Financial Partnering and Other Strategies to Help Centers of Teaching and Learning Thrive in Hard Times

Charlie Sweet
Hal Blythe
Bill Phillips
Eastern Kentucky University

With Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) entering a period of economic downturn, the authors demonstrate how their Center has survived hard times through financial partnering with on- and off-campus groups. They also explain how to develop successful strategies for partnering (both financial and otherwise), analyze the dynamics of such collaborations, and offer some useful guidelines.

Introduction

These are difficult times for centers of teaching and learning (CTLs). One of the regional comprehensive institutions in our state has already cut out its Center, our state budget shortfall this year is estimated around $500,000,000 (with a minimal 4% cut in each state university's funding), and with the national economy suffering, the situation isn't likely to improve in the near future. In an interview with M. Marklein, Jane Wellman, director of the non-profit Delta Cost Project, an analysis of federal data from 2002-06 reveals that public colleges and universities are scaling back on instructional spending—primarily faculty salaries and benefits: "I don't think institutions have decided to disinvest in instruction, " Wellman says, but research indicates "a lack of strategic approach" (2009, p. 8D). In order to thrive, perhaps even survive, CTLs need to locate and utilize revenue streams beyond that of base university funding and outside grants as

well as other strategies.

Research has dealt with this subject. Diamond (1984) offered practical survival suggestions, Nemko and Simpson (1991) provided keys for CTLs to enhance their influence, and Everley and Smith (1996) suggested how to institutionalize faculty development programs. However, it has been 13 years since that last article, CTLs have entered the Age of Networking, schools like ours (that is, regional comprehensives) have gone from being state-funded to state-assisted, and the accountability movement is demanding far more from CTLs.

The American poet Walt Whitman once suggested that the soul sustains itself much like a spider, by sending forth "filament, filament, filament, out of itself" to connect to something else out there. The good gray bard's metaphor provides a promising path for CTLs: connecting to and partnering with entities within and outside our academic setting. Among her "Ten Principles of Good Practice in Creating and Sustaining Teaching and Learning Centers," Sorcinelli (2002) advocates a collaborative strategy "of ideas, staff, resources and funds—with other campus agencies (e.g., Provost's Office, Academic Deans' Council, Writing Program, Office of Academic Computing, Graduate School, Office of Research Affairs, and Office of Academic Planning and Assessment)" (p. 20). In the past two years, operating on a Maintenance and Operations budget under $15,000 (not counting our salaries), we have managed not only to survive but also to sustain our Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) by establishing financial partnerships with several groups. To foster such alliances, we have co-sponsored events with the Library, African-American Studies, and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as well as provided a venue for events put on by departments, colleges, and organizations. The result is strong political alliances, increased good will, and solid foundations for future projects. Kanter (1994) posits a concept called "collaborative advantage . . . a well-developed ability to create and sustain fruitful collaborations [which] gives companies a significant competitive leg up." To be successful, such collaborations must "yield benefits for the partners" [. . .] "involve collaboration (creating new value together) rather than mere exchange" [and] "require a dense web of interpersonal connections and internal infrastructures that enhance learning" (pp. 96-97).

By employing Sorcinelli's good practice principles and Kanter's guidelines, we have devised a systematic strategy for financial partnering. While other CTLs no doubt have developed funding streams to suit their particular needs, what follows are some examples of our successful collaborations, a glimpse into how we devised a strategy for collaborating, an insight into the dynamics of collaboration, and some general guidelines

for partnering that can be implemented by those in search of effective ways to supplement baseline and grant-driven funding.

Some Successful Partnerships

University Foundations

Most universities have some sort of research or initiative funding. Three years ago, we successfully applied for a grant from our University Foundation that paid for our first learning community, a campus-wide conference with a national facilitator, and an outside consultant for our CTL.

Administrators (Deans and Others)

We are now in our third year of co-sponsoring a research and scholarship group with the Graduate School. The dean provided the funds, and we offered the expertise to launch the program that has now served 40 pre-tenure junior faculty. Two years ago we also helped the Dean of the College of Education establish a learning community to solve one of his college's pressing problems with a laboratory school by serving as facilitators for the community that he paid for. This year that same dean is sponsoring (that is, paying for) 15 more learning communities open to the entire university, and we are helping him prepare training for the needed facilitators. Currently, we are trying to establish another such relation with the Dean of the College of Justice & Safety, with whom we are collaborating on a project centered on Social Intelligence. Finally, a frequent visitor to our facilities, the Associate Provost for Student Affairs, with our encouragement, convinced Food Services, who cater many of our events, to provide us with a large-screen plasma television that our friends in IT then configured for use in presenting PowerPoints to small groups as well as serving for larger presentations such as the recent presidential inauguration, and he provides for the daily delivery of coffee, tea, and breakfast rolls to our faculty lounge (we greet him with a free cup of our special brew upon his arrival to campus every morning).

