

Final Assessment Report

Centre for Teaching Excellence (CTE)

Submitted March 9, 2018, by Donna Ellis, CTE Director

Summary of the External Review

At the request of the Associate Vice-President, Academic, Mario Coniglio, an external review of the Centre for Teaching Excellence (CTE) was undertaken in response to the Academic Programming part of the institutional strategic plan. As an academic support unit, CTE is not part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP); however, the review adapted many of the processes outlined in Waterloo's IQAP for academic programs. This final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the CTE.

A [self-study](#) was submitted to the Associate Vice-President, Academic Office on August 18, 2017. The self-study presented an overview of the purpose and process used for the review, a description and analyses of the Centre's work, and data collected through CTE's on-going assessment process. Additional data collected for this review include: a SWOT analysis with contributions from all Centre staff members; a reputation survey, distributed to Directors of teaching centres at universities across Canada; a needs assessment survey of Waterloo instructors; individual and small-group interviews with CTE's key partners; and a survey focusing on the impact of CTE staff members' conference participation. Six questions for specific feedback were identified for the reviewers.

Two arm's-length external reviewers (Julia Christensen Hughes, Dean, College of Business and Economics, University of Guelph, and Nancy Turner, Director, Teaching and Learning Enhancement, University of Saskatchewan) were chosen by the Associate Vice-President, Academic, in addition to one internal reviewer (Dan Davison, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering).

They reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit at the University on September 19th and 20th, 2017. The visit included interviews with: the Provost and Vice-President, Academic; the Associate Vice-President, Academic; the CTE Director; Deans and AFIW presidents/principals; Faculty Teaching Fellows; intensive workshop faculty facilitators; faculty members, including representation from the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo; graduate students and postdoctoral fellows; staff from partner and collaborator

units; and CTE staff members, including graduate students and undergraduate co-op students employed at the Centre. Approximately 100 people participated in the site visit.

Centre Characteristics

The Centre for Teaching Excellence resulted from the merger of three existing units at Waterloo that provided support and recognition for various facets of teaching and learning development. In 2007, the Teaching Resources and Continuing Education (TRACE) Office, the Centre for Learning and Teaching through Technology (LT3), and the Learning Resources and Innovation (LRI) unit were amalgamated to provide Waterloo instructors with resources and learning opportunities to enhance teaching and learning practices, course design, and curriculum renewal. Support for fully online courses was, and continues to be, provided by the Centre for Extended Learning (CEL) (previously Distance and Continuing Education).

The mandate of CTE is to act as a resource to the University of Waterloo academic community to enhance instructional practices and deepen student learning; inform its practice through using and engaging in pedagogical research; and contribute expertise to the broader external discussion on post-secondary education. CTE's vision is to inspire teaching excellence, innovation, and inquiry. And the mission is to collaborate with individuals, academic departments, and academic support units to foster capacity and community around teaching and to promote an institutional culture that values effective teaching and meaningful learning.

To achieve this mandate, vision, and mission, CTE employs 21 full-time staff, plus every term an additional 10 graduate students (part-time) and 1 to 3 undergraduate co-op students. The main services provided by the unit include: consultations, workshops and instructional programs (university-wide and department/Faculty-specific), support for program-level curriculum (re)design, and online resources. The key areas of service involve: faculty programs and research, graduate student and postdoctoral fellow programs, blended learning, integrative learning, emerging educational technologies, and curriculum and quality enhancement. CTE's main client groups are: faculty members, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and staff who are involved in instruction. The unit also contributes significantly to institution-level strategic plan projects.

Summary of strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities

Overall Strengths

- CTE staff members are positive, energetic, responsive, trustworthy, and expert, and they work well together in an environment of mutual respect
- CTE staff value all members of the institutional community as teachers and learners

- Clients are positive: they hold CTE in “very high regard” and demonstrate solid demand for CTE’s services and programs
- A clear, unit-level strategic plan exists that is based on stakeholder input, rooted in educational development scholarship, and regularly evaluated

Overall Weaknesses and Challenges

- Staff are over-committed, with too much of a “can do” attitude and without enough appreciation for the “opportunity cost” of the services they provide
- Staff identified very few programs or services to let go and stop doing as a means of refocusing on institutional and Centre priorities and rebalancing workloads
- The unit’s organizational structure is spread too horizontally, leading to not enough career progression opportunities for staff and too many operational responsibilities for the Director role due to the large number of direct reports
- Limited Director and other senior leader time is available to contribute fully to institution-level strategic initiatives on teaching and learning and those needed to respond to the higher education context in Ontario (this is an institutional level issue, not specific just to CTE)
- CTE’s systems and resources have some significant limitations, including cumbersome administrative systems (e.g., university-managed workshop registration system) and limited time available to engage in more advanced Centre assessment projects

Opportunities for CTE are addressed in the reviewers’ recommendations so are not summarized in this section.

