Magicians of the Golden State

The CSU Center Director Disappearing Acts

Cynthia Desrochers

The California State University

The California State University (CSU) Teaching and Learning Center directors perform daily feats of magic, often culminating in one particularly dramatic trick at the end of the academic year—their own disappearing acts. This chapter traces the history of the center director position in the CSU system, reports where directors go when they leave the position after only a few years, and proposes how frequent turnover might be reversed through organizational factors aimed at promoting retention of these Magicians of the Golden State.

The date is January 2000, and seventeen California State University (CSU) Teaching and Learning Center directors (henceforth called center directors) are gathered for their semi-annual meeting of the Faculty Development Council (FDC), this one being held at CSU Sacramento. The FDC is an unofficial affinity group composed of all twenty-three center directors in the CSU system. The day's topic is "A Discussion of Center Director Burnout." Forty-seven ideas for avoiding burnout are generated and subsequently organized into six major themes. The follow-up report on this session reads, "The discussion was far-ranging, positive in focus, and energizing to participants" (Faculty Development Council Report, 2000).

Fast-forward the calendar to fall 2007, and we find that only one of the original seventeen center directors remains on the roster; this represents a 94 percent turnover in seven years. In addition, two new center directors have just been appointed, and four additional center directors have resigned over the summer, leaving their posts vacant as the academic year begins.

Although there are many benefits to being a center director in the CSU system—the twenty-three center directors communicate often, meet semi-annually, and receive support at the CSU system level—the CSU center director position is a challenging one. Centers have typically two employees: the center director, who may be part-time (.2 to .8) and an administrative support assistant, who may also be part-time (.5 to 1.0). Consequently, the demand for center services is often greater than a center is able to provide. Moreover, because historically our directors come from the ranks of CSU tenured faculty, they perform daily feats of magic, not only for their centers but also for their academic departments and colleges, as they fulfill teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities.

The “magic” and their “bag of tricks” might look like this on any given Monday. Begin the day with an 8:00 A.M. college personnel meeting; scurry off to Costco to buy inexpensive snacks for a workshop; run to class to teach thirty students in a freshman seminar, meeting Mondays and Wednesday, 10:00 to 11:30; be back at the center by noon to lead a session on classroom civility; meet at 2:00 P.M. with three faculty who are writing an NSF grant and need to include a faculty development component; arrive late to the faculty senate meeting but just in time to deliver the commercial for the center-sponsored mini-grants; feel a bit under the weather by day’s end but can’t call in sick tomorrow because there are no “substitutes” to facilitate tomorrow’s workshop session on course redesign, and now it’s off to the car and home, grateful not to be teaching that 4:00 to 7:00 P.M. class, like last semester. Then, after a few comparable semesters, like many magic acts, these center directors stage their most dramatic finale—their own disappearing acts.

This chapter is guided by the assumption that frequent and often unanticipated turnover of center directors both impedes the overall functioning of teaching and learning centers and prevents

smooth transitions between center directors. What follows is a systemwide study that relies on CSU reports, surveys, and personal interviews to investigate and provide partial answers to the following questions: 1) What, exactly, is the CSU center director turnover rate? 2) Where do CSU center directors go when they leave the position? 3) What role do workload, resources, and stress play in the high turnover rate? 4) What changes in organizational conditions might result in higher retention of CSU center directors?

The CSU Teaching and Learning Center

The twenty-three-campus CSU is the nation's largest and most diverse university system, with approximately 40,000 faculty and 450,000 students. Student enrollments at individual campuses range from approximately 800 students to 36,000 students. Our first Teaching and Learning Center was established at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) in the late 1970s. By 2000, all twenty-two campuses in the system at that time (the twenty-third campus opened in 2002) had either a coordinator or director of teaching and learning, with differentiated amounts of released-time provided them to promote campuswide instructional enhancement endeavors. The rapid development of campus centers was the result of a few highly motivated leaders in the CSU who spread the word regarding the importance of establishing a Teaching and Learning Center. In the mid-1980s, the CSU chancellor created the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL). Under the leadership of the ITL faculty director, with an advisory board of academic senators, campus administrators, and system administrators, ITL's mission was to support systemwide, discipline-specific research on teaching and learning. In the early to mid-1990s, as new centers sprang up throughout the CSU system, the ITL directors informally mentored the new center directors. In 1994, the ITL held a meeting and discussed impressive goals for their future direction, including becoming the "preeminent system faculty development operation in the country through