Units

While serving as a conduit for various units around campus, we often become privy to their needs (for example, the Library wanting to serve as a venue for major campus presentations, or Housing needing a method of faculty input for their in-dorm programs). If feasible, we arrange for a learning community, a group of interested individuals who

come together on a regular basis to engage in research and discussion on a specific issue, or help them identify an appropriate speaker or faculty member for their needs. The units are usually quite willing to contribute the funding for such events. At one of our Fireside Chats, designed to bring together administrators and faculty, we listened to the head of our university's technological services (IT) as she revealed her desire to integrate new technologies into the classroom. Helping her put together a team from our TLC, IT, the Instructional Development Center (IDC), and the College of Education, we created the LEAF (Learning Environment for Academia's Future) program. Our contribution was expertise, IT and the IDC contributed funding and space, and for research and clerical duties the Graduate School provided a graduate assistant. (an act of reciprocity, as earlier we had provided pedagogical training for the University's incoming teaching assistants).

Others

In return for our serving as advisors to our University's new Office of Quality Enhancement Programs (OQEP) and coaching their coaches in critical- and creative-thinking strategies—each of our colleges has several faculty members whose mission is to educate their colleagues in such strategies—the OQEP has sponsored professional development events and brought in nationally known conference facilitators for whom we could not have paid. We offered to sponsor the Society of Foundation Professors, our university's highest teaching rank, then helped them secure university funding for their agenda. In return, the Society sponsored a lecture series, provided mentors for our faculty development program, and developed a critical and creative thinking certification program for the OQEP. In addition to allowing us to offer a wide variety of professional development activities to our campus, these alliances created a great deal of campus-wide good will as diverse units worked together for the common good.

Outsiders: Alumni and Agencies

Tapping alumni for support is a familiar strategy for universities, whether through an advancement unit, colleges, or departments. However, because CTLs don't grant degrees, asking for donations from their "majors" is impossible. Nonetheless, we have formed a mutually beneficial relationship with the Vice-President for University Advancement. In exchange for writing him several articles for the alumni magazine and

handling the arrangement for a faculty dinner for the Foundation Professors, who are funded through the University's Foundation, he has paid for the annual dinner, plaques, and stoles and medallions worn during official University events by the Society of Foundation Professors.

In an effort to create both emotional and financial ties, we have also reached out to several former students in our academic discipline who are successful alums. One has created an endowed fund through University Advancement for aiding new faculty that will be administered next fall through the TLC. We have also contacted several other alums to see if they are willing to provide funding to help develop new faculty at their alma mater. While many alumni prefer anonymity, some are enticed to contribute funding as a way of honoring a family member or friend through a named endowment program.

Although we have also explored external funding, we admit to near failure. Our lone success was helping the Disability Office write a grant that secured them two half-time positions; we look for future financial reciprocity. However, our off-campus service, while fostering great relationships, has not financially benefitted us—nor would we want it to. Serving on the board of the Jesse Stuart Foundation, a regional press, allowed us to showcase faculty and statewide talent in a book we edited, *New Growth*, and working on the state's Council on Postsecondary Education Faculty Development Workgroup (an organization to help faculty development officers at the state's institutions) has allowed us to stay abreast of the "best practices" in professional development. Neither, however, has provided any financial opportunities. With our limited success securing grants, we have identified a grant-writer as a necessary addition to our CTL staff.

Developing a Strategy

How did we develop a successful strategy for financial partnering? Basically, we started with a campus-wide electronic survey that allowed us to perform a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis, emphasizing the strengths and opportunities we found on the campus. We examined ourselves, especially our campus reputation, the idiosyncratic nature of the campus, our "capital" (that is, what we have to offer potential partners), and our weaknesses—all to provide us with a solid foundation for developing our strategy.