Summary of key findings from the external reviewers

The external reviewers, Dr. Christensen Hughes and Ms. Turner, provided a positive assessment overall of the Centre for Teaching Excellence. The reviewers were very impressed with the self-study and the broad participation in the site-visit interviews. They also noted that CTE has fit their services to the Waterloo context exceptionally well, and should continue to consult with the Faculty Deans to ensure ongoing fit with emerging needs. Compared to teaching centres at other Canadian universities, CTE fared well in the areas of: institutional reach and engagement, the provision of support for both academic and non-academic units, unit-level strategic planning and evaluation processes, and staff members’ scholarship and reputation. CTE was also seen to have “extensive and strong relationships” across campus with partners and collaborator units. Overall, the reviewers identified CTE as “one of the leaders in Canada and indeed internationally in progressing educational development practice.” However, they did suggest a number of recommendations – focused on CTE and on the university more broadly – which they believed would add benefit to CTE and its stakeholders.

Centre response to external reviewer recommendations

The reviewers made 13 specific recommendations, divided into three categories: 1) services provided, 2) internal structure, and 3) position within the institution. A few additional ideas

were included throughout the report for consideration and will be addressed in this section as well. Each recommendation is provided verbatim from the report and will be briefly described from CTE's perspective, followed by the proposed response. A table that outlines the implementation plan for each action item appears at the end of this report.

Services

1. **Decrease the number of university-wide workshops.** As these are acknowledged mechanisms for promotion but not particularly effective for deep learning or sustained enhancement of pedagogy, we recommend scaling back here as well as selecting particular topics where awareness raising and networking are the primary intended outcomes. Access to larger classrooms might reduce the number of events while maintaining overall enrollments. The CTE may wish to maintain some programming by expanding on the success of the faculty leadership of programming as successfully done in the Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW).

Response

The reviewers appear to have assumed that all of CTE's university-wide workshops are short (90 minutes). However, CTE also provides full-day and multi-day workshops that have, as one intended outcome, the development of communities around teaching. Community-building is one of three key areas of focus in CTE's mission. As such, some university-wide workshops will continue to be offered. This recommendation provides incentive, though, to more carefully check results from the 2017 faculty needs assessment survey and review input data in relation to number of events offered over time to assess preferences and trends. In the graduate student area, reviews of the Fundamentals program and the Postdoctoral Fellows program will occur in 2018. Faculty programming data and plans will be reviewed in 2019-2020. CTE's office and workshop space is also under review centrally; CTE staff members trust that any new space will match the unit's needs and those of the various client groups.

2. **Consider modeling innovation in more flexible and technology enabled programming, particularly in the graduate student programming area.** This may allow for increased number of participants or a lessening of resources needed for delivery while modeling good practice in these areas.

Response

The review of graduate student programming outlined in the response to Recommendation 1 will include consideration of program delivery options. However, in the graduate programs area, existing online resources developed for the mygradskills.ca website need to be updated but are not Waterloo-owned nor controlled. Program delivery options will also be reviewed for faculty programming in relation to needs assessment data and available, existing online resources. CTE staff members recognize, however, that there is value in creating online materials in-house so they fully address

needs and are easier to update and revise. As such, discussions will ensue with CEL to investigate leveraging existing platforms and technologies available to create new content and frameworks for online and blended delivery. CTE staff members also recognize that community-building occurs most easily face-to-face, so programs and events with that express outcome will likely continue to be offered in this format.

3. **Shift resources to department/Faculty-specific programming.**

Response

CTE already provides tailored programming in Faculties and departments. For example, one graduate student position was reconfigured a few years ago to have six TA Workshop Facilitators (one per Faculty) to provide discipline-specific programming. For faculty members, this more tailored programming stems from CTE's Faculty Liaisons and from curriculum-focused retreats. The reviews of CTE's programs described in response to Recommendation 1 will include a review of the balance between university-wide and department/Faculty-specific programs as well as the effectiveness and utility of the tracking and assessment of department/Faculty-specific programs since faculty members do not currently need to register for these programs. This rebalancing discussion should also include workload projections since distributing programs across Faculties would seem to require more time and resources versus less.

