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## PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

This project supported the development of an Institute for Instructional Improvement and Innovation for California Community Colleges. Its goal was to provide major assistance to all colleges working to implement staff development activities identified in AB 1725. Focus was on faculty and instructional development. The project provided resources and communication designed to facilitate creative and wise use of staff development funds and to provide the Chancellor's Office with feedback on structuring staff development programs and resources.
The Institute for Instructional Improvement and Innovation

A Professional Development Resource for California Community College Faculty

The development of this Institute will be a major FII Project designed to have an immediate positive impact on the quality of instruction in our CCCs. The past year has demonstrated that the colleges have welcomed substantial guidance on how to invest their faculty development funds well. Previous FII projects led by Director Mike McHargue have filled part of this statewide need; this Institute will address the need directly while also supporting a wide range of Board of Governors and FII projects that will directly serve CCC faculty and the staff development officers and committees that support instruction. The projects include newsletters, phone consultations, workshops, conference presentations and an Instructional Development Resource Bank. A statewide survey will initiate the process and provide guidance on additional services we should offer. We will also gather instructional information through professional meetings and materials and then disseminate it in formats that will facilitate implementation. We will also link the Institute to other professional development units to increase its (and their) effectiveness. Our evaluation plan will provide feedback on how to better serve instructional needs and how the Chancellor's Office can better structure its faculty development resources in the future. Since the project expects to have a major, immediate, and positive impact on instruction, the evaluation will also focus on the implementation of instructional innovations-the ultimate goal of the project. We will also plan to improve our services and seek long term support for the programs.

We request $49,000 in FII funds to support a half-time Director and a half-time Secretary for twelve months, and to provide the clerical instructional and travel resources they need to function effectively. Although this would be a major investment of FII funds, this project is precisely in line with the Fund's goals. Foothill College and the faculty development organizations already linked to the Director will provide substantial additional resources-up to 60% more than we are requesting from the Fund.

The Institute for Instructional Improvement and Innovation will have a major and immediate impact on the quality of instruction in our colleges. It will focus on the gathering, disseminating and implementation of good teaching techniques. Its results will be more powerful, more universal, and more immediate than the usual FII project because it is an ambitious project that can muster important outside resources that will augment the FII investment.
1. Specific Educational Program Being Addressed

SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES BEING ADDRESSED

A. Overview:

This project is designed to support the development of an Institute for Instructional Improvement and Innovation for our California Community Colleges. It will provide major assistance to all colleges that are working to implement the staff development activities recently funded by AB 1725. The focus for this project will be on the faculty development activities within staff development and, even more precisely, on the instructional development aspects of faculty development—the primary mission of the Fund for Instructional Improvement. This project will provide the resources and communication needed for colleges to spend their faculty development funds creatively and wisely; it will also provide the FII and Chancellor's Office with substantial feedback on how to structure its staff development programs and resources in the future.

B. Basic Agenda Priorities:

Several of the Board of Governors' Basic Agenda Priorities are directly addressed by this project. They include:

1. Educational Excellence
   • Academic Standards and Quality
2. Student Access and Success
   • Defining and Integrating Student Services with Instruction
   • The Underrepresented
   • The Underprepared
   • Student Retention
3. Human Resources
   • Teaching Incentives
   • Faculty and Staff Development
Several others will also be affected (most notably, Transfer, Vocational Education and Basic Skills education) because this project will improve instructional excellence across our entire curriculum.

During the past two years, some of the FII projects were noted as "Part B" activities because of their close relationship to the specific Basic Agenda Priorities of the Board. This project, which builds on previous Part B activities, probably would have been so designated this year had that category been retained. It furthers several of the specific agenda items and it is a major statewide project that promises to improve faculty development programs across our entire system.

C. Continuity:

This has been listed as a new project because it is not officially sponsored by the Academic Senate/Chief Instruction Officers as were its 1988-89 predecessors, "Rewards for Good Teaching" and "Flex Calendar Evaluation." The short timeline to complete this proposal and the difficulty of orchestrating the approvals of their two executive boards preclude formal sponsorship. But this project is an outgrowth of that cosponsorship and its projects. The earlier programs were devoted to improving the quality of teaching in our system through flex calendar activities and other professional development work. This project has the same goals—this time emphasizing even more precisely the improvement of instruction and innovation. Samples of the earlier project documents are attached-The Executive Summary of the Rewards for Good Teaching Project recently sent to the Board of Governors and forwarded to the legislature (Attachment 1), and the most recent AS/CIO newsletter (Attachment 2).

