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We are all apprentices in a craft where no one ever becomes a master.

- Ernest Hemingway
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides a brief overview and summary of the research objective, key data and findings, and recommendations.
AUDIT OBJECTIVE

The purpose of the collected data was to evaluate faculty and staff perceptions of Marquette University’s Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), as well as to determine its strengths and weaknesses. Dr. Shaun Longstreet, Director of the CTL requested feedback and recommendations from the findings in order to determine current perceptions and maximize faculty and staff utilization.

The conducted research focused on three areas of the CTL: the integration of technology in the classroom, students’ perceptions of faculty use of technology in the classroom, and how to improve faculty outreach regarding provided services.

As Marquette University undergoes its Strategic Planning process, one main priority that is outlined includes the Pursuit of Academic Excellence for Human Well-being. With that in mind, bolstering academic strength should be the primary focus of Marquette’s planning and the CTL has potential to play a vital role in that. That provides great evidence for a change in the way technology is complementing a student’s learning in addition to providing faculty with the right resources to work with all entities at the institution to achieve their common purpose, which is to provide students with a transformational education.

DATA AND KEY FINDINGS

In order to obtain necessary data, interviews were conducted with three Marquette University faculty members, two focus groups were conducted each with 6-12 students, and a survey was distributed to a random sample of full and part-time faculty members. After transcribing the interviews and focus groups, and analyzing survey results, the following common themes emerged:

- Lack of effective technology integration
- Not all adjunct, tenure and teaching assistants receive or respond to communication from the CTL
- Need for programs tailored toward specific college needs
- Change the stigma of the CTL from remedial to innovative
- Lack of faculty incentive to utilize the CTL
RECOMMENDATIONS

After a thorough analysis of the data, the following recommendations were made:

- Create a platform on the CTL website that allows for online interaction between a faculty member and a CTL member staff
- Create a “How do I” page
- Significant need for the CTL to break through the noise by using traditional and creative approaches to target specific college needs.
- Penetrate different colleges and programs- have teachers from other programs, colleges at Marquette University or other institutions run seminars with the attendance of their colleagues
- Engage and retain incoming faculty and junior faculty about CTL services (with potential to retain this demographic during an orientation event)
- Provide information and training of emerging technologies, especially in the beginning of the year

CONCLUSION

The Center for Teaching and Learning has evolved throughout the years; however, with the possible implementation of the recommendations listed in the following report, the CTL can enhance its image and maximize utilization of its services to benefit Marquette University faculty and staff, and its students.
II. SITUATION ANALYSIS

This section provides research rationale after examining four major competitors to Marquette University’s CTL. They are Georgetown University, Boston College, Saint Louis University and Fordham University.
SITUATION ANALYSIS

Marquette University’s Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) was established roughly seven years ago. Housed under Marquette University’s Office of the Provost, its mission statement is as follows:

“The Center for Teaching and Learning serves as a catalyst for promoting a culture of pedagogical excellence at Marquette University. Rooted in Ignatian pedagogy and the scholarship of teaching and learning, we advocate innovative teaching and the use of student-centered technology while partnering with faculty as they prepare Marquette students to be agents of change for a global community” (“About the center,” 2012).

The CTL’s primary purpose is to support and assist faculty in the development and improvement of learning opportunities for students. Four key resource areas include: Manresa for Faculty, Faculty and Professional Development, E-learning and, most recently added, Service Learning. The CTL consists of 10 staff members and is located at 326 John P. Raynor, S.J., Library and the Service Learning Program is located on the 3rd Floor of the 707 Building.

COMPETITIVE ANALYSIS

This section compares Marquette University’s CTL with four other nationally ranked Jesuit college institutions. We compared and contrasted services that Marquette currently offers out of their CTL with similar establishments at the following four campuses: Georgetown University, Boston College, Fordham University and Saint Louis University.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

The U.S News and World Magazine on the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities website ranked Georgetown University as one of Marquette University’s highest competitors. According to Georgetown University’s Center for New Design and Scholarship, the center “has supported faculty and graduate students with tools, resources and opportunities for new learning environments” (“Cndls :: About,” 2012). The center is dedicated to researching the most innovative practices, assessment techniques, instructional design, student learning and technologies to enhance the latest educational environments. Georgetown offers ongoing programs in apprenticeship in teaching as well as Education, Inquiry and Justice. The center also offers institutes and seminars to help support its demographic to achieve their ultimate objective. Some of these institutes include the Teaching, Learning & Innovation Summer Institute (TLISI) and the Provost’s Seminar in Teaching and Learning. Finally, the university lists workshops, events and resources weekly on its website. Upcoming workshops, new faculty orientation, resources from recently finished events (accompanied with any relevant video, presentation slides, handouts or notes) and an event calendar are all available for the center’s users. In contrast, Marquette University’s Center for Teaching and Learning is focused more on current faculty members and not as much on adjunct professors or graduate students. However, each University has a strong emphasis on both face-to-face institutions, workshops, consulting and E-Learning.

A unique advantage Marquette has to Georgetown University is its’ Manresa Faculty Program. This program consists of seminars, workshops, faculty learning communities and university faculty conferences in an effort to support and enhance Marquette’s Catholic Jesuit mission.
BOSTON COLLEGE
Boston College’s (BC) Faculty and Teaching Assistants/Teaching Fellows (TA/TF) Support Center, known as the Connors Family Learning Center, provides assistance to all instructors in the Boston College community. Although BC’s center is open to a larger demographic, the center has very strict guidelines of what each group of users can and cannot do at this center. According to Boston College’s Faculty and TA/TF Support Center, teaching assistants and teaching fellows “can participate in one and one half day Fall Teaching Orientation, ongoing seminars dedicated to college teaching, higher learning and academic life, assistance in developing teacher portfolios, and class visits and teaching consultations, upon request” ("Faculty and ta/tf," 2012). The center only offers full-time faculty members “information and materials on college teaching and learning, class visits if requested and ongoing seminars on teaching and university life” ("Faculty and ta/tf," 2012). In comparison, Marquette University offers more educational tools and services in which participants can engage in.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
Similar to Marquette, Fordham’s Center for Teaching Excellence offers programs such as: Teaching Seminars, Teaching Forums and Ignatian Pedagogy Discussions. The center is calling for grant proposals for the 2012-2013 academic year from the following: interdisciplinary course development grants, Pedagogy development grants and assistance in attending pedagogy conferences. Based on information pulled from their website, Fordham’s center appears to be less developed than Marquette University’s Center for Teaching and Learning as is evidenced by the support that is offered to faculty and staff. Currently, the heavy focus seems to be professional development and not so much on the enhancement of learning opportunities for students.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
According to Saint Louis University’s (SLU) Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence website, the center “is a comprehensive teaching center, serving faculty, graduate students, and other educators at Saint Louis University.” It offers an array of “instructional development and design services and programs, both for individual faculty/instructors and for departments/programs.” Additionally, the Center sponsors as well as co-sponsors workshops dedicated to pedagogical topics, which are led by Center staff, SLU faculty and national/international experts. SLU has a teaching and learning center with services consisting of: certificate programs, institutes, workshops, conversation series, mentoring for new SLU faculty, consultations, teaching observations, small group instructional feedback sessions (i.e., mid-semester focus groups), as well as video-recorded teaching reviews. Marquette University and Saint Louis University are extremely high competitors towards one another within the faculty educational market. One unique advantage Marquette University has to SLU’s faculty program is Marquette’s drive for its educators to receive their E-Learning Certificates.