- Research
- Exchange/Dissemination of ideas and information

- Renewal
- Mentoring
- Focus on learning
- Promoting reflection about the nature and process of teaching and learning” (Institute for Teaching and learning, 1994, p. 1)

By all accounts, the CSU was trailblazing in its goals. Eight years later, Cook and Sorcinelli (2002) would highlight many of the same benefits derived from establishing an effective Teaching and Learning Center, as synthesized here:

- Plays a key role in creating a campus culture that values and rewards teaching and learning
- Provides an overview of campus best practices in order to highlight and disseminate them campuswide
- Fosters faculty conversations across disciplines
- Addresses unique campus interests and needs in support of educating students
- Takes responsibility for staying abreast of and communicating the literature on student learning
- Assists faculty on a confidential basis
- Offers a comprehensive program to support faculty professional development, including workshops and seminars, new-faculty orientation programs, grant competitions to stimulate teaching improvements, and publications to share basics and innovations
- Provides the institutional memory that allows for continuity in teaching support services as department chairs, deans, and provosts come and go

Throughout my twelve years of involvement with CSU faculty development, first as the founding director of a campus center (1995 to 2005) and currently as the director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning, I have witnessed many of these same benefits provided by our established centers, except for one—institutional memory. Unfortunately, many of our centers suffer from amnesia due to frequent turnover of center directors. Acknowledging that two campuses have three-year-rotating director positions that permit term renewal, the other campuses have no such policies to prevent center directors from remaining in

Figure 5.1. Number of Directors at CSU Campus Centers, 1995–2007

the position indefinitely; however, few remain for long. In the 2006 survey of center directors, of the nineteen responding, 53 percent had been in the position two years or less, and 32 percent had been in the position three to four years (Faculty Development Council Survey, 2006). Figure 5.1 depicts the historical roster of the twenty-one established CSU campuses from 1995 to 2007.

The longevity of center directors varies considerably, ranging from no turnover during this time period to a campus that has had seven different directors over the same twelve-year period. (*Note: This campus is currently experiencing stability, having had the same director for over three years.*)

Director Disappearance Act

Where do CSU center directors go when they leave the position? A search of historical reports, coupled with interviews of past CSU leadership, resulted in information about forty former directors between 1995 and 2007.

Exit Goals

The major exit goal, representing 42 percent of those departing, as illustrated in Figure 5.2, was to assume a higher-level administrative position within the CSU system. These data confirm that the CSU center directorship is a stepping-stone position to becoming an associate dean, dean, associate vice president, assistant provost, or system-level director in the CSU system. Although exact reasons for each exit may remain confidential for many, informal interviews reveal two publicly expressed reasons for their exits. First, the center director position is a positive administrative experience; hence, some directors are motivated to seek higher-level administrative positions because they find that they enjoy administrative work. Second, some center directors, working on partial released-time, seek a full-time administrative position in order to enjoy greater job focus, compensation, and status. Regardless of the underlying reasons that center directors exit the position in favor of administrative roles, however, this practice results in a high turnover rate for CSU center directors. Moreover, I would argue that as beneficial as it may be to have campus administrators who are knowledgeable about teaching

Figure 5.2. Where CSU Center Directors Go Directly After Leaving the Position, 1995–2007

and learning, it severely retards the cumulative faculty development expertise in the CSU system.

The next greatest departure destination, at 25 percent, was to retirement. This indicates that directors tend to take the center directorship toward the end of their careers. Many report that the directorship is a vehicle for giving back to the university by sharing one's accumulated wisdom with newer faculty. Next, of the 13 percent who left the center director position in order to take a similar job in another state, their reasons included the desire to move closer to family or to leave an unhealthy work environment. And finally, the 10 percent who returned to teaching have tended to be midcareer faculty who reported that they missed teaching and discipline-based research. There are no doubt other reasons for leaving the center director position that are personal and have gone unreported, such as being ineffective or not enjoying the work.