D. Collaboration:

This project is not listed as a formal consortium effort because of the RFP timeline and the practical problems we found last year when cosponsorship caused some delays due to formal "signoffs." Nevertheless, this proposal grew out of the two projects being conducted this year and the close collaboration of several groups with major investments in improving the quality of instruction in our colleges and classrooms. They include:

- The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and its Faculty Development Committee
- The Chief Instructional Officers Organization and its Board of Directors
- The Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC) and its Council on Curriculum and Instruction
- The "4C/SD" - CCC Council for Staff Development and its Executive Committee
- The Professional Development Academy of CACC

Representatives from all of these crucial organizations have provided direct input for the development of this proposal. They will be able to immediately provide direct and coordinating support to help achieve the goals of the Institute for Instructional Improvement and Innovation.
E. Project Director:

The proposed director of this project, Dr. Michael McHargue of Foothill College, is uniquely qualified to guide it and to take full advantage of the collaboration possible through the other organization. He directed the two FII projects that led the way for this one, he chairs the Academic Senate Faculty Development Committee, and he is on the Executive Committees of both the 4C/SD and the Professional Development Academy. He also serves on the appropriate FACCC committee and recently made staff development presentations for ACCCA, FACCC, Academic Senate, and CIOs among others. Professor McHargue also has important contacts with the major national community college staff development groups—the National Institute for Staff and Organization Development (NISOD) and the National Council for Staff, Programs and Organization Development (NCSPOD). He has presented at several of their recent national staff development conferences and he conducted the recent Western Regional NCSPOD conference using the "Great Teachers Seminar" format. Additional details about his qualifications are noted in Attachment 3.
SPECIFIC PROBLEMS BEING ADDRESSED
Many of the crucial problems were raised in the preceding section. Here is a brief reiteration:

• AB 1725 provided substantial funding for new staff development but very little guidance on how to spend it well.

• The money was provided to the colleges themselves. Very little was devoted to the statewide need to help train new faculty and staff development officers or their new committees.

• The colleges need a resource to help them plan and develop excellent programs.

• The overall staff development funding is for administrators, classified and faculty and much of the faculty funding is for non-instructional training (senates, shared governance, peer review, etc.). More focus needs to be placed on the FII’s key goals—the improvement of instruction and innovation.

• The Chancellor’s Office recently drafted a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) which recommended that the Governor double the AB 1725 Staff Development funding to $10 million for 1989-90. One of the alternatives listed was the establishment of some regional staff development centers. The Governor has recommended no increase for staff development next year. This project would test the viability and usefulness of one Instructional Development Center.

• Although the professional organizations noted above have assisted colleges in their faculty development implementation, they do so with limited resources of money and time. They rely on “volunteer” members (who already have full-time jobs) and they have little budgetary support. The FII could provide the resources needed to help assure that the implementation of the AB 1725 monies is achieved professionally.
3. Population To Be Served

POPULATIONS TO BE SERVED
This project is designed to serve the faculty of the California Community Colleges. It will provide information on how to improve teaching and faculty development projects and it will serve both full-time and part-time instructors. The project will serve them through their Staff Development Officers, Academic Senate Presidents, and Chief Instructional Officers—the co-sponsors of this project's predecessors and the recipients of earlier mailings such as Attachment 2.

The other direct beneficiaries of this program will be the staff development officers and their campus committees. The current year has indicated clearly that these professionals need some practical guidance from the field on how to use their faculty development resources in the most cost-effective and professional way. Assisting them to be more effective will directly assist the instructors they support.

Of course, the ultimate population served will be our 1.2 million students. This project, designed to provide statewide assistance in faculty development, will have quick and positive results that will enhance the quality of the teaching and learning they seek.
4. Objectives

A. Project Objectives:

The major objectives of this project are:

1. Survey the faculty development needs of our faculty, staff development officers and their college advisory committees.

2. Establish a Newsletter that can improve communication with college instructional development groups-seven issues in 1989-90.

3. Highlight and focus on the faculty development aspects of the AB 1725 Staff Development funding-the improvement of instruction and innovation.

4. Enhance and elaborate on the staff development communications from the Chancellor's Office.

5. Plan and implement five faculty development workshops during 1989-90.

6. Gather faculty development information through professional organizations and instructional materials.

7. Provide free telephone consultations to the colleges about faculty development. (Local college follow-ups would be financed through their own AB 1725 Staff Development funds.)

8. Disseminate information on faculty development through conference presentations, workshops, newsletters, and phone contacts.

9. Develop a Resource Bank (or library) of information on instructional development resources-print, non-print, and human.

10. Provide information on details of faculty development programs like Great Teaching Seminars, Instructional Skills Workshops, Classroom Research, Teaching Resource Centers, etc.

11. Establish intersegmental faculty contacts with four-year colleagues and those from our local high schools.

12. Facilitate the local implementation of faculty development funds so that we are all more innovative and more effective in our instruction.
5. Workplan Narrative

Proposed Schedule of Activities:

September 1989
• Develop survey of instructional development needs
• Include it in first Newsletter that announces the Institute and describes its functions
• Begin telephone consultations-this is continued throughout the entire project

October 1989
• Evaluate surveys
• CIO Conference
• Newsletter
• Workshop

November 1989
• Report on survey results
• Newsletter
• Academic Senate Session
• CACC Conference
• NCSPOD Conference

December 1989
• Workshop
• Resource Directory of Programs, Resources, Professionals

January 1990
• American Council on Education Conference
• Mid-year Review and Evaluation
• Workshop
• Newsletter

