteworthy outcome of the Lilly and Adams Programs is the wide "ripple impact" on the campus. Participants said they share what they have learned with colleagues as well as with graduate students. Our interviews with both the Lilly Program and the Adams Academy participants revealed passion, commitment, and a strong desire to "give back" to the MSU community based on their experience. Harnessing even more fully this energy, commitment, and expertise among participants in these signature programs offers interesting possibilities as F&OD plans for the future.

The LEAD seminars and the CIC Academic Leadership Program are additional examples of highly rated programs that are changing the leadership culture at MSU. Participants as well as senior institutional leaders praise these programs for providing training "where administrators are" and helping them move to "where they need to be." In our interviews with Chairs, they were unanimous in their praise for the resources that have been provided to them through F&OD-sponsored programs. Several commented that their experiences elsewhere and conversations with colleagues at other universities have led them to realize that the level of support they are receiving for professional development exceeds what is typically available elsewhere. Their conclusion is that the Leadership Seminars are "absolutely critical" resources for learning and

handling their responsibilities as institutional leaders. They specifically appreciate the networks that are formed with colleagues to whom they can turn for support, the open and ready access to Dr. DeZure as well as to Associate Provost Curry and Director Paulette Granberry Russell when they have questions, and the detailed resources provided to them (e.g., sample letters for disciplinary action or retirement arrangements).

The Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) also make an impact through the opportunities they offer for groups to work together on specified projects. Among the faculty participants with whom we talked, a significant number are very enthusiastic about the work they have accomplished (e.g., the textbook targeted to STEM faculty about developing writing through science) and the collaborations and colleagueship cultivated within the FLCs that enrich participants' teaching and scholarly work. These communities seem to have high impact for relatively modest institutional financial investment.

F&OD programs offer a path for faculty members and administrators to grow and progress over the course of time and their careers. As a set, the programs support the complexity and diverse dimensions of faculty and administrative careers. The orientations for new faculty and administrators and the "one-off" workshops serve to attract interest in the opportunities and offerings of F&OD and provide a path to other professional development options. The Summer Institute and the initial leadership programs for faculty members cultivate deeper interest in either teaching issues or leadership topics. The cohort programs—such as the Lilly Program, the Adams Program, the CIC Academic Leadership Program, and the Faculty Learning Communities —provide opportunities for longer-term commitment to and involvement in professional development. During the course of the interviews we conducted, we heard faculty members and administrators praise the suite of programs for the personal growth opportunities they afforded, the "just-in-time support" (such as that provided to new administrators), and the various outcomes that enrich the University (such as the classroom enrichment and curriculum development resulting from some of the Lilly Fellows' projects and the Faculty Learning Communities).

A key element in the excellence associated with F&OD is the quality of the unit's staff, about which many faculty members and administrators expressed much admiration and appreciation. We heard praise for Dr. DeZure's communication abilities, teaching talents, knowledge of the higher education literature and resources, networking skills, and vision. We also heard many testimonies about the dedication, hard work, and professionalism of all members of the F&OD staff.

To summarize, the most consistent message heard by the review team involved the *quality* of F&OD programs and services and the commitment of the leadership and staff of the unit. Uneven quality is not unusual at faculty development and teaching centers across the country; it is a byproduct of the inability to match expectations between participants and providers. In contrast, we heard—loud and clear—that high quality information, evidence-based practices, and a desire to "get it right" are hallmarks of F&OD operations.

Criteria 3: Distinctiveness and Comparative Advantage

F&OD has excelled at pursuing innovation through constant efforts to improve the unit's programs and services, aggressive expansion of programs when necessary, and timely additions

to their suite of offerings. In fact, some participants with long history at MSU specifically noted the programs have evolved in positive ways over time, becoming more interesting and useful. Many of the programs and resources of F&OD are recognized as being exceptionally innovative and important, including the Lilly Program, the Adams Program, the LEAD Program, and the Online Instructional Resources (OIR) provided on the F&OD website.

Indeed, we believe there are many points of excellence in F&OD. What is particularly distinctive about F&OD operations, as compared to what is available at many universities, appears to be:

- The scope and quality of its leadership and mid-career faculty programs compared to those typically offered at many faculty development centers
- The capacity for voluminous, comprehensive, and influential programs and services in light of the small staff size
- The national and international presence of F&OD in its online resources, scholarly writing, and award-winning programs, and
- An evidence-based approach that contributes to and is informed by research findings. (The research conducted by F&OD has won respect within the University and attracted praise and recognition from well-informed leaders in the field of professional development and scholars in higher education nationwide.)

The evidence is compelling that F&OD is seen nationally and internationally as an exemplar of high-quality, innovative, responsive, and comprehensive faculty and leadership development. The work accomplished by F&OD is perceived as setting the bar and inspiring and guiding other institutions (as evidenced by awards F&OD has received, and the visits, workshops, and resources requested by other institutions—including from those in the international arena).