Underdeveloped Expertise

How does a novice center director become an expert? Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000), presenting research from the cognitive sciences, caution that expertise falls on a continuum, from novice to expert, and is field-dependent; hence, it typically does not transfer directly from one field to another. Moreover, the nature of expertise is such that experts in a field have developed a well-organized knowledge base that they thoroughly understand, can easily call on and use, and often adapt to fit different conditions. Given the requirements needed for a center director to develop expertise in this role, and given the long-running performance of the "Center Director Disappearing Acts," the CSU system needs to address factors that may increase center director retention in the position so that directors attain an operational level of expertise, leading to that systemwide preeminence, as envisioned by CSU visionaries in 1994.

Historically, our center directors have been recruited from the ranks of campus tenured faculty with outstanding teaching records and interest in faculty development; however, few have experience in directing a center and even fewer a well-organized knowledge base in designing curriculum, instruction, and assessments for a

variety of disciplines. In the 2006 survey of center directors, of the nineteen responding, one came from the field of education, three from educational technology, and one from educational administration. The other disciplines represented include computer science, communication studies, sociology, English, history, political science, plant science, nursing, and business law. Hence, with expertise in a wide range of disciplines not directly related to faculty professional development, new center directors get on-the-job training in order to develop expertise in learning theory, instructional strategies, course design, assessment, working with faculty and administrators, and managing a center. Nancy Chism (2006) made this comment in a POD session: "For the School of Medicine, we don't say, 'You're healthy; let's make you dean of the school.' However, in faculty development we often say, 'You teach well; let's make you head of our center.'" Perhaps the CSU is guilty of doing this, as currently only one campus out of twenty-three employs a director who was hired as an experienced faculty developer through a nationwide search. Might this practice of selecting inexperienced faculty developers contribute to our revolving door of center directors? Would director longevity improve if experienced faculty development professionals were hired to fill the CSU center director positions? Would these individuals need to hold tenured faculty positions to be perceived as credible by our disciplinary faculty?

Mullinix (2008) is exploring the perceived impact of center director faculty status on director credibility with discipline-based faculty, and she finds that a significant majority of experienced faculty development professionals "perceived faculty status to be an important contributor to their credibility, effectiveness, and interactions with faculty colleagues" (p. 190). This may lead us to conclude that if experienced faculty development professionals are hired by the CSU in the future, it is important that they be tenure-track in order to increase center director retention rates without compromising center director effectiveness with faculty.

Magicians on Overload

The responsibilities of our center directors are numerous and varied. Surveys conducted in 1996, 2002, and 2006 confirm a high level of center productivity. In the most recent 2006 survey,

with nineteen center directors responding, the majority of center directors (50 to 100 percent) reported the following activities as “major responsibilities” of their centers:

- Providing pedagogical workshops
- Establishing faculty learning communities
- Conducting individual faculty consultations
- Providing academic technology workshops
- Organizing fall-term new-faculty orientations
- Providing new-faculty programs throughout the year
- Administering mini-grants and follow-up
- Supporting Retention, Tenure, and Promotion portfolio development
- Promoting scholarship of teaching and learning projects (Faculty Development Council Survey, 2006)

Moreover, 42 percent report major responsibility for providing service learning support and 32 percent for coordinating program assessment. In addition, 37 percent report having a peer-review or peer coaching program, and 32 percent run book groups. In order to provide these faculty development programs, 80 percent of our centers have at least one dedicated room; however, the other 20 percent have no room dedicated to their use.

Do our center directors feel overloaded? And if so, does this overload lead to stress, and ultimately, director burnout in early stages of careers, accounting for some of the CSU center director turnover? The systemwide study provides answers to these questions.

Job burnout starts with stress, which is often the result of being faced with too many demands, a lack of rewards, and a feeling of powerlessness (Potter, 1998). Eventually, an individual’s coping skills are strained, and she may burn out and quit the job. *Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary* defines *burnout* as “exhaustion of physical or emotional strength or motivation usually as a result of prolonged stress or frustration.” Recalling the center directors’ meeting where Center Director Burnout was the topic, key ideas from this discussion appear in Table 5.1 and suggest why sixteen of the seventeen center directors in attendance have since left the position.

