



## 2003 Interim Report

### Overview and Impact on Campus Culture

In July 2002, the University of California, Berkeley received a two-year grant in the amount of \$138,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The purpose of the grant was to pilot a campus strategy to strengthen the connections between faculty research and undergraduate education, with library collections and information literacy as integral parts of student learning.

Given the volume of instruction at a large public research university -- with approximately 1,800 permanent ladder-rank faculty, lecturers and adjuncts, and 1,600 graduate student instructors -- a scalable model for undergraduate research that incorporates library collections and information literacy starts with instructors. At Berkeley, the faculty members oversee the curriculum and they, with other classroom instructors, need to be the primary agents of curricular reform. Therefore this project is designed to: 1) forge a campus collaboration of academic partners, working together to create a supportive infrastructure for faculty and other instructors, and 2) develop and nurture a cohort of instructors dedicated to a new way of teaching, who become change agents within their departments and throughout the university.

Mellon funding has enabled Berkeley to experiment with a strategy that can serve as an example for other large research universities. At the core of Berkeley's model is development of a long-term, sustainable campus collaboration of academic partners who share skills and leverage resources to focus on issues related to the pedagogy of teaching and learning, with and/or without technology. The Project Partners are the University Library, Office of Educational Development, Graduate Student Instructor Teaching and Resource Center, Office of Undergraduate Research, Educational Technology Services, and Division of Undergraduate Education.

These Project Partners worked together to create a Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research, piloted in summer 2003, which was modeled on the campus' successful American Cultures Summer Seminar. The Project Partners defined the role of the Mellon Fellows, structured the curriculum for the Institute, and planned with the Mellon Fellows how they could best share their experiences with colleagues. During the Institute, the Mellon Fellows participated in an intensive series of symposia, workshops, and individual consultation sessions that addressed course and research assignment design, student learning outcomes, information literacy, scholarly communication, instructional technologies, assessment, and pedagogical strategies. Through demonstrations, peer learning, hands-on instruction, and discussions with librarians and experts in instructional development, faculty explored ways to more fully incorporate undergraduate research as part of their courses.

The Project Partners continue to organize ways for the Mellon Fellows to work closely with teams of librarians, instructional technology specialists, pedagogy experts, and other academic staff after the Institute as they implement their redesigned courses and conduct classroom assessments. Additionally, the Partners will be providing venues for the Mellon Fellows to share their experiences with colleagues and disseminate the results of their individual projects.



The project is structured in three phases over two years. During Phase I, from July through December 2002, we developed a collaborative vision and workplan for the project, and made significant progress at institutionalizing and leveraging the campus collaboration. During Phase II, from January through May 2003, we developed the curriculum for the Institute, selected the Mellon Fellows, and developed an overall evaluation/assessment plan. We are currently in Phase III, which began in June 2003 with a three-week Institute for the thirteen Mellon Fellows, and which will continue through May 2004 with Project Partners consulting individually with the Mellon Fellows as they prepare to implement their new or revised courses in 2003-2004. During and after Phase III, Mellon Fellows and Project Partners will share their experiences with the local and national academic community.

Our overall goal is to contribute to the campus objective of leveraging its research strength to enhance undergraduate education. In 2001, UC Berkeley underscored its commitment to undergraduate education by creating a new position, a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VP-UE), and by implementing a reorganization across divisions to create a Division of Undergraduate Education that includes instructional technology services, academic support services for students, and faculty development services. The VP-UE is one of the co-principal investigators for this grant and expanded the membership of the Project Partners to create a parallel, permanent advisory group to her office, the Council of Academic Partners (CAP) (<http://education.berkeley.edu/cap/>). Most of the members of CAP have been involved in working collaboratively on various teaching and learning initiatives on campus, including the campus accreditation process.

In 2002, the VP-UE assumed responsibility for the campus accreditation process, recognizing that the new outcomes-based framework adopted by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) might provide opportunities for Berkeley to review and expand its teaching and learning agendas as part of the review process. In its Institutional Proposal, the campus identified three broad themes to guide the self-study process: 1) Enhancing Faculty-Student Engagement at a Large Public Research University; 2) Rethinking the Delivery of Education; and 3) Improving Academic Program Review. Within those themes, we focused in on several topics for analysis, including preparing students for successful capstone experiences, reinventing large enrollment courses, and enhancing the culture of teaching (<http://education.berkeley.edu/accreditation>).