Based on the previous information, these four institutions offer similar establishments to the CTL. However, they all have distinguishing characteristics of advancement ranging from basic professional development for faculty and staff, to comprehensive efficiency and technological training, all the way from offering resources to undergraduate students to customized workshops specific to respective colleges and educational programs.
RESEARCH RATIONALE

Currently the CTL is looking to improve its services for faculty and aims to differentiate itself as the leading center in comparison to competing universities such as: Georgetown University, Boston College, Fordham University and Saint Louis University. A quote by Fr. Peter Hans Kolvenbach, featured on the CTL’s website, speaks to the overarching challenge the CTL seeks to address: “If the measure and purpose of our universities lies in what the students become, then the faculty are at the heart of our universities…What do they need in order to fulfill this essential vocation?” (“Staff,” 2012).

To be more specific:

- What does the CTL need to improve to become better utilized?
- How can its services be revamped to better suit faculty’s needs?
- What are faculty perceptions of the CTL in assisting them to succeed in the classroom?

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the perceptions of the CTL from faculty and students, and determine the strengths and weaknesses of the center. Dr. Shaun Longstreet, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, has requested feedback and recommendations from the findings in order to determine current perceptions and maximize faculty utilization of the CTL, which in turn benefits students.
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III. PARAMETERS AND PROCEDURES

This section examines the research focus of the three areas of CTL, which include: the integration of technology in the classroom, students’ perceptions of faculty use of technology in the classroom, and the improvement of communication between the CTL and faculty. In addition to the examination of the three areas, this section will include the procedures used in consultant research.
PARAMETERS AND PROCEDURES

To better determine the perceptions of both faculty and students, the research focuses on three areas of the CTL: the integration of technology in the classroom, students’ perceptions of faculty use of technology in the classroom, and how to improve the communication between the CTL and faculty/staff regarding available services. The following provides reasons for each focus and the procedures utilized to obtain the qualitative and quantitative data.

TECHNOLOGY

An integral part of the Center for Teaching and Learning’s services is the use of technology in the classroom. The center provides resources for faculty to utilize in their classrooms to engage with students, an example of this is Desire2Learn (D2L). D2L serves as an online platform of communication between students and faculty. The integration of technology into the classroom can also be analyzed through the faculty completion of the CTL’s E-learning program.

STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

Although students are not invited to participate in CTL training events, their courses are directly impacted by faculty participation in CTL programs, or lack thereof. The integration of Service Learning into a course is one of those ways in which a student is directly impacted by CTL Service Learning services.

IMPROVING FACULTY OUTREACH

Another focus of this project is the alternatives faculty use in place of the CTL. In other words, if a faculty member is having a problem with D2L and they do not seek the help of the Center for Teaching and Learning, then where else do they turn to for help and why? This data will help the CTL understand ways in which they can improve their outreach to faculty.
Interviews

Interviews were conducted with three Marquette University faculty members, one who also serves as a department chair. Interviewees were chosen for their varying experiences and perspectives of the university. They were contacted via email, briefing them of the three focus topics. The interviews allowed for immediate feedback and provided a better sense of the perceptions of the CTL. The data collected from the interviews contributed insight for the development and improvement of the CTL and its resources.

• Two members attended each interview. One was a designated interviewer and the other recorded data by hand as well as using a digital recorder (provided that there was consent from the interviewee).
• Interviews were conducted face-to-face with the use of an interview guide that encouraged progression and follow-up questions. [See Appendix A for Interview Guide].
• All data collected was transcribed. As transcripts were available, the responses were separated and organized chronologically by question in order to find patterns and common themes.

The following faculty members were interviewed:
• Tenured professor from College of Arts and Sciences for 10+ years
• Adjunct professor in the College of Education and College of Communication who has worked at Marquette for 10+ years
• Tenured professor in College of Communication who has worked at Marquette for 20+ years
Focus Groups
Two focus groups were conducted, each with 6-12 students. Three consultants were present at each focus group. In order to encourage conversation and uncover opinions, a moderator prepared discussion topics and questions relating to the instructors’ uses of technology in the classroom. [See Appendix B for Focus Group Guide]. Additionally, two assistants took notes and operated the tape recorder (with participant consent).

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling. The first focus group consisted of members of the Marquette University Urban Scholars community. The second focus group consisted of members from the Marquette University Student Government (MUSG). Students involved in MUSG come from a variety of areas on campus and represent their constituents in university topics. These participants represented a wide range of colleges, student organizations and demographic backgrounds.

All data collected was transcribed. As transcripts were made available, the responses were separated and organized chronologically by question in order to find patterns and common themes.

Surveys
Dr. Fyke administered a university-wide survey to a random sample of both full and part-time faculty members. In the survey, faculty were asked about their perceptions of the CTL, sources of information pertaining to the CTL, as well as the number of times faculty participated in any CTL services. [See Appendix C for Survey Questionnaire]

Upon receiving survey data, patterns and common themes were defined, which provided empirical data to support the qualitative data gathered via interview and focus group methods. All of the data was analyzed using a grounded theory approach (Hargie & Tourish, 2011) by which the consultants identified recurring themes.