February 1990
• Workshop
• Teaching Excellence Conference
• FACCC Conference
• ACCCA Conference
• Mid-year Evaluation Report
• Newsletter

March 1990
• Write new FII Grant
• AACJC Conference
• Co-sponsor NCSPOD West Conference
• Co-sponsor 4C/SD Conference
• Newsletter
April 1990
- AAHE Conference
- Regional CIO and CEO Workshops
- CACC Research Meeting
- Academic Senate Session
- Final Newsletter
- Distribute Project Evaluation materials

May 1990
- NISOD Conference
- Workshop

June 1990
- Evaluation Analysis
- Begin Report

July 1990
- Interstate Great Teachers Seminar
- Intersegmental Great Teachers Seminar
- Continue Evaluation

August 1990
- California Great Teachers Seminar
- Submit Final Report

We will also encourage the inclusion of faculty development/instructional development workshops and presentations at regional and discipline-oriented conferences. If the FII rules permit it, we will also attempt to move the start date of the project to August 1, 1989. That will enable us to more effectively impact the start-up of many more colleges' academic years and the summer/fall Flex Days that are so crucial to faculty development.

C. Resources Needed:

In order to complete the project, we will need:
- A half-time coordinator and half-time instructional associate
- An office setup to handle the coordination, clerical and newsletter needs
- Funds for materials, books, and periodicals
- Office support like printing, postage, phone, duplication, etc.
- Conference and travel funds for conferences, workshops, meetings.

Details of resource needs are in the Budget Summary
6. Expected Outcomes

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

A. Project Objectives:

The project objectives listed in the Work Statement section are stated as behavioral objectives (eg. "Plan and implement five faculty development workshops in 1989-90"). Therefore it will be very easy to conduct the quantitative section of the outcomes. The qualitative section will be less tidy. It will be conducted through the evaluation methods noted in 5e below.

B. Probable Impact of the Project:

We expect a major, direct, and immediate impact on the quality of instruction in our colleges through the more effective professional development programs we will support and deliver. The Work Statement lists a substantial number of workshops, conference presentations, newsletters, and phone consultations that will provide direct input to faculty and additional information through the staff development professionals and their committees. The project will strongly support the Chancellor's Office goals of assuring that staff development funds are invested in a timely, efficient and effective manner. Since the project is designed to focus on applying new faculty development ideas immediately, it really is a "transferability project." It will not have the lag time of many FII projects. The very first newsletter will provide useful ideas for immediate implementation.

C. Potential for Continued Support:

This project has been discussed with Foothill College President Tom Clements and Foothill-De Anza Community College District Chancellor Tom Fryer. While they are very supportive of its goals and have agreed to the reassignment of the project director's time to achieve them, they are less clear on the direct value to their college and district. In fact, they may pay the highest price in the state for the value gained because of their direct and indirect support. The continued support for this project will probably have to come from the FII for the second year- while the first year's evaluation is being considered and revisions are made. During the second year (assuming the project is successful), we should seek permanent funding through the Chancellor's Office Staff Development funds. It doesn't seem likely that a local college or district will see enough local value to continue this project which is designed to serve all of our colleges and all of our instructors. Projects of this nature need statewide support. We might consider the possibility of asking colleges if they would support the program through memberships paid by their staff development funds. That seems complicated. Statewide faculty development programs ought to be sponsored and supported by statewide units. We will request FII assistance in helping us to identify the appropriate resources.
D. Potential for Adaptation at Other Institutions:

This is a dissemination project so it is unlikely to be duplicated anywhere in toto. Many of the programs it recommends will be adopted—that is the point of the project. The only likely duplication of this project would come if it is so successful that it becomes clear that the one center that it supports isn't enough to meet the demand and we decide to support the Chancellor's Office idea of additional regional instructional centers. Even such an "embarrassment of riches" might alternatively call for providing more resources for one center, rather than funding several clones.
7. Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Plan:
There are really three evaluation points in this project-two formative (to help us plan and fine-tune the program) and one summative (to give it a "final grade"). All three are noted in the Work Plan. They include:

- The September survey which will solicit new ideas on useful services we can perform that go beyond the ones already identified in this proposal

- The January Mid-Year Review which will ask our colleagues to evaluate our current services and suggest still more ideas. (This review will provide important data for a possible Year II request from the FII), and

- The May Evaluation which will provide the "final grade" on this year's project. (Even here we will solicit new suggestions.)

These systemwide evaluations will be augmented by the evaluations of our conference presentations, workshops, telephone consultation service, etc. The evaluations of the sub-parts of the project will also provide information on how to improve what we do as well as to grade it after the fact. Since this is an implementation/application project, one major measure of success will be how many ideas are used.
8. Dissemination Plan

Dissemination Plan:
As noted above, this is a dissemination project. It is designed to take the ideas of the Chancellor's Office and faculty development professionals and get them to our faculties in useful form. It should be immediately useful in many cases because the emphasis is on the application of innovative instructional techniques. So the Dissemination Plan really is the Work Plan. If we didn't disseminate, the project fails. It won't.
9. Budget Narrative

[NO “BUDGET NARRATIVE” ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]