The recruitment, application, and selection processes for the Mellon Fellows, as well as the overall Mellon project objectives, were aligned with specific campus initiatives on undergraduate education as developed over the last several years in a series of key campus documents, including the *Commission on Undergraduate Education Final Report*, the *Strategic Academic Plan*, and the campus accreditation self-study process. These priorities include integrating the research and teaching mission of the campus through inquiry-based education, identifying learning objectives and incorporating effective mechanisms for assessing student learning into courses, engaging students in complex problems that draw on multiple fields, and promoting the development of information literacy and undergraduate research competencies including leading to capstone experiences. Our efforts all along have been to bring in alignment the varied and disparate activities on campus related to teaching and learning, including this Mellon project, to create both a critical mass and a common vision of what we want to achieve in undergraduate education.



We believe we have made outstanding progress thus far. In this first year of the Mellon grant, we:

- Expanded and institutionalized the Steering Committee, forming the Council of Academic Partners (CAP)
- Developed an application and selection process in alignment with campus priorities
- Selected thirteen Mellon Fellows
- Developed the Institute curriculum
- Implemented the three-week Institute
- Created an overall evaluation/assessment plan for the project
- Started a culture shift within the University Library by creating teams in support of the Mellon Fellows
- Initiated and/or supported several campus projects related to teaching and learning through CAP such as the New Faculty Orientation, e-Berkeley Symposium on Large Enrollment Courses, and the Presidential Chair Fellows.

The Project Partners are providing ongoing, personalized support to the Mellon Fellows for their new or revised courses for the 2003-2004 academic year including designing evaluation/assessment plans, incorporating specific library connections to collections and services, rethinking the role of graduate student instructors in courses with a substantial research component, and engaging instructional technology as appropriate. Additionally, through CAP, we are collaborating on other projects related to Berkeley's teaching mission.

## Organization

Two primary objectives of the grant were to develop a sustainable infrastructure for collaboration, and to support related faculty development initiatives on campus. Many decisions about the staffing, budget, evaluation and assessment, publicity, selection, and curriculum reinforced the commitment to these ideals.

### Project Staff

In August 2002, the part-time Project Manager, part-time Assessment Consultant, and additional Project Staff were identified and participated in an initial meeting. The Project Staff consists of fifteen people from the Project Partners (Appendix A). The involvement of individual Project Staff varies widely; the Project Manager has communicated weekly about aspects of the project since August 2002, while other Project Staff primarily will provide the Mellon Fellows with individual post-Institute support after July 2003.

A sub-group of the Project Staff, with at least one representative from each of the Project Partners, forms the Steering Committee (Appendix B). While the Steering Committee is a fairly large body with eight members, it was important during the first year to ensure that discussions held and decisions made included the range of perspectives and expertise brought by each of the Project Partners. The Steering Committee met once a month from August 2002 to March 2003 to make decisions pivotal to project administration, process of Mellon Fellows' application and selection, Institute design and curriculum, publicity, and project timeline (Appendix C).



Once the overarching decisions were made by the Steering Committee, three Working Groups were formed in Spring 2003: 1) Screening and Selection Committee, to review applications and select the 2003-2004 Mellon Fellows, 2) Institute Planning Group, to plan the themes, sequencing and content for the Institute, and 3) Evaluation/Assessment Group, which drafted and continues to work on an overall assessment plan for the project. Project Staff members were asked to identify the Groups for which they felt they had the most knowledge and/or interest. Each of the Working Groups was designed to include representatives from multiple Project Partners. Since the Groups functioned concurrently for a number of months, some members served on more than one Group to encourage greater communication between each of the areas. The Institute Planning Group and the Evaluation/Assessment Group each were composed of five members of the Project Staff. Alternately, the Screening and Selection Committee provided an opportunity to increase awareness of the goals of the Institute and invite others pivotal to its success to participate in the review and selection of candidates. This committee consisted of two of the Principal Investigators, two Project Staff members, and two ladder-rank faculty from committees of the Academic Senate.

Developing an infrastructure for ongoing communication and collaboration among the Project Partners was important for the success of this grant and for the long-term sustainability of this initiative. In addition to the representative composition of the Working Groups, a listserv and web site were created in Fall 2002 for the Steering Committee and Project Staff to share ideas and documents (<http://library.berkeley.edu/Staff/MellonProject>). In February 2003, Steering Committee members completed an initial survey designed to solicit feedback about the collaboration through which we gained primarily qualitative data. Now that the Institute has concluded, a follow-up survey will be administered post-Institute to the same group so we can identify approaches for communication and administration that will improve and sustain our collaborative relationships through Year Two of the grant and beyond.