4. **Stop writing blogs and the newsletter.** Focus instead on development and/or securing of high quality "just in time" on-line resources and website development. On-line resources could showcase faculty contributions as 'cases' of good practice. Partnering with the communications department on this to enable broader sharing of outcomes would be ideal.

Response

CTE staff members agree with stopping the blog and the newsletter. A unit-wide exercise to "prune" the Centre's activities was undertaken around the time of the site visit, and staff identified both of these communication vehicles as having limited value for the effort required to produce them. As a result, January 2018 was the final publication date for the newsletter (previously produced in the Winter and Spring terms; the Fall term newsletter had already been replaced by an annual report), and the blog will be stopped by the end of April 2018.

The staff in CTE who work on communications will continue to work on a plan to produce different resources that provide timely information to stakeholders and showcase faculty stories about teaching and learning. Ideas being considered are: adding more succinct and timely news items to the website's newsreel; creating the next generation of teaching stories which would highlight the implementation of current, evidence-based instructional practices rather than specific instructors in an

effort to focus on effective teaching and learning versus teachers; and a digest of top stories and resources targeted at senior administrators. CTE staff will continue to reach out to the central university-level communications units, but will also attempt to foster stronger connections to Faculty-specific communications officers in a quest to increase the promotion of teaching and learning at Waterloo. This level of activity assumes the continuation of the Communications Associate role as discussed in Recommendation 7.

5. **Recognize that in the achievement of the above recommendations, current CTE metrics may shift.** With a reduction in university-wide workshops, for example, may come a decrease in the output metrics currently shared by the CTE as part of its annual report. There will need to be an acceptance that a richer picture of reach and outcomes (as articulated in program logic models and/or theory of change models and assessed through more qualitative and flexible means) will be acceptable as evidence of the significant work of the Centre and its value to the institution. Some examples of this shift in evaluating Educational Development work can be seen in Bamber & Stefani (2016).

Response

The evaluation of teaching centre work is challenging and no consensus exists in the educational development literature about how best to do it. The reviewers encouraged an extension to the Centre's current practices in order to focus on identifying program outcomes for the range of services provided (e.g., curriculum development support, research on teaching support, department-specific events, and faculty-led learning communities). They also advised that the assessment of these broad outcomes would likely require qualitative data and longitudinal data collection to understand the larger departmental and institutional outcomes to which CTE is contributing.

This recommendation to assess more deeply rather than broadly aligns well with the next phase of CTE's existing assessment plan, in which dedicated evaluation projects will be tied to key programming. Specifically, while output data will continue to be collected since such data are valuable for assessment and planning purposes as well as institutional reporting on key performance indicators, CTE staff will be undertaking evaluation projects over the next few years that focus on gaining a richer understanding of the outcomes from key intensive programs (e.g., Postdoctoral Fellows programming, New Faculty programming, and the Graduate Supervision Series). Since many CTE staff members also engage in research as part of their positions, increasingly more effort will be paid to aligning future research projects with the Centre's strategic priorities and addressing questions embedded in the CTE assessment plan.

Concurrently, efforts will soon commence to refine plans for each of CTE's newly launched strategic priorities to clearly show how the Centre's initiatives align to each priority while identifying resource and staff development needs and appropriate

assessments. In the near future, discussions about the theories of change that underpin the Centre's work will also occur. Professional development workshops for all CTE full-time staff members occurred in 2017 regarding various change management theories; this training should be of assistance when addressing this particular recommendation.

Internal Structure

6. **Better use administrative support and streamline processes to reduce administrative work of all IDs.** The new registration system coming in 2019 will assist with this.

Response

CTE agrees there are opportunities to look more critically at various processes within the Centre. A Process Working Group has recently been established within the Centre to explore process evaluation, including looking critically at various tasks.

To address this recommendation specifically, CTE will undertake a workload analysis of our administrative tasks, particularly focused on the roles of our three full-time administrative staff and the co-op students who support Centre operations. With respect to the institution's transition to Workday, early system testing has revealed functionality that should reduce administrative workload in the Centre. For example, the new system gives participants the ability to drop courses themselves rather than making the request through CTE. It is anticipated that this and other Workday features will reduce the work related to CTE's programming and will enable staff to shift time to other administrative tasks identified through the workload analysis.