Strengths

Campus Cred(ibility)

Perhaps the greatest strength we discovered was who we are. When the three of us took over in 2006 as co-directors, our TLC had been in existence only five years. The unit had been through one off-campus director, and Hal, the second author, had served twice briefly as interim director/co-director. With the two of us, the University gained a sense of permanency as we had a combined 70 years as teachers at the institution. We had excellent reputations as teachers; both of us were Foundation Professors and had won the state's Acorn Award, given annually to the best college professor in any field. We also had excellent reputations as scholars, for we had published some 600 items, including nine books, literary criticism, educational research, and popular fiction. Moreover, Hal had been in charge of an on-campus faculty consulting/mentoring program for nearly 20 years.

Nature of the Campus

Eastern Kentucky is a comprehensive regional institution that emphasizes teaching first. Our 550 faculty are fairly closely knit, and, with 4/4 loads, they have a strong work ethic. In the past three years, due to retirements from the massive hirings of the late '60s and early '70s, half of EKU's faculty has turned over, and all new hires, including part-timers, go through a New Faculty Development program that the TLC runs. Thus, we have an opportunity to shape the campus culture. Our TLC is located at the center of campus, between two of the most popular locales for faculty, the library and the student union, where the faculty dine. Furthermore, our building is the nicest on campus, with a large gathering hall for up to 150, an informal lounge area for up to 50, and a conference room for up to 20. Having such facilities at the physical "heart" of the campus positions us as a comfortable venue for important faculty events. We originally reported directly to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, who was strongly pro-faculty development. He has subsequently been replaced by a Dean of University Programs, who is equally pro-faculty development.

Capital

What do CTLs have to offer their partners in exchange for funds? We have discovered that for the most part our capital can't be given a dollars-

and-cents value, but it consists of elements deemed of great worth on our campus:

- Expertise in pedagogy.

- Facilitation/coordination (for example, learning communities, workshops, conferences).

- A conduit: Knowledge of various campus needs and strengths and the ability to link them.

- Independence: not tied to any department or college; somewhere between administration and faculty; essentially apolitical on campus.

- Venue.

Weaknesses

Obviously, our major problem was our meager baseline funding and the impending possibility of a decrease; moreover, the entire campus was operating under reduced funding. We also came from a field outside of educational research and had not been formally trained in faculty development. However, we had attended the Lilly Conference on College Teaching at Miami University (Ohio) for years, and we had met a lot of people sitting on the state's Council on Postsecondary Education Faculty Development Workgroup who were willing to help us. With their 4-4 loads, our faculty don't have much time either to attend or present events, and our campus survey found for the most part that they do not see the value of professional development outside their field of expertise.

Opportunities

Our initial campus survey revealed campus units normally not considered for partnerships, such as Student Affairs and Continuing Education. The fact that 50% of our faculty had turned over during a three-year period provided us with a large segment of faculty needing help in their march toward tenure and promotion. Perhaps most importantly, our new president designated professional development as one of the major components of the University's upcoming strategic plan in addition to declaring his desire to see individuals and units across campus pooling resources for both financial and educational purposes.

Threats

Some of the major threats were things we could do nothing about. For instance, the state could change its funding of the University/devalue CTLs and faculty development, or a new administration might have low priorities for our unit. On the other hand, some things we could control, such as stepping on campus toes or being perceived as motivated by ego and vaulting ambition. Likewise, the huge turnover of faculty, while perhaps affording opportunities, might cause roadblocks by presenting too varied an audience to capture under one agenda. For us the major threat seemed to involve our own shop: could we muster the necessary personnel and organization to carry off all the collaborations we were forming?

Dynamics of Financial Partnerships

How does a CTL go about creating partnerships? Fundraisers tell us that before they raise funds, they raise friends. Thus, we try to bring as many campus personnel to our location as possible. As we have the diversity of available spaces in our building to accommodate a variety of events, we invite groups such as committees (for instance, General Education), departments, colleges, and even administrators to meet in our facilities. We make it a point to provide drinks and snacks and to chat with them before and after meetings. We are not only making friends, but discovering what needs these groups have.

