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Abstract

Many professors come to the college environment with a strong understanding of their discipline but lack teaching skills. To address the issue of faculty development, many colleges use Boyer’s Scholarship of Engagement to guide the development of faculty in teaching and learning centers, but little is known about how community colleges develop faculty through the growing use of centralized services. The purpose of this study was to examine how a Teaching and Learning Center at a community college located in the northeast of the United States develops faculty. The qualitative case study included inductive analysis of 11 semi-structured in-depth interviews, observations, field notes, and documents. Observations were conducted on a wide range of offerings of the Center for Teaching and Learning. Participants were purposefully sampled, ring a different college departments, levels and gender. Study results indicated that the CTL develops faculty by aligning with the mission of the college, building relationships by maintaining a visible presence on campus, scanning the environment to meet faculty needs, leveling departmental and hierarchical boundaries to promote idea sharing and helping faculty integrate innovations into the classroom. From these findings, three salient conclusions were drawn. First, the director’s role and behavior in the CTL is integral for overcoming political resistance in fostering faculty development. Second, the CTL promotes sharing best teaching practices across disciplines and levels of hierarchy. Last, the changing nature of technology is a major driving force in faculty development.
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CHAPTER ONE: PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction

Consider the different teaching styles of two 21st Century History professors. One professor has a knack for bringing the subject to life. When he teaches about World War II, he describes life in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp and what the Jews had to endure. To illustrate his points, he pulls up his sleeve and displays the tattoo on his arm that he received in the concentration camp. Students are quietly engaged as they hear him tell the compelling story. Another professor and expert in World War II history begins to read from a book about the Holocaust. He rarely looks up from the book except to write an important date on the board. Students looked bored, scroll through their phones, and occasionally write notes in their notebooks. Consider these two examples. Both groups of students are given the same information, but the first group benefits more from the professor’s interest, teaching style, and direct experience. Expertise in a subject area does not always equate to teaching skill that fosters student learning.

Many professors are hired with a background in their particular discipline but lack a foundation in pedagogical practices (Kalivoda, Broder & Jackson, 2003). Not every professor is a natural teacher (Boyer, 1990). Some professors are experts in their content area but are not necessarily effective teachers (Reder, 2007). Based on the preceding statements, one can see that not all professors have the qualities necessary to inspire students, and they may not all possess a talent for teaching the material. The passion and knowledge in a teacher who is an expert in content and pedagogy can captivate many students’ minds by allowing them to personally connect to the content. Faculty development is one way in which higher education institutions can help faculty develop and grow their abilities to connect with students in authentic ways, and
to share best practices of teaching and research within their campus communities. Colleges have responded to this new focus on developing skills in the classroom with Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) (Sorcinelli, 2002). The next section will provide historical background on Centers for Teaching and Learning. Throughout this study the Center for Teaching and Learning is often referred to as “CTL” or “Center.” If more than one center is referred to it will be noted as “CsTL”.

**Centers for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education**

Centers for Teaching and Learning did not begin as a centralized location for faculty development. The origin of faculty development can be traced to 1810 with the first sabbatical leave at Harvard University. This sabbatical allowed a faculty member’s time to research their areas of expertise. In the 1950s and 1960s a student rights movement demanded that students have a voice in their education and evaluation of faculty members (Gillespie & Robertson, 2010). This put further focuses on faculty members’ teaching abilities in which the movement led to the re-evaluation of faculty members teaching (Gillespie & Robertson, 2010), and emphasized the question of where faculty acquire teaching skills.

Centers for Teaching and Learning were developed in the United States to address and promote faculty development, and strengthen faculty’s teaching abilities (Lieberman, 2005). They are also designed primarily as venues in which faculty development occurs (Eckel, Green & Hill, 2001). Centers for Teaching and Learning are locations where faculty can build knowledge and skills that will be necessary in the future (Dunwoody, Westcott, Drews & Hosler, 2012). The concept of centers for teaching and learning was developed in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Carnegie Foundation, 2014), and has spread through the US since its inception.
Most “Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) partner with instructors, academic units, and external collaborators on pedagogy, technology, and assessment to advance excellence in teaching and learning in face-to-face, online, and hybrid settings” (University of Texas [UT], 2014, par.1). Additionally, these centers were to respond to higher education’s pedagogical needs in the United States (Lieberman, 2005). They came into existence as a place for faculty to obtain the skills to become better and stronger teachers at the college level (Lieberman, 2005). A strong teacher has many skills to provide the content to the student. For example, if a student is a visual learning, the professor is able to provide graphs to explain the information to the student. As society and accreditation agencies imposed new regulations in higher education, CTL became a vehicle to answer concerns about faculty’s credentials in teaching as part of an institution’s accreditation. Higher education institutions’ accreditations impacts how and to what extent faculty are developed in a given region of the U.S.

Universities and colleges across the country define centers of teaching and learning differently. Many of CTLs provide professional faculty development in pedagogical theory, and practices to utilize technology in the classroom. Other centers focus on changes in colleges and universities’ missions. The centers are currently adding to their missions to include retention, new dimensions of teaching, and advancement in learning. The art of teaching and learning is now in the forefront as centers work with faculty to improve students’ ability to absorb information (Pratt, 2002). Each center employs different approaches to achieve its goals.

**Continuous Needs for Faculty Development**

Higher education institutions are equipping faculty with the tools to deliver education through their development of faculty. The pressure of accreditation as well as changes in society that have challenged faculty skills causes many changes in the college system. The need for
faculty development is continuous as the context of higher education and student needs change. Centers for Teaching and Learning are providing the training necessary to respond to college system’s pressures and changes. Training can include implementing best practices to develop faculty. Examples of best practices include faculty being developed in a variety areas: giving clear and well organized interactive lectures, helping students prepare for exams by offering special study sessions, and collecting student feedback on a regular basis in order to determine how to improve curriculum to support student learning (Butt & Reutzel, 2005). National, state, and local stakeholders are demanding the implementation of best practices and such demand impacts how faculty members are developed. To accomplish the continuous needs for faculty development, many Centers are drawing on the scholarship of teaching and learning (Andurker, Fjortoft, Sincak & Todd, 2010) as the framework for best practices in faculty development.

**Scholarship in a Community College**

Today, colleges across the country are not only focusing on faculty members as experts in content areas, but colleges are also concerned with other forms of scholarship. Their concern is in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). SoTL has many definitions, and is still evolving as a concept in higher education. This study will define the SoTL to include not only faculty development, but also research in the classroom, peer review, peer mentoring, reflection of practices, and cross-disciplinary relationships (Boyer, 1990; Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Glass-Starr, 2011).

Boyer (1990) asserted that scholarship extends far beyond the traditional subject area research to other areas. Scholarship is the formal study of a subject or research area. Boyer (1990) expanded scholarship to four areas that include discovery (knowledge), application (service to the community), integration (research between disciplines), and teaching (Boyer,
Writing from a community college perspective Vaughan (1986) added that scholarship must build upon previous work of other researchers, and that it must contribute to the knowledge of community. The community college is connected to the surrounding towns and serves as a place for people to come and acquire new knowledge. In the past, scholarship focused only on researchers and their own individual research. Now it has expanded to faculty delivering their knowledge of their content area to others in the profession and to their students. Professors can thus bring new findings to the community, discover new teaching methods, and learn from other educators in the college environment.

It has been implicit in the community college culture that faculty are not required to conduct research as an obligation for employment. Many community college professors have struggled to understand how to define themselves as scholars if they do not conduct research (Vaughan & Palmer, 1991). Faculty members in community colleges have failed to understand that there are many alternatives to research scholarship. One new alternative form of scholarship is evidence-based teaching practice in the classroom. Another addition to scholarship is experimenting with the best style to deliver content. Faculty may ask: “As a professor, am I providing the best way to deliver the content to my students?” This might result in faculty conducting an action research study within or for a community college (Vaughan & Palmer, 1991). Professors in the classroom would examine an action they are using in the classroom. For example a professor can change the seating in the classroom to have the students in a circle. After the class, the teacher examines the new action to decide if the change should be incorporated into the environment. Examining teaching practices is becoming an increasing focus for college accreditation.
**Accreditation Impact**

States have imposed changes on colleges. One of those changes imposed is a new accreditation requirement that emphasize faculty development. During the already intensive accreditation process, colleges are now being asked to provide ongoing development for faculty and staff to sustain effective teaching practices and must document the development (Barr, 1995; Padro, 2010). The Department of Education Spelling Report (2006) states, “Faculty must be at the forefront of defining educational objectives for students, and developing meaningful, evidence-based measures of their progress toward those goals” (p. 33). This report offers recommendations for changing the way colleges and their CTLs address the development of faculty. When society and the government change the direction and requirements of teaching, the college must respond to those changes. With new accreditation requirements institutions must train the professors to meet new standards.

Community colleges are required to be accredited by the state, and thus are involved in the accreditation process every ten years if not sooner. As an example, the State of Iowa’s community colleges are required to have (a) preprofessional education, (b) career and technical training, (c) in-service training, and (d) a plan for developing faculty in order for its community college to stay accredited. The Center for Teaching and Learning for this study is accredited by the Middle States Accreditation, which includes an institutional, and student learning assessment. A CTL within a community college is one place in which faculty members can be developed and learn new teaching skills as well as any other skills including the opportunity to offer the potentiality for student-centered education. The student-centered approach to the higher standards set by some accreditation authorities move colleges and universities to use a best
practices approach to improve their educational mission through the Center for Teaching and Learning (Barr, 1995).

**Conceptual Framework**

Many Centers for Teaching and Learning across the country use Boyer’s (1990) four functions of scholarly engagement as a road map to guide faculty development. A review of publicly available websites reveals that colleges like Vanderbilt University, Georgia Southern University, and Western Carolina University, to name a few, are utilizing Boyer’s theory of scholarly engagement. In 2007, Western Carolina University announced it would adopt Boyer’s theory of scholarly engagement to develop its faculty in reaching tenure status. This transition would not totally eliminate the traditional measurement of research and publishing of scholarly engagement in accordance with most tenure guidelines, but rather expand those measures to ensure many other faculty members could reach tenure even if they did not conduct research and publish (University of Texas [UT], 2014). As described previously, colleges have an expanding notion of scholarship that involves teaching practices as well as research, and so a broader framework for understanding faculty development is important. This study involves the development of faculty at a community college that uses Boyer’s model to inform the work of the CTL. The conceptual framework that will inform this study is Boyer’s four functions of scholarly engagement.

Boyer (1990) developed four functions of scholarly engagement: 1) scholarship of discovery; 2) scholarship of integration; 3) scholarship of application; and 4) scholarship of teaching. Higher education institutions in the United States are establishing centers for teaching and learning, and are drawing on Boyer’s theory of scholarly engagement (Carnegie Foundation, 2014). Whereas all of the functions of Boyer’s theory may not be engaged simultaneously, many
of those functions are used as frameworks for centers of teaching and learning. Many colleges are designing workshops and materials specific to one of the functions of scholarly engagement (Lieberman, 2005).

**Boyer’s Four Functions of Scholarly Engagement**

Boyer (1990) developed four functions of scholarly engagement in which colleges’ and universities’ could develop faculty: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. This study will utilize all four functions as the conceptual framework of how a center for teaching and learning develop faculty.

**Scholarship of Discovery.** Boyer (1990) defined scholarship of discovery as the research function of his model of scholarly engagement. Boyer (1990) does not diminish research but rather reconceptualizes it as an exploration of new avenues for discovery. His scholarship of discovery underscores the importance of research, and urges colleges and universities to continue to expand on it. For instance, Boyer (1990) used medical research as an example of the benefits of discovery. He noted medical researchers in universities discover cures for diseases, and new ways to advance medicine and surgical procedures, and such new discoveries lead to saving more lives.

Boyer (1990) extended the scope of research to include classroom practices in higher education. He asserted that professors must continue to expand their knowledge in their area of expertise and find new ways to provide content to students through their discoveries in the classroom. Leisey, Lanning, Polich, & Schaub (2011) found that when faculty members engage in scholarship they are able to reflect on prior teaching experiences. A professor is discovering when they alter the classroom seating to examine if students will increase engagement with other students. A professor in the psychology department finds that students in a circle configuration
engage more with other students. The department then changes the entire classroom to optimize engagement. With the new discovery they are able to make changes to all classrooms.

**Scholarship of Integration.** Boyer (1990) defines the scholarship of integration as faculty making connections across disciplines. He (1990) explains that connectedness between disciplines reveals patterns within different knowledge areas. Baglin (1973) discussed that departments are broken down into subject matter. He found that faculty in other disciplines are an important resource of information for other faculty in different departments. Collaboration between disciplines is a vital and worthy of further investigation (Baglin, 1973). Huber, Sherwyn, & Morreale’s (2002) concurred with Boyer (1990) and Baglin (1973) that scholarly engagement is important across disciplines to trade their research and skills. They (2002) asserted that the idea of sharing information between disciplines could only help faculty become better educators; they call it “big tent” of integration (p. 2). Departments are designed by disciplines but the “big tent” idea integrates the departments to work together.

Evidence of a university using Boyer’s Integration domain can be found at Georgia Southern University. Georgia Southern University utilizes Boyer’s (1990) scholarship of integration in its CTL to support faculty by providing opportunities to present cross-disciplinary research. The university’s Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Commons, is a website and includes an international conference that is held annually at the college (Georgia Southern University). The Center for Teaching and Learning utilizes the SoTL Commons as a place for faculty to stimulate discussions and collaborations on improving student learning across disciplines (GSUCTL, n.d.).

**Scholarship of Application.** Boyer (1990) defined scholarship of application as applying innovations and research findings to the college and outside community that can be
shared and evaluated by others. The scholarship of application helps answer the question "How can the research be helpful to individuals as well as the institution?" (Boyer, 1990, p. 574)

Research could provide knowledge to communities at large and not just the academic community. Shulman (1999) added that for knowledge to be considered scholarship it must include three characteristics for application. The knowledge must be public, available for review and able to be exchanged and used by other scholarly members. Faculty members have the responsibility to give their knowledge to their students and apply that knowledge in their field (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). The CTL provides a centralized location for faculty to exchange their knowledge.

Additionally, the scholarship of application addresses how new knowledge impacts stakeholders. Those stakeholders may include the college community, local community near the institution, and the nation. According to Boyer (1990), the service component is important because it demands that research findings be useful, and moves theories found in new research into actual practice. This provides another avenue to test theories in various practice venues. This might include testing the innovations in the classroom and outside community. The CTL is the place that faculty come to share their knowledge with the community.

**Scholarship of Teaching.** The last domain in Boyer (1990) four functions of scholarly engagement is the scholarship of teaching. Boyer (1990) defines the scholarship of teaching as a communal act that includes sharing information with students. He noted, “Great teaching inspires future scholars to become educators” (Boyer, 1990, p. 23). According to Boyer, the act of teaching begins with the faculty being able to teach the knowledge that they have obtained. Testing and designing classroom assessment, developing instructional materials and advancing learning theory through research are examples of scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990).
Vanderbilt University’s Center for Teaching and Learning uses the scholarship of teaching as a guide in developing faculty to be better educators. They describe their scholarship of teaching and learning as a bringing together of teaching, learning, and research which aims to bring a scholarly lens (the curiosity, the rigor, the disciplinary variety) to each classroom (Vanderbilt University, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, n.d.).

Butt and Reutzel (2005) expound on Boyer’s (1990) scholarship of teaching by defining the ten best teaching practices that focus on the learning style of the student. Some examples of those best teaching practices include helping students prepare for exams, collecting student feedback, and giving students a chance to revise assignments. For students to acquire the content that the faculty member is teaching, they must ensure that the students understand the material. Boyer (1990) in his scholarship of teaching explains that the faculty member must be sure that he/she is able to actually teach the content. The purpose of best practices is to develop faculty to promote active learning to assist in ensuring that the students are learning (Butt & Reutzel, 2005). It is important for scholars to pass on their knowledge to their students in order to continue their work. Reder (2007) found that successful CTLs must embrace diversity of teaching styles within each discipline. Improved teaching skills help foster greater knowledge acquisition by students. The scholarship of teaching supports professors as they explore new teaching skills that include more student participation.

As noted by Parilla (1986) and Vaughan (1986), faculty must not only contribute to the discipline, but to have the skills to deliver the content. No matter at a four-year college or a community college, if a faculty member is not able to connect with the students, learning will become a challenge. Colleges need to support faculty by providing faculty development services to improve content delivery to students.
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and CTLs are linked through the idea that faculty growth should be more than developing faculty researchers, but also develop them through application and communication of ideas that involve stakeholders, including students. In 2003, Arreola, Theall, and Aleqmoni redesigned Boyer's (1990) model of scholarship and added the dimension of "meta professionalism." Faculty members are more than researchers, more than instructors in the classroom. Faculty members need to continuously expand services to meet the student needs. The CTL is the place for faculty to develop new skills to help their students succeed. Boyer’s Four Functions of Scholarly Engagement fit as the conceptual framework to study how a CTL develops faculty because they are appropriate for the teaching focus of a community college.

**Problem Statement**

Given that every professor is not a natural teacher (Boyer, 1996), Centers for Teaching and Learning are important for providing a centralized place for developing faculty in teaching skills that can improve student outcomes as well as fostering other types of scholarship. Centers evolved from providing basic campus information to adding services that help faculty members move from lecturer to learning facilitator. New services include integrating technology in the classroom, new teaching pedagogies such as student-centered classrooms, fostering reflection after teaching, and developing the mentoring skills of faculty (Lefoe, 2009). As universities and colleges begin to focus on development of faculty and accreditation, CTLs are beginning to offer more services to fit a variety of faculty needs. CTLs have become quite common at major universities, and are increasingly found in community colleges (Stern, 2003); however, little is known about how community colleges use CTLs to develop their faculty. Until recently, many community colleges did not have a Center for Teaching and Learning. Murray (2001) performed
the first primary study on community college faculty development. The goal of the study was to find the types of programs in a community college faculty development center. In the study he found the community colleges include little more than random activities that lack much intent. Historically, community colleges did not create centralized locations for faculty development, but employed staff to provide some training (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Given that colleges primarily recognized faculty publications as the most critical criterion for advancement (Boyer, 1990), an expansion of how scholarship is defined makes it more applicable to the community college setting, and, specifically, to a CTL at a community college. Today’s administrations recognized that there are other forms of scholarship that can demonstrate faculty’s contribution to the advancement of knowledge, and can be incorporated into faculty’s development and evaluation. Just as importantly, these forms of scholarship may also advance student-centered education important for improving student outcomes, and thus, important for accreditation. Scholarship in teaching, service to the college community, and mentoring other faculty and students may be evident in a CTL. Many of these skills do not come naturally to faculty; therefore Centers for Teaching and Learning are primarily places to develop these skills (Boyer, 1990).

Centers for Teaching and Learning can be a venue for faculty to share research and other types of expertise. As faculty members learn from each other, they may find opportunities to explore new avenues of research, and collaborate on learning new teaching pedagogies. Given new learning technologies, faculty may also learn from other experts who work with technology every day or from faculty who possess advanced skills in this area. The CTL could be the location where skilled staff can share tips and tricks that improve teaching practice and student outcomes. A CTL at a community college, then, may reflect interdisciplinary collaboration.
amongst faculty from various disciplines, and multiple disciplines may be represented at training workshops.

Centers for Teaching and Learning may provide faculty new ways to enhance students’ learning at the community college level. As an example, teaching an introductory biology course that utilizes a lab may require faculty to learn teaching methods different from those used for teaching remedial math. To be effective, it stands to reason that a CTL must tailor services to help with diverse teaching contexts, including the unique mission of the community college.

Research is needed to address Centers for Teaching and Learning in community colleges, which have a different mission from research-intensive universities. Studying a single CTL provides an opportunity examine faculty development in the community challenge using and expanded view of scholarship that more readily applies to a community college setting. Community colleges do not rely heavily on faculty producing academic publications. Student learning is a primary focus in the community college environment. This study employed a qualitative research method to study faculty development at a community college in the northeast United States.