7. **Make the "Communications Associate" role permanent** to ensure ongoing contribution to internal and external teaching and learning profile-raising work can be undertaken.

Response

CTE staff members fully support this recommendation. The role began as a two-year contract position in order to test the need for it. In just over a year, the incumbent has significantly increased the support for external teaching award nominations and has strengthened CTE's ability to raise the profile of Waterloo's teaching and learning both internally and externally, particularly via website-based resources. CTE will submit a request for permanent funding for this position in this fiscal year. Without this position, the preparation of external teaching award nominations cannot be supported by CTE.

8. **Review the role and title of the "Faculty Liaison" position** to ensure these roles are being used to best effect in advancing the strategic goals of CTE and the institution, and

the needs of the specific Faculties to which each is applied. More consistency in skill and service is needed as well as greater coordination with the Teaching Fellows.

Response

The CTE Liaison role has evolved significantly over the past decade as additional areas of responsibility are being covered more frequently by many of the Liaisons. CTE's leadership team members (the Director and the six Senior Instructional Developers) see value in reviewing the Liaison role in relation to the existing Instructional Developer roles. This review will require consultations with all staff involved in these roles to determine the most logical response for the future of the Centre. It is anticipated that these discussions will reveal gaps in CTE's staffing, including an instructional developer position to oversee curriculum work done in support of program reviews and accreditation, a possible separation of the TA Training and Writing Support functions into two instructional developer positions, and an instructional developer position in the area of diversity (which may include indigenization).

9. **Create two Associate/Assistant Directors supported by 4 senior SIDs** to decrease operational load on Executive Director/Dean (to enable contribution to strategic/policy leadership – see next section).

Response

This term, the leadership team in CTE developed and discussed a number of possible organizational structures for the Centre to maximize effectiveness and create a more visible succession plan. The reviewers' proposed organizational structure is not feasible, given our existing resources, but a new structure has been drafted after receiving the reviewers' report. Revisions to the organizational structure will require extensive consultation with CTE staff members as well as Human Resources since a new structure would constitute an organizational change. Position titles will also be part of this ongoing consultation as will the development of revised job descriptions (as needed). Any organizational structure changes will also require approval from the university's Staff Relations Committee. The consultation and approval processes should be completed by the end of 2018.

10. **Ensure greater profile and consistency in the "Teaching Fellow" position**, further supporting enhanced department/Faculty-specific programming and support.

Response

CTE has no oversight over the Teaching Fellow positions, so this recommendation steps beyond the Centre's area of control. However, this coming fiscal year CTE does plan to invite the Teaching Fellows to key planning and professional development activities (e.g., annual program planning retreat, journal club) and assess the effect of these activities on department/Faculty-specific programming. Regular Teaching Fellows'

meetings with CTE's Director and Faculty Liaisons should also assist with information sharing. To help increase the profile of this role, work with the Teaching Fellows will continue to be highlighted in CTE's annual report. Finally, a CTE evaluation project on the development of educational leaders is likely to commence in 2020.

Position within the Institution

- 11. Change the Director position to take on a more strategic/leadership role within the institution.** There exists a need to pull back from the operational work of the CTE to work more closely with the Deans and lead projects like the student evaluation of teaching work, as one example. We recommend considering a title change to "Executive Director", "Dean" or "Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning".

Response

Organizational structure changes to CTE will necessarily change the Director's areas of responsibility and will likely make more time available for institutional-level work, but the primary focus of the Director should continue to be CTE given the unit's size and various accountabilities. A new Executive-level position could be created to focus primarily on institutional strategic initiatives related to teaching and learning; however, this type of proposal is beyond CTE's scope. As a result, the Associate Vice-President, Academic (AVPA), should be the one to consider this recommendation and, if deemed feasible, explore with Waterloo's senior administration team the possible creation of a new position. Should that occur, CTE's Director and leadership team should be consulted as part of this exploration. This type of senior-level role would seem useful as the institutional focus on teaching and learning continues to expand and the AVPA's areas of responsibility grow. The current AVPA's term ends in June 2019; as a result, this recommendation should be explored before that date.

- 12. More explicit alignment of services with other central service units will be important.** This might include the CTE Director overseeing more than one unit and/or more explicit articulations of mandate and partnership across units including Instructional Technologies and Media Services (ITMS), Institutional Analysis and Planning (IAP), and the Writing and Communication Centre (WCC).