Hosting Opportunities

We host four different series that bring faculty, staff, and administrators to our spaces. We invite any faculty member to present a topic at our **Roundtables**, discussions of a general interest (for instance, Fulbright Scholars, collaborative scholarships, best practices in teaching). Our **Fireside Chats** (yes, we're actually blessed with a beautiful Art Deco glass and marble fireplace in the faculty lounge) provide administrators and faculty a forum to discuss their interests and answer questions. Each semester kicks off with a Fireside Chat with our President followed the next week by one with our Provost. Our **New Faculty Development Series** occurs every fall, bringing campus groups (Cooperative Education, the Counseling Center, Instructional Development Center) in to explain, especially to our new faculty, what service each performs; these events serve as a follow-through on introductory presentations given during our New Faculty Orientation Week that occurs before the fall semester. Finally, our **Technology Series**, run by the University's IT unit, offers

short introductions to such things as Vista, BlackBoard, our faculty laptop program, and Web 2.0. Our total "out of budget" costs cover only food and, on occasion, duplication.

Listening to these presentations provides us with a plethora of opportunities to learn what groups are doing and needing as well as meeting and bonding with so many campus players. For instance, a presentation by the co-op director referenced how one department had hired a communications major to create a brochure for them. We then linked up several departments and a dean with other talented students; one student, in fact, helped revise a unit's webpage. At a Fireside Chat with the provost, we noticed one dean was disappointed with the lack of a specific mechanism for shared governance. Afterwards, we talked with the dean and provost, then set up a Roundtable with the Faculty Senate and the local AAUP chapter on ways to implement University-wide shared governance. That event helped us make friends with the chair of the Faculty Senate, and after hearing her frustration with a lack of informal faculty gatherings on campus, we agreed to co-sponsor a holiday break party for the faculty during the dead week before exams.

Another time after we had hosted a Roundtable on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). Because one of the attendees was the Dean of the Graduate School, whose mission was to promote scholarship on campus, we helped develop a campus-wide learning community of administrators and faculty interested in studying how we could improve the status of research and scholarship. We also worked with the dean and an endowed chair of scholarship in the College of Health Sciences to create another campus program. The Graduate Education and Research (GEAR) Scholars, now in its third year, is a program wherein second- and third-year faculty compete for up to 20 positions. The scholars who are chosen spend one semester learning effective research techniques and developing individual research projects, while in their second semester the dean pays for each to have a three-hour research re-assignment to pursue their project. In essence, we help to fulfill our unit's scholarly mission by doing one presentation a semester for GEAR and serving on the board that both sets up selection criteria and makes the actual selections. Importantly, all these collaborations involve our time and talents *without* costing us much in funding.

Enhanced Professional Learning Communities

Because of their capacity for involving a diversity of faculty and staff (Petrone, 2004) and their ability to address a wide range of issues in depth

(Richlin & Essington, 2004), we have been staunch advocates of learning communities, or enhanced professional learning communities (EPLCs as we call them). We went from running one EPLC our first year (2006-07) to 20 this year (2008-09). Learning communities play to the campus's strengths. They help break faculty and professional staff out of their natural silos (Sandell, Wigley, & Kovalchick, 2004), offering them social networks and friends outside their departments/units; they bring together faculty with common interests (Wildman, Hable, Preston, & Magliaro, 2000); they emphasize the University's commitment to teaching (Shulman, Cox, & Richlin, 2004); their basis in scholarship introduces new faculty to the SoTL (Cox, 2003), thus providing them with a new venue for the requisite publication demanded for promotion, tenure, and merit; and in some cases, they provide an instrument to promote shared governance (Shapiro & Levine, 1999). Perhaps most importantly, as Cox (2004) points out, "In the construction of a transformative learning environment, the participants gain a new view of themselves and new sense of confidence in their abilities" (p. 19). Learning communities thus provide a great "bang for the buck," especially if funds and other resources are shared.

Mechanisms

What are some effective models of collaboration, and why do some work better than others? Each university is unique in its organization, personnel, funding, and alumni base. Partnerships are generated by figuring out the best resources to tap. Perhaps our greatest success story to date is our relationship with the College of Education (COE), especially its dean. We first met the new dean of the COE at the start of our second year as co-directors; it was his first year on campus. During our New Faculty Orientation bus tour of the region, one of us sat beside the dean and was impressed with his enthusiasm, his desire to experiment, and his drive to raise the status of his college. We paid his way to the Lilly Conference that fall and drove him up to Miami University. The Conference so impressed him that he now pays the way for any of his new faculty wishing to attend, which, in turn, saves us money; we annually support attendance for a number of our faculty. As a result of our trip, we arranged to do a joint presentation on SoTL the next spring.