Criteria 4: Enhancement of Academic Partnerships

University faculty development centers have the potential to be hubs for partnerships that extend across support units, colleges, schools, and departments. F&OD is well-connected to many colleges and departments, as well as to such institutional units as the Graduate School and the Office of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Beyond individual impact, F&OD has had a major impact on the whole University's culture and practices. Specifically, the programs and resources of F&OD have created a large network of colleagues across the colleges and units of MSU with considerable knowledge of high-impact, evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning and to effective leadership. These colleagues constitute an institutional resource with the skills and abilities to help guide and lead the institution as it faces the significant challenges confronting higher education today.

F&OD also has played a significant role in helping departments, colleges, other units, and the University to effectively address curriculum design, mentoring new colleagues, establishing approaches for supporting the vitality of mid-career faculty, and ensuring wide knowledge of such issues as ensuring the safety of minors and creating inclusive environments. A number of Department Chairs with whom we talked highlighted their appreciation for the work that F&OD has done directly with their departments (e.g., offering tailor-made workshops on teaching issues, working on topics with their Departmental Advisory Committees, or assisting in the design of mentoring programs).

Our interviews with the Deans of MSU Colleges highlighted their appreciation of the F&OD connections to the Provost and Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources, which assist in the flow of information to Deans and Chairs (particularly through the LEAD Conversations with the President and Provost, which F&OD facilitates). Throughout the interviews, we heard respondents emphasize the importance of the connectivity among colleagues across departments and units that F&OD fosters through their workshops and cohort programs, as well as the specific efforts provided by Dr. DeZure in connecting individuals to each other around shared interests. Interviews with F&OD collaborators also pointed toward the Faculty Learning Communities that have flourished based on joint sponsorship between F&OD and other units. A Department Chair noted that F&OD "connects the University …. [which is important since] the University is enormous and it is very easy to be isolated." This Chair also reiterated that F&OD provides "a way for faculty and administrators to experience the University as a whole." Not a single member of the interview groups mentioned partnerships with F&OD that were unproductive or that did not have a satisfying conclusion.

One way in which F&OD connects with other units and gathers information on institutional needs is through its Advisory Board. We met with current and past Board members who were unanimous in reporting that they perceived their work on the Board to be an excellent use of their time. They mentioned that meetings were always managed effectively and productively with clear expectations and specified results. They also saw their involvement as providing them with opportunity to engage in interesting questions significant to the University and their own work. They view themselves, by virtue of their membership on the Advisory Board, as "ambassadors to the institution," thus creating more linkages for F&OD and providing a conduit for ideas and needs to reach the F&OD staff.

Criteria 5: Demand

Successful faculty development centers are highly sensitized to changing market demands for their services and programs. Leadership acumen is needed to know when fluctuations in attendance are temporary and contextual, versus being a "sea change" in the needs of colleges, schools, and departments. Based on ongoing scanning of institutional priorities and national trends, F&OD has developed an impressive suite of offerings that are tracked regularly. Some programs have been sustained for many years (e.g., instructional development seminars, orientations). Some are newer and are poised for possible deeper investment (e.g., LEAD seminars, Leadership Learning Communities). The extensive data available in the self-study is enviable in its attention to detail and delivery of facts on the depth and breadth of F&OD offerings.

Criteria 6: Efficiency and Leveraging of Resources

One of the most obvious characteristics of F&OD noticed during our review was the volume of work produced by one of the smallest faculty development centers in the country relative to university size. Furthermore, most faculty development or teaching centers do not also include a focus on organizational development. Our observations and the regular perceptions of our interviewees confirmed the assertions of F&OD's self-study: the small number of staff in F&OD is able to produce robust and extensive programs and services that exceed in number and quality what might be reasonably expected from the number of professional and support staff in the unit. To be clear, F&OD is not the sole provider of professional development at MSU, but its

place is particularly visible and it is most comprehensive in the scope of its work. Financial resources at F&OD are typically stretched to the maximum, and we have been impressed with the capacity of the staff to distribute resources creatively where needed.

The Changing Context and Circumstances in which F&OD Conducts its Work

At the same time FOD has systematically and creatively carried out its mission over the past decade, the context within which that work occurs has changed in significant ways since the last program review ten years ago--with major implications for F&OD. Additionally, the circumstances for F&OD as a university unit have also changed. These factors should be considered in envisioning future directions for F&OD, and include the following:

The changing context for higher education: Major forces are affecting all higher education institutions and creating new challenges and opportunities for the university and its faculty members and administrators. These factors include:

- The changing needs and expectations of an increasingly diverse student body;
- The opportunities and challenges accompanying the expansion of technology, including online teaching and learning, and innovative and "disruptive" technologies and delivery options such as MOOCs;
- The growing expectations facing higher education institutions from the public, including parents, legislators, and parents; and
- The increasing demands for accountability coupled with efficiency.

What is certain is that faculty members and administrators must be agile, responsive, creative, innovative, and effective; their roles are changing and evolving. These changes and expectations mean ongoing professional learning will be an essential part of their work lives. Within the University, the demand for professional learning is growing, according to many faculty members and administrators we interviewed. Early career faculty members want support as they work toward tenure. Non-tenure-track, fixed-term faculty members want to enhance their abilities to respond to work expectations. New administrators recognize the learning curve is high and want support. Experienced administrators realize the terrain is changing and their professional skills must stay apace. All told, the need and demand for professional development for faculty members and administrators is certain to increase. As one member of our team observed, the expectation is increasing for "just in time, just enough, and just for me" professional development. The demand and need for systematic, accessible, responsive, and forward-looking professional development will only expand.

