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Teaching & Learning Center and International Teaching Assistant Program
Annual Report, 2008-2009

Mission Statement

The TLC’s mission is to promote the value and practice of excellent teaching, teaching that facilitates student learning and growth. The TLC provides programs and resources designed to promote teaching methods that are consistent with the research on how people learn. The TLC provides opportunities for faculty and TAs to reflect on their work, and to learn from the experience and expertise of their colleagues. The TLC also aims to promote this reflection in the form of assessment and scholarly research on teaching and learning. By supporting faculty and TAs in their work as teachers, our ultimate aim is to support the success of Temple’s richly diverse student body and the development of our students as scholars and citizens.

Introduction to the Annual Report

This report begins with a description of TLC’s alignment with the Academic Strategic Compass followed by our accomplishments this year in support of our mission. These accomplishments can be attributed not only to the expansion of our staff, but also to the successful integration of new staff members into a highly effective team (see Appendix A for brief descriptions of new personnel). The report concludes with our goals for future expansion and improvement, as well as an account of the resources that are needed to achieve these goals.

Alignment of TLC Mission and Programs with the Strategic Compass

The mission and work of the TLC are well aligned with the Temple University Academic Strategic Compass, as will be demonstrated in greater detail throughout the annual report. We begin this report with specific instances of our close relationships to core values and goals.

Access to excellence and opportunities for success for all students: Simply put, our mission and practices are dedicated to this core value; research indicates that quality teaching is the primary factor in student success. The 983 faculty, administrators, and graduate students who used our services from July 2008 through June 2009 overwhelmingly report that they apply the research-based practices that we espouse to their teaching. We are poised to create more opportunities for success through major new faculty development initiatives developed in 2009-2010: Teaching in Higher Education (THE) Certificate, the Provost’s Teaching Academy and the Summer Teaching Institute for Health Science Faculty.
**Creation and application of knowledge/Research excellence:** Our work is aligned with both the creation and application of research and to research excellence:

- Knowledge creation and research excellence: We contribute to the educational research literature (also called the scholarship of teaching and learning) through our own investigation and through our research collaborations with faculty. Our success in publishing and presenting in the field indicates the excellence of this research.
- Knowledge application: Per our mission, we help instructors apply the research on how people learn and on best teaching practices to their own teaching. Our program pedagogy is based on well-documented research and we teach research-based content.

**Ethical, social and community responsibility/Metro-engagement:** The TLC contributed to two key initiatives that involve the University in social and community responsibility and in metro-engagement:

- Social and community responsibility: Since its inception, our staff has been integral to the Community-Based Learning initiative (CBL). As members of the Faculty Senate's CBL steering committee, we helped to: draft the proposal for the CBL center, develop criteria for designated community based learning courses, create a community partners board, and design programs. We are involved in providing faculty development for community-based teaching.
- Metro-engagement: The TLC meets regularly with General Education leaders to develop the Philadelphia Experience program (PEX). We contributed to PEX guidelines, the design and implementation of the first PEX conference, PEX faculty development programming at the Mosaic Institute, and consulted with individuals and small groups of faculty re-integrating PEX.

**Cultural and global awareness/Global commitment:** The TLC contributed to the advancement of global awareness through a Global Teaching Circle.

- The Global Teaching Circle: Recruited and facilitated by the TLC, six faculty members from across the university met monthly to discuss the challenges of teaching students for global competence. The group presented a poster at the AAC&U Global Learning Forum. Now called *The Marco Polo Collaborative*, the group is developing a web resource for teachers of globalization in 2009-2010.

**Investigation, innovation and entrepreneurship:** Our major projects this year are characterized by both innovation and entrepreneurship.

Innovation: Faced with the challenge of developing a Certificate in Teaching in Higher Education for community college faculty, TLC exceeded expectations and developed a multi-faceted model that will offer the program to these faculty members and to Temple graduate students as well. The model is *innovative* in several respects:
• We designed an unusually inclusive Teaching in Higher Education (THE) syllabus. Faculty members across schools and colleges will teach this syllabus with the addition of a module that they will design about teaching in their fields.

• Faculty members will experience the Teaching in Higher Education seminar - both content and best practice teaching methods - for themselves during a summer session of the Provost's Teaching Academy in July 2009. This training helps insure standards and consistency for the program.

• The model for certifying non-matriculated students through bringing the THE seminar to community colleges is unique nationwide.

The Health Science Summer Institute, that also launches summer 2009, is a second innovative initiative in that it brings together all of the health science schools and colleges to support an interdisciplinary vision of teaching and learning in this area.

Entrepreneurship: In order to provide stipends for faculty who participate in the Provost's Teaching Academy Summer session, the TLC developed a business plan and successfully applied to form an auxiliary. Additionally, for the first time in its history, TLC has applied for and secured grant funding for programs and assessments throughout the university. This has resulted in two new grant-funded part-time staff positions.

Commitment to sustainability: We contributed to sustainability both in our office practices and in our programming, through facilitating the Sustainability Teaching Circle. We adhere to Temple University sustainability guidelines and include sustainability tips on our website resources page.

• Sustainability Teaching Circle: Recruited and facilitated by the TLC, this multidisciplinary group of seven faculty members and one graduate student met monthly to discuss teaching challenges and solutions in the field. Working closely with the Office of Sustainability the group accomplished its mission of developing definitions to designate university-wide courses as meeting “sustainability” criteria.