Response

Any changes to unit reporting structures is beyond CTE's control and will need to be discussed by senior administrators outside of CTE under the leadership of the AVPA. The second idea suggested of having more explicit articulations of mandate and areas of collaboration makes sense, particularly with CTE's partner units. Currently CTE is updating its contact list to verify that streamlined connections are in place with partner and collaborator units. Feedback from partner units that was collected as part of the self-study will be analyzed further to determine ideas for increasing clarity and

transparency (e.g., meetings of staff below the Director level, written agreements). An extensive review of partner relationships and joint projects is scheduled to begin in 2018.

13. **Continue to partner with other central units on some aspects of provision – being careful not to overstep mandate.** Hopefully HR will shortly be in the position to take back responsibility for the new faculty orientation, and others will expand their capability in event planning.

Response

The response provided for Recommendation 12 applies to this recommendation as well. CTE cannot control event planning capability or capacity in other units, but the new HR Workday system may be helpful for all units engaged in offering training programs. A workload analysis that identifies the efforts needed to coordinate the new faculty welcome events will be completed this calendar year and shared with HR to initiate discussions about how they can support these events.

Additional Reviewer Comments:

While not part of the recommended changes within the CTE, a few key institutional changes identified in the reviewers' report would allow CTE's work to be more effective and support the University of Waterloo in achieving its strategic goals in teaching and learning. These ideas include more active engagement by the Deans in supporting the university's teaching and learning aspirations, better processes for the design of new spaces and the acquisition and use of learning technologies, and the establishment of a senate committee focused on teaching and learning.

Response

CTE staff support any institutional changes that bolster the focus and resources provided to the ongoing development of effective teaching and learning at Waterloo. Possible projects of interest for CTE in the upcoming few years include:

- Teaching and learning space design to enable and promote more active learning and student engagement (Director is a member of the existing Teaching and Learning Spaces Committee)
- Institutionally supported acquisition and use of educational technologies
- Training for faculty administrators (e.g., Chairs) and Teaching Fellows on teaching development and teaching evaluation that may help to support Faculty-level and institution-wide initiatives

CTE's response plans run through to 2021, but the next external review is unlikely to occur before 2024. Additional planning activities scheduled include:

- Engagement in discussions to develop Waterloo’s next institutional strategic plan (2020-2025) – new activities and initiatives will emerge for CTE from this strategic plan and are set to begin as review-related activities are concluding
- Updates to CTE’s strategic priorities and identity statements – current priorities run from 2018-2021, so work will also begin in 2020 to review and update them, with new strategic priorities being developed for 2021-2024

Implementation Plan

| | Recommendations | Proposed Actions | Responsibility for Leading and Resourcing (if applicable) the Actions | Timeline for Addressing Recommendations |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Services Provided | | | | |
| 1. | Decrease the number of university-wide workshops | 1a. Review program design of Fundamentals of University Teaching certificate for graduate students and the Teaching Development Seminar Series for postdoctoral fellows | SID – Graduate Programs & Internationalization SID – Curriculum & Quality Enhancement | Teaching Development Seminar Series (January – May 2018) Fundamentals of University Teaching (May – September 2018) |
| | | 1b. Review program design for faculty programming, including definitions of core faculty workshops and distinctions between short and intensive workshops and their associated metrics | SID – Faculty Programs & Research SID – Curriculum & Quality Enhancement | May 2019 – April 2020 |
| 2. | Consider modeling innovation in more flexible and technology enabled programming | 2a. Identify existing open online resources (including CTE’s) that we can reuse and integrate into our programming and consult with CEL about the creation of new online resources (may have cost implications) | SID – Graduate Programs & Internationalization SID – Faculty Programs and Research | Graduate and postdoctoral fellow programming (January – September 2018) Faculty programming (May 2019 – April 2020) |