**Study Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to examine how a center for teaching and learning at a community college located in the northeast region of the United States develops faculty. One research question guided this study:

How does the center for teaching and learning develop faculty?

**Significance of the Research Problem**

In the past, quality teaching was taken for granted and was considered the norm for highly qualified professors in all fields (Reder, 2007). It is not a given that a faculty member is
an expert in subject matter content and can also teach the subject. If colleges are graduating students who are not obtaining the skills needed for the job they seek it will disrupt the nation’s ability to compete and society as a whole. From life-saving doctors to scientists finding cures for terminal illnesses, the journey begins with the education students receive in the college classroom.

Faculty members need support to build skills to deliver content to students. The Center for Teaching and Learning is one of many places that can provide faculty development. Findings in the study can advance knowledge that can spur a community college to change polices on faculty development. A community college can add more faculty development and provide more programs through the CTL. The study can provide a layout on how a community college develops faculty. Understanding how a CTL promotes the development of faculty is critical to understanding faculty’s advancement of new scholarship and skills.

**Positionality Statement**

As a professor, I view CTLs as places in which I can advance my skills of teaching and using those skills learned in the classroom. Colleges and universities are gradually persuading faculty to use Centers of Teaching and Learning to enhance or garner the scholarship of teaching and learning. College and universities are recognizing the value of faculty development, and thus are using the Centers of Teaching and Learning and the scholarship of teaching and learning as a tool for faculty advancement and/or promotion and scholarship.

Although most of my experiences in the classroom is examining why students are having trouble learning, this is not considered scholarship at my institution. Other professors are using their publishing abilities to solidifying their scholarship designation. This leads me to believe that all colleges and university have the same beliefs about what scholarship is, and this causes
me to have some biases that may be revealed in this study. This study will provide me opportunity to do more to advance scholarship of teaching and learning and to be recognized as a scholar. Also studying students’ learning style and sharing those findings with other faculty is component of the scholarship of teaching and learning and thus can provide me a scholar designation. In sum, this researcher believes that the Center of Teaching and Learning is the venue for promoting faculty development using the scholarship of teaching and learning.

**Definition of Terms**

**Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL):** A teaching and learning center is a place for professors to find new pedagogical practices for teaching students (Lieberman, 2005).

**Best practices:** include encouraging contact between students and faculty, developing cooperation between students, encouraging active learning, giving feedback, emphasizing time on task, communicating higher expectations, and respecting diverse talents (Chickering & Gamson, 1987).

**Effective teaching:** ability to give instruction to a variety of students with multiple ability levels while using different instructional styles and assess student outcomes (Vogt, 1984).

**Faculty development:** equipping professors with the tools to deliver information through different approaches.

**Scholarship:** the formal study of a subject or research area.

**Scholarship of teaching and learning:** typically includes faculty development, research in the classroom, peer review, peer mentoring, and reflection of practices (Boyer, 1990).

**Scholarship of discovery:** the need to continue to explore new avenues of research. It emphasizes the importance of research and that its importance should never be diminished (Boyer, 1990). Discovery can be an informal and formal process. It does not have to be for publication alone but to improve an issue in the classroom.
**Scholarship of integration**: faculty making connections across disciplines, which brings new insight into the classroom and content (Boyer, 1990).

**Scholarship of application**: scholarship that must prove its value not only according to its own merits but also for its service to the nation (Boyer, 1990).

**Scholarship of teaching**: The act of teaching begins with the faculty’s ability to teach the knowledge that they know (Boyer, 1990).

**Student-centered teaching**: placing the learner in the center of the learning process (Estes, 2004).

**Stakeholder**: people or groups that can gain or lose from the failure or success of a system or organization (Gross & Godwin, 2005).
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine how a center for teaching and learning at a community college located in the northeast region of the United States develops faculty. One research question will guide this study:

How does the center for teaching and learning develop faculty?

Introduction

This literature review will build on Boyer’s (1990) Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to examine how a Center for Teaching and Learning develops faculty. When examining the research question, many topics and subtopics must be examined to thoroughly review the literature. The words and phrases that were involved in the search included Boyer’s scholarly engagement, center of teaching and learning, best teaching practices, student-centered learning, systems theory, reflection, faculty development, and innovation in the classroom. Literature was found by searching several databases including ERIC, using the collections EBSCO, ProQuest and Gale. Limitations in the data will support the need to address the research questions. Not only was it necessary to look at literature that provided the foundation of teaching and learning and faculty development, but to identify which authors in the field are innovating. All efforts were made to ensure that the literature was reviewed.

Teaching and Learning Centers

Centers for Teaching and Learning did not begin as centralized locations for faculty development. Originally, CTLs were designed to provide faculty with pedagogical practice to improve student learning (Lieberman, 2005). CTLs encourage quality teaching and provide a place for faculty to improve their instructional/teaching abilities (Padro, 2010). Many topics
were added to the offerings of CTLs, including course design, pedagogy, classroom management and course delivery to expand their presence for faculty development (Padro, 2010). It appears universities and colleges became concerned with faculty’s teaching abilities when classroom outcomes were brought to the forefront in society and state government. In the late 19th century, state government became responsible for public colleges and universities in their states through the Morrill Act of 1860 with the establishment of land grants to certain state universities and colleges (Nettles, Cole, & Sharp, 1997). As a result state government had a stake in the outcomes of their state universities and colleges (Nettles, et al., 1997). As states contributed more and more to higher education, their voice as a stakeholder in education has become louder. In the 1980s, accreditations standards were developed which brought about new assessments for more accountability in the classroom (Nettles et al., 1997). In 1979, Millett stated, “Now state governments will be told that it is time to give renewed attention to the quality of our higher education endeavors,” (p. 3), and part of the solution to improve quality was the development of Centers for Teaching and Learning. One of the roles in the center is to adjust to changes imposed by state government and society, which includes implementing increased faculty development to support student learning.

In the 1990s there was a move for Centers for Teaching and Learning to examine and support student retention, improve student learning, and develop curricula. Retention also became important with the change of standards required of the colleges. As accreditation of colleges and university became the most critical standard requirement many colleges have developed Centers for Teaching and Learning to assist faculty with their teaching credentials (Eckel, Green & Hill, 2001). In The Spelling Report (2006), the federal government expressed the need for faculty to have support in teaching practices. Lieberman (2005) followed up on the
report and studied how Centers for Teaching and Learning were becoming laboratories for faculty to learn.

When the stakeholders in colleges recognized the importance of teacher training and the style of the delivery of content, the issue of scholarship of teaching became a subject that CTL would be required to address. “Proliferation of Centers for Teaching across university campuses is evidence that pedagogical scholarship is finally gaining recognition and promotion on some campuses. It seems that institutions are making an effort to encourage the scholarship of teaching among faculty” (Ochoa, 2011, p. 100). Since The Spelling Report (2006) the scholarship of teaching has gained attention. CTL gives the professors a location to improve teaching methods that altered colleges’ advancement of professors.

Today Centers for Teaching and Learning can be found at many colleges across the country. The University of Mississippi joins many other universities in composing their center’s purpose statement, which is to “improve student learning” (“Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning,” 2014). The university’s mission statement states that teachers also need to improve their teaching abilities. Many institutions are examining the role of the professor within the classroom and the impact that role has on a student. For example: When students are in the class of a teacher with exemplary teaching skills, they will attain the information more easily. When a professor does not connect to the students, they become disconnected and frustrated.

Currently, many Centers are adding an online component to expand its reach to more faculty members (Vanderbilt University, Teaching and Learning Center, n.d.). CTLs are following the lead of the overall colleges move to online classes, and training faculty in the CTL on how to deliver online classes. Today it would be unusual to find an academic community that has not made the transition to online learning (Bickley, 2014). Centers are using online deliver
by uploading workshops, articles, and presentations in which faculty can access 24 hours a day. The materials uploaded may address an individual faculty need. If a faculty member is unable to participate in a workshop onsite at the Center they can gain access online at their convenience.

Community colleges also have answered the call to incorporate a Center for Teaching and Learning onto their campus. Scholarly activity is common among faculty at a community college. Pellino, Blackburn, and Boberg (1984) have found that 95 percent of community college professors spend at least one hour per week on an activity related to a scholarly nature. These professors perform research not for publication alone, but also to improve teaching and learning in the college. It becomes important to express the need for further definitions of scholarship and research on the community college level (Parilla, 1986). If faculties at a community college are actively engaging in the teaching and learning as a scholarship, it becomes a natural progression for these colleges to have vibrant Centers for Teaching and Learning.

When connecting teaching and learning centers with the faculty, it becomes apparent that each department has its own needs and values. The department of social sciences may have different needs when it comes to teaching styles than the business department. Baglin (1973) was one of the first researchers to be credited with the research on the issue of different needs between different disciplines. The centers are there for support and to promote faculty development.

**Faculty Development**

Faculty development has a long history since its inception in 1827. Francis Wayland, president of Brown University, emphasized the ability of faculty to be able to communicate the knowledge they need to students (Park, 1979). When colleges started specializing faculty into a
In the 1980s the importance of making students to more active learning came to the forefront. Kolb (1984) developed an experimental learning theory that focuses on the "active learner." This meant that no longer were students simply sitting in class and taking in information, but were sharing in the learning process. The students are learning by interacting with the materials in the classroom. Students become partners in the classroom. Faculty will need to develop skills to ensure that students become more involved in the classroom.

The 1990s brought a shift to a faculty development focus on student learning. Then in the 21st century, Sorcinelli (2006) marked the beginning of the "Networker". He (2006) noted faculty development is to "preserve, clarify, and enhance the purposes of faculty…and to network with faculty and institutional leaders to respond to instructional problems, and propose constructive solutions as we meet the challenges of the new century” (p. 28).

Faculty is one of the vehicles from which students obtain information. With that said, faculty must be able to pass their knowledge to students. It is important that students are able to take the information provided by the professors and build the skills needed for their chosen profession. Professors must be able to teach the information in a way that learning can occur (Kim, 2008).

Revell and Wainwright (2009) examined 10 interviewees and lectures in five focus groups to investigate teaching skills. The study found that moving to small teaching groups may improve teaching skills, and that moving farther from conventional lecture hall teaching can deepen the approach to learning. The conclusion of the study was that professors who have
passion and enthusiasm for teaching along with alternative teaching styles could have a positive impact on the students.

One way a faculty can improve or learn about new skills is to be paired with an experienced faculty. In many CTLs, a mentoring component can be found. Bryant-Shanklin and Brumage (2011) defines mentoring as two individuals working together to improve and develop abilities in a career or job. Mentoring was not held in high regard by researchers until the 1980s, but institutions that focused on teaching viewed this as a promising mode of faculty development (Thomas, 2007).

Mentoring takes on many different forms, one of which is to provide a relationship that can teach a person about the culture of the professional environment. Mentors of newly minted faculty can assist understanding of rules and regulations and characteristics of the students (Kram, 1985). The role of the mentor might involve the knowledge of the best ways to perform job requirements and responsibilities (Thomas, 2011).

Shim and Roth (2009) found that professors in a college setting usually leave the mentoring process with experienced professors up to a chance meeting. Many mentoring situations are not organized formally. Faculty schedules are usually not structured so it is not unusual for colleges to rely on informal mentoring programs (Weber et al., 2007). Conversely, it is important for faculty to have opportunities to interact with senior faculty to learn different skills (Germain, 2005).

A study by Crester (2012) described a dual sector university's peer partnership approach for faculty development over three years. The aim was to provide opportunities for cross-disciplinary relationships to improve teaching quality. Results found that even though professors
were from different disciplines, the mentoring program could enhance supportive professional relationships.

It was found that professors could benefit with a program that has controlled, scheduled interaction so that novice professors can be mentored (Germain, 2005). This can be an important initiative for the development of great professors. Fostering collaboration can promote innovation and improvement in the teaching profession. Padro (2007) shared that higher education institutions need to cultivate new pedagogies to evolve with the changing knowledge economy.

“Proliferation of Centers for Teaching across university campuses is evidence that pedagogical scholarship is finally gaining recognition and promotion on some campuses. It seems that institutions are making an effort to encourage the scholarship of teaching among faculty” (Ochoa, 2011, p. 112). It was the original role of the centers to become a focal location for professors to obtain support and improve their craft of teaching. Centers support professors with the best ways to deliver content, opportunity to try an alternative teaching approach, and become better vehicles in providing learning (Tiberius, 2002; Lieberman, 2005). Hoessler, Britnell, and Stockley (2010) found that Teaching and Learning Centers support effective teaching and educational practices.

Eckel, Green, and Hill (2001) recommended providing continued growth for professors and supporting teaching excellence in the university setting. "Educational developers can contribute to the faculty development across their multiple roles involving creation and coordination of training programs, consultation for instructors, engagement in educational development units, and leadership instructional policies” (p. 87).
Reder (2007) studied how a particular Center for Teaching and Learning operates within the university. It is important not only to support professors in the beginning of their careers but throughout. The research community has turned to studying the CTL to investigate support and development. Centers across the country started examining services that they provided and investigating the success of their programs (Reder, 2007). It was found that centers needed to understand that each department and professor will have different teaching style and no one style is correct. Each discipline will have its own way of delivering the content needed to further the students’ education (Reder, 2007).

As stated above, professors are coming to the centers to improve the delivery of content to the students. What are the best practices for teaching? Each department determines best teaching practices, which also incorporate college standards. Faculty development in CTL might incorporate the SoTL. SoTL provides a blueprint for centers adding more faculty development programs.

**Scholarship in a Community College**

Cross and Steadman (1996) defined the scholarship of teaching as reflecting, observing and sharing data with other colleagues on the art of observing students in the act of learning. However, the research needs to clarify the definitions of the scholarship of teaching and learning. There is no single solid definition of the SoTL in the literature. However, according to Huber and Hutchins (2005), the SoTL includes faculty examinations that provide improvement to their skills and then presenting the findings to peers and community.

Baglin (1973), a seminal author of the scholarship of teaching and learning, found that the environment within a university could be divided by subject manner (education, business, social science, etc). His research examined the characteristics of each academic area within the
college environment. Based on the research three dimensions were discovered: (a) the degree of which a paradigm exists, (b) concerns with the degree of application, and (c) life system concerns. His research informs the view that different teaching styles may be used in each academic area.

Baglin (1973) also mentioned systems theory by discussing the college environment and how professors interact with the overall structure of their departments. Each department is designed in a different way to suit the needs of its professors. In addition, Baglin (1973b) examined social connectedness and the differences between departments. The study found that the differences between the departments are so vast that a researcher cannot make generalizations about an entire teaching body at a college. “The results of this study show that university-wide standards for the evaluation of faculty members will not be possible” (Baglin, 1973b, p. 12). This study states that it is impossible to generalize the needs of every department within the teaching scholarship and training. Many researchers utilize Baglin’s (1973b) research as a tool to understanding that all departments are not the same.

Smart (1975) added to Baglin’s (1973) research in regard to the differences between departments in his quantitative research study. Smart examined Baglin’s (1973) three-dimensional model examining 48 academic departments at 32 universities. The study found that it is plausible to use the three dimensions with research involving interactions among people in a university environment.

The topic of scholarly development continues with the research of Boyer (1990, 1996) and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Boyer talks about the four functions of scholarly engagement: discovery, integration, application and teaching. Boyer expands Baglin’s (1973) research by examining the scholarship of teaching. The main component in his research is that
teaching evaluation (teaching ability) should be held in the same high regard as the act of research. For professors to be eligible for promotion, they should be evaluated not just on research they performed, but also on their teaching abilities. Boyer (1996) argued that teaching should be at the core of importance in the university environment.

Many researchers have examined and reexamined Boyer’s claim and even added some new variables about the scholarship of teaching (Cross & Steadman, 1996; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Kreber, 2001; Wentzell, Richlin, & Cox, 2007; Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011). These researchers believed that to practice the scholarship of teaching and learning, the professor must provide the content of the class to society and make the research accessible so that other professors can build on the findings.

Kreber (2001) studied the scholarship of teaching using a Delphi study; a questionnaire sent to a panel of experts. The research found many positive effects of participating in the scholarship of teaching. Some of the findings include the higher rate of sharing ideas, and deeper insight when implementing new teaching practices. Also, when professors participated in the scholarship of teaching, they explored new ways to teach content. The professors became more aware of how students learn and the impact teaching has on student learning. The scholarship of teaching broadened the professors’ thoughts about researching the teaching process. Kreber (2001) found that professors believe that research needs to go beyond the classroom and into the community.

In 2003, Arreola, Theall, and Aleqmoni redesigned Boyer's (1990) model of scholarship and added the dimension of "meta professionalism." To understand the faculty members’ teaching, administration must take into consideration the complexity of the job. Professors are teachers in the classroom, mentors to students outside the classroom, researchers, and life
coaches. When all the tasks of the professors are evaluated and understood, Centers for Teaching and Learning will be able to better service the faculty members through faculty development.

Hutchings (2004, 2011) made a contribution to the literature with several different co-authors. In 2004, Hutchings studied effective teaching, scholarly teaching, and the scholarship of teaching. He discovered that effective teaching builds higher rates of learning. Scholarly teaching happens when the professor incorporates the assessment of learning in the classroom (Hutchings, 2004, 2011).

In 2006, Kreber added that novice professors need not only engagement with students, but also interaction with experienced professors. Wentzell, Richlin, and Cox (2007) noted that when developing teaching skills, it is important to observe a professor who has been teaching for several years. Some professors come to the professions with little to no teaching skills and can use the assistance of experienced professors (Reder, 2007).

Later, Hutchings collaborated with Huber and Ciccone (2011) to research the outcome of the scholarship of teaching and how it affects academic life. "A number of respondents reported that engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning had led faculty members to embrace different classroom approaches” (p. 5). The research also shows that teachers can develop new ideas and inspire each other. They found that the scholarship of teaching can promote more collaboration between professors and can bring about institutional changes.

Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) expressed the belief that the scholarship of teaching and learning can impact how teachers teach and assess learning, and it can change the rewards of the profession (moving up the hierarchy). Hutchings et al (2011) discovered that there are four areas that scholarship can impact practice and policy within an institution:
The conclusion to the study was that the scholarship of teaching and learning could alter the way institutions deliver professional development, how professors teach, and faculty assessment tools and rewards.

Secret, Leisey, Lanning, Polich and Schaub (2011) examined how the scholarship of teaching and learning differs between tenured and non-tenured professors. According to the research non-tenured professors are judged more on teaching skills than tenured professors. Tenured professors are not held to the same standards for teaching but are required to perform research in the field of expertise. Non-tenured professors are not required to research in the field but are required to have some teaching experience.

To become great teaching professors in the future, doctoral level students must be trained. Students need to be taught the art of teaching and to research the act of teaching. Austin and McDaniels (2006) identified the needs that must be met for in order for students to carry on the tradition of the current professors. "Ensuring support for doctoral students can be difficult. Barriers can include lack of knowledge of teaching skills from faculty, and the ability to guide in various departments” (p. 63).

The scholarship of teaching also can impact student retention. Teachers experienced in the art of teaching and researching can encourage students to stay in the college where they started freshman year. Mundy, Kuncynski, Ellis, and Salgado (2012) discovered that new
learning theories, which include innovative teaching, have a positive affect on retention. Faculty development can help professors find new approaches, improve teaching skills, retain students and in turn promote best teaching practices.

Many institutions are utilizing the SoTL as a framework for scholarship for its faculty members. Vanderbilt University is using SoTL as a guide for faculty development within the walls of its CTL. The university defines SoTL as “specialists studying student learning.” (Vanderbilt University website). Likewise, George Southern University uses Boyer’s (1990) scholarship of integration in its CTL to support faculty in providing the opportunity for faculty to present cross discipline research at the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Commons, which is their international conference held annually. They expanded their scholarship of integration to include building a portal for the SoTL. This portal is used to stimulate discussion and collaborations in improving student learning (Georgia Southern University, The Center for Teaching and Learning, n.d.). Georgia Southern University noted that the CTL supports faculty by providing workshops to promote professional development. The Center is a place that develops staff to promote the SoTL to enhance learning experience for students.