* In order to report more accurate results, consultants referred to data from 6 additional interviews and 4 additional focus groups gathered by other teams to supplement and compare to our own.
IV. RESULTS

Through the use of student focus groups and faculty interviews, there were common themes to permeate. The following section pulls quotes from each research method and concludes with the following identified challenges for the CTL:

1. Lack of effective technology integration
2. Not all adjunct, tenure and teaching assistants receive or respond to communication from the CTL
3. Need for programs tailored toward specific college needs
4. Change the stigma of the CTL from remedial to innovative
5. Lack of faculty incentive to utilize the CTL
KEY FINDINGS

In our qualitative research (focus groups and interviews) we determined some overarching categories and identified key themes (illustrated in charts 1 and 2 on pages 20-21 is the coding scheme the researchers used and it highlights the most commonly heard concepts and concerns.) Following the charts is a list of our recommendations supported with the use of direct quotes to illustrate our findings. The recommendations first outline the current perception by faculty and students, state the visionary goal, and then provide a tactical way to attain the goal. While some tactics for the Center and Teaching and Learning to take into consideration may seem lofty, the larger goals include some short term and long term improvements that can be made or modified.

SUMMARIZED STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS ON CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY

A list of the commonly used types of instructional technology includes: PowerPoint, projectors, D2L, Skype and Prezi. In students’ opinion, many professors do not know how to use instructional technology properly, especially D2L. As an institution that fosters innovation and learning to better prepare students for their future careers, it makes it difficult for students to take a lesson seriously and credibly when teachers do not know the best ways to present their teaching material.

**Student A:** “I have a teacher right now and there is no point in going to class for he reads word for word off the power point. Yeah, I haven’t learned anything from him basically.”

Secondly, in comparison to students’ high schools, Marquette is fairly behind in the integration of different technology into the classroom. Some students have seen better uses of technology such as Blackboard, a site similar to D2L. All grades were kept on the Blackboard site and allowed students to better monitor their classroom progress. The site also held teachers accountable for timely posts. Other types of technology more prominent in past high school experiences include technology such as Smartboards and its interactive capabilities to teach students in an effective and efficient manner. More specifically, the use of Smartboards allowed quicker access to internet sites and increased interaction because of its ability to use pen tools to add content, drawings and diagrams to the projected material as well as activities that include sound-enhanced lessons, web screenshots, PowerPoint presentations, Excel spreadsheets and video presentations.

**Student B:** “I’d say the technology in my high school was more advanced than Marquette. And that was three and a half years ago.”

There was a big key takeaway from all comments made and that is the idea of integrating technology to make lessons more interactive which also adapts to more learning styles in a classroom.

**Student C:** “Like certain systems, it’s better to have a picture of it in your mind and have it interactive sort of thing to see how it works rather than like this is a diagram, this is a PowerPoint of the diagram.”
In regards to D2L, students dislike the lack of consistency that occurs with the posting of syllabi and grades. Some professors will use the tools and others do not use it at all, consequently students use D2L less due to the inconsistency. In addition, there is a strong dislike for online quizzes mainly because of its layout and the time limits it usually is accompanied by. It was mentioned that a few students were more likely to use their books or work with partners when taking a quiz on D2L as well. Some argued that the quizzes still provided learning experiences and others thought it was far better to take quizzes in class. There was never an overall consensus on the topic of quizzes.

**Student D:** “I don’t know, I study more and pay more attention when I like have to take a quiz in class than at home with all my books so...”

Some students spoke about their desire to centralize all classroom enhancing sites like McGraw, Ares, Aplia, etc. Many students voiced strong dislike in finding the same information that served the same purpose on multiple sites.

**Student E:** “I feel like if there were a system where it was much more efficient and I didn’t have to go through and click through every class for every grade and I could just pull it up and it would be like here are your grades for all your classes and teachers were held accountable for putting them up I think I would utilize [D2L] a lot more.”

Lastly, many students mentioned some other miscellaneous features of D2L they disliked such as:

- Information posted is lost after semester ends
- Some D2L features work better for some classes than others (i.e. discussion, dropbox, etc.)
- There is a need for user friendly D2L mobile application that functions for all smartphones
- Most instructors do not post grades making it difficult for the students to determine whether the work they are turning in is correct

### SUMMARIZED FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AND INTERACTIONS WITH THE CTL

Based on faculty responses, there appears to be discrepancies concerning the purpose of the CTL. Instead of viewing the center as a place for professional growth, **faculty view the center as a place for those who need improvement.** Those who identify as full-time or tenured feel as though they do not need to utilize the CTL, while adjunct faculty perceive the CTL to be only for full-time or tenure track individuals.

“I think that they’re the central group that’s involved in helping full-time faculty improve their teaching. I mean, I think that’s their central role and mission.”

- Adjunct Professor in the College of Education
Of those interviewed, one of the main reasons for not utilizing the CTL was due to time constraints and lack of incentive to do so. Faculty expressed that current incentives are not contingent with their professional needs and thus are less motivated to utilize the CTL.

“The current campus environment for a faculty member is very closely linked to promotion and tenure guidelines...If I am something of a new professor, my promotion and tenure is based on three things: Research, teaching and service and that order always comes that way...Why should they go? If you have to do all of this to get promoted...why should you do it when okay teaching will probably be just as likely to get you tenure?”

- Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

In regards to technology, faculty expressed that they need individuals who specialize in those areas. Their knowledge is only limited to what the CTL provides as such, and if there is new emerging technology or new opportunities in general, the CTL needs to communicate in a more efficient way.

“The short answer to that is there is no existing technology that I am aware of that I am not already using but I appreciate opportunities to be made aware of new things that are coming up.”

- Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

With the above mentioned in mind, of those interviewed, many expressed a lack of efficient and effective communication between faculty and the CTL. While many commented that they are aware that the main tool of communication for CTL is e-mail, faculty are not likely to be as responsive to this method.

“I log on to d2l on a regular basis. I never actually see tips come up on my screen or ‘Hey did you know that this was available?’ or that kind of stuff. I get e-mail reminders about things for things like when you have to turn in your grades or how to take attendance at the first day of class and that kind of stuff. I never gotten anything from the Center of Teaching and Learning -- “Here are some resources available to you as a part-time or adjunct.”

