Blended Learning Taskforce Meeting  
December 11, 2015, 11:00 am

Summary

Present: Dr. G. Hack, Dr. S. Hanson, Dr. M. Hart, Dr. M. Marsiske, Dr. G. Miller, Dr. J. Pomeranz, Dr. C. Prins, and Michelle Heeg (transcriber)

- **Complete discussion of competency framework and narrow competency list**
  Dr. Hack presented the operationalized competencies in tiered objectives, and the Taskforce discussed the document and the scope of the Teaching Excellence program.
  - It was agreed that the Taskforce’s focus is to develop a Teaching Excellence program that would support a college certificate and teaching portfolio.
    - There may be components of teaching excellence that will be highlighted in the program materials but not be included in the final certificate because they are beyond the reasonable scope of what the project should be.
  - Dr. Hack noted that the objectives are identified with Bloom’s taxonomy and levels. He also explained that the first levels are terminal objectives, and the lower tiers under each terminal objective are enabling objectives.
  - The Taskforce should come to a general consensus on the critical competencies needed for the program, and then define and operationalize them.
  - It was agreed that members should look into other campus programs that help with terminal objectives so that available materials aren’t recreated for our program.
  - It was suggested that the program can hook faculty early on by providing skill building tools that they find critical to building a course. Once faculty are engaged, they will be interested in what else can help them teach better.
  - Dr. Hack mentioned that these objectives are not complete in scope or fixed in sequence. The list is a way to measure skills and know when faculty have arrived at certain levels.
  - The Taskforce agreed on some goals of the program:
    - Present objectives to faculty to explain what they will learn if they participate
    - Create something that resonates with faculty on a skills-based level
    - Present a matrix to help them organize what they’ve learned for their tenure packets
  - The Taskforce discussed the possibility of narrowing the program scope further to assist faculty specifically in putting together teaching portfolios for tenure and promotion. If faculty are more advanced, the program can provide additional tools to improve teaching skills.
The Taskforce discussed the possibility of having a faculty member review the program mid-way through to help identify what works and what additional things would help.

The group discussed the possibility of back-building the program by identifying what they want the teaching portfolio to look like.

The Taskforce reviewed the importance of each objective and its inclusion in the program:

- Dr. Hanson suggested that all terminal objectives below #8 shouldn’t be included in the Teaching Excellence certificate. These objectives should be part of an advanced/specialist/scholar level.
- It was noted that some terminal objectives after objective 8 are included in the tenure packet. It was agreed to focus on earlier objectives in the early stages of the program and focus on the more advanced objectives later on.
- It was mentioned that, regarding objective #9, not all faculty have doctoral and research students, so this may not be a core objective.
- Objective #12 varies by department, and it is more of an administrative management objective that should be considered later in the program.
- Objective #10 may serve better as an extra objective since it is important for some faculty but may scare those who are working toward tenure.
- Objectives #2 and #3 can be combined as instructional design.
- It was mentioned that having over 10 or 12 objectives may create a buy-in issue with faculty.

The Taskforce presented some options for moving forward with the program:

- Dr. Marsiske suggested creating scorecards of teaching excellence that can be quickly reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Taskforce can then build teaching excellence into the process of helping faculty get high scores on the scorecard.
- It was suggested that the concrete approach of a scorecard may help organize faculty teaching methods to increase teaching excellence.
- Two levels of rating teaching excellence were suggested based on the UF Online Guidelines: minimally acceptable and exemplary. These levels have to do with how particular faculty will go up for tenure and promotion.
- It was agreed that incorporating a behavioral checklist that the Tenure and Promotion Committee may use would be useful for the program. The group can pull some activities information from the CITT website.
- The Taskforce can hold group sessions on teaching excellence to tie the program to faculty tenure and promotion portfolios. The goal is to afford opportunities to support the teaching excellence process without appearing overwhelming to faculty.
- Section assignments within the program can be specific to the faculty’s courses.
- The Taskforce can set up a metric for objectives that can be graded. A checklist can also be created with guidance on how faculty can judge their competencies.
• The Taskforce can come back to the teaching portfolio as a place of organization, maintain the objectives for the program, and script out some of the objectives to see what it would be like in a teaching portfolio. Then, Taskforce can build out the program from there to see how it would look for faculty use.

• **Action Item:** The Taskforce will narrow the fundamental objectives while not losing critical skills. The group will then begin building learning objectives into the context of the teaching portfolio.

• **Action Item:** Taskforce members will review terminal objective 1 to see if they have materials that would help with this objective, and if so, send the materials to the group.

• **Action Item:** The Teaching Excellence Program Objectives document should be updated to reflect the following:
  - Objectives #9 and #10 are for a specific audience and should be moved to an advanced level.
  - Remove objective #12.
  - Combine objectives #2 and #3. Possibly combine these within the organization of the program if not combined in this document.
  - Simplify the language of all objectives to make them more practical and less specific and theoretical.
  - Add the critical objectives to the framework to make it a skills-based focus.

• **Completed Action Items**
  - Dr. Hack operationalized the competencies into broader objectives and tiered them out.

• **Action Items for Follow Up**
  - The Taskforce will cut down the list of competencies, combine similar competencies, remove any skills, and try out models for framing the competencies.
  - The Taskforce will review UF’s Best Practices to see if there is anything left out of the above list of competencies.

• **Pending Follow Up Items**
  - Dr. Hanson and Dr. Hack are working on reorganizing the orientation program to be more intuitive for faculty, and the reorganization will be finalized over the next few weeks and presented to the Taskforce for feedback at an upcoming meeting.
  - The Taskforce will review the orientation program to make sure it is seamlessly accessible and clear regardless of how faculty use and access it.
  - Dr. Prins will work with the PHHP Curriculum Committee to document bad syllabus stories for the module.
  - Taskforce members should review the Helpful Hints document created by Dr. Marsiske and send additions to Dr. Hack.
  - The Taskforce will consider organizing the helpful hints for faculty into a section addressing student and faculty issues.
  - Prior to the next meeting, Taskforce members will identify faculty in their department who are willing to serve as resources on blended learning topics they have experience with.
• Michelle will work on moving the PHHP Blended Learning website to a more accessible location on the PHHP website. The BL website should also contain additional information so that it serves as a robust resource.
• The Taskforce will lay out a systematic process for connecting new faculty to resources.
• **Next meeting: January 22nd, 2016 (December 25th meeting canceled due to the Holiday break, and January 8th meeting canceled due to the start of spring classes)**