President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Lee S. Shulman, which is the location Boyer did much of his research, said Western Carolina’s shift is significant in the tenure process (Jaschik, 2007). According to “Western Carolina University” website, before the change of the tenure process the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence in the academic 2003-2004 was recognized nationally for its SoTL work. The Center for Teaching and Learning established a peer-reviewed journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
Role of Technology in Faculty Development

It is becoming clear that technology is an important part of campus life. Many organizations are spending a lot of funds providing faculty with the tools to use technology (Shapiro & Cartwright, 1998). Video games, emphasizing 3D environments and teamwork outsell top movies (Thorsen, 2007). As the U.S. faces changing technology, people who develop faculty must play an active role to assist them to keep up with the change (Fletcher & Patrick, 2006). Instead of only providing content to a student in person, the faculty members will have to make an adjustment and acquire the new skill of delivering information on the computer (Beaudoin, 1990).

As the teaching environment changes, new and senior faculty members need to be prepared to use technology in the classroom and classroom management (Boyden, 2000). Faculty has limited amounts of time and resources and technology can assist with these issues. Around 17 years ago, e-learning came of age. With many colleges moving to an online format, professors are required to learn the portals to deliver the content to students (Moser, 2007). Success of the educational-technology programs requires tremendous efforts on the part of faculty members (Miller, Martineau & Clark, 2000). It is difficult for faculty to stay abreast of new technology (Zellweger, 2003). Faculty requires continued support to constantly establish new skills in technology (Moser, 2007).

Teachers that are motivated create virtual environments but are often met with institutional difficulties. Many colleges lag behind in other technologies by embedding technologies that are considered a one-way model. Such technology that faculty uses lack the depth of technology that students are using at home. Students are playing games and interacting online in 3D immersive environments (Molenda & Bichelmeyer, 2005). Within the academic
community, there is a growing consensus that imbedding learning tools into the classroom that are interactive brings positive results to students (Warschauer & Kern, 2000). Goodyear, Jones, Asensio, Hodgson, & Steeples (2005) found that students value faculty who integrate computer-mediated discussions. Many times integrating an online component into the classroom relieves some of the other traditional classroom issues such as class size or student behaviors (Chen, F. J., Warden, A. C., Tai. D., Chen., & Chao, C, 2011).

Universities are advocating for the use of technology as an important subject manner in faculty development. One such university is the George Mason University who in 1998, implemented their” Technology Across the Curriculum” initiative, which was a collection of ten technology learning goals. With this initiative the university’s faculty development workshops began to slowly moving toward incentives for technology programs to target technology-learning goals for students (Agee & Holisky, 2000). Because of the technology student learning goals, George Mason University designed the Information Technology Unit’s Instructional Resource Center to facilitate a faculty development program that would encourage faculty to use technology in databases and courses (Agee, Holisky, & Muir, 2003).

Technology can improve education by educators having access to an large volume of research material, being about to share ideas and online resources, online education allows more students to work a own pace (Saxena, 2013). With the support of technology, no matter the weather, students are able to continue their education. In 2011 many schools using the learning platforms online to kept students aware of assignments, teacher communication between parents and even hold lectures for students (Allen, 2014).

Technology in education can be utilized to encourage collaboration between students and educators. Digital media allows people to share ideas at home and in the classroom. Students
that normally are shy, have the opportunity to share with other students in an environment that is less intimidating. Students and educators can interact in 3D environments that explore places that cannot be accessed in the classroom. Interacting with students in other countries allows student to learn about cultures from first hand experiences (Lokesh, 2013).

**Best Teaching Practices**

Chickering and Gamson (1987) first spoke about best teaching practices for undergraduate education with seven principles. The principles include: (a) Encouraging contact between students and faculty (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). This means that professors need to be in constant contact with the students, either by holding seminars or running extra help sessions. (b) Developing cooperation among all students and faculty (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Students need to understand that learning is a group effort. Sometimes studying is a solitary event, but hearing and learning from other students can enrich the content that the professor gives to the class. Students can meet in groups after a lecture to work on assignments given by the professor. (c) Encouraging active learning, which will allow students to apply the knowledge gained in class to the workplace (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). The students must be able to apply what is learned in class throughout their working lives. (d) Understanding what a student needs to build upon knowledge that is already known (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Professors should be able to deliver feedback whenever it is needed. (e) Teaching students how time management and breaking up assignments into smaller segments are important to success at a university and in a workplace (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Professors should be required to set realistic expectations for students. (f) Universities and students alike will try harder when expectations are high but reasonable (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Students make an extra effort when they believe that they can do the work. (g) Students learn in different ways, and the
professor needs to respect the differences of each student and highlight the talents of each student (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Then the professor can encourage the students to try new learning styles that might be difficult in the beginning but will allow them to grow.

Shea, Pickett, and Pelz (2003) showed the importance of the environment for best practices of teaching. Positive learning environments promote students’ willingness to ask questions of the professor and work together with other students. These environments provide ways for students to connect to the outside communities to promote lifelong learning. The mission of the college is to have students take the skills from the classroom and extend the experience into everyday life.

In 2005, Butt and Reutzel modified the best teaching practices into a top ten format. They include:

1. giving clear and well organized lectures; 2. helping students prepare for exams by offering special study sessions; 3. collecting student feedback; 4. carefully explaining course goals, expectations, grading, and ground rules at the beginning of the course; 5. asking for and acting upon student suggestions for improving the course; 6. promptly reviewing homework, exams, and assignments; 7. providing examples of “superior” exam answers, “excellent” projects, and “A” papers; 8. giving students an opportunity to revise assignments before a final grade; 9. having a formal agenda including a schedule of goals and topics for each class; and 10. incorporating group discussion activities as part of each class. (Table 1, para. 8)

Yuen Fook (2012) examined the importance of relationships and best teaching practices, and concluded that faculty members should show concern and support for student. Yuen Fook (2012) identified the importance of student engagement, the need to hold students responsible for
new knowledge and ideas, learners need self-motivation, and the need for students to reflect on their own work. Connections between faculty and students continue to be of interest to the community that is examining best teaching practices.

Udall (2013) further built upon Chickering and Gamson (1987) and designed five best practices for improving teacher and student learning. Udall (2013) added that best teaching practices entails students and faculty members both gathering evidence of learning to come up with positive learning results. Another practice is promoting student engagement, which encompasses working with peers (Udall, 2013). Encouraging students to collaborate provides a vehicle for students to engage more in the classroom (Udall, 2013).

The growing importance of development for professors with a best practices approach promotes new teaching pedagogies. Many public schools and universities are migrating to student-centered education. With students and parents becoming large stakeholders in the higher education system, they are looking to become active participants in the learning process. In the CTL student-centered education becomes a part of faculty development.

**Student-Centered Education**

Until recently, student-centered education has been without a clear definition, which has resulted in many disputes as to what it means. Many researchers assert that student-centered education includes increased interaction with students and the need to encourage students in their studies. Students need motivation to tackle difficult subjects and cope with everyday hardships (Educational International, 2010).

Around the 1930s, United States Educators have used the term “student-centered” to describe this approach to education (The Glossary of Education Reform, 2014). Piaget, Dewey and Vygotsky among other theorists have made contributions to understanding student learning.
and how to increase students potential (Iowa Core, n.d.). Many researchers believe that student-centered education includes increased interaction with students and the need to encourage students in their studies. Students need motivation to tackle difficult subjects and cope with everyday hardships (Educational International, 2010). Student-centered education is often linked with classrooms that have desks that are arranged in small groups or circles. These classrooms include “self-paced” learning model plus outside learning experience. Students are encouraged to take learning to internships, independent research projects, and travel experiences (The Glossary of Education Reform, 2014).

Student-centered education is not a new concept, but it does involve reversing the idea that the professor is the center of the classroom. Student-centered pedagogy envisions the students as active participants in the learning process; it is a popular topic for workshops in a center for teaching and learning (Estes, 2004). Baxter and Gray (2001) concurred that it is more desirable to move toward a model where students become actively engaged in the learning within the classroom.

Weimer (2002) coined the term “sage on the stage,” which, conversely, referred to the act of the professor lecturing the information to the students. Many times the students do not interact with the professor, but are merely required to be able to pass a test on the material in the lecture. Hundreds of students can crowd an auditorium; the professor walks in as an actor on the stage and delivers a brilliant performance. Weimer (2002) discusses the move to the “guide on the side.” This encourages the students to move away from being empty vessels and toward becoming seekers of knowledge. Professors are in the classroom to guide the students through the material and promote discussion among students.
Many professors are concerned about changing their approach to teaching, and worry about how the students will adjust (Wright, 2011). Student-centered education requires students to become involved in the classroom and can require some adjustments. Students who are excited and active in the classroom will adjust more quickly than students who are introverted and passively sit in the classroom.

For many, researchers have found that technology can improve student outcomes. Student-centered education reforms are integrating technology in efforts to impact student outcomes (Moeller and Reitzes, 2011). Even though a large percentage of faculty are using technology in the classroom, only 26% of students are encouraged to use technology themselves (Moeller and Reitzes, 2011). When the student-centered education approached is used students and teacher have more control of their time. Technology can allow education to be administered on a flexible schedule. Faculty members can provide online resources for students to access on-demand. The online community allows students more opportunity for face-to-face contact with content and faculty. The contact can include, video chat, groups and online-communities. With the integration of technology throughout the learning environment, faculty members and CTLs have devoted more attention to the role of technology in student-centered education (Moeller and Reitzes, 2011).

Students are one of the larger groups of the stakeholders in the college, and they should be the focus of the changes the university makes to improve the learning environment (Wright, 2011). Many college teachers, according to the literature, believe that a student-centered classroom provides more effective learning environment and are making efforts towards this style of teaching (Wright, 2011). Stakeholders must have a voice in what pedagogy the college will move toward, and the CTL needs to support the staff in the transition. The many changes
currently facing higher education are raising the importance of faculty development within the larger system of the college.

**Systems Theory**

The study of systems becomes important because it helps explain why society, groups, and institutions behave as they do. Macy (1991) defined as a “system as a group of interacting components that conserve some identifiable set of relations with the sum of the components plus their relations to other entities including other systems” (p. 72).

Many Centers for Teaching and Learning reside within the college campus and the larger community (the system). The administration, departments, professors, and students all have different ideas about what is needed in the development and support of the university. The center must navigate those needs. Each group of stakeholders (administration, teachers, students) has its own pressure from other systems and the center must adapt.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy (von Bertalanffy & Rapoport, 1956) is the originator of General Systems Theory, which considered a “set of elements standing in interaction” (p. 3). He believed that it is important to examine the interactions between the overall system and the organisms that reside within the system. The theory stresses the importance of looking at the larger system and how it interacts with smaller systems that reside within it. When he examined organisms, he thought that they depended on a linear system and the interaction with the components of the systems (Brandell, 2011). Morel and Ramanujan (1999) concurred with von Bertalanffy as to the interaction of the elements, but added the concept of complex system, which posits that systems tend to be made up of larger elements that interact with one another.

Von Bertalanffy (1968) became frustrated with the cause and effect theories of his time and thought that changes might happen within an organism (colleges) because of the interaction
between its parts. He challenged the existing thinking by looking at the organism (college) as a whole. This concept was not yet covered in any theories of the time. Even though he was a biologist, his findings translate to the fields of organizational theories, psychology, sociology, and social work: According to von Bertalanffy (1968), “A system may be defined as a set of elements standing in interrelation among themselves and with environment” (p. 252).

The research of von Bertalanffy, in addition to two leading sociological studies by Weber, Durkheim, and Brandell (2011) and Durkheim (1984) established that societies have defined divisions of labor to maintain the system. When a person within a group stops performing a task, it does not mean that the need for that task is eliminated. The system still has roles that persist even though the participants in the system change. For example, society needs paramedics to transport seriously ill patients to the hospital. The person who performs the job as a paramedic might decide to change profession, but that does not mean the need for the job has changed.

Parsons (1951) designed the term “structural functionalism” as a theoretical framework. Social structures involve people as “actors” when they interact within the social system. These include adapting to change, attaining goals, coordination of components in the system, and maintaining norms and values in system (Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology Online, 2009). In the context of this dissertation, Parson’s theory can be used to examine college teaching and learning centers’ adaptation to the larger system, which includes society and communities. The college then moves to attain a goal by moving staff to carry out the task to achieve the goal. Many divisions and departments within the organization are briefed of the changes and told to comply and assist when needed. Lastly, the institution will continue the change and make sure that “actors” are maintaining the change.
Many researchers including Hall and Fagen (1956) and Ackoff (1981) have studied the environment in which a system resides. According to Hall and Fagen (1956) the environment is defined as a set of objects that can alter the attitudes of the system and also how the objects are changed by the behavior of the system. Ackoff (1994) spoke about the environment of every social system’s and the importance of the individual parts.

More recently, Gross and Godwin (2005), when looking at the college as a system, realized that students are also a part of that system. The authors also believed that it is important to focus on the student as a whole and stressed that it is critical to understand the stakeholders within the college community, which can include parents, communities, and staff. Stakeholders within the university are people who can gain or lose from the failure or success of a college. Colleges must take into consideration that the system includes the community in which it resides, the alumni, and the places where the students will be employed. Understanding the whole system is key to having a successful system; without understanding there can be a breakdown in communication that can cause failure.

Systems theory encompasses how environments interact with the components within the system (programs, businesses, and people). Centers for Teaching and Learning reside within this system, which impacts how the center tends to the needs of all the stakeholders. The culture of the overall environment provides formal structure to locate where learning with occur. Institutions need to define who is required to distill, apply and share knowledge. CTLs are the centralized locations that are recognized to provide the institution’s faculty the necessary teaching tools (Milway and Saxton, 2011). Understanding the growth and function of CTLs can help explain how they can support faculty development.
Limitations and Conclusion

A review of the literature showed vast evidence that the study of teacher development, teaching as a scholarship, best teaching practices, and student-centered education and systems theory has been covered over several years. A key point in the literature includes the need for innovation in teaching styles. Stakeholders’ needs are always changing and colleges require professors to be agile in their teaching efforts. Development of professors is an ongoing process and teaching and learning centers can be used as a focal location for this effort.

The examination into how best to educate students on a higher educational level continues in the literature. In the review, it was found that professors need support and a place to gain skills within the college to maintain consistency between professors teaching styles and the goals of the college. This study will show how a teaching and learning center develops their faculty on campus.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine how a center for teaching and learning at a community college located in the northeast region of the United States develops faculty. One research question will guide this study:

How does the center for teaching and learning develop faculty?

Interpretivism

This study used the Interpretivist approach, which includes interpretation, subjective reality, specificity and self-validation (Roth & Mehta, 2002). Interpretative qualitative research states that there are many realities for a participant (Merriam, 2009). In the interpretative research there is not one universal truth but varying views of reality. Within a single context different participants are influenced by norms in the environment that include culture, history, politics, and social constructs (Crotty, 1998). I intended to examine the reality of different participants within a Center of Teaching and Learning.

The interpretivist method is made up of three basic principles: consciousness, action, and unpredictability (Livesey, 2006). Consciousness entails the idea that humans are aware of their decisions about behavior but that behavior can also be hard to predict. Understanding faculty’s experiences of CTL will enable me to gain a better understanding of the programs the center is providing, how faculty is developed, and how faculty are using what they learn in the classroom.

The action principles examine how participants make deliberate choices about how to behave in different situations (Livesey, 2006). With this particular study, I was able to explore how a center for teaching and learning develops faculty. Observing seminars and interviewing
staff were the vehicles that were used to obtain the data. Through the qualitative research design, faculty was able to express how they are using the new teaching skills that they obtained. One example is how a faculty member understands how to use a new reflective skill after learning the skill from the CTL.

The last principle that Livesey (2006) proposed was unpredictability. It is believed that behavior can be unpredictable. During the collection of data I was not able to predict how the participants would react to a certain environment. After the data was collected then I was able to describe and explain the behavior of the participants within the CTL from an interpretivist perspective.

**Strategy of Inquiry**

To achieve the purpose of the study, I used qualitative research methodology. Qualitative research provided the freedom to explore the processes of a center for teaching and learning in great depth and to produce rich data. According to Merriam (2009) qualitative research is concerned with how people interpret and understand the world around them and what meanings they assign to those interpretations. A single case study was appropriate to address the purpose of this study because it allows an in depth look at a CTL at a community college (Merriam, 2009). How does a teacher and learning center develop faculty?

A qualitative research design is ideal for the study of education because it focuses on people and their everyday issues (Merriam, 2009). I examined the CTL for duration of one semester, and examined the everyday workings of those who developed faculty. Merriam (2009) explains, “The overall purposes of qualitative research are to achieve an understanding of how people make sense out of their lives, delineate the process of meaning-making, and describe how people interpret what they experience” (p. 14). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) added that
researchers use a qualitative approach study phenomena in their natural environment. This study examined faculty development at a CTL, which means that understanding the phenomenon required exploring the experiences and meanings that participants involved in the center derived from their interactions with the center, and potentially with each other during faculty development. A single research question was selected to explore the dynamics of a CTL at a community college, and answer questions that will help improve conditions in the setting as well as other CTLs.

This study drew upon four primary methodological theorists in case study literature: Merriam (2009), Creswell (2009), Yin (2008), and Stake (1995), and it integrates other perspectives as well. The case was a single case design, defined by Creswell (2009), as an in-depth program, an event and activity, a process for one or more individuals. Creswell (2009) stated that there are nine characteristics of a qualitative study, in which all are applicable to this case study. The characteristics include: (a) study takes place in a natural setting, (b) the researcher is the main instrument, (c) multiple sources of data are used to collect data, (d) inductive analysis techniques are used, (e) researcher focuses on finding meaning (f) emergent design is used, (g) theoretical lens being utilized, (h) interpretive inquiry is used by the researcher, and (i) a holistic account is used as the reporting mechanism (involves multiple perspectives and identifying many points of view in a situation).

Yin (2008) also defined a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, even when context and phenomenon are not clearly evident” (p. 18). A CTL is a real-life component of many campuses in higher education, and a case study would be expected to address each individual context. What makes case studies unique is that they deal with a variety of data that includes current and historical
documents, artifacts, interviews and observations (Yin, 2008). Yin’s (2008) definition of a case study includes “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 18). As a result, one relies on multiple sources of evidence with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion.

In case studies, data are collected by personal observation, interviews and documents (Stake, 2000). Stake (2000) believed that case studies are threaded with a specific purpose. They represent a “bounded system” or a single entity with natural boundaries (p. 40). The Center for Teaching and Learning on Burt Community College is a single entity, one unit. The CTL has one location and employs a limited number of people. Louis Smith, who was one of the first educational ethnographers, defined a “bounded system.” He believed that the “bounded system” was not referring to a system but an object (Bassey, 1999). Adelman, Jenkins, Kemmis (1983) added to the discussion to say that the “bounded system” needs to have common margins such as a program, site or person. Supportive of this thinking was Bromley (1986) who agreed that the case study needs boundaries, including not only concept but also empirical evidence. Miles and Huberman (1994) also believed that the case exists in a bounded environment. Lastly Merriam (1998) agreed that if the case is not bounded then it is not considered a case. In this study the single teaching and learning center is the “bounded system.” This type of qualitative research allowed an in-depth description of a center that gives more options for readers to use different aspects of the data for future studies.

Bassey (1999) believes that an educational case study includes: (a) localized boundary of space and time (singularity—a study of a particular event or location), (b) examination of an interesting educational activity, program, location and system, (c) examination in a natural
context and respect for participants, and (d) informed judgments and decisions of participants and policy makers.