**Table 5.1. Themes and Suggestions for Avoiding
Center Director Burnout**

Theme I. Network with colleagues.

1. Attend dean and associate dean meetings with your provost.
2. Become a member of campus committees and the faculty senate.
3. Recruit good advisory board members and promise not to overload them with excessive demands.

Theme II. Just say no.

1. Have a clear view of your mission and only accept responsibilities and opportunities consistent with it.
2. Tie new initiatives to resources (only agree to support an effort with additional staff or budget).
3. Don't stretch so far that you undermine the quality of what you are already doing.
4. Negotiate your role with your supervisor. If you have multiple roles, negotiate less than full-time expectations with each supervisor. Invite your supervisors to meet with you all together, so they have a better understanding of their joint expectations of you.
5. Set deadlines and limits (for example, do not provide last-minute assistance to grant writers).

Theme III. Get the human resources you need to do your job well.

1. Know the tasks performed by other units on campus and refer appropriate inquiries to them.
2. Develop skills in others (for example, recruit faculty who will assume responsibility for some programs).
3. Recruit workshop leaders. Don't try to do everything yourself.
4. Delegate some responsibilities to student assistants.

Theme IV. Take care of yourself.

1. Make hard decisions about your continued role in your discipline. Don't try to be a full-time expert in your discipline and a full-time faculty developer.
2. Find an intersection between your discipline and faculty development (for example, become active in teaching-related aspects of your discipline).
3. Make hard decisions about your continued role as a teacher. Don't try to teach more than you can cope with in addition to your faculty development role.
4. Protect your health with appropriate exercise and diet.
5. Recognize that you can't do everything.

(Continued)

Table 5.1. Themes and Suggestions for Avoiding Center Director Burnout (*Continued*)

Theme V. Advocate for your center.

1. Advocate for yourself through periodic reports to the right people.
2. Advocate for yourself through a flashy brochure and a newsletter or Web site.
3. Get others to advocate on your behalf. When people express gratitude for your work, suggest that they let those above you know about it, too.
4. Schmooze your provost. What initiatives are important to him or her? What resources can he or she provide you to make them happen?
5. Walk about campus with an administrator; let him or her see your connections to the faculty.

Theme VI. Replace yourself.

1. Mentor your own replacement to ensure continuity when you take a sabbatical or leave the position.
  2. Develop skills in other faculty so you can delegate responsibilities to them.
  3. Get resources for an associate director, program coordinator, or graduate student intern.
-

These suggestions for combating burnout imply that these hard-working center directors created self-protective radar screens in order to identify and eliminate tasks that placed excessive demands on their time and well-being; moreover, they resorted to myriad informal social connections and marketing tactics in order to earn administrative approval and gain resources to run their centers. Where are the clear position descriptions and sufficient, predictable budgets that might alleviate some of the stress associated with directing these centers? Perhaps part of the reason they are lacking lies in our history, as many of the CSU Teaching and Learning Centers sprang up virtually overnight in the early to mid-1990s. At that time, many director position descriptions were merely one-paragraph blurbs defining general duties, such as "to support faculty in their multiple roles," with a modest budget allocation to match. These limitations aside, the development of Teaching and Learning Centers on each CSU campus signaled an interest in faculty professional

development and student learning, and many of us were excited to be a part of this new teaching and learning focus in higher education.

Retention Motivators for Center Directors

Having just returned from a POD conference excursion to Fallingwater—Frank Lloyd Wright’s acclaimed architectural masterpiece in Pennsylvania—I cannot help but reflect on the degree to which pre-planning resulted in a magnificent concrete home cantilevered above a roaring waterfall among huge rocks. Similarly, can our faculty development centers become attractive and stable units if we plan now by surveying the landscape, situating ourselves on a strong foundation, and avoiding large overhanging boulders? The current reality of having many novice center directors in the CSU presents not only a challenge to mentor them but also a critical point for change if we can identify and implement institutional conditions that might foster retention of directors.