#### Project Budget

The Mellon funding totaled \$138,000, with an additional \$2,823.26 in interest generated to date. Total expended in FY 2002-2003 was \$115,697 (Appendix D). We requested and received permission from Mellon to redirect \$10,000 to pay for two additional Mellon Fellows; \$2,000 was redirected from the web manager/clerical budget line and \$8,000 was redirected from the costs designated for Institute presenters. The College of Engineering funded the third additional Mellon Fellow. Awards have been allocated to the Mellon Fellows, and the funds for the Project Partners have been allocated to their accounts for personnel expenditures. We expect those expenses to be reflected in FY 2002-2003 accounts but, given the deadline for fiscal year close, several may carry forward into FY 2003-2004. Remaining funds in the web manager/clerical line will assist in building a robust web site containing instructional materials developed by the Mellon Fellows. To date, we have spent only \$563 of the collaboration budget line, covering costs for an organizational development consultant to facilitate the February collaboration meeting, and anticipate using funds from this line in Year Two for related meetings and workshops.

In addition to in-kind contributions of project personnel from all the Project Partners as listed on the original grant proposal, the University Library paid \$9,768 as cost share toward the Institute (catering: \$3,976; facilities rental: \$3,893; brochures: \$1,899) and allocated an additional \$26,000 of collections funds for Mellon Fellows to identify relevant library collections to purchase or digitize.



### Evaluation/Assessment

Evaluation planning was part of the Mellon proposal from the project's conception. A part-time Assessment Consultant was budgeted to work with the Steering Committee as part of the Office of Educational Development, a unit which reports to the Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education who is one of the Project Staff. The Assessment Working Group, consisting of five Project Staff including the Assessment Consultant, continues to work on an overall evaluation/assessment plan that includes four evaluation areas: 1) the Project Partners' collaboration, 2) the summer Institute (SI), 3) the impact of Mellon on teaching, course design, curriculum, and students' library use, and 4) the impact of Mellon on student learning.

For each evaluation area, the plan includes questions guiding the evaluation, indicators of success, potential evaluation tools or processes, subjects, and a timeline (Appendix E; Appendix F). For example, in the area of collaboration, one of the evaluation questions is "How has this collaboration impacted other collaborative projects involving the same or new partners?" An indicator of success might be that "at least one new collaboration resulted from this collaboration" or "participants expressed enthusiasm for collaboration with the same group." The evaluation tool is a Collaboration Survey, with the Steering Committee as subjects. Similarly, in the evaluation area for the Institute, one of the evaluation questions is "How effective is the Institute as a means for affecting change in the curriculum and in teaching?" An indicator of success might be "instructors applied techniques, ideas, tools, etc. from the Institute to their curriculum and teaching" and another indicator might be "basic information competencies have been integrated into teaching and coursework." Two evaluation tools for these questions would be content analysis of course syllabi and the Institute Evaluation Survey, with the Mellon Fellows as subjects.

The following assessment instruments have already been administered and analyzed:

- Steering Committee Collaboration Survey (Appendix G)
- Content analyses of the Fellows' applications and pre-Institute syllabi
- Pre-Institute Survey of Mellon Fellows (Appendix H)
- Mid-Institute Evaluation (Appendix I)
- Institute Final Evaluation (Appendix J).

During the application review and selection process for the Mellon Fellows, three projects were identified for potentially broader impact and special evaluation. In one case a lecturer, who teaches one section of several required for the French major, secured support from the department chair to experiment by teaching the course with an emphasis on the use of library collections' secondary sources. Her experiences with this new approach may impact not only a core course in the French major, but also core literature courses for other language majors.

Similarly, two lecturers who teach sections of a technical writing course required for the Engineering major applied to be Fellows. The potential for impact on all Engineering students was appealing, but the Screening and Selection Committee was reluctant to award two slots to the same course. Conversations with the Course Director within the College of Engineering revealed that the College was interested in using the Mellon experience to experiment with the curriculum for this course and apply what was learned to other courses. The College of Engineering supported the stipend for the second Mellon Fellow.



Additionally, a professor in Archeology, who was interested in restructuring her course curriculum, provided an opportunity with the potential for longitudinal data. This faculty member has taught the same large enrollment course required for the major, for a number of semesters, and her course had been selected as a case example in the campus's *Educational Effectiveness Report* for the accreditation process. With prior experience with the course, she is well positioned to compare student performance in the restructured course environment to previous results. The reinvention of large enrollment courses is a major priority for undergraduate education at Berkeley. The selection of several instructors of large courses was a deliberate choice to gain experience with inquiry-based learning and the use of library collections in such settings.