A case study can be used as a judgment of a certain situation or circumstance (Merriam, 1990). She believed that one case study could become a prototype for other studies and understanding of a phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). Two characteristics of qualitative research include the researcher as the primary instrument to collect data and research is an inductive process. Since the researcher is the primary instrument in collection of data, the research is adaptive, allowing the researcher to quickly respond to the participants. On the other hand, there is a clear issue with bias as a researcher. Bias cannot be eliminated but the researcher can identify his/her bias and monitor it throughout the study (Merriam, 2009).

During data collection concepts and/or theories were built, but hypotheses were not tested. The data were collected by field observations and interviews to glean an understanding of the concepts being studied (Merriam, 2009). As the study progressed, the information about how the center developed faculty unfolded. According to Bassey (1999) data is collected to (a) bring out important features of the study, (b) create reality-based interpretations of results, (c) be able to test validity and reliability of researcher interpretations, (d) create a worthy discussion, (e) build upon prior data, (f) be able to explain the data or story to the public, and (g) provide evidence so that other researchers can challenge the findings or build on the study (p. 58). It was understood that this researcher was not seeking absolutes but understanding about the interviewee’s beliefs on the subject matter. It was expected that emergent themes would come about in the answers that were provided during the interview process. As the research continued, new themes evolved.
Sampling

According to Merriam (2009), qualitative research in a case study requires two levels of sampling which include the case itself and then the contents or participants of the case. The first level of sampling for this study is the selection of the case itself. Burt Community College Center of Teaching and Learning was chosen because of its number of services, stability of leadership, and years of existence. The center needed a full time director for at least two years for a substantial history to review. The research site selected was a public community college located in the northeast United States, which is part of a larger university system. Throughout the years the center has grown to offering many services for faculty and students. Services include individual consultations, demonstrations, workshops, and structured discussions. Other community college’s where considered but this particular case had several years of running many workshops, online resources and a director that was highly motivated to learn more about her center. Other Centers did not express the same amount of interest in examining how their center was developing faculty.

The university has approximately 6500 currently enrolled students. There are 3,499 full-time and 3,277 part-time students. Currently, 57% of the college faculty is female and 43% are male with a population of 58.6% white, 22.1% Hispanic, 11.3% African American, 2.4% Asian and <1% American Indian, Alaska Native, and National Hawaiian. Gender of staff is 41% male and 59% female. All faculty hold a master’s degree and many have a doctorate in their area of expertise. As of 2011, staff included 75.13% white, 5.11% African American, 6.49% Hispanic, Asian 2.04% and 10.9% unidentified race.

For this particular study purposeful sampling was used. I chose the site and participants because they can purposefully assist in the understanding of the research question (Creswell,
2007). The decision about who would become a participant was based on what individuals could help answer the research question. However, it was understood that being flexible is important because changes in sampling might change in the field. The study was able to hold to the sampling that was purposed. Still, planning ahead was very important (Creswell, 2007)

**Second Level of Sampling**

Case studies require a second level of sampling (Merriam, 2009), which includes the people, documents, and observations that will help explore how faculty are developed at a teaching and learning center. A purposeful sampling was used to examine the Center for Teaching and Learning. According to Merriam (2009) a purposeful sampling is “based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (p.77). I provided a sample of participants that showcased a wide range of perspectives to ensure that the reader gets an overall picture of the teaching and learning center. Because the central phenomenon involves developing faculty, people are the primary source of data, which were collected through the interviews with participants. This case study includes:

**Participants**

A variety of people who can offer perspectives on the case were selected to participate in the study. This included two administrative staff at the teaching and learning center, faculty who have used the CTL services, and instructors who teach for the center. According to Merriam (2009) these participants possess a volume of knowledge on the center and the college, including the inner workings of the center. The director assisted with the identification of potential participants. She was unaware of the final list of participants in the study. Only faculty who used the services of the center was asked to participate in the study.
The sampling included five faculty members, two staff that work in the center, and four workshop instructors who provide services to the teaching and learning center. I interviewed at least one male and one female from each group. Only full time faculty members are sampled to ensure that the faculty members have an extended relationship with the college. Many of these faculty members have tenure status. All participants were sent a recruitment letter (Appendix B). Table 1 contains a breakdown of sampling groups.

Table 1

Sampling Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Center Staff</th>
<th>Workshop Instructor</th>
<th>Faculty Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations

According to Patton (2002) observations put the readers in the setting. Observations do not include judgments but rather a description of the environment and what has occurred. Workshops are held at the college for professors each semester. Three workshops and one one-on-one training was observed to identify the information that was available to professors. All participants in the workshops and one-on-one training were aware of my role as a researcher. After each observation, this researcher walked around the college to gain a better understanding of the campus during that particular time of day. This researcher observed workshops during the morning and late afternoon hours. A separate pad to write notes was brought to every observation. The task in the start of every observation was to draw the layout of the room and label the participants within the space. Next, was to write down field notes about the participants.
and workshop instructors. Confidentially was explained to all participants before they participated in the study.

The first workshop observed was a student engagement workshop. All four participants in the workshop were woman and full-time faculty. The workshop was performed by a female instructor and was allotted an hour in length. A presentation was conducted on PowerPoint and participants asked questions throughout workshop.

The second workshop was fifty minutes in length and covered the topic of flipping the classroom. This workshop was chosen because of the diversity of faculty that normally participates. Two faculty members (female and male) were leading the workshop that included two male and two female faculty members. The departments and titles of the participants varied from a chairperson of a department to a faculty member. A PowerPoint presentation was provided and a discussion about the material followed.

The last workshop was on Googledocs with a single female instructor. This particular workshop was different from the other workshops observed, because the participants were using computers during the presentation. The session included six female faculty members all with computers in front of them. A PowerPoint presentation was provided with time during each task to test for understanding of the skill.

One one-on-one training was observed during the study. During a one-month time only one-on-one training was scheduled. Faculty members must ask for training from the director because they are not in the main schedule of the CTL. The director provided the training on the SMART classroom with a chairperson of a department. They went over the main aspects on how to use the classroom and what other main components of the classroom other faculty members struggled.
Documents

A document, according to Merriam (2009) is “a term used broadly to refer to printed and other materials relevant to a study, including public records, personal documents, popular culture and visual documents, and physical artifacts” (p. 86). These documents include: mission statement for the center and the college, published goals of the center, and handouts from workshops. During the workshops, documents provided assistance for learning. The workshop student engagement instructor handed out a list of books about the subject matter. She also provided best practices literature to support student engagement.

Field Notes and Audit Trails

Creswell (2007) examines the idea of field notes as a form of data in a qualitative research study. These notes were collected during interviews and observations. “The researcher needs to develop protocols or written forms for recording the information and needs to develop some forms for recording the data” (Creswell, 2007, p. 119). Field notes according to Merriam (2009) are the written account of observation in the study and are equivalent to the interview transcript. In the study, the field notes were taken every time the researcher was on the community college campus. During and after the interviews the researcher took notes on gestures and content of the sessions.

Audit trails describe how data were collected, and how the researcher made decisions during the study (Merriam, 2009). The audit trails were written using a highlighter to stand out in the field notes. This is an example of an audit trail: Make sure to observe a workshop with director. Look at the relationship between director and workshop instructor. During tour, the director was reaching out to many faculty members to talk about future projects. This interaction moved the questions of the data towards relationships. Another audit trail was from an
observation in a workshop: Workshop instructor passed out a faculty needs survey. Does the CTL scan the faculty to find their needs? Look into faculty needs in the data. Every time this researcher spoke to participants or walked around campus, field notes and audit trails were taken. They also included drawings of the CTL and campus. Field notes were coded and kept separate from the audit notes.

**Phone and Onsite Interviews**

Interviews are defined by Merriam (2009) as an interviewer and an interviewee who are engaged in a conversation that is structured around the topic of a research study. This researcher focused the interviews on past and present events related to the teaching and learning center. The goal of this researcher was to get first hand accounts of the workings in the center. The focus of the interviews was to ask questions relevant to the research question.

**Data Collection**

Creswell (2007) considers several approaches of data collection that include observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials. Bogdan and Biklan (2007) suggested 10 steps in data collection and analysis. This researcher used the steps to guide the data collection and analysis. Data collection is a difficult task and organizing the collection into clear steps kept this researcher on task. The ten steps include, making decisions that will narrow the study focus, deciding the style design of the study with a clear focus, developing analytic questions, follow up after data collection, making-e comments during observation to produce a critical eye, writing a journal throughout the study, testing themes during interviews, examine literature during the study, using metaphors and concepts to analyze the data and using models to visualize the data to produce clarity (Bogdan & Biklan, 2007).
Some of the data in this study were collected directly in the college setting and some were collected remotely over the phone or online. Interviews were collected online via Skype or over the phone if faculty were unable to accommodate a face-to-face interview. All interviews were approximately 60 minutes in length with follow-up questions a week later. Interviews were audio-recorded on a device and transcribed for analysis. The recordings were first translated on rev.com and then manually reviewed from the website in the auditory form. Transcripts were reviewed to ensure that the transcripts were correct. When the transcripts did not match the audio version, the researcher made corrections to ensure accuracy ahead of data analysis. Data was collected during three months.

Interviews

In qualitative research, interviewing is the most common form of data collection. In many studies the use of interviews is the only form of data presented (Merriam, 2009). According to Patton (2002) the interview’s purpose is to gain understanding of another person’s perspective. In this study, the interviews were designed to explore how a person thinks and acts within a certain environment. It is a “conversation with a purpose” (Dexter, 1970, p. 136). The construction of the interviews can vary, but for this particular study the interviews were semi-structured.

Merriam (2009) explains that a semi-structured interview includes some questions that the interviewer planned before the interview, as well as non-structured questions that emerge from the data as it develops in real time. During the interview the participant may bring up a topic that was not planned. When the interviewer thinks it is relevant, a follow-up question based on this new topic is asked. When the interview is not fully structured it allows the interviewer to explore deeper into the topic (Merriam, 2009). Applying a semi-structured format
is important for this study because each participant had a unique perspective on the questions, and open-ended questions allowed the freedom to explore their perspective.

The semi-structured style helped this researcher obtain specific data. Some of the questions were structured; this ensured the minimum necessary data from each participant. This structure guided the interview through the list of questions that were created prior to meeting the participant (Appendix D-F).

The interview guides (Appendix D-F) followed Merriam’s (2009) guide to qualitative research interviewing. Three interviewing guides were developed, each adapted to a specific participant role. The faculty guide focused on how the center is providing services. The workshop instructor interview guide included what the instructors believe the participants in the workshop take-away from the session. The center staff interview guide included questions on the operations of the center. Hand-written notes were taken during each interview in conjunction with a recorder. The notes were used to capture behaviors that could not be recorded; these include gestures and facial expressions.

This researcher followed certain interview procedures. Being respectful and courteous to participants will provide a level of comfort to keep communication open during the interview (Creswell, 2007). An important aspect of interviewing is to understand that it is important to not only ask questions but to be a good listener (Creswell, 2007).

Notes were taken during the interview to supplement the recording. Many times participants cited specific information about programs in the college, so a quick note was taken to follow-up. Faculty members talked about committees that they participated in and provided the information in the interview. A note was taken to contact the committee members when the participant allowed. After the initial interviews, follow-ups questions were asked either over the
phone or on campus. These questions ensured that the researcher understood the answers that
the participants explained.

**Observations**

The case study also relied on observational data. The purpose of observational analysis is
to take the reader into the setting that is observed (Patton, 2002). This means that observational
data must have depth and detail. The data must be sufficiently descriptive so that the reader can understand what occurred and how it occurred. This was accomplished through first hand observations. Arriving at the workshop early to observe the staff step-up equipment and prepare the room allowed a different perspective into the process. It was observed that participants came early to the workshops to talk with director and mingle with each other. Food was provided and participants ate and spoke with each other about issues in the classroom. Many times staff spoke freely about why they were at the workshop and what they hoped to learn.

I spent about five days at the center observing not only the CTL but also the overall campus activities. This was spread out over a couple of months to ensure that I observed the workshops and a one-on-one session. After observing the first workshop, I decided to make time to come an hour early to observe the preparation before a workshop. Observing the interactions between staff and students by simply walking around campus gave me a feel for the college. The CTL was observed during several different hours with many different types of participants.

The observations of a workshop on Googledocs lead to examining a one-on-one session. The participants spoke about how they use the computer in the classroom. The conversation went on for about twenty minutes with a great back and forth between everyone in the session. A participant asked for more assistance and made an appointment with the director for a one-on-one session (observation, October 12, 2013).
Data from observation were examined to determine codes. During the session Debbie was teaching with humor, which is perfect for this professor because she uses this skill in the classroom. Sarah and Debbie were laughing and learning at the same time (observation, October 20, 2013). This interaction leads to the code on teaching styles.

Documents

In addition to interviews and observations, I examined pertinent documents. Records consist of documents, artifacts and archives, which provide rich information about the organization (Patton, 2002). Every center, university, and organization amasses a multitude of documents about all aspects of the environment. Important documents included paperwork (flyers, information about the center, etc.) from the center, documents from the seminars observed, mission statement of the center, and Web pages about the center. The faculty handbook, surveys given to faculty from the CTL, the Master Plan for the overall college and CTL flyers that were informing faculty of out coming events. During and after each workshop the instructor provided handouts that included notes in the lectures and references to examine.

Data Analysis

According to Creswell (2007) analysis in qualitative research entails organizing and collecting data. The goal is to reduce the raw data to a manageable size, find significance, identify patterns, and develop a way to communicate the data to the reader (Patton, 2007). Interviews, observations and documents were examined for developing codes and categorizing and looking for patterns. The code, talking in workshops, code changed to the sharing of ideas category. Which then caused the examination of idea sharing in the CTL. During the study, categories/themes from the data emerged through an inductive process. Analysis began immediately with the first interview and continued throughout as more data were collected.
Coding

A code is often a word or short phrase in a qualitative inquiry that captures the essence of the data (Saldaña, 2009). “The data can consist of interview transcripts, participant observation field notes, journals, documents, literature, artifacts, photographs, video, websites, email correspondence, and so on (Saldaña, 2009, p. 3).” Coding helps the researcher organize, group, and reflect on the data. The process includes isolating patterns and categorizing the data. A spreadsheet was designed to organize the codes and then group them by likeness. As each interview came to completion it was coded and placed in the spreadsheet to organize the codes and help distinguish amongst them. With the initial coding it is important to write down preliminary field notes. Saldaña (2009) defined initial coding as the first impressions of the data. Many times the coding process is not perfect the first time around, so there might be a second round of coding that is called recoding (Saldaña, 2009). I employed Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw’s (1995) guidelines, a general list of principles for coding and field notes that include: What are the participants trying to accomplish, and what are they doing? What strategies are they using to accomplish the goal? How do the participants talk about and characterize the process used to achieve the goals? Are they making any assumptions during the search for goals? What can be learned from the field notes? Why were the field notes included? In the one-on-one session the director spoke to the participant about connecting to other faculty members. In the field notes I noted to examine the process of how they are connecting to other faculty and what goals the staff of the center have when connecting.

I utilized open coding in the beginning of the coding process. The goal is to produce concepts that can be utilized to further explore the data (Straus, 1987). Open coding is appropriate at the beginning because it allows the researcher to be open to any data that can be
used in answering the research questions. Assigning codes to the data assists the researcher in placing data into categories. These categories help in the process of moving from open codes to axial codes (Merriam, 2009).

Axial coding is a second cycle of coding (Saldaña, 2009); it examines the open codes to find out how the concepts and categories are related to one another. According to Saldaña (2009) axial coding “describes a category’s properties and dimensions and explores how the categories and subcategories relate to each other” (p. 151). Categories are put back together and connected through interpretation and reflection (Merriam, 2009). After the initial open coding, I reread the interviews several times and came up with clearer codes. Interaction between faculty members, different departments communicating, building a relationship with CTL, how CTL can help faculty, and CTL staying vital to faculty were some of the initial codes. I started clustering codes that were similar, CTL can help faculty and CTL staying vital to faculty and CTL building relationships and communicating. Then several of the codes altered with the examination of the data. The code for departments communicating changed to the sharing of ideas. The code CTL can help faculty was changed to scanning the environment code.

Merriam’s (2009) expresses the need to have data analysis meet many criteria. The first is the need to have categories that are responsive to the purpose of the research (p. 185). The categories must be in line with the research question. During the research process I first read through the data and pulled out the information that was not as important to the research question. An example of this is casual conversation that did not include information that is relevant to the study.

The coding should also always be exhaustive in that all data should only fit into a specific category or subcategory. Data cannot fit into several categories; if an item does then the
researcher must reexamine the codes. Comparison of the codes during the process ensured that each code only had one category that it could be placed in. Categories also need to have a clear meaning (Merriam, 2009). An outsider should be able to see the categories and understand their meaning. Last, categories need to have conceptually congruent categories. Do the categories make sense together and are they at the same level? I followed Merriam’s (2009) suggestion of creating a chart for the categories to assist in the process of building categories. Categories should be definably different, one from another, and so I developed definitions for each category as they developed into themes. During several rounds of reading the data, I ensured that codes could not fit into several themes, but the data was exclusive to one particular theme. This allows a reader to understand the construct of each answer to the research question.

**Data Storage and Destruction**

All transcripts, audio recordings, and paperwork that can be identifiable as related to the study are locked in a storage cabinet accessible only to the researcher. Every electronic item related to the research study is stored on a password-protected computer. After a year, the main components of the study (lists of participants, and audio files) will be destroyed. Consent forms (Appendix C) will be retained and protected in the locked cabinet and scanned on my password-protected computer for one year. After three years the transcripts’ hard copies will be destroyed by a shredder and computer scanned copy will be deleted.

**Validity, Trustworthiness and Verification**

This study placed strict importance on validity, trustworthiness and verification. The researcher took steps during the research process to ensure that each participant was comfortable to express their comments. Below examines how the researcher took steps to protect the participants.
Validity

Ensuring the validity of the research is always a concern of researchers. “Validity describes how well a measure actually assesses what you want it to” (Light, Singer & Willett, 1990, p. 150). Internal validity focuses how well the study matches the reality it represents. Merriam (2009) suggested maintaining a level of validity through crystallization, member checks, adequate engagement, reflexivity, and peer examination. The different types of data (interviews, observations, documents) assisted with crystallization (coming together and making connections) for the study. When the data are crystallized it confirmed that the data is aligned.

Another way to ensure validity is triangulation. Triangulation according to Yin (1993) is the union of three or more independent data types (interviews, seminars, workshops, documents) that all aim to a set of facts, events and individual interpretation. McMillan and Wergin (2002) stated that triangulation happens when data from different sources relate to the same question and are used by the researcher to verify the findings of the study. In this study the triangulation included the documents, interviews and observations. Scanning the environment was found during the interviews, documents and observations. Many participants spoke about the CTL asking what other resources that they would need in the classroom. The CTL was providing surveys to ask the faculty what workshops need to be added to the schedule. Also during a walking tour the director looked for faculty and approached them about anything they need from the CTL.

The other tool to ensure validity is member checking. This can help ensure that a researcher is in line with the interpretation of data (Merriam, 2009). Member checking was performed three times to ensure the participant’s data was correct. Each participant was given the findings of the study to look over and then comment. When edits to the findings came about,
each participant was also provided with the changes. This researcher did follow-up interviews with some participants and discussed the emergent categories/themes with the interviewees. Comments from the follow-up interviews were added to the data to confirm the findings.

Understanding the bias that the researcher brings to the research is another level of validity to the study. Laying out biases and assumptions can assist the reader examining how the conclusions were made. The advisor for the researcher reviewed findings and questioned any instances of potential bias by asking the researcher to provide evidence to support the themes.