To better understand what factors might motivate a center director to remain in this position for five more years, a short anonymous survey was conducted at a systemwide center directors’ semi-annual meeting in late fall, 2007. Fifteen of the nineteen permanent center directors, representing 80 percent of the permanent-director group, responded to the following question:

What would *motivate you personally* to stay in the Center director position for five more years versus moving to a new position? Think in terms of anything your university could realistically do for you/your Center as being possible. List five *motivators*, if possible.

Most directors were able to list five motivators, resulting in a total of fifty-eight items. In analyzing these items, those listed by only one center director were removed from the sample. Subsequently, items were categorized, and percentages of the total remaining were calculated, yielding the following results, as shown in Table 5.2. Moreover, these responses were analyzed according to the years of experience as a center director. Of those responding, 30 percent were considered “experienced” faculty developers (five years or more experience), whereas the

Table 5.2. Motivators for Center Directors to Stay in This Position for Five More Years

<i>Motivator</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Examples</i>
More resources	40% (half responded <i>increased budget</i>)	Increased budget, released-time, staff time, and faculty associate time
Enacted institutional mission that values faculty development (FD)	30%	Institutional actions that show support and commitment for FD (such as encouraging faculty participation), as well as growth of FD
Enhanced decision-making responsibility in the university	15%	Report to provost; value center director input and expertise, not just a midwife for campus initiatives
Center physical space	15%	Provide a permanent physical space; better location

other 70 percent were combined, representing either “novice” (up to two years experience) or “moderately experienced” (from two to five years experience).

Experienced faculty developers’ motivators to remain in the position differed from those of the less experienced developers in that they had an *institutional focus*. For example, experienced faculty developers listed motivators such as the following: a stable administration, an institutional decision-making role, administrative support, and higher-level reporting lines. The novice and moderately experienced faculty developers’ motivators were more *center-focused*. For example, these newer developers typically listed the following: staff support, released time, increased budget, more faculty associates, and dedicated center space. This indicates a developmental path toward the desire for greater institutional involvement and impact as individuals mature in the center director position. Also of interest was that none of our center directors

listed what might be termed self-serving motivators, such as greater salary compensation, elevated rank, or high-status title.

Potential Solutions

How can the picture I have described here—The Case of the CSU Center Directors' Disappearing Acts—be interpreted and what possible solutions can be offered? General job satisfaction reports, organizational development literature, and experienced educational developers provide insights.

The Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) annually interviews employees and human resource professionals in order to publish a Job Satisfaction Survey Report. Its purpose is to identify factors that contribute to job satisfaction so organizations can implement measures to retain skilled employees. The SHRM 2007 Report lists the top five “very important” job satisfaction aspects, in order of importance, as the following: compensation, benefits, job security, work-life balance, and communication between employees and senior management (Meisinger, 2007). This list demonstrates how unique higher education employment opportunities and faculties are, in that only the last one on the top-five list—“communication with senior management”—appears comparable to a motivational need cited by our center directors, identified as “institutional support.” That our center directors do not mention the other top-three satisfaction aspects may indicate that either they are well compensated, with benefits and security, or that these are not their top-priority job-satisfaction needs. It is less clear that work-life balance goes unnoticed by center directors, as this area was not investigated directly; however, directors do report a need for more human resources in order to provide center services. Moreover, center directors typically come to campus five days per week, whereas their previous teaching schedules often permitted an on-campus schedule of three to four days per week. And recalling that all of our center directors are discipline-based faculty, directors with five-days-per-week center-director schedules must relegate disciplinary-scholarship projects to the weekends, which by most definitions constitutes a work-life imbalance.

Nelson (1988) states that the goal of organizational development is to improve the functioning of the entire organizational

system. For colleges and universities, this means students, faculty, administrators, and staff. Moreover, organizational development is based on the assumption that an organization is most effective when both individual goals and organizational goals are integrated (Nelson, 1998). This suggests that if greater student learning and talent development are a high priority for the university, the Teaching and Learning Center director holds a pivotal role in this goal's attainment.