- Adjunct Professor in the College of Education

The following charts (Chart 1 and Chart 2) list the most common ideas and concerns that emerged from our qualitative research. The ideas and concerns have been categorized in titles that our researchers used to code.

Chart 1 outlines the most common ideas and concerns from students who participated within the focus groups. In the coding process the categories that were extracted from the focus groups were technology and Desire2Learn.

Chart 2 includes the most common ideas and desires from the faculty interviews. In the coding process the categories that were delineated from the interviews include current perceptions, incentives, technology and outreach (or communication).

The categories and themes with allow the CTL to ensure that they are not only providing faculty with the tools and information that the faculty need for success, but also so that it aligns with
students desires to achieve a symbiotic relationship between teaching and learning with different technologies and audiences. Recalling the quote in the situation analysis that states, “If the measure and purpose of our universities lies in what the students become, then the faculty are at the heart of our universities…What do they need in order to fulfill this essential vocation?” (“Staff,” 2012). In order to provide students with the best education possible, faculty and staff need to know what the students need and how to provide that.

**Chart 1 – Student Focus Group Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Object of interest:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common Themes:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for effective use of common technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for efficient use of technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing better use of technology in high schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students desire to determine use of personal technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong dislike for multiple homework hosting sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2L</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency in usage by faculty especially with grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is lost after class ends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate use of full potential Some features work better for some classes than others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong dislike for online quizzes and challenges academic integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for user friendly D2L mobile application (for all smartphones)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the Dropbox tool, but not process to receive graded paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object of interest: Perceptions:</td>
<td>Object of interest: Classroom Technology:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Themes:</td>
<td>Common Themes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CTL’s purpose is remedial and not for professional growth</td>
<td>• Faculty aim for promotion and tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full-time professors do not believe they need the CTL because they have a lot of experience</td>
<td>• CTL does not offer much support to foster academic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjunct professors believe the CTL’s services aid full-time faculty and tenure track to reach career goals</td>
<td>• Lack of recognition in e-learning certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty do not have time for the CTL services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of interest: Technology:</th>
<th>Object of interest: Outreach:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Themes:</td>
<td>Common Themes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty has limited knowledge of technology and need experts in the emerging technology</td>
<td>• Faculty receives vast amount of email and fails to acknowledge CTL specific notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty is interested in new teaching technologies and services, but do not always hear or learn of them</td>
<td>• Outreach appears to support only full-time faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELECT CTL SURVEY RESULTS

In order to obtain a sample of faculty perceptions regarding the Center for Teaching and Learning, a survey was administered (see Appendix C for the survey questionnaire). After securing approval from Marquette University’s Online Survey Review Group, the survey was administered to a random sample of full- and part-time faculty across the various colleges at Marquette. An incentive of two $25 Marquette Cash cards were offered to faculty for completing the survey, in the hopes that it would yield a higher response rate. In all, the survey was sent to a sample of 280 faculty members. A total of 49 surveys were completed resulting in 18% participation.

Following survey administration, simple tests were conducted to yield frequencies and descriptive statistics. The following tables show each survey item along with means and standard deviations (SD) for each of the items.

Please note the different scales included with the tables (e.g., “1=Strongly Agree; 5=Strongly Disagree”). The standard deviation indicates the degree to which the numbers are spread out from the mean (i.e., the higher the SD, the more spread out).

Some key findings have been highlighted to support much of our qualitative research.

For each item below the participants were asked to mark the number that best indicates the amount of information that he/she currently receives (Table 1.1) and the amount of information that he/she would like to receive (Table 1.2).

The Likert scale used is as follows: 1=Very Little 2=Little 3=Same 4=Great 5=Very Great

Table 1.1 Current Information received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info about Teaching &amp; student learning-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Creating inclusive classrooms-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Faculty work-life balance-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Developing teaching portfolios-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Ignation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Teaching with technology (e.g. clickers, smart phones) -Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about DLL use training-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Faculty fellowships and teaching grants-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Service Learning and community-based learning-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Peer mentoring for faculty programs-Current</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Desired Information received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info about Teaching &amp; student learning-Desired</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Creating inclusive classrooms-Desired</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Faculty work-life balance-Desired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Developing teaching portfolios-Desired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Ignation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Teaching with technology (e.g. clickers, smart phones) -Desired</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about DLL use training-Desired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Faculty fellowships and teaching grants-Desired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Service Learning and community-based learning -Desired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Peer mentoring for faculty programs-Desired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 (left) suggests that faculty currently do not receive much information about work-life balance, how to develop portfolios, and peer mentoring programs. Table 1.2 (right) shows that faculty desire more information about these areas.
Table 1.3 (left) suggests that a large reason faculty would use the CTL’s services is to prepare for tenure.

Table 1.4 (right) shows high interest in learning how to use D2L.

If you have any questions about this survey or would like to see the full results, you can contact Dr. Jeremy Fyke at 414-288-4061 (jeremy.fyke@marquette.edu) or Dr. Shaun Longstreet at 414-288-0263 (shaun.longstreet@marquette.edu).

**MAIN CHALLENGES**

The following is a list of challenges that we derived from the common themes shown throughout our research:

1. Lack of effective technology integration
2. Not all adjunct, tenure and teaching assistants receive or respond to communication from the CTL
3. Need for programs tailored toward specific college needs
4. Change the stigma of the CTL from remedial to innovative
5. Lack of faculty incentive to utilize the CTL
The following section is based off the audit findings and pertains to the challenges concluded with in the previous section. By integrating theory with these challenges, a set of specific recommendations has been developed.
**Challenge 1:** Lack of effective technology integration

**Goal:** Improve integration of technology in the classroom

**Recommendation 1:**
Some faculty have minor questions that they do not feel are big enough to bring to the CTL, yet students are bothered by these same small inefficiencies when faculty incorrectly use technology. Create a platform on the CTL website that allows for online interaction between a teacher and a member of the CTL staff. An online chat would be preferable, or even a submission page where someone can respond within 24 hours would make small progress. Time is a scarcity for faculty members and this online forum provides convenience and efficiency considering that not all inquiries require a face-to-face consultation. Furthermore, chances are that if one person has a question regarding a particular subject, someone else may have the same question. This will allow the CTL to monitor and record what faculty and staff seek the most assistance with and what they ask questions about to eventually lead to a FAQ page or, similar to Boston College, a “How do I...?” page.