**Trustworthiness and Verification**

According to Merriam (2009), in the late 1940s ethical guidelines for conduct of research were established. Since then the guidelines have gained enormous attention in the academic community. Gaining trustworthiness can be examined through the study’s external and internal validity. The study must provide the readers with evidence that the conclusions that make sense and are worth paying attention to (Creswell, 2008: Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The audience for this study includes, CTLs, administration at any college or university, educators, and researchers. The study brought to the attention the steps that a Center for Teaching and Learning can take to develop the faculty in their college. Trustworthiness was very important to the study because other institutions must feel confident that they can utilize the data in the study to develop their own faculty members.

**Subjectivity and Assumptions**

Many practitioners conduct research that they find in their workplace or observe in society (Merriam, 2009). As a college professor, I was interested in the process of delivering content to my students. When I asked my students about other professors, they expressed the need for professor training. Many students thought that professors were not always equipped to
teach the material. As a college professor, I can see the difficulty in meeting the needs of the students. Together with my interest in teacher training, the teaching and learning center seemed like the perfect study. Since this researcher is not part of a teaching and learning center, there were few assumptions of the data before it was collected.

Limitations

It is always important to acknowledge that all studies have limitations. Communication between individuals is always dependent on how each person interprets the meaning of the spoken word. I was always concerned that the true meaning that the participant was trying to express was presented. It is also understood that anxiety, politics, and personal issues might have impacted my responses to the interviewees. The limitation of a small number of participants, which is typical of a qualitative research, is a limitation of this study.

Protection of Human Subjects

The relationship between the researcher and the participants is also changeable and is very complex (Maxwell, 2005). It is of critical importance that the participants feel a sense of security and trust with the researcher. They understood that the study required voluntary involvement and that participants could withdraw without any negative consequences. The director of the CTL started the process of finding participants for the study. After the first few interviews many interviewees suggested other faculty members that would be appropriate to interview. Most interviews where held on campus in several locations including the library, offices and the CTL.

It was vital for this researcher to keep their identity anonymous to ensure that the study did not impact their employment status. I provided every participant with the questions before the interview to ensure that they were comfortable on the day of the interview. I confirmed that I
would not disclose the participants' names to the college unless required by law. The interviewees and I also agreed upon the interview locations. After each interview, the transcripts were kept in a locked cabinet. To further protect participants, all individuals were assigned a pseudonym and the college was also provided a pseudonym.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to examine how a center for teaching and learning at a community college located in the northeast region of the United States develops faculty. One research question guided this study:

How does the center for teaching and learning develop faculty?

This chapter begins with a case description, which provides a detailed background of the setting and a “walk through” of the college campus, particularly the teaching and learning center. The purpose of this tour is to bring the reader into the study’s environment to better understand the study. Next, the 11 participants of the study are discussed based on the interviews conducted. The last section of the study is the findings.

Case Description

Burt Community College (BCC), a pseudonym for the actual name of the college, is part of a larger state university system located in the northeast region of the United States. It serves a community of about 350,000 residents across several counties. The college encompasses two campuses and three satellite locations. BCC consists of 7,000 students in which 50% are full-time and the residual are part-time students. The college has approximately 1,000 employees consisting of faculty and staff. Approximately 90% of faculty are white, 6% African American, 6% Hispanic. Women make up 58% of faculty and with males at 42% of faculty and staff. The general age range of faculty and staff is between 45 and 64. The college consists of three academic divisions: health professions, liberal arts, and business, math, science and technology. Students can earn an Associate in Science, Associate in Arts and/or Associate in Applied Science degree. There is many certificate programs: Accounting Procedures, Clerical Office Assistant, Early Childhood Development and Care, Law Enforcement/security, and Teaching Assistant.
The Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS) accredit BCC for credit and non-credit courses.

The CTL mission statement states that the center is committed to supporting faculty to enhance the quality of the teaching and learning process through faculty development. Their skills can be developed through training courses, workshops, one-on-one training and customized training to meet specific needs of a single faculty member. Descriptions of these services can be found in the faculty handbook and/or the CTL website. Faculty development is critically important to the college’s accreditation and innovation. The college raised the importance of faculty development, and created the Center for Teaching and Learning in 2006.

**A Walk-through of Burt Community College**

Burt Community College is located in a suburban community on a small road lined with houses. The campus lies inside a circular drive with parking outside the gates of the main campus entrance. The campus is a park-like environment with buildings scattered within a circle road. As I approached the campus, I could see that parking is definitely limited as several cars were circling around the driveway to try to find a parking space. Looking at the number of cars constantly circling the campus, I concluded that the campus population is also growing, based also on the erection of a new building.

In the middle of the campus stands an ornate building that was the original residence of the person who donated the land to the college. This historical house is currently being used as an administration and meeting building. During a tour of the campus given by the director of the CTL, the director took great pride in showcasing the ornate woodwork and windows of this building. This pride appears to emanate from the unusualness of this particular building being housed on a community college campus. Because of the uniqueness of this structure with its
grand staircase that frames the beautiful artwork of the building, the structure is used for a number of special events.

After walking out of the building I glanced across a large lawn to view the structure of a new building that will house many new departments. The building appears to be the largest on campus, and possibly will be the most modern building compared to the other older structures on the campus. The Center for Teaching and Learning will be one of the departments housed in this new building.

When I faced the main lawn and look to the left I could see the library is a large brick building that is left of the old house-administration building. BCC’s library is two stories with the first story housing primarily books, information desks, and study areas. The first floor of the library also holds a smart classroom, which joins several BCC campuses together through its computer system. Through the smart classroom professors not only teach in the classroom but also virtually teach on other campuses of the BCC simultaneously. The smart classroom has several cameras and screen permitting professors to be seen by students in numerous classrooms. To make this a smart classroom, the college spent in excess of $100,000 in construction and equipment. The smart classroom is a “shared resource” throughout the entire college. The CTL conducts training sessions on the use of all equipment housed in this smart classroom for any faculty who wants to learn how to use this classroom.

The second floor of the library houses the Center of Teaching and Learning, more books, a large meeting room, and restrooms. The CTL would be difficult to find without directions in that it is located down a dark area of the library. It seems to be tucked away from the main section of the library but there are signs posted the entrance of second floor.
The Center for Teaching and Learning

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is temporarily housed on the second floor of the library until a new building on Burt Community College’s main campus is constructed. The Center also has an online presence on the college Website. The CTL falls under the budget of the academic affairs department. The physical CTL is a large room with four desks and many cubicles with a large open work area that can be set up or arranged for workshops for approximately twelve people. The workshop area is equipped with a projector and a computer that can be used for presentations. The Center for Teaching and Learning has three employees that include a full-time director, part-time Information Technology (IT) professional and a part-time administrative assistant. Professors and staff are encouraged and solicited as volunteers to assist in facilitating workshops offered by the CTL. The CTL also solicits external lecturers when internal professors and staff are not available.

The Center for Teaching and Learning was established in 2006 with the intent to develop faculty. The Vice President of Academic Affairs started the Center on a part-time basis. According to Rebecca, a participant in the study, faculty did not trust or even like the person who served in that capacity resulting in the person’s no longer being employed at the college (departure reason is unknown). Many faculty members felt that the Center’s creation was not faculty-driven resulting in a bit of resentment toward the Center.

After several years the administration hired a new director to take over the Center. As the faculty started building a relationship with the director more faculty approached the Center to meet their developmental needs. The director now sees a growing number of faculty members coming to her to participate in the Center. Faculty members are sharing their ideas as workshop instructors. One participant described the Center as an “epicenter” for faculty development.
With the college utilizing the center for more of their needs and the infusion of additional funding the Center can now operate on a full-time basis.

The Center for Teaching and Learning is constantly evolving with the growth of BCC. As the college moves towards utilizing technology in the classroom, the CTL does support the faculty by providing workshops to incorporate new technology in the classroom. Table 2 identifies some of the services that the Center offers. The Center utilizes these types of services to assist faculty in achieving their delivery of a high quality education to students. Table 2 identifies the resources of the CTL and the formats that are supplied to deliver content. The information for the table originated from the CTL website.

Table 2

*Resources of Center for Teaching and Learning: Adapted from website of the center*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop and Training</td>
<td>Sessions that are provided every semester, which can include new pedagogical approaches and technology for the classroom. Examples: PowerPoint, Flipping the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one Consultations</td>
<td>When a professor needs more support or cannot make a workshop/training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media</td>
<td>Provide content for online classes, video/audio. Example: Green Screen, videoeing in classroom, audio equipment, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Sharing</td>
<td>Time to discuss successful teaching strategies and techniques. Sharing issues. The session is very informal in a conversational style of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Spotlight Series</td>
<td>Faculty and staff host their own event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar Library</td>
<td>Web-based library that features over 100 topics in higher education that faculty can attend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the college community evolves and grows in size so does the Center for Teaching and Learning. The growth can be observed by the space the center will be acquiring in the new facility being constructed. The following section describes the participants in the study.

**Study Participants**

The main source of data for this study was collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews. The following participants’ descriptions are arranged in the order of their interviews. Table 3 presents a visual representation of key demographics obtained during the selection of participation process. Table 3 includes gender, position at BCC, and role in the Center for Teaching and Learning.
Table 3

Participants’ Key Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position at BCC</th>
<th>Role in CTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1: Melissa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Faculty Member Librarian</td>
<td>Workshop Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2: Sarah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Faculty Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3: Rebecca</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Planning and Assessment Officer</td>
<td>Workshop Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4: Rachel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Faculty Member Librarian</td>
<td>Faculty Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5: Bob</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Faculty Member Biology</td>
<td>Workshop Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6: Debbie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>CTL Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7: Mary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Faculty Member Education</td>
<td>Workshop Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8: Peter</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Multi-Media Specialist</td>
<td>Multi-Media Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9: Betty</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Faculty Member English</td>
<td>Faculty Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10: Betsy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Faculty Member Sciences</td>
<td>Faculty Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 11: Don</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Faculty Member Education</td>
<td>Faculty Participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant 1: Melissa**

Melissa is a female librarian at the BCC. The participant is currently in the third year at the college and is up for tenure. She is a workshop instructor for the CTL. In describing her typical day in the role of a librarian she noted:

Today, I’m going to be teaching a class at the CTL…I have a library research session with a group of English Formula One students. That’s actually an embedded class that
I’m doing where I do multiple sessions with the students and then they come back to me
if they need further help...I’m a librarian for students.

Participant 2: Sarah

Sarah is a female who is the chairperson of a department at BCC. She is in her early 50s,
and holds a tenured position. Sarah is a faculty participant in the CTL. In addition to performing
administrative duties in the chairperson position, she teaches several classes in the department.

Participant 3: Rebecca

Rebecca is a female who is in the department of Planning and Assessment. Rebecca has
been a faculty member in her department for several years in addition to working as a Workshop
Instructor at the CTL. In her position as faculty in the Planning and Assessment Department she
conducts the Students’ Learning Alpha Assessments, and College Life Survey. In her role as
Workshop Staff at the CTL, she explains her department’s role to faculty. In that capacity she
explains outcomes of various assessments and college life surveys. Rebecca’s primary
relationship with the CTL is as a workshop instructor who provides the information that her
department wants to share with faculty. She explains:

More often then not I have some involvement in providing presentations of facilitating
workshops regarding the student learning alpha assessments, the methodology around the
assessment as well as presentations of data in regards to the results of college life surveys
or different demographics or other information that the college collects into something.

Participant 4: Rachel

Rachel is a female and employed as a librarian at the BCC and has been with the college
for 12 years. Her status with this college is as a tenured faculty member. As a part of her job
description she supervises other librarians and also teaches other librarians new skills. Rachel’s
role with the CTL during the study is a faculty participant.

**Participant 5: Bob**

Bob is a male and currently in his fourth year at BCC and is tenured faculty. He is one of few faculty members who hold a doctorate degree. He also is involved with an external organization in which he gathers information and knowledge that he brings back to the classroom to make him a more effective professor. Bob is an advocate for the CTL’s existence. At the CTL Bob is a workshop instructor of the Flipping the Classroom Series.

**Participant 6: Debbie**

Debbie is a female and the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning. She is the newly hired director as of two years ago. She also teaches and holds a tenured faculty position. Debbie started as an adjunct professor, and gradually became involved with opportunities to keeping the CTL viable; thus, she was promoted to director of the CTL.

**Participant 7: Mary**

Mary is a female assistant professor at the college. She has been employed for over five years. Mary is full-time tenured faculty who teaches primarily upper-level courses. Additionally, she is a workshop instructor for the CTL. Inside the CTL she instructs faculty on how to use SMART Boards and the Flipping the Classroom series. SMART Boards are white boards that can be used to enhance the classroom experience by projecting what is on the computer and working directly on the board. Flipping the Classroom is a new way of running the classroom that helps the students become more “active” learners.

**Participant 8: Peter**

Peter is a male and the Media Specialist in the CTL. He serves in a part-time capacity and has been with the CTL for one year. In Peter’s role as Media Specialist, he works in all
capacities of technology including the CTL website and the use of media in the classroom. For example, if a faculty member needs his/her classroom videoed, he produces the video. He is also responsible for updating CTL’s website. He works on other special projects regarding technology in the classroom and the CTL’s website. He describes his role at the college:

I mostly do video editing and producing. Faculty would come in and want to put videos up onto the streaming server we’ve got…I also do promotional stuff for the website, but for the most part, I try to focus on the faculty-oriented videos.

Participant 9: Betty

Betty is a female and holds a faculty position and is currently in her fourth year at the college and is up for tenure. She teaches seven classes in the English department. Her relationship with the Center for Teaching and Learning is as a faculty participant.

Participant 10: Betsy

Betsy is a female and a professor in the biology department, and has been in this capacity for about one year. Betsy has been with BCC for a total of 13 years, serving in the capacity of adjunct faculty, and assistant and associate professor. She teaches primarily science courses and will be teaching in an honor course in the spring term.

Participant 11: Don

Don is a male and he is employed in the education department as a coordinator. He is a faculty participant in the CTL. Don has been in this position for four years and prior to that he was an adjunct professor in physical therapy for eight years. Don explains his unique position:

I’m a very unique faculty member on campus meaning that I am in the faculty but my job description actually falls under a librarian. I come in on a day; I typically will bring documentation back to students due out in clinic, which they’ll submit to me. Then I
follow-up with contracts meaning that each of the different clinical sites that we use there has to be a valid contract, up-to-date contract with them and we have over 90 sites.

**Themes**

Table 4, Overview of Findings, presents the findings of the study. The findings include five themes: (a) Aligning with the Mission of the College, (b) Building Relationships by Being a Visible Presence on Campus, (c) Scanning the Environment to Meet Faculty Needs, (d) Leveling Departmental and Hierarchical Boundaries to Promote Idea Sharing, and (e) Helping Faculty Integrate Innovations into the Classroom.

Table 4

*Overview of Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How does the center for teaching and learning develop faculty?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning with the Mission of the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships by Maintaining a Visible Presence on Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning the Environment to Meet Faculty Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveling Departmental and Hierarchical Boundaries to Promote Idea Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Faculty Integrate Innovations into the Classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aligning with the Mission of the College**

The first theme, *Aligning with the Mission of the College* is defined as the integration of priorities of the college into the Center. A review of the college’s website, the mission of the college is described as creating a community of learners and providing high quality education to students. In order to carry out that mission, the CTL set priorities and gave specific attention to those areas that are important and critical. Debbie, the director of the CTL, stated, “We look at the direction of the college…the strategic priorities of the college, and look at how the [Center’s] programming can reflect [that direction].”
In order to ensure quality of education within the community of learners, the college’s website identified the Center as a resource to promote, support, and explore excellence in teaching and learning in the faculty. The college noted in its master plan that the CTL would address faculty needs identified in the plan. This master plan thus became a road map for the CTL in directing faculty’s activities in their development in order for faculty to achieve the end results of a high quality education for students. In addition to the master plan, the faculty handbook describes the direction of faculty in that the college as a “community of learners” is dedicated to reaching out to all residents to enhance their lives through high quality education. A community of learners is defined as the institution cultivating the intellectual pursuits of everyone within the college environment. According to the college website every faculty member is a learner and is encouraged to seek out new knowledge. Betty explains the aligning of the Center with the mission of the college is the impetus of faculty development. Betty said: “We [full-time faculty] have a requirement in our contract to participate in professional development… this can include going to the CTL session and taking a class.” To respond to the college mission of highest level of education, faculty must demonstrate continuous development throughout their tenure.

According to the end of the year report for 2012-2013, produced by the Academics Affairs Department, 70% of full-time faculty attended one or more CTL events. The report noted that faculty members frequently come to the Center to enhance their skills and/or learn new ones. However, the report does not give the exact meaning of “frequently.” This annual report did validate that many departments use the CTL as a resource to develop their faculty. Peter, a faculty member, concurred that the CTL is the location where faculty come to enhance their teaching skills. He noted that the CTL’s mission is to provide professional development to
faculty. Betsy states the importance of faculty members continuing their faculty development.

She noted:

Our emphasis really is teaching and we should be holding ourselves to the highest standards possible to be the best possible educators we can be and that means that we have to look at what is out there…to stay [competitive] with other colleges [in providing a high quality of education to students].

Debbie also concurs and articulates that the CTL’s responsibility is to provide services to faculty, and it should be accountable in aligning with the mission of the college. Those services include workshops, one-on-one trainings, and outside speakers on various subjects to enhance faculty skills. Debbie noted that through administration surveys to faculty, she attempts to fill the knowledge gap by providing programs for faculty. As part of Debbie’s responsibilities, she is constantly looking for ways in which the CTL can continuously align with the mission of the college- community of learners. She also notes that she prioritizes services to ensure faculty members are offered appropriate programs to meet their needs. For example adding more training to Googledocs because of demand from faculty members.

As stated on the college website, the mission of the college is to ensure that students have high quality education. High quality of education for students includes helping the faculty acquire skills to deliver subject content at the highest level. Bob, a faculty participant noted: “There are so many interesting things helping your teaching at the CTL, your pedagogy. I really wanted to make sure I was doing things correctly.”

Debbie shared the point that the CTL develops a strategic plan in which they actively attract faculty to the Center by offering programs and training to enhance faculty’s delivery of education. According to Debbie, the agenda is executed by providing services to assist faculty in
delivering a high quality education. Thus, she explains that the CTL is the place that faculty can come to utilize their services.

Faculty members are encouraged by the staff at the Center for Teaching and Learning to learn new skills that will impact the quality of education for students in the classroom. Below are two examples of how the CTL addresses the college’s educational goals of high quality education.

![Diagram]

*Figure 1.* Addressing new skills and new teaching styles.

Figure 1 illustrates how new skills are introduced in the classroom. Example #1 demonstrates the types of workshop and training services offered by the CTL. In this example, faculty learned how to introduce new skills in the classroom by using technology. Several participants reflected that the Center designs workshops that can assist faculty members in reaching their high quality education delivery goals. In this particular workshop, faculty learn to integrate a new application that can be used in the classroom. Thus, the CTL labeled it “Appy Hour.” In this Appy Hour session, the CTL is able to demonstrate how faculty members integrate the iPad
as a teaching tool in the classroom. This aligns with the mission of the college of providing a high quality education by offering a space for faculty to learn a new skill that can be integrated in the classroom. As another new skill, faculty members also shared how to use Facebook to continue a classroom conversation in the classroom. In that session faculty contributed to the group how to design a group that is private only to students in the classroom.

In Example #2 of Figure 1, the CTL designed two workshops: Student Engagement and Flipping the Classroom, to introduce faculty to a new teaching style. The student engagement workshop delivers tools to faculty to assist them in engaging students in the classroom. The second example of #2 is flipping the classroom. In the flipping the classroom workshop faculty learn how to present materials through activities in the classroom. To engage students in the classroom, faculty demonstrated to their students how to present materials online; then faculty give students an exercise to be carried out which in turn engages them in showing the skills that they have learned from the faculty demonstration. Participants in the study shared that student engagement, such as the flipping the classroom enhanced their teaching skills, which is evidence by the students’ engagement. Additionally, participants in this study noted that the CTL seeks to provide new ways to deliver the content, which is one of the many teaching strategies that the CTL offers.