MSU as a High-Performing Organization: One of the key imperatives in *Bolder by Design*, MSU's strategic framework, is "to advance the culture of high performance." In our conversation with Provost Youatt, she reiterated that MSU is a "large, complicated, independent campus." Both the President and Provost indicated that, in such an institutional context, and in light of the implications of a changing external environment, the University's commitment to advancing a

culture of high performance involves commitment to high quality, to maximizing resources, and to creating successful, focused, and productive collaborations and partnerships. Both emphasized the importance of creating relationships and partnerships and bringing together people from different units whose joint expertise is needed in regard to specific challenges and opportunities. Organizational development is a key part of a high-performing organization—as is finding new ways to provide such support to administrative leaders and faculty members in an agile, networked, accessible way. MSU administrative leaders, including senior leaders and deans, expressed a strong recognition that professional development is critically important to the quality of the institution and to individual faculty members and institutional leaders. Of particular note, deans expressed willingness to support the allocation of institutional resources to provide such support.

Institutional network of faculty and academic leaders: Partly through the effective professional development opportunities available to faculty and leaders over the past decade, the university now has a solid network of talented faculty members and leaders who understand principles of effective teaching and learning, as well as principles of leadership, and who would like to share their experience with colleagues. This resource did not exist at this level a decade ago. In short, the successes and outcomes of FOD have contributed significantly to a new institutional context.

Limits to F&OD Capacity: There is wide consensus that FOD has reached the limits of its resources; that is, further expansion is not possible within the framework of current resources. Specifically, the F&OD self-study explicitly states that the current level of work with current resources cannot be sustained. In Dr. DeZure's words, "We have very real challenges to face, and we need and welcome new ways to approach them. We know that the status quo is not sustainable." In fact, virtually everyone with whom we have met recognizes that F&OD could not add additional programs within the current staffing context.

<div align="center">

The Opportunity and Challenge:
A Renewed Vision for Faculty and Organizational Development

</div>

F&OD, while praised for its many contributions and successes, cannot realistically continue its work with its current level of staffing. This recognition opens the door for the final section of this report which addresses the following questions:

- How should F&OD move into the next decade?
- What options will enable it to build on its significant successes and accomplishments?
- How might MSU find new ways to respond to current circumstances such as
    - the changing higher education context
    - the commitment of the University to advance as a high-performing organization
    - the increasing presence of administrators and faculty members with interests in sharing their talents, and
    - the current limits in its capacity to meet ever-growing institutional needs for professional and organizational development?

As Dr. DeZure wrote in the Conclusion to the Self-Study, "We hope, of course, that MSU will choose to reinvest in our program, enabling us to grow and continue to serve and support our MSU colleagues. But we are also open to recommendations to adjust or redefine our mission and our methods to better meet the needs of MSU, now and in the future. That is, after all, the goal of this endeavor."

We believe this is an opportune time for MSU leadership and F&OD staff to refresh and renew the vision and model for carrying out F&OD's mission of supporting the professional and organizational development needs of the University. As we have outlined, demands on faculty members are increasing as higher education institutions anticipate and respond to the needs and expectations of students and the broader public. Technological advances are rapidly changing the landscape for learning and for organizing the work of faculty members and administrative leaders. In the current volatile environment, institutions that are agile, forward-thinking, responsive, collaborative, and accountable are best poised to meet increasing demands. In short, as President LouAnna Simon has articulated, the university must continue to advance as a "high-performing institution." For the past decade, F&OD has provided admirable and significant contributions to support the work of MSU's faculty and administrative leaders. F&OD now has a unique opportunity to advance institutional priorities through a new "compact" with the University that leverages a wider base of support and new roles for F&OD staff.

The Self-Study Report concludes with a request for more staff and resources to enable F&OD to meet the ever-increasing calls for its services. Our review team recognizes and respects the rationale that led to this request. We believe that F&OD cannot sustain the range and depth of work that it is now doing with its current structure and level of resources. Rather than simply recommending the addition of new staff, however, we believe a strategy that offers more long-term benefit is needed. We recommend that University leaders (the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources, and the Assistant Provost for Faculty and Organizational Development) convene an appropriate task force to reconsider the over-all conceptualization and approach to faculty and organizational development at MSU. A starting point for the task force may well be the current report of the external review team.

The result of this process is expected to yield new approaches to organize the work of F&OD, new ways to collaborate with other units and individuals, and new uses of resources. While the task force could certainly suggest additional or reconfigured resources (e.g., personnel and staff, budget, space), these requests would be made in the context of designing a new role for F&OD to meet the changing needs of the University as it "advances a high-performing culture."