According to Geoff Scott (2003), the best programs to manage change include an FAQ page. This allows users to gather information in “digestible chunks”. If the current CTL website had a page for even the smallest questions about how to access a class list or how to post a syllabus this would begin to help professors avoid students’ frustrations when technology such as the projector screen or D2L do not function. A simple “How do I...?” page that is conveyed from the CTL, not using the outside source it currently uses, with quick fast facts on how to utilize D2L could provide faculty with easily accessible information.

**Challenges 2 and 3:** Not all adjunct, tenured and teaching assistants receive or respond to communication from the CTL, and there is a need for programs to be tailored toward specific college needs.

**Goal:** To improve the communication between the CTL and faculty/staff regarding available services.

**Recommendation 1:**
The CTL needs to break away from its traditional approach and expand its horizons into more innovative techniques to reach different professors. Currently, they are using a “net approach” or throwing out a large message and seeing what professors resonate with messages to attend programs or participate. With the shift in technology perpetually transforming higher education, this approach is out of date. The Minimalist Theory, developed by J. M. Carroll in 1990, suggests that while training someone on a new technology it is best to assign them meaningful and active learning tasks (Orchid Systems, n.d.). It is implied that the CTL should be aware of what constitutes a meaningful task for a particular audience, making a need for smaller target audiences critical. There is significant need for the CTL to break through the noise, and that is done by creating meaning.
“I think the CTL does a perfectly adequate job but I would not say they break through the noise moreover any other unit or initiative does.”

- Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

The CTL should still maintain some level of mass communication about its services as there will be some professors that independently seek the CTL services. However, for the professors that do not actively seek the CTL services, a less one-way approach of notifications the CTL should also appeal to their smaller target audiences. This can be accomplished by crafting messages that specifically target different departments and programs in which the smaller areas will then create greater overall participation by faculty with more relevant services provided. Sending out an email with many different updates is not effective for an already time restricted faculty or professor. Of those interviewed, one of the main reasons for not utilizing the CTL was due to time constraints and lack of incentive to do so.

The CTL should start working with the department chairs of each college to start to penetrate into the different audiences on campus. If the department chairs are familiarized with the CTL’s services they can determine the most beneficial information to provide each particular department with. While Marquette University Online Course Evaluation System (MOCES) may not provide students with the help they need in picking classes or professors, they can be used for the department chairs knowledge about areas for growth in each respective college. There could be additional questions or open response to MOCES in relation to classroom-technology integration. The use of technology in a classroom is dependent upon what course type it is and with those evaluations this can better be defined.

“It [technology] depends on the type of class it is, what you are trying to do, what the content is, how many students are in the class, what your goals are.”

- Adjunct Professor in the College of Education

Adding one or two questions to MOCES about classroom technology uses can provide specific data to best determine what technology or needs are required for a certain class. As Marquette University undergoes its Strategic Planning process, one main priority that is outlined includes the Pursuit of Academic Excellence for Human Well-being. With that in mind, bolstering academic strength should be the primary focus of Marquette’s planning and the CTL has potential to play a vital role in that. That provides great evidence for a change in the way technology is complementing a student’s learning. Each semester when the department chairs receives the MOCES information a member from the CTL should set up a consultation appointment with the department chair in order to determine which ways they can determine the most helpful and relevant services and information to provide the professors. The information can be used by the CTL to create workshops, tutorials and more about ways to improve areas that seem to lack according to the students, especially in regards to technology. This would allow the CTL to provide more marketable programs and services.
Challenge 4:  Change the stigma of the CTL from remedial to innovative

Goal:  Foster more interdisciplinary collaboration to change the stigma and to provide faculty with incentives to use the CTL

Recommendation 1:
The CTL should make more of an effort to go to different colleges to provide training on its particular needs (i.e. College of Communication - Adobe Creative Suite). For those colleges that already have internal training capabilities (i.e. The Wakerly Technology Training Center), perhaps the CTL could partner with them to increase visibility for the CTL. Rather than remain an area in which people can come to for help, they can extend themselves to professors that otherwise may not know how to or be willing to update their use of technology. This action will foster a two-way relationship between faculty/staff and the CTL. This is also an attempt to shift the stigma that the CTL is made for only remedial purposes.

Secondly, in lieu of the idea of collaboration, there is a need to ensure support systems for all types of faculty. This includes full-time faculty, tenure, associate, adjunct and even graduate students.

“I think the first thing, I don’t even know if I can answer that question, because I am not sure if the Center for Teaching and Learning even sees it in their mission to help support part-time or adjunct faculty.”

- Adjunct professor in the College of Education

Recommendation 2:
In order to shift faculty’s association with the CTL as a remedial center, the CTL should aim to foster better cross departmental collaboration. More collaboration will empower more faculty and different areas on campus (i.e. University Library, Office of Marketing Communications, etc.) to provide a more cohesive service. Georgetown, one of Marquette’s biggest rivals, hosts a new faculty orientation in addition to its services similar to the CTL. With increased collaboration different areas on Marquette’s campus can all work together to put on a form of faculty orientation as well; however, in respect for the need to “break through the noise,” the orientation does not have to be presented in a formal and boring manner as most orientations are. While many new faculty coming to the university may be challenging, the CTL has a unique opportunity to show the new incoming faculty ways to benefit from their services.

“If you think, what we have, 600 and some full-time faculty in the University, so you think 30%, that’s 200 faculty are going to be leaving, it’s a third of the faculty, younger faculty will come in to replace them. I think that puts a -- will put a real burden on every part of the University in terms of integrating these new younger faculty, the Center for Teaching and Learning especially.”

- Associate Professor in the College of Communications
With that in mind, a committee could be comprised to put together an orientation event, but charged with marketing the orientation in a more modern and relatable manner. The design of this orientation event should outline student’s needs for classrooms, interactivity and engagement and show how the CTL can help faculty in that. The CTL could host a celebration for all faculty to kick off the year and get to know the newer faces in addition to highlighting the following areas:

1. Academic advising
2. Effective technology use
3. Managing various classroom sizes
4. Emerging technologies

To the last point, emerging technologies refers to a common theme that was mentioned and that is that professors see a vital role in the CTL providing information not just how to use technology such as D2L or PowerPoint, but rather keep up to date on new and emerging technologies.