After the Institute, the Assessment Consultant, along with the Assessment Working Group, will continue to assist the Mellon Fellows in addressing evaluation/assessment issues relevant to their new and revised courses (Appendix K).

### Publicity and Outreach

Based upon Steering Committee decisions, a publicity plan was implemented. One phase was designed to encourage faculty to apply to become a Mellon Fellow and redesign their courses for the following year. A second phase was designed to promote general awareness of the Mellon grant and its connection to the educational themes and priorities on campus. A third phase will begin in Fall 2003, announcing the 2003-2004 Mellon Fellows, describing the content and enthusiasm which defined the Institute, and sharing insights and ideas about undergraduate research assignments and student learning at the conclusion of the redesigned courses.

Focusing first on soliciting applications, the Steering Committee chose to utilize avenues of communication on campus with which faculty and staff are familiar and responsive. A specially designed brochure promoting the Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research was mailed to all ladder-rank faculty, lecturers, and adjunct instructors with a personalized address label (Appendix L). The brochures were sent by campus mail in January 2003 so faculty would receive them just after the winter break. In addition, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education sent to all Academic Senate faculty using the campus' CalMail system announcing this opportunity, explaining its relationship to other current campus priorities, and inviting their participation. She also contacted Deans and Department Chairs, requesting their assistance in promoting the Institute to faculty and lecturers in their units. A web site was designed and referenced in both mailings, offering additional details about the Institute and providing application information (<http://library.berkeley.edu/MellonInstitute>). The Project Manager responded to all inquiries about the grant, Institute, and application process.

Promotion and publicity to other groups were undertaken as well. Remaining brochures were shared with Project Partners to distribute in other venues and all Partners were encouraged to discuss the objectives of the grant and promote the Institute as opportunities arose. For example, the Mellon Institute and focus on undergraduate research were agenda items at the spring meeting of the Library Advisory Board, a select group of major donors who may be influential in providing or identifying future funding for this initiative. Articles were published in campus newsletters such as the March 2003 *Newsletter of The Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities* (Appendix M),



and the initiative has been discussed at forums such as the 2002 Reinvention Center National Conference, "Undergraduate Research and Scholarship and the Mission of the Research University."

### Review and Selection

The Screening and Selection Committee reviewed and prioritized the applications submitted. Since the committee's selections would have significant implications for the alignment with and implementation of campus teaching and learning priorities, the selection committee was chosen from respected campus positions. The Screening and Selection Committee members included: Christina Maslach, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; Thomas Leonard, University Librarian; one faculty representative from the Academic Senate Committee on Teaching; one faculty representative from the Academic Senate Committee on the Library; and two representatives from the Mellon Steering Committee.

Building on the campus priorities and themes emphasized by the VP-UE, preference was given to applications (Appendix N) related to courses that:

- proposed innovative strategies to introduce students to research methods;
- required intensive investigation and use of The Library's print or digital collections;
- addressed at least one of the criteria related to instructional settings and approaches:
  - large, lower-division lecture courses promoting student engagement and research;
  - team-taught courses requiring students to engage in interdisciplinary research;
  - sophomore seminars integrating a research component;
  - capstone courses providing seniors with a culminating research experience.

Within the month between the initial announcement to faculty and the deadline for application, the Project Manager received 36 inquiries and applications, which were passed to the Screening and Selection Committee. Because of the number and quality of the applications, the committee recommended thirteen Mellon Fellows, three more than originally planned for funding. The 2003-2004 Mellon Fellows represent a broad spectrum of departments and disciplines (Appendix O):

- 5 Faculty Fellows from social sciences
- 3 Faculty Fellows from humanities
- 5 Faculty Fellows from sciences and engineering.

### Curriculum

The Institute Planning Group developed the initial framework of the curriculum for the Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research. The Group included five members of the Project Staff, each representing a different Project Partner unit and bringing complementary expertise. Both the Institute Planning Group and Steering Committee committed a great deal of time to this element of planning, realizing the final product could be repackaged and leveraged for greater impact in other faculty development initiatives at Berkeley.