Accomplishments 2008-2009

TLC accomplishments described in this report are:

a) The development and implementation of major initiatives, including new Teaching in Higher Education Certificate;
b) Significant increase in faculty and administrative use of our services;
c) Increased use by Tenured and Tenure-track faculty
d) Expansion of programming including improved models;
e) Expanded outreach to and collaboration with schools & colleges, campuses, and other academic units;
f) The development and dissemination of educational research (the scholarship of teaching and learning);
g) Website redesign;
h) Improvement and transfer of the International Teaching Assistants program;
i) The summary of findings of our first systemic assessment program which validates the success of our accomplishments.
A. **Major Initiatives**

The TLC designed and is currently implementing three interrelated initiatives that institutionalize our role in improving teaching and learning across the university community. They are the Teaching in Higher Education Certificate program, the Provost’s Teaching Academy, and the establishment of an auxiliary. The Teaching in Higher Education Certificate program will be launched in 2009-2010 in collaboration with the College of Education. The certificate may be earned by both matriculated graduate students and non-matriculated students who teach or aspire to teach in local community colleges. The Provost’s Teaching Academy launches July 2009 when a selective cohort of interdisciplinary faculty meets to learn and experience the certificate’s requisite coursework, for the Teaching in Higher Education seminar. (See Appendix B for list of current enrollees). The TLC auxiliary allows us to teach the certificate coursework to community college faculty and receive revenue for funding this effort in the future. (See Appendix C for a more complete description of initiatives). This new program, with its many interrelated parts, is a university-wide change for Temple and will define the TLC for years to come.

A separate major initiative, launching in August 2009, is the four-day Summer Teaching Institute for Health Science Faculty. In preparation for this event, we are working with the five health science schools to plan and deliver sessions on: Teaching Methods for Reaching all Students; Assessment & Feedback; Clinical Teaching; and Best Classroom Practices for Lecture and Small Group Teaching.

B. **Increased Use**

We measured the increase of TLC usage by the Temple community along two dimensions: the number of individuals served and number of total contacts.

**Individuals served:** The TLC served 983 instructors, administrators, and graduate students. Faculty use increased by 101% and administrator use by 69%. This fiscal year the Center served instructors from every school and college, reaching 19% of the Temple instructional faculty. Service to graduate students (mostly TAs) remained relatively stable with a 1% decrease. For changes in attendance from 2007 to 2009, see Table 1 below. (Appendix D provides additional information about individuals served.) We will expand our service to TAs with the advent of the THE certificate program.
Table 1: Changes in Individuals Served by Category, 2007-2008 to 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>Percentage change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>218%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total contacts:** There was a 67% increase in the number of TLC contacts with instructors, administrators, and students since the previous year (from 1120 contacts to 1868). Forty-two percent of this population participated in TLC programs or services more than once, evidence that instructors find our programs and consultations valuable.

We are also seeing more faculty members attend individual events. For example, 165 people attended the one day Winter Faculty Conference on “Engaging Students in Critical Thinking.” In contrast, 83 people attended the first day of last year’s conference. We have also served the community with our web resources, including relevant tip sheets and articles. Our April average was 110 site visits per week.

**C. Increased Use by Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

The Center served tenured and tenure-track faculty at a higher rate (43%) than non-tenure track (31%) and adjunct faculty (26%) (represented by Figure 1). Previously there had been equal distribution among faculty in these categories This redistribution may reflect that: a) our services are increasingly perceived as integral to Temple’s core faculty; and/or, b) our increasing focus on balancing demands of teaching and research and c) our increasing focus on supporting faculty research in field of teaching and learning.

**Figure 1:** Faculty Served According to Rank
D. Expansion of Programming and Consultation Services

The TLC offered 143 pedagogy programs and engaged in 172 individual consultations (see Table 2). The increase in consultations is especially notable, at 266%.

Table 2: Growth in Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>Percentage change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy programs</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>291%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our workshop menu has expanded to include new programs such as balancing research and teaching, teaching the millennial generation, and engaging in classroom research (See Appendix E for list of all programs.)

In addition to expanding the workshop menu, we developed and implemented more sustained, substantive opportunities for instructors to reflect on their teaching and to explore new teaching ideas and methods. Chief among these were faculty teaching circles, monthly faculty development groups facilitated by TLC staff about globalization, sustainability, diversity, and teaching practices. Products of teaching circles include a web resource for higher educators who teach globalization and definitions to designate university-wide courses as meeting sustainability curricula.

The post-doctoral fellows Teaching Transcript program was also added to our repertoire for 2008-2009. Two fellows earned the teaching transcript after completing a series of requirements, including TLC workshops, course material production, classroom observation and feedback, and one-on-one consultations. This program will be discontinued as the new THE Certificate can better serve the purpose of preparing future faculty for teaching roles.

E. Expanded Outreach to Schools & Colleges, Temple Campuses & Other Academic Units

The Center expanded outreach to and was engaged with a wider segment of instructors and administrators through tailored programming and consultation.

Schools and colleges: At the request of 11 of Temple’s schools and colleges (Ambler, Boyer, CST, Dentistry, ED, ENG, FOX, Medicine, Podiatry, SCT, Tyler) we provided programs and consultations tailored specifically for their faculty. These programs include:

- STEM Educators’ lecture series (CST, ED and ENG)
- Designing classroom research (Dentistry)
- Teaching millennial students and using universal design (Podiatry faculty retreat)
- Teaching in creative fields (Boyer’s music & dance teaching academy)
- Developing student motivation (Engineering collegial assembly)
Temple Campuses: The TLC expanded its offerings and consultations beyond main campus, including:

- Ambler (pedagogy workshops and adjunct orientations)
- Health Science (provision of tailored programs for Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Podiatry)
- Temple Japan (consultation on adapting Provost’s Teaching Academy curriculum).