In aligning with the mission of the college, the CTL offers training services that enable faculty members to obtain tenure status. Tenure is designed to give a label to accomplished faculty members. Melissa shared her excitement to be able to finally achieve the status. To obtain tenure a faculty member must meet certain requirements. Tenure is a faculty member receiving a long-term promotion for demonstrating their high quality of education delivery and ability to teach at that level over a period of time.
In reviewing the faculty handbook, I found that there are four criteria in which faculty can attain tenure status:

1. Teaching and learning
2. Service to the students
3. Service to college and community
4. Professional growth.

In examining the criteria, faculty members must demonstrate mastery in high quality teaching and learning in delivering education to students to ensure their tenure. To do so, faculty members look to the CTL to offer programs that enhance their professional growth with skills necessary to meet the tenure requirements. The Center offers numerous and various sessions on teaching and learning for faculty in order that they may meet those tenure requirements. For example, Melissa, a workshop instructor is up for a tenure position. She would visit the Center to attain new skills to enhance her chances to obtain a tenure position. Administration keeps records and reviews faculty members’ development as criteria for promotion to tenure.

The CTL is a vehicle faculty members use to fulfill those development requirements. Often those sessions are custom designed for faculty to access subject matter expertise in order for them to progress to tenure. For example, one of the requisites for tenure is for faculty to demonstrate online course development as professional growth in a teaching and learning skill. As such, Debbie noted that faculty come to the Center to receive knowledge and training on developing online courses, and thus, receive credit towards tenure if they do successfully develop online course offerings. Development of an online course offering demonstrates their professional growth and new expertise. Faculty who complete the designated training are given a professional development certificate from the CTL which then goes into their portfolio for
Debbie noted that the CTL often tailors some workshops towards faculty specific needs relative to the tenure criteria.

Additionally, another alignment with the mission of the college to provide high quality education is training faculty to ensure students are engaged in their learning. Engaging students in the classroom promotes high quality education. When students become an active participant they will ask questions and interact with the faculty member. Sarah noted:

At the community college, it’s a unique opportunity to really be able to teach and focus on that, kind of developing relationships with the students as opposed to maybe when I taught someplace else where that wasn’t maybe the primary focus.

During one of my visits to the CTL, faculty members were being trained on students’ engagement in the classroom. Melissa, who is a workshop instructor for the CTL, facilitates a session on students’ engagement. All participants had eyes on the workshop instructor with notebooks and pen ready for use. Melissa asked the participants to draw what they saw as student engagement. Then they discussed the drawings and why they believed engagement was depicted in the various drawings. During the workshop the group read literature on student engagement to learn how they can improve the classroom experience. Melissa shared the idea that assessing how their classroom has improved, by setting up benchmarks throughout the semester, is important to ensuring that the students are getting a high quality education. She went on to mention that student engagement is a tool to assess whether students are attaining the content provided by the faculty member.

The CTL has also partnered with Institutional Planning and Research Office (IPRO) to provide assessment-based workshops for faculty. Both the CTL and the IPRO are under the Academic Affairs Department. Rebecca serves as an assessor in the IPRO, and is a workshop
instructor at the CTL. In her workshop instructor’s role, she provides assessment outcomes using a college life survey and other information collected by the college. Rebecca presents the data from the surveys to the faculty to better serve the students. She also performs workshops on different assessment options in the classroom. Rebecca stated, “We are accountable for having our faculty have knowledge and skills…[and to] increase literacy [of students].” She concurs with Melissa on the importance of using assessment as a tool to assess faculty members’ teaching skills. Additionally, Debbie, the director, noted the importance of continuing to build relationships with administration and faculty to develop faculty.

**Building Relationships by Maintaining a Visible Presence on Campus**

This second theme, *Building Relationships by Maintaining a Visible Presence on Campus* is defined as constructing partnerships between with the Center for Teaching and Learning and stakeholders in the college community through interaction during campus events, meetings, and informal conversations. Stakeholders in the college community include BCC faculty, staff, and administration. Activities that build relationships not only market CTL services but they allow the CTL to connect with faculty members in order for them to overcome their resistance to the CTL. The Center staff reaches out to the college community to come to the center as a development tool. When the Center is visible to a larger part of the community, more faculty members are given the knowledge that some of their development answers can be solved in the CTL. The Vice President of Academic Affairs established the CTL six years ago. It was noted by Rebecca that faculty did not trust the CTL, and thus they refused to engage in any activities offered by the CTL. This resistance presented barriers that stifled the CTL growth. In Rebecca’s explanation she noted that there was such resistance and opposition to having the Center for
Teaching and Learning because the thought was, “Who are you or they or the center to tell me how to teach?”

Betsy raised another issue, “There really wasn’t any internal support.” She shared that the CTL was developed without the input of the faculty, thus causing the faculty to ignore its existence, which ultimately impacted the faculty’s dismal rate of attendance. However, this evolved once the college hired a new director for the Center. Rebecca acknowledged that the CTL worked to advance its visible presence on BCC campus. Rebecca stated: “With time passing and a new person at the helm of the center for teaching and learning there is more acceptance of it [CTL] and over more time the experience that something can be learned at the Center.”

Sarah was the first in my interviews to discuss the impact that the director, Debbie, had on the Center. She stated that Debbie encouraged faculty to participate in the Center’s activities. Sarah and many other faculty members spoke about the director’s impact in building the CTL presence on campus. Sarah further shared:

Debbie is so receptive…She never shut me down…That’s what I think is fabulous….If she does not know something, she searches and is very helpful. That’s what I really find useful…I want to see her…What she does as one individual is amazing.

The Center’s director developed programs that faculty saw as valuable to their development. Value was determined by the survey results taken by faculty after each workshop. The survey gives the CTL feedback on the needs of faculty and what can be improved in the workshops. By building such programs participation of faculty in the CTL increased.

Additional actions to building relationships on campus include the director of the CTL attending administration meetings and connecting with faculty on campus. Debbie, the director,
noted that connecting with faculty, her public relations role, is an integral part of building the CTL presence on campus. She stated:

Part of this job is to be sort of a public relations person for what we’re doing through the CTL, so I try to communicate that to as many people as possible. I think just through more contact with folks and more communication of the events, they are sort of sharing it more. We are drawing more interest, we are getting more veteran faculty, which we are happy about because that tells us a lot about the role of the CTL and how we are growing.

The director shared that she builds relationships with faculty and encourages them to engage and participate in what the CTL has to offer through various workshops, and/or through one-on-one sessions if that is preferred. In building these relationships many of the participants in this study expressed that the director is a key reason why they seek out the CTL for development. Nine participants acknowledged how she encourages new ideas for them to use in their classroom. Sarah noted that Debbie ensures that the Center has something to “offer” faculty to assist in their development. She also shared that the director never says no to any questions and is always helpful in any situation. Rebecca concurs with Sarah, and she acknowledged:

The director is doing a good job at outreaching [and] dialoging with faculty and chairs,…whether it's through focus conversations, attending department meetings, handing out surveys or looking at information.

In my observation, the director is actively building relationships with administration and faculty to enhance the status of the Center on campus. Debbie demonstrated this relationship building by greeting participants as they walked in the CTL and introducing participants to each other. The director was observed during the workshops prompting faculty to address each
other’s needs. After each workshop, Debbie would solicit faculty to see if additional training is needed. In building relationships on campus, the director noted her role is critical to the Center:

My role is several things. As the Director of the CTL, it’s my job to gather the information about what faculty and staff would like to see through this room, through this department, so it’s putting the training together. It’s deciding what curriculum or pedagogical curriculum we need to be focusing on. It is, like I mentioned before, it’s a public relations piece, communicating with people, finding out what they need.

During observations the director elected to become an active participant in the workshops. Not only does she set up workshops and services for faculty, she actually participates in the workshops. Debbie models the behavior that she would like to establish in the center. Debbie was an active participant in a student engagement workshop and asked many questions of the workshop instructor. I am not sure if she was seeking answers to gain knowledge or was demonstrating how she engages participants in the Center.

Rebecca offered that Debbie is an integral part of what makes the CTL visible to the faculty and overall college. However, with the continued push to growing relationships for the CTL on the campus, Debbie is often called away from some activities in the Center in order to fulfill her public relations role for the CTL. As the Director, she has multiple tasks that include instructor, director and public relations advocate. Betsy noted that Debbie is continually being called in for administrative support, which really diminishes what she can do as far as supporting the faculty. Because of her multiple tasks many faculty are frustrated with the administration. Betsy noted this takes away time to work with faculty and add new workshops to the Center. Debbie expressed that she is constantly juggling the need to grow the Center while also proving to the academic affairs department that the Center is vital for faculty development. The Director
is often torn between what is most important and needed to grow the CTL. In response she noted:

One of my goals is to infuse the CTL in every possible capacity….We were sort of embedding ourselves into a lot of different areas. The difficult part of that is there are only a couple of us (staff in the Center) here….It is only our media-specialist, a part-time person, and then myself just a few hours a week that do some administrative pieces.

The participants shared that they are disappointed that they are not getting her attention at the Center with one-on-one training. This interaction provides feedback to improve communication with other faculty members. The awareness and details of the complaint sparked the director to evaluate the needs of the Center and the faculty members. There is a clear struggle between promoting the CTL and providing direct services. On the other hand, Debbie must leave the Center to advise administration that the Center has merit and is worth funding.

To ensure funding to the CTL, it must be apart of the college’s funding structure and faculty curriculum. Debbie is reaching out to other committees to convey the importance of the Center. Once information is shared about the center and confidence increases she can secure more money to provide more workshops and services for the faculty. Bob shared that as Debbie builds relationships on campus, more faculty members will come to the Center, which allows it to acquire more funding to grow further. The director cited that word of mouth is important. When a faculty member says that the workshop is helpful and tells the rest of the department it causes more faculty to come to the center to obtain the same skill.

Regarding the visibility of the Center, Mary notes, “As the Center becomes more visible, faculty become more aware of what is being offered, what other faculty members are doing and what resources are available.” Bob concurs that the Center needs to promote awareness on
campus. He asserts that the Center needs to do more outreach to faculty to tell the college community about the great programs that they have. Bob noted:

Nobody’s going to utilize the Center if they don’t know it exists or don’t know what they had to offer, so one of the ways that I saw the services was at the big assembly meeting that the college has once a month.

To better understand, I asked Bob to explain the “big assembly” in a follow up question. The presentation at the assembly is called “CTL Minute.” The presentations provide faculty and staff a sneak peak of new offerings at the CTL. This is also published in the monthly newsletter that goes to all faculty members in the college community. This gives the Center a forum in front of the entire college for its public relations campaign. Peter further described the assembly meetings, “The director goes up [in front of the college] and she speaks about what the CTL is doing and all the events. We usually try to show a clip of something or whatever we have available at the time.”

Debbie’s director role in public relations is impacting the visibility of the Center in a positive way. The attendance at the CTL is improving. Debbie noted:

The second year I’ve noticed I have more people coming to me now saying, “I’d really like to present this through the CTL,” so that’s been a wonderful thing. Probably just in the last two months, I’ve had four or five people come forward and say, “I’d like to present on this topic.”

In building relationships on campus, the virtual campus became a focus. The goal for 2012-2013 was to enhance the CTL’s web presence with more resources for faculty and video tutorials. The Center incorporated a redesign of the web page, and provided new resources including Microsoft multimedia presentations. Peter, the media specialist, stated: We’re
constantly are working on our webpage. I think being able to put up examples or maybe a clip of the day or some sort of way to cycle things through so faculty could see the results of things we’re capable of creating without having to necessarily come in to the Center.

**Scanning the Environment to Meet Faculty Needs**

The third theme, *Scanning the Environment to Meet Faculty Needs*, is defined as examining the college’s internal and external milieu to match the available resources with faculty development needs. The director and CTL’s staff are constantly exploring the college environment internally and externally to inquire about the needs of faculty. The Center scans the internal environment by providing surveys after each workshop, emails, committee meetings, campus required assemblies, and faculty-to-faculty word of mouth on campus.

The CTL also creates a faculty and staff survey to document the current needs within the college community. The Faculty Professional Development Survey is administered through the Academic Affairs Office. According to Debbie, the CTL staff uses these data to determine the services to be delivered to faculty to meet their needs. She asserts that the CTL also reaches out to faculty through open forums. The Director stated, “We’re trying to get feedback as much as possible and see what kinds of trainings people need and want.” Those needs could be in curriculum and/or technologies for the faculty’s developments. Peter explained that after acquiring the data, the Center’s staff decides what faculty will need those new skills. During an interview with Rebecca she discussed the General Education courses that students are required to take to graduate. Part of the curriculum is technology literacy. Technology literacy is defined as a student’s acquiring certain technology skills. When professors are asked to teach these courses they must master the technology literacy to teach the course. The CTL is there to provide the education needed to these faculty members to successfully teach these particular courses.
To scan the environment, the director interacts with faculty members. Throughout a walking interview, many staff and faculty members of BCC approached the director and they openly communicated with her regarding their concerns. When the director spends time walking around campus she is able to come into contact with faculty members that normally do not walk into the Center. It was established that the CTL builds relationships with faculty, but she uses any opportunity to get feedback on faculty needs. As we were walking on the tour, the director was scanning the environment to see if there was a faculty member with whom she could interact. During a walking interview with the director, two staff members approached to ask a question about services in the CTL. The director responded with a smile, and said, “No problem!” and offered her contact information and a time they could contact her.

During the walking tour I learned that faculty have very little time to spend outside the classroom; they need to be assured that the Center will be integral to their growth and not a waste of their time with nonessential information. Participants in the study shared that time is limited and the CTL must provide quality services in a timely manner. Conducting an internal and external scan of the environment provides the CTL staff an opportunity to assess if the faculty will find the new skill of value. Mary asserts that the CTL does a good job in reaching out to faculty, and noted:

I do think that the Teaching and Learning Center is doing a good job, especially in the last couple of semesters, reaching out to the faculty and asking what is your need or desire? What would you like to see be presented? What would you like to support in, what areas?

Debbie explained that the CTL examines the internal faculty pool with the subject matter expertise to present in the CTL. The CTL asks the faculty to volunteer time to lead the
workshops at the Center, because faculty within the Center is limited. If faculty members are not identified within the college faculty the Center looks externally. The Academic Affairs Annual Report identified outside professional development opportunities that the Center for Teaching and Learning could address. For example, the CTL offered a weeklong graduate course then administered a survey to gauge the learning experience. The positive results of the survey prompted the Center to design more training courses in the future.

While scanning the college environment many faculty members identified time as an issue to participating in faculty development. The issues with time came up in several of the interviews. Bob cited that with the large workloads, he has little time to learn new skills. He states, “It [CTL] should be the epicenter for [learning new skills], [for] those kind of discussions to happen.” The Center is fully aware of the problem and wanted to resolve this issue with time getting in the way of development. Although the CTL cannot alter faculty’s time in the classroom they could help to provide other time availability for development in the CTL. Melissa stated, “I think part of the strategy might be to keep offering things [workshops] multiple times at different time slots.” Faculty members are offered repeat workshops every week to ensure that they have a chance to participate in any workshop. Appendix G provides an example of the typical schedule of offerings the CTL posts.

Sarah concurs with Mary and Bob and reiterated that, “time is limited and the Center’s location in the community college environment helps support the staff. Since the Center is in the college, faculty members are being provided services that they might not seek out on their own.” With the input of faculty the CTL’s director decided that modifying their schedule of workshops would be one way to solve the time problem. For example, the Angel Workshop is held several times a month and in a series of sessions to answer all of the faculty questions. If a faculty
member is unable to participate in any of the workshops the director will schedule a one-on-one session to accommodate any faculty member.

According to Debbie, the BCC has limited funds to provide faculty continuing education. By scanning the environment Debbie could not only target financial issues relating to development, but how to help meet faculty needs in the CTL. Since the college provides departments limited funding for faculty development the CTL is the place for faculty to get training. With the CTL being a centralized location in very close proximity to all faculty members, it becomes a convenient place to learn new skills. Sarah explains:

I think that the Center for Teaching and Learning is vital. I think it is a great way for us to be able to stay in–house, and even if that sounds selfish, it’s hard to go other places…budgeting wise, we do not have the money.

With limited funding, the CTL’s director takes on the responsibility to scan the internal and external environment to develop faculty in-house training. Bringing a pedagogical expert into the Center is more cost efficient than sending one faculty member across the country to a conference, according to Debbie. The CTL recruits an expert to come in-house, which gives a wider range of faculty the chance to learn the skill.

Yet another example of the director and staff of the CTL’s scanning the environment is participating in several committees in college. It is important to scan not only by speaking to faculty but also by reaching out to committees and listening to what they need. This aids committees in understanding how they can use the Center to fill the needs of a wider group of faculty. When she participates in a committee she shared that she covers more “ground” instead of talking to one faculty member at a time. Debbie, the director, noted:
I've started to see the needs that were happening and then made a recommendation: Could all the committees be talking to the CTL about things that happen in their committee and what professional development could be related to the task or the charge of the committee and how could the CTL be supporting all these committees as well?

Debbie shared that she is constantly listening to committees’ needs and targeting how the CTL can assist in not just the development of individual faculty but also committees in the college. If they have a need she asserted a willingness to examine into how the CTL can be of assistance.

After searching external environments, which includes other experts in education, the CTL often targets new technology and processes that other colleges have incorporated, according to Peter the Multi-Media Specialist. He shared that the staff at the CTL examines what other colleges in the university system are doing in regard to technology, pedagogy, and student learning. He also asserted that in order for BCC to compete with other colleges they must implement technology that is recognized by the students. Peter says that he is constantly looking at other colleges to learn what technology they are utilizing. Keeping abreast of what other similar colleges are doing is of great importance to BCC and the CTL. Debbie and Peter both concurred that if the CTL discovers new technologies or processes that can improve BCC’ faculty development and teaching, the CTL will design workshops to address the possible needs.

As an example, a new concept “Flipping the Classroom” was introduced to the CTL from a faculty member. The flipping of the classroom changes the design of instruction in the classroom. Students’ first exposure to the content material is at home by the material posted online, and then faculty members process the information in class by using activities to engage students. The CTL staff asserted that students would benefit from faculty’s new way of
teaching, and faculty would become reengaged in the classroom. The CTL decided to add a workshop to the schedule that taught faculty the “Flipping the Classroom” process. Several faculty members are now using the “flipping” concept, and have asked for more training after their first workshop. To address those needs the center is now conducting on-going sessions on Flipping the Classroom.

**Leveling Departmental and Hierarchical Boundaries to Promote Idea Sharing**

The fourth theme, *Leveling Departmental and Hierarchical Boundaries to Promote Idea Sharing* is defined as fostering open communication by treating all participants as equal learners and valuing everyone’s contribution. The Director of the CTL fosters communication among those who participate at the CTL by modeling behavior that facilitates communication. During my observations, Debbie communicated with all faculty members equally and asked many faculty members to help each other with classroom issues. Sarah stated that the CTL is a place for sharing, and Rachel concurred that it is a place to “catch up” with other faculty members. Sarah discusses how the director opens communication between faculty members and provides a comfortable place to share ideas. Sarah states:

> She makes people feel valued in that what you are doing really is a good thing and you should share this information, you are cutting edge, and other people could learn from you [faculty member].