“I think every technology that I know of, I sooner or later use. So what I would like is more on what I don’t know yet.”

- Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

Providing information about emerging technology in the beginning of the year helps faculty make quicker realizations that they can seek the CTL’s services for help in the future with new technology. This embodies the idea of shifting perceptions from remedial to innovative as well. The idea of hosting a new faculty-welcoming event not only establishes a good base of information for the newer faculty, but also begins to establish early colleague mentorship. Not many of the interviewed faculty enjoyed the idea of a formal mentorship program to help acclimate new faculty; however, strong colleague relationships are an informal way of mentorship. Despite this, systems approach states that all individuals, in this case faculty, are interdependent. This approach also makes it clear that communication is multidirectional, not necessarily top-down like a normal mentorship would occur (Ashcraft, n.d.).

“I have other faculty I will consult with things, but not a formal peer mentor relationship. Nor do I want to be a mentor; I have enough other things going on, and I would be more a mentor than otherwise, but there are a couple of us who talk about how things are going in the classes.”

- Associate Professor in the College of Communications

There is vital importance, such as there is in classrooms, to engage faculty in the CTL’s services as they are entering the Marquette community and help establish strong colleague relationship. In addition to consulting that the CTL already offers, the idea of mentorship is vital. When new teachers reach the campus, they should learn of the CTL right away. Those who have been at the university for an extended period of time have a particular view of the CTL, but if you start to build the proper image with the influx of new professors coming in, this can provide a great opportunity. This event can enable a mentorship program without necessarily calling it a “mentorship program”. By hosting such an event the CTL can gain insight into the communication patterns within the different faculty. This will allow the CTL to more accurately plan further events to ensure attendance and participation by being able to identify the communication channels and types used most often by faculty. In addition, the CTL can observe the flow of bottom-up communication by focusing on how receptive older faculty are to newer faculty. This, according to Network Theory and Analysis, will highlight any behavioral changes brought on by the relationships fostered by the CTL (University of Twente, n.d.).
**Recommendation 3:**

One very apparent theme that surfaced in our research included the lack of motivation and incentives that faculty have to utilize the CTL.

> “Incentives get peoples attention...There are always other kinds of incentives but it depends on the constituency you are talking about.”
> - Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

Acknowledging the significant financial commitment that could occur with monetary incentives, we recommend a few of the following non-monetary incentives: one very large area that the Center for Teaching and Learning can provide faculty with much benefit is in the realm of supporting research in addition to classroom teaching. In doing so, the CTL would be exemplifying one of Marquette University’s Strategic Planning priorities, Research in Action, which states, “the distinguishing focus of our university [Marquette University] needs to be both better articulated and better prioritized through our planning process,” (Pilarz, 2012).

Supporting academic research can provide great incentive for faculty to want to use the CTL as well as promote further awareness. Additionally, there is much research done on campus that can complement the CTL’s mission and services. An institutional setting has much information on emerging technologies and improvements to make in higher education that should be utilized by the CTL.

> “I think the Center for Teaching and Learning can help, especially this incoming group of younger faculty, develop an efficient way to teach well, which frees up time then for research.”
> - Associate Professor in the College of Communications

This provides a mutually beneficial relationship between the CTL and the research that faculty are strongly encouraged to do. The CTL could post various research and findings on the CTL’s webpage in addition to asking faculty to come in and speak on behalf of their research. This fosters new and innovative thinking and will help put specific work in one central location; especially for those who spoke about a lot of self-motivated research to obtain materials for classes as well as professional development. Faculty could use this as a means to network and connect as professionals.

> “The extent to which [the CTL director] can cycle through and get faculty from different colleges, that might improve the communication aspect because then you get instructors who have buy in and if he can, again it goes back to resources. If he can effectively and modestly bribe instructors to give a small presentation, the CTL is more likely to get that colleague’s colleagues interested.”
> - Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

In respect to the relationship that improving efficiency and effectiveness in teaching, these two concepts are pivotal for faculty who are on the track towards tenure. The CTL can promote its services by setting a framework for faculty to realize how the services can help influence progress for those on a tenure track. By doing so, the CTL is conforming to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory which has at its peak self actualization and esteem needs. Allowing faculty to present their research or to use the CTL as a road to tenure gives the faculty confidence in their own work and respect for themselves and their coworkers.
“...thinking about to the extent in which can these other pedagogical best practice training can be a part of the promotion and tenure process. If he [Director of CTL] can get that, then we can go back to the basic point I made that efficiency governs decision making, and then suddenly efficiency and the CTL align, at the current moment they do not align.”

- Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

Additionally, there are creative ways to improve incentives such as small gestures in which there is recognition in small accomplishments such as the e-certificate. In the competitive analysis Marquette’s offering of the e-certificate was a differentiating factor from one of Marquette’s biggest competitors, Saint Louis University. With that in mind, one suggestion we had was to put a larger emphasis on the degree of recognition an e-certificate brings.

“But other kinds of incentives in terms of, ya know, I don’t think the CTL’s idea of an E-Certificate is bad incentive but it’s not a big one, but particularly if it is a follow-up after the certificate, a kind of letter from Sean or get the Vice Provost, which would be a lot better, to send a letter to that faculty member’s Chair or Dean that would be a kind of non-resource incentive.”

- Tenured Professor from College of Arts and Sciences

For an overview of the challenges, goals, and recommendations; we have provided a visual [please refer to Chart 3].

**Conclusion**

In examining the Center for Teaching and Learning from a critical lens, we were able to take a step back and provide recommendations that would help the overall success of the CTL as the outside analyst. Based on our research, we found that CTL weaknesses stem from the following:

- Lack of effective technology integration
- Not all adjunct, tenure and teaching assistants receive or respond to communication from the CTL.
- Need for programs tailored toward specific college needs
- The stigma of the CTL as remedial as opposed to innovative
- Lack of faculty incentive to utilize the CTL.

And with the implementation of the recommendations developed in this report, we hope that the CTL will accomplish the goals of increasing faculty use of the CTL and ultimately create an optimal learning experience for Marquette students.

