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This study focused on leaders of teaching and learning centers, typically faculty, who have developed a strong teaching and research portfolio, and are respected by their peers. The researcher conducted a mixed-methods study to understand how academic leaders of teaching and learning centers (the middle managers), could utilize Stewart’s (1976) leadership theory of demands, constraints, and choices. Understanding the effect institutional culture and administrative policies can have on their leadership of a faculty TLC, will better inform them as to the challenges they face in performing and leading.

Data acquisition was accomplished through a survey sent to the members of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network comprising leaders of TLCs, supervisors of the leaders, and faculty/staff members of the TLCs. The survey was created and administered using the Qualtrics Survey™ platform.

The findings from this research has strong implications for these leaders as it is important for them to be mentored, trained, and guided to be competent within their TLC and educational institution. A weakness found in the findings was the absence of documentation in training for leaders of TLCs, how to address administrative policies and politics, and understanding the effect of institutional culture on their leadership.
CHAPTER ONE
Introduction to the Study

Background

Every organization deals with the challenge of leadership as it relates to competition, guidance of employees’ work, the professional conduct between employee and employer, and how best to maintain balance between managing and leading. In his writing on Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail, Kotter (1995/2007) defined leadership as a set of processes that creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Additionally, leaders are challenged to define a vision for their organization, lead staff members by example, and at the same time understand the demands of their superiors in order to align and manage the direction of their units to that of the overall organization. Kotter (1995/2007) illustrated the differences between managing and leading. Managing includes planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving. All necessary and important processes, but in the realm of leadership, the need for transformational leadership requires positive change for those being lead.

The study of leaders and leadership qualities has been extensively documented in the corporate fields, from the line manager to the chief operating officer (Northouse, 2010). This has not been the same in higher education, and certainly not in the area of centers supporting faculty professional development. In the burgeoning field of on-line course offerings, universities have begun to increase their presence as they grapple with
low enrollments due to increasing tuition costs and competition from for-profit universities and community colleges. At the same time, universities are being subjected to increasing scrutiny and external intervention (Cameron & Tschirhart, 1992; Gumport & Sporn, 1999) with the result being a new “managerial” culture (Bess & Goldman, 2002). In the need to address economic efficiency which ultimately affects the bottom line, university leaders are shifting from what Bess and Goldman (2002), called a “political or collegial frame to a bureaucratic or structural frame” (p. 420). The leaders of these units and organizations must be committed, not only to the vision of educational and student success, but also to the continued viability of their graduates to society and industry. The actions of the leaders must align with and to the vision of the institution in order that they may fully influence all employees (staff and faculty) to meet the institution’s goals (Northouse, 2010).

Higher education institutions are constantly being challenged to provide opportunities for change for their faculty by improving the integration of teaching, research, and public service as a means of strengthening the faculty professional responsibility to the university (Schumann, Peters, & Olsen, 2013). In an effort to support faculty in their work, higher education administrators have created teaching and learning programs and centers with the priority to support faculty in teaching, advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning, and supporting the use of new information technologies in teaching, research, and library services to enhance course materials (Bartlett, 2002), amongst other services. The rise of centers of teaching and learning allow higher education institutions “to search for synergies or balance between their scholarly pursuits and commitment to teaching excellence” (Singer, 2002, p. 63). As
more universities increase offerings of some type of faculty development program support (Kuhlenschmidt, 2011), the highest rate of growth of teaching and learning centers has been created among small, four-year private institutions of higher learning (Fink, 2013). Fink found that within these small colleges, there is a push to increase the knowledge of faculty in various pedagogical methodologies such as active learning, small group learning, and instructional technology. There are also learning opportunities offered to faculty members to ensure constant upgrade of their skills and collaboration to learning and research communities through conferences and workshops that are mutually beneficial to the institution and to the faculty. These teaching and learning centers provide professional support to faculty (Wilkerson & Irby, 1998) through instructional developers/designers, media production staff, and faculty consultants who provide faculty mentoring, research opportunities through scholarship of teaching and learning, and teacher evaluation of practice.

The history of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions has seen greater investment in faculty development (Miller & Groccia, 2011) because of the influence of innovative instructional practices, educational programs that promote student success, and greater integration of information technologies in teaching and learning. As centers have increased their support for faculty in their teaching, a number of faculty centers are engaged in offering scholarly writing, career advancement, and leadership development (Lee, 2010) as additional service offerings for faculty members.

The challenges faced by directors of these centers range from justifying, defending, and showing relevance of the center’s effort to the mission of the university, to securing funding for the center’s existence. Many of these leaders are either former
faculty or existing faculty who are in their first experience as middle managers in higher education (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2005). Generally reporting to a provost or vice-president, they are tasked with directly supporting instructional improvement, student success, and faculty effectiveness while facing the prospect of having their services undercut or closed. It is timely for research to identify the leadership qualities best supportive of leaders of teaching and learning centers by looking at the demands, constraints, and choices they face and how best to meet these challenges of change. It is important for these new and emerging leaders to be mentored, trained, and guided to be competent within their department and educational institution.

Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study

A framework to understand the challenges faced by these leaders of teaching and learning centers is through Stewart’s (1976; 1982) research on demands, constraints, and choices that described a model to interpret the challenges faced by leaders and managers toward understanding their perception of the challenges affecting their job. Demands are what anyone in the job has to do, and is described as job requirements, goals of the position, the type of work involved in carrying out the job, the amount of supervisory experience the leader must have, as well as the required supervision and communications with personnel within the unit (Kroeck, 2003). Constraints are the factors, internal or external, which limit what the jobholder can do, and includes “available resources, legal constrictions, technological limitations, and dependence on the attitudes of others” (Kroeck, 2003, p. 205) within and outside of the unit. Other constraints consist of the competence and performance of members of the unit, available facilities for workshops, required technology for training, and being able to provide funding in support of services
being demanded. Choices are the activities that the jobholder can do, but does not have to do. The leader is able to exercise his or her choices by how they will actually perform the work, how much of the work they will actually delegate, and how much energy they will dedicate outside the domains important to the unit and the institution (Kroeck, 2003).

The leader in the education institutions is challenged to model his or her school, which Hiatt-Michael (2001) defined, “as a learning community, incorporating both the qualities of a learning organization and that of a defined community of learners” (p. 114). Stewart sought to identify both the similarities and differences managers spend in their jobs, and concluded that leaders who have a distinctive and consistent style of leadership are more effective than leaders who vacillate because staff members know where they stand with their leader. The effectiveness of these leaders is based on how well they manage the challenges of demands, constraints, and choices of administrative policies and institutional culture on the centers. Additionally, the organizational culture in some cases can provide more constraints to the job than the job itself, through the limiting choices and/or decisions the leader can or cannot do.

Organizations deal with the challenge of leadership as it relates to competition, guidance of employees’ work, the professional conduct between employee and employer, and how best to maintain balance between managing and leading. Kotter (1995/2007) defined leadership as a “set of processes that creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances” (p. 25). Additionally, leaders are challenged to define a vision for their organization, lead staff members by example, and, at the same time, understand the demands of their superiors in order to “align and manage the direction of the centers to that of the overall organization” (p. 25). Kotter
(1995/2007) illustrated the differences between managing and leading. Managing includes planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving. These are all necessary and important processes but in the realm of transformational leadership, there is a need for “leadership which can motivate actions to alter behavior in major ways” (p. 30). In Mintzberg’s (1973) taxonomy of roles, he stated managers must seek to provide guidance to staff members, ensure motivation, and create favorable conditions for growth and doing the work.

The literature on leadership styles includes transformational leadership traits which are documented in organizational behavior and individual performance. Rooke and Torbert (2005/2011) in their paper *Seven Transformations of Leadership* described leaders as opportunist, diplomat, expert, achiever, individualist, strategist, and alchemist – leadership traits that persons develop as their leadership abilities grow and evolve. For higher education institutions, the strategist presents the more stable of leadership roles that is needed. Rooke and Torbert (2005/2011) wrote that for leaders, it is their internal “action logic” (p. 137) that determines how they interpret their surroundings and react when their power of safety is challenged. These leadership traits and skills are many times learned through experiences rather than from formal training programs (Yukl, 2001). As indicated by Yukl (2001), coaching and mentoring can be used to help managers interpret their experiences and learn new skills. Based on research on development of leadership skills, learning from experience is affected by the amount of challenges in assignments provided, the variety of tasks and assignments, and the quality of the feedback (Dragoni, Tesluk, Russell, & Oh, 2009; Mumford, Campion, & Morgeson, 2009).
Leadership is a combination of traits, styles, skills, and situational approaches that influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2010). Northouse (2010) defined the emergence of situational leadership theory as a means of determining organizational transformation, which provided opportunities for organizations to train and develop their leaders. The professional development of these leaders provided opportunities for changes in their leadership style and behaviors, strengthening their awareness to adapt to the requirements and demands of the work situations. The study of leaders and leadership qualities has been extensively documented in the corporate fields, from the line manager to the chief operating officer (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Northouse, 2010). The pressures of increasing efficiency and achievement in higher education has held presidents accountable to ensure more management of the institution and less on the collegial practices in decision making (Waugh, 2003). These types of decisions have, in turn, affected the performance and direction of academic departments and faculty support units such as teaching and learning centers.

The history of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions has seen greater investment in faculty development (Miller & Groccia, 2011) because of the influence of innovative instructional practices, educational programs that promote student success, and the wider use of technology in teaching. Fewer faculty centers are engaging in scholarly writing, career advancement, and leadership development (Lee, 2010), as more higher education institutions focus on student engagement, on-line and blended course design, large course redesigns, and wider use of technology in teaching and learning.
The establishment of teaching and learning centers at higher education institutions sought to address three key important needs for faculty, the institution, and the growing educational challenges facing students. Fink (2013) described these needs as a campus-wide program which sought to support faculty to acquire and implement “better ideas about teaching and educational programs” (p. 251); providing professionals who are knowledgeable with the literature on teaching in college, and can provide professional development in teaching and learning; and finally supporting faculty with access to varying ideas on active learning, group dynamics, and the effective use of technology in teaching and learning.

The leaders of the teaching and learning centers have to be agents of change at their respective institution to advocate for resources and services in a time when universities are expanding their class sizes, pushing for less lecturing in the classroom and more active learning for their students, and embracing the increase of blended and on-line courses to accommodate larger student populations within their system (Poon, 2013). The demands, constraints, and choices placed on the leaders of teaching and learning center, begins with organizational change (Fink, 2013), which will provide faculty with the necessary professional and instructional development support in teaching and learning to create significant learning experiences for faculty and students.

As middle-level leaders of academic units in higher education institutions, they are faced with competing interests from their direct reports and from their supervisors to meet the demands of the job and addressing the constraints and choices that come with decisions and directions of their units. Inman (2009) showed that providing professional development for these middle-level leaders is very important in their development to
provide “structured succession planning” (p. 492) that will support their careers as leader-academics. What is needed is a formal professional development system, which establishes a mentoring system of support, supports the creation of meaningful networks, has professional communities of like-minded leaders, and allows for important reflection of practice, to support these leaders in their work (Inman, 2009).

**Statement of the Problem**

The role of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) in higher education institutions is to provide professional and developmental support for several functions. Singer (2002) itemized these as pedagogical and technological practices in developing and implementing blended and on-line courses, faculty mentoring, course assessments, writing seminars, workshops on teaching and learning, and literature and book reading circles. The TLCs also support faculty engaging in research to broaden the understanding of scholarship for teaching and learning, and providing teaching and learning grant opportunities. These teaching and learning centers are known by many names ranging from teaching and learning centers, teaching and learning development units, learning and teaching centers, faculty center for teaching and learning, academic support centers, center for teaching excellence, or center for teaching among others. The TLCs primary purpose is to “develop and implement faculty development programs” (Herman, 2013, p. 33), as a means of helping faculty improve student learning and student educational success in higher education institutions.

The Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of Kansas (The University of Kansas, n.d.) has links to centers in the Americas and around the world. As stated by Singer (2002), these centers have provided significant contributions in the form of
supporting campus-wide conversations on the future of teaching and learning in higher education, as well as quality support to new and experienced faculty. As the visibility and support from TLCs to tenure practices has increased, the leaders of the TLCs are increasingly being encouraged “to become liaisons between faculty innovators and academic leaders for the design and implementation of assessment of programmatic or curricular reform efforts” (Singer, 2002, p. 63). These leaders are usually full-time faculty managing the TLCs or faculty members who have transitioned to the position as a middle manager in higher education.

This research seeks to address two problems experienced by leaders of TLCs, namely, a gap in research on the demands, constraints, and choices faced by leaders of teaching and learning centers, and the impact of administrative policies and institutional culture on the leadership of TLCs. The need to discover research data on the type of leader (the middle manager) favorable for TLCs is paramount to this research as it is important for these new and emerging leaders to be mentored, trained, and guided on using proven leadership approaches toward competency within their educational institution.

Bolman and Gallos (2011), described the successful strategies used by these middle managers as, “(1) being able to listen, understand, and respect differences; (2) look for mutual gains; and (3) stay alert to system dynamics and take new leadership stands” (p. 2). The researcher sought to provide data showing how demands, constraints, and choices can have an effect on these leaders, which in turn will guide the necessary leadership development training, mentorship, institutional support, professional
experience, and educational background needed to excel as a leader of a teaching and learning unit in higher education institutions.

Even as most faculty development programs focus on the faculty member as teacher (Sorcinelli, Gray, & Birch, 2011) or as the “sage on the stage” (King, 1993, p. 30), there is a critical need to expand these offerings toward many other areas, such as blended and on-line teaching, course transformation, research, collaborative writing, teaching statistics, and student learning, among others. Sheets and Schwenk (1990) gave their definition of faculty development as, “Any planned activity to improve an individual’s knowledge and skills considered essential to the performance of a faculty member in a department (e.g., teaching skills, administrative skills, research skills, and clinical skills)” (p. 145).

By providing mixed-methods data showing how the leadership theory of demands, constraints, and choices affects these leaders, the researcher will gain a better understanding of the type of leadership qualities needed to excel in the role of director of faculty teaching and learning centers. This researcher sought to illustrate the various demands, constraints, and choices (Stewart, 1982a), which are placed on these leaders by his or her institution, and identify the perceived impact of the leaders’ actions on staff members and the center. By addressing how activities the jobholder can do, or not do, can affect his or her leadership, the researcher will examine the various internal and external factors which limit what the jobholder can do, and identify the perceived impact of the institution’s administrative policies and institutional culture on the job the leader/director has to do. The ability of academic leaders to motivate faculty and their expectation of the institution is very crucial as the subject of policies and institutional
culture (Neal and Peed-Neal, 2010) play a major role in facilitating the involvement of the faculty in instructional development programs. Felder, Brent, and Prince (2011) showed that maximizing the impact of instructional development programs had a positive effect on institutional teaching quality. Fink (2013) proposed that institutional leaders should expand the traditional work of faculty from teaching, research, and service to that of teaching, research, service, and professional development as a means of positioning faculty on a “growth curve professionally which our institutions would benefit enormously” (p. 244). This change coming from administrators would provide supportive administrative policies and an institutional culture that rewards and recognizes professional development as on par with the traditional work of faculty.

While evidence of leadership theory of demands, constraints, and choices on managerial work and behavior has been studied in the corporate business world in great detail, no such relationship has been ascertained with mid-level directors of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions. The leaders of teaching and learning centers are constantly seeking to manage change in an environment which faces administrative policies that call for greater faculty support and competing needs for utilizing technology in greater effect in teaching and learning. The institutional culture is one of balancing the financial needs and educational visions of administrative leaders such as presidents and provosts, while ensuring academic freedom for faculty in the delivery of teaching and scholarly work.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the demands, constraints, and choices faced by mid-level leaders of the primary teaching and learning
centers in higher education institutions, and the effect of administrative policies and institutional culture on their leadership of the centers. By using a mixed-methods research approach to the investigation of the leader’s perceptions, this researcher sought to ascertain how leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions dealt with the demands, constraints and choices (Stewart, 1982a) placed on them to perform. By motivating their direct reports in the face of increasing demands to support faculty developing and teaching courses, especially on-line courses, these leaders have had to diverge from constraints of only supporting development of courses, and increase their service offerings with faculty mentors, learning communities, writing support, book and peer-reviewed article discussions, and opportunities in researching scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).

The researcher selected the directors of teaching and learning centers to ascertain the leadership challenges they face based on the administrative policies and institutional culture of their respective institutions. This researcher sought to gather survey data from members of the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD Network, n.d.) in Higher Education which number approximately 1,800 members and acts as the supporting organization for these directors (Herman, 2013). The purpose of POD has revolved around providing improvement of faculty teaching activities, instructional collaboration, using technology in teaching and learning, pedagogical methodologies, and organizational guidance on teaching and learning for higher education institutions (Sorcinelli & Austin, 2010). As the oldest and largest professional association (incorporated in 1974), the POD Network membership has supported educational development of scholars and practitioners in North America. The POD Network thus
became the established organization to survey directors of teaching and learning centers including academic leaders who supported these centers, and staff and faculty developers who work in such a center.

Faculty instructional methods are constantly evolving to deal with the widening modalities of course delivery including traditional face-to-face classes, blended (mix of on-line and face-to-face courses), and fully on-line courses. Additionally, greater populations of individuals are attending colleges and universities leading to wider course offerings, larger classroom sizes to accommodate greater student populations, and more intensive use of technology to address instruction. Coupled with this is a diverse student population which has impacted faculty teaching in addressing different learning styles, demographic needs, and the requirement of implementing universal design of teaching to support students with learning and physical disabilities.

The creation of faculty learning communities (Cox, 2004) is one method of having groups of early, medium, and senior faculties collaborate to facilitate group discussion and workshops supporting the enrichment of their professional development as educators. As stated by Stevenson, Duran, Barrett, and Colarulli (2005) the use of faculty learning communities “reaps multiple benefits both for the participating faculty members and for the students who participate in the learning communities” (p. 35), thus building stronger faculty collaboration in teaching, service, research, and student engagement.

Universities have instituted tenure-track responsibilities as part of the workload of faculty. These responsibilities cover research (scholarly work showing continued professional growth), teaching (facilitation of education and learning for students) and service (community-centered work ensuring commitment to the growth of the institution
and the community). As the student population has increased, more universities, to meet the needs of the students and to address lower institutional funds for permanent staff, have incorporated non-tenure (adjunct) faculty as part of the instructional staff to meet these needs. The success of student learning and development is affected greatly by faculty instructional practices which seek to instill student engagement, learning, transfer of learning through student-created work, and assessments that provide an opportunity for students to showcase what they have learned in tangible ways.

The overall purpose of professional learning is what Webster-Wright (2009) described as helping faculty move from being instructors to becoming learning facilitators. Webster-Wright defined professional learning as comprising three main assumptions, namely, (a) learning through experience, (b) learning from reflective action, and (c) learning mediated by context. Webster-Wright also stated that experience comes from observing others, and from experiential engagement; learning from reflective action comes from questioning ones' teaching and learning assumptions, and then making changes based on transformation; learning mediated by context comes from active learning through active engagement in practice.

The examination of demands, constraints, and choices on leaders was important to this study because it was hoped it would be possible to identify the characteristics and factors contributing to significant differences in leader relationships with staff members versus administrative leaders and faculty. The studying of managerial behavior generally captures aspects of leadership dynamics, leader-to-staff relationships, and the challenges leaders face. The second part of the study asked respondents to identify the attributes of
demands, constraints, and choices the leaders face and how the effect of administrative policies and institutional culture affected their leadership styles.

**Research Questions**

There is a need to explore the possible connections between the perceptions of administrative leaders of teaching and learning centers (TLC) to the demands, constraints, and choices in managing these TLCs. Additionally, this research sought to determine how administrative policies and institutional culture affected the performance of TLCs as it related to faculty professional development. The focus of this study leads to the following research questions, namely:

1. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture?
2. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture?
3. Given the demands and constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture, what are the choices available to leaders of teaching and learning centers?

**Design of the Study**

The objective of this study was to send an electronic survey with both open- and closed-ended questions to leaders and faculty/staff consultants who are actively involved in teaching and learning centers in various roles as leaders or mid-level managers (tenure track and non-tenure track) in higher education institutions. This study sought to ascertain how the demands, constraints, and choices of decision making affected these leaders of teaching and learning centers in their ability to promote, lead, and support their
department, including the challenges brought by the administrative policies and institutional culture of their respective institution.

The findings from this study will be beneficial to leaders of teaching and learning centers and their direct supervisor to understand the demands, constraints and choices placed on these leaders, and the type of leadership qualities favorable to the successful operations of teaching and learning centers. The teaching and learning centers are agents of change, and the leaders of these centers have to be part of the transformation by understanding the different knowledge, skills, dispositions, and ability needed beyond just being managers (Gardiner, 2005). As stated by Kotter (1996), “successful transformation is 70 to 90 percent leadership and only 10 to 30 percent management” (p. 26). In his book on *Leading Change*, Kotter (1996) described eight steps required for leading a successful institution toward organizational transformation, a methodology that has the potential to teach, mentor, manage learning, and lead others toward effectiveness within their circle of responsibility. Additionally, leadership training and mentoring could be identified as advantageous to faculty and other instructional leaders to excel in these positions as leaders of change and increase the effectiveness of their respective units. (Ferman, 2002; Gardiner, 2005; McDonald & Stockley, 2008; Solansky, 2010).

The primary participants of this survey (See Appendix A) will be directors and leaders of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) in higher education institutions who provide instructional support to faculty toward their teaching, service, and research responsibilities. The researcher is an instructional designer/technologist who works in a teaching and learning center providing this same support and is knowledge of both the discipline and the institutional structure of TLCs, and has access to the POD
organization, through which the survey will be provided to participants within this organization. The procedures of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) will be adhered to for the proper conduct of research, and ensuring the safety and privacy of participants. The IRB of the researcher’s institution and that of the POD governing body will be given the IRB application in order to gain permission to conduct the survey.

The approach of the study used a mixed-methods analysis research to address a problem of practice using, as stated by Creswell (2009), a means to exploring and understanding a group of individuals and the social challenges they faced in their work responsibilities. The rationale for using mixed-methods research was to (Creswell, 2009) capture the perspectives of these leaders as a basis for their actions in the social setting of providing teaching and learning support to faculty in higher education. A mixed-methods approach allowed for merging quantitative and qualitative data “in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research problem” (Creswell, 2009, p. 15). The collection of both forms of data allows the researcher to integrate both data in the interpretation of the general results.

The institution identified to receive the survey for this study is the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD) in Higher Education comprising approximately 1,800 members. As suggested by Krueger and Casey (2009), the researcher used, in conjunction with the quantitative questions, qualitative questions such as open-ended questions, to allow participants to provide full and more detailed answers as a means of explaining their knowledge and feelings.
Definition of Key Terms

The following section provides information on the key terms and concepts relevant to this study. The terms and concepts are defined and discussed to provide organization and clarity. Each of the definitions provided will allow readers to have an overview of this study with supporting citations provided where deemed necessary.

**Academic Leadership.** Within the context of this study, the term of academic leadership refers to the director of teaching and learning centers (TLC). Leadership can be the process which according to Antelo, Henderson, and St. Clair (2010) “emerges from interactions between the leader and the follower. The interactions may show varying degrees of the quality and effectiveness that help leaders and followers accomplish challenging and demanding organizational goals” (p. 10).

**Administrative Policies.** In this research study, administrative policies in higher education institutions is defined by Cox, McIntosh, Reason, and Terenzini (2011) as “policies which shape the institution’s faculty culture in a way that increases the use of effective instructional practices (Institutional Policy > Faculty Culture > Instructional Practice)” (p. 809).

**Choices.** Stewart (1982a) defined choices as the activities that the jobholder can do, but does not have to do.

**Constraints.** Stewart (1982a) defined constraints as the factors, internal or external, that limit what the jobholder can do.

**Demands.** Stewart (1976) defined demands as jobs made by working with other people and by the work pattern that the job may impose - that is, “what any jobholder must do apart from the specialist content of the job” (p. 27).
Educational Development. Fraser, Gosling, and Sorcinelli (2010) referred to educational development “as the field of professional and strategic development associated with university and college learning and teaching” (p. 49). Over the years, faculty development has evolved to the term educational development which is described by Felten, Kalish, Pingree, and Plank (2007) as “a profession dedicated to helping colleges and universities function effectively as teaching and learning communities” (p. 93).

Faculty Development. Sheets and Schwenk (1990) gave the definition of faculty development as “any planned activity to improve an individual’s knowledge and skills in areas considered essential to the performance of a faculty member in a department or a residency program (e.g., teaching skills, administrative skills, research skills, clinical skills)” (p. 145). Steinert (2000) defined it further as a scholarly activity critical for “encouraging and rewarding educational leadership, innovation, excellence” (p. 45), and the “key to academic vitality” (p. 49). Faculty development programs range from promoting scholarship and academic success, instructional development for teaching improvement, leadership development for curricular planning and change, and organizational development to influence policies, procedures and culture of the organization (Wilkerson & Irby, 1998).

Faculty Learning Communities. Faculty learning communities (FLC) is defined by Cox (2004) as a “cross-disciplinary faculty and staff group comprised of six to fifteen members (eight to twelve members is the recommended size) who engage in an active, collaborative, yearlong program with a curriculum focused on enhancing teaching and learning” (p. 8). Cox further describes this group as meeting with “frequent seminars and
activities which provide learning, professional development, and opportunities for scholarship of teaching and learning, and community building” (p. 8).