The strategic consideration we are recommending should address these key questions:

- What should be the mission of F&OD within the context of the University's current needs, priorities, and commitments as a "high-performing organization"?
- What should be the balance of attention to faculty development and organizational development within the F&OD portfolio?
- What should F&OD continue to do and what should it do differently, better, or not at all?
- What needs exist within the institution that should be addressed by F&OD, but are not currently being addressed?

- How can F&OD more fully include and address the interests and needs of those individuals and units that are not currently involved?

Below we highlight several specific issues and offer recommendations that emerged through the review process. We believe these issues should be considered in the context of envisioning the appropriate future for F&OD. Decisions or actions involving any particular issue are likely to have implications for other issues. We note also that F&OD cannot address or carry out these strategic steps without the collaborative investment of the Provost and Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources. In addition, the input of an appointed Task Force could be useful in designing a new vision for faculty and organizational development at Michigan State.

Recommendation 1: Consider new models for conceptualizing and organizing F&OD.

We recommend that a new model be conceptualized for F&OD's work in supporting faculty and organizational development at MSU. One model we heard from various respondents is the "air traffic controller model" in which F&OD identifies resources and programs across the campus, convenes conversations, facilitates collaborations, and guides faculty members, administrators, and units in finding the support they need. Those who suggested this model highlighted several important elements:

- Creating close and ongoing collaborations with many units and programs that provide services relevant to faculty and organizational development.
- "Coalescing people and encouraging conversations that they [F&OD] don't own," in the words of one senior administrator.
- Developing thematic approaches that emphasize university priorities.
- Putting more emphasis on delegating responsibilities, identifying resources, and facilitating shared programming efforts with somewhat less emphasis on "doing" programs (although some programming would certainly continue).

We highlight two specific ideas that respondents recommended for consideration. First, in the Graduate School, Dean Karen Klomparens has used an organizational model in which several faculty members serve as Associate Deans. She reports that this model enables her to delegate substantial responsibility for programs, an approach that contrasts with Dr. DeZure's commitment of personally handling much programming. Additionally, the involvement of respected faculty members enhances the credibility of the work of the Graduate School, and the colleagues serving in these roles appreciate opportunities for their professional development. While not necessarily less costly, the model has benefits worth considering, including the possibility of relieving some of the responsibilities currently falling directly on Dr. DeZure. This model does not alleviate the need for excellent and sufficient logistical and technological support. Faculty members can take on major responsibilities for conceptualizing and leading programs, but this role is not likely to be attractive if appropriate logistical support is not available.

Second, various respondents suggested a "one-stop integrated center" could be an effective model for F&OD. Such a model envisions a single center in which faculty members, deans, and chairs could turn for support regarding an array of issues. Consistent with the "air-traffic controller model", a one-stop center would begin by triaging the needs of a faculty member or administrative leader and would then connect that person to the resources pertinent to those

needs (like an "air-traffic controller" coordinating elements in the landscape). Additionally, clients might be whole units, such as departments or groups of faculty members seeking to engage in major projects (e.g., redesigning curriculum, integrating technology into program plans, designing college-wide mentoring programs, or developing thematic and integrated international study programs). In a one-stop model, F&OD might have some of the resources needed by a user, but would also have close relationships with other units to which users could be referred in a seamless, integrated process. Such a model could more fully support thematic institutional priorities (e.g., the use of technology to support learning) than is possible at present. Dean Klomparens mentioned the Graduate School is organized around this kind of model in supporting graduate students, and Dr. DeZure mentioned her interest in such a model in the self-study report as she looked to the future.

Recommendation 2: Identify key themes and priorities for faculty and organizational development

The issues facing higher education today require focus and prioritization for their solution. While the extensive array of programs and services offered by F&OD is praise-worthy, there were comments from senior administrative leaders, deans and chairs, and faculty members that the offerings and the topics addressed can seem too extensive and sometimes unconnected. An underlying theme, especially as we talked with administrative leaders, is that the efforts of F&OD might be even more effective if guided by a set of themes and priorities. Presumably these priorities would resonate with *Bolder by Design* and would be reviewed periodically for adjustment and responsiveness to current institutional issues.

Recommendation 3: Develop more extensive partnering and collaboration

We encourage F&OD's continued attention to building and expanding cohesive partnerships across campus. A number of offices and units across the institution offer services and programs relevant to organizational and faculty development. These include, for example:

- Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives
- Graduate School
- Human Resources
- MSU Global
- Instructional Technology
- Office of the Vice President for Research
- Office of the Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement
- International Studies and Programs, and
- STEM Initiatives in several colleges.

While F&OD currently collaborates on various programs with a number of units, senior leaders of the University emphasized the importance of much closer collaboration and integration of effort across multiple units within the University. Furthermore, the close working relationship between Provost Youatt and Vice President Udpa enables the expansion of collaborative efforts across MSU units. By building on shared commitments to educational initiatives and institutional priorities, F&OD can do even more to develop bridges that enable the University to tap into the

multitude of talent and energy that exists on campus and to create an even more fulsome array of professional development opportunities.