Remembering that “we are all apprentices in a craft where no one ever becomes a master,” the CTL’s work is continually relevant to enrich the learning of adjunct, tenure track, and tenure faculty to provide enhanced teaching for students.
Chart 3 – Challenges and Recommendations

**Challenge 1:** Lack of effective technology integration

**Recommendation 1:** "How do I.." page on CTL website

**Challenge 2:** Not all adjunct, tenure and teaching assistants receive or respond to communication from the CTL

**Recommendation 1:** Break through the Noise

**Challenge 3:** Need for programs to be tailored toward specific college needs

**Recommendation 1:** Expand to more innovative techniques to reach different professors

**Challenge 4:** Change the stigma of the CTL from remedial to innovative

**Recommendation 1:** More emphasis on providing training to different colleges and their specific needs

**Recommendation 2:** Foster better cross departmental collaboration

**Recommendation 3:** Provide faculty with incentives to use the CTL
VI. APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: FACULTY INTERVIEW GUIDE

Opening:
[Provide brief overview of the project]. Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with me and answer a few questions. Please feel free to ask for clarification for any of the following questions. Also, if you would like me to repeat any question, or skip one, just let me know. I just want to assure you that my team and I will do everything we can to ensure that this conversation is kept in confidence. When we report out findings, we will not give any names or other identifying information (e.g., departmental affiliation). Let’s get started!

Part One: Overview
a. What is your role/title at MU? In what college/department do you teach?
   b. How long have you taught at Marquette?
   c. What are some examples of classes you typically teach?
      -- Any experience with Online/ Lecture/ Hybrid
   d. Where else have you taught besides MU?

Part Two: Teaching Style
a. What teaching setting do you most prefer? Why?
   -- Big class, small class, active class, etc.
   b. Describe what a typical class of yours looks like.
   c. Do you prefer lecturing or an interactive class? Why?
      -- What are the pros and cons of each?
   d. What type of instructional technologies are you most comfortable using? Why?
      -- Which type(s) do you use most frequently?
   e. What kinds of technology would you like to use, but don’t know how?
   f. What do you consider to be some “best practices” with regard to instructional technologies?
   g. What type of training/help have you had in developing your teaching?
      -- In general
      -- Related to technology

Part Three: Training/Professional Development
a. What is our definition of professional development? What role does it play in your professional life?
   b. What would be your ideal version of professional development?
   c. To help you develop/progress as a faculty member, what resources do you need?
   d. What previous professional development have you had? What resources do you use?
      -- Did you feel it was helpful or beneficial?
      -- Was it required?
      -- How could it have been improved?

Part Four: CTL Overview
a. In a few sentences, describe the Center for Teaching and Learning.
   -- What is your understanding of their mission/aims/goals?
   -- What role do they play on campus?
b. To your knowledge, what services do they provide?
c. How have your colleagues used the CTL?
   -- What have been their experiences?
d. Based on your experiences at other universities, how does MU’s CTL compare?
   -- What does the CTL do better? Worse?

[Transition: we’ve talked about the CTL in general; now let’s get into how the CTL is perceived and some issues related to communication about CTL-related initiatives]

Part Five: Image and Communication
   a. How do you view the CTL? How helpful are their services?
   b. How is the CTL viewed by your department/college?
   c. How does the CTL communicate with you?
      -- How do you get CTL-related information?
   d. What do you think would be the best way for CTL to get their information out there?
   e. Is the CTL and their offerings accessible/visible?

Part Six: Personal Use of the CTL
   a. Describe your personal use of the CTL?
      -- Do you use the CTL for specific classes?
   b. How many CTL workshops have you attended?
      -- Which ones?
         -- Service learning, teaching workshops, one-on-one classroom
   Consulting
   c. What did you get out of this experience?
   d. What were some key insights/learnings you received from the experience?
   e. What were some of the shortcomings of your experience?
   f. What’s an example of a time when you used something learned in a workshop for a class?
   g. How has your classroom teaching been affected by the CTL?
   h. What is your personal understanding of Manresa for Faculty?
   i. How does CTL promote Manresa for Faculty?
   j. Do you currently have a peer mentor?
      -- If yes, in what ways do you find it helpful/not helpful?
      -- If no, why not?

Part Seven: Recommendations
   a. What other services do you think CTL should offer?
   b. What other comments/suggestions do you have?

Closing:
Well, that’s about all the questions I have planned. Do you feel that there are any topics that we did not cover? What else do you think we should know to report back to the CTL? Thank you so much for your time. We truly appreciate you being here.
APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

Opening: Thank you all for being here today! We really appreciate your time. I want to cover a couple of ground rules before we get started. First, please silence your phones and keep them put away so we can focus on our discussion here. Second, if you have any questions, need some clarification, or would like to take a break, just let me know. Third, my team members and I will do everything we can to keep your identity confidential. So, we will not use any names when we transcribe the focus group data, and will use no names in our final reports. We encourage you to keep what is said here in confidence. Finally, it’s important that you realize that my role here today is a moderator of this discussion; I am not an interviewer. The most important distinction here I’d like you to remember is that this focus group is most successful when you talk among yourselves and not just back-and-forth we me. Any questions before we get started?

[Provide overview of project/purpose of focus group]

1. What types of hardware technology (i.e., laptops, desktops, tablets, mobile phones, etc) do you currently use in conjunction with your MU education?

2. What types of software do you typically use in conjunction with your MU education?

3. Do you feel faculty use D2L adequately and why or why not?

4. What are some examples of how faculty are using D2L?

5. Do you feel faculty are successful in their use of technology in the classroom and why or why not?

6. What are the most common D2L features utilized by faculty?

7. What are some other technologies that faculty typically use in their classrooms?

8. Can you describe how the current use of technologies in classrooms compares with your experience in high school?

9. What are your impressions of e-textbooks?

10. What are your feelings regarding the use of technology and academic honesty?

11. Based on your experiences, how could faculty improve their teaching through technology?

12. Based on your experiences, how do you think using mobile devices, such as smartphones and tablets (ex. iPad) could impact learning in the classroom?
APPENDIX C: FACULTY SURVEY

A Survey of Communication about and Faculty Perceptions of the Center for Teaching and Learning at Marquette University

Dr. Jeremy Fyke – Department of Communication Studies
Dr. Shaun Longstreet – Director, Center for Teaching and Learning

You have been invited to participate in a survey about the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at Marquette University. The goal of the survey is to better understand the amount and sources of information regarding CTL offerings, faculty perceptions of the CTL, and faculty participation in CTL offerings. The better participation that we receive the better our responses to the information can be.