Faculty Professional Development. A faculty professional development program provides faculty, administrators, and staff with the knowledge and skills required to reach stated goals for student teaching and learning (Diamond, 2005). Examples are “offering workshops, leadership seminars, consultation to faculty, administrators, and staff with a focus on using the research on learning and student development, change, and pedagogy” (p. 32). Diamond also describes other programs offered as including topics such as “technology, new forms of instruction, writing learning outcomes, leadership, and assessment” (p. 32).

Institutional Culture. Kezar and Eckel (2002), described institutional culture as the “deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organization or its work” (p. 438).

Instructional Designers. Otherwise known as faculty developers, these instructional designers work with a diverse cross-section of individuals within the university in the development of courses, writing curriculum, and the use of technology in teaching and learning. The individuals the instructional designers work with range from provosts, deans and directors, and faculty members to technology experts, instructional designers, campus planners, and graduate teaching assistants (Dawson, Mighty, & Britnell, 2010; Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2005).

Instructional Development. This term refers to the enhancement of course design to support student learning (Taylor & Colet, 2012). Course design is depicted as
course “development which includes framing appropriate learning objectives and outcomes, the redesigning of teaching methods and strategies, student assessment and course evaluations, and aligning all to improve student learning” (p. 142).

**Leadership.** Northouse (2010) defined leadership as a process whereby an individual “influences a group of individuals to achieve a certain goal” (p. 3). In the context of higher education, the leader in the academic arena seeks to influence, motivate, and galvanize constructive actions, among a wide range of stakeholders from students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

**Organizational Development.** Organizational development is defined as the process of building change in the organizational structure of the institution and its subunits (Gillespie, 2002). As a process for change, organizational development supports the work of faculty in teaching and learning, leadership training for institutional leaders, support of effective learning communities, and institutional governance (Gillespie, 2010).

**Path-Goal Theory of Leadership.** The path-goal theory predicts “subordinates who have strong needs for affiliation prefer supportive leadership because friendly and concerned leadership is a source of satisfaction” (Northouse, 2010, p. 129). Leaders, who actively work to remove obstacles to work processes, enable employees and staff members to successfully complete their work responsibilities. Employees are motivated through this supportive leadership which empowers them to increase his or her motivation level, job success, and work satisfaction.

**Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD).** The POD is a “professional organization which fosters human development in higher education through faculty, instructional, and organizational development” (POD Network, n.d.). POD was
founded in 1975 and is devoted to improving teaching and learning in post-secondary institutions.

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL).** The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) comprises scholarly activities (Hoessler, Britnell, & Stockley, 2010) by “educational developers and instructors which contributes to excellence in teaching and scholarly teaching by building a foundation of theory-based and rigorously tested techniques that educational developers and university instructors can use” (p. 83). Examples of SoTL (Hubball & Burt, 2006) include development of a teaching dossier, development of a learning-centered course syllabus, curricula and classroom research projects, team-teaching projects, peer-interview of exemplary curricula and/or teaching practices, pedagogical grant applications and manuscript publications, curriculum development initiatives, program evaluation projects, and faculty development initiatives.

**Teaching and Learning.** Wilkerson and Irby (1998) provided a definition of teaching and learning as “a tool for improving the educational vitality of institutions through attention to the competencies needed by individual teachers and to the institutional policies required to promote academic excellence” (p. 390).

**Teaching and Learning Center (TLC).** A teaching and learning center (TLC) also known as educational development center (EDC), seeks to ensure that its mission is aligned closely and clearly with the university’s academic plan; works to build the teaching leadership capacity of faculty members; and provides instructional skills workshops and supports new teaching development programs ranging from large course redesign, to active learning techniques, and the support of blended and on-line courses (Hoessler, Britnell, & Stockley, 2010; McDonald & Stockley, 2010).
Significance of the Research for Leadership Practice

The leaders of the teaching and learning centers are typically faculty who have developed a strong teaching and research portfolio, and are respected by their peers. As leaders or mid-level (middle) managers of a center or unit in higher education, they are responsible for the instructional support of faculty. Rosser (2004) stated that these mid-level leaders are an essential group of individuals whose administrative roles and functions support the goals and mission of the academic enterprise, especially for the work, career, and life development of faculty.

The challenge for the university is providing the needed support to these faculty leaders for leadership education through faculty learning communities. An educational leadership development program will prepare these faculty members to understand the demands, constraints, and choices faced by leaders of TLCs and providing professional support through faculty mentors, being faculty fellows within a TLC, and strengthening the scholarship of teaching and learning. This is the difference for leaders to face the challenges and be a difference for students between success and failure in their education.

The significance of this study is to help leaders of teaching and learning centers and their direct supervisor and staff members understand the demands, constraints, and choices of decision-making and level of leadership responsibility placed on these leaders. By becoming advocates for change, the centers will be seen as educational and instructional transformation units needed for universities to meet the needs of faculty and students in the ever changing medium of teaching and learning. The type of leadership qualities favorable to the successful operations of teaching and learning centers calls for
persons who are equipped as competent individuals with the requisite skill and knowledge to seek change that is meaningful and durable.

**Chapter Summary**

The function of teaching and learning centers (Ewing & Sorcinelli, 2008) supports teaching and learning initiatives such as individual consultations, seminars and workshops on teaching methods and issues; orientation programs for new faculty; administration of grants competitions to stimulate teaching improvements; and publications and websites with both basic and cutting edge information about teaching and student learning. Based on a thorough examination of the research literature and to the knowledge of the research, no other studies were found that sought to understand how the demands, constraints, and choices afforded to directors of TLC, was affected by the administrative policies and institutional culture.

The information in Chapter One sought to show how preparing the leaders of TLCs to be change agents and supporters of the educational, service, and research initiatives will empower these ‘middle managers’ to be better equipped to provide a sense of urgency, vision, and alignment for the work of faculty and the institutional goals. The purpose of this research study was to show how institutional leaders who have a clear vision for their institution and understanding of their specific roles in the change process can be better equipped to deal with the constraints, choices, and demands in their leadership of the teaching and learning centers.

Chapter Two outlined a review of the literature on leadership in higher education as it affected middle managers such as directors of teaching and learning centers. An examination of the history and purpose of teaching and learning centers was presented as
well as the challenges the directors/leaders of these centers faced in their work. Stewart (1982b) theoretical work on demands, constraints, and choices was presented as the framework that guided the research study.

Research methodology employed in the study was presented in Chapter Three, along with a discussion of the rationale for choosing the POD Network for the research study. A description of the potential research participants and the survey instrument, plus the mixed-methods approach of data collection and analysis outlined how the data was gathered. The presentation and findings of the emergent data as discovered through the mixed-methods survey instrument constituted Chapter Four. A discussion of the major conclusions of the research study as well as implications for the directors of teaching and learning centers, and recommendations for further research in the area was presented in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Over the past 10 years there has been a substantial increase in distance education or on-line course offerings within higher education. The 10% growth rate for on-line enrollments far exceeds the 2% growth in the overall higher education student population (Allen & Seaman, 2011). As seen in the Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C) surveys regarding on-line education, on-line enrollments have continued to grow at rates far in excess of the total higher education student population (Allen & Seaman, 2011). Additionally, Allen and Seaman have shown that the rate of growth in on-line enrollments is ten times that of the rate in all higher education. With these factors, higher education leaders have been challenged to make education accessible and affordable to all, while maintaining rigor and quality in education course offerings.

An examination of research on the transformations occurring in higher education and the student body (Magjuka, Shi, & Bonk, 2005; van Ameijde, Nelson, Billsberry, & van Meurs, 2009) have revealed several factors such as changing demographics of the student body, increased enrollment and large class sizes, impact of assessment and retention on students, emergence of different teaching modalities, educational costs, demand from the population for greater educational access, competition between higher education institutions, and the importance of assessment, diversity, and technology. All these changes affect how institutions manage these changes and how best are the educational needs of students met in these changing times.
As professional educators in higher education, the responsibilities of faculty extend to research, teaching, service, on-line teaching, and distance education course offerings. These responsibilities added to traditional (face-to-face) course offerings in higher education institutions, require faculty to respond to this new modality of teaching and learning as additional parts of their work load. The purpose of faculty professional development units, as stated by Ouellett (2010), is providing support to the faculty to ensure their specific content knowledge, skills, and values will be sufficient in promoting effective educational outcomes. The history of faculty professional development has been traced to sabbatical leave first instituted at Harvard University in 1810 (Ouellett, 2010). While the primary goal then was the development of scholars, over the years this has evolved to supporting the increase in research, advising, and faculty mentoring; the creation and support of faculty learning communities, and over the last 10 years, supporting faculty as course developers for on-line and distance education courses.

By having a teaching and learning center staffed by professionals versed in instructional design and knowledgeable of the use of technology in teaching and learning, this center can (Fink, 2013) support faculty to quickly assimilate the techniques and knowledge needed to become more effective in teaching and learning. The leaders of teaching and learning centers are challenged to create opportunities for collaboration and learning communities by advocating changes in the way their institution addresses the methods of college teaching and the professional development and growth of faculty to become facilitators in this new paradigm of teaching and learning.

This chapter comprises a review of the literature and research, which are relevant to the study of leadership and understanding the demands, constraints, and choices placed
on directors of faculty professional units in higher education. The first section consists of a review of the literature pertaining to the historical development of leadership theory, and current research and perspectives in leadership studies. The second section includes a discussion of the literature on higher education issues and perspectives, including organizational characteristics of faculty professional development units in higher education, and a review of directors of faculty professional development units, the leadership position addressed in this study. The third section reviews the literature of the theory of demands, constraints, and choices as it affects managers and leaders of organizations and departments. Emphasis in this section is given to the leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions as it affects their work and responsibility to their staff, their managers, and to the faculty in their institution. The chapter concludes with a summary section, which positions this study within the existing body of literature.

**Leadership**

The term leadership or leader describes both the behavior and attributes of persons who are in positions of power and authority. Sadeghi, Yadollahi, Baygi, and Ghayoomi (2013) spoke to the differences in both terms by stating leadership as related to “skills and abilities to influence others” (p. 172) while leaders are described as “a role and a duty in a special system” (p. 172) to influence others or cause change in a process. In his book, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, Northouse (2010) defined leadership as a process through which the “leader influences groups of individuals to achieve a common goal within an organization or a work setting” (p. 3). To achieve this common goal, leaders must challenge or motivate staff members' goal attainment by providing
“information or rewards” (Northouse, 2010, p. 125) as well as removing obstacles and giving directions, toward making the attainment of those goals sufficient. This describes the path-goal theory (Northouse, 2010), which directs leaders to be directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented to motivate employees to be productive in their work. As indicated by Schroeder and Associates (2012), centers for teaching and learning might not have existed if they had not responded to leadership challenges and institutional changes requiring emphasis on learning, instructional and faculty development, and the impact of technology in teaching and learning.

The attractiveness of the path-goal theory is found in leaders being able to choose specific leadership behaviors to fit specific working behaviors and circumstances (Northouse, 2010). Through removing obstacles to work processes, employees and staff members are able to successfully complete their work responsibilities. The path-goal theory of leadership is a more applicable leadership theory than transformational and situational leadership for leaders of teaching and learning centers (TLC) for several reasons. Rather than focusing on the leader’s vision for the center, which a transformational leader would do, path-goal theory of leadership pushes leaders to focus on the center’s vision for the institution.

On the other hand, situational leadership is concerned with leadership which instills “confidence, loyalty, and attraction that followers feel for their leader” (Northouse, 2010, p. 112). The ability and work output of staff members is dependent on their work environment and how staff members collaborate with their leader, their ability to complete the work, the removal of obstacles to their work, and the leadership style used in motivating, managing, and directing the work.
**Definitions of Leadership**

There are many definitions of leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Kotter, 1995/2007; Mintzberg, 1973; Senge, 1990;) that describes the attributes, qualities, and expertise needed for governance in large and small organizations, corporate and academic, for-profit and not-for-profit. Northouse (2010) defined leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a certain goal. In the context of higher education, the leader in the academic arena seeks to influence, motivate, and galvanize constructive actions, among a wide range of stakeholders from students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the community to promote change, which benefits society and the future of the institution. To do so effectively, the leader must take a role which, according to Yukl (2001) should make his or her organization and the organizational subunits “function as an integrated whole in the pursuit of its basic purpose” (p. 32).

Mintzberg (1973), in his famous work on the nature of managerial work, developed a taxonomy on managerial work where he described in detail the functions of these roles. The basic purpose of higher education institutions is that of a learning organization, which as defined by Senge (1990), is where “people are continually learning how to learn together” (p. 9).

**Theories of Leadership**

In using path-goal theory as a leadership principle and practice, there are four components of focus that Northouse (2010) described as leader behavior, staff characteristics, task characteristics, and motivation. The leader in the path-goal theory is challenged to find the optimal leader behavior which fits the situation and needs his or her staff members require at any moment. The leader then applies the proper leadership
style toward increasing their staff motivation level, job success, and satisfaction. While situational leadership prescribes to leaders how they should behave based on the demands of a particular work situation, path-goal theory challenges leaders to remove obstacles which can increase the demands and lower the performance of staff members (Northouse, 2010). Unlike transformational leadership which focuses on the leader being the one to push staff members to “do exceptional things” (Northouse, p. 189), the behavior of the leader in path-goal theory is one of defining a clear task and authority structure which allows the staff members to accomplish the work without feeling controlled or told how to complete the work.

Supportive leadership as defined by Rafferty and Griffin (2006) seeks to provide a level of satisfaction and caring for staff members as they do their work and are appreciated for their efforts. Rafferty and Griffin reported that “employees with supportive leaders reported less transformational change and also reported that more planned change had occurred” (p. 1159). Diamond (2005) made the point that by “expanding the support for faculty, teaching and learning centers (TLC) will serve their role well as change agents” (p. 33) in higher education institutions. These supportive change efforts have the potential to lead toward effective teaching methods, student engagement for learning, and student success toward retention and graduation. This type of leadership shows concerns for the staff’s welfare and work effort, by creating a supportive work environment which is friendly and psychologically supportive (House, 1996). Northouse (2010) described supportive leadership as leaders “going out of their way to make work pleasant” (p. 128). This is opposite of the transformational leader
where the focus is on one person being the main focus of the effort, such as the leader being the visionary; the person who ‘transforms’ others (Northouse, 2010).

Participative leadership creates opportunities for staff members to be part of the decision-making process by having a place at the decision table. While leader-member exchange (LMX) theory uniquely “conceptualizes leadership as a process that is centered on the interactions between leaders and followers” (Northouse, 2010, p. 147), participative leadership suggests a greater interaction comprised of generating ideas and opinions from staff members, toward integrating the suggestions into the decisions on how the organization will function (House, 1996). Before emergence of the path-goal approach, leadership was viewed as something a leader did to employees who followed. However, according to path-goal theory, leaders seek to motivate their employees by removing the obstacles to completing their work.

Achievement-oriented leadership (Northouse, 2010), unlike the situational leadership model, challenges employees to perform at “high standards of performance” (House, 1996, p. 327). Not only is excellence stated, but this leader has full confidence in the staff’s ability to accomplish the given task. Situational leadership, on the other hand, is concerned with matching staff development ability with a style of leadership, and thus performance of staff members is directly dependent on the style of leadership being exhibited. House (1996) stated that the achievement-oriented leadership behavior is “behavior directed toward encouraging performance excellence: setting challenging goals, seeking improvements, and showing confidence” (p. 327) in the ability of staff members to do the job at hand. Achievement-oriented leadership encourages higher standards of performance, not because of the skills of the leader, but because the leader
shows confidence in staff members who “have more confidence in their ability to meet challenging goals” (House, 1996, p. 327).

In path-goal theory, the staff members’ characteristics govern the leader’s behavior through the staff members’ self-perceived level of task ability. This suggests as staff members feel competent to accomplish a task, there is a reduced need for directive leadership. Directive leadership is when the leader makes an effort to set clearly defined standards for work performance and then communicates to staff members the rules and regulations which govern the work (Northouse, 2010). Added to this competency of skills is an increase in work motivation. When the work situation has outlined a clear task objective, strong team and workplace standards, plus an organizational structure that is supportive to the task, Northouse (2010) described staff members as seeking to find the paths to complete the task without needing the input from leaders to complete the goals. The type of leadership behavior needed to motivate staff members is one of a task-oriented style. Northouse (2010) wrote not only are “these leaders goal-oriented, but their work is meaningful” (p. 70).

The concept of staff members’ behavior characteristics affects the leader’s behavior, as the leader may have to change his or her performance based on the staff members’ needs. As explained by Northouse (2010), staff members who have an *external locus of control* have a strong belief of “fate, or outside forces” (p. 129) being influential in their life and performance events. For staff members with an *internal locus of control*, their life events or circumstances are defined by them being in charge of their situation. While this may seem to describe a type of situational leadership characteristic, the difference is seen in a situational approach that is dependent on tasks where the staff
has to show mastery of a skill or “display a positive attitude regarding the task” (p. 92). Leaders who exhibit a task characteristic in their work are goal-oriented; they want to achieve, engage in work that is meaningful, and are strong on structuring and organizing their work (Northouse, 2010). These leaders become more directive when the task becomes more complex, requires greater standards of detail, and higher expectations for the task to be completed. By simplifying the complex task, staff members feel “more competent about accomplishing the task” (Northouse, 2010, p. 216). Leaders have to be constantly seeking ways in which they can motivate their direct reports to see the vision they have for the organization, lead staff members by example and at the same time manage the demands of their superiors in order to align and manage the direction of their units to that of the overall organization (Kotter, 1996). It is through leading by example that leaders create opportunities for change and instill a sense of purpose in the workplace.

**Leadership in Organizations**

Bolman and Deal (2008) described organizations as comprised of people, departments, technologies, and goals. Each of these sets or groups all play an important part in the success or failure of the organization. If seen as a chain link, then any weak link will instigate problems in other areas, leading to potential failure. Bolman and Deal (2008) defined organizations as having four characteristics, namely:

1. Organizations are complex – populated by people and being open systems with a changing and erratic environment.

2. Organizations are surprising – today’s sensible choice may turn into tomorrow’s regret.
3. Organizations are deceptive – they camouflage mistakes and surprises, and communication is rarely candid, open, or timely.

4. Organizations are ambiguous – time, events, and processes can be intricate, scattered, and uncoordinated that no one truly understands the real truth.

In his work titled *The Power Game and the Players*, Mintzberg (1983/2011) described a group of players in organizations called “*influencers* who seek to control the organization’s decisions and actions by joining together to *influence* the organization to which they belong” (p. 330). Higher education lives in the realm of the “garbage can” model which Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) defined as “problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation” (p. 16) which directed their decision-making and managerial practices. Cohen, March, and Olsen likened universities to ‘organized anarchies’ where various problems and solutions are dumped by participants, creating what Trowler (2002) called, a “loosely coupled relationship between policy initiatives and outcomes” (p. 3).

An organizational leader must take responsibility for his or her actions, by projecting trust and consistency in language and behavior, communicating effectively for change actions, and seeking to motivate staff members to believe they can accomplish their work. Northouse (2010) stated that leaders can enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation. Having a mission that is concise and specific means there is a greater chance of ownership by all employees. As such, both leader and employee will constantly engage in attaining knowledge for the purpose of understanding the deeper meaning and usage of information that makes them beneficial to society, and able to pass these lessons to the next group of employees.
These are pragmatic behaviors which will assist in the continued success of the organization.

**Components of Leadership**

Many organizations deal with the challenge of leadership as it relates to competition, by providing guidance to their employees’ work, fostering professional conduct between employee and employer, and maintaining a balance between managing and leading. Kotter (1990/2011) illustrated the differences between managing and leading as managing includes planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving. All necessary and important processes, but in the realm of leadership, the path-goal theory of leadership requires motivation through change; “motivation and inspiration energize people, by satisfying basic human needs for achievement” (p. 49). In Mintzberg’s (1973) taxonomy of roles, managers seek to provide guidance to staff members, ensure motivation, and create favorable conditions for growth and doing the work.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory uniquely “conceptualizes leadership as a process that is centered on the interactions between leaders and followers” (Northouse, 2010, p. 147). These interactions can take the form of day-to-day communication, sharing of ideas, teaching and learning, as well as clear expectations and goals of work. Leaders can promote or impede the learning of staff members through creating, communicating, and empowering others to act on the organization’s vision. This takes consistent focus and good communication skills. Marquardt (2011) explained shared vision as something which gives the staff and the university “stars to steer by” (p. 61). He contended a shared vision offers the energy and focus for learning, drives individuals
toward action, pushes the desire for change over the need to maintain the status quo, and determines the type of knowledge to be shared.

Leadership and Change

In his writing on *Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail*, Kotter (1995/2007) defined leadership as a set of processes which creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Additionally, leaders are challenged to define a vision for their organization, lead staff members by example, and at the same time understand the demands of their superiors in order to align and manage the direction of their units to the overall organization. The path-goal theory of leadership also addressed the human resource frame detailed in Bolman and Deal’s (2008) organizational theory, by showing how the performance of staff members (task and work characteristics) could be impacted by the leader’s style of leadership. This shows both the organization and its employees benefitting from relationships formed through employment and effective communication.

This relationship is strengthened when, as Kotter (1995/2007) indicated, leaders are able to empower people to affect change by “communicating a sensible vision to employees, making structures compatible with the vision, providing the training employees need, aligning information and personnel employees to the vision, and confronting supervisors who undercut needed changes” (p. 115). Ancona, Malone, Orlikowski, and Senge (2007/2011) challenged leaders to transform a vision of the future into a present-day reality by devising processes which will give it life. This inventing is what moves an organization like a university, “from the abstract world of ideas to the concrete world of implementation” (p. 191).
Leadership is a combination of traits, styles, skills, and situational approaches which influences a group of individuals “to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2010, p. 3). The emergence of situational leadership theory as a means of determining organizational transformation, provided opportunities for organizations to “train and develop their leaders to learn how to change their leadership style to become more effective and able to adapt their leadership style to the human resource requirements and demands of the work situations” (Northouse, 2010, p. 107).

There are four assumptions of the human resource (HR) frame (Bolman & Deal, 2008) which are founded on the premise of people expecting more from employment than just compensation. Viewing an organization through the HR lens shows both the organization and its employees may benefit from relationships formed through employment. The HR perspective is partially founded on Maslow’s theory (1943/2011) of human motivation. After basic human needs (i.e., food, shelter, and safety) are met by financial means, employees seek to have higher needs (i.e., belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization) met in part by attaining employment through which they feel empowered, supported, and valued. Employees who are satisfied with their work are more committed to an organization and more motivated within their spheres of influence, as opposed to merely doing their jobs, receiving paychecks, and going home.

In addition to organizations meeting employee needs, the HR perspective emphasizes good fit between employees and organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Successful organizations find employees who espouse and act in alignment with organizational values, mission, and purpose. These organizations reward employees well, invest in them, empower them, promote from within, and provide support (Bolman
& Deal, 2008), thereby affirming the organizational valuing of employees. According to Bolman and Deal, “high-performing companies do a better job of understanding and responding to the needs of both employees and customers” (p. 136), this leads to these organizations attracting employees who are strongly motivated to do a superior job. Employees who fit and are satisfied with their work retain positions and enhance organizational stability.

Finally, path-goal theory addresses the issue of leadership decisions and choices based on the institutional culture and policy that affects the decisions leaders of TLCs face in support of pedagogy, instruction, and technology in teaching and learning. The culture of an institution can affect the performance and effectiveness of the leader and staff members. Kezar and Eckel (2002) stated, “leadership at the top alone is insufficient and that change requires collaborative leadership from throughout the institution, particularly from the faculty” (p. 448). By having a culture where institutional leadership is collaborative in decision-making much of the action is pushed out to individual faculty members and departments, then these units are able to complete the work because of the support and trust from the leaders.

Stone (2012) described policy as divided between polis and market forces. In the polis, cooperation is as important as competition for the following reasons. Politics involve seeking allies and organizing cooperation in order to compete with opponents. The path-goal theory supports leader behavior that House (1996) described as facilitating collaborative interactions between members of the unit. These interactions support positive associations between the academic units and the institution, provide access to adequate resources and support for the unit to accomplish its work, and safeguard the
legitimacy (for the good of the public interest) of the unit among the wider organization. In short, setting an example or being a role model for others to follow starts by removing the obstacles to do exemplary work which then leads to change in the process and production of employees and the organization.

The market as described by Stone (2012) is a social system in which individuals pursue their own welfare by exchanging things with others whenever trades are mutually beneficial. Individuals are seeking to pursue their own welfare and interests. The connection between path-goal theory and the polis is critical for TLCs to use the concept of a community working to achieve student engagement and success through instruction, pedagogy, and technology in teaching and learning. The work of the leader is to instill change by removing obstacles and motivating persons through the creation of challenging opportunities that will lead to personal and collective achievement and a culture of leadership for all stakeholders within the higher education institution.