Recommendation 4: Consider the appropriate balance between centralized versus decentralized services

Several points are important to the question of balancing centralized and decentralized services. First, a decade ago when the last program review of F&OD occurred, few college-level opportunities were available for faculty development. Over the past decade, a number of colleges have developed local activities, and some now have Associate Deans for Faculty Development. Several colleges are collaborating to develop STEM Essentials, a program providing seminars focused on teaching in STEM fields and held within the colleges. The easy accessibility to these workshops is reported to be a factor in their popularity among many faculty members in the STEM-related colleges.

Second, another issue to consider regarding this recommendation is the fact that many faculty members and administrative leaders across the University have been participants in F&OD programs. Throughout our interviews, we heard from former participants who would like to use what they have learned to contribute more extensively to the institution. Third, a senior administrative leader mentioned the success of the "ISP Model" used by International Studies and Programs (ISP), which involves ISP collaboration with Assistant/Associate Deans in the Colleges who work closely with the faculty, support college-level international activities, and coordinate with ISP on university-wide initiatives. These various factors relate to the question of the appropriate balance between institution-wide and college-level faculty and organizational development opportunities.

We recognize and emphasize the importance of also providing centralized opportunities and resources. Some colleges may not have the resources for or may not prioritize the importance of faculty development. Furthermore, faculty members sometimes prefer institution-level professional development opportunities if they are in departments or colleges where leaders do not encourage (or may even discourage) time spent on these opportunities. At the same time, however, some resources and programs may be more effective, inviting, and accessible if available at the local level.

To summarize, we recommend further consideration of the appropriate balance between a centralized and decentralized approach to faculty and organizational development. The activities already underway indicate that college-level efforts are occurring and more are likely to develop. Dr. DeZure already works closely with college-level leaders in planning particular programs. We recommend more formal conversations between Dr. DeZure, the Associate Provost, and College Deans to explore the larger issue of the balance between centralized and de-centralized resources and services and ways to conceptualize this relationship.

Recommendation 5: Draw more extensively on the wide network of colleagues prepared in F&OD Programs

We encountered a network of talented colleagues who have participated in the programs offered by F&OD and who are eager to be tapped more fully to share their expertise around teaching and learning issues and institutional leadership. Certainly not every participant in F&OD

programs has the expertise, interest, or circumstances needed for making such contributions. Pre-tenure faculty members, for example, must be especially thoughtful about any extra responsibilities they take on. However, among the many people who have participated in the Lilly Program, the Adams Academy, the CIC Academic Leadership Program, and other opportunities provided by F&OD are a sizable group that are willing and ready to contribute to faculty and organizational development initiatives. While Dr. DeZure already calls on individuals in this group to help as consultants, workshop leaders, and mentors, we see the potential for more systematic use of this resource group.

We offer a few examples. One senior administrator suggested that individuals in this group might be organized around thematic topics to develop ideas and proposals relevant to University priorities. Our team observed that Dr. DeZure's personal work with the Lilly Fellows group each year is highly valued by them, but we also believe some talented former Lillies may be effective in such a leadership role. Clearly discussions need to occur with Deans and Chairs when faculty members' talents are tapped for institutional priorities, but in specific circumstances such arrangements may serve both institutional and individual purposes and goals.

The Faculty Excellence Advocates (FEAs) are a relatively new group on campus serving to support faculty excellence in the Colleges. During the interviews, we heard several people comment on the value of a more formal relationship between F&OD and the FEAs. At present, F&OD has not been asked to have any substantial role with the FEAs. We suggest F&OD might be involved in preparing the FEAs with information about faculty and organizational development opportunities; thus, the FEAs might be used as an explicit conduit of information to faculty and administrators in the colleges. If F&OD is involved in mapping a wide array of institutional resources relevant to faculty and organizational development, such a liaison role would be even more useful in linking institutional units to college faculty and administrators.

Action Steps

While providing the recommendations for consideration above, our review team considered whether we should offer a specific vision for the future of F&OD. We concluded such a vision should come from the leadership of F&OD, in collaboration with the Provost and Associate Provost. However, we do offer some specific action steps here which would help move forward the recommendations above.

- Task Force on Long-Term Planning for F&OD: Earlier we suggested the Provost and Associate Provost convene a Task Force charged with re-envisioning the overall approach to faculty and organizational development at MSU and the specific positioning of F&OD in the broader institutional context. This process should involve consideration of (a) institutional long-term priorities for organizational and faculty development (as indicated in *Bolder by Design*), and (b) a vision for structural ways in which resources and units across university units might collaborate more fully. It would be most appropriate for senior administrators to convene this task force since its charge would involve looking across the University and would concern more than F&OD alone. Dr. DeZure would be a key member of this task force. Other appropriate members might include representatives of the following groups:

- o F&OD Advisory Board
- o Former participants of F&OD Programs, including deans and department chairs
- o Individuals familiar with the broad context of faculty and administrative issues within both the University and the broader context
- o Leaders of other units providing various resources and programs for faculty and administrators
- o F&OD staff members.

Drawing on this Program Review Report and their collective knowledge of the University and broader context, the task force could reasonably complete its work with a due date of late spring, 2014.

- Institutional Resource Mapping: We suggest a process of Institutional Resource Mapping to identity those units whose programs and services contribute to faculty and organizational development. The mapping process would identify overlapping efforts as well as gaps in services and support.