Decisions about the Institute dates, nine days spanning three weeks, were made by the Steering Committee before the first curriculum discussions. The Institute Planning Committee proposed general principles:



- Sessions were to employ active learning strategies that when experienced together would model a range of approaches the Fellows might use in their own classes.
- Session leaders were called “facilitators” rather than “presenters” or “experts” to respect the experience and expertise that the Fellows themselves brought to the table.
- Facilitators would be drawn from the Berkeley campus to test our ability to provide a sustainable model of faculty development with local resources.
- Session topics and arrangement would be informed by expertise in various units, striving to refrain from the creation of isolated products and disjointed segments.
- Each day, after the first day, would include a morning “Review and Preview” session facilitated by the same person all three weeks to create continuity and address lingering issues.
- Each day would include an afternoon “Homework” session facilitated by the same person all three weeks to explain and answer questions about the readings and assignments for the next day.
- Each day would conclude with a group lunch during which Fellows would be invited to facilitate discussion about a topic of their choice.

The Institute Planning Group discussed and organized the potential themes that framed the content for each week: 1) Undergraduate Research and Student Learning; 2) Redesigning Course Syllabi and Research Assignments; and 3) Creating the Learning Environment. Topics and session times were proposed for each day, and Project Staff were selected to take the lead for organizing the specific content and activities of that session, and for previewing their plans with another Project Staff member from a different unit or area of expertise. When planning sessions, Project Staff were asked to adhere to the general principles but were given leeway to select any approach or develop any resource they wished. Sessions included a mix of individual presentations, panels, small group discussions, large group discussions, individual reflection, oral presentations, and a video created specifically for the Institute to capture the synergy between undergraduate research assignments, library collections, and student skills ([http://teles.berkeley.edu:8080/ramgen/2002/special\\_events/lib/mellon.rm](http://teles.berkeley.edu:8080/ramgen/2002/special_events/lib/mellon.rm)). A Day Organizer was appointed for each of the nine days of the Institute so all sessions during one day would have more cohesion. All Day Organizers met twice to share and revise descriptions, learning outcomes, instructional approaches, homework assignments, and the names of all session facilitators (Appendix P; Appendix Q).

## Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research

The Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research was held from June 2 through June 20, 2003. The Steering Committee had selected dates to align the Institute with the first third of the summer semester. Arrangements were made to host each week of the Institute in a different location around campus, which was an easy way to maintain energy for participants and facilitators alike.

The Mellon Fellows were presented on the first day with binders including the Institute Program and copies of all assigned readings (Appendix R). After an opening day focused on acquainting the Fellows with each other and asking them to define research through a number of lenses, the



Fellows returned on the second day with energy, respect, and an openness to learning from each other which continued and built over the three weeks. By the conclusion of the Institute, the Fellows were requesting monthly meetings throughout the year to discuss their courses, suggesting they mentor future Mellon Fellows, and offering ideas for ways they could become change agents within their departments and on campus.

A daily "action items" assignment was designed to provide immediate feedback on the effectiveness of the Institute providing a useful formative assessment tool for Institute planners. After every day of the Institute, the Mellon Fellows were asked to email three ideas derived from that day which they might consider using in the course they are developing. Over time the assignment became a way for many of the Fellows to share all manner of thoughts with the Project Staff member collecting them, thus fostering reflection, communication and an ongoing feedback loop. Through this avenue, and the Mid-Institute Evaluation Survey, the facilitators were able to glean a great deal of information. The day after administering the survey, many of the facilitators met to discuss the Institute and agreed upon changes for the final week, demonstrating responsiveness to the Fellows' comments and modeling the ability to adapt the content and format to meet learners' needs.

On the final day of the Institute, the Mellon Fellows completed a survey rating each session on two levels: the usefulness of topic and the effectiveness of the presentation of the material. Additionally, the survey asked Fellows to rate the overall effectiveness of the Institute for which they gave an average score of 4.5 on a scale in which 5.0 signifies "Extremely Effective." The Assessment Consultant is analyzing the complete data, which will be useful for planning ongoing workshops and future Institutes.

## Impact on Project Partners

### The Division of Undergraduate Education

In 2001, as part of a reorganization of the senior campus leadership, the Chancellor appointed the first cabinet level position charged with campus-wide responsibility for undergraduate education and created the Division of Undergraduate Education. Led by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Division's mission is to provide campus-wide leadership for undergraduate education and to administer faculty and student programs that support and assess excellence in teaching and learning. The Division houses several units that provide faculty development services, including the Office of Educational Development and Educational Technology Services. Given the decentralized culture of the Berkeley campus, the Vice Provost recognized the importance of establishing linkages with other campus units who support the teaching mission of the campus. The Mellon grant provided an opportunity to pilot a cross-unit collaboration around the development of the Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research and to institutionalize that collaboration in the form of an expanded Council of Academic Partners, composed of the core Mellon Project Partners and including other faculty development units across the campus, that would serve as a permanent advisory group to the Vice Provost.