According to the director, the Center’s personnel are there to engage faculty to share experiences and ideas. Observations yielded many examples of faculty members sharing ideas in the workshops. During the student engagement workshop the instructor asked faculty members about their experiences in the classroom and their difficulties in engaging students. Melissa, the instructor, acknowledged each faculty member and asked other faculty members, “Do you have
any ideas to solve the problem that she is having?” Melissa encouraged participants of all levels of faculty to assist each other and pass ideas to each other. Even though Melissa is the facilitator of the conversation by providing information she encourages conversation between participants with no direct regard for hierarchy. Melissa said, “I hope to make them better teachers in sharing with them resources they can use to improve their own teaching.” She is not only a workshop instructor, but also a faculty member that comes to the Center to share ideas with other faculty. The director shared that she herself and the staff of the Center are consciously trying to build a space that faculty understands is a place to communicate openly. They are doing this by providing workshops that are geared towards open communication. As an example the research sharing roundtables are designed for faculty to share ideas with no facilitator. The session is administered for faculty by faculty. Betsy spoke about one of these discussions:

Many of the workshops that I have been at involve roundtable discussions where faculty look to each other for information on ways to be more successful in the classroom.

Sharing personal and professional experiences is a huge part of that.

Bob concurred and asserted that the Center is a perfect place for conversation to happen. He stated that they put up a vibe of “Let’s talk about this stuff.” The centralized location allows faculty to come and have a conversation and engage with each other. Bob noted, "This is a place (CTL) where you can come and learn new things and express your ideas and talk to other faculty.” Betty added that the Director promotes the culture in the Center that allows for communication between faculty members. Betty explained the dynamics of learning from faculty in different departments:
It’s the only place where people actually get up and go. If I want to go talk to someone from another department, I’ve got to wander over to their department or they have to come over to mine. It just doesn’t happen all that often, because we’re so busy.

The CTL is not just for one particular faculty member but all other employees of BCC. Other participants in the study stated that the CTL is a place where “everybody” can come together and talk about what they are doing in the classroom. All faculty members from all departments are invited to the Center to learn. Betsy thought that the Center does not have any boundaries and that all ideas and suggestions are carefully examined and implemented. The Center has many different levels of faculty members’ participation. Mary stated: “It is important for each faculty member to have a save place to share ideas, thoughts and concerns without judgments or fear of repercussion.”

Debbie’s action within the Center and beyond has an impact on the leveling of departmental and hierarchical boundaries. She requests that various faculty member’s present information at the Center and also co-presents with faculty on various projects. Don, the educational coordinator, and the CTL director presented in a conference together on the iPad application in the classroom as an example of the loose boundary environment the CTL exemplifies. According to the college website the Faculty iPad Program started in 2012 and continues on an annual basis. Faculty submits proposals, which outline their potential use of the iPad, and how it will enhance their teaching and learning goals. The CTL sends out the process to enroll and the deadlines. The CTL provides a workshop on utilizing the iPad in the classroom to coincide with the program. Don discusses his experience about co-presenting with the director, “There were times when we both came back and forth in terms of getting material together. There was never a time that I did not feel like my opinion was not important and vice
versa as well.” In regards to participation, Debbie encourages every faculty member to come to the Center. In the workshops she will ask faculty members of all levels to help each other.

During a workshop session observation, a chairman of a department was asking a question about a certain issue in the classroom. Debbie asked if anyone could give advice on the chairman’s situation. A faculty member gave an example how she would solve the problem. The chairman was very excited and thanked her for the help. The director then praised her answers to the questions of the chairman.

Faculty members from several departments were speaking informally in the Center before the official workshop started. Debbie even moved the faculty around so everyone would speak to each other. This might have been unconscious but she encouraged conversation between everyone before, during and after the workshop. During the workshop the director asked all members of the workshop to give ideas. One faculty member used GoogleDocs for a certain assignment and encouraged another faculty member to organize class through Google. The faculty members shared how they could use the new program.

Departments might have different ideas on skills they use in the classroom. During one of the sessions a biology professor helped an English professor with the “flipping the classroom” concept. The English professor might never have received this information from another English professor because the department does not schedule labs. When the CTL levels the boundaries between faculty members there is an open flow of ideas between departments. Bob explains the lack of communication between departments outside the Center, “I feel like a lot of times, we’re kind of islands and we just do what we do and occasionally you have a conversation with another faculty member.” The CTL closes the gap between the departments as a place that they can share ideas and not just pass ideas in the hallways.
Helping Faculty Integrate Innovations into the Classroom

The fifth and final theme, *Helping Faculty Integrate Innovations into the Classroom*, is defined as helping faculty incorporate technical advancements and new teaching methods in the learning environment to optimize student learning. Faculty members at BCC have explored and learned how to integrate innovations into their classroom through their participation in the CTL. Melissa shared that many of the skills faculty members learned were innovative ways to improve the students’ classroom experience through the use of technology. In my discussion with Peter, he noted that faculty had learned to incorporate emerging technology into their classroom by participating in the CTL technology series. Often in faculty’s participation at the CTL they learned what other colleges were doing and then adopted the technology relevant to new pedagogy, research styles, student engagement methods and the field of teaching. For example, Appendix G is a two-week schedule of some of the technology offerings at the CTL. The technology sessions have high participation rates and are requested most often in the faculty surveys given from the center.

Of particular interest was the demonstration of what the Green Screen Training was capable of in regard to delivering classroom instructor. In the CTL’s demonstration of this technology, they showed how faculty members could incorporate this technology to deliver content to students in the classroom. The technology utilizes a screen that drops from the ceiling in a classroom; faculty members load any content they like. The content shown on the screen assists faculty members to deliver the lecture and brings the information to life visually. This is an effective way to keep students engaged. To assist in class management the Angel portal is used to help faculty and students in the classroom by providing an online grade book and
Debbie designs these types of workshops to ensure that the CTL is delivering skills that faculty could use in the classroom, and to keep up with what other colleges are doing. Betty noted how confident she is in the CTL’s delivery of technology.

I feel confident enough to go to these sessions and get something that I can bring back to my classroom. Even if it’s just here are some apps that you can use on your iPad, or if it’s something more in-depth like what a faculty member did with student engagement.

Integrating innovation into the class comes not only from the session in the CTL but also through the way the CTL staff engages faculty members and encourages them to learn from each other. Bob expressed that if the CTL did not exist it would be difficult for faculty to be so engaged unless they by chance overheard conversation on new innovations and tried to imitate it along the way.

In another example, the college acquired SMART Boards but did not know how to integrate them into the classroom. SMART Boards are whiteboards that are activated by a person’s touching the screen. This is called touch-detection. As an example of its use, content can be put up onto the board by drawing and/or writing. In order to get full utilization of this new technology, the CTL was requested to do a presentation and teach a lecture series on SMART Board technology at the CTL. Mary was asked by the CTL to come in and present the SMART Board technology to other faculty members. She shared that many faculty never utilized the technology in the classroom and the college is moving towards integrating this technology into more classrooms.
In helping faculty integrate new skills in the classroom, Debbie is quite aware of the various technologies that faculty members are trying to deploy in delivering education. As such, she often approaches faculty to examine if the CTL could be of any assistance in training faculty in order to have full utilization of technology. According to Debbie, the BCC needed to expand technology in delivering education, so they hired a technology subject matter expert assigned the title of Multi-Media Specialist to assist in training faculty members and implementing technology into the classroom. Once the Multi-Media Specialist was hired the college began to purchase more technology equipment. Bob, a workshop instructor, noted:

They want to see us move with the technology and anything that’ll help, so they’ll often look into acquiring those kinds of pieces of machinery or whatever, computers, screens microphones, anything that can help in the classroom. They are the go-to resource.

The CTL offers more technology workshops than any other subject matter because of its high demand, and because other colleges are moving towards technology in the classroom. Many participants in the study agree that the Center is providing a place to explore innovation in technology. Betsy, a faculty member, noted that the CTL provides novel technology methodologies that can enhance her teaching and learning processes.

According to the college website, the college started an iPad Program in 2012, which allows faculty to deliver course content to students. The CTL provides training to faculty member on the use of the iPad. Faculty reported results of the program to the Center for Teaching and Learning. Debbie explained that the program’s training was such a success that faculty wanted to continue such training as updates in that technology occurs.

Many faculty members discussed their experience in the iPad training program and the subsequent use of such technology in the classroom with other faculty during their Faculty
Sharing Session. In the Faculty Sharing Session they reported that they used the iPad for grading, research, presenting material in class, and to enhance course content. Peter noted that with the faculty iPad Program they can use the tablet throughout the school year, and then have the option to purchase it at the end of the school year. He went on to assert: “The iPad has become one of the most coveted technologies in the classroom and it serves as a resource in delivering education in the classroom.”

Innovation not only includes technology but new teaching pedagogies. The CTL provides workshops on engaging students, which includes, “Flipping the Classroom.” Many participants discussed issues when assisting students in the learning process. This series is a new innovation in teaching delivery. The faculty members were coming to the center in search of innovation in the classroom. The Flipping the Classroom series brings together technology, new teaching strategies and provides a place to learn how to integrate this delivery mechanism. Faculty must learn how to design lectures to be placed online. After the faculty members learn the new technology piece, they must create a lesson plan to test if the students understood the material that they viewed online. Faculty members provide the lesson in class and get feedback from students on the lecture.

Bob, during a workshop session on “Flipping the Classroom” spoke about his experience of designing an innovative classroom. Within the CTL, Bob provides faculty with alternative teaching styles that moves away from faculty being the center of the classroom. This approach puts students in the center of the learning model. Faculty members provide students the information but engage students in the classroom on a creative level to make sure they are obtaining the information.
Faculty members are learning new innovation skills in the CTL, which can include new pedagogies or technology skills. The staff members at the CTL provide faculty opportunities to develop new skills to bring to the classroom. The CTL is assisting faculty in the understanding of how to integrate innovations into the classroom.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter presented findings for the research question to guide a qualitative case study. The overall focus was on how the Center for Teaching and Learning develops faculty in a community college setting. The first focus was on how the Center is aligning with the mission of the college. This was defined as integrating the priorities of the college into the services of the Center. The Center examined the mission of the college and tried to ensure that their mission was aligned and that they chose their own priorities to make sure they are doing what is necessary to help the college stay accredited. The director was involved with several committees to ensure that the Center was vital to the overall college.

During the study the data also showed that the CTL thought it was very important to build a visible presence on the college campus. This was seen as a survival mechanism, not only seen by the staff of the Center but also the faculty members. If the faculty did not know that the Center existed no one would come and learn new skills, then the Center would not be as vital a part of the community and funding for the Center would evaporate.

The Center’s staff is always scanning the internal and external environment to ensure that faculty needs are being met. Debbie, the director, continuously examines the environment to explore how the Center can serve the college community. Understanding the environment is a key component to the CTL.
Other data presented in this chapter illustrated how the Center levels departmental and hierarchical boundaries to promote idea sharing. This is defined as every participant becoming a learner upon entrance; therefore, all participants are created equal. The Center is a place participants are treated equally. All faculty members are there to learn from each other, ensuring that faculty members have a place for the flow of ideas to acquire new skills. The CTL opened communication by also leveling the departmental and hierarchal boundaries between participants. No faculty member that participates in the Center’s activities should feel guarded when communicating between different departments and levels of staff members.

Lastly the CTL is helping faculty integrate new innovations into the classroom. The CTL encourages faculty to learn new skills and how to integrate those skills into the classroom. During the year the Center offers several opportunities for faculty members to come and learn the skills needed to integrate innovations into the classroom. The Center is the “epi-center” for faculty to learn new skills that are new to the teaching field.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine how a center for teaching and learning develops faculty at a community college located in the northeast region of the United States. One research question guided this study:

1. How does the center for teaching and learning develop faculty?

This qualitative case study explored a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at a community college and its faculty development activities. The study was conducted using case study methodology, which is used to gain an in-depth understanding of a situation or place (Merriam, 2009). To understand CTL’s function in developing faculty at this community college, data were collected primarily through 11 participants who held the position of faculty, workshop instructors, or center staff. Additionally, data was collected through documents and observations of three workshops. One of those workshops was a session conducted by the CTL’s director and a faculty member of the community college. The second observation was a workshop performed by two faculty members. Another, of the observations was a walking tour of the campus with the CTL’s director, who provided me an overview of the college campus and its relationship with the CTL. Themes arose from the variety of collected data. Interviews were based on an interview guide that aligned with the single research question. Data analysis was conducted in a step-by-step process, and it began with coding and concluded in findings identified as themes (Merriam, 2009).

A purposeful sampling was used in this study to achieve diversity in participants by gender, job title, and department of work. This diversity was to ensure that participants did not come from the same department and/or one gender. A total of 11 participants engaged in semi-
structured interviews. Participants in this study were first solicited by email to determine their interest; invitation to participate was subsequently extended to those who were interested. Snowball sampling was also used as a purposeful sampling strategy by asking each interviewee to refer other potential participants for the study.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the three research conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research. This chapter contains three sections: (a) Conclusions and Discussion, (b) Recommendations for Practice, and (c) Recommendations for the Future Research.

**Conclusions and Discussion**

This section offers conclusions and discussion for this qualitative case study. Three conclusions were drawn: (a) The Director’s Role and Behavior in the CTL is Integral for Overcoming Political Resistance in Fostering Faculty Development, (b) CTL Promotes Sharing Best Teaching Practices Across Disciplines and Hierarchy and (c) The Changing Nature of Technology is a Major Driving Force in Faculty Development. Conclusions were drawn from an analysis of findings. The following three sections elaborate these conclusions and discuss how they relate to the conceptual framework and existing literature that guided the study.

**CONCLUSION ONE: The Director’s Role and Behavior in the CTL is Integral for Overcoming Political Resistance in Fostering Faculty Development**

The first conclusion was drawn from the findings in which Debbie, the director, is instrumental in overcoming the political resistance of faculty to attend the center. Boyer (1990), in his scholarship about teaching stated that teaching is a communal act and must be shared. For the communal act to exist in the CTL, the political resistance of faculty members must be lowered. As stated in chapter four, Rebecca, a workshop instructor at the Center for Teaching
and Learning, told the story about the beginning days of the Center and how faculty did not acknowledge its presence and actually denounced its purpose. The college faculty questioned CTL’s validity and usefulness. They thought the CTL would infringe upon their academic freedom, which they considered a faculty privilege and right. This created an intent that could have damaged any potential relationships that needed to be established in order for the CTL to execute its intended purpose. As noted by one participant in the study, “Why should I trust the center with my development needs?” With that type of resistance being a potentiality, the CTL experienced low attendance, and faculty lost a valuable opportunity for development.

Burt Community College hired a new director hopefully presenting the opportunity for the Center to be visible on campus and to ensure that it overcame the political resistance from faculty members. Debbie became the face of the CTL. She brought the leadership style that is invaluable for the forward momentum of the CTL on all three campuses. Kezar (2001) stated that having a positive force in an organization is important for progression and success. She has many roles to increase faculty confidence and participation. Some of her roles include but are not limited to serving as public relations spokesperson, serving on committees, engaging faculty on campus, and communicating with administration.

As observed, Debbie demonstrates the qualities of a relations-oriented leader. This leader focuses on having a supportive relationship with his/her staff and followers. Singer (2002) noted that venues that facilitate teaching and learning, such as the CTL in this study, encourage development of faculty. The leader of the Center needs to encourage faculty to come to the center, to try to overcome the feeling of resistance. The goal of the leader is to build relationships with staff, but also give autonomy to those who follow (Yukl, 2010). In the role of leader, Debbie provides opportunities for faculty to develop their own presentation styles but
continues to give support in the process. In observations, Debbie reached out to faculty members to set up times to discuss future opportunities to participate in the Center. As a leader, Debbie builds relationships and supports those faculty initiatives to explore new skills.

To overcome political resistance, the leader of the CTL must be an effective leader to reach the center’s goal of developing faculty members. Debbie worked on developing interpersonal relationships to encourage faculty to come to the center. An interpersonal relationship is defined as being aware of social and emotional needs of non-leaders with the leader (Stogdill, 1963). When the CTL is a new concept to faculty, they may resist coming into the Center. What perhaps adds to the resistance of the CTL is that faculty may have a fear of change and might have issues with the uncertain effects of the change (Ginsberg & Bernstein, 2011). To overcome faculty resistance from past experience, the leader of the CTL works on building relationships with faculty members.

For Debbie to be successful overcoming political resistance, she must foster faculty development throughout the entire campus environment. The relationship between the leader and her environments can have a direct impact on her (Burns, 2008). Debbie works not only with faculty members but committees throughout the college environment. As she is building a strong relationship with her environment, she is able to break down resistance in a more efficient manner. She can go to a committee and build a positive relationship; in turn, the committee will utilize the CTL’s services. During the interview process, Debbie spoke about the importance of building relationships with the college community. According to Debbie, these relationships help encourage more faculty to come to the center for development. She says that the more she gets into the community, the higher the enrollment in the workshops. As she builds trust with the college community, she is more respected (Bass, 1995). The key component in a transformational leader is trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).
In many situations, Debbie is scanning the environment to look for faculty members to help present workshops in the CTL. To break down resistance, she approaches faculty in a positive manner to participate in the Center. Leaders focus on the positive attitudes of staff, which will be able to protect them from the negative stress (Sturdier, 2000). Debbie lowers the negative beliefs of the Center by replacing the negative thoughts with positive relationships and experiences. Debbie reached out to Rebecca to lead a workshop in the Center. Rebecca expressed a negative impression of the center, and prior to Debbie becoming the director, would not participate in the center’s activities because of the way the Center was developed. After speaking to Debbie and leading several workshops, she has changed her negative impressions for positive ones.

CONCLUSION TWO: CTL Promotes Sharing Best Teaching Practices across Disciplines and Levels of Hierarchy

The second conclusion was drawn from findings in which faculty members are able to communicate, and learn freely between disciplines and hierarchy. From the CTL perspective, all faculty members are created equal, and in the center they are encouraged to interact and learn from each other. Although, faculty members come to the center from different areas of the campus and hold different positions, when they enter the Center the staff views them all as learners. The purpose and goal of the Center is to develop faculty and provide them with the skills they need to deliver education to students. Faculty serve the same purpose to students, so it is paramount that they learn from each other best practices, and develop better skills to impart education to students. The sole purpose of the Center is to develop faculty, and administer to their needed skills. One of the critical needs was integration of knowledge from each other, i.e., learning from each other. Boyer (1990), in his scholarship of integration, noted the importance
of faculty building a relationship with other faculty from different disciplines. Thus, the center became the venue, which facilitates relationship building and cross learning. The Center was able to build relationships between faculty by providing them opportunities to engage in activities and to interact and learn from each other. The director of the CTL integrates the Center into the everyday activities of the college campus by engaging in committees, classroom activities, and overall campus presentations. The director is the person who sets the tone of the Center and directs staff and participants that everyone is treated equally. By giving all faculty members equal time she models to her staff that all faculty have the same importance. Debbie, the director, did express that administration can take up a large quantity of her time, but that she tries to spend time with faculty in the Center. She also expressed that drawing faculty from all departments and levels of hierarchy is of great importance. To attain this goal is to attend meetings in several departments on all campuses.

For a diverse population of faculty members to engage in the Center, the CTL must be highly visible, credible, and futuristic. As found in this study, once faculty members began to come to the Center, it built momentum for other faculty to engage in the Center. The CTL thus became a fixture on the college campus. In Chapter 4, Bob noted that after his first encounter with the CTL, he became more comfortable and thus was more apt to take more workshops. When faculty is exposed to the Center for Teaching and Learning, it increases the faculty members’ understanding of the value of the Center (Ginsberg & Bernstein, 2011). Debbie scans the college environment to seek out all departments to ensure that faculty members get an opportunity to learn from all departments. When more departments participate in the Center the power is to an extent equalized because all departments have chairpersons, and when several are participating in a workshop not one of them has a higher standing than the other. Each faculty
members comes to the Center as a “learner”. A librarian assists a chairman in finding new ways to help his faculty research new teaching topics. All participants are there to help each other. The director sets this tone by expressing before each workshop that everyone is here to learn.