Chism (1998) addresses the role of center directors in promoting institutional change, noting the importance of achieving the following to be most effective in that role: alignment of center goals with institutional priorities, development of center director authority, as derived from credibility and respect, and development of enabling conditions, such as access, which she defines as "ready channels of communication with individual faculty, governance bodies, and curriculum/course design decisionmakers and participation on task forces and committees that deal with these issues" (p. 146) and resources.

Bolman and Deal (1992) cite many of the same factors as Chism, listing the following as necessary characteristics for effective teamwork: "clear goals, open communication, shared leadership, and a comfortable, informal atmosphere" (p. 35). Recalling the CSU center director reports of desiring a meaningful decision-making role within the university, it is critical that center directors become integral team members on the provost's cabinet if student-learning initiatives are a high priority of the university.

The Whole Picture

Table 5.3 provides a graphic to visually depict, organize, and suggest outcomes for factors contributing to center director satisfaction and retention. Nilson (2007) argues persuasively that a well-crafted graphic enhances our ability to both comprehend and draw inferences about information. Those are the goals of this matrix. In developing the Center Director Retention Matrix, I have borrowed from the business world by adapting Ambrose's (1987) change matrix format. Moreover, this matrix draws substantively from organizational development and change principles (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Nelson, 1988), the work of Chism, CSU Reports, and CSU center director surveys and personal interviews,

Table 5.3. Center Director Retention Matrix: Institutional Factors to Consider to Retain Center Directors

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Center Director is Likely to Feel:
Center Director is Credible, Skilled, and Respected	Center has Sufficient and Stable Budget	Center has Sufficient Human Resources	Center has Space and Good Location	Center Programs are Aligned with Campus Goals	Campus Actions Show that the Center is Valued	Center Director is a Member of the Campus Decision-Making Team	↑ Satisfied w/Position
Limited or Missing	Sufficient Budget	Human Resources	Center Space	Programs Aligned	Center Valued	Team Member	↑ Anxious
Skilled	Limited or Missing	Human Resources	Center Space	Programs Aligned	Center Valued	Team Member	↑ Frustrated
Skilled	Sufficient Budget	Limited or Missing	Center Space	Programs Aligned	Center Valued	Team Member	↑ Stressed
Skilled	Sufficient Budget	Human Resources	Limited or Missing	Programs Aligned	Center Valued	Team Member	↑ Frustrated
Skilled	Sufficient Budget	Human Resources	Center Space	Limited or Missing	Center Valued	Team Member	↑ Peripheral
Skilled	Sufficient Budget	Human Resources	Center Space	Programs Aligned	Limited or Missing	Team Member	↑ Angry
Skilled	Sufficient Budget	Human Resources	Center Space	Programs Aligned	Center Valued	Limited or Missing	↑ Mistrusting

as reviewed throughout this chapter. The resulting matrix identifies seven center director satisfaction factors to consider in order to retain center directors. Appearing horizontally across the top of the matrix, these seven factors include the following:

1. The center director is credible, skilled in the tasks required of the position, and respected by faculty and administrators.
2. The center director has a sufficient and stable budget in order to operate and provide the services necessary to run an effective faculty development center.
3. The center has sufficient personnel, both professional and administrative support, in order to provide high-quality services to the college or university.
4. The center has dedicated space, including offices, conference rooms, and computer labs as needed, and these workspaces are located where faculty can easily attend workshop sessions.
5. The center programs are aligned with campus goals, which assumes that 1) the campus has stated goals, 2) the campus enacts these stated goals, 3) the campus communicates to the center about furthering the campus goals that are related to faculty development, and 4) the center designs programs that are aligned with these campus goals.
6. The campus actions show that the center is valued, which may include allocation of resources, recognition and rewards, and policies and practices.
7. The center director is a member of the campus decision-making team that formulates important campuswide policies and procedures related to faculty development.

The Center Director Retention Matrix suggests center director feelings as outcomes that may result when each of the seven factors on the matrix is either limited or missing for the center director within the institution. Note that these are suggested outcomes, and others may be experienced. Moreover, serving as a heuristic to analyze problematic conditions existing for a center director within the university's organizational structure, this matrix has the potential to predict center director satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the position, the latter leading to center director

resignation and, ultimately, increased center director turnover rates and compromised faculty development programs.