- Regular Cross-Unit Meetings: We suggest that a structure be developed to provide opportunities for the leaders of units identified in the mapping process to meet on a regular and on-going basis to discuss priorities and resources for various target audiences, gaps to be addressed, a central calendar of programs and resources, and opportunities for collaboration.

- Expanded Uses of Technology to Support Faculty and Organizational Development: As indicated in the Self-Study Report, F&OD can carry out its mission more effectively by using technology in new ways. We offer two suggestions below. We also emphasize that the request made in the Self-Study for support for technology expertise seems not only reasonable but necessary, no matter what new model is proposed for the unit.

  - o We suggest the development of an easily accessible website that highlights resources from all relevant units available to support the work of administrative leaders and faculty members. This would need to be organized around themes and issues pertaining to faculty work, leaders' responsibilities, and key priorities in regard to organizational development.

  - o We also suggest further consideration of ways to use technology to support faculty and leadership development. We found respondents had mixed views on their interest in using technology-mediated approaches to their professional development. Overall, however, we believe technology can be used more extensively to support professional learning. For example, some respondents suggested taking a "flipped classroom" approach in which basic information on professional development topics could be provided through websites and creative uses of technology, followed by opportunities for colleagues to meet (either in cross-institutional meetings or in local college gatherings) to discuss the implications and uses of the ideas in their own work. Chairs suggested having materials used in their work (e.g., various forms or instructions) especially available and searchable on a website devoted to their needs.

- Planning Process in F&OD: We recommend F&OD use the next six months as a time for re-visioning their approach, structure, and staffing. This planning period would then prepare F&OD to begin the implementation of a new model beginning in fall, 2014. Certainly the full implementation of new plans may take longer, but the start of implementation should begin after the six-month planning period.

    o Six-Month Planning Period: We suggest decisions be made immediately to modify as needed the spring programming schedule in order to provide time for engaging in the major visioning process and action steps recommended above. This adjustment may mean deciding not to offer some programs originally intended for the spring. Also, on a short-term basis, resources should be provided for appropriate staff to address the gap left by the departure of Dr. Shaw and the previous vacancy in the other Associate Director position. We suggest that much of Dr. DeZure's time in the next six months should be devoted to working (with the Task Force) on re-envisioning the model to guide the structure, programming, and staffing roles within F&OD.

    o Fall, 2014 Start of Implementation: Based on the planning process over the next half-year, F&OD could begin the first phase of implementing new plans in the Fall 2014 academic year, with additional phases to follow in 2015 or beyond.

    o Resources for a New Approach: A new model needs appropriate resources for implementation. The self-study makes a compelling case for the importance of logistical and support staff and additional expertise to provide technology support. We recognize the need for such support but encourage a request be made within the context of a re-envisioned model for F&OD that takes into account the recommendations presented above.

    o Regular Assessment of Programming: While F&OD already engages in on-going assessment of its programs, we encourage rigorous annual self-review and decision making in line with the model and vision (presumably addressing recommendations above) that emerges from the next six months of planning. Consistent with the successful approach of the Graduate School to annually develop a "not-to-do list," we encourage F&OD to make decisions about what core programming should be included each year and what "supplemental" programming could occur every other year or even less frequently. We expect the re-envisioning we have recommended will lead F&OD to seek input from deans, chairs, and faculty as they prioritize programs that are most critical to the directions and emphases of the university and those which are valuable but less urgent in the context of multiple demands.

Concluding Comments

F&OD has been central to the University's successes in professional and organizational development over the past decade. We believe the office is essential to help the university as it continues to advance as a "high-performing organization" committed to fulfilling its missions for Michigan and the world. Exciting opportunities lie ahead in the work of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development. MSU and F&OD have the opportunity to develop a new and

transformative professional development approach that supports institutional excellence in demanding times. Such a model could serve as an exemplar to other higher education institutions, nationally and internationally, facing similar challenges. F&OD can now harvest the outcomes of its past decade of work by taking on the challenge of creating a model for professional and organizational development for the twenty-first century university. Rigorous intellectual leadership and visioning, passion for and commitment to quality, and collaboration and shared responsibility with other leaders and units across campus will be important ingredients in this next stage.

Final Note
We express our deep appreciation to the staff of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development: Dr. Deborah DeZure, Assistant Provost for Faculty and Organizational Development; Dr. Allyn Shaw, Associate Director, Office of F&OD, and Director of Leadership Development Programs; Cindi Leverich, Project Event Coordinator; and Vanessa Pollok, Executive Secretary and Budget Analyst. Dr. DeZure and the staff of F&OD invested much time and thought in preparing the review materials, arranging and coordinating all details of the site visit, and discussing with us their work, commitments, concerns, and vision. We are deeply impressed with the work and dedication of these colleagues and appreciate the confidence invested in us to conduct a thoughtful, productive, and useful program review. We thank them for all they did to facilitate our work.