When the COE dean saw how much our learning community on Dee Fink's principles of course design had helped one of his faculty, he asked us to help him develop a learning community for a problem he was having trouble solving: revising the mission of a K-12 laboratory school run by his college in order to meet 21st-century realities. We facilitated the

community's first meeting, then turned it over to a facilitator we had trained, and he paid for it. That community was so successful that this past fall we hatched a plan to develop 15 more learning communities, funded entirely by the dean, to address a variety of issues confronting both his college and the University at large. We arranged to bring in Milt Cox, Director of the Lilly Conference at Miami, to kick off the event, and the dean again picked up the tab.

Early last year we were approached by a visiting scholar on our campus, who told us how impressed she was with the activities of our center. She had been charged with the enormous task of putting together the *Kentucky African-American Encyclopedia*. Encountering somewhat lukewarm interest by faculty in contributing entries for the text, she asked if we thought a learning community might be the answer to her problem. We saw her inquiry as yet another potential chance for collaboration. Currently she is facilitating a second-semester extension of the community whose members have produced substantial entries for the *Encyclopedia* as well as encouraging colleagues to contribute. Not only does the community foster diversity, one of the University's strategic goals, but our nationally recognized scholar has mentored over a dozen faculty in research and scholarly writing, one of our Center's goals.

Other Partnerships

Not all partnerships need be financial. Some activities a CTL should do because of its mission—our mission is contained in our advertising catch-phrase "Helping Teachers Help Students Learn"—some because they align with their institution's strategic plan (for EKU's, see www.oie. eku.edu/spc/StrategicPlan/2003-2006/), and some because, as suggested earlier, they build relationships.

During this past academic year, for instance, we have co-sponsored non-fund-producing (in fact, they often cost us money) events and programs with the aforementioned Faculty Senate, the AAUP, the Student Senate, and the library. We offered an online learning community on Dee Fink and backward design—for which no one, including the facilitator, was paid—as well as an online community on Parker Palmer's *The Courage to Teach*, wherein we actually paid the facilitator and other expenses. We aided the Dean of University Programs in offering a discussion group on Derek Bok's *Our Underachieving Colleges* (2005). When the Dean did not have time to renew the group for the next academic year, we created the Breakfast and a Book series and will be paying an instructor to facilitate that monthly-meeting learning community. We ran the Faculty Mentoring

Program, which we redesigned this year by funding a learning community; it helped some departments and colleges as well as several faculty members wanting to use our observations for promotion and tenure. To take some pressure off our dean, we helm the University's Bachelor of Individualized Studies degree. We have helped several faculty and administrators by collaborating with them on scholarship. We recently facilitated a meeting for the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Coaches that taught them a brainstorming process and helped them get a jump-start on next year's activities. We collaborated with Student Judicial Affairs to create a 911 Project (complete with booklet and website) for campus-wide emergency response. Finally, our University does not have the official position of Ombudsperson, but as the TLC is not affiliated with any of the five colleges or 37 departments, we have served in that function unofficially for the past three years. We have regularly been willing to meet with the president, the provost, deans, and faculty members about various concerns.

Some Guidelines for Partnering

1. Develop an Awareness of Your Campus Environment.

Some CTL directors can perform what Institutional Research (IR) loves, a SWOT analysis. Others may wish to use IR to create a campus-wide electronic survey, covering attitudes, resources, obstacles, and the like. In fact, asking a few open-ended questions on our survey helped us later develop our SWOT analysis.

2. Take the Initiative to Make Friends With Those in Power.

Neal and Peed-Neal (2009) stress, "the first rule of success in any job is to pay close attention to the administrator to whom you report and look to that person for the clarification and elaboration of your duties" (p. 19). Note the number of things we have mentioned doing to support our previous boss and current dean. Within the first week of our being named co-directors of the TLC, we e-mailed every dean on campus requesting a meeting. Desrochers (2009) is more blunt: "Schmooze your provost" (p. 98). We also met with various organizations from the Provost's Council to the Chairs Association. We visited the heads of other campus units, such as the Library, Information Technology, Institutional Effectiveness (we ended up publishing an article with its director on a topic of mutual interest), Public Relations, and Alumni Affairs (we wrote articles for their magazine). Robert Frost once noted how hard it is to hate someone up

close. We not only got on their radar, but through offering our services (writing, presentations to their unit, and so on), we developed bonding relationships.