Debbie cites that part of her job is to build good relations with the overall campus community, and to publicly relate to faculty and administration. She works with all departments to ensure that all faculty members understand that they are welcome in the Center. The overall college is made up of many departments and hierarchy of faculty. The CTL is the centralized location where the college community system can come and learn from each other. Macy (1991) defined a system as a group of interacting components that conserve some identifiable set of relations with the sum of the components plus their relations to other entities including other systems (p. 72). Debbie shared that she understands that she is a part of the larger college environment and must interact with the environment to succeed. She is always examining ways to have more faculty members understand that the Center is on campus, and provides faculty development services.

Debbie explained that the Center grows in parallel with the college growth. The college is made up of many departments, and the Center must mirror the attendance with this knowledge. When the needs of the college change, the Center must change to meet those needs. As Schwandt and Szabla (2007) stated, these (Center and college) systems are dynamic and must answer to changing concerns, their purpose, and the need to endure. If the Center for Teaching and Learning does not grow with the college, its existence will not be warranted. Buckley (1968) concurred that the Center will be impacted by the larger system of the college. He expressed that the systems are constantly reacting to each other. Reigeluth (1992) added to the conversation, citing that one aspect of a system requires fundamental movement of other aspects to be
successful. In this study, the college directly impacts the success of the Center. Debbie states that the administration and faculty are directly responsible for the success of the Center. If the administration does not believe that the Center is important, then funding will be extinguished. The Center exists within a larger community so it must always be scanning the college to assist with the needs of the college community.

Evidence from the literature (Hall & Gagen, 1956) suggests that each component of the system indirectly or directly reacts to each other. This can be a stable, unstable, or multifaceted and shifting relationship. The Center for Teaching and Learning has a multifaceted and shifting relationship with the college environment. The college is not a system that stays the same; it is constantly changing. This causes the Center to react to the college and change along with the college. The Center’s role is not just to service one particular department. The staff of the Center must always adapt the larger system of the college. When new departments are designed, the Center’s staff must try to meet the needs of the new department. This can be the director sitting in on a staff meeting, or offering new faculty workshops in the Center.

If faculty members from every department and hierarchy level see value in the Center, this works out to the benefit of students (Revell & Wainwright, 2009). The CTL works towards developing faculty member best practices in teaching across departments in the college. Debbie will reach out to all faculty members to help the Center present topics to other faculty members. Departments can learn new skills from each other in the CTL. The librarian becomes a workshop instructor that teaches other departments how to instruct students in research projects.

Peter, the Multi-Media Specialist, understands that the more faculty members see that technology can add to the classroom, the more participation in the Center will increase. He said that faculty members from all levels of ability come to the Center to learn. Senior faculty
members come to the CTL to enhance existing skills while new faculty come to obtain new skills. The success of the CTL increases the opportunity to reach more faculty members and build legitimacy in the Center (Scott, 2011). The final decision whether the Center remains in existence, is based on the administration examining the attendance levels of faculty. As the CTL continues to attract more faculty members, its level of importance to the administration will rise, and investment in the Center will increase. When the CTL is successful and collects more funding, it will have the resources to develop more faculty members in many different subject areas and methods. Faculty will have access to more services, which gives more opportunities for faculty learning. More outside speakers can be enlisted to teach faculty, new technology can be acquired, and the CTL can employ more staff to assist faculty in and outside the classroom. Debbie understands that the CTL is a part of a larger system and must keep it relevant to the campus.

As Lieberman (2005) stated, teaching and learning centers are laboratories for faculty to learn. The belief of faculty members in the Center is vital to its survival. The faculty and the Center understand that everyone comes to the Center as a “learner”. The Center does not exist alone; it is a part of a larger system and has to build relationships with the other components of the system to impress its importance. To achieve this goal, all faculty need to feel that the CTL is the place for faculty to be developed.
CONCLUSION THREE: The Changing Nature of Technology Is a Major Driving Force in Faculty Development

The third conclusion is the need for faculty to keep abreast of new technology in light of the fact that it is the new format to deliver content to students. The scholarship of discovery discusses the need for faculty to explore new skills (Boyer, 1990). Faculty members’ technology training enables them to be more productive. As found in this study, faculty members learn classroom management technology, which decreases the time to grade student assignments. The Angel portal, a portal that faculty members use to manage the classroom activities, has a grade book section that grades multiple choice tests for the faculty member. As seen in Appendix G, the CTL’s technology offerings outnumber any other types of courses or training. Faculty members come to the Center to learn new technology to integrate into the classroom as well as into their administrative responsibilities. For example, Burt Community College requires faculty to use its online portal, Angel, to access their class roster and for student grading. CTL holds workshops to teach faculty about the Angel portal product. With a variety of online offerings several times during the day, the CTL gives faculty ample opportunities to learn new technology skills. The several offerings and times portray the importance to learn new ways to integrate technology into the classroom. Bob, a workshop instructor, discussed the priority of technology integration by administration via the acquiring of new computers, screen microphones, and anything that can assist in the classroom.

Many students are engaged with the recent innovations in technology; many of their professors indicate they are overwhelmed by the heavy workloads and administrative requirements, leaving them with little time to engage in new technology (Olney, Wright & Herrington, 2009). Debbie often has to convince faculty that injecting new technology into the
classroom and into preparation for class can have a positive effect on time management. Many faculty members did concur that after they used the technology a few times, it added to the experience for the students and cut down on extra questions and time needed after class. In an observation, a senior faculty member demonstrated some new technology that he uses in the classroom and the positive effects in the classroom. He stated, “Students are more engaged.”

After a question and answer session, a faculty member was asked about the time taken to design the work. He expressed that it took some time, but he will be using it for several classes, so in the end it cuts out time. Thompson (1996) argues that it is often difficult to convince academic staff that investment of their time in learning to use new technologies effectively will provide long-term gains, most especially in the current climate of competing priorities and demanding deadlines. According to Debbie, BCC is requiring faculty members to learn new technology as part of hiring standards.

With the move towards students using technology for many aspects of their lives, incorporating technology into their learning allows students to progress in their studies. With this knowledge, teaching with technology is a vital tool for faculty to engage students. Boyer (1990), in “Four Functions of Scholarly Engagement”, states that the act of teaching starts with the faculty being able to transfer knowledge to students in an effective way. Betsey, a faculty member, noted that the center offers new technology methods that allow faculty to enhance their own teaching and learning.

The CTL also provided support to faculty when it came to technology. Betsey shared, “The center is a resource of best practices, new trends and also providing education for faculty who want to make changes and improve their coursework….Maybe this is going to change what
equipment we have available for teaching.” The college invested in new technology, which includes the Green Screen and SMART Boards to assist in delivering knowledge to the students.

Many technology skills do not come naturally to all faculty members, and the CTL can assist in that development (Boyer, 1990). Reder (2007) found a Center for Teaching and Learning must embrace the diversity of teaching skills and abilities. Peter shared, that many faculty members come to the Center with different levels of technology abilities. He went on to say, “When the college invested in the Green Screen technology to upload lectures online faculty gravitated to using this technology.”

In conclusion, discovering new ways to innovate in the classroom is ever changing. Boyer (1990) believed that faculty must continue the pursuit of new ways to deliver information to students. BCC uses technology as a way to infuse innovation into the classroom. In this study, it was found that Green Screen, Ipad, and SMART Board technology was the vehicle BCC used to incorporate innovation. Ultimately, the staff at the Center must provide a product (offerings) that the faculty members find of value. Staff must build trust with the campus community to infuse the idea that CTL is a place to discover new skills.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Findings in the study are relevant to many areas in higher education that include development, hiring practices, faculty minimum requirements, and accreditation. Many institutions have implemented some kind of center for teaching and learning; there are implications of the study for a wide range of colleges.

The first recommendation of this study is for administration to take into consideration the person who is in charge of the CTL. Ochoa (2011) discusses the proliferation of Centers for Teaching and Learning as institutions are making an effort to encourage innovation in teaching.
The CTL needs a leader at the helm who is encouraging to faculty and takes the steps to further the development of all faculty members. When hiring this particular person, administration must not just look at credentials but at the skills of reaching out to faculty. These skills can include, prioritizing, encouraging, advising, and developing faculty.

The second recommendation is for the CTL to have a public relations component. As this case demonstrated, the director and all the staff of the center made a point to demonstrate how the CTL can be of service to administration and staff. During the CTL Minute, the campus presentation, the staff of the Center demonstrates all the new technology that the faculty can use in the classroom. Faculty at the college must be aware that the Center exists and what it has to offer faculty. If a faculty member has a positive experience in the Center, then she/he shares and promotes the experience to other faculty members in the department, causing more faculty members of the department to go to the Center to learn new skills.

It is vital for the Center’s survival to hire a director who understands how to get the word out about the Center to the college community. For the CTL to exist, many faculty members need to come to the Center to learn. The CTL needs to help faculty with this activity and encourage more of that behavior.

The third recommendation is to develop an environment in the CTL that allows for open communication. Having an environment that is level for all faculty members—which means that no matter what their job title, they are free to share ideas without judgment. This can be done using the strategies that Debbie used; for example, introducing faculty and moving the faculty seating around. Boyer’s (1997) model of scholarship focuses on sharing across disciplines. In an open environment, faculties feel free to share ideas. Melissa, a librarian, can present findings in student development to Betty, a full time teaching faculty member. When the CTL’s
environment has open communication, it allows information to flow freely from department to department and from novice faculty to tenured faculty members.

The fourth recommendation is for the CTL to have an online presence or use multiple strategies to reach faculty (such as or including web-based materials, various formats/times). During the observations of workshops, it became apparent that many faculty members could not come to the Center at the time that the workshop was running. Why should faculty who want the information not receive it due to a busy work schedule? Many CTLs have staff that is considered media specialists. These individuals should record all workshops and individual sessions, with the consent of faculty participants. The goal of the center is to develop all faculty members in the community college, but why limit it to the brick and mortar center? If all centers offerings were online, faculty could log in at any time to learn. If CTLs wanted to become more innovative, they could offer a live feed for faculty on other campuses to participate in the workshops. This would raise the participation rates because faculty can log into the live instruction from their homes.

**Looking Back and Moving Forward**

The process of becoming a scholar has been difficult but a rewarding process. The goal of this research was to examine how a particular CTL was developing faculty. I have always had a passion to help faculty and students. I myself have struggles in learning new skills. Teaching and learning centers are needed to support all faculty members, no matter the differences. When it comes to development, there should be no hierarchy. Not one faculty member should be more important than the other when it comes to development. We all (as faculty) need help and some development. When a college supports faculty and they are excited and challenged in the
classroom, the students will benefit. New to the role of researcher, I asked the question, “Now what do I do with the results of this study?”

I plan to disseminate my research to other colleges to help them build strategies for their own teaching and learning center. Many colleges might not be aware of what the CTL needs in order to develop faculty. My study will recommend that the center needs a public relations director to raise awareness that the center is an ideal place to learn new skills. I will initiate a conversation in the institution where I work about my findings, and perhaps they can raise the visibility of our center to other faculty members. At this moment, most faculty members only use the center as an online schedule of conferences.

Second, I would like to conduct another study that focuses on a research-one university center based on Carnegie Classification and examine how they develop faculty, then compare and contrast how research universities develop faculty differently from community colleges. The study should focus on the type of college and how each emphasizes teaching and learning. Borra (2001) identified that many professors value the art of teaching, but their universities do not value or reward innovation in the classroom.

I plan to add to this study by conducting more research in other areas included in the next section, “Recommendations for Future Research.”

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study’s findings allowed me to understand how a center for teaching and learning develops faculty. The study sets out a road map of elements that contribute to a successful center that develops faculty. There are, however, many recommendations for future research that enhance improve faculty development in teaching and learning centers.
1. This research was conducted with an institution that already had a center that was fully embedded in the college environment. It was impossible to observe the process of building a CTL. Conducting a study observing how a center of teaching and learning is developed could provide a road map for other colleges.

2. This study was conducted as a case study that primarily used interviews and observations. Another study should be conducted using mixed methods research to survey a larger sample’s views on how this particular center is developing faculty. This survey could be used at other colleges to survey if the center is doing what it was intended to do—develop faculty.

3. What are the tools needed for a successful CTL? The study examined how the Center develops faculty but did not investigate what tools are needed to have a thriving center.

4. This study was conducted in a community college setting. I would like to add to the study by studying a research-one university and examine how they develop faculty and compare and contrast the two environments. Do they have the same priorities when developing faculty?

5. Future study should include a review of how CTLs could measure increased effectiveness in teaching and the impact on student learning outcomes.

Concluding Thoughts

This study attempted to fill the knowledge gap of how a teaching and learning center in a community college develops faculty. By understanding how one center develops faculty, other colleges can design a road map to their own effective teaching and learning center.
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Appendix A

Recruitment Letter for Site

August 1, 2013

Dear Participants,

One of my colleagues at Northeastern University thought you might be some help. My name is Monica Levine-Sauberman and I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University. The study will examine how a teaching and learning center has incorporated the scholarship of teaching and learning to create or improve student-centered education in a northeast university. I would like to discuss with you the possibility of having your center participate. The study is under the direction of faculty member principal investigator, Dr. Elisabeth Bennett.

The study was prompted by my love for higher education and to answer several questions about a teaching and learning center. What circumstances does a teaching and learning center develop? What are the outside impacts on that center? With the renewed interest in higher education this is the opportune time to investigate how universities are answering the call for change. The study would include interviews and observations of some of the programs. This information will be helpful to further more research about teaching and learning centers. Participation is confidential.

Thank you for your consideration.
Monica Levine-Sauberman
845-598-9307
ajsmhl147@yahoo.com
Appendix B

Recruitment Letter for Participants

Northeastern University
College of Professional Studies

September 10, 2013

Dear Participants,

My name is Monica Levine-Sauberma n and I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University. xxxxx, the director of the teaching and learning center at the college, suggested that you might be a great participant for the study. I am investigating how a college’s teaching and learning center promotes faculty development.

Selected participants will engage in one audio-recorded interview, approximately sixty minutes in length. Your identity will be kept completely confidential. Participation in the study is voluntary and will not affect your status at the college. If you decide to participate you can withdraw at any time during the interview process. After the interviews are conducted participants will be able to review the findings for accuracy. The findings of the interview will be published without identify information. Every participant will sign an informed consent form.

If you are comfortable with the nature and purpose of this study and would like to participate please contact by email ajsml147@yahoo.com.

Thank you in advance!

Monica Levine-Sauberma n
845-598-9307
ajsml147@yahoo.com
Appendix C

Informed Consent Form

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies, Education Department
Monica Levine-Sauberaman
“A Case Study of How a College’s Teaching and Learning Center Promotes Faculty Development”

Dear Participant,

I am inviting you to take part in a research study that will be directed by my doctoral dissertation advisor, Dr. Elisabeth Bennett. In this form will be information about the study but first it will be explained to you first in length. After, you may decide to participate in the study or not. If you decide to participate in the study I will ask you to sign this statement and will provide you with a copy to keep.

You are being asked to participate in the study because you worked or participated in the services provided by the teaching and learning center. There will be approximately 11 participants in the study. The purpose of the study is to understand how a teaching and learning center promotes faculty development. If you decide to participate in this study, you will be interviewed about your experiences. The interviews will be sixty minutes in length and ten minutes will be spent going over the informed consent form. Once the interviews are finished and I have all of my findings, I will email you a copy of my findings to review. You will be asked to provide feedback via email or telephone.

There are no foreseeable risks in the involvement in the study. All participates will be provided the time to reflect on experiences in the teaching and learning center. Information obtained in this study will help other teaching and learning centers.

Your identity will always be confidential and only this researcher will know your identity. I will remove from the interview all identifying information, including other names of individuals. I will replace all names will code names and all data will be in a locked cabinet. This form will be in the cabinet until the completion of the study. In some cases authorized people might ask to see the information in the study. This is only to ensure that the study is being performed properly. Only certified personal from the Northeastern University Review Board will be able to assess information.

No compensation or payment will be given to any participant. Your participation in the study is totally voluntary; you do not have to participate if you do not want to. During the process if you
decide to not participate you will not lose any benefits, rights or services that you have as a member of the college.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 845-598-9307, or via email at ajsmh147@yahoo.com. You may also contact Dr. Elisabeth Bennett at el.bennett@neu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617-373-4588, Email: irb@neu.edu. You may call anonymously.

I agree to take part in this research.

_____________________________________________
Signature of person agreeing to take part          Date

_____________________________________________
Printed name of person above

_____________________________________________
Signature of person who explained the study to the participant above and obtained consent          Date
Appendix D

Interview Guide for Faculty

Participant Information

Pseudonym:

Title:

How long at this title:

Age range:  20-34    35-49     50+

Gender:    Male    Female

Tell me about your role at the college.

What is the role of the teaching and learning center for developing faculty?

How does the center meet your faculty development needs?

What are your takeaways from the faculty development needs?

Is there anything else you would like to mention?

Acceptable probes:

Can you tell me more about that?
Tell me about a time when….
Can you share an example?
How does that work?
Appendix E

Interview Guide for Workshop Staff

Participant Information

Pseudonym:

Title:

How long at this title:

Age range: 20-24  35-39  50+

Gender: Male   Female

Tell me about your role at the college.

Please provide an overview of the center’s instruction services.

What is the role of the teaching and learning center for developing faculty?

How does the center meet the development needs of the faculty?

What do faculty members take away from workshops?

Is there anything else you would like to mention?

Acceptable probes:

Can you tell me more about that?
Tell me about a time when….
Can you share an example?
How does that work?
Appendix F

Interview Guide for Administrative Staff

Participant Information

Pseudonym:

Title:

How long at this title:

Age range: 20-24  35-39   50+

Gender: Male    Female

Tell me about your role at the college.

Please provide an overview of the center’s operations.

What is the role of the teaching and learning center for developing faculty?

Who are the stakeholders of the teaching and learning center?

How does the center meet the development needs of the faculty?

What do faculty members take ways from workshops?

Is there anything else you would like to mention?

What perspectives internally (the campus community) and externally (regulators etc.) shape the center?

Acceptable probes:

Can you tell me more about that?
Tell me about a time when….
Can you share an example?
How does that work?
## Appendix G

**Example of Past Two-Week Schedule of Center for Teaching and Learning**

### Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Director of CTL</td>
<td>Angel Workshop 3</td>
<td>Understanding the platform that is used online by the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>CTL staff member</td>
<td>TurnItIn Dropbox Workshop</td>
<td>Explaining how students can turn in papers through Angel on Dropbox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Research and Publishing Round Table</td>
<td>Gather with other faculty that are pursuing research projects and share ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>CTL Staff</td>
<td>Engaging Students with Web 2.0 Tools</td>
<td>How to use certain tools to engage students with the assistance of the web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>CTL Director</td>
<td>Appy Hour: Utilizing iPad Apps in Higher Education</td>
<td>Discussion about the latest apps on the iPad for higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Determining Best Practices in Blended Learning</td>
<td>Bring faculty together to discuss best practices for online teaching. Teaching strategies will be presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>CTL Staff</td>
<td>Green Screen Open House</td>
<td>Learn best practices for Green Screen Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Flipping the Classroom Series</td>
<td>Traditional classroom structure is switched. Flipping provides faculty the opportunity for more active learning in the classroom. Best practices, support and examples will be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>CTL Director</td>
<td>Angel Workshop 4</td>
<td>Understanding the platform that is used online by the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>CTL Staff</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff iPad Round Table Discussion</td>
<td>Information about apps, software and how to utilize iPad in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>CTL Staff</td>
<td>CTL Sharing Session</td>
<td>Gives the chance for faculty to share new teaching strategies, Angel Shell and best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>CTL Sharing Session</td>
<td>Gives the chance for faculty to share new teaching strategies, Angel Shell and best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>Angel Faculty Luncheon</td>
<td>Lunch provided. Understanding the platform that is used online by the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>Angel Workshop 5</td>
<td>Understanding the platform that is used online by the college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>