**Leadership Behavior**

Leadership behavior in higher education as defined by Wolverton, Gmelch, Montez, & Nies (2001) involves working effectively with many different stakeholders in complex situations, and where educational leaders face the leadership challenge of “preserving a mission of teaching, research, and service without creating a rigid and inflexible environment” (p. 93). While the mission of higher education has been to educate persons to be highly skilled members of society, today’s economic, social, and global challenges call for a skilled workforce able to engage in highly complex and diverse cultural environments. Senge (1990) described the role of leaders as being designers, teachers, and stewards “having an ability to build shared vision and foster
more systematic patterns of thinking” (p. 9). Leadership, while a single effort of a person on individuals and groups, is thought of by Chemers (2000) as being a process of social influence in which “one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a single task” (p. 1). However, there is a big difference between managing and leading change, as indicated by Northouse (2010). While management provides order and consistency, leadership produces constructive change and movement. A leader is thus encouraged to have a vision that will guide and inspire all persons to visualize the future of the organization.

The learning vision, like any vision, must be communicated effectively, since even “the most sophisticated vision is of no use unless it can be clearly understood by others” (Marquardt, 2011, p. 215). Kotter (1995/2007) encouraged leaders to motivate people by (a) regularly involving people in deciding how to achieve the organization’s vision, (b) support employee efforts to realize the vision by providing coaching, feedback, and role modeling, and (c) recognize and reward success. Empowering people to comprehend a vision of an alternative future is a communications challenge of a completely different magnitude from organizing them to fulfill a short-term plan. When a clear sense of direction has been communicated throughout an organization, lower-level employees can initiate change actions without the same degree of vulnerability.

Viewing an organization through Bolman and Deal’s (2008) human resource lens shows both the organization and its employees can benefit from relationships formed through employment and effective communication. This relationship is strengthened when, as Kotter (1995/2007) indicated, leaders are able to empower people to effect change by: communicating a sensible vision to employees, making structures compatible...
with the vision, providing the training employees need, aligning information and personnel employees to the vision, and confronting supervisors who undercut needed changes.

**Mid-Level Leadership**

The role of any leader, whether leading a small or large unit or organization, is to ensure that the path of leadership is aligned with the vision of the organization, ensuring consistency and uniformity in goals. The core of this alignment is dependent on the leader effectively attracting, deploying, developing, adapting, and retaining human capital on a better scale than anyone else (Marquart, 2011). By motivating and empowering employees to develop and produce innovative work, the organization is able to compete and increase the organizational knowledge base. The behavior of the leader should be one of motivating employees on the task to be carried out, ensuring that all concerned understand the objectives of the task and the path being taken, and that the needed support is being provided toward successfully completing the task. Northouse (2010) described this as task characteristics, which directs the staff’s task, ensuring there is a formal authority system providing guidance, and a primary work group that maintains group norms and peer support. Employees are empowered to complete the work without needing a leader looking over their shoulder, and knowing “their work is of value” (p. 130), and respected by the leader and the organization.

Leaders who are at the top of the hierarchy in their organizations are better positioned to lead and direct these efforts for change and advancement than those who are middle leaders or mid-level leaders. While leaders at the top may report to a board, they have the authority to provide an organization-wide vision and mission for the
organization to follow. Leaders who are positioned in the middle (units, departments, centers, etc.), face a bigger challenge as they answer not only to a higher placed manager but are being held accountable for the operations and performance of their direct reports, while seeking to follow a vision or a process in which they have no opinion in the decision. Such a mid-level leader has to motivate his or her direct reports by building trust among members of their unit, ensuring opportunities for conflict resolution, encouraging commitment to the task at hand, ensuring all persons are held accountable, and always paying attention to results within the units (Lencioni, 2002), all the while listening to upper management and their demands, and ensuring customer needs are being met.

These demands can lead to stress on the mid-level leader that can affect his or her effectiveness as leader and motivator. These demands occur as the mid-level leader is constantly engaged in tasks that require change efforts and initiative for success. Change, whether for individuals or groups, can be painful leading to resistance or flight. Kotter (1995/2007) wrote about change as a series of transformation efforts that gives the best chance for success. To be a change leader, mid-level leaders need to “establish a sense of urgency” (p. 3) by convincing members of the need for change and ensuring that top management provide the support in person for that urgency and change.

Implications for Leadership in Institutions of Higher Education

As experienced by all leaders and managers, the directors of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) in higher education engage in efforts to motivate and encourage work behaviors that build trust, coalitions, and collaborative working conditions and expectations within the university working environment. By engaging in joint meeting
sessions, encouraging free-flow of information between units, and sharing expertise, these units work to strengthen the services provided to students and faculty. This learning innovation can be enhanced through faculty learning communities and group-directed activities which support peer-to-peer collaboration and scholarly conversations, requiring commitment and support from the institutional leaders for sustainability (Furco & Moely, 2012).

Along with the changes within the higher educational institution, there are changes in the public attitude as to the transparency of colleges and a growing concern for the student loan debt now estimated at $1.1 trillion (Kantrowitz, 2013). Academic departments and units are constantly being challenged by the political (state and federal) and institutional leaders to find measures to control costs while ensuring the educational experiences, and academic rigor and success for students are maintained. At the same time students are looking to graduate in a timely manner and find jobs after graduation.

The TLC is one such academic unit that seeks to support the professional development of faculty through peer learning communities, pedagogical and andragogical methods of teaching and learning, course transformation, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and using technology intentionally in teaching and learning. One of the purpose of TLCs is the support of an academic culture which values and rewards teaching and scholarship and, in so doing, challenge the institution to promote student success through active learning engagement and service (Brunvand & Byrd, 2011; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2010). The directors of the TLCs, as mid-level leaders, can promote or impede the learning of staff members through creating, communicating and empowering others to act on the organization’s vision. This takes consistent focus and good communication skills.
on the part of the leader to ensure the vision is equally communicated to all with one message received by all.

Marquardt (2011) explained shared vision as something that gives the staff and the school “stars to steer by” (p. 61). He contended a “shared vision offers the energy and focus for learning, drives individuals toward action, pushes the desire for change over the need to maintain the status quo, and determines the type of knowledge to be shared” (p. 62). The learning vision, like any vision, should be communicated effectively, since even “the most sophisticated vision is of no use unless it can be clearly understood by others” (Marquardt, 2011, p. 216). Kotter (1995/2007) encouraged leaders to “motivate people by: (1) regularly involving people in deciding how to achieve the organization’s vision, (2) supporting employee efforts to realize the vision by providing coaching, feedback, and role modeling, and (3) recognizing and rewarding success” (p. 49). Empowering people to comprehend a vision of an alternative future is a communications challenge of a completely different magnitude from organizing them to fulfill a short-term plan. When a clear sense of direction has been communicated throughout an organization, lower-level employees can initiate actions without the same degree of vulnerability.

Leaders who excel in “visioning, walk the walk; work to embody the core values and ideas contained in the vision” (Ancona et al., 2007/2011. p. 191). Leaders who communicate well incorporate the vision into their hour-by-hour activities. They not only use every available communication channel to broadcast the vision, they help “articulate a vision, set standards for performance, and create focus and direction” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 345). Kotter (1995/2007) presented seven key elements in
effective communication: (a) simplicity, (b) metaphor and analogy, (c) having multiple forums, (d) repetition, (e) leading by example, (f) explanation of seeming inconsistencies, and (g) give-and-take as in two-way communication.

The challenges faced by higher education, as stated by Zusman (2005) range from rising costs in expenditures, acute state revenue constraints, competing demands for state resources, competition for students, and concerns among the nation of the ballooning costs of college. Universities are being challenged to not only do more with less, but show the cost of college is justified while facing decreased funding amounts from their state all the while trying to improve graduation and course completion rates (Hossler, Lund, Ramin, Westfall, & Irish, 1997; Ryan, 2004; Volkwein & Tandberg, 2008; Zhang, 2009). Northouse (2010) effectively described the path-goal theory as leaders defining goals, clarifying the path to accomplish the work, removing obstacles, and providing support to their direct responsibilities.

Leadership in any organization calls for persons who are able to influence persons, whether leading by example or having a vision that others will buy into so as to provide a common goal for success and purpose in the workplace. While leaders have different expertise, traits, and abilities that support or strengthen their leadership role, it is important that these leaders are able to galvanize others to engage in activities that benefit the work and the community to which they belong. The many theories of leadership identified researched principles and practices that all who aspire to be leaders can understand and learn from, in an effort to be change agents in the work they do. These practices should be very important to mid-level leaders in higher education institutions as
they address the growing challenges of demands, constraints, and choices they face in leading a TLC.

**Teaching and Learning Centers in Higher Education**

Faculty professional development units (hereinafter called teaching and learning centers or TLCs) in higher education have been around since the 1800s with Harvard University recording the oldest form of faculty development (Ouellett, 2010). The meaning of faculty development, as described by Diamond (2002), focused on the “improvement of the individual instructor’s teaching skills, instructional development of students learning by improving their course and curriculum experience, and organizational development on the interrelationship and effectiveness of units within the institution” (p. 4). The role of the directors of teaching and learning centers is vital to the support of faculty and instructors in the realm of teaching and learning, while carrying out the mandates of the institution and the institutional leadership. Persons who occupy the position of director of the teaching and learning centers are seen as “mid-level” managers who are in the middle of the hierarchy of the institution meeting the needs of faculty while managing unit members who comprise both faculty consultants and professional staff.

**Educational Priorities of Higher Education institutions**

The priorities for higher education are balanced across a complex set of needs based on market pressure, according to van Ameijde, Nelson, Billsberry, & van Meurs (2009). van Ameijde et al. described the market pressure needs as “teaching an increased number of students despite diminishing financial means while struggling to maintain traditional academic and educational principles of quality” (p. 764), all while
providing their stakeholders with good return on their tuition investments. The importance of good pedagogy for strengthening student success cannot be overstated, as one of many drivers to student retention and success. With the increasing pressure on academicians to publish, Kember and McKay (1996) have shown that governments have become concerned about the quality of teaching leading to calls for “financial accountability from higher education institutions” (p. 528). Coupled with this concern is the need to provide instructional support in the form of professional development for faculty. By understanding the knowledge that college faculty has of teaching, higher education institutions will be able to better understand how instruction complements student learning in the classroom (Major & Palmer, 2002).

Institutions of higher learning are becoming more involved in offering on-line/distance education courses in an effort to increase their student enrollment, which in turn will increase their financial outlook. With these growing needs, universities have to address the tactical and structural challenges that come with increasing enrollment through on-line courses, such as technology infrastructure, institutional support, student services, and faculty professional development. Of the four challenges, providing institutional support and faculty professional development bring the most challenges as institutions of higher education need to create a cohesive institutional vision and a set of policies for e-learning (on-line learning) that foster adoption and cultural change (Arabasz, Pirani, & Fawcett, 2003).

In a paper on the key decisions related to course design, Kampov-Polevoi (2010) considered the faculty perspective on the process of course conversion, and handling of associated pedagogical and technical challenges as well as institutional factors and
administrative considerations impacting on-line course development. The author showed faculty members should remain the main decision makers on what and how to teach in the on-line version of their course, for a quality course to be developed. Kampov-Polevoi encouraged administrators of higher education institutions to be sensitive to the issues and resources needed in the development of on-line courses by creating policies which recognize and support the role of faculty as course authors.

Academic professional development practice is a valuable support tool for increasing the effectiveness of faculty professional growth. As a means of informing future professional development strategies, Ferman (2002) showed the effect of mentoring (referred to as a joint endeavor with colleagues) as being professionally enriching, with emphasis on communities of practice as opposed to individual approaches as well as being future-oriented. Mentoring provides a rich range of knowledge on expectations of faculty for professional development, and the support from university administrators on approaches to research-oriented, or inter-disciplinary context of academic scholarship.

Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture in Higher Education

Whether it is in a face-to-face or an on-line class, quality teaching and learning remains the most desired outcome (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). Research has shown that instructors are more likely to produce quality on-line courses when they can utilize a checklist of tasks directed to that goal (Chapman & Henderson, 2010). Furthermore, checklists for on-line course development contribute to improved quality over the long-term. In fact, Chapman and Henderson (2010) found that after on-line instructors at one university reached their first set of quality benchmarks, they requested additional tasks so
they could continue to improve their courses. Bolliger & Wasilik (2009) found that instructors demonstrate higher satisfaction when institutions have policies in place to support them with on-line teaching.

Not only are faculty members excited to produce quality courses, but students are also more likely to have a positive experience in the course when faculty members follow institutional policies and procedures during course development (Cox, McIntosh, Reason, & Terenzini, 2011; Knowles & Kalata, 2007). Additionally, Knowles and Kalata (2007) found that universities seeking to improve on-line course development use Quality Matters (QM) as an effective tool to accomplish this purpose. Similar in purpose to the QM initiative, Quick Checks is used to evaluate the construction of a large number of on-line courses in a brief period of time (Schulte, 2009). The On-line Course Website Best Practices Checklist website (LERN, n.d.) is one such guide for instructors to assess the quality of their on-line courses or use as a peer review tool. By having a supportive culture which recognizes the importance of teaching in the same level as research activities, institutions show faculty that their work is valued and appreciated, and will be rewarded in equal measure. Likewise, having administrative policies which support instructional and faculty development coupled with appropriate technological innovation allows directors of TLCs to experiment with new ideas and programs that address the learning of students and the work of faculty (Frantz, Beebe, Horvath, Canales, & Swee, 2005).

**Quality Matters (QM©)**

The Quality Matters (QM) standard rubric provides alignment with institutional goals to offer quality on-line courses which will lead to student retention and success in
their education. Quality Matters began in the fall of 2003 as a three-year grant funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) entitled "Quality Matters: Inter-Institutional Quality Assurance in On-line Education," and later became a non-profit organization known as MarylandOn-line, Inc., to provide support and training to ensure quality in on-line education. During this process MarylandOn-line Inc. developed a process to certify quality on-line components and courses. After the completion of the grant, MarylandOn-line continued Quality Matters and transitioned Quality Matters into a self-supporting organization through subscription fees for services, tools, and trainings.

Quality Matters evolved from eight general standard areas, which included (a) course overview and introduction, (b) learning objectives, (c) assessment and measurement, (d) resources and materials, (e) learner engagement, (f) course technology, (g) learner support, and (h) accessibility (Quality Matters, 2011). These eight standards form the framework of the QM rubric which guides faculty in the design of their courses, and the prerequisite knowledge, course learning objectives, assessments, learning activities, and resources. These standards should be developed as part of the course for a quality teaching and learning experience for faculty and students. The concept of QM evolved from the University of Maryland in an effort to streamline the process of faculty development, course creation, and integrating technology to enhance course content. Each of the eight standards is guided by research, which supports the Quality Matters rubric standards. Course Overview and Introduction describes the building of an on-line course which supports a sense of community learning, social learning, and teaching presence (engagement) which provides course satisfaction and support to students. The
use of the Quality Matters rubric supports course design and development, not the delivery of the course. Through the use of peer assessments from other faculty designers, faculty receive constructive feedback on the efficacy of their course design, which creates opportunities for a better learning experience for students and a robust teaching practice for faculty.

The Learning Objectives or Competencies guide the faculty to focus on objectives and the mapping of objectives to outcomes (Swan, Matthews, Bogle, Boles, & Day, 2010), which in turn focus on the many learning activities in which students are expected to engage in the course (Yen & Tu, 2008). Assessment and Measurement address learner participation in single and collaborative projects and assessment exercises which gauge the progress and transfer of knowledge through measurement techniques such as assignments, testing, and higher order thinking through writing assignments.

Instructional materials contain the content for learning and understanding the body of knowledge being presented. In order for students to understand and develop critical thinking on the content, Beatham (2008) advocated for faculty to “make sure the task or purpose is clear. Begin with the end in mind, not the means toward the end; tool should follow task” (p. 69). Learner interaction and engagement can be correlated to student motivation to learn the content. Motivation, as stated by Keller (2008), is promoted when “a learner's curiosity is aroused due to a perceived gap in current knowledge; when the knowledge to be learned is perceived to be meaningfully related to a learner’s goals; when learners believe they can succeed in mastering the learning task; when learners anticipate and experience satisfying outcomes to a learning
task; and when learners employ volitional (self-regulatory) strategies to protect their intentions” (p. 177).

On the standard which defined course technology, Picciano (2009) postulated, “instructors must carefully consider their objectives and understand how to apply the technologies and approaches that will work best for them” (p. 14). By focusing on the effective use of technology to support the content, faculty should utilize a universal design of learning to be able to wisely choose the appropriate technology toward increasing content knowledge and the educational success of students. Universal design for learning supports the learner when the focus “is on the desired learning outcomes rather than on the type or amount of technology to be made available in the learning environment” (Basham, Meyer, & Perry, 2010, p. 339).

Finally, on the issue of accessibility, this is described in four categories; (a) visual, (b) hearing, (c) motor, and (d) cognitive. It is important for on-line courses to build disability standards into a course in the initial design versus retrofitting to fit the needs of a diverse and growing population of on-line/distance education students. In advocating support for students with disabilities on-line courses, Barnard-Brak and Sulak (2010) showed studies “do indicate that students who report having visible disabilities appear to have more positive attitudes toward requesting accommodations in the on-line versus face-to-face learning environment compared with students who report having hidden disabilities.” (p. 87). The use of the QM rubric standard provides alignment with institutional goals that seek to offer quality on-line courses supported by faculty professional development, which hopefully supports student retention and success in their education.
The TPACK Theory of Quality On-line Course Development

In an effort to explore on-line policies, it is vital to dig deeper into the purpose of on-line classes and what it takes to build them successfully. In other words, is the class designed to facilitate student-to-student and student-to-instructor interaction? Is the instructor using technology to enhance instruction in the on-line environment or trying to mimic the structure of the face-to-face classroom? The ability to integrate technology with good teaching (Koehler & Mishra, 2009) is built around three core components, namely content, pedagogy, and technology, as well as the relationships between them. The concept of TPACK (technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge) was developed from Shulman’s (1987, 1994) work to “describe how teachers’ understanding of educational technologies and pedagogy and content knowledge (PCK) interacted with one another to produce effective teaching with technology” (p. 62). Pedagogy described the methods of instruction used by the teacher, and content knowledge described the teacher’s knowledge of the subject matter as the subject matter expert.

Technology, which came later, saw the development of appropriate technological tools within educational purposes. The TPACK framework and its knowledge components sought to show how each of the respective components (Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Technology Knowledge, Technological Content Knowledge, Technological Pedagogical Knowledge, and Technology, Pedagogy, and Content Knowledge) described a connection with the “three key components of teacher knowledge: understanding of content, understanding of teaching, and understanding of technology” (Koehler & Mishra, 2009, p. 67). By
understanding implications of each of the components, teachers were better able to focus on the real connections between pedagogy, content, and technology.

Teaching is sophisticated and complex, more so perhaps than the untrained individual might assume. Therefore, the skills mined from an understanding of pedagogy and content are sometimes overlooked by course designers; this can happen outside of on-line learning, too. Yet, on-line learning has brought technology, pedagogy, content, and knowledge into laser-like focus as evidenced in the TPACK theory (Cavanaugh, Dirkin, & Mishra, 2007). The TPACK theory focuses on skill development and the flexible knowledge required for good teaching and creating optimal learning environments. TPACK skills can be developed over time and applied through practice (Mishra, Koehler, & Yahya, 2007).

**Mentoring**

Various researchers have examined the impact of mentoring and its effectiveness in improving the quality of on-line teaching and on-line courses as a whole (Barczyk, Buckenmeyer, Feldman, & Hixon, 2011; Mandernach, Donnelly, Dailey, & Schulte, 2005; McNaught, 2003). The studies have addressed various aspects and intensity of mentoring. In some studies, mentoring has been face-to-face interaction among peers (Barczyk et al., 2011; McNaught, 2003), while others focused on electronic evaluation systems, which served as mentoring aspects or virtual mentoring programs where one experienced on-line faculty member guided 15 new on-line adjuncts for one year (Mandernach et al., 2005; Rogers, McIntyre, & Jazzar, 2010). Various forms of faculty mentoring have been shown by Villar Angulo and De La Rosa (2006) to produce lasting positive effects on teaching improvement. Mentoring is especially important for adjunct
faculty who may lack access to institutional policies and support services; consequently, being connected to campus resources and instructional best practices for on-line classes can improve the quality of the on-line courses they develop (Rogers et al., 2010).

Mentoring has also been shown to have a positive impact on the quality of on-line courses and effectiveness of on-line teaching, regardless of the extent of the mentoring policy in place. As stated in Barczyk et al. (2011), “In addition to developing faculty members into scholars and master teachers, mentoring can be useful in assisting faculty members with the transition to more technology based teaching” (p. 10). Additionally, Mandernach et al. (2005) stated, “overwhelmingly, new instructors valued the mentorship and suggestions for improvement” (p. 6).

The Distance Education Mentoring Program (DEMP), (Hixon, Barczyk, Buckenmeyer, & Feldman, 2011) at Purdue University is an example of a successful mentoring program. In a recent program evaluation, 95% of the faculty participants agreed their on-line teaching improved as a result of participation in the DEMP, and 93% reported they applied the skills and knowledge they learned in the DEMP to other courses they taught (Hixon et al., 2011). Based on their findings, Hixon et al., (2011) concluded that mentoring programs like the DEMP, positively impact face-to-face courses as well as on-line courses, a ramification that benefits the entire institution.

**Faculty Development in Higher Education**

Change in organizations begins when stakeholders recognize that the status quo will not do if personnel, systems, and the institutional culture does not adapt to the challenges and demands of competition, increases in knowledge management capability, innovation in educational service and product, and advanced expertise and leadership
Kotter (1995/2007) summed up leadership in the midst of change as persons setting directions, clarifying a vision for all to have an understanding of the direction of the change, and then motivating persons to set about making the change happen despite the challenges, sacrifices, and difficulties that will appear. Northouse (2010) described this leadership behavior as involving motivation through influencing change behavior, and creating a shared vision that builds trust between individuals and within groups.

Higher education institutions (colleges and universities) have experienced several change patterns over the years as society has turned to them to train and develop critical thinking skills in students toward the development of future leaders and employees who are able to support, sustain, and develop organizations and institutions in a world that has experienced significant growth in various industries. To meet these needs, new thinking in teaching and learning, as well as the delivery of education has caused change to occur more rapidly than many of these higher education institutions and their members have been able to sustain. One way many institutions of higher learning have dealt with the change is through professional development of the teaching faculty, and innovative uses of technology to support teaching and learning. In their work on understanding faculty development, Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach (2005) compiled the various stages of faculty development over the years into five ages, namely, the ages of the scholar, teacher, developer, learner, and the network, to explain the research and practices of faculty development over the years.

Each of these ages clarifies the goals of faculty development and its impact on faculty and the institution of higher education. The age of the scholar (around the mid-
1950s and early 1960s), as described by Sorcinelli et al. (2005), served to “provide opportunities for improvement and advancement of scholarship” (p. 8). Faculty who are seen as subject matter experts and instructional professionals are described as focused on scholarly activities, and were not seen as professionals in teaching and learning in the classroom (Ouelett, 2010), in comparison to educators in the secondary school settings. Pedagogy was not the focus but rather the pursuit of content expertise and mastery as seen in the increase of research and publication records. Institutions of higher learning supported their faculty with sabbaticals and research funding as part of faculty development efforts (Brinko, Atkins, & Miller, 2005). The age of the teacher (mid-1960s through the 1970s) saw faculty beginning to become dissatisfied with the narrowing of their role and resources on research, and began to look at improving teaching effectiveness. Ouelett (2010) stated that a combination of events occurred starting from an increase in the number of faculty members who became dissatisfied with the narrow role of research, the beginning of student rights groups demanding emphasis on teacher evaluation, faculty seeking a greater role in defining the curriculum, to students advocating for greater relevancy of course content with the real world experiences they would meet upon graduating.

The result was that universities met this challenge with a “broadening of scholarship of research” (p. 6) and an exploration of faculty development efforts through centers that offered workshops on teaching improvement efforts. These centers, or as Herman (2013) described them teaching and learning development units (TLDUs) or teaching and learning centers (TLCs), functioned as administrative units that developed and implemented these first types of faculty development programs. The effort of the
TLCs would hopefully improve educational quality for teaching and learning practices, organizational development, but also as Sorcinelli et al. (2005) suggested, lead to the “improvement of faculty as teachers” (p. 8).

The age of the developer (1970s to 1980s) heralded the movement of a group of faculty and scholars to establish the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD Network) in 1974 (Ouelett, 2010). This led to an increase in teaching and learning centers as faculty development units within higher education institutions, and an institutionalization of faculty developers (Sorcinelli et al., 2005). These centers offered programs centered on career choices, and an increase in incentives and funding toward providing seminars and workshops which addressed teaching, learning, life planning, personal growth, and career initiatives. Ouelett (2010) described these initiatives as “providing the resources and motivation for innovation and experimentation” (p. 6) for new approaches to teaching and learning. Other initiatives offered were mentorship, writing across the curriculum, individual consultation, faculty learning communities, and pedagogical methods of increasing teaching and learning effectiveness (Scorincelli et al., 2006).

The age of the learner (the 1990s) indicated that the focus of learning moved away from a singular focus on the pedagogical and andragogical nature of teaching and learning, which Ouelett (2010) termed as the “sage on the stage,” to that which focused on student engagement, collaborative learning, and encouraging student critical thinking (teachers as the “guide on the side”; p. 6). During this time, teaching and learning centers (TLCs) experienced a surge of interest from faculty and administrators as they provided (Sorcinelli et al., 2005) a venue for the understanding of the underlying theories of
teaching and learning, and to help faculty increase their skills and strategies to meet the educational needs of their students. Sorcinelli et al. (2005) indicated that during this same period, the number of faculty development centers increased not only at research universities, but also at comprehensive and liberal arts institutions and community colleges.

TLCs were being encouraged to support innovative teaching and learning initiatives that would address the demands of stakeholders for new methodologies and learning metrics, and increase the visibility and educational diversity of the institution. These initiatives ranged from increasing the use of technology in teaching and learning, introducing the concept of multiculturalism and service learning, and increasing scholarship of teaching learning (SoTL) programs for scholarly and research assessment of pedagogical methods. By collecting and analyzing different methods to assess student learning, institutions would embrace assessment as a means of showing student success and retention within programs.

Sorcinelli et al. (2005) suggested that the age of the network (21st century) has turned the spotlight of faculty development on faculty developers, who are expected to “preserve, clarify and enhance the purposes of faculty development” (p. 28). These faculty developers assist faculty and administrative leaders to respond effectively to the constructive solutions needed to meet the growing influx of technology in teaching and learning, to provide instructional support for distance and on-line programs, and to address the pedagogical complexities of large class sizes within higher education institutions (Ouelett, 2010). Faculty development centers or teaching and learning centers will have to meet this challenge through staff with the required expertise and
experience to provide the educational development support, and managers who can provide strong leadership and a vision for the next age of faculty development.

Organizational Characteristics of Teaching and Learning Centers

To address the changing nature of on-line teaching and creating learning in this new paradigm, the professional development of faculty to teach in these modalities must be strongly supported by the institution to ensure quality and rigor of content. This can be achieved through fostering a community of learning to assist educators in becoming authentic and critically reflective (Cranton & King, 2003). The use of appropriate technology to support and enhance the course content holds great potential for increasing student interaction and collaborative learning. Oblinger and Hawkins (2006) noted that developing and delivering effective on-line courses requires pedagogy and technology expertise possessed by few faculty members (p. 15).

A more effective model is to pair a faculty member with an instructional designer/faculty developer so that each provides a unique expertise to the course-creation process. The faculty member functions as the content expert and teaching facilitator, providing pedagogical collaboration, critical thinking methodologies, group work assessments, and other educational dynamics to improve student-centered teaching and learning practices in the classroom (Yuen & Hau, 2006).

The instructional designer or faculty developer provides opportunities for the faculty to engage in different educational techniques, by providing a safe environment to “test their ideas without having to worry about making mistakes or jeopardizing the progress of their students” (Ertmer, 2005, p. 34). In an effort to provide adequate course creation support, Wang, Gould, & King (2009) called for institutions to work to provide
faculty members with the support they need, in the form of “instructional design resources, technical assistance, and administrative structure, to design and teach quality courses” (p. 1) under the guidance of a teaching and learning center.

The teaching and learning center also facilitates opportunity for ongoing, wide-ranging dialogue covering faculty career development, learning objectives, use of assessments, and scholarship on teaching and learning practices. Whether it is assessment, student-centered learning, or curriculum changes, the impact of diverse teaching methods on student learning and success affects faculty members in their scholarship of teaching and learning, mentoring, and involvement in faculty learning communities, as they practice and research innovative teaching and learning methodologies. Senge (1997) argued that “enduring institutional learning arises only from three interrelated activities: research, the disciplined pursuit of discovery and understanding; capacity building, the enhancement of people's capabilities and knowledge to achieve results; and practice, people working together to achieve practical outcomes and building practical know-how in the process” (p. 32).

Sorcinelli et al. (2005) described faculty development as organized support helping faculty in their development as scholars, teachers, and citizens in this new concept of teaching and learning. Herman (2013) noted that the field of faculty development functioned as “improving student learning through the professional development of faculty” (p. 33). This necessitated institutions of higher learning to provide resources and opportunities in support of faculty growth in instructional methodology, increasing their own disciplinary expertise as well as the technological advances that have made their way into the classroom. Fink (2003) contended that higher
education institutions “need to give serious attention to their role in supporting faculty change” (p. 196) in the classroom, in their discipline, and in their ever evolving role as educators and educational facilitators. As faculty comprise the core of higher education operations (Sorcinelli et al., 2005) through the provision of their service, teaching, and research expertise, these experiences ultimately impact and shape the lives of students and the community. Universities and colleges recognize the importance of faculty development based on external expectations, demands from legislators, parents, and students for an inclusive educational experience that builds on the changing demographics, societal challenges, and the rise in technology in all facets of life.

Fink (2003) outlined five specific recommendations of a TLC, with one recommendation being the establishment of a TLC that is “staffed by professionals conversant with the literature on college teaching” (p. 220). To meet these changes and challenges, Sorcinelli et al. (2005) argued for the organizational structure of TLCs to include the following:

- A “centralized unit” (p. 19) which serves the institution and is supported by a dedicated and professional staff able to offer and support multiple faculty development programs.
- Having “a clearinghouse” (p. 19) that functions as a central location for programs and offerings, but also providing its own programs.
- A supporting “committee” (p. 19) comprised of volunteer faculty or members of the faculty senate who are willing to oversee the offerings of faculty development programs.
“Single individual programs” (p. 19) which an administrator has responsibility for faculty development programs, whether that administrator functions as a faculty fellow or faculty developer.

“Professional staff members” (p. 19) responsible for covering multiple activities such as teaching and learning techniques, using technology to support teaching and learning, supporting scholarship of teaching and learning, researching methods of student retention, and addressing the ethnic and social diversity in the classroom, through the changing demographics of students. These staff members also engage in analyzing the impact of pedagogy and andragogy on teaching and learning styles, assessing the impact of service-learning projects on student learning, identifying different methods of evaluating student learning outcomes, student evaluation, collaboration, group cooperative learning, and group dynamics in the classroom, among others.

Faculty or professional staff administrators usually manage the organizational or reporting structure of TLCs with experience in the field of teaching, human resource development, psychology of learning, or instructional design and development. In research looking at the education background of directors of TLCs, (Brinko, Atkins, & Miller, 2005), the demographics of these directors showed that 34% had their highest degree in education, 16% in social sciences, and 13% in the humanities, while the remaining were from “business, science, mathematics, communication and other disciplines” (p. 96). These administrators come from a wide cross section of disciplines and experience to lead faculty professional development services toward enhancing and improving the teaching climate in their respective institution (Frantz et al., 2005).
Faculty development has grown beyond faculty leave (Sorcinelli et al., 2005) offered by individual departments to TLCs providing professional development which increases the pedagogical knowledge of faculty members, and the “incorporation of learning management systems (LMS) into university teaching programs which supports the development of new learning resources and a comprehensive management of learning” (Coates, James, & Baldwin, 2005, p. 30). To do this, institutional support is needed through a center with professional staff having a wide systems and educational knowledge-base to support the faculty.

As institutions of higher learning face more scrutiny on accreditation and accountability of resources, TLCs are expected to be among the main providers of institutional data for performance, as well as an advocate for faculty professional development support and ensuring quality of courses and diversity in the modalities of course delivery. Universities and colleges need academic leaders who understand and are able to competently manage the demands, constraints, and choices of leading faculty development in the higher educational institution toward student success and for the faculty as educational facilitators.

**Demands, Constraints, and Choices on Leadership**

In her seminal work on the work of managers and what managers really do, Stewart (1982a) presented a line of research which provides details on the demands, constraints, and choices that managers and thus leaders face in their work and responsibility. Through the use of grounded research methods such as structured interviews, diaries, structured observations, group discussions, case analysis, and critical incidents (Lowe, 2003), the methodology of determining demands, constraints, and
choices is described as “useful models for defining differences in managerial work and discretion across jobs” (p. 193). The demands, constraints, and choices model looked at the differences in managerial jobs and how leaders in similar jobs see their role and responsibility differently. As described by Lowe (2003), the model allowed researchers to see how managers (leaders) examine not only the formation of their work, but also the unique ways in which they accomplished their work and the way they went about doing it. Yukl (2001) also described the demands, constraints, and choices model as the dependence a manager (leader) has with direct reports, supervisors, and other stakeholders based on the interactions the leader has with these people and the demands they make on the work of the leader. Stewart described this as situational influences that determined the behavior of their leadership and the choices they made depending on the demands and constraints they faced in their work (see Table 1).

Leaders face choices in what area of their job to concentrate on, how much time they should spend on it, and which persons to spend it on. Yukl stated that managers would be better served to fully understand the demands and constraints they face in their job, and then work to make the right choices in their decisions. Research conducted by Graham and Benoit’s (2004) on the roles and responsibilities of department heads in higher education, identified roles as demands and constraints which affected their level of leadership and responsibility. Additionally, Bryman (2007) identified several behaviors associated with effective leadership in higher education at the departmental level which were described as having a clear sense of direction/strategic vision, treating academic staff fairly with integrity, communicating well about the direction of the unit and acting a role model with integrity. Other behaviors of effective leadership identified were
creating a positive work atmosphere in the unit, and advancing the department’s cause with respect to constituencies internal and external to the university. As always, being able to provide feedback on performance to members of the unit was also important.

By thinking about jobs along the lines of demands, constraints, and choices, one can identify new ideas about leadership, management, and vision which will determine selection of leadership candidates and the training needed for them to excel at their jobs (Stewart, 1976). Rather than focus on similarities in managerial work, Stewart (1976) showed that a new way of thinking about managerial or leadership jobs is to perceive these responsibilities as “the demands that they make, the constraints that they impose, and the choices that they offer” (p. 32). These managers (leaders) are being challenged to make choices in their work and jobs, which will “maximize their effectiveness given the different constraints and demands of the job” (Lowe, 2003, p. 210). The model sought to compare the perceptions of managers’ responsibility of their job based on what they saw and experienced of the demands, constraints, and choices within their unit and the organization.
Table 1

*Description of Demands, Constraints, and Choices facing Work of Leaders of Teaching and Learning Centers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demands</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance demands, Behavioral demands</td>
<td>Limited resources (people, technology, financial, expertise, time, facility)</td>
<td>Focus of attention between competing interests, colleges, departments, and project initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders’ involvement in the work of the unit, faculty support and needs, institutional projects and requirements</td>
<td>Legal, ethical, and professional constraints; workforce diversity, and organizational policies</td>
<td>Time spent on supervision of direct reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic responsibilities that cannot be delegated; administrative policies</td>
<td>Financial and technological limitations; working environment; culture of organization</td>
<td>Amount and nature of delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with administration, institutional initiatives, policies, expectations</td>
<td>Attitude of administrators, faculty, direct reports, supervisor of director, perceptions, and attitudes</td>
<td>Attention given to boundaries and whom the leader seeks to influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demands

The leader in the path-goal theory is challenged to find the optimal leader behavior, which fits the situation and the needs that his or her staff members require at any moment. The leader then applies the proper leadership style toward increasing his or her staff motivation level, job success, and satisfaction. As indicated before, leaders (Northouse, 2010) are challenged to constantly seek ways to remove obstacles that can increase the demands and lower the performance of staff members. Leaders also seek to define a vision for their organization, lead staff members by example, and at the same time understand the demands of their superiors in order to align and manage the direction of their units with the overall organization. Stewart (1976) defined demands as those pressures that arise from work requests or appeals made by working with other people, the demands that jobs have on the “jobholder’s behavior” (p. 22) and challenges that the job may impose. In describing the model, Stewart (1982a) identified demands as comprising two kinds, namely, “having to do certain kinds of work and satisfying certain criteria” (p. 9).

Demands are jobs or responsibilities that leaders have to do or what must be done. These job responsibilities are guided by the job descriptions, the responsibilities of the position, or the charge given by the jobholder’s leader. Stewart (1982a) outlined some of these responsibilities of demand as performance measures, level of personal involvement needed by the jobholder, and the various work relationships between direct responsibilities and leaders. Additionally demands included the various work personalities and the challenges that come with work relationships, the political power
and bureaucratic policies and procedures that are either delegated or attended to directly, as well as meetings that have to be attended.

**Constraints**

Stewart (1982a) described constraints as “the factors, internal or external to the organization, that limit what the jobholder can do” (p. 9). The work of the leader of a unit or department is constrained to the extent of the defined work for his or her unit and the goals prescribed by the organization and the institutional leaders. These work or job facets cannot be changed as they operate within physical constraints or within the institutional policies which act as boundaries in the organization. The manager (leader) of the unit has to be aware of the expectations of his or her respective leader but also of his or her peers, staff members, the customers, and entities outside of the organization.

Stewart (1982a) provided a summary of examples of different kind of constraints that are experienced in managerial jobs. These constraints range from limitations of resources (technology, people, material, and funding), legal constraints based on the organizational structure and industry, physical location of the unit or the organization, how the manager’s unit is defined and organized based on goals and mission, and the attitude of people to changes to the type of services offered and produced. How much work can be developed outside of the unit, as well as changes in systems, procedures, organization, pay, and working conditions, are also constraints placed on the managerial job and leader responsibilities.

**Choices**

The definition of choices provided by Stewart (1982a) describes it as “activities that the jobholder can do but does not have to do” (p. 9). The framework that Stewart
developed to explain the study of a manager’s job is described by Lowe (2003) as managers exercising “their choices in carrying out the functions of the position” (p. 205). Lowe depicted the model as “a domain of managerial choice” (p. 205); constraints and demands limiting and providing multiple choices for managers. The issue of time spent on the job or project is very important to Stewart in explaining the various choices that managers face in his or her day-to-day job. The amount of time on the job defines the demands and the amount of choice that is left to do other work.

Choice of domain provides managers with opportunities for changing the domain of their unit for which they are responsible (Stewart, 1982a) as well as changing the choice of domain outside their own unit. This could be through work sharing or collaboration, or through the managers becoming experts in a particular field or discipline within and outside their organization. Stewart showed that choice of domain allowed these managers to have a choice in the emphasis of their job so as to devote more time and energy to those areas where they choose to increase their expertise and ability. Examples of choices offered by Stewart were summarized as choices in how the work was done, in what work was actually done, whether by emphasizing certain aspects of the job or becoming experts in some tasks and delegating others. Managers have choices to change their unit’s domain of responsibility, to modify the area of the unit’s work or through collaboration, and share the work with other units or colleagues, while participating in “organizational and public activities” (p. 11).

Roles of Teaching and Learning Centers

The role of TLCs is to support faculty members in their quest to be better-equipped teachers, mentors, and educational facilitators able to guide and support the
knowledge of students in critical thinking, and able to apply the knowledge gained in practical and real-world problem conditions. TLCs seeks to create an environment where faculty are able to move from “transmitting knowledge” (King, p. 30, 1993) through lecturing to teaching that embraces the constructivist model, where students are placed at the center of the teaching and learning, and are able to actively participate in thinking and discussing ideas (King, 1993). Frantz et al. (2005) conducted extensive research on the roles of TLCs based on a central question of “what do these centers provide to enhance and improve the teaching climate of their institution” (p. 73).

The researchers found that the majority of centers surveyed engaged in services supporting faculty and instructional development activities ranging from faculty consultation work, providing facilities for faculty meetings and discussions, and workshops on instructional design. Other activities or services offered were instructional technology support for teaching and learning, multicultural teaching and learning services, proctoring and examination services, writing, grant proposal support, and student learning skills assistance.

Based on their findings, Frantz et al. (2005) were able to itemize the different service offerings these TLCs provided to their institutions, what were the primary feature in those TLCs, and the perceived best practices and strategies being used by the TLCs to achieve their goal as instructional change agents and champions of faculty development. It is important to note that the services that the researchers were able to add in their survey was based on visiting a number of centers as well as visiting websites of the centers and itemizing their service offerings.
Bartlett (2002) described the work of TLCs as organizing workshops and working with professors one-on-one, and dissecting their course content to develop objectives that challenge students through active verbs (develop, create, assess, describe, compare). Aligning these objectives to resources and assignments as collaborative, cooperative, or active learning methodology is useful for students to develop course materials as evidence of what they have learned. The faculty then provides assignments or group activities to assess student learning and applies a grade as evidence of accomplishing the understanding of the course.

The purpose of the TLCs is to provide effective organizational development that supports effective instructional development. As part of their service, TLCs support faculty to apply technology to their courses as a means of enhancing their course content. Technologies such as lecture capture, on-line quizzing, forums, wikis, to name a few, are utilized within the course development. The consultation with faculty members also means listening to faculty talk about what is not working in their courses and searching for solutions (Bartlett, 2002). As seen in many TLCs, providing services which support faculty in their teaching is a large part of their work as teaching can be a challenging venture for faculty who were never trained to teach as part of their graduate studies or research. In a study of sources of stress for faculty, Gmelch, Lovrich, and Wilke (1984) showed that faculty reported 60% of stress they experienced was associated with the teaching, research, and service functions, with teaching as the most stressful activity.

TLCs are well placed to be change agents and supporters for faculty to equip them with the knowledge and skills needed to reduce the anxiety that can affect their teaching, research, and service to the university community. Lee (2010) outlined several programs
and services most commonly offered by TLCs and fall into three categories, namely “workshops, individual consultations, and classroom observations” (p. 26). These programs and services form important resources for faculty and their development as instructional developers, and point to the centers as an important facilitator for faculty support and change agent for organizational development.

The three categories, as described by Lee (2010) can be divided into multiple events and topic areas that TLCs seek to offer or not offer, in some level or detail or just as resource for research and knowledge. Workshops are described as including course design, various teaching strategies, evaluation of students, facilitating graduate student teaching and mentoring, evaluating faculty teaching, use of technology, or creating multimedia assets for use in the different modalities of teaching and learning. For the category of individual consultation, these services are defined as a “faculty member meets one on one with a center staff member or less commonly, with a faculty fellow in strict confidence on some aspect of teaching” (Lee, 2010, p. 26).

Examples of topics covered in faculty consultations are introducing a new teaching strategy, employing technology in an intentional manner in a course so as to enhance the course materials, development or redesign of a course or syllabus, a strategy to introduce methods for active learning, team or group work, the implementation of online assessment activities, and instructional strategies to support large courses. Some institutions, based on the level of staffing of their TLCs and support from senior or more experienced faculty, are able to offer classroom observations as a means of guiding faculty or acting as a mentor and facilitator to discuss core strengths of teaching and offer areas where improvement may occur, and are shared with the faculty (Lee, 2010).
As institutions of higher learning begin to see the valuable role TLCs can play in their mission of educational excellence and student success, services offered will be dependent on the level of support and staffing TLCs cover for faculty orientations and teaching and learning conferences. As a means of celebrating the work of instructors, various research grants or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) can be provided to faculty members to show evidence of implementation of an instructional method and the results of scholarly research.

The use of faculty fellows, who are senior faculty or faculty who have been successful with an innovative teaching and instructional methodology, is helpful for developing faculty learning communities where a cohort of faculty meet regularly to focus on similar topics, be it diversity in the classroom, accessibility and teaching, teaching with technology, mentoring, or attending conferences that the TLCs can support through travel money for the faculty. Equally, as the services of the centers become more important to or heavily utilized by the faculty community, TLCs in some universities are finding themselves consolidating with instructional technology units as academic leaders find the merger “more appropriate because the teaching center reflects correctly the means-end relationship between and among learning, pedagogy, and technology” (Lee, 2010, p. 31). The consolidation of academic support units offers great opportunity for best use of academic capital, both in human resources and financial support, as an efficient use of assets in a time of budgetary constraints and calls for accountability.

**Challenges Facing Teaching and Learning Centers in Higher Education**

In the article *Transforming the Environment for Learning: A Crisis of Quality*, Gardiner (2005) charged academic leaders to look urgently at methods and processes that
can “foster high level learning” (p. 10) for all students by implementing continuous improvement of the “quality of learning it produces” (p. 14). The institutional leaders, according to Gardiner, needed to become transformational and change leaders to affect the required higher quality academic change efforts by moving away from focusing only on “first-order change” (p. 9) such as scheduling classes, registration and tracking of student progress – seen as management issues, to issues that are seen as leadership (second-order change), such as addressing “problems where solutions are not well understood and that require adaptation to new realities through changes in peoples’ values, beliefs, and behavior” (p. 9).

Kotter (1995/2007) illustrated the differences between managing and leading as, managing includes planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving, while leadership seeks to motivate change through having a vision of the future of the organization, and leading by example. Kotter described these as eight steps for organizational transformation from (a) developing a sense of urgency, (b) creating a leadership team that is informed, committed and credible, (c) having a vision and a strategy of where the organization needs to go, (d) being able to communicate effectively the desired change for the future, (e) empowering team members to feel they have a stake in the decision and direction being taken, (f) engineering short term successes in order for improvements to be solidified (g) consolidating the change efforts and produce more change, and (h) institutionalize the change efforts so these become the norm of the organization. Gardiner (2005) encouraged academic leaders to instill in their educational institution the ability to produce “high-quality learning” (p. 9), which society demands and needs for the future.
In their article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Cook and Sorcinelli, (2002) documented the value of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) as occupying a unique place in the structure of an institution because the mandate of TLCs “addresses the needs and interests of the entire academic community in support of the education of students” (p. 1). The core premise of a structural frame within an organization, as noted by Bolman and Deal (2008), suggested the need for “clear, well understood goals, roles, and objectives” (p. 46) where adequate coordination is essential to organizational performance.

Frantz et al. (2005) researched the roles of TLCs and the challenges they faced in the ever-changing higher educational environment. Their research sought to address seven areas of interest regarding faculty development centers. These interests were (a) the functions and programs offered, (b) the perceived best practices of the centers, (c) what obstacles they faced toward achieving their goals, (d) their organizational and reporting structure, (e) accountability measures put in place, and (f) the relationship that existed between the TLCs and use of technology by faculty in teaching and learning. The findings by Frantz et al. (2005) showed the TLCs needed to ensure that their range of services aligned with the mission of the university, the “conception of faculty work” (p. 87), and the expectations of the faculty. Support from institutional administrators was very important to promote and advocate on behalf of TLCs so that a strong message of support could be sent to faculty. Additionally, not only should institutional administrators work to “promote the center as a site of inquiry about learning” (p. 87), but these administrators should support the use of emerging technology in an intentional manner in all faculty and staff development efforts of teaching and learning initiatives.
Sorcinelli et al. (2005) described the evolution of faculty development as offering a “cafeteria of services” (p. 14) to support faculty in their many initiatives of teaching, research, and service. The emergence of new teaching methodologies such as on-line and blended teaching propels centers to be current to the trends in higher education and ensure their services are consistent. Services such as individual faculty consultations, large course redesign initiatives, intensive seminars of faculty learning communities, teaching fellowships, presentations at conferences of journals and publications, and scholarship of teaching and learning centers are a few of the services or practices models Sorcinelli et al. (2005) described as services TLCs will need to build upon and provide for the years to come. While the history of TLCs has been filled with closures, reduction of services, or breakup in the support structure, Cook and Sorcinelli (2002) contended these challenges as services TLCs needed to provide as an “overview of campus activities in order to highlight and disseminate instructional innovations and prioritize areas where more support is needed” (p. 2).

**Academic Leadership of Teaching and Learning Units**

Academic leadership in higher education is constantly being challenged by political examinations of the cost of education, the rate of graduation, and the relevancy of what graduates are learning compared to the expertise and knowledge needed by industries and countries. Swil (2002) in his article *Higher Education and the New Demographics: Questions for Policy*, stated that higher education is going through “significant changes stimulated by the rapid growth of the Internet, the increasing globalization of higher education, and the ever-pressing question of institutional and instructional quality” (p. 16). Swil argued that universities are facing these questions on
the institutional and instructional quality of education, and how higher education addresses these challenges because of a redefinition of higher education to “evolve, adapt, or desist” (p. 16).

On the impacts on higher education, Swil showed that the rise in “virtual instruction and alternative delivery methods, using technology-based methods of instruction” (p. 23), has the potential to increase opportunity and access for a wider demographics of students who previously did not have access. How the academic leadership addresses those challenges depends on the strategic vision and culture of the institution to accept and manage the changes as a learning organization. The level of academic leadership needed is one that is able to adapt to the rapidly changing landscape of education by being able to develop a more “systematic processes for creating/acquiring new knowledge to better their core processes of teaching and learning, or applying new knowledge in improving instruction” (Garvin, 1993, p. 77). Garvin stated that using a stringent test for learning organizations; universities would fail the test given the need to “modify its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights” (p. 77).

Given the increasing competitive environment, universities find themselves in what Dill (1999) suggested, is a number of changes that need to be taken so that the institutions could become stronger as a learning organization in their quest to improve the teaching and learning experiences for students and faculty. One of the changes Dill outlined was instilling a “culture of evidence” (p. 149) for academic problem solving to improve the quality of teaching and learning. A method used to address this change would be for academic departments to show how their teaching processes measures up against actual student learning. The improved coordination of teaching units is another
change Dill advocated as a means of increasing the ability for coordination, communication, and accountability among faculty members and academic departments. This meant instituting structural adaptations among different units able to “coordinate the quality of teaching and learning within academic units” (p. 149).

Institutions of all sizes and structures have to be able to efficiently coordinate among their units to be successful in developing their service and product offerings. Universities are no different and most do so in a structure that is highly decentralized in its leadership and education service offerings. Dill (1999) advocated for universities to improve its coordination of learning, by “providing more effective coordination, support, and accountability for the systematic improvement of teaching and learning” (p. 150).

Finally, Dill showed that for learning organizations, there needed to be a better process for transferring knowledge through managers and leaders identifying best practices on the quality of teaching and learning, and then moving the knowledge across academic units to learn from each other and being consistent with the experiences learned. Leaders within organizations must be adept at deciphering multiple information sources while sorting through what can work versus those that will fail. Being able to adapt to the changes can be addressed through professional development, listening to the various stakeholders, are some of the leadership traits that instills the knowledge needed to be successful. Raines and Alberg (2003) showed that a “successful leader in academic administration must find time and opportunity to obtain feedback and engage in continuous self-improvement based on that feedback” (p. 38). These elements are some of the challenges faced by directors of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) as they manage the institutional demands from administrative and political leaders who are
constantly seeking ways for the institution to adapt to the changing environments so as to improve the academic quality of the university, and increase its effectiveness as a learning organization.

**Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers**

The rise of TLCs as supporter of teaching and learning initiatives and best practices has occurred as more and more universities are seeking to allocate funds and services for the improvement of teaching and learning within academic units. The coordination of these improvements require a department, committee, and/or body of educators who are able to manage funds and other resources to support various educational innovations and research on teaching and learning, as well as provide assistance to methods of student engagement and active learning (Dill, 1999). The TLCs meet that description of an academic unit able to coordinate and manage the improvement of teaching and learning. Sorcinelli et al. (2005) in a research on faculty development programs, studied nearly 500 faculty developers from all institution types, and identified structural variations among faculty development programs, based on the goals, purposes, and models that guided and influenced the faculty program developments and the top challenges facing faculty members, institutions, and their programs.

Three types of faculty support personnel were identified within faculty development units (professional, instructional, and organizational development). These were:

1. Instructional designers/developers/staff – attends to instructional, technological, and pedagogical methods in teaching and learning
2. Psychology faculty – teaching, mentoring, advising, doctoral student support

3. Administrative personnel – leaders, managers, and supervisors

Many TLCs have experienced volatility through restructuring due to ever changing teaching and learning policies as institutional leaders race to address accountability and relevancy of their institution to the society they serve. Directors of TLCs have to work with this unpredictability by being strategically aware of the demands, constraints, and choices they face in leading the center. By understanding the deliverables and what is expected in terms of performance, being able to have systems and personnel in place to meet the changes, and having an understanding of the key questions to ask, these academic leaders seek to provide the necessary research data to show how the center will perform to meet these challenges (Palmer & Holt, 2009).

In a research project entitled, *Strategic Leadership for Institutional Teaching and Learning Centres: Developing a Model for the 21st Century*, Palmer and Holt (2009) observed the key areas of TLC performance and the factors affecting strategic leadership in these centers. The primary constraint identified by the centers was a perceived ‘lack of staff time,’ both in faculty members and in the operations of the center, to engage in teaching and learning improvement activities. Another major constraint identified was incorrect or outdated general perceptions of the role and function of the center by the institutions and their leaders.

The role of the director in this environment becomes one of educational leader, mentor, role-model, and advocate for faculty teaching and student learning, while carrying out the demands of the institutional leaders for quality of the educational process, and ensuring accountability through the best use of the resources of the
institution. Garvin (1993) showed that universities were facing increasing external pressure in the form of performance indicators, teaching assessments, and academic audits designed to maintain or improve the quality of teaching and learning; a situation that directors of TLCs needed to manage through systematic processes that showed success. These key challenges meant that the directors needed to have the training and expertise able to navigate this growing call for teaching and learning improvement, while ensuring job satisfaction and motivation for their staff members. The performance of TLCs is based on the talents of its people and their ability to advocate change and a willingness to try new research and innovations in teaching and learning.

The concept of teams as shared by Kezar (2005) described a body of talented people who come together under a shared vision to contribute with a broad notion of intelligence to find solutions to problems. The directors of TLCs, as leaders, must be able to gather personnel with different understandings of a problem, to collectively recognize that no one person has the answer, but as a team with diverse perspectives, they can “create organizational learning to face the myriad of challenges and to best serve students” (Kezar, 2005, p. 57). This role as a middle manager forces the director to understand how to discern the effect institutional culture can have on the support needed from faculty to accept necessary changes to take place in teaching and learning, while dealing with administrative policies that can frustrate the necessary organizational improvements needed for change.

**Selection and Training of the Directors**

“Parents, employers, and legislators are interested in the quality of teaching provided by colleges and universities. Learning outcomes are emphasized, including
traditional subject matter expertise and skills as well as abilities to use technology effectively, integrate and apply knowledge, and solve open-ended problems” (Austin, 2002, p. 94). In the research article titled, *Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty: Graduate School as Socialization to the Academic Career*, Austin (2002) advocated for current faculty members to support and prepare future faculty members for the new challenges for teaching and learning for the coming century by mentoring and sharing lived experiences so that the new faculty can capitalize on the information and build their experiences. This is the same with faculty entering the realm of academic leadership in whatever field they find themselves.

Many of the characteristics of successful academic administrators can be observed in their role as faculty members. Strathe and Wilson (2006) showed that successful academic leaders worked well with others and enjoyed collaborative and cooperative efforts in their position of responsibility. Successful administrators were able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of others and to build cohesive teams based on those individual differences. They delegated appropriately but assumed personal responsibility for making difficult decisions. Effective academic leaders were also able to sustain high levels of confidentiality and were more concerned about institutional advancement than personal advancement. For-profit organizations tend to offer corporate learning opportunities for their members to learn and grow with experience, an occurrence that does not readily take place in higher education with many faculty finding themselves as accidental leaders based in a personal desire, having conducted seminal research in teaching and learning, or having professed a desire to become directors of TLCs. In the same way most faculty were not prepared as teachers, directors of TLCs are mostly in the
position due to a love of teaching and learning or because they practiced what was viewed as good teaching methodology, or came to the interest of the institutional leaders (Raines & Alberg, 2003).

Jones (2008) wrote that institutions must support new faculty in their development as teachers and provide the necessary resources, including release time, mentoring, and seminars, to facilitate that growth. Herman (2013) showed that an institution’s commitment to its leaders and the TLCs was seen through their allocation of dedicated professional time to professional development and the improvement of teaching. In looking at research on the critical issues facing mid-level leadership in postsecondary settings, Filan and Seagren (2003) identified six critical issues that would be a “continuing increase in role demands and complexity” (p. 22) for midlevel leaders. The six issues were: (a) understanding self, (b) understanding transformational leadership, (c) establishing and maintaining relationships, (d) leading teams, (e) leading strategic planning and change, and (f) connecting through community.

Filan and Seagren advocated the development of a professional development academy that would “build a learning community among the participants, sustain the community through high-performance leadership challenges, and recognize the accomplishments of each individual as he or she completed the rigorous year-long program” (p. 29). Directors of TLCs should be provided with that support to ensure their effectiveness, not only as practitioners of the discipline, but also as change agents for their institution, leaders of personnel, and able to utilize the skills and ability of their team.
Challenges Faced by the Directors

Many of the key challenges faced by for-profit institutions in managing success when confronted with the same opportunities and constraints, is the quality of its leadership and how effectively the organization responds to industry and competitive conditions (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). The ability of academic leaders to be flexible to changing situations, maintaining efficient and reliable operations, and provide services and support that is needed by their customers, determines the performance of the organization and how they maintain employee morale and productivity. These directors need to be leaders who are good at managing and can influence organizational processes and outcomes (Kotter, 1995/2007). As universities seek to address the needed organizational change efforts necessary to compete, and provide quality teaching and learning experiences for their constituents, directors of TLCs must be able to be change agents able to advocate for the type of change needed, and outline the necessary institutional culture and policy changes that will be needed to be effective and successful for students and faculty. Kotter’s model of leading change advocated eight steps from establishing a sense of urgency for change to creating a coalition of change members through a vision and organizational strategy that supports the necessary changes needed in the organization.

The work of the center must move from a micro level, whereby work is focused on working one-on-one with faculty, to that of macro level of change efforts, developing learning communities of practice among faculty, and creating opportunities of practice among a cohort of faculty. The directors of TLCs in their role as educational advocates
and faculty developers are well informed and self-confident to take on an influential role in the transformation of the university, through their strong skills in communication, team building, and collaboration (Dawson, Britnell, & Hitchcock, 2010). To effectively demonstrate the practice within teaching and learning centers, directors must understand the importance of their personnel to the mission of the center, appreciate the role their direct responsibilities bring to the center, advocate for the proper and adequate resources and expertise needed to fulfill the mission, and showcase the abilities of the center through reports and performance data (Palmer & Holt, 2009).

The leaders of TLCs are faced with a climate that is placing greater emphasis on student retention and academic success, and developing comprehensive programs that support both faculty and students in an effort to maximize resources. TLCs have to identify the best practices of instruction through observing other centers, being current on the research taking place in their field, and ensuring that the operations of the center is aligned with the mission and direction of their respective institutions. The expertise and experience of the director of a TLC will be challenged to rise to that of a leader who is flexible to adjust to the changing landscape of education, but steady to ensure that the best practices of instruction, will emphasize collaboration and faculty buy in, place their unit in the center of the academic structure, plus capitalize on the potential of technological innovation for the success of the academic community.

Chapter Summary

A leader in the narrowest of definitions is one who seeks to lead others through motivation and example. Many definitions of leadership were identified with qualities of leaders in relation to large and small organizations, corporate and academic institutions,
for-profit, and not-for-profit organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Kotter, 1995/2007; Mintzberg, 1973; Senge, 1990). By empowering and providing guidance, the leader creates opportunities for members of the organization to contribute skills, time, experience, and knowledge to the creation and delivery of ideas, knowledge, and products. The leaders of TLCs face a challenging climate that places greater emphasis on academic success for students and developing comprehensive programs which will support both faculty and students to maximize resources. An important dynamic of leadership is being able to effectively manage direct reports, remove obstacles, or lead change efforts to ensure success and the continued viability of the organization.

The role of the director in this environment becomes one of educational leader, mentor, role-model, and advocate for faculty teaching and student learning while managing the demands, constraints, and choices from institutional leaders for quality of the educational process and accountability of resources. By having a supportive culture that recognizes the importance of teaching on the same level as research activities, institutions have the opportunity to value and appreciate the work of faculty in equal measure to that of research activities. Likewise, having administrative policies which support instructional and faculty development coupled with appropriate technological innovation allows directors of TLCs to experiment with new ideas and programs that address the learning of students and the work of faculty. As institutions of higher learning face greater scrutiny on accreditation, TLCs will be expected to be among the main providers of institutional data for performance, advocating for faculty professional development support, and supporting quality of courses and diversity in the modalities of course delivery.
The preceding literature review was divided into three sections of material that were pertinent to this study of leadership and understanding the demands, constraints, and choices on directors of faculty professional development units in higher education. The first section consisted of a review of the literature pertaining to the historical development of leadership theory and current research in leadership studies. The second section included a brief discussion of the issues and perspectives of organizational characteristics of professional development units in higher education including the new challenges of face-to-face, blended, and on-line or distance education in higher education, and a review of the directors of faculty professional development units, the specific leadership role addressed in this study. The third section reviewed the literature of the theory of demands, constraints, and choices as it affected managers and leaders of organizations and departments. Emphasis in this section was given to the leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions as it affected the work and responsibility of their staff, their managers, and to the faculty of their institution.

The literature reviewed in this chapter served as a justification for the purpose of this study; to quantitatively explore the demands, constraints, and choices placed on directors of faculty professional development units in mid to moderate sized universities. Through the support of faculty in the development and delivery of course content, faculty developers supported faculty members to utilize learning communities for pedagogical content knowledge, and the integration of technology to enhance teaching and learning.

Specific methodology designed to assist in the accomplishment of this purpose is described in Chapter Three. The emerging findings and subsequent discussion of such findings will be presented in Chapters Four and Five, respectively. Following the
concluding chapter, an appendix will be provided which contains the informed consent and introduction letters, and the qualitative instrument used to gather survey responses.
CHAPTER THREE
Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

Higher education institutions are constantly being challenged to provide opportunities for teaching and learning to their faculty as it affects their professional responsibility with respect to service, teaching, and research. The rise of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) as stated by Singer (2002), allow higher education institutions “to search for synergies or balance between their scholarly pursuits and commitment to teaching excellence” (p. 63). Higher educational administrators have created teaching and learning programs and centers with the objective of supporting faculty in their teaching, providing opportunities to conduct research on the efficacy of their teaching, and implementing various technologies toward enhancing their course materials (Bartlett, 2002). These TLCs provide professional support to faculty (Wilkerson & Irby, 1998) through instructional developers/designers, media production staff, and faculty consultants who provide faculty mentoring, research opportunities through scholarship of teaching and learning, and teacher evaluation of practice.

This research examined the challenges experienced by leaders of TLCs in higher education institutions in managing the demands, constraints, and choices of leading a TLC in the midst of changing administrative policies and institutional culture. As described in Figure 1, Stewart’s model of demands, constraints, and choices (Kroeck, 2003) observes how managers exercise the central core of demands from those they lead to those that they report to. The managers determine how they meet the day-to-day
demands of the job; an outer edge of occupational constraints based on the limitations and dependence established by the job; and the inner margin of choices faced in carrying out the wide functions of their job which is limited by the constraints and demands. These choices, within the demands and constraints of the job, represent the “domain of managerial choice” (Kroeck, 2003, p. 205) or the amount of time the leader will spend on the job. The constraints and demands both limit and provide opportunities for choices by the leader.

Figure 1. Stewart’s Model of Constraints, Demands, and Choices

The need to find research data on the type of leader favorable for TLCs (the middle manager) was paramount to this research as it is important for these new and emerging leaders to be mentored, trained, and guided on using the path-goal theory leadership approach to be competent within their educational institution. The challenges
faced by the leaders of these centers range from justifying, defending, and securing funding for their unit’s existence (demands, constraints, and choices).

A search of research articles and journals by the researcher, revealed no quantitative or qualitative data which looked at the demands, constraints, and choices that directors of TLCs faced in Carnegie classified higher education institutions (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). Additionally, results from the research in this area could be beneficial to directors of TLCs as a means of improving their understanding of the challenges of the managerial jobs these middle leaders face, and how those demands, constraints, and choices were affected by administrative policies and institutional culture. The outcome of the research may impact decisions regarding the methods of selection, retention, recruitment, and the training and development of directors of teaching and learning centers. It may also provide insights into choices that could be made by these directors in relationship to the improvement of their leadership effectiveness. The researcher sought to provide survey data showing how the leadership theory of demands, constraints, and choices affected the decision-making of these leaders. It is hoped that the information gathered will inform the type of leadership development training, mentorship, and educational experience required to perform as a leader in a faculty teaching and learning unit in higher education.

Statement of Research Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the connection between the demands, constraints, and choices encountered by academic leaders of TLCs in higher education and what effect, if any, did administrative policies and institutional culture have on their capacity to lead the centers. These academic leaders are comprised of faculty members
who have transitioned to the role of mid-level leaders, as well as professional staff who have made important educational contributions, and are acknowledged as peers by faculty and administrative leaders. By using a mixed-methods research investigation of the leader’s perceptions, this research sought to ascertain how the leaders of TLCs in higher education institutions dealt with the challenges of meeting the demands, constraints, and choices of decisions within their respective center.

Though directors of TLCs were selected to provide feedback on the leadership challenges they face in meeting the administrative policies and institutional culture of their respective institutions, administrative leaders who supervised leaders of TLCs, and professional staff and other faculty members of TLCs were also asked to offer their perspectives on these leaders and their ability to manage the demands, constraints, and choices of decisions affecting TLCs. Administrative policies within higher education institutions have affected teaching and learning through increases in class sizes, the issue of intellectual property ownership on course content, the growing population of adjunct faculty, the growth of on-line and distance education courses, the growing adoption of technology to enhance course content and student learning, and greater awareness of faculty professional development needs through TLCs (Meine, Dunn, & Abbey, 2012).

Institutional culture, as described by Kezar and Eckel (2002), is the “shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organization or its work” (p. 438). In the context of TLCs, the institutional culture of the institution affects how well the culture of the faculty members support collaboration with the professional staff, how supportive administrative leaders are on initiatives to improve the work environment for the professional staff, the level of communication across the disciplines,
and a recognition of change efforts which can lead to the strengthening of services and resources for faculty and students (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010).

The primary objective of this research was to examine how the leaders of TLCs dealt with the demands, constraints, and choices within their work as they lead the initiatives of their unit and provide both functional and technological support of teaching and learning. Their experiences as academic leaders of TLCs would be used to identify the practical approach needed to engage students and faculty in program development, encourage dialogue about best-practices in teaching and learning, share resources across the institution, behave intentionally in the implementation of technology in teaching and learning, and provide support and mentorship to their staff and faculty through learning communities (Spracklin-Reid, James, Hawboldt, Ahmed, & Shirokoff, 2013).

**Research Questions**

There is a need to explore the possible connections between the perceptions of administrative leaders of teaching and learning centers (TLC) to the demands, constraints, and choices of managing these TLCs. Additionally, this research sought to determine how administrative policies and institutional culture affected the performance of TLCs as it related to faculty professional development. The focus of this study leads to the following research questions;

1. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture?
2. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture?
3. Given the demands and constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture, what are the choices available to leaders of teaching and learning centers?

**Research Design**

The approach of the study used a mixed-methods analysis research design to address a problem of practice as an “approach to inquiry that combines or associates both qualitative and quantitative forms” (Creswell, 2009, p. 4) of data analysis. The rationale for using mixed-methods research was “to capture the perspectives of these leaders as a basis for their actions in the social setting” (Hatch, 2002, p. 7) for the qualitative data by providing pedagogical and andragogical support for faculty in higher education. The quantitative data would provide a means of “testing objective theories by examining the relationship between variables” (Creswell, 2009, p. 4). By exploring the demands, constraints, and choices faced by leaders of TLC in managing the centers, the researcher sought to show the effect administrative policies and institutional culture of higher education institutions can have on managing the centers and providing faculty professional support in a changing environment. This mixed-methods approach of the study used an on-line survey comprised of open- and close-ended questions, designed by the researcher based on a review of the literature on demands, constraints, and choices faced by mid-level leaders of departments. The survey was reviewed by the dissertation committee on mixed-methods design before dissemination to the target population in the POD Network.
Participants and Sampling Procedures

As stated by Gay and Airasian (2003), qualitative research is “useful for describing and answering questions about participants and contexts” (p. 163). Qualitative research also clarifies questions on topics not easily addressed using purely quantitative methodologies. Based on the open-ended questions, themes or topics emerge as the study progresses. Quantitative research is concerned with the gathering participants perspectives on the research being conducted and interpreting any “cause-effect relationships” (Gay and Airasian, 2003, p. 184). Mixed-methods research uses the qualitative analysis of the study to interpret and elaborate on the quantitative results. The institution identified to receive the on-line survey (see Appendix A) for this study was the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD) in Higher Education comprising approximately 1,800 members.

As stated on their website, POD Network (n.d.) supports a network of faculty and teaching assistant developers, faculty, administrators, consultants, and others who perform roles that value teaching and learning in higher education. The dataset from the POD Network membership included members from many countries with the highest number coming from the United States. These members worked at universities of various sizes and classified through the Carnegie’s basic classification (McCormick & Zhao, 2005) of associate, baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral/research institutions of higher learning, with additional members coming from community colleges, for-profit and non-profit organizations. The teaching and learning centers of the members provided the services within their respective institution comprising faculty development, instructional
development and faculty learning communities, teaching with technology support, scholarship of teaching and learning, and institutional change efforts.

The POD members’ career positions included directors of primary teaching and learning centers in higher education, instructional designers/technologists, faculty consultants, education and psychology researchers involved in faculty teaching and learning, and university administrators responsible for the creation and funding of these teaching and learning centers. While directors of the primary TLCs in higher education institutions were sought as the main participants in the study, the study captured data from staff members of teaching and learning centers and institutional administrators to whom the directors reported by using branching questions that differentiated whether the respondent was a director or staff/supervisor of a director.

The data was captured by the use of branching questions that gauged the role of the respondent and then provided questions that were connected to that role. This was done in support of the literature on managerial jobs in terms of the demands that they make, the constraints they impose, and the choices that they offer to mid-level managers who typically spend most of their time “responding to the problems, instructions, or requests of other people” (Stewart, 1976, p. 28) in order to receive feedback from staff members and supervisors of the directors.

In order to identify the TLCs, it was important that the criteria used in the research addressed units within higher education institutions that had as their service mandate, faculty instructional development, best practices of pedagogical methodologies, scholarship of teaching and learning, as well as the appropriate use of technology in teaching and learning. Herman (2013) provided three criteria for what is defined as a
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TLC, (a) the unit is charged with providing faculty professional development, (b) the center serves postsecondary institutions, and (c) pedagogy is actively delivered as part of the service provided by the centers.

Kuhlenschmidt (2011), in her research on teaching and learning development units in higher education, used a criterion to select these units for inclusion in her research based on the typical characteristics of units belonging to the POD Network. The criteria was based on the units identified as providing instructional support to post-secondary instructors “whether faculty, graduate student, or adjunct” (p. 277), that the directive given to the unit involved teaching development responsibility for instructors, and finally, that the mission of the unit was largely focused on pedagogy, and not only on teaching with technology. Such a mandate would involve “seminars on active learning, teacher learning communities, and consultation on instructional design” (p. 278) among some of the activities. Hence, this research study focused on leaders of primary TLCs that provided professional and instructional development services to all faculty members in higher education institutions.

**Rationale for Mixed-Methods Study**

The strategy of inquiry used was a grounded theory to determine (Creswell, 2009) a general, abstract theory of a process, action, or interaction grounded in the views of the participants who were identified as leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions. A mixed-methods research was seen as necessary to use qualitative analysis and interpretation to provide insights and explanations on the quantitative results of the study (Gay and Airasian, 2003). This study was guided by a mix of quantitative and qualitative questions within the survey that provided descriptions
or insights into the higher education institutions of participants based on the Carnegie Classification for universities and colleges (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). The researcher defined insights as themes that “emerged from the data set as a whole” (LeCompte, 2000, p. 164) without the use of specific codes. Insights discovered by the researcher were analyzed using an inductive approach. By using themes, stories would emerge from the coding to inform findings, recommendations, and implications (LeCompte, 2000) on the study.

The mixed-methods survey was comprised of three sections. The first section of the survey collected institutional information and the services provided by the teaching and learning centers. Attitudes toward various faculty teaching and learning initiatives in four areas (faculty teaching, course redesign, using technology in teaching and learning, and faculty learning communities) were also asked of respondents. The second section of the survey addressed the demands, constraints, and choices faced by mid-level leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education.

The impact, which administrative policies and institutional culture had on the leader, was also examined to see how these affected the leader’s effectiveness of his or her center. To identify the various services, resources, and functions offered by TLCs, previous research from four studies was used to identify the various roles of a TLC so as to develop items (stems) that would guide the demands, constraints and choices faced by directors of TLCs. The first study was conducted by Wright (2000) which identified services offered by TLCs including faculty and instructional development activities, providing resources and facilities for faculty work, varied workshops, and newsletters. Other services also identified were instructional technology support, media production
facilities, examination services, multicultural teaching and learning services, and student learning skills assistance.

The second study, conducted by Frantz, Beebe, Horvath, Canales, & Swee (2005) identified 45 different types of services offered by TLCs at various institutions ranging from institutions identified as public associate to public doctoral. It was noted that the various services listed by respondents followed Sorcinelli’s (2002) 10 best practices for developing and maintaining TLCs. The third and fourth study from Challis, Holt, and Palmer (2009) and Palmer, Holt, and Challis (2010), identified services and roles of Australian TLCs based on the characteristics, capacities, and constraints faced by the directors of the TLCs. Various services were identified which provided items (stems) that formed the various services provided by TLCs used in this study.

The third section of the survey assessed participants’ demographic information (e.g., sex, administrative position, faculty rank, locus of appointment, education). The survey used in the Australian study was modified with permission given by the researchers through email correspondence. As indicated by Mertens (2010), including variations within participants such as gender, ethnicity, and age, will help determine the effect gender, years of service, and administrative experience had on their leadership practice and performance. Qualitative survey questions also identified the demands the leaders perceived affected their ability to fully lead and manage as mandated by their institution. Questions also sought to identify how these leaders became directors of their teaching and learning centers, and what training, experience, or mentoring, if any, they received prior to or during their leadership tenure.
The participants in the study were given an informed consent document (see Appendix B) stating the information would be kept confidential, the purpose of the study, the benefits of the research, and the potential risks of the research. The sampling method chosen for this study was a convenience sample (Creswell, 2009) taken from a supporting organization representing a core group of leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education. This supporting professional organization, known as the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD), provides support, information, and practice (Singer, 2002) to TLCs.

Qualitative data was collected using open-ended survey questions of the leaders’ perception of leading their teaching and learning centers; the effectiveness of faculty learning communities as it relates to faculty teaching and its effect on student learning and success; and the choices of leadership strategies faced by leaders of teaching and learning centers. The survey was given on-line and provided anonymity through the use of pseudonyms for the higher education institutions, as well as for all participants. As this study was carried out under the banner of a university, permission was received from the institutional review board (IRB) of that institution.

Prior to the survey being accessed by potential participants, an informed consent was presented as a means to discuss the research activity that would involve human subjects and the gathering of qualitative and quantitative data questions or concerns about the study before agreeing to participate. The information gathered using the survey instrument sought to ascertain the demands, constraints, and choices faced by the directors of teaching and learning centers as they were challenged by the administrative policies and organizational culture of their higher education institutions.
Data Analysis

This study used the QUAN-Qual model of research (Gay and Airasian, 2003), which is described as taking the findings of the quantitative study and following up the study with qualitative analysis and interpretation of the quantitative results. Analyzing qualitative data as indicated by Gay and Airasian (2003) can be a formidable task to collect “rich, thick, and deep data to reveal the perspectives and understandings of the research participants” (p. 227). The task of analysis is to bring order to the received data through “organizing and crunching the data” (Gay and Airasian, 2003, p. 227), so as to find themes and bring meaning to the data. By constructing patterns from the open-ended questions of the survey, meanings or themes would hopefully emerge to support the data from the quantitative questions. Creswell (2009) described the analysis of qualitative data as “building patterns, categories, and themes from the bottom up” (p. 175), so as to organize the data into manageable units of information that shape the information that emerge from the process.

The on-line survey was sent to the POD organization with a potential 1,800 members as participants in the research. It must be noted that only the POD members of the primary TLCs in postsecondary institutions were sought as valid participants in the research. The researcher attempted to keep the focus of the research on the demands, constraints, and choices on directors of TLCs while analyzing the data from the qualitative survey, so as to gather thick, rich descriptive data from the analysis. The quantitative questions were first analyzed using descriptive analysis to describe the respondents and provide as indicated by Fink (2009), “simple summaries about the sample and the response to questions” (p. 78). The researcher then read each of the
responses, developed themes, insights, and classified the information, before interpreting the data and analyzing the qualitative questions.

Both data types were analyzed to find potential connections where applicable that supported the interpretations and meanings in the responses. An inductive approach was used to analyze the responses meaning, “the data are read searching for particulars that can be put into categories because of their relation to other particulars” (Tracy, 2010, p. 164). Validity of the measuring instrument was measured by the qualitative interpretations of the survey that required the collection of themes from the open-ended questions to support the desired interpretation (Gay & Airasian, 2003) of data from the quantitative sections of the survey findings.

**Research question 1:** For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture? A quantitative analysis was used to test the frequency and percentage of responses based on the level of importance and satisfaction on the demands affecting leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions. The demand category was analyzed to examine the levels of importance and the levels of satisfaction between the leader’s descriptions of the demands on his or her work and the perceptions from faculty/staff members and supervisors of the directors of teaching and learning centers. A Likert scale of one for ‘not applicable’ and five for ‘very high’ was used to determine the response for the importance and satisfaction levels. To determine the levels between the ‘not applicable’ and ‘very high’ mean ratings, mean scores at and below 1.9 was determined to be ‘not applicable’, and mean scores between 2.0 and 2.7 was determined to be low rating. Mean scores between 2.8 and 3.6 was determined to be a moderate rating, mean scores between
3.7 and 4.3 was chosen as high rating, and mean scores at and above 4.4 was chosen as very high ratings. Qualitative data from the open-ended questions were examined to identify themes or recurrent insights to organize and manage the descriptions based on inductive thematic analysis. The analysis would describe findings from the most important and the least important function or items of demands observed from the data.

**Research question 2:** For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture? A quantitative analysis was used to test the frequency and percentage of responses based on the level of importance and satisfaction on the constraints which affected leaders of teaching and learning centers based on internal or external factors, which limit what the jobholder can do. The constraints category was analyzed to examine the levels of importance and the levels of satisfaction between the leader’s descriptions of the constraints on his or her work and the perceptions from faculty/staff members and supervisors of the directors of teaching and learning centers. A Likert scale of one for ‘not applicable’ and five for ‘very high’ was used to determine the response for the importance and satisfaction levels. To determine the levels between the ‘not applicable’ and ‘very high’ mean ratings, mean scores at and below 1.9 was determined to be ‘not applicable’, and mean scores between 2.0 and 2.7 was determined to be low rating. Mean scores between 2.8 and 3.6 was determined to be a moderate rating, mean scores between 3.7 and 4.3 was chosen as high rating, and mean scores at and above 4.4 was chosen as very high ratings.

A qualitative analysis was used to analyze themes or insights discovered by the researchers using an inductive approach. This analysis was based on the responses from the open-ended questions from the leader’s perception of the constraints from
administrative policies and institutional culture, and how it affected the leader’s role and responsibility to effectively support the organization’s policies and practices.

Descriptions from the responses of faculty/staff members and supervisors of the directors of teaching and learning centers were also noted for their perception of the constraints they observed with regards to administrative policies and institutional culture. The means and the standard deviations from statistical differences could be used to determine any significant differences in the leader’s description of these constraints. The analysis would also describe findings from the most important and the least important function or items of constraints observed from the data.

**Research question 3:** Given the demands and constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture, what are the choices available to leaders of teaching and learning centers? A quantitative analysis was used to test the frequency and percentage of responses based on the choices category of importance and satisfaction on the choices of activities that the jobholder can do, but does not have to do, which affected the leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions. The choices category was analyzed to examine the levels of importance and the levels of satisfaction between the leader’s descriptions of the choices of activities on his or her work and the perceptions from faculty/staff members and supervisors of the directors of teaching and learning centers. A Likert scale of one for ‘not applicable’ and five for ‘very high’ was used to determine the response for the importance and satisfaction levels. To determine the levels between the ‘not applicable’ and ‘very high’ mean ratings, mean scores at and below 1.9 was determined to be ‘not applicable’, and mean scores between 2.0 and 2.7 was determined to be low rating. Mean scores between 2.8 and 3.6 was determined to be
a moderate rating, mean scores between 3.7 and 4.3 was chosen as high rating, and mean scores at and above 4.4 was chosen as very high ratings.

Survey questions to identify the level of involvement the director has in relevant decision-making activities was included to ascertain whether the administrative policies and institutional culture of the institution was inclusive allowing the members of the TLCs to be part of the early discussion on decision activities concerning teaching and learning. Qualitative data from the open-ended questions were examined to identify themes or recurrent insights to organize and to manage the descriptions based on inductive thematic analysis. The analysis would describe findings from the most important and the least important function or items based on the activities that the jobholder can do, but does not have to do.

The overall descriptive study allowed for three tables of data to be created showing the perception of demands, constraints, and choices from the three target groups (leader, supervisor, and faculty/staff member) and a fourth table itemizing priorities of functions deemed most important and eliciting the greater satisfaction from the respondents.

**Human Subjects’ Protection and Other Ethical Considerations**

The researcher adhered to the University of Missouri’s Institutional Review Board’s (IRB) procedures for conducting research as well as the POD’s research permission form procedure. In accordance with IRB’s guidelines, an informed consent document (see Appendix B) was provided to all participants advising of the research study potential rewards and risks, informed that participation of the study was voluntary and confidential, and gave the participants the opportunity to opt out of the study at any
time as well as understand the discomforts, inconvenience, and risk of this study. All participants were asked to sign the informed consent form before participating in the survey.

**Role of Researcher (or Positionality)**

In describing action research projects, Hatch (2002) defined action research as “improving practice based on what is discovered” (p. 31). Hatch further described action research as identifying a problem, reflecting on the variables of the problem, design some change toward addressing the problem and then offering suggestions for implementing the change. As the researcher in this research study, the theoretical framework of demands, constraints, and choices was proposed as a valid construct for leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions to use in their field to address the challenges of administrative policies and institutional culture on the centers. As an instructional design practitioner and researcher, the goal is to constantly engage in research of methodologies of teaching and learning to support faculty members in their quest to innovative instructional methodologies in the delivery of their course, be it face-to-face, blended, or on-line. Being constantly curious in one’s area of expertise ensures proficiency in supporting faculty in their course development, appropriate use of technology, and post assessment of their courses.

**Trustworthiness**

According to Graneheim and Lundman (2004), researchers seek to present research findings that are as “trustworthy as possible, and studies that are evaluated in relation to the procedures used to generate the findings” (p. 109). Within qualitative research the “concepts of credibility, dependability, and transferability have been used to
describe various aspects of trustworthiness,” (p. 109) and reliability of the research data. Mixed-methods research findings based on using the “QUAN-Qual model” (Gay and Airasian, 2003, p. 185) uses the findings of the quantitative findings to determine the type of data collected and interpretative based on the qualitative study. The researcher sought to identify sub-themes and themes supported by objective qualitative content analysis, for trustworthiness and consistency.

The concept of dependability is aligned with trustworthiness, in that research that is reliable is parallel to dependability (Mertens, 2010). Within this study, the researcher remained open to possible changes with the focus of the research process, and any changes were documented to “ensure the reliability, quality, and appropriateness with the inquiry process” (p. 259) of the research. Dependability in the survey data received and analysis of the findings was also a factor ensuring trustworthiness in the statistical findings and implications measured in actual evidence that supported the originality of the research.

As indicated by Gay and Airasian (2003), analyzing the results of the data can be a formidable task when collecting “rich, thick, and deep data” (p. 227) in order to understand the perception and experiences of research participants. Mertens (2010) described this as transferability, providing thick descriptions to “enable readers of the research to make judgments about the applicability of the research findings to their own situations” (p. 259). The survey instrument used was adapted from research by Palmer and Holt (2009) which studied teaching and learning center leaders and staff members engaged in a productive strategic leadership development program to enhance the center’s long-term performance. The questions used in the survey for this research
included open-ended questions that allowed respondents to provide rich and thick
descriptions of their perceptions and experiences to the research questions. This in turn
allowed the researcher to develop themes for inductive reasoning to support the research
findings.

The data and the subsequent analysis of the findings enabled the researcher to
present evidence related to the research questions in order to show that the researcher did
not contrive these findings. Mertens (2010) called this confirmability, which is
“qualitative parallel to objectivity” (p. 260). Any data analysis and the interpretation of
the data were received from the on-line survey instrument that the researcher provided to
respondents within the POD Network. Both the survey instrument and the data gathered
were protected by the faculty advisor and the researcher as a means of ensuring
trustworthiness that the information and the conclusions reached could be confirmed.

Limitations and Assumptions

The limitations and assumptions within this research were presented by the
researcher as affected by the criteria developed for the population chosen for the research,
the potential biases of the researcher based on internal knowledge of the field, and the
data analysis skill of the researcher. Instead of denying objectivity in qualitative
research, the researcher sought to, as presented by Hatch (2002), concentrate on
reflexively applying one’s own subjectivities in order to understand the motives and
assumptions of the research participants.

Limitations

Although this research was carefully prepared, the researcher was aware of the
limitations of the study. First, the research was conducted using participants from an
organization called Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD Network, n.d.), which acts as a support group for academic leaders, researchers, and instructional designers of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions. While the on-line survey could have been sent directly to higher education institution for responses, the sheer number of IRBs to contact made it impractical. As the members of the POD represent community colleges, universities and corporate and not-for-profit organizations, the study sought to limit the population sample to members of higher education institutions with a primary teaching and learning center.

The centers provide instructional support to faculty for their teaching, service, and research responsibilities as a means of supporting their pedagogical responsibilities, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the intentional use of technology in teaching and learning. By seeking approval from the POD and the Institutional Review Board from the researcher’s educational institution, the survey was electronically delivered to the directors of the primary TLCs, the employees of the centers, and the supervisors of the directors, making the process manageable and realistic. The process of conducting the survey, as well reviewing the data from these participants, made the delivery of the study efficient.

Another limitation to the design study was the concern for research bias, which is always a concern in validating the accuracy and balance of the research. Research bias, based on the presence of the researcher, is always a concern in validating the accuracy and balance of the research (Creswell, 2009). The researcher had prior connections with the POD Network and possibly some of the institutions being researched through being employed within the discipline for a number of years. Additionally, the researcher
worked in the field of faculty professional development, instructional design, and the
design of courses in a higher education institution. Efforts were made to reduce the level
of bias throughout the study based on the researcher’s familiarity with the operations of
teaching and learning centers, so as to control its impact on the validity and reliability of
the findings.

The research population was chosen from administrative leaders, supervisors of
the leaders, and faculty and staff members of primary TLCs within postsecondary
institutions which the researcher either had prior knowledge of, or familiarity with
personnel practices, administrative policies, and institutional culture. This led to a
smaller participant group from the POD Network, which numbered over 1,800 members,
and is comprised of academic members and directors of teaching and learning centers.
While this research sought to gain perspectives from members of POD within the United
States, it was possible that some of the respondents included in the study were from other
countries. It would have been possible to ask respondents which part of the world they
were from, but this would have detracted from the main purpose of the research, to gain
information from all qualifying POD members. By gaining responses from
administrators (provosts, associate provosts, and vice presidents) and staff members of
TLCs provided, a strong breadth of informational data, showing the demands, constraints,
and choices these respondents have observed being placed on the leaders of TLCs.

The data collection method used was that of a qualitative survey or questionnaire
for the capturing of closed and open-ended questions. While Stewart (1976) used
grounded theory work in her research such as wide-ranging research techniques
comprising “structured interviews, diaries, structured observations, group discussions,
case analysis, and critical incidents” (Lowe, 2003, p. 193), the researcher used a qualitative survey in the research. This research sought to primarily capture this first study of the demands, constraints, and choices faced by directors of teaching and learning centers, using a mixed-methods approach as an exploratory analysis of the effect administrative policies and institutional culture can have on the work of these leaders of TLCs in higher education.

The results from the survey would then form deeper analysis using in-depth interviews in future research. Merriam (2009) described data analysis as the “process of making sense out of data” (p. 193). Interviews provide opportunities for respondents to concentrate on the lived experience of the topic, to provide concrete details of their experience, and to reflect on the meaning of their experience. Creswell (2009) identified interviews as most appropriate to a phenomenological study as it clarified researcher bias, allowed for member checking, and the creation of a rich, thick and deep description of the experiences of respondents. The theoretical framework of Stewart (1982a) advocated using interviews and observations to acquire data to support the type of demands, constraints, and choices leaders face in managing their locus of control. Stewart (1968) also studied managers using “intensive face-to-face and telephoning interview methods, analysis of diaries, group discussions, case analysis, and structured observation methodology” (Kroeck, 2003, p. 204). By using only a qualitative survey as the tool for gathering data, this limited the extent to which the researcher followed the methodology of Stewart in her research, and the richness of the data gathered in the study.

Finally, the data analysis skills of the researcher may have affected the outcome of reporting the data findings. If the researcher had been more experienced, the data
analysis may have yielded additional information that would have improved the richness of the data provided by respondents. In fact, it may have been more objective if seasoned researchers outside of the field of research had conducted the study.

**Assumptions**

A researcher involved in qualitative research seeks to understand the world based on the experiences, perceptions, and descriptive reasoning of those under investigation (Hatch, 2002). Several assumptions were made in this research to streamline the process of data gathering and analyses. The respondents for this research came from the POD Network that is the supporting organization of members of teaching and learning centers in higher education. This research sought to narrow the population of respondents by focusing on the leaders of primary TLCs that provided faculty professional development support to permanent faculty in post-secondary institutions. The survey also targeted supervisors of the leaders of TLCs and faculty and staff members of TLCs. The researcher assumed that within the POD Network this subset of TLC members would be easily found and open to participate in the research by providing their experiences, perceptions, and descriptive reasoning.

Another assumption made by the researcher was that the research of Stewart (1982b) which primarily looked at business and corporate managers and leaders would be relevant to leaders within higher education institutions to determine how they dealt with the demands, constraints, and choices of leading a TLC. Upon analysis of the survey results, a grounded theory (Creswell, 2009) might emerge as being more appropriately suited through the use of a survey instrument, interviews, and discussions for
understanding the demands, constraints, and choices placed upon leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions.

Finally, in researching the possible effects administrative policies and institutional culture had on these leaders of TLCs in higher education, the researcher assumed that both variables would be consistent across higher education institutions, and thus the challenges they bring to the position would allow the survey data to show strong “patterns, relationships, and themes within typologies” (Hatch, 2002, p. 153), related to the perspectives and experiences of respondents.

Chapter Summary

Chapter Three began with a listing of the research questions that were proposed to be addressed in this study, followed by a review of the specific qualitative research design methods chosen to expedite the work. A qualitative research survey was utilized to gain valuable information in an attempt to understand and answer the three questions posed as the stated objectives in this study. The on-line survey was emailed to members of the POD Network who held positions as directors of teaching and learning centers, staff members of these centers, and supervisors of directors of teaching and learning centers. This approach allowed the researcher to gain a total analysis from different stakeholders of teaching and learning centers, such as the leaders of the centers, their supervisors, and their direct reports, meaning professional staff and faculty members who work within the center. The on-line survey was sent to these groups with subsequent emails reminding the target participants of the survey and the deadline for submission. The survey protocol for the three groups was presented, and issues regarding validity and reliability were addressed. Transformation of the data collected and analyzed is
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elaborated upon in Chapter Four, and emergent findings discussed. Results of the research study and integrated findings are included in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation of Findings

Introduction

The results of the survey data included within chapter four, comprises analysis of the demands, constraints, and choices faced by directors of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) in post-secondary institutions. This study used a mixed-methods approach to investigate the challenges faced by directors of TLCs through responses from three constituents within higher education. These constituents comprised the directors, their immediate supervisors, and faculty/staff members of the TLCs, and their responses provided varying perceptions based on their roles and professional contact with the directors and the work of the TLCs. The respondents of the study were members of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network comprising leaders of TLCs, supervisors of the leaders, and faculty/staff members of the TLCs. Additionally, through the POD Network, other TLCs who may not be members of POD were also sent the survey to receive their responses for the study.

The researcher received responses from TLC members of higher education institutions, which were classified by the Carnegie Classification system within the United States. Though POD has international connections, the responses were mostly received from North American institutions of higher education. While the TLCs do not fall under an accreditation body, many of its members are within the POD Network, which plays an active role in championing the work and research of TLCs, and thus provided a strong avenue to receive feedback for this study.
The mixed-methods approach of the study allowed the researcher to gather a wide cross-section of responses using quantitative and qualitative analysis toward determining the type of demands, constraints, and choices the leaders of TLCs faced, especially as they managed the challenges of change from institutional culture and administrative policies. Respondents to the study were questioned on the importance and the significance of types of work demands, constraints, and choices they faced as they addressed the various support responsibilities within the department, and how institutional culture and administrative policies hindered or supported the work of the department. Though the focus was on directors of TLCs, the study divided respondents into three groups (directors, their supervisors, and faculty/staff members) to gain a 360-degree perspective and observations of the demands, constraints, and choices these leaders face in their work, and broaden the understanding of the roles of the directors.

The qualitative data provided valuable perceptions from the three groups to identify themes that emerged from the data to extend the understanding of the work of the directors. These themes also provided an understanding and interpretation of the distinctive obstacles and challenges faced by these leaders toward achieving the mission of their respective TLCs. This study relied on the theoretical framework of Stewart’s 1968, 1976 and 1982 seminal work to ascertain how leaders in institutions dealt with the demands, constraints, and choices (Stewart, 1982a) placed on them to perform. This study was guided by Stewart’s work to frame the themes to gain a full analysis of the challenges based on the responses from members of the POD Network.

This chapter comprises four main sections. A description of the study is outlined, with an explanation of the data collection process from the research setting and details on
the participants. This is followed by a statement outlining the researcher’s professional background and potential research bias brought to the study. Based on the three research questions in the study, an analysis of the responses will be provided for results, and finally a conclusion of the study.

**Researcher Background and Bias**

**Researcher Background**

The researcher holds a Master’s degree in Business Administration from a Doctorate-granting institution and a Masters in Instructional Technology from a Master’s College and University according to the Carnegie classification for colleges and universities. The researcher has over 10 years within the instructional technology field working in a center for teaching and learning department at a Master’s granting higher education institution plus working in an academic technology department at a Doctorate-granting higher education institution.

The researcher’s professional experience covers faculty professional development for all modalities of instructional delivery as well the pedagogical methodology of teaching with technology. The researcher is a member of the POD Network and the Association of Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) which are two international organizations devoted to the support of leaders in educational communications and technology as well as institutional research on the work of professionals who support centers for teaching and learning (POD Network, n.d.; Conn & Gitonga, 2004). Coupled with the instructional support of faculty teaching and learning, the researcher’s interest in the field of instructional design and technology provides the opportunity to put into practice the practical application of cognition, educational
psychology, information technology, graphic and web design, and problem solving; all leading to the intentional use of technology in teaching and learning for student success. Having presented research posters and workshops, the researcher is deeply involved in strategic leadership and development of instructional initiatives that involve instruction at a university level.

**Researcher Bias**

Two biases were brought to the study and the analysis of the study data by the researcher. The first bias was that the researcher had historical connection with the POD Network being a member of the POD Network and being familiar with the organization through a previous supervisor who was a director of the CTL that the researcher was employed. This director was heavily involved with POD and supported several research initiatives within the POD community. The researcher also knows some of the higher education institutions and its members who are part of this research because of participation in workshops, webinars, conferences, and professional communications within the discipline for many years. As part of professional responsibilities, the researcher has led numerous institutional efforts in the field of faculty professional development, instructional design, integrating technology in teaching and learning, and supported the design of courses in higher education institutions.

The second bias concerned the researcher’s strong familiarity with the operations of teaching and learning centers, having led institution-wide instructional initiatives, participated in implementation of campus-wide technology integration, and delivered workshops and webinars to support faculty and staff professional development. In order to limit bias from the researcher, the survey and the collection of the data was shared with
the dissertation committee and other researchers to gain their perspectives and ideas so as to strengthen the validity and reliability of the survey tool.

**Participants and Setting**

The collection of data for this study was provided mainly by members of the POD Network, which is comprised of members of TLCs within higher education institutions in North America. Permission was requested from the POD Network for access to their membership list as a means of receiving responses from members through the on-line Qualtrics survey. Based on the POD Network research-support protocol, the researcher was asked to pay for access to the POD Network membership, and then an email with the summary of the research and link to the survey was sent to the POD members. Three weeks after the initial email, a reminder email was sent to the POD Network members, and then two weeks later, the survey was closed.

**Participants**

The primary data collection came from the on-line Qualtrics survey that captured responses from POD Network members, who were comprised of directors (D) of TLCs, supervisors (SU) of the directors, and faculty/staff members (F/S) of the TLCs. The on-line survey had two sections for background and demographic information which captured quantifiable statistical data on the job position (role), purpose, personal characteristics, and highest level of education of the population in the survey (see Table 2).
Table 2

Classification Background and Demographics of Respondents from the POD Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Avg. Yrs. worked in Higher Ed; mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.0 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.6 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.2 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7 (9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.0 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. D = Director; SU = Supervisor; F/S = Faculty/Staff; n = 72; s.d. = standard deviation*

These three groups were carefully selected and targeted for this research as their role, position, and experience provided the perfect opportunity to gain an understanding of the purpose of TLCs in universities, and what level of demands, constraints, and choices the director faced in his or her day-to-day work. By receiving responses from the supervisors of the directors and the faculty/staff of TLCs, a 360-degree feedback would provide different perspectives from these groups on the demands, constraints, and choices the director faced in his or her work. It is important to stress that each of the responses from participants was anonymous so as to reduce the likelihood of respondents being identified.

As seen in Table 2, the average years worked in higher education by the 45 respondents who identified themselves as the director (D) of a TLC, was approximately 18 years (male and female). Over 58% of respondents (n=34) identified themselves as directors of a TLC with their highest level of education being a doctoral degree. Almost
31% \((n=14)\) of these directors were male and approximately 69% \((n=31)\) were female. A small number of female directors \((n=3)\) indicated having professional degrees such as law (J.D.) and medicine (M.D.), among others. Of the respondents who identified themselves as directors of TLCs, 72% \((n=41)\) worked at universities classified as Master’s and Doctoral-granting institutions based on the Carnegie Classification description of universities and colleges (see Table 3). Approximately 12% of the directors \((n=7)\) came from Associate-granting institutions, and 15% \((n=9)\) from Baccalaureate-granting institutions. The Carnegie Classification ("Carnegie Classifications - Basic Classification," n.d.) defines the Master’s Colleges and Universities as institutions that awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees during the update year. For the Doctoral-granting university institutions, these award at least 20 research doctoral degrees during the update year (excluding doctoral-level degrees that qualify recipients for entry into professional practice, such as the J.D., M.D., PharmD, DPT, etc.).

Table 3

*Carnegie Classification of Universities and Colleges and Professional Role of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Associate College</th>
<th>Special Focus Institution</th>
<th>Tribal College</th>
<th>Baccalaureate College</th>
<th>Master's College and University</th>
<th>Doctorate-granting University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 21% of those identified as directors reported being director (interim, acting, other) with seven years of experience or longer in the position, while over 70% of those identified as directors were in their position up to six years. Before they became directors, their previous positions ranged from university administrators (24%), faculty (61%), and staff (12%). The rest of the directors came from corporate and non-profit organizations. Only 18% of the directors had served as a leader of a TLC at another institution prior to their present position.

For the five respondents that identified themselves as the supervisor (SU) of the TLC director, their years of experience in higher education averaged 24 years for males and 28 years for females. Their highest degree was a doctorate and their position titles ranged from associate vice president, dean, provost, vice chancellor and chief information officer (CIO), to manager – training section. Approximately 80% (n=4) of these SU respondents were male and 20% (n=1) were female. Almost 80% (n=4) of the respondents who identified themselves as supervisors of the directors of TLCs worked at universities classified as Master’s and Doctoral-granting institutions based on the Carnegie Classification description of universities and colleges, while 20% came from Associate-granting institutions. At least 60% (n=3) of these supervisors indicated that they had supervised the TLC directors for more than seven years while the rest had supervision for less than a year to about two years.

For respondents identified as faculty/staff (F/S), approximately 37% (n=22) of these respondents worked in a TLC, with an average experience of 14 years. Approximately 60% (n=13) of the faculty/staff served in the TLC served up to four years, while 17% (n=4) served over seven years. Approximately 32% (n=7) of these F/S
respondents were male, and 68% (n=15) were female. The highest degree earned by the F/S was a doctorate followed by a master’s; 71% male F/S reported having a doctorate, and 33% of female F/S had a doctorate. Over 22% (n=8) of the respondents who identified themselves as faculty/staff in TLCs worked at universities classified as Masters-granting, while 78% (n=28) came from Doctoral-granting institutions based on the Carnegie Classification description of universities and colleges. The F/S official title in the TLC ranged from associate/assistant director/interim associate director, instructional designer/specialist, faculty developer, instructional consultant, instructional technologist/specialist/consultant, provost fellow/faculty fellow, doctoral intern, production manager, to program coordinator.

Each of the respondents was asked to what degree they were included in decision-making activities or discussions concerning projects on teaching and learning at their respective institutions. When asked whether they were routinely included in relevant decision-making activities concerning teaching and learning at their institution, 46% of the directors reported being included in the discussions, 40% reported sometimes being included, while 16% of the directors reported never being consulted or included in the discussions or decisions. When asked whether they routinely included the director (D) in relevant decision-making activities concerning projects in teaching and learning at their institution, 60% of supervisors reported including the directors in the discussions, while 40% reported sometimes including the director in the discussions or decisions. For the faculty/staff members, 22% of the faculty/staff reported being included in the discussions, 38% reported sometimes being included, while 31% of the faculty/staff reported never being consulted or included in the discussions or decisions.
Setting

Other essential background information gathered looked at the hierarchy of the teaching and learning center (TLC) in relation to reporting units as well as structure of TLCs. A TLC is primarily responsible for developing activities which support faculty development, as described by Diamond (2002), which focuses on the “improvement of the individual instructor’s teaching skills, instructional development of students’ learning by improving their course and curriculum experience, and organizational development on the interrelationship and effectiveness of units within the institution” (p. 4). Within the survey, 97% of respondents reported that their institution had a primary teaching and learning center, which supported faculty professional development as well as activities on pedagogy and the practical use of technology in teaching and learning.

The TLCs reported to academic affairs (provost or vice president), information technology services unit, dean of undergraduates, or a combination of office of the provost and the technology services unit. The mandates and responsibility of these reporting units guided the mission and focus of the TLC. Having a primary TLC also meant that there were other sub-units that supported students and active learning, units that dealt with curriculum initiatives, and centers that functioned not as a physical unit, but as one participant in the survey quoted, “comprised of a few faculty who work with various faculty committees and groups to further faculty development, teaching, and learning.” In other responses, several participants noted that their institution offered faculty support through a number of different support areas, while other institutions separated the technological support side from the pedagogical side as a service to faculty.
The survey sought to gather the various names of centers from the participants. For the majority of responses, the names of these centers had the descriptive name of “teaching and learning” as part of the official name of the center. Other descriptive names ranged from the “center for faculty development,” “center for information and technology excellence,” “center for teaching and scholarly excellence,” and “center for teaching, learning, and assessment,” to “center for innovative teaching.” Approximately 49% of respondents reported that the center had experienced a recent restructuring to the operations and mission of the work of the center. The majority of restructuring lasted between one and four years, and within this group, 59% reported that their institution had a TLC between one and 15 years, and approximately 30% had a TLC over 16 years.

Respondents to the survey reported the various services offered by the center which in terms of prevalence covered the following: (a) 98% of respondents reported service on teaching and learning initiatives and faculty professional development, (b) 80% reported faculty learning community support, (c) 85% reported instructional development services offered, (d) 69% reported scholarship of teaching and learning services, (e) 83% reported services on using technology in teaching and learning, (f) 61% reported classroom teaching evaluation, (g) 69% reported faculty mentoring, and (h) 49% reported large course redesign.

Other services offered were new faculty programs, curriculum design, support to university quality enhancement planning (QEP), career support services, on-line course development, and program assessment and service learning initiatives. The general staffing of TLCs comprises full-time academic and professional faculty/staff, a few part-time staff members, and faculty/staff appointed for special projects. From the survey, the
average staffing in a TLC consists of full-time professional staff (0-5 persons), full and part-time academic staff (0-3 persons) and special projects personnel (1.5 persons).

Results

Research Questions

Three research questions were developed to support the study, and lead both the research and analysis of the data.

1. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture?

2. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture?

3. Given the demands and constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture, what are the choices available to leaders of teaching and learning centers?

Data Analysis

The researcher began the analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data in the effort to separate the responses based on the three research questions. The quantitative data was analyzed based on the three roles D, SU, and F/S to ascertain background and demographic information as it related to their experience and years of working in a TLC and in higher education. This data helped to form a representation of the respondents and their knowledge of TLCs, the impact of TLCs in faculty professional development initiatives, and the various support programs TLCs provide in universities and colleges.
The next step was to analyze responses from each of the roles to determine the quantitative data of the demands, constraints, and choices, and to see what were the comparisons and differences between the answers provided by respondents. Each of the responses that addressed demands, constraints, and choices provided quantitative data on how much importance and satisfaction the three roles placed on the job functions and responsibilities the director had to do, could do, or could choose not to do. By analyzing the data from the perspectives of the three roles, a trend in the data could determine how the director effectively dealt with the demands, constraints, and choices on their performance in the TLC.

For the qualitative data analysis, the researcher spent time reading and synthetizing the qualitative from the three roles (D, SU, and F/S) to gain a comprehensive understanding of the responses. The qualitative data covered five questions which were divided between three for the directors, and two for all respondents. The researcher spent time reading the responses from each of the questions, to gain a full understanding of what each respondent was explaining, and then see what general themes emerged from their responses. Notes were made on quotes that provided important information that would be useful in supporting the themes and common threads found in the qualitative and quantitative data.

The themes and subsequent threads of qualitative responses allowed the researcher to study the effect that administrative policies and institutional culture had on the leadership of the directors based on the demands, constraints, and choices they faced in their work. The central themes that emerged were placed in the categories of (a) perception of demands, constraints, and choices as seen by directors, faculty/staff, and
supervisors of the directors of TLCs, (b) satisfaction relating to demands, constraints, and choices of work, and (c) importance relating to demands, constraints, and choices of work. Supporting these quantitative categories are several sub-themes that emerged from the qualitative data on the effect administrative policies and institutional culture had on the work performance of the director. The responses from the three roles helped to provide different perspectives from individuals serving in different positions, but all observing the performance of the director. Both the supervisors and the faculty/staff roles provided their perception on how the demands, constraints, and choices affected the work of the director, and which services they felt was important to the performance and satisfaction of the director. The next sections of this chapter will address quantitative means and comparisons, plus the themes and sub-themes that emerged from the qualitative data to explain and support the answers to the three research questions.

Demands of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture on the Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers

The demands placed on the work performance, job responsibilities, and leadership of the directors of teaching and learning centers affects the extent to which they are able to provide directions for the work of the center, and ensure adequate personnel support, while supporting the educational initiatives of their institution. Within the TLC, the supervisor of the director sets the initiative that is important while the director provides the necessary level of leadership and support to the faculty/staff of the TLC to guide the work of the center. The demands placed both on the work of the center and on the performance of the director is guided by what Stewart (1976) defined as “what any jobholder must do apart from the specialist content of the job” (p. 22).
For the director, the primary work of what a TLC must do hinges to a great extent on the mandate or the initiative set by the supervisor of the reporting unit as well as the institutional mission and vision of the university. The quantitative responses from the directors (see Table 4) provided an outline of projects or initiatives the directors determined to be important and the type of demands that affected the performance of the center to satisfactorily meet those needs.

Table 4

Outline of Types of Demands on Teaching and Learning Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Providing adequate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improving teaching experience for graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Developing/implementing teaching and learning policies and plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Implementing large course redesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implementing effective educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Researching best practices in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Implementing and supporting all educational technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Providing institutional research data for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The quantitative responses from the supervisor and the faculty/staff provided their perception of how well they perceived the director addressed these demands.

Eighteen different work demands were provided to respondents as a series of demands placed on the director that affected their job performance and leadership. By dividing these work demands into highest, moderate, least, and not applicable in importance and satisfaction, the mean responses from the three groups (D, SU, and F/S) were analyzed to look at their mean rating of importance and satisfaction. It must be noted that the survey had responses of high and very high for the importance and satisfaction levels. The “not applicable” values were noted as a means of gauging which, if any demand, participants felt were not applicable to work that TLCs should be involved.

**Demands of importance.** The directors \((n=52)\) indicated that the demand “Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff” (question #6) measured a high to very high importance of demands (see Table 5). This correlated with how the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture affected the directors and their TLC performance in delivering these functions. The directors rated this demand a mean score of 4.6 for importance of demands, with the next demand “Improving the institution’s teaching and learning performance” (question #1) a mean score of 4.4. Almost 87.3% of the directors gave this rating while 9.1% gave it a moderate to low rate.

The majority of survey participants who identified themselves as supervisors and faculty/staff members consistently rated these two demands at the highest mean rate, with the percentages of supervisors and faculty/staff members that rated this demand being an equally high percentage with directors who rated themselves.
Table 5

Importance of each Demand of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture with Center’s Performance in Delivering these Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demands</th>
<th>Director mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Supervisor mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Overall mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional development</td>
<td>4.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>5.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving institution’s teaching/learning</td>
<td>4.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving quality of courses</td>
<td>3.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching best practices</td>
<td>3.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing adequate resources</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing educational technology</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing SoTL as research activity</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing blended/on-line courses</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing teaching/learning policies</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting programs recognize teaching</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing effective educational prgs.</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing large course redesign</td>
<td>2.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching experience for G/S</td>
<td>1.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/support of academic faculty</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting academic workload balance</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing institutional research data</td>
<td>2.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring</td>
<td>1.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. s.d. = standard deviation; SoTL = scholarship of teaching & learning; prgs. = programs; G/S=graduate students
Likert scale: 1 = not applicable and 5 = very high.

For example, while 94.3% of directors assessed the demand “Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff (workshops and consultations)” as being of greater importance in their work, 100% of the supervisors (n=5) and 93.3% of faculty/staff members (n=30) perceived “Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff (workshops and consultations)” as being the second highest mean
level in demand of importance for directors (see Table 6). For the faculty/staff members, 96.7% indicated, “Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance” (question #1) was their highest choice in importance of demand on directors and TLC.

Feedback on this same question regarding importance on the effects of work demands on the performance of directors was received from supervisors of directors and faculty/staff members of TLCs. The perception from the supervisors (mean score of 5.0) indicated that providing professional development for faculty and professional staff was top of the list in their mean importance of demands followed by improving the institutions teaching and learning performance. For the faculty/staff members (mean score of 4.6), they perceived that “Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance” was the highest mean importance of demand (mean score of 4.6) on the performance of the director, followed closely by the demand, “Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff” (mean score of 4.5). The overall mean score of 4.7 and 4.6 for both functions was also the highest score for all functions.

For the supervisors, the demands “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings” (question #11) and “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7) measured the next two highest importance of demand with how they perceived the directors performed to meet these demands (see Table 6). With a mean score of 4.4 and 4.2 respectively, both demands were seen as important by 80% of the supervisors. These are challenges supervisors of the directors are concerned with and which they see as being a bigger demand on the work performance of the directors.
Table 6

Importance of Demands: Top Four Demand Functions by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Important Demand Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 52)</td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing adequate resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 30)</td>
<td>Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing adequate resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both the director and the faculty/staff members, the importance of this demand of increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings was moderate to least important for them as this was not as big a demand from the needs brought by the academic faculty. Instead the demand for “Recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning” (question #5) registered a greater mean of importance for both the director and the faculty/staff.

The next two demands that measured the highest importance for faculty/staff members were, “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7) and “Researching best practices” (question #10) with mean scores of 4.4 and 4.0 respectively.
The other demands that were rated at high mean scores for directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff alike were “Researching best practices in teaching and learning” (question #10), “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7), “Providing adequate resources” (question #2), “Recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning as a research activity” (question #5), “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings” (question #11), and “Implementing and supporting all educational technology” (question #12). The supervisors were the only roles, which gave the last two questions (question #11 and #12) a mean score of 4.4 (80% of directors) and 4.2 (100% of directors) respectively.

Approximately 31.5% of directors saw question #11 as a moderate demand of importance in the work of directors, while 20.4% rated it of least importance, and 29.6% of the directors saw question #11 as not applicable in demand of importance (mean score of 2.6). Again for the directors, question #12 received a moderate mean rating of 2.9 in importance of demand, with 38.9% rating it of great importance, 9.3% giving it low importance, and 25.9% as not applicable in demand of importance. As a demand, “Recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning as a research activity” (question #5) was seen as moderate demand of importance by 60% of the supervisors. Almost 40% of supervisors saw this question #5 as not applicable in demand of importance.

For the faculty/staff members (F/S), both question #11 and #12 received moderate mean scores, with question #12 receiving a moderate mean score of 3.4 with 60% of F/S rating it of highest importance, and 16.7% of F/S rated it moderate to low importance (see Table 5). Question #11 was perceived as being in the least importance of demand on the work of directors and the TLC by the F/S rating a mean score of 3.1 by 35.7% of the
respondents. Approximately 23% of the F/S respondents saw question #11 as being not applicable in terms of importance of demand compared to the other questions. The demands that measured a moderate mean level of importance for the D and F/S roles were providing “funding for faculty travel” (question #14), “supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching” (question #13), and “developing/implementing teaching and learning policies and plans” (question #4).

The demands that measured the least mean level of importance for all three role functions were perceived as not supporting the core mission of a TLC, which is based on faculty professional development, teaching, and learning activities (see Table 7). For the directors, four demand functions were rated least in importance, which the director had to do. The first two were, “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #18), which 18% of directors rated at a mean score of 2.3, and the demand function of “Improving teaching experience for graduate students” (question #3), which 13% of directors rated at a mean score of 1.7. The other two least importance demand functions were “Providing institutional research data for accreditation” (question #17) with 20% of directors giving this function a mean rate of 2.2, and the demand function “Promoting constancy of restructuring” (question #15) with 13% of directors giving this demand a mean rating of 1.7.

The supervisors perceived the following four least important demands as a function the director had to do. The first two demand functions of importance were “Providing funding for faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences” (question #14) with 20% of the supervisors giving it a mean rating of 2.2, and demand function of
importance “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #18) which had a mean rating of 2.2 by 20% of the supervisors.

Table 7

*Importance of Demands: Lowest Four Demand Functions by Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Least Important Demand Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution. إذا ضمّنَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(n = 52)$</td>
<td>Improving teaching experience for graduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing institutional research data for accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(n = 5)$</td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution. إذا ضمّنَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing institutional research data for accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Providing institutional research data for accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(n = 30)$</td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution. إذا ضمّنَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 40% of the supervisors did not see question #18 as applicable to the demand function of the TLC and which the director had to do. The other two lowest demand functions of importance were “Providing institutional research data for accreditation” (question #17) which had a mean rating of 1.8 by 20% of the supervisors. Almost 60% of the supervisors indicated that this demand function was not applicable to the demands that the director or the TLC had to do.
For the faculty/staff participants, they perceived the following four least important demands as a function the director had to do. The first two demand functions noted by the faculty/staff were “Providing institutional research data for accreditation” (question #17) with 41% of directors giving this function a mean rating of 2.9, and demand function “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #18) which had a mean rating of 2.6 by 37% of the faculty/staff. Approximately 40% of the faculty/staff did not see question #18 as applicable to the demand function of the TLC and work the director had to do.

The last two least demand functions of importance for the faculty/staff were “Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments” (question #16) with 30% of the faculty/staff giving this demand function a mean rating of 2.6, and “Promoting constancy of restructuring” (question #15) which had a mean rating of 2.1 by 13% of the faculty/staff. Approximately 43% of the faculty/staff indicated that this demand function was not applicable to the demands that the director or the TLC had to do. The four demand functions that were the overall least demand of importance were “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution,” “Supporting balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments,” “Providing institutional research data for accreditation,” and “Promoting constancy of restructuring.”

**Satisfaction of demands.** On the mean scale of satisfaction (see Table 8), the directors (n=51) indicated that the “Demand of providing professional development support for faculty and professional staff” (question #6) and “Conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning” (question #10) measured as their top two
demands with the highest mean satisfaction with delivering these functions.

Approximately 74.5% of directors were satisfied with the center’s performance in meeting this demand, while 80% of the supervisors (n=5) and 80% of faculty/staff members (n=31) responded to this question with the highest mean satisfaction with their director and the center’s performance in meeting the demand of providing professional development for faculty and professional staff.

Table 8

*Satisfaction of each Demand of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture with Center’s Performance in Delivering these Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demands</th>
<th>Director mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Supervisor mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Overall mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional development</td>
<td>4.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching best practices</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving institution’s teaching/learning</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the quality of courses</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing adequate resources</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing educational technology</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing teaching/learning policies</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing blended/on-line courses</td>
<td>2.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing SoTL as research activity</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting programs recognize teaching</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing institutional research data</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing effective educational prgs.</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing large course redesign</td>
<td>2.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/support of academic faculty</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel</td>
<td>2.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching experience for G/S</td>
<td>1.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting academic workload balance</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring</td>
<td>1.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* s.d. = standard deviation; SoTL = scholarship of teaching & learning; prgs. = programs; G/S = graduate students. Likert scale: 1 = not applicable and 5 = very high.
This level of satisfaction is an indicator that all three roles were satisfied with the center’s performance being adequate to supporting these demands and that the work of the TLC adequately met the needs of faculty work load of service, teaching, and research while supporting their institution’s teaching and learning performance. The perception from the faculty/staff members of the satisfaction of these two demands concurred with that of the directors’ responses. The supervisor’s perception, however, differed slightly in that, while “Providing professional development” (question #6) registered as their highest mean satisfaction for directors (80% rating it as a high satisfaction) toward meeting the demands, “Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance” (question #1) registered as their second highest mean satisfaction (60% rating it as next highest satisfaction). The next two work demands that measured the highest satisfaction of scale for directors were “Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance” (question #1) with 42.3% giving it a high mean of satisfaction and 11.8% to 31.4% providing low to moderate score of satisfaction.

The demand “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7) received a mean score of 3.1 with 34.6% of the directors rating a high satisfaction and 11.5% to 46.2% giving a low to moderate score of satisfaction. As seen in the data presented in Table 9, four unique functions were identified that the three roles ranked as the highest in satisfaction with overcoming the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture with the center’s performance in delivering these functions.

For the supervisors, they perceived the demand “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7) and “Researching best practices in teaching and learning”
Table 9

*Satisfying the Demands: Top Four Demand Functions by Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Satisfied Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Providing professional development support for faculty and professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Providing professional development support for faculty and professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Providing professional development support for faculty and professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(question #10) as being the next two demands of satisfaction for the directors. The next two demands that measured the mean highest level of satisfaction for the directors were “Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance” (question #1) followed by “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7). These two demands of satisfaction were the same for the faculty/staff members. For the supervisors, “Improving the quality of courses and curriculum” (question #7) and “Researching best practices in teaching and learning” (question #10) were their next highest mean levels of satisfaction of demands on the performance of the director.
The demands that measured the least mean level of satisfaction (see Table 10) for all three roles were “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #18), “Supporting academic workload balance” (question #16), “Improving teaching experience for graduate students” (question #3), “Providing funding for faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences” (question #14), and “Promoting constancy of restructuring” (question #15).

Table 10

Satisfying the Demands: Lowest Four Demand Functions by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Least Satisfied Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving teaching experience for graduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting constancy of restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing funding for faculty travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 40% to 60% of participants representing the three roles measured indicated that these demands were not applicable to the satisfaction of performance for the director. In all, three unique functions were identified that the three roles ranked as
the lowest in satisfaction with overcoming the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture with the center’s performance in delivering these functions. The four overall lowest demand functions in satisfaction for the three roles were “Providing funding for faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences” (question #14), “Improving teaching experience for graduate students” (question #3), “Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments” (question #16), and “Promoting constancy of restructuring” (question #15).

**Directors’ strategies for addressing demands on position.** Within part II of the survey, a qualitative open-ended question was asked of the directors to identify the strategies they used to address the demands on their position. The researcher read through each of the responses to identify general primary themes then divided them into the following categories to answer the research question: partnerships, priorities, and performance. These primary themes are presented from the most frequently cited to the least frequently cited (see Table 11).

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Needs</td>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Politics</td>
<td>Department Focus</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Connections</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Advocate</td>
<td>Evidence of Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses from the directors detailed how they dealt with the demands on their leadership of the TLC, supporting the constituents of faculty/staff members of the TLC,
how the faculty engaged in teaching and learning activities, as well as mandates on initiatives received from their supervisor. For the 16 comments which cited partnerships, 40% of the directors reported seeking partnerships as a means of “coming in from the margins” to understand the mission of their institution and address institutional needs and expectations.

On the theme of priorities, 30% of directors (14 comments) alluded to this theme as a way to focus on the important things and do them well. For the performance theme, 30% of the directors (12 comments) responded on the need for time management and collaboration. Data collected from the qualitative question guided the responses used to explain and support the answer to this research question.

**Partnerships.** The theme of partnerships emerged from the directors’ responses as they perceived how the demands of doing a job they had to do, was a challenge to their performance in meeting the objectives of the center. Within this category, several sub-themes emerged; (a) faculty needs, (b) institutional politics, (c) building connections, and (d) teaching advocate.

**Faculty needs.** A total of four comments indicated this sub-theme as a challenge to partnerships necessary for the directors to address the demands on the work. This demand as perceived by two directors was the expectation that their TLC provided all the support needed for the faculty and the institution to deliver what the faculty needed for their work and development. As explained by one director, “We are very strategic in the training and support that we offer. We conduct regular needs assessments to ensure that what we are providing is what faculty need and want for their (professional) development.” The other director that mentioned needs as a rationale for addressing
demands indicated that, “I work very, very hard - I ask for help from a variety of sources (administrators, faculty, part-time employment, interns) - I write reports trying to explain the needs of the center to administrators.” By outlining the work of the center, this director showed what the actual needs were and then built partnerships to manage the demands.

*Institutional politics.* The issue of institutional politics (six comments) was another theme identified for using partnerships to manage demands. One director commented, “We have worked very hard to ‘come in from the margins’ and to make our work mainstreamed with that of the university. We have been here for decades and serve 96% of our faculty every year.” The unique role of these directors as middle managers challenges them to take on greater and more visible leadership roles so as to bring attention to the work of the center, as a viable change agent. As described by another director, building partnerships were accomplished “Through one-on-one contact with key stakeholders--a lot of coffee meetings, lunches, talks at department meetings.” Taking the understanding and scope of the theme of institutional politics a bit further, another director explained:

“…, I choose my battles carefully. That is, I do not forge ahead or try to push others ahead on everything that comes to me. Instead, I guess I'd say I triage extensively. By that I mean that I consider carefully (sometimes alone, sometimes with others) who across the university or within the TLC ought to be involved in or own a particular issue or project. Then I work hard to help that unit or person understand the importance of the issue/project to them, and I offer to help in whatever way I or the TLC can. This takes time and lots of patience on
my part, but I think it helps keep teaching and learning related issues the property of everyone, not just the TLC.”

In addition to addressing and understanding what are the possible demands, emerged the understanding of how knowing the culture and priorities of the institution can be of great help. “I also serve on broad, cross-campus committees that help to provide me with a better understanding of the culture and priorities of the institution, so that I can better identify which demands are more important and which are less important. I hold tight to the mission of our center, to help define what and how we can say ‘yes’ to competing demands.” To understand the politics of the institution means understanding the strategic direction of the administration, so as know which resources will be needed to get things done.

*Building connections.* Faculty and institution demands were also perceived in understanding the value of building connections (four comments). To get an understanding of the plans of the university and its possible effect on the center, a director indicated that “I let the strategic plan of the university drive decisions about what we do. Secondly, I rely on hearing from our faculty and administrators on any system- or university-wide initiatives.” Part of knowing how to build those connections many times starts within the TLC, as a director noted:

“[I] … build a strong team with my staff, stay connected with faculty and draw on their expertise as needed, stay connected with administrators and strategic planning to help address institutional needs and expectations,… work long hours, [and] stay abreast of current pedagogical research (and research on learning communities, faculty support, SoTL, teaching with technology, etc.).”
Another director extensively sought to consult with others. The director commented:

“I address the demands of the position by consulting with my Advisory Committee, numerous faculty and manager colleagues, participants of activities in my center, and Institutional Research. I collaborate constantly with faculty and staff in a wide variety of disciplines. I plan, coordinate, and help facilitate over 50 events/activities (some are ongoing) each year - I couldn't accomplish this without my colleagues and support staff.”

Receiving and seeking the necessary support from administrators and faculty was a method used by directors to manage and position the demands into projects and services that were important and provided a measure of satisfaction and success to accomplish.

Teaching advocate. As the director of a TLC, these individuals (two comments) recognize the unique role of supporter and activist that they held in their institution. As explained by a director, “…by striving to expand our partnerships and presence on our campus. Advocating for the advancement of teaching at a research focused institution, and providing high quality and useful services.” The focus on customer service was another method of combating the varied demands on the director’s work and performance.

Priorities. The theme of priorities (14 comments) emerged as another category for directors to be focused on, and ensure their work was aligned with their mission so as to manage the demands on their work. Within this category, several sub-themes emerged: (a) strategic alignment (five comments), (b) department focus (five comments), (c) time-management (two comments), and (d) evidence of work (two comments).
Strategic alignment. A director described the benefit of alignment as being able to “concentrate on a few key activities and do them well. Up to now, we have simply reacted to the whims of certain faculty members. [I]…have had to negotiate tough boundary lines with faculty leaders with limited knowledge of pedagogy and course design... A new boss is helping me better position the Center's efforts in the context of these faculty.” By aligning the strategic plan of the center with the mission of the institution, helps to manage the demands. As counseled by one director, “In my position the demands are significant and the pressure is high. I do my best to prioritize tasks and projects to ensure that the most important things are attended to each day. Do what you can and make an impact where it counts.”

The issue of delegation and personnel support was also mentioned as a way for alignment. This director commented that, “I juggle a lot. I prioritize a lot. When I can delegate, I do it. I rely on longstanding Partnerships across the university to get stuff done. Another director also put forth the value of planning by commenting, “I take my job a day at a time and determine where I can make the most impact. Strategic planning is important but the ability to see need and act upon it is still vital. It is a careful balancing act.”

Department focus. The ability to concentrate on few things and do them well was a point made by several directors. According to one director, “Always stay focused on the brick and mortar needs, don't get too caught in the flavor of the month whether it's technology or new pedagogical approaches.” Another director discussed the importance of seeking support from his/her supervisor with this recommendation: “I discuss priorities with my supervisor to make sure that the most important issues and concerns are being
addressed.” There are moments when perception of the ability of the center to provide resources can clash with the reality, and as a director advised, “Sometimes, the constituents believe the TLC is supposed to be all things to all people. I have to beware of mission creep but also allow our effectiveness as opinion leaders to shine.”

Time-management. One director commented on the efficacy of managing one’s time and that of the center, by explaining,

“The priority in my position is to plan and implement faculty development events, including promotion of these events. This activity takes up about 40-50% of my time. I spend another 20% of my time on administration, including agenda planning, personnel management, budgeting, and so on. My job is to coordinate these activities.”

Evidence of work. As directors who are faced with many demands on the center and their staff, it is important that the reason why projects are taken on is because evidence from research and needs of the faculty have been properly validated. As commented by a director,

“I model use of evidence for continuous improvement in the TLCs function,…use of active learning in classroom teaching, mentoring faculty to develop expertise in teaching,…facilitating workshops is balanced against committee work on institutional efforts related to evaluation, assessment, and accreditation and campus-wide initiatives directed to curriculum change.”

Having the necessary data creates validity with the projects in which the TLC is involved.

Performance. Another of the categories to emerge from the analysis of the qualitative question was how well the director felt they performed (12 comments) when
dealing with the varied demands placed upon them and the center. Within this category, two sub-themes emerged; (a) collaboration (seven comments) and (b) work life balance (5 comments).

_work life balance._ This theme presented a major challenge for directors as it dealt with having the support of personnel in the TLC to manage and delegate the many demands on the center. Two of the directors highlighted this challenge specifically: “Being a center of essentially one, with a shared professional staff member, this job is very stressful. In addition, the lack of funding means that I have to provide all of the professional development.” The lack of adequate personnel translated into a constraint to provide the necessary support to faculty in their teaching and learning, which another director described as, “[I] … work too many hours; [Need to] strive for more interpersonal interactions with various groups across campus; encourage other TLC members in their pursuits.” Another director commented, “Efficient time management and planning programs [needed]; and [plan] events far in advance.” This lack of adequate personnel in the TLCs evidently created work life challenges for the directors in managing their responsibilities for supporting faculty professional development and other teaching and learning initiatives.

_Collaboration._ The value of a TLC is in its ability to build cooperation and alliances from varied disciplines to achieve success in a program deemed necessary for the institution. To meet the demand for services, different directors commented on the techniques used to build and maintain collaboration. “I rely on volunteers for many things (leading learning communities, mentoring, etc.), which I believe is also beneficial
to the volunteers. We are currently changing our focus from workshops to long-term institutes and communities,” said one director. Another director also commented:

“We are currently changing our focus from workshops to long-term institutes and communities. The job was simplified quite a bit when we separated into the teaching center and a center for distance education. They handle all of the push for on-line and hybrid, including much of the training. That allows our center to focus on pedagogy and career.”

In an effort to use various technologies in addition to collaboration, another director indicated that:

“The demands are too much for an understaffed center. I am beginning to outsource some training and development. We have always used webinars and Magna videos as part of our program offerings. We used faculty for programs for a few years, but funding for stipends disappeared. We are trying again this year.”

Even with collaboration, the perception of the center can face challenges as one director indicated, “I think as an institution they see the Center as a supplement and not necessarily a requirement.”

**Addressing the effect of administrative policies on the center: Demands.** The next qualitative open-ended question asked the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff, to describe the effect administrative policies had on the demands on the center.

Administrative policies seek to “shape the institution’s faculty culture in a way that increases the use of effective instructional practices (Institutional Policy > Faculty Culture > Instructional Practice)” (Cox et al., 2011, p. 809). From the responses to the question, the researcher spent time reading through each of the responses and to identify
primary themes. These themes were then divided into the following categories to answer the research question on the effect administrative policies had on the demands that affected the center: (a) restrictive policy and (b) supportive policy.

From these two themes, it was determined that supportive policy was a primary theme covering demands. Examples of initiatives that functioned as supportive policies were (a) large course redesigns, (b) faculty professional development, (c) use of technology in teaching and learning, (d) confidentiality policy, (e) adjunct support, (f) curriculum policy, (g) faculty recognition, (h) allocation of resources, (i) quality enhancement planning (QEP) for program certification, (j) emerging forms of scholarships (SoTL and Scholarship of Engagement), (k) student engagement, (l) course evaluation, (m) faculty workloads, and (n) faculty mentorship. The responses from the participants detailed their perceptions of the effect administrative policies had on the TLC, the types of policies, and how these policies either increased or reduced the demands on the performance of the directors and the functions of the TLC.

**Supportive policy.** Approximately, 40% of the directors cited examples of supportive policies that had an effect on their TLCs, while 47% of faculty/staff cited supportive policies that had an effect on the demands on their TLC. A total of 22 comments from directors and faculty/staff formed the body of responses describing policies that were supportive. None of the supervisors provided any comments on supportive policies. From these 22 comments, several sub-themes were developed comprising teaching infrastructure, TLC responsibilities, student success initiatives, faculty professional development, course evaluation, faculty orientation and mentoring, and work life balance.
Teaching infrastructure. One participant commented on the creation of new classroom space and design as: “…encouraging 21st century [learning] and engaging pedagogies in connection with the center for teaching and learning space.” This participant described this new classroom space as allowing,

“innovative practices to be experimented with and faculty to observe these practices. This has provided opportunities for showcasing effective teaching practices and technology integration. The center provides training and professional development opportunities with this new space.”

Thus, policies on effective teaching with technology, active classroom teaching, and faculty professional development created opportunities for this demand to be supported by the center.

TLC responsibilities. Another administrative policy example which had an effect on the performance of a TLC was described as policies that affect everything that the TLC performed. Various policy examples were described as “strict confidentiality policy, policy requiring instructors to use the learning management system (LMS) which the center administered, provision of an innovative QEP, and supporting emerging forms of scholarship related to teaching, learning, and engagement.”

Two participants gave mention of policies regarding the use of LMS and ownership of course materials. As commented by one of the participants, “Our institution is just now creating policy regarding the use of the LMS and the ownership of materials created by faculty members, so we’ve been working without such guidance for nearly a decade.” The participant went on to describe the effects of not having previous policy guidance on the use of the technology by observing, “It's long overdue, and has
tied our hands in terms of how much programming we can support in new modalities.”

The other participant that mentioned policy related to LMSs described these modalities as, “Launching of hybrid courses; Incorporation of a post tenure project/research; LMS incorporation.” A supportive policy that advises persons on the usage of on-line teaching resources provides needed guidance to TLCs as they meet and satisfy the demand of implementing and supporting all educational technology.

*Student success initiatives.* The most mentioned supportive administrative policy was that of student achievement, which a participant described as “supporting large course redesign to meet the increased student load in the freshman and sophomore classes. The goal is to increase the actions taken to ensure that students will be retained.”

Another participant mentioned several examples of policies related to the use of technology and pedagogy as a means of supporting student success. “These policies drive our support initiatives and long term goals. We seek to support departments in meeting administrative policies and goals.” Examples of initiatives were e-Portfolios for creative thinking goals, clickers (for active learning), and large course redesign efforts to meet the increase in student numbers. Such policies serve to encourage the research of best practices in teaching and learning toward improving the quality of courses and curriculum.

With most policy initiatives, the challenge is identifying the type of effects they have had on the constituents it seeks to support. As described by a survey participant, “There is a positive effect of administrative policies on our center, [from] standards for curriculum design, credit hours pertaining to sufficient pedagogy, outcomes delivered within the course structure, and course evaluations.” Another participant described the
positive effect as “[having] teachers help students learn deeply; to promote high quality scholarship; to run the society of foundation professors.” Not only are the policies directing the demands, but also guides the creation of foundations or communities that will sustain the efforts of change, through improving the institutions’ teaching and learning performance.

Professional development. The creation of learning communities is determined by the level of development and training received by members of the community. The directors, supervisors and faculty/staff rated highly the demand of “providing professional development for faculty and professional staff (workshops and consultations)” both for importance and satisfaction meeting that demand. Having a supportive policy directed toward this demand meets the needs of faculty in their career development and their teaching.

A participant outlined that, “[our] faculty is routinely polled to determine topics of learning communities.” Another participant described the effort exhibited by the TLC to provide this support and the participation of the faculty as, “Evaluation of faculty is required (with some differences for tenured vs. non-tenured). This has led to a request by department chairs to have training on how to effectively evaluate faculty.” The participant further explained that, “Effective teaching is a major factor in tenure and promotion decisions. The programs provided by the CTL are credited to the faculty as ‘above and beyond’.” Additionally, explained this participant, “[the] administration approved funding for ‘merit bonuses’ for faculty who have gone above and beyond.” Providing supportive policies with tangible benefits can hopefully encourage and increase participation. The institution will need to balance the evaluation of faculty to ensure
fairness in tenure and promotion assessments, toward providing alignment between performance and outcomes.

*Course evaluation.* Student evaluation serves to provide faculty with (hopefully) constructive feedback on their teaching and strengthening the delivery of course materials. The perception from one participant described evaluation being strengthened by administrative policies in this manner:

“1. Performance appraisal: the university's approach is to appraise performance as a whole (teaching, research, service, and administration) and to reward good practice with a financial bonus.

2. Student evaluation: All the main lecturers (faculty) are evaluated by students at the end of every term. Faculty discusses their evaluations with their chair person, who may recommend that they attend faculty development workshops to improve their performance.

3. Faculty Orientation: In their letters of appointment faculty are informed that they are expected to attend the faculty orientation program which is provided at the beginning of each term.”

Instead of being punitive, the language of evaluations should be coached as performance incentives, part of the faculty professional development initiatives, supporting faculty orientation to bring the faculty up to speed quickly as they begin their career.

*Faculty orientation and mentoring.* Another supportive policy that outlined the effect of administrative policies on the TLC was described by a participant as faculty orientation and mentoring. “All faculty [members], full, part-time, and all distance faculty receive a two day orientation which includes an introduction to the teaching
philosophy of our institution and provides resources and examples.” Added the participant, “[the] administration supports the one-on-one mentoring program and the peer teaching consultations,” provided by the TLC. The issue of tenure was also commented on by another participant as policy that seeks to encourage and strengthen the work efforts of all faculty. This participant described the effect of this policy as, “Our promotion and tenure policies [which] require that faculty be excellent in either teaching or research or service, and satisfactory in the other two.” The result, as shared by the participant, was that;

“We take this seriously, so faculty who are struggling often come to our center for assistance; faculty who are excelling come to the center to learn more or to share their skills, and faculty in the middle come because everyone else is coming!”

The above policies address the demand of contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution, as a way to providing ongoing professional development for faculty.

Finally, in an effort to meet the demand of improving the institution’s teaching and learning performance, several participants described programs that were delivered to faculty as an institutional support for teaching and learning. Several participants provided example of some of these programs. “We have support from our administration and have been able to institute several great programs: Teaching & Learning Bash, Teaching with Technology Symposium, and Graduate Student Teaching Summer Institute,” was how one participant described their initiatives. Another participant said, “All faculty must complete a New Faculty Institute, and complete nine hours of some sort of PD (professional development) each year.”
Work Life balance. Still another participant expanded on the type of support provided to faculty as that affecting work life balance. “Our mission requires ongoing professional and personal development of faculty and staff and sustained wellness of our employees,” said the participant, adding further that, “Faculty and staff development take the form of professional knowledge and skills as well as personal growth.” Examples of some of these professional and personal growth initiatives were: “professional development ranges from acquiring new knowledge in a discipline to learning new pedagogies to acquiring new skills with technologies. Personal development includes health, wellness, and work life balance.” Supporting policies such as these go a long way to meet the demand of improving the institutions teaching and learning performance.

Having supportive administrative polices provide tools and resources to the TLCs and the directors to itemize which of the demands are important and can be addressed satisfactorily. These policies determine the level of administrative support and the value faculty development has in the institution, as well as transforming the educational experience for all students. In any discipline and work environment, being able to meet the needs of ongoing professional and personal growth and wellness initiatives can develop, in the words of one participant, “Employees who are healthy and well-prepared, can better perform their job duties, and can also serve as strong, effective role models to students.” The value of a TLC, as described by a survey participant, cannot be limited to pedagogy and the appropriate use of technology, but in supporting, “transformational education by creating and maintaining intellectually challenging academic programs and extra-curricular experiences that involves them in civic engagement and community service.”
Addressing the effect of institutional culture on the center: demands. The effect of institutional culture on the center was the next qualitative open-ended question presented to the three roles to determine the effect of culture on the demands faced by the director. Institutional culture is defined as “deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organization or its work” (Kezar & Eckel, 2002, p. 438).

The researcher spent time reading each of the responses and identified primary themes which were divided into the following categories to answer the research question on the effect institutional culture had on the demands on the center: (a) limiting, (b) supportive, and (c) uncertain. The supportive culture category defined the topic of demands on the center and was used as the main topic area for this discussion.

Supportive culture. In this section, the supportive theme was discussed by identifying how the sub-themes of support for funding, and equal focus on research and teaching were beneficial for a supportive institutional culture. Numerous participants described how having a supportive culture helped the center and director perform positively to meet the demands of their constituents. Approximately, 37% of the directors cited examples of a supportive culture, which affected their TLCs, while 31% of faculty/staff cited supportive policies that had an effect on the demands on their TLC. For the supervisors, 25% cited supportive policies that affected the TLCs. A total of 19 comments from directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff formed the body of responses describing policies that were supportive. Sub-themes related to demands were then developed which are described as institutional support for the TLC, support for funding, and equal focus on research and teaching.
Institutional support for the TLC. One participant commented that “The institutional culture supports and promotes the teaching-learning function of the Center, but is less supportive of the Center's potential role in faculty reward, recognition, and the balance of teaching and research demands.” In one way, there is strong support for having a TLC, but pushback in the roles and programs the TLC should be involved with results in little to no support when it comes to faculty recognition.

Another participant described faculty as being “highly collegial and supportive, and that has contributed immensely to our teaching center's success.” As a measure of the success of the work of the center, the culture of the institution allowed, “Those faculty, full time, part time, and graduate teaching assistants who know of and use our Office of Faculty Development [to be] very happy with the services,” was how another participant described the supportive culture.

From another participant the supportive culture was seen in the value perceived by many stakeholders in the university. “Our institutional culture values teaching (although research is also required). This means that our Center's work is highly valued by most everyone,” was how the participant described the support to the center. Comments from another survey participant indicated, “We now have a mission statement that emphasizes student learning as our prime mission. And this has drawn faculty applicants who embrace the primacy of teaching balanced with scholarship.” A supportive institutional culture allows the TLC and the director to better manage and support the demands of the institution, understand which demands are important to stakeholders, and then satisfy those demands.
Support for funding. The demand for providing adequate resources (personnel, funding, technology, books, etc.) is a never ending challenge for TLCs and directors to provide to the faculty. By understanding which demands are beneficial to the teaching community, and meets the needs and mandate of the institutional leaders, funding in the form of grants and budgets becomes very important. As articulated by one participant, “The CTL is highly respected, resulting in requests for funding of projects that are more likely to be accepted.” The challenge is to ensure that the results of these projects will not only be viable for the goals of the institution but many persons will benefit from the results.

Examples of such projects that received funding because of the value they had to their goals, was offered by one participant as; “…academic integrity and leadership initiatives to promote a culture of assessment. I’ve taken the approach that assessment simply informs decisions about teaching and stuck to that philosophy.” Out of that recognition, the center received funding for technology and other support resources to “promote good authorship practices.” Another participant shared information that because the TLC is a partner at the decision table, “The center is included in a number of curricular change projects to manage projects and to ensure faculty and departmental support for those changes.” In this way, “We work with general education to ensure that courses meet category outcomes. We work with committees that award faculty development travel awards,” describes the participant of how funding for this specific program was supported.

Equal focus on research and teaching. The workload of faculty is based on teaching, research, and service as well as leadership initiatives to a lesser degree. To find
a supportive balance between research and teaching can be a struggle. This is a challenge to be able to offer faculty incentives that supports both initiatives. As explained by a participant, “The institutional culture was always around teaching, and…talking about teaching has been very successful because it taps into a long history and culture of concern with student learning.”

At the same time that a supportive institutional culture values teaching, “…[it can be] less supportive of the TLCs potential role in faculty reward and recognition,” offered another participant. Another participant commented that “funded disciplinary research is ‘all that counts’. This attitude makes efforts to change teaching practice and especially SoTL work more difficult to advocate for and persuade faculty to spend time on.” To develop such a needed culture will require change and addressing the various resistance from varied units and persons.

Two participants offered examples of how their institution has developed a supportive culture around teaching and research. “At one time, there was a gradual movement toward valuing research over teaching,” explained the participant, “[but] due to a change in leadership…we now have a mission statement that emphasizes student learning as our prime mission. And this has drawn faculty applicants who embrace the primacy of teaching balanced with scholarship.”

Healthy participation rates in TLCs-offered workshop can create a positive reputation among the faculty community and administrators. Another participant offered similar comments, “Our institutional culture values teaching (although research is also required). This means that our Center's work is highly valued by most everyone, so the
A supportive culture seeks to create a vision for the institution that benefits all stakeholders. When the TLC and the director is able to guide the work of the center in conjunction with the vision and goals of the institution, then a strong sense of ownership and support by the institution and faculty will allow the center to better manage and satisfy the demands.

Summary of demands of administrative policies and institutional culture.

The directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff members of TLCs surveyed in this study perceived that the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture on the directors were substantial and challenging. The quantitative data analyzed from the survey provided excellent information from the three roles as to which demand was important. Based on the effects of institutional culture and administrative policies, the level of demand would provide opportunities to understand the type of services to deliver towards satisfaction for stakeholders and for the center.

The qualitative data provided an analysis of the quantitative responses to identify the effect institutional culture and administrative policies would have on the demands for services from the TLCs. The three roles perceived a difference in the demands, based on the functions that were important versus those functions that gave the greatest satisfaction in overcoming the limitations. For the demands identified as important, the three roles perceived providing professional development for faculty, improving their institution’s teaching and learning performance, and improving the quality of course and curriculum
as the top demand functions. Other top demand functions identified as important were increasing the number of on-line and blended courses and providing adequate resources.

The top demands that were perceived as providing the highest satisfaction to deliver the functions by the TLC were providing professional development support for faculty and staff, conducting research on best practices related to teaching and learning, improving the institutions’ teaching and learning performance, and improving the quality of courses and curriculum. Based on the importance and satisfaction of demands, there was some uniformity in both except for the function, increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings, which was identified as important as a demand but not providing the highest satisfaction in delivering as a demand function of TLCs.

The quantitative data analyzed from the survey provided information from the three roles as to which demands was important and based on the institutional culture and administrative policies, provided the director with the direction to satisfy the demands. The directors identified various strategies to overcoming these demands on their leadership and work. These strategies comprised developing partnerships among university units and leaders, creating and maintaining priorities of work, and what strategies the director could use to perform optimally in the scope of their responsibility.

The analysis of responses that detailed the effect which administrative policies and institutional culture had on the TLC summarized how supportive policies and culture can increase or reduce the demands on the TLC and the director. Having supportive policies increases the positive engagement between faculty, TLC, and the institution toward finding commonality in demands, goals, and the mission of the institution. Having a supportive institutional culture provides opportunities for knowing which of the
demands are important based on the mission of the institution. This in turn increases the satisfaction of supporting and meeting those demands.

**Constraints of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture on the Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers**

The constraints placed on the work of the center and on the performance of the director are guided by what Stewart (1982a) defined as the “factors, internal or external, that limit what the jobholder can do.” (p. 9). For the leader, work can be constrained by defined work imposed on the unit and the goals, which have been approved by the institution and the leaders. As the definition makes clear, these constraints create boundaries that can make change difficult for the directors to provide services, personnel, and other resources that meet the needs of internal and external customers. In the arena of higher education, the directors of TLCs can face a limitation of resources (technology, people, material, and funding), legal constraints based on the organizational structure, physical location of the unit or the organization, how the director’s unit is defined and organized based on institutional goals and mission, and the attitude of people to changes to the type of services/functions offered and produced.

From the survey, the quantitative responses from the three roles of director (D), supervisor (SU), and faculty/staff (F/S) were analyzed. This allowed the researcher to determine the importance of the constraints and how satisfied the participants were with the center’s performance to overcome the limits of these services/functions. From here on the services/functions will be identified simply as constraints.
Twenty one different job constraints were provided to survey participants as a list of constraints imposed on the director which acted as limits to what they can do and affected their work performance, leadership, and work life balance (see Table 12).

Table 12

Outline of Types of Constraints on Teaching and Learning Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Insufficient resources (people, money, materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insufficient number of TLC personnel members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Insufficient TLC personnel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inability to complete a cycle of planning and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Institutional priority given to research over teaching and learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of the work of the center among administrative leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Perception that only faculty can improve teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Short-term thinking on achieving lasting and significant outcomes/changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lack of student evaluation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Restrictive institutional culture of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lack of teaching and learning data required for the center operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lack of access to administrative decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constraints were divided into highest, moderate, least, and not applicable in importance and satisfaction. The responses representing the mean responses from the three groups (D, SU, and F/S) were then analyzed to look at their mean rating of importance and satisfaction. It must be noted that the survey had responses of high and very high for both the importance and satisfaction levels. The “not applicable” values
identified constraints which participants felt were not applicable to functions or activities that the TLCs should be involved. Additionally, the twenty one work constraints were divided into groups of three representing the highest, moderate, and least important and satisfied mean constraint.

**Constraints of importance.** The participants who identified themselves as directors reported their two highest constraints were “Insufficient resources (people, money, and materials)” (question #1) and “Insufficient number of TLC personnel members” (question #2), which affected the center’s performance to overcome the limits of these functions (see Table 13). With a mean score of 4.1, 78.8% of the directors (n=51) identified this constraint as the highest constraint that limited their work. Question #2 had a mean score of 4.1 with 76% of the directors identifying it as their second highest constraint of importance limiting their work. Almost 17.3% of the directors gave question #1 a moderate mean score while 24% gave question #2 a moderate mean score.

Participants identified as faculty/staff (n=27) also agreed with the directors that questions #1 and #2 merited the highest mean score of constraints to their work. Both questions had a highest mean score of almost 4.0 from 74.1% and 66.7% respectively of the faculty/staff. Approximately 14.8% to 7.4% of faculty/staff gave question #1 a moderate to least rating, while for question #2, 25.9% to 7.4% gave this constraint a moderate to least rating of importance. The participants identified as supervisors (n=5) to the directors differed slightly in their perception of the two highest constraints versus those identified by the directors and faculty/staff.
Question #1 rated the highest mean score of 4.0 from 80% for the supervisors (n=5), but question #7 identified as “Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty,” was assessed the second highest mean score of 3.6 from 60% of the supervisors. Nearly 20% of supervisors gave both questions #1 and #7 a low to moderate rating of

Table 13

Importance of each Constraint of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture with Center’s Performance to Overcome the Limits of these Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Director mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Supervisor mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Overall mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient resources</td>
<td>4.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient number of TLC personnel</td>
<td>4.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient TLC personnel time</td>
<td>3.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate sense of shared direction</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of center by leaders</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of SoTL as research</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of center by faculty</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to administrative decision</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect institutional perceptions</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term thinking on achieving change</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of alignment of center’s work</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to complete a cycle of planning</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to relevant technology</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional priority given to research</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive institutional culture</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception only faculty improve teaching</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teaching and learning data</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over dependence on support from areas</td>
<td>2.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policies prohibit work</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited success with external grant</td>
<td>1.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of student evaluation systems</td>
<td>2.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* s.d. = standard deviation; SoTL = scholarship of teaching and learning
Likert scale: 1 = not applicable and 5 = very high.
importance as constraints on directors and on the TLC (see Table 14). The work of a TLC affects the entire institution on matters related to teaching and learning, plus institutional projects and programs that require interdisciplinary collaboration and impact