The Council of Academic Partners (CAP) has since been invited to partner in several other campus-wide events and projects. Most notably, in May 2003, CAP co-sponsored (with the Division of Undergraduate Education and the Academic Senate) the "e-Berkeley Symposium: Rethinking



Large Enrollment Courses, New Ideas for Teaching and Learning." Over 120 members of the campus community, about half of them faculty and the remaining half students, graduate student instructors, senior administrators and staff, convened for a day-long forum to discuss challenges and solutions for the effective teaching of courses enrolling 200 students or more. The day included breakout sessions on such topics as developing new course models to build learning communities, assessing student learning, and using technology to minimize the administrative burden of large courses. As an outcome of the symposium, participants helped develop a set of recommendations, also incorporated into the campus accreditation *Educational Effectiveness Report*, which will guide campus leaders in the future. By increasing the visibility of the many faculty development units on campus, CAP co-sponsorship of this high profile event is expected to lead to the establishment of stronger partnerships between teaching support units on campus and campus faculty. Other recent collaborations have included the redesign of the Teaching Resources web page on the Berkeley web site and the New Faculty Orientation. Since its inception, CAP has established itself as an important venue for communication and collaboration across unit silos as well as an important advisory group (via the Vice Provost) to the Chancellor's Cabinet on matters concerning the teaching and learning mission of the campus.

#### Office of Educational Development

Because the Office of Educational Development (OED) in the Division of Undergraduate Education provided key staffing for the Institute, the impact of that project on OED is described in more detail in this section. The Office of Educational Development provides faculty development services to the campus' almost 1,900 ladder-rank faculty, lecturers, and adjuncts. OED has a very small staff, and by collaborating with other Project Partners on the Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research, the unit has developed a closer working relationship with staff from these units, in particular The University Library and the GSI Teaching and Resource Center, which will improve its effectiveness in carrying out programs for faculty development. OED has gained a better understanding of these units' operations and learned effective ways of structuring collaborations, both at the unit level and at the interpersonal level, which at a decentralized campus such as Berkeley is the most effective way to generate change.

These working relationships have not only significantly reduced OED's isolation on campus but made possible such successful collaborations as the Spring 2003 "e-Berkeley Symposium: Rethinking Large Enrollment Courses" and other partnerships with CAP. The Institute has also resulted in a cohort of thirteen faculty that OED can not only continue to work with but can use as resources for other faculty development activities. Further, these faculty contacts improve OED's connections with academic departments.

The Mellon project has put the infrastructure and relationships in place that reduce planning time for OED projects, such as the Presidential Chair Fellows program, debuting Fall 2003, in which thirteen faculty members will meet periodically during the academic year to explore ways to enhance their teaching. The Partners' work, facilitators' experiences during the Institute, and Fellows' evaluations have all provided valuable information that OED is applying to the Presidential Chair Fellows program. The participants in the Mellon Institute all brought considerable teaching experience and expertise along with their enthusiasm, learning from each other as well as from the facilitators, supporting our assumption that bringing instructors together across disciplinary lines in a collegial setting is an optimal way to bring about change.



The development of curriculum modules for the Mellon Institute will be used in the development of other faculty programs developed by OED, including the Presidential Chair Fellows' Program, as well as other campus activities. In addition, the ideas and innovations generated during the Institute have improved the OED Faculty Development Coordinator's knowledge base of how courses can be improved, which he can use in helping faculty improve their teaching.

Berkeley's self-study for the WASC accreditation discusses extensively both the benefits and disadvantages of the campus' highly decentralized organization and the impact of that decentralization on the culture of teaching. The Mellon project has helped to demonstrate that the best way to effect change in the culture of teaching at Berkeley, both with individual faculty and at the departmental level, is to bring small groups of faculty together across departments to discuss common concerns and pursue a common agenda. Mellon Fellows take what they have learned back to their departments and help create a critical mass to leverage change in the culture of teaching. In addition, the increasing prestige and selectivity of Mellon Fellowships signal to the campus the importance of teaching undergraduates and incorporating inquiry-based learning in the curriculum, as well as supports the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education's mission. Mellon planning and implementation has created closer alignment between our goals and what we are achieving to change the campus' culture.