Before you agree to participate, it is important that you read and understand the following information about the survey. We hope that you will agree to participate, but your participation is completely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand before deciding whether or not to participate.

By clicking on the “Start Survey” button below, you are agreeing to the following basic considerations:

PURPOSE: The purpose of this survey is to explore the various communication issues related to faculty perceptions of and participation in activities offered through the Marquette University Center for Teaching and Learning.

SURVEY DETAILS: The survey will ask you to respond to a series of questions and statements regarding various issues related to communication and the CTL. The survey will be conducted online and should last about 15 minutes.

BENEFITS: First and foremost, the information collected from this survey will be used to build on the strengths of the CTL and identify any changes that might be made to enhance its offerings. This survey will benefit you by identifying the CTL’s strengths and weakness and helping to make it more beneficial to faculty. If interested, a copy of the overall findings of this survey will be made available to you at the completion of the project. All participants who complete the survey will be entered in a drawing for one of two $25 MarquetteCASH cards.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Be assured that your response to the survey will be anonymous; no identifying information is collected in the survey and we will not know who has responded. All participants are randomly assigned a number through Marquette’s Opinion survey tool and no names are collected.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF PARTICIPATION: Your participation is completely voluntary. Your employment within the university will in no way be affected by your decision to participate or not to participate.

CONTACT INFORMATION: If you have any questions about this survey you can contact Dr. Jeremy Fyke at 414-288-4061 (jeremy.fyke@marquette.edu) or Dr. Shaun Longstreet at 414-288-0263 (shaun.longstreet@marquette.edu).

Click Below to Start Survey
I. Amount of Information Received about Various Activities

For each item below, mark the number that best indicates (a) the amount of information you receive now, and (b) the amount of information you would like to receive about the following activities, regardless of source.

1= Very Little 2=Little 3=Some 4=Great 5=Very Great

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Received About</th>
<th>Amount I Receive Now</th>
<th>Amount I’d Like to Receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; student learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating inclusive classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty work/life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing teaching portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatian Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching with technology (e.g. clickers, smart phones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2L use/training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fellowships and teaching grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning and community-based learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mentoring for faculty programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Sources of Information

Below are listed a number of sources of information. For each item below, mark the number that best indicates (a) the amount of information you receive now, and (b) the amount of information you would like to receive about the following activities from the various sources listed below.

1= Very Little 2=Little 3=Some 4=Great 5=Very Great

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Amount I Receive Now</th>
<th>Amount I’d Like to Receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty in my department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Department head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in other colleges at Marquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues at other universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From CTL programming/workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From CTL staff (Faulty Programing, eLearning, Service Learning, Manresa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From CTL website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty handbook from College/department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators and staff in Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other current information sources not listed (write in)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information sources you would like to have, but are not currently available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Website-Specific Questions

I have visited the CTL website over the past year: Y/N

I find information of use to me on the website

1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree

What kind of information would you seek out from the website? _____________

III. Image/Perception of CTL

Indicate the number that best represents the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the scale below:

1=Strongly Agree 2= Agree 3=Neutral 4= Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree

I understand the mission/purpose of CTL

CTL offers enough workshops to suit my needs

The quality of the programs offered by the CTL is high

The programming is relevant to someone in my career stage

The programming is relevant to someone at all levels in their career stage

The programming is relevant to someone in my discipline

The staff at CTL are competent, knowledgeable

For whom is CTL programming most relevant? ________________

What else could CTL offer that would interest you? _________________

IV. Motivations/Intentions

Indicate the number that best represents you using the scale below:

1=Highly Likely 2= Likely 3=Neutral 4= Unlikely 5=Highly Unlikely

I am likely to recommend attending CTL will attend a CTL workshop/event/seminar to a colleague

I will seek out additional information about CTL offerings

I will attend a CTL workshop/event/seminar this semester

I would attend a CTL workshop/event/seminar if they were offered at a different time

I would attend a workshop/event/seminar if it was part of a certificate program for my promotion and tenure file

I would participate in a CTL program event/seminar if I felt it would be better recognized in Faculty Activity Reports

I would attend CTL workshop/event/seminar if I knew more about them

I would attend CTL workshop/event/seminar if topics were different

Please provide an example of a different offering: ___________
Below is a list a different reasons you might attend a CTL workshop. Please rate each of them according to how they factored/would factor into your decision to attend a workshop using this scale:
1=Very High    2= High  3=Neutral  4= Low  5=Very Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching ideas for better learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying something new in my classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network/connect with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged by department/college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help prepare me towards tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Attendance

Please indicate each of the following CTL events you’ve attended over the past year, and with what frequency *(drop-down boxes provided with 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, more than 5)*

- Teaching and Learning Faculty Seminar/Workshop
- Service Learning Seminars, Roundtable
- D2L Workshop
- Online Teaching, Teaching with Technology Seminar/Workshop
- Manresa event (e.g., “One Thing Led to Another”)
- Creating Inclusive Classrooms Seminar
- Other programs? (e.g. Celebration of Teaching, Faculty Socials, Learning Communities, Summer Institute)
- Individual Consultation

Below is a list of activities that are offered at Marquette’s Center for Teaching and Learning. Using the scale provided below, please indicate (a) your level of interest in each and (b) the level of interest to people you know, to the best of your knowledge.
1=Very High    2= High  3=Neutral  4= Low  5=Very Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level of Interest to Me</th>
<th>Level of Interest to Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices in Teaching seminars/workshops</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating Service Learning in my curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to use D2L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching online workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manresa event (e.g., “One Thing Led to Another”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatian pedagogy, Catholic higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentoring, peer mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please mark yes or no to the following if you’ve attended a CTL workshop. If you have never attended a CTL workshop, please skip to the next section:

- I am likely to return for another workshop (Y/N)
- I told a friend/colleague about the offerings (Y/N)
- I learned something I could apply to my teaching (Y/N)
- I met a new colleague (Y/N)

VI. Open-ended

What are some ideas for improving CTL offerings? _________

What actions can CTL take to increase faculty participation in their various activities? ________

VII. Demographics

- Role (include part-time/adjunct and clinical)
- Rank
- College and Department
- Years at MU
- Gender
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