Other Academic Units: The TLC co-sponsored and collaborated or consulted with other teaching and learning oriented units on campus (see Appendix F for further details). These collaborations include:

- Regular consultation and collaboration with General Education Program, Disability Resource Services, Community Based Learning, and Intellectual Heritage;
- Co-sponsored programs with Office of Multicultural Affairs, Paley Library, Academic Computing, Russell Conwell Center, and Human Resources;
- Consulted with administrators of Office of Multicultural Affairs, Office of First Year Programs, Diamond Peer Teachers, Math Science Resource Center, the University Writing Center, and the Institute for Disabilities; and
- Participated in the revival of the Teaching, Learning, Technology and Research Group.

F. The Development and Dissemination of Scholarship of Teaching & Learning Research

TLC hired and developed staff with the aims of expanding TLC’s scholarly activity and becoming a resource for faculty who would research their teaching practices and their effects on student learning. We have also collaborated on grant proposals related to implementing and assessing teaching interventions.

TLC Staff: Staff members have published one article, currently have two articles in print, have submitted one article for publication, and have presented at three conferences. Two conference proposals have been accepted for presentation at the International Society of Study of Teaching & Learning in Philadelphia, October 2009 (for detailed information, see Appendix G).

Collaboration with Temple faculty: TLC has participated in the enhancement of research on teaching and learning in higher education at Temple by undertaking projects with faculty. These projects include:

- Research collaborations on effects of innovative teaching methods with two Professors from Electrical and Computer Engineering, Dr. Robert Yantorno and Dr. Dennis Silage. (see Appendix G for presentations, and publications);
- Assessment of Bio-Organic Reaction Animations, an NSF-funded project (Principal Investigators: Dr. Fleming, Professor of Chemistry at Temple, and Dr. Savage of Brigham Young University); and
- Grant-writing collaborations:
  1. School of Medicine, proposal to Stemmler Foundation on assessing clinical skills with geriatric patients (submitted and outstanding)
2. School of Medicine, material for proposal to Macy Foundation on training faculty to teach residents cross-cultural competence (submitted and rejected)

3. Colleges of Education, and Science and Technology, proposal to NSF, Reese grant, on developing tools for problem based learning (in process.)

G. Website Redesign and Expansion

We redesigned the website to improve accessibility and added the following features:

- Resources: Doubled the number of tip-sheets and articles
- *Recommended Books* page (with purchasing link to Barnes & Noble)
- *Resource of the Month* added to homepage
- *Temple Publications* page linked to teaching and learning publications by Temple authors
- Calendar: “next up” feature that highlights upcoming events
- The Google Analytics tag: added to provides data about web traffic; in April averaged 110 hits/week

H. Improvement and Transfer of the International Teaching Assistants Program

The costs of this program were reduced by approximately $70,000 while improving quality. We have also successfully planned and negotiated to move ITA under auspices of Intensive English Language Program, a unit with extensive TESOL expertise. Improvements included:

- Increase in the Teach Test pass rate from 67% to 89%;
- Reduction in ED 2211 requirements from 6 to 3 credits while maintaining pass rate;
- The hiring of a new program coordinator; movement of program under aegis of the Intensive English Language Program (IELP).

I. Assessment Findings

In Spring 2008, TLC assessed impact on teaching practice for the first time since the Center’s founding in 2002. Members of the Temple community reported high levels of satisfaction with using our services and report that the services contribute to improving teaching practice (see Appendix H for a detailed report of findings). The following are highlights from an aggregated analysis of workshop evaluations completed on the day of the program, and quarterly follow up surveys that collect information about usefulness and implementation of ideas.

- 96% of responses were positive on the day of the program
- 85% of responses were positive in follow-up surveys
- 79 of 80 sampled evaluations indicate that participants applied ideas learned to their teaching
• 64% of respondents discussed what they learned at TLC with colleagues, magnifying impact and creating teaching community

• What was learned: new ideas and techniques, including ways to make lessons more engaging, ways to grade fairly and efficiently, the necessity of aligning learning objectives with assessments, and the value of self-reflection and reflective teaching.

**Goals for 2009-2010**

Our goals are to continue both our programming, with an emphasis on the major initiatives begun this year, and our work in the area of scholarship of teaching and learning. In addition, we plan to increase the number of Temple faculty whom we serve.

**Major initiatives**

We plan to continue rolling out the initiatives that we developed and have begun implementing this year: the Provost's Teaching Academy, the Teaching in Higher Education Certificate Program, and offering the Teaching in Higher Education Certificate through our auxiliary unit.

**Provost’s Teaching Academy:** We will host the first annual summer working group for 20 members of the Provost’s Teaching Academy in July 2009.

**Teaching in Higher Education Certificate:**

• Matriculated students: Eight schools and colleges have committed to launching the requisite Teaching in Higher Education seminar within the next two years. They are ED, ENG, BOYER, CHP, CLA, CST, FOX, and SCT.

• Non-matriculated students: We plan to teach two sections of the Teaching in Higher Education seminar to community college faculty in spring 2010. We have a commitment from the provost to offer the course DCCC and are planning to launch an additional section at TUCC campus for faculty from CCP and other institutions.

**TLC Auxiliary:** We plan to earn $56,000, based on 34 enrollments of non-matriculated students. We will use this to pay stipends for 20 faculty members to join the Provost’s Teaching Academy in summer 2010 and to assist with clerical costs associated with the new business.

**Scholarship of Teaching & Learning and Grants:** TLC staff will submit articles for publication, make conference presentations in the field, and are committed to work with two Temple faculty members on educational research. We will complete the first phase of the assessment for the BIO-ORA chemistry animations assessment project and apply for the NSF Reese grant with co-investigators from Education and CST.
Service to Temple faculty: We plan to raise the percentage of Temple faculty whom we serve from 18% to 20%. This projection is based on: increased participation by Health Science faculty through the Health Science Summer Institute, offering additional programming at Ambler, and the expectation that we will continue to grow through referrals.

Service to Temple TAs: We plan to significantly raise the percentage of Temple TA’s whom we serve, largely through the new certificate program. Our goal is to confer the certificate on 100 students by Spring 2011.

TLC Needs for 2009-2010

The Center’s four full-time and two part-time staff members worked hard to meet our mission in 2008-2009. At this time, we serve more faculty members, more successfully, in more ways, than ever before. Our success developing initiatives and increasing our services has bred some immediate needs for additional space and additional staff.

Space Needs

Currently, our staff consists of four full-time, three half-time, and one part-time (10 hour) worker. The Center suite houses three offices, one reception space, and a seminar room that seats twelve. Given the disparity between the current staff and the space, we already work in three different campus locations and, if no change is made, will probably need to add a fourth space in 2009-2010. In addition to hiring an additional research assistant through an NSF-funded assessment project, we expect to increase the staff through additional grants, funding from our auxiliary and/or a budget line.

The current space arrangement both negatively affects our efficiency and communication and dilutes TLC’s “branding” as the university’s faculty development unit. For example, a new Verizon funded faculty development initiative, Project Edit, is being carried out on the periphery, perhaps not identifiable with our unit.

We seek a space that meets our current needs, and preferably, anticipates future ones. Minimally, we need: 1) seven offices; 2) a seminar room that seats 20 people 3) storage for equipment, files, office supplies, etc.

Preferably, the Center would also include a small conference room for meetings of several staff and faculty members. This space could be converted to office space if the center staff were to grow, precluding overcrowding and negating the potential costs (e.g., moving expenses, staff time) of further relocation.
Table 3: Immediate TLC Space Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office 1</th>
<th>Director: Pamela Barnett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office 2</td>
<td>Associate Director: Carol Philips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 3</td>
<td>Assistant Director: A. Baris Gunersel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 4</td>
<td>Lead Administrative Specialist: Mary Etienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 5: Shared</td>
<td>Part-time professional staff: Amy Weigand (Coordinator) Faculty Fellow (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 6: Shared</td>
<td>Part-time clerical staff: Keisha Kirton (work study student) Additional clerical worker (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 7: Shared</td>
<td>Part-time professional staff (Ph.D. students): Suzanne Willever (web, graphics) Research Assistant for NSF assessment (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar room</td>
<td>Seats 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage space</td>
<td>For equipment, files, office supplies etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference room *</td>
<td>Seats 8 (for meetings among staff and faculty members); could be converted to office space if necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The conference room is not an absolute necessity, but would be quite helpful for holding meetings at times when the seminar room is in use.

**Staffing Needs**

In response to the Center's growth, we have developed both professional and clerical staffing needs.

**Professional Staff, Faculty Fellow:** On the professional side, we need a staff member who can contribute to providing services, especially consultations which have expanded 266% despite our not having advertised this service. A faculty fellow working 15-20 hours a week, with a one course buy out for two consecutive semesters, could take on a consultation caseload throughout the academic year. We project that a faculty fellow would cost $15,000 a year. TLC does not have sufficient budget for this position.

**Clerical Staff, Reclassification for Lead Administrative Specialist:** The administrative demands in TLC are growing beyond our Lead Administrative Specialist’s capacity in her full-time position. We propose to reclassify our Lead Administrative Specialist position since it involves far greater responsibility and creativity than was indicated in the original position description. The change in functions is due especially to the new auxiliary, the new certificate program and the two new summer institutes. In order to meet growing administrative and clerical needs, we are restructuring. The restructuring plan, which has already begun, includes two components. The first, which has already been accomplished, is the elimination of a graduate extern/research assistant position (the Lead Administrative Specialist conducts research formerly conducted by the extern). The second is hiring a part-time clerical worker who will relieve the administrative specialist of many clerical duties. We are making no budget requests in this area.
APPENDIX A

Descriptions of New TLC Staff Members

**Associate Director Carol Philips** earned her Ed.D. in Human Development and Psychology from Harvard and has over 30 years of college teaching experience in both studio arts and education. She also brings experience in developing and providing instructional programs at Harvard and Walden Universities.

**Assistant Director Baris Gunersel** earned her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from Texas A&M where she also worked for five years in their Center for Teaching Excellence. She has co-authored six recent articles in the field of teaching and learning.

**Program Coordinator Amy Weigand**, a Temple Ph.D. in Religion, was recently hired to lead a new Inclusive Teaching initiative in 2009-2010. The TLC is collaborating with DRS on this initiative which is funded by a $50,000 grant awarded by Verizon.
## APPENDIX B

**Faculty Enrolled in the Provost’s Teaching Academy 2009 as of 5/29/09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dr. Shohreh Amini</td>
<td>Professor/Dept Chairperson</td>
<td>CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr. Shenid Bhayroo</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>SCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Jean Boyer</td>
<td>Assistant Professor-Teach/Inst</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dr. Natasha Davis</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>CHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Steven Fleming</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dr. Terry Halbert</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>FOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dr. Alistair Howard</td>
<td>Assistant Professor-Teach/Inst</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dr. Daniel Kern</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>SCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ken Finkel</td>
<td>Distinguished Lecturer</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Pred</td>
<td>Assistant Professor-Teach/Inst</td>
<td>FOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Rickie Sanders</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dr. Justin Shi</td>
<td>Associate Professor/Dept Chairperson</td>
<td>CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dr. Juandalynn Taylor</td>
<td>Assistant Professor-Teach/Inst</td>
<td>SCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Tsvetlin Tsankov</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>SCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dr. Amy Weigand</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>CLA, Project EDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Yantorno</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Certificate in Teaching in Higher Education program was conceived in response to a request from community college leaders, conveyed by Provost Lisa, that Temple provide such a program for their faculty. We have developed a Certificate in Teaching in Higher Education that will improve teaching outcomes both at Temple, per our mission, and at partnering community colleges. In order to accomplish these two ends, we have developed the following academic entities:

- Teaching in Higher Education Certificate Program
  - For Temple graduate students
  - For non-matriculated students (primarily community college faculty)
- Teaching in Higher Education Seminar
- Provost’s Teaching Academy.

Additionally, we have established a TLC auxiliary that allows us to secure funding for TLC initiatives.

**Teaching in Higher Education Certificate**

*Temple Graduate Students:* To earn the certificate, matriculated graduate students are required to complete the Teaching in Higher Education Seminar (a three credit course offered in their areas) and an individually designed reflective practicum. Practicum options include: TA group meetings or individual meetings with a disciplinary mentor; disciplinary pedagogy courses with reflective components; TLC reflective practice teaching circle, or a teaching in higher education module offered by the College of Education (see below).

*Non-matriculated students:* The track for non-matriculated students requires completion of the Teaching in Higher Education seminar, tailored to community college teaching, and three additional credits of electives in teaching in higher education offered by the School of Education. Modules under consideration include: Assessing Student Work; The Context of Teaching in Higher Education; Examining Learning Styles; Inclusion, Diversity, and Universal Design; Strategies for Managing a College Classroom; and Effective Uses of Technology.

**Teaching in Higher Education Seminar**

The TLC staff developed the core curriculum of the seminar which will be taught within schools and colleges by disciplinary faculty members who have participated in the Provost’s Teaching Academy. The seminar emphasizes research-based practice and includes the following key issues in higher education pedagogy:

- Research on how people learn and human development
- Course design
- Teaching methods for classes of all sizes
- Diversity and inclusive teaching.
In addition, the seminar includes a module on teaching in specific academic areas. Members of the Provost’s Teaching Academy develop that module for their own areas. (Syllabus attached).

**Provost’s Teaching Academy**

The Provost’s Teaching Academy (PTA) is comprised of a select group of faculty members from across the university. Invited faculty members will participate in a summer section of the Teaching in Higher Education seminar that is facilitated by the TLC professional staff. PTA members will develop a module for the Teaching in Higher Education seminar focused on teaching in their areas, and commit to teaching the seminar, including the area-specific module, to graduate students in their own schools and colleges.

**TLC Auxiliary**

The TLC has established an auxiliary that allows us to secure funding for our initiatives. Tuition collected for TLC staff members’ teaching the Teaching in Higher Education seminar to non-matriculated students will be directed toward supporting offerings of the Provost’s Teaching Academy in summers subsequent to 2009. We are working closely with Extension Services on the logistical arrangements necessary for launching the following seminars in spring 2010:

- Delaware County Community College: We have a commitment from Provost Ginny Carter to launch the course at DCCC where faculty members will enroll as a first step in the Teaching in Higher Education Certificate program.

- Temple Center City: Based on conversations with leaders from the Community College of Philadelphia and Montgomery and Bucks County Community Colleges, we intend to launch an additional section of the Teaching in Higher Education seminar at TUCC.
APPENDIX D

Attendance Data for July 2008-June 2009

In this appendix there are two tables and three figures that indicate TLC attendance. They are:

- Table 1: Attendance by school/college
- Figure 1: Total Served by school/college
- Table 2: Total served by position/title
- Figure 2: Percentage breakdown of total served by position/title
- Figure 3: Frequency of visits

**Table 1: Attendance by school/college**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School College</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>Total Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambler College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Tyler School of</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management, Fox School of</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Theater, School of</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry, Maurice H. Kornberg School of</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, College of</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, College of</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions, College of</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Beasley School of</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts, College of</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, School of</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance, Boyer College of</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy, School of</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podiatric Medicine, School of</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology, College of</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Administration, School of</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>983</strong></td>
<td><strong>1868</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Total served by school and college

Table 2: Total served by position/title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>983</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Percentage breakdown of total served by position/title
Figure 3: Frequency of visits

- Came once: 567, 58%
- Came more than once: 416, 42%
APPENDIX E

TLC programs 2008-2009

Workshops

Beyond Google: Teaching Database Searching Techniques for Course Assignments
Beyond Term Papers and Exams: Aligning Goals, Assignments & Assessments
Blackboard Basics (pre-TA Conference workshop)
Building Active Learning Environments
Creating Learning Goals
Dealing with Difficult Situations in the Classroom
Developing Strategies that Promote Active Learning
Developing Student Understanding through Reflective Assignments
Diversity and Inclusive Teaching
Diversity Workshop: Teaching, Not Cloning
Engaging in Classroom Research: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Engaging Students in Lectures
Interpreting Student Feedback Forms
Learning Differently, Teaching Differently: Ways to Accommodate Various Student Learning Styles
Making Connections: Inclusive Teaching Strategies
Motivating the Millennial Student
PowerPoint Workshop, Part I: PowerPoint Basics
PowerPoint Workshop, Part II: Using PowerPoint as a Teaching Tool
Resources to incorporate quantitative and qualitative data analysis in your classes
Responding to Student Writing
Summer Book Group Discussion as a Way of Teaching
Syllabus Design: From Learning Goals to Learning Opportunities
Targeting Cognitive Processes for Effective Writing Assignments
Teaching and Learning through Small Group Activities
Teaching Effectively and Efficiently
Teaching Portfolios
Teaching with PowerPoint: Best Practices
The Why, What, and How of Rubrics
What Brain Research Means for Your Teaching and Your Students’ Learning

University-wide events and conferences

7th Annual TLC Winter Faculty Conference
Faculty Fieldwork: Observe your colleagues’ teaching
New TA Orientation and Teaching Conference (2days)

Department Workshops

Active Learning at the Russell Conwell Center
Balancing Teaching and Research (IH)
Clinical Teaching, Asking Good Questions (Psychiatry)
Engaging in Classroom Research (Dentistry)
Interdisciplinary Collaborations (Boyer's Music and Dance Teaching Academy)
Peer Review at Engineering
Peer Review at GEEC
Peer Review Workshop at CST department retreat
Questioning for Critical Thinking (FOX honors program)
Read, Think, Engage (FOX)
Teaching American Students (FOX)
Teaching Interview at English
Teaching Medical Residents
Teaching today’s student in higher education (Podiatry retreat)

**Teaching Circles**
- Diversity Teaching Circle
- Globalization Teaching Circle
- Project EDIT: Inclusive Teaching
- SCT New Faculty Seminar
- Sustainability Teaching Circle

**Co-sponsored events**
- Advancing Internationalization (Office of International Affairs)
- Promoting Intergroup Dialogue in the Classroom (Office of Multicultural Affairs)
- Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM) Educators Lecture Series: Sean Brophy, Prudue University (CST, ED, ENG)
- Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM) Educators Lecture Series: Thomas R. Harris, Vanderbilt University (CST, ED, ENG)
- Understanding and Engaging Millennial Generation Students: A Focus Group (Paley Library, Academic Computing)

**Train-the-trainer workshops**
- TA conference facilitator training 1
- TA conference facilitator training 2
- TA conference facilitator training 3
Collaborations with Other Academic Units

• General Education Program: TLC’s Associate Director worked weekly to develop the Philadelphia Experience (PEX), including a January conference on PEX and meeting with individual and small groups of faculty. TLC’s Director met bi-weekly with the four members of the Gen Ed Assessment Team (GAT) to develop and implement an assessment plan. We also collaborated on development of a new peer review process, guidelines for course proposals, and other faculty development initiatives.

• Disability Resource Services: TLC’s Director worked with DRS to write a successful grant proposal to Verizon, which funds the new year-long initiative in Inclusive Teaching called Project EDIT. We hired a coordinator, with whom we are working closely to develop a training curriculum and assessment plan and helped to recruit participating faculty.

• Community Based Learning: The Director and Associate Director have contributed to the development of the proposal for the new community based learning center. They also contributed to developing criteria for designated community based learning courses, advised on creation of community partners board, and consulted on meeting agendas.

• Course and Teaching Evaluation Committee: The Director chaired a subcommittee that drafted a set of recommendations for alternative assessments, namely standards-based peer review and teaching portfolios.

• Intellectual Heritage: The Associate Director consulted on their faculty development programs, including delivery and implementation of their summer faculty development institute.

• Other co-sponsored events included: “Intergroup Dialogue” with Office of Multicultural Affairs, “Teaching the Millennials” with Paley Library and Academic Computing, “Active Learning” with Russell Conwell Center, and “Adjunct Orientations” with Human Resources.

• We provided consultation for administrators and instructors in Office of Multicultural Affairs, Office of First Year Programs, Diamond Peer Teachers, Math Science Resource Center, the University Writing Center, and the Institute for Disabilities.

• Director participated in the revival of the Teaching, Learning, Technology and Research Group.
APPENDIX G

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Publications


Presentations


Gunersel, A. B., Yantorno, R., Cadesky, N., Menon, S. Student improvement and feedback on team-based learning versus lecturing in an electrical engineering course. Accepted poster presentation at the 2009 Annual Conference of the International Society for Exploring Teaching and Learning, Philadelphia, October 2009.

APPENDIX H

Assessment of TLC Programs and Services

In the 2008-2009 academic year TLC programs and services were evaluated with two types of assessments: (1) Workshop evaluations, filled out by participants after a workshop and (2) Quarterly follow-up surveys, filled out by people who have attended various programs and services during a semester (summer, fall, and spring). Both types of assessments have been analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The results are presented below.

A. Workshop Evaluation Forms:

A total of 228 workshop evaluation forms regarding workshops offered between July 2008 and April 2009 were analyzed. The forms had one Likert-scale question (“How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?”) and three open-ended questions, one of which is included in this analysis (“Do you plan to apply any idea learned in this workshop? Please tell us about your plans”).

Quantitative Analysis

The Likert-scale question on the evaluation form was, “How would you rate the overall quality of this workshop?” Participants could choose from four answers: Excellent (4), Good (3), Average (2), and Poor (1). Out of 228 total evaluation forms, 220 had responses to this question.

Descriptive statistics analysis revealed that average of the answers was 3.57 with a standard deviation of .57. The response that was chosen most frequently (the mode) was “Excellent” (N=134, 61% of responses). “Poor” was not marked on any of the evaluation forms. While 35% (N=77) marked “Good,” 4% (N=9) marked “Average” (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Responses to TLC Workshops
Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis focused on responses to the open-ended question, “Do you plan to apply any idea learned in this workshop? Please tell us about your plans.” Responses from 80 randomly selected evaluation forms were transcribed and analyzed.

Out of the 80 responses, 79 of them indicated that the participants would use one or more of the ideas they learned in the workshop. Some participants did not specify which ideas they would use, but emphasized the usefulness of the whole workshop. Examples include:

- “Yes - everything! All practical and relevant.”
- “Great short cuts! Learned a lot.”
- “Yes, I am presently being evaluated and found the information to be extremely useful.”
- “Yes! Helpful tips for assessment, goal setting, and feedback... will use all tips!”

Responses of the sample presented a variety of ways in which the workshops led the instructors wanting to try to use different strategies. Examples of such responses include:

- “I will be more explicit on my ideas, especially on writing and public speech.”
- “I plan to add more demonstration for surgical procedures, maybe have virtual office hours for questions.”
- “Yes. I'll try using a grading rubric and will sequence writing assignments.”
- “Yes, I plan on using the ’2 quotation’ technique and a discussion/group talk on at the beginning or end of class.”

The only person who did not respond with an affirmative wrote, “Not sure, I was scared away from anything too technical.”

B. TLC Services Surveys (Quarterly Follow-Up Surveys):

Between September 2008 and May 2009, the TLC conducted three surveys through zoomerang.com to get feedback on the participation and quality of its services. The launch dates for the surveys were September 17th, 2008 (the Summer 2008 Survey), January 23rd, 2009 (the Fall 2008 Survey), and April 9th, 2009 (the Spring 2009 Survey).

A total of 240 people who participated in TLC activities or utilized TLC resources filled out the quarterly follow-up surveys (23 people in Summer 2008, 112 in Fall 2008, and 105 in Spring 2009). The majority of the participants were from the College of Liberal Arts (28.7%). 11% were from the School of Communications and Theater, 9% were from the College of Education, and 8.7% were from the College of Science and Technology (for numbers and percentages, see Table 1) ¹.

Each survey consisted of one Likert-scale question, two questions with answer choices, and four open-ended questions. Questions were:

- “Program(s) or service(s) used (please check all that apply)” (Answer choices provided)

1 Tables are presented at the end of the document.
• How useful was/were the program(s) or service(s)? (Answer choices: Very Useful, Useful, Somewhat Useful, Not Useful.)
• Please share your comments or suggestions about the program or service.
• Have you discussed teaching or what you learned through TLC programs and services with a colleague you met at TLC or other colleagues? (one or both choices)
• If you have tried anything new or made any change to your teaching, based on your participation in a TLC program or service, please let us know. What have you tried?
• How did it work? (Consider evidence of students’ responses and student learning, as well as your own experience of the change.)
• Please describe any differences in your understanding of teaching and learning that you would attribute to your experience with TLC programs or services.

This report presents the quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted with the responses to the surveys. Survey responses have been aggregated.

**Quantitative Analysis**

Participants indicated that they attended a variety of programs. Table 2 presents percentages from each survey separately, since the list of TLC programs was specific to the three time periods and could not be aggregated. (The percentages do not add up to 100, since participants could choose more than one program or service they attended.)

The two questions that could be analyzed quantitatively were:

(1) “How useful was/were the program(s) or service(s)?” (a Likert-scale question with choices “Very Useful, Useful, Somewhat Useful,” and “Not Useful”)

(2) “Have you discussed teaching or what you learned through TLC programs and services with a colleague you met at TLC or other colleagues?” (one or both could be chosen).

Responses to the first question indicated that out of a total of 239 responses, 52% (N=124) found TLC’s programs and services “very useful” and 32.6% (N=78) found TLC’s programs and services “useful” (see Figure 2 and Table 3). Only 13% found TLC’s programs and services “somewhat useful” and 2.5% found them “not useful.”

Responses to the second question indicated that 36% of the participants discussed teaching or what they learned at the TLC with a colleague they met at the TLC and 64% of the participants discussed such topics with other colleagues (see Table 4). Since participants could choose both responses, there may be participants who chose both, which cannot be determined.
Qualitative Analysis

There were three open-ended questions in the surveys which are presented in this section. In the Summer 2008 Survey, there was an additional open-ended question: “Why did you try it?” Participant responses were aggregated and analyzed.

Question 1: “Please share your comments or suggestions about the program or service.”

A total of 147 participants responded to this question (19 in Summer 2008, 66 in Fall 2008, and 62 in Spring 2009). Participants typically referred to specific TLC programs, although most did not specify the title of the programs. Some examples include: “Excellent one-on-one consultation regarding upgrading a course project, incorporating it into Blackboard, changing course evaluation metrics, and using specific technology” and “This was a great session. I only wish that it lasted longer.”

Some of the responses addressed TLC programs in general and all of such comments were positive. For example:

- “There are great opportunities to discuss teaching. The access to TLC programs is impressive. The range of topics is also to be commended.”
- “I really appreciate the way that many of these programs provide opportunity for immediate application in the classroom.”
- “I was greatly impressed by high impact programs and I found them very helpful in regards to introducing new concepts and findings in the teaching and learning field.”
• “The programs at TLC are rewarding to the faculty.”

Overall, participants found the programs in which they participated useful. For example, some comments about a workshop on syllabi design were: “Very informative program. I ended up redesigning my syllabi because of what I took away from the session” and “(The facilitator) offered to follow up with a 1:1 review of my syllabus. That, combined with the workshop, was tremendously valuable.”

Several participants made comments about the TA Orientation 2008. Responses were often positive and sometimes mixed. For example, one participant noted, “Roundtables were NOT helpful--too many people trying to talk at once. Seminars w/ people who had done what we were doing were EXTREMELY helpful. More of those!” Another participant wrote, “I was absolutely nervous about my teaching assignment but became confident after attending the conference. I learned some important skills about class preparation generating discussions in class.”

Several participants commented on the 2009 Winter Faculty Conference. Comments include: “The speaker was engaging and enthusiastic. The conversations at our table were also helpful in gaining other perspectives about promoting critical thinking;” “I really enjoyed the winter faculty conference, and thought it was very well done. There were some space issues in some of the breakout sessions, but I guess more people is better than fewer;” and “Used time very effectively-lecture plus break-out groups. Perhaps more handouts would have been useful.”

Some participants offered suggestions in their responses. Some suggestions include:

• “We need more programs on assessment and evaluation of teaching.”
• “My teaching schedule often conflicts w/programs you offer. It would be great if you could post PowerPoints for the presentations for those of us that can't be there.”
• “I would attend TLC more, but the scheduling conflicts are nearly unerring. If you could offer more replicates spread over a few days, I suspect you'd find others in the same boat.”

Question 2: “If you have tried anything new or made any change to your teaching, based on your participation in a TLC program or service, please let us know. What have you tried?”

A total of 146 participants responded to this question (14 in summer 2008, 62 in fall 2008, 70 in spring 2009). Responses either expressed the general usefulness of TLC programs or presented what new strategies participants used. Some comments focusing on the general usefulness of TLC programs include: “I realized the challenges I face are being faced by many faculty and that I had some good solutions and ideas for putting the TLC subject into action” and “(A workshop) refreshes a lot of things I have learned before and excites to try new ideas.”

Responses indicated that TLC programs not only provided participants with several new and useful strategies that they used in their classes, but also led participants to approach their teaching and their students’ learning differently. Examples include:

• “I tried to formulate more in-class assessments as a result of attending a TLC session.”
• “Course delivery in large lecture to be more interactive and participatory.”
• “I designed homework assignments that "elicit higher order thinking" by my students in my classes.”
• “Involving the students more in discussions. Trying to avoid boring lecture format.”
• “Experimenting with approaches to increase student engagement in class.”

Question 3: “How did it work?” (Consider evidence of students’ responses and student learning, as well as your own experience of the change.)

A total of 126 participants responded to this question (12 in summer 2008, 51 in fall 2008, 63 in spring 2009). Almost all of the participants indicated that they observed positive results after using the new strategy, while a few were still assessing how the strategy worked. Positive responses include:

• “Very well; I think my students this semester get a better sense of the course information as a result of structured class discussion.”
• “Student response was enthusiastic about material that I had told them was going to be somewhat experimental, but turned out to be exactly what motivated their learning.”
• “So far: Raised energy levels and increased classroom culture. I learned not to fear taking time away from dispensing content.”
• “Students seem much more engaged and responsive when they’re asked to interact and think than when they’re spoon fed.”
• “I feel that the modifications to my teaching that I have done based on TLC seminars have been hugely useful and improved my teaching.”

A few of the responses indicated that the participants had mixed experiences with the new strategy. Some of the participants criticized the students in relation to the new strategy. Examples include:

• “It worked well in that students benefitted from having time to refresh their memories about the readings and collect their thoughts for discussion. However, there were still a handful students who showed up unprepared.”
• “Discussion techniques worked well. Critical thinking, not so well because students are conditioned to the banking method of learning and too many were resistant.”
• “The students learned more but the workload caused a ton of complaints.”

One participant demonstrated his or her engagement in self-reflection and wrote: “Varied experiences. I need to be more comfortable with silences and letting students think through their responses.”

Question 4: “Please describe any differences in your understanding of teaching and learning that you would attribute to your experience with TLC programs or services.”

A total of 108 participants responded to this question (14 in summer 2008, 46 in fall 2008, 48 in spring 2009). Responses to this question were overwhelmingly positive and mostly indicated what participants gained through TLC programs. Examples include:
• “I realized that I am not the only one who has difficulty getting students to do class readings.”
• “New techniques and ideas for incorporating/managing classroom and student learning experience.”
• “Recognition of the value of providing services for faculty to help improve teaching.”
• “It has made me more aware of trying to view my courses through the eyes of my students.”
• “More reflection of what I am doing and why it works (or does not work).”
• “I have learned that it is essential to design lectures and presentations with the understanding that there a different types of learners attending my program.”

Several of the participants explained how TLC helped them in various ways. Examples include:

• “TLC keeps my approach to thinking fresh and centered.”
• “My TLC experiences have given me more courage to break out of the received model of college teaching, and I can never overstate the value of that.”
• “TLC programs and in particular professional workshops have exhibited their positive influence in class by increasing my experiences and ability of teaching.”
• “Since the academic focus of the TLC experience is centered on the teaching/learning process, the workshops give me the motivation, time, and space to consider ways to develop this area of my professional expertise.”

A few participants expressed their appreciation for the TLC. Examples include:

• “In general, I appreciate the commitment TLC staff have to helping instructors improve their work and I enjoy meeting faculty and TAs from other departments.”
• “After taking TLC workshops, I realized its actual impact on my teaching skills and my improved knowledge of significant learning.”
# Table 1: Participants’ Schools and Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Summer 08</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambler College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Tyler School of Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management, Fox School of Dentistry, Maurice H. Kornberg School of Education, College of Engineering, College of Health Professions, College of Law, Beasley School of Liberal Arts, College of Medicine, School of Music and Dance, Boyer College of Pharmacy, School of Podiatric Medicine, School of Science and Technology, College of Social Administration, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, School of Other affiliation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dentistry, Maurice H. Kornberg School of Education, College of Engineering, College of Health Professions, College of Law, Beasley School of Liberal Arts, College of Medicine, School of Music and Dance, Boyer College of Pharmacy, School of Podiatric Medicine, School of Science and Technology, College of Social Administration, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, School of Other affiliation</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2: Responses to question: “Program(s) or service(s) used (please check all that apply)”

### Summer 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Book Group. Discussion as a Way of Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus Design: From Learning Goals to Learning Opportunities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program in school/dept. (on assessment, peer review, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teaching consultation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA Orientation &amp; Conference</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Circle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program in School/department</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop at TLC</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fieldwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consultation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TLC program or service, please specify</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Faculty Conference 2009</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Circle: Sustainability, Diversity, Globalization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program in School/department</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop at TLC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consultation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TLC program or service, please specify</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Responses to question: “How useful was/were the program(s) or services(s)?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 08</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Responses to question: “Have you discussed teaching or what you learned through TLC programs and services with....”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 08</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Spring 09</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A colleague you met at TLC?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colleagues?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>