#### The Graduate Student Instructor Teaching and Resource Center

The Institute has contributed to faculty development in that it has enabled the thirteen Mellon Fellows to redesign course syllabi and research assignments so as to integrate research, information literacy, and assessment into teaching. Equally important, however, is the impact that these changes will have on the role played by teaching assistants or graduate student instructors (GSI) who guide students step-by-step through the research process. While the faculty member may design the research component of the course, it is the GSI that guides the student through each step, from defining a topic to evaluating student work.

In addition to playing a central role in the design of the Institute curriculum, the GSI Teaching and Resource Center, one of the Project Partners, is working one-on-one with Mellon Fellows who will be teaching courses with GSIs. The Center is assisting these Mellon Fellows in considering ways to rethink the traditional discussion section, making it a site in which to foster undergraduate research skills rather than one in which lectures simply get rehashed. The Center is also working with faculty to assess the mentoring and training needs of GSIs as they guide and evaluate student research. In this manner, the Mellon Institute will strengthen the important role that faculty play in the professional development of GSIs and will encourage mentoring practices that are consistent with the newly revised Graduate Council Policy on the Appointment and Mentorship of GSIs.

#### The Research Library

The Mellon grant has been the catalyst for introspection about the future role of the University Library at Berkeley. The University Library, which has traditionally cited its extensive collections and subject expertise as hallmarks of the organization, is beginning to envision the educational role of the library and librarians as an important new responsibility. The challenge lies in developing staff to be true collaborators in the curriculum design process on a scaleable and sustainable level. Developing a culture of instruction within the organization requires redesigning communication



structures between units and areas of expertise, creating and supporting related professional development opportunities for library staff, and developing and sustaining a vision for all instructional activities within the University Library as a whole. To meet this challenge, the Project Staff from the University Library believed it was important to create a larger cohort from the libraries across campus with which this initiative could begin.

During Fall 2002, the Project Manager made presentations to the five major subject, collections, and service councils within the Library, introducing the Mellon Project and engendering interest in the Institute and ongoing work with the Mellon Fellows to follow throughout the year. Once the thirteen 2003-2004 Mellon Fellows were selected, a team of library staff was formed to support each. Two Associate University Librarians identified library staff who would bring a subject, format, and/or instructional expertise to the team -- in essence, developing smaller communities of learners (Appendix S). An all-staff meeting was held in May 2003 to update library staff about the planning activities to date, announce the 2003-2004 Mellon Fellows and related library teams, and reconnect this initiative to other related campus initiatives. To underscore the importance of collaboration for the project overall, three non-Library members from the Project Staff were invited to lead the discussions about many of these issues at the meeting.

In May 2003, members of the library teams participated in a working meeting coordinated by the Head of Instructional Services, who is also a member of the Project Staff and Steering Committee. At the meeting, the responsibilities of team members and team leaders were discussed, the Mellon Fellows' applications were analyzed, and participants identified the ongoing professional development opportunities they desired in order to fulfill their new roles. This was the first time the teams had met, and one of the first occasions for library staff to work collaboratively on a project of this nature and scale. To begin to build communication within the teams, the groups were asked to address all the above-mentioned topics first in small group discussions, before reporting back. Since the initial meeting, the entire group has remained in communication through a listserv by which weekly updates about the Mellon Institute were shared, relevant articles and web sites are exchanged, and other announcements are posted from team members.

Professional development series have continued, both to support the teams working directly with the Mellon Fellows and to continuously include all interested library staff in the discussions about teaching and learning issues. In June 2003, all library staff were invited to hear a summary of key issues discussed during the Institute about undergraduate research and information literacy. Following that session, team members participated in a facilitated activity on reviewing syllabi and designing assignments that integrate library research skills. In July 2003, all library staff were invited to a session about information literacy and assessment.

Since the initial working meeting in May 2003, the library teams have been fully engaged with this project and communicating with their respective Mellon Fellows. Midway through the Institute, each library team selected one member of their group to join their Mellon Fellow for a lunch discussion about the course syllabus, research assignments, anticipated learning outcomes, and possible library resources of benefit. Since that time, members of each team have continued to meet and share ideas among themselves and with their Fellows and are expected to continue to do so throughout the course of this year. The Head of Instructional Services continues to lead conversations with individual teams, and with the library teams as a whole, to encourage greater



networking and a co-mingling of ideas to support courses with similar audiences, settings, or goals. In the longer view, there is an ongoing expectation that these teams will impact the nature of librarian-faculty collaborations with not only these individuals but also with other colleagues in those departments. Similarly, the discussions will continue within the University Library as a whole about the manner in which a research library can offer instructional services and how best to create the necessary connections between library collections, information literacy skills, and the students.