Appendix A

Program Review of Faculty and Organizational Development (F&OD)
September 22-24, 2013

Sunday – September 22, 2013

- Fly/Drive to E. Lansing; Stay at the Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center, East Lansing.
- MSU Shuttle will bring reviewer(s) from East Lansing airport to the Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center and return them to the airport as needed.
  - Kellogg Center Shuttle will pick up Dr. Langley at Capital City Airport (Lansing, MI) at 3:30 p.m. – September 22, 2014
  - Kellogg Center Shuttle will drop off Dr. Langley at Capital City Airport (Lansing, MI) at 4:30pm – September 24, 2013
- F&OD staff will drive reviewers to campus locations in the Hannah Administration Building and the Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center.

6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.   Dinner (Program Reviewers and Theodore H. Curry, Associate Provost/Associate Vice President for Academic Human Resources, Michigan State University)
State Room, Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center (Reservation-Austin)

7:00p.m. – 10:00 p.m. Vista Room, Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center
Note: The Vista Room has been reserved for the Program Reviewers if they wish
to meet after dinner.

For additional assistance, please contact:

Vanessa Pollok – main office - 517-432-1185 or cell number - 517-648-3757
Allyn Shaw – cell number – 517-667-0261
Deborah DeZure – cell number - 517-282-2579 or home number – 734-668-6816

Monday – September 23, 2013

7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. -   Breakfast (Program Reviewers only)
                               State Room, Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center
                               (Reservation-Austin)

(Allyn will meet Program Reviewers at the State Room and provide transportation to campus.)

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.   Meet with June Youatt, Acting Provost and Executive Vice
 President for
  (30 minutes)   Academic Affairs, Michigan State University
                              432 Hannah Administration Building

9:30 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.   Meet with Deborah DeZure, Assistant Provost for Faculty and
  (70 minutes)   Organizational Development, Michigan State University
                              308 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

10:40 a.m. – 10:50 a.m. Tour of F&OD Office
  (10 minutes)

10:50 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Transition to President's Conference Room and Short Break
  (10 minutes)   President's Conference Room, Hannah Administration
Building

11:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. Meet with F&OD Staff - (**4 confirmed**)
  (45 minutes)   President's Conference Room, Hannah Administration
Building

11:45 a.m. – 12:20 p.m. LUNCH with Deborah DeZure and F&OD Staff – (**4
confirmed**)
  (35 minutes)   President's Conference Room, Hannah Administration
                              Building

12:20 p.m. – 12:30 p.m. BREAK
  (10 minutes)   443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.   Meet with F&OD Advisory Board Members – (**8 confirmed**)
  (60 minutes)   443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

1:30 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.   BREAK
  (15 minutes)   443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

1:45 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.   Meet with MSU Deans – (**7 Confirmed**)
  (60 minutes)   President's Conference Room, Hannah Administration
 Building

2:45 p.m. – 2:55 p.m.   BREAK
  (10 minutes)   443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

2:55 p.m. – 3:55 p.m. (60 minutes)	Concurrent Sessions:
	- Meet with Lilly Teaching Fellows – (**7 Confirmed**)
	412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration

Building

| | - Meet with Adams Academy Fellows – (**8 Confirmed**) |
| | 443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building |

| 3:55 p.m. – 4:05 p.m. (10 minutes) | BREAK |
| | 443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building |

4:05 p.m. – 4:50 p.m. (45 minutes)	Concurrent Sessions:
	- Meet with Faculty Learning Community (FLC) Facilitators –
	(**8 Confirmed**)
	443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

| | - Meet with Early Career Faculty in the Tenure and Health Programs Systems - (**5 Confirmed**) |
| | 412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building |

| 4:50 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. (10 minutes) | BREAK |
| | 443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building |

5:00 p.m. – 5:45 p.m. (45 minutes)	Concurrent Sessions:
	- Meet with Representatives requesting Customized Programs & Services &
	Organizational Development Unit Consultation Services –
	(**8 Confirmed** – 7 Customized and 1 OD)
	443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

| | - Meet with F&OD Student Employees – (**3 Confirmed**) |
| | 412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building |

(Allyn will provide transportation to the Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center.)

6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Dinner (Program Reviewers only)
	State Room, Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center
	(<u>Reservation-Austin</u>)

| 7:00p.m. – 10:00 p.m. | Vista Room, Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center |
| | <u>Note:</u> The Vista Room has been reserved for the Program Reviewers if they wish to meet after dinner. |

For additional assistance, please contact:

Vanessa Pollok – main office - 517-432-1185 or cell number - 517-648-3757
Allyn Shaw – cell number – 517-667-0261
Deborah DeZure – cell number - 517-282-2579 or home number – 734-668-6816

Tuesday – September 24, 2013

7:00 a.m.	Check-out – Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center (bags, etc. can be left at hotel bell station)

7:15 a.m. – 8:15 a.m.   Breakfast (Program Reviewers only)
      State Room, Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center
      (<u>Reservation-Austin</u>)

(Allyn will meet Program Reviewers at the State Room and provide transportation to campus.)