Conclusion

This discussion of center director disappearing acts must be placed in the context of our goals for higher education. How much do we value good faculty development that leads to good teaching and good learning? Bok (2006), former president of Harvard University, states that our colleges are underachieving and accomplishing far less for students than they should. Reflecting on the quality of undergraduate education, he asks, "Has the quality of teaching improved? More important, are students learning more than they did in 1950?" To these questions Bok responds, "The honest answer is that we do not know" (p. 30). Bok describes a tendency for faculties and academic leaders to focus on subject matter and neglect pedagogy with a "studied disregard of the research on student development in college" (p. 50). Noting that changing instructional methods requires a lot of effort, Bok determines that neither university faculties nor administrators are motivated to discover better ways of educating students, so business as usual continues.

Fink (2003) discusses barriers to change in teaching faced by faculties themselves, including overcoming habitual teaching patterns, receiving no encouragement to rethink their assumptions about teaching, finding the time to learn and prepare for alternative ways of teaching, and being confronted by uncooperative students who reject an innovative teaching strategy with which they are unfamiliar.

Holding firm the belief that all faculties can change instructional methods in favor of those designed to improve student learning and recognizing that there are many challenges to overcome, I conclude that the CSU must strengthen the connection between our CSU Teaching and Learning Centers and campus-wide initiatives related to teaching and learning. Center directors are the principal campuswide teachers of and advocates for instructional innovations, encouraging others to keep a laser's focus on intentional teaching, curriculum and assignment design, and outcomes assessment. It is, therefore, critical that we provide

our Teaching and Learning Center directors with the necessary resources—human and financial—to effectively operate the CSU centers and campuswide programs. In addition, we must allow directors a respite from non-center-related university-service tasks in order for them to become experts at center directing and pedagogy, leading to career-long center director roles on CSU campuses. In some instances, center director impact and longevity will increase through hiring experienced professional faculty developers and giving them a tenured faculty position. If we eagerly support these steps, the CSU system will edge closer to the lofty goal expressed in 1994—that of “becoming the preeminent system faculty development operation in the country.”

References

- Ambrose, D. (1987). *Managing complex change*. Pittsburgh, PA: The Enterprise Group, Ltd.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992, Autumn). What makes a team work? *Organizational Dynamics*, 34–44. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from www.fromccl.org/leadership
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school* (Expanded ed.). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Chism, N. V. N. (1998). The role of educational developers in institutional change: From the basement office to the front office. In M. Kaplan (Ed.), *To improve the academy: Vol 17. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 141–154). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Chism, N. V. N. (2006, October). *If there's a scholarship of professional development, why don't we educate for it?* Concurrent session at the 31st annual meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Cook, C. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). *The value of a teaching center*. Retrieved September 25, 2007, from www.podnetwork.org/faculty_development/values.htm
- Faculty Development Council. (2007, February). *Defining the field: The CSU faculty development center survey 2006*. Summary report, p. 3.

- Faculty Development Council (January 2000). Report on a discussion of center director burnout.
- Fink, L. D. (2003). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Institute for Teaching and Learning. (1994, October). Summary of the October 7, 1994, discussion on the future direction of the ITL.
- Meisinger, S. (2007, October). Job satisfaction: A key to engagement and retention. *HR Magazine*, 45(10), 8.
- Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary. Definition of *burnout*. Retrieved October 16, 2007, from www.m-w.com/dictionary/burnout
- Mullinix, B. B. (2008). Credibility and effectiveness in context: An exploration of the importance of faculty status for faculty developers. In D. R. Robertson & L. B. Nilson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 26. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 173–195). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Nelson, G. (1988). Organizational development: Working with change agents. In E. Wadsworth (Ed.), *A handbook for new practitioners* (pp. 175–180). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Nilson, L. B. (2007). *The graphic syllabus and the outcomes map: Communicating your course*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Potter, B. A. (1998). *Job burnout: What it is and what you can do about it? Summary*. From *Overcoming job burnout: How to renew enthusiasm for work* (pp. 1–2). Ronin Publishing. Retrieved August 28, 2007, from www.docpotter.com/art_bo-summary.html