## Plans for Year Two

The second year of the grant will be spent supporting the Mellon Fellows, promoting the Mellon Project, enhancing collaborations, and analyzing the impact of the Institute to determine effective practices for faculty development initiatives.

Toward the end of the 2003 Institute, Fellows were asked to submit training and support requests. Currently, individual and group appointments are being arranged between the Project Partners and Mellon Fellows in areas such as course web development, consultations on library resources and instructional sessions, assignment development, and assessment design and implementation. Approximately half of the Fellows will be teaching their redesigned courses in Fall 2003, with the remainder teaching courses in Spring 2004; these designations have assisted the Project Partners in timing their support.

The Mellon Fellows have also expressed the desire to continue to meet as a group, on a monthly basis, to share developments within their individual course planning and innovations or problems encountered in the redesign of their course syllabi and assignments. A series of informal monthly lunches is being planned for this purpose, and Project Partners who were also Institute facilitators are encouraged to attend as well.

To share the results of the Mellon Fellows' Institute experiences and impact upon their courses beyond their cohort, a series of colloquia will be planned to encourage wider discussion and infusion of these ideas on campus. The Fellows have also been encouraged to suggest other venues, such as meetings within their departments and centers. One suggestion was to sponsor departmental or discipline-based events recognizing students who completed high-quality products in the courses that have been redesigned through the support of this Mellon grant. Another idea was to promote the Library Prize for Undergraduate Research, an annual award for both lower-division and upper-division students who complete research projects exhibiting acumen in the research process and knowledge of research sources, within these courses. The current CAP discussions about other faculty development teaching and learning initiatives will likely lead to collaborative development of new curriculum based upon the most well-received segments of the Institute curriculum.

Communication about the progress and impact of the grant will continue to be an emphasis in Year Two. The Mellon Institute web site will evolve to become the central repository for revised syllabi, assignments, and other innovations developed by the 2003-2004 Mellon Fellows, as well as a space for Project Partners to post other announcements and communications about the Institute and grant (<http://library.berkeley.edu/MellonInstitute>). Announcements about the Mellon Fellows



and the summer Institute are scheduled for publication in campus newsletters, news sites, and listservs in Fall 2003. Similarly, Project Partners have discussed sharing their experiences in articles published in their professional literature, hoping to increase awareness of effective practices for faculty training and development, which could be implemented at other research institutions.

Professional development and enhanced collaboration among the Project Partners is a primary goal. In August 2003, a post-Institute meeting with all facilitators will be held to discuss the Institute evaluations and other recommendations gathered from the January 2003 Steering Committee meeting (Attachment N). Training and other methods for enhancing communication and strengthening relationships between the Project Partners will be considered. Similarly, each of the Project Partners is encouraged to continue sharing their ideas for related staff development opportunities to the staff within their units to which others may be invited.

## Conclusion

We are grateful for the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, which has enabled us to experiment at Berkeley with a campus strategy to:

1. forge a campus collaboration of academic partners that can be a catalyst for change, working together to provide support and create infrastructure for faculty and other instructors
2. develop and nurture a cohort of instructors dedicated to a new way of teaching, who become change agents within their departments and throughout the university.

We have made a good start towards building the campus collaboration, and we have learned a great deal about our shared motivations, individual strengths, and the ways in which we all contribute to student learning. The project provides an impetus for us to work together and make the connections between our areas of expertise. But, to make progress on our second objective, we need more time for the first cohort of Mellon Fellows to implement their course changes and share their experiences, and a greater number of cohorts of Mellon Fellows to build a critical mass that can effect campus-wide change.



## Appendices

- A. Directory of Project Staff
- B. Directory of Steering Committee
- C. Project Timeline
- D. Expenditures of Funds
- E. Evaluation/Assessment Summary Plan (draft)
- F. Evaluation/Assessment Timeline (draft)
- G. Steering Committee Collaboration Survey Results
- H. Pre-Institute Survey Results
- I. Mid-Institute Evaluation Survey
- J. Institute Final Evaluation
- K. Mellon Fellows' Evaluation/Assessment Areas and Interests (draft)
- L. Mellon Faculty Institute on Undergraduate Research brochure
- M. Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities Newsletter
- N. Mellon Faculty Institute Application
- O. Biographies of Mellon Fellows
- P. Comprehensive Institute Plan
- Q. Biographies of Institute Facilitators
- R. Institute Program
- S. Directory of Mellon Library Partners' Teams