| | Recommendations | Proposed Actions | Responsibility for Leading and Resourcing (if applicable) the Actions | Timeline for Addressing Recommendations |
|-----------|--|---|---|--|
| 3. | Shift resources to department/Faculty-specific programming | 3a. Analyze department/Faculty-specific programming already being offered and how participation is being tracked | SID – Graduate Programs & Internationalization SID – Faculty Programs and Research | Graduate and postdoctoral fellow programming (January – September 2018) Faculty programming (May 2019 – April 2020) |
| | | 3b. Identify an appropriate balance between university-wide and department/Faculty-specific programming with respect to staff members’ workload levels | SID – Graduate Programs & Internationalization SID – Faculty Programs and Research | Graduate and postdoctoral fellow programming (January – September 2018) Faculty programming (May 2019 – April 2020) |
| 4. | Stop writing blogs and the newsletter | 4a. Stop writing the newsletter | SID – Emerging Technologies | Completed January 2018 |
| | | 4b. Stop writing the blog | SID – Emerging Technologies | April 2018 |
| | | 4c. Develop and implement a plan to produce different resources that provide timely information | SID – Emerging Technologies | Start May 2018 – April 2019 |
| | | 4d. Foster stronger connections to Faculty-specific communications officers | SID – Emerging Technologies | Start May 2018 – April 2019 |

| | Recommendations | Proposed Actions | Responsibility for Leading and Resourcing (if applicable) the Actions | Timeline for Addressing Recommendations |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 5. | Recognize that in the achievement of the above recommendations, current CTE metrics may shift | 5a. Refine plans to assess new strategic priorities | SID – Curriculum & Quality Enhancement | May – August 2018 |
| | | 5b. Launch large-scale evaluation projects identified in CTE assessment schedule to assess whether programming has met intended outcomes and whether those are still the right outcomes (e.g., New Faculty program) | SID – Curriculum & Quality Enhancement | Starting May 2018 |
| | | 5c. Explore theories of change and other theoretical frameworks that underpin the Centre’s work (SIDs retreat) | Director | May 2020 – April 2021 |
| Internal Structure | | | | |
| 6. | Better use administrative support and streamline processes to reduce administrative work of all IDs | 6a. Develop and execute a transition plan for shift to Workday system, identifying impact on administrative roles | SID – Curriculum & Quality Enhancement | June – December 2018 |

| | Recommendations | Proposed Actions | Responsibility for Leading and Resourcing (if applicable) the Actions | Timeline for Addressing Recommendations |
|------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | 6b. Conduct workload analysis for administrative staff (i.e., Program Coordinator - Faculty Programs, Program Coordinator - Graduate and Postdoctoral Programs, Administrative Assistant, and the co-op students) | Director SID – Faculty Programs and Research SID – Graduate Programs & Internationalization | May – December 2019 (post-Workday launch) |
| 7. | Make the “Communications Associate” role permanent | 7a. Request permanent funding | Director SID – Emerging Technologies | January – April 2018 |
| 8. | Review the role and title of the “Faculty Liaison” position | <i>See Recommendation 9</i> | | |
| 9. | Create two Associate/Assistant Directors supported by 4 senior SIDs | 9a. Engage with Human Resources and CTE staff to launch and execute an organizational change initiative for the Centre | Director | January – December 2018 |
| 10. | Ensure greater profile and consistency in the “Teaching Fellow” position | 10a. Invite Teaching Fellows (TFs) to the CTE program planning annual retreat | Director SID – Faculty Programs and Research | June 2018 |
| | | 10b. Establish regular meetings with TFs, Director, and Liaisons | Director | Starting August 2018 |
| | | 10c. Meet (at least) annually with Deans and TF | Director | Starting August 2018 |

| | Recommendations | Proposed Actions | Responsibility for Leading and Resourcing (if applicable) the Actions | Timeline for Addressing Recommendations |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | 10d. Profile teaching development conducted by our partners and collaborators in our annual report | Director SID – Emerging Technologies | Starting May 2019 |
| Position within the Institution | | | | |
| 11. | Change the Director position to take on a more strategic/ leadership role within the institution | 11a. Investigate and develop a proposal for an Executive level position (if deemed feasible) with the Associate Vice-President, Academic | Director | February – December 2018 |
| 12. | More explicit alignment of services with other central service units | 12a. Draw on self-study partner feedback and existing work practices to develop formal agreements with key partners regarding scope of services | Director and appropriate SIDs | Starting May 2018 |
| 13. | Continue to partner with other central units on some aspects of provision – being careful not to overstep mandate | 13a. Review our connections with partner and collaborator units | SID – Integrative Learning | February – December 2018 |
| | | 13b. Complete a workload analysis that identifies the efforts needed to coordinate the new faculty welcome events and discuss with Human Resources | SID – Faculty Programs and Research | March – December 2018 |

CTE’s Director, in consultation with the Associate Vice-President, Academic, shall be responsible for monitoring the Implementation Plan.