3. Pay Attention to the People You Meet.

One former department chair we know had a sign on his desk visible only to him: SHUT UP AND LISTEN. In our first Fireside Chat, our president noted that the K-12 schools have better faculty development programs than do universities and that he desired more professional development on campus. With that information, convincing him to create a small amount of extra funding for us was an easy sell.

4. Create Opportunities and Rewards for Faculty and Administration to Visit Your CTL.

We send out personal invitations to select personnel for programs of particular interest to those we invite, announce all programs several times in our University's daily electronic newsletter, publicize the events on our website, and pass out brochures and event schedules. We also "bribe" our guests with food and drink when they come, and we offer a reward program for the people who attend the greatest number of presentations each fall. Last spring we set up a learning community for IT, who wished to involve faculty in new technological developments. Ironically, the community came about only because of a misunderstanding about one of our Fireside Chats. The head of IT came by our center because of an opportunity to hear the Provost speak; the only problem was that she showed up earl—a week early—so we sat down with her over coffee, and, after listening to her problems, we suggested the learning community.

5. Synthesize: Bring Together Differing Campus Groups/Personnel.

Nelson and Kleinsasser (2009) stress the need for creating "horizontal structures that cut across disciplines, departments and colleges" (p. 154). Neal and Peed-Neal (2009) state that "Faculty developers are uniquely placed to support multi-disciplinary, inter-institutional dialogues, projects, courses, and programs for faculty and students" (p. 27). To start and sustain successful faculty development, Reder, Mooney, Holmgren, and Kuerbis (2009), though focusing on small colleges, argue that CTLs should "Collaborate within your own institution" (p. 278). We provide specific suggestions of what each has to offer the other. One of our most

successful presentations each year is "Money Matters," and it is given by an unlikely source. At a poorly attended presentation on first aid, we heard the presenter from Exercise and Sports Science answer a question concerning money. When we talked with him afterwards, we found out he and his wife were certified financial planners, so we brought him back to discuss financial planning with our new faculty. As a member of the faculty, he connects in a way HR personnel never seem to.

6. Persist.

Don't be afraid of failing. The head of our new Regional Stewardship office gave a presentation for which almost no one showed. Instead of dwelling on the lack of attendance, we asked the director what his needs were. We then put him together with another unit, grant funding, that turned out to be very helpful to him. We have also had several faculty come to us with rejected articles and conference proposals. We help them rewrite their submissions, even partnering with a few, and our success rate in getting the revisions published is well over 90%.

7. Be Dependable.

As John Madden is fond of saying on football telecasts, "Finish the play." Two years ago the University named a task force charged with enhancing university scholarship. For a variety of reasons, including the changing of a provost, the initiative petered out. Recognizing that scholarship is also one of our missions, we partnered with the group to offer Roundtables, learning communities, and individual consultations on the subject.

8. Take the Initiative.

As the previous example demonstrates, when there is a campus void in an area that falls within our mission, we happily leap in. Are we over-worked and overstressed? Overworked, maybe.

9. Be Patient.

Universities move at a speed matched only by glaciers, and economic and political cycles subject us all to their will. If, however, you have a good strategy and reputation, your time will come. Starting from very sparse attendance at our events, we have seen participation (and enthu-siasm) increase by 10%, while our learning communities have increased twenty-fold.

10. Be Flexible.

Not everything works. Plan B is often more successful than Plan A. As you have probably noticed, some of our partnering did not bring us an immediate financial influx. However, by patiently building good will and critical mass, we found our budget increased this academic year by 33%. Moreover, the Provost has given us access to some additional funds. Successful programs attract people—and funding.

Summary

Have our strategies worked, or, to put it another way, do we have evidence as to the impact of our partnerships? When we assessed all our presentations in our series (Fireside Chats, Technology Series, New Faculty Development, and Roundtables), we discovered that, on a Likert Scale of 0-4 (with 0 being a "waste of time" and 4 being "extremely helpful"), faculty and staff participants had given us a satisfaction quotient of 3.7. Likewise, using a similar scale, evaluators of our seven EPLCs provided a satisfaction quotient of 3.9. By the end of the 2008-09 academic year, we will have hosted more than 60 events, sponsored 27 learning communities (the TLC's 7 and the Dean of Education's 20), and taken faculty to two large conferences—all on a very limited budget. In addition, every volunteer presenter in our fall New Faculty Development Series has re-upped for Fall 2009, and we had to turn away faculty and staff applicants for our upcoming EPLC on creativity. We will have collaborated with/mentored faculty, administrators, and even a graduate student on five published articles. In addition, high-level administrators have asked us to run an EPLC for them in Spring 2010.