8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.   Meet with Department Chairs – (**8 Confirmed**)
(60 minutes)   443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.   Meet with Leadership Fellows – (**11 Confirmed** – 6 CIC ALP, 1
CIC DEO
(60 minutes)   and 4 ELA)
- Committee on Institutional Cooperation Academic
  Leadership Program
    (CIC ALP) Fellows
- Committee on Institutional Cooperation Department
    Executive Officers (CIC DEO) Fellows
- Executive Leadership Academy (ELA) Fellows
    443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.   BREAK
(15 minutes)   443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

10:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.   Concurrent Sessions:
(75 minutes)   - Reviewers meet with F&OD Collaborators – (**7 Confirmed**)
       443 Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

- Reviewers meet with Faculty Excellence Advocates
  (FEAs) –   (**6 Confirmed**)
    412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.   LUNCH and PLANNING MEETING (Program Reviewers only)
(120 minutes)   President's Conference Room, Hannah Administration
Building

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.   Program Reviewers debrief with Theodore H. Curry
(60 minutes)   412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.   BREAK

      (15 minutes)   412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

3:15 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.   Program Reviewers debrief with Deborah DeZure and F&OD
                                Staff
      (45 minutes)   412A Conference Room, Hannah Administration Building

(Allyn will provide transportation to the Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center.)

4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Program Reviewers prepare to leave campus

Appendix B

Review of MSU F&OD Program
Questions to Guide Interviews with Senior Leaders

- Context

    o What should the Review Team know about the university's current context, priorities, and challenges that would help us as we conduct the review of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development?

- Current Purposes and Role

    o How has FOD specifically contributed to achieving the priorities of the University?

    o In what areas or in what ways could FOD make a more substantial contribution to the MSU community? Are there changes or adjustments in the programs, services, or approach of FOD that you would like to see?

- Looking Ahead

    o What is your vision for the purposes, roles, and focus of FOD in the next five years?

    o What other insights about the University and the work of FOD do you think should be considered by the Review Team?

- Making the Report Useful

    o How can the report of the Review Team be most helpful to you in your leadership role for the University?

Questions to Guide Interviews/Conversations with "Users" of FOD Programs and Services

- <u>General Info</u>

    o Name, position/ rank, unit/department, years at university

- <u>FOD Programs/services you have used</u>

- <u>Assessment of Programs</u>

    o What are the strengths of the programs and services in FOD that you have used?

    o What are the reasons why these seem to you to be strengths of the programs and services? [Note: Treat this as a follow-up question. The specific wording would depend on how the interviewees had answered the previous question. The overall point is to get the participants to explain the rationale for their comments in response to the previous question.]

    o What do you see as the important benefits or impacts of the work of FOD—for you individually or for your unit or the broader University? What has been the value garnered from your involvement?

- <u>Looking to the Future</u>

    o What do you see as areas for improvement or adjustment in the programs and services offered by FOD?

        ▪ Probe: Programs or services to expand? Programs or services to reduce?

        ▪ Probe for the quality, type, or number of programs or services. Also be alert to other areas for improvement, such as, for example, the ways in which program staff interact with faculty.

    o What other suggestions and recommendations do you have for FOD as it plans for the future?

Questions for "Random" Group of Early Career Faculty

The intention for this focus group is to talk with some non-users. The strategy is for the Review Team to talk with a group of randomly selected faculty—a group that will presumably include both users and non-users.

- <u>General Info</u> : Name, position/ rank, unit/department, years at university

- <u>Preferred Approaches for Professional Development</u>

  - What are your preferred approaches for expanding your professional skills, especially your expertise as teachers and leaders?

- <u>Knowledge of Programs and Services for Professional Development at MSU</u>

  - What programs and services are you aware of at MSU to support faculty professional development?

- <u>FOD Programs/Services you have Used</u>

  - Have you used any of the programs and services available through FOD? [Note: Probe as needed.]

  - What factors have influenced your decision to use (or not use) formal professional development programs and services, especially around teaching and leadership development?

- <u>Assessment of Programs</u>

  - For those programs and services in FOD that you have used, what are the strengths of these programs and services?

  - What do you see as the important benefits or impacts of the work of FOD— for you individually or for your unit or the broader University?

  - For those who have not used FOD services and programs, what are your reasons? What kinds of programs or services would you be more likely to use?

- <u>Suggestions and Recommendations</u>

  - What suggestions and recommendations do you have for FOD as it plans for the future?

    - Probe: Areas for improvement, expansion, or reduction in the programs and services offered by FOD?

Questions for FOD Staff

- <u>General Info</u>

    o Name, position, years at university and in role

- <u>Assessment of Programs</u>

    o What do you see as the primary purposes and roles of FOD in the university?

    o How has FOD specifically contributed to achieving the priorities of the University?

    o What do you see as the strengths of FOD and its programs and services? What do you see as the impacts of benefits of FOD's programs and services? Why do you point to these as strengths?

    o In what areas or in what ways could FOD make a more substantial contribution to the MSU community?

    o What would you like to see done differently in how FOD does its work?

        ▪ Probe: Areas to expand? Areas to reduce or eliminate programs or services? Areas for improvement? Different ways to organize the work?

- <u>Looking Ahead</u>
    o What is your vision for the purposes, roles, and focus of FOD in the next five years?

    o What other suggestions and recommendations do you have for FOD as it plans for the future?