Minnesota Common Report Form

We are pleased to introduce a Minnesota Common Report Form. Minnesota grantmakers developed this form to make the reporting process simpler and more efficient for nonprofits. For ease of use and to eliminate unnecessary duplication of work, you may reproduce any part of the form you find helpful.

Report Narrative

1. Please briefly outline your original goals and objectives, as stated in your proposal.
   The goals of this faculty development program are to:
   • Promote the scholarship of teaching by creating a campus culture where teaching is made public, discussed, examined, improved, and rewarded
   • Implement a faculty development program that encourages and supports the use of technology in the classroom
   • Establish communities of faculty and students whose conversations are focused on specific teaching and learning problems and opportunities
   • Establish communities of faculty and students engaged in research using information technology and other resources.

2. What progress have you made toward your original goals and objectives? What activities led to meeting these goals and objectives?
   From the data we collected throughout the three-year course of this initiative, three particularly significant themes emerged:
   • Faculty members have critically examined their own teaching and its impact on student learning.
   • Faculty members’ conscientious, reflective, and research-based approaches to their teaching have resulted in improved student learning.
   • A community-based approach to faculty development has resulted in improved teaching, student learning, and faculty and student scholarship.

   These outcomes were achieved through support of faculty and student learning communities, workshops, and faculty and student travel grants.

3. If applicable, describe the population served or community reached during the grant period. Use numbers and demographics such as race/ethnicity, gender or geographic location.
   We have collected data on the number of faculty and students who participated in grant-related activities (see the table below). We did not collect data on the gender or race/ethnicity of these faculty and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three-year grant period (1998-2001)</th>
<th>Number of faculty who participated in the grant initiative</th>
<th>Number of students who participated in the grant initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>184 (87% of all faculty)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>180 (84% of all faculty)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>164 (76% of all faculty)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Data from the 2000-2001 University Profile compiled by the University’s Office of Institutional Research regarding faculty and student gender and race/ethnicity are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Faculty (percentage)</th>
<th>Students (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Faculty (percentage)</th>
<th>Students (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Were there any unanticipated results, either positive or negative? What did you learn because of this grant?
   The data we collected provide several important lessons that continue to inform and shape the programmatic activities of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching. The lessons include:
During the past three years, several faculty members and students were funded to pursue traditional research projects. These projects, though productive venues for faculty and student investigation and discussion, rarely produced measurable results or tangible “products.”

The teaching communities, in contrast, yielded preliminary classroom assessment results, and even conference presentations, grant proposals, and other scholarly works. These projects, however, could benefit from greater assistance and support from university faculty and staff with expertise in assessment and evaluation.

As concerns the impact of faculty development workshops, the data point to two important avenues for improvement, including:

1. The need to contextualize workshop content in ways that are appropriate, relevant, and applicable to Xavier University and its faculty and students. Although nearly 70% of the workshop participants indicated that the workshop topics were of “high importance,” more than a third of the participants found the workshop information to be of little or no usefulness.

2. The need to link individual workshops with other Center initiatives and projects in order to sustain the goals of the workshops.

Faculty and students in some of the teaching and research communities indicated that the work of the communities did not fully achieve their goals due to a lack of faculty and student leadership.

Finally, projects that focused intensively on technology proved to be more successful on an individual basis, rather than through the community approach.

5. Will you make any changes based on these results?
In order to foster a campus culture where teaching and research are improved and made public, we will implement a means to assist and ensure that the work of research communities will in fact be made public.

By placing the focus of the teaching and research communities squarely on improving teaching and research (hence, the requirement for assessment data or evidence of impact) and making the work of the communities public, we expect a greater degree of faculty and student ownership and commitment to the projects. In addition, the Center will develop a mechanism to work more closely with the communities.

6. (for program/project grants only) What are your future plans for sustaining this program or project?
In the absence of any grant support, the University will continue to support Center staff salaries. In turn, Center staff members will continue their work at improving faculty and student scholarship, and teaching and student learning. They will, for example, continue to offer workshops, and consult with and assist faculty members. Through the diverse array of faculty development opportunities provided by the University and its Center for the Advancement of Teaching, the initiatives that have been supported by this grant will continue, albeit to a lesser degree.

Xavier is implementing an ambitious plan to increase endowments for scholarships and faculty salaries, expand and renovate its facilities, construct new student housing, and upgrade information systems, network capability, and instructional technology.

7. Are there any other important outcomes as a result of this grant?
There are several examples of faculty and student scholarship that have resulted, either directly or indirectly, from this faculty development grant. A description of these scholarly activities is on-line at http://cat.xula.edu/scholarship/.

8. Do you have any plans to share your results or findings? How?
We will continue to make various projects associated with this grant public via the World Wide Web. For example, the on-going efforts of faculty involved in the Course Portfolio Working Group are published on our website.

Xavier faculty members and students have presented various aspects of this grant initiative at national and regional conferences. Although no presentations are scheduled at present, we will continue to look for good opportunities to present the findings of this grant initiative.