One caveat: While you are striving to ensure that your CTL survives, don't overlook your own survival. Even if everything you do falls within your center's mission and follows the best practices for professional development, a real danger exists that you will burn out. Some centers rotate directors every three years, and some higher education studies have pegged the life-span of an administrator at five years in any particular role at an institution. Partnering not only sustains the center, but the director as well. Collaborating and sharing provide financial and emotional resources, someone to talk with, someone to share the load with, someone to bounce ideas off. Indeed, we are all Whitman's spider needing to make connections.

Why partner up? As that famed "banker" Willie Sutton once replied about why he targeted financial institutions, "Because that's where the

money is." With CTLs, there is also a great deal of mission fulfillment, good will, and effective professional development.

References

Cox, M. D. (2003). Proven faculty development tools that foster the scholarship of teaching in faculty learning communities. *To Improve the Academy*, *21*, 109-142.

Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. In M. D. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities: New directions for teaching and learning*, No. 97 (pp. 5-23). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Desrochers, C. (2009). Magicians of the golden state: The CSU center director disappearing acts. *To Improve the Academy*, *27*, 88-107.

Diamond, R. (1984). Instructional support centers and the art of surviving: Some practical suggestions. *To Improve the Academy*, *3*, 49-57.

Everley, M., & Smith, J. (1996). Making the transition from soft to hard funding: The politics of institutionalizing instructional development programs. *To Improve the Academy*, *15*, 209-230.

Kanter, R. (1994, July-August). Collaborative advantage: the Art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, 96-108.

Marklein, M. (2009, January 15). Colleges cut back spending on instruction. *USA Today*, p. 8D.

Neal, E., & Peed-Neal, I. (2009). Experiential lessons in the practice of faculty development. *To Improve the Academy*, *27*, 14-31.

Nelson, J., & Kleinsasser, A. (2009). Leadership for Learning: A new faculty development model. *To Improve the Academy*, *27*, 150-165.

Nemko, M., & Simpson, R. (1991). Nine keys to enhancing campus wide influence of faculty development centers. *To Improve the Academy*, *10*, 83-87.

Petrone, M. (2004). Supporting diversity with faculty learning communities: Teaching and learning across boundaries. In M. D. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities*: *New directions for teaching and learning*, No. 97 (pp. 111-125). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reder, M., Mooney, K., Holmgren, R., & Kuerbis, P. (2009). Starting and sustaining successful faculty development programs. *To Improve the Academy*, *27*, 267-286.

Richlin, L., & Essington, A. (2004). Overview of faculty learning communities. In M. D. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities*: *New directions for teaching and learning*, No. 97 (pp. 25-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sandell, K., Wigley, K., & Kovalchick, A. (2004). Developing facilitators for faculty learning communities. In M. D. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities* (pp. 51-62). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 97. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, N., & Levine, J. (1999, November). Introducing learning communities to your campus. *About Campus*, *4* (5), 2-10.

Shulman, G., Cox, M., & Richin, L. (2004, Spring). Institutional considerations in developing a faculty learning community program. In M. D. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities*: *New directions for teaching and learning*, No. 97 (pp. 41-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M. (2002). Ten principles of good practice in creating and sustaining teaching and Learning centers. In K. Gillespie (Ed.), *A guide to faculty development* (pp. 9-23). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Wildman, T., Hable, M., Preston, M., & Magliaro, S. (2000, Summer). Faculty study groups: Solving "good problems" through study, reflection, and collaboration. *Innovative Higher Education*, *24* (4), 247-263.

Charlie Sweet and **Hal Blythe**, *who are Foundation Professors of English and codirectors of the Teaching & Learning Center at Eastern Kentucky University, have been collaborating for 35 years in the classroom, administration, scholarship, and creative writing. Together, they have some 800 publications, including 10 books (five in the best-selling "It Works for Me" series from New Forums Press), critical articles in such journals as* The Hemingway Review *and* Studies in Short Fiction, *and pedagogical articles in* Pedagogy *and* The Journal of Faculty Development. **Bill Phillips** *is dean of the College of Education at Eastern Kentucky University. He has an Ed.D. in Special Education from the University of Southern Mississippi. His research interests are in faculty professional development and in the transition of students with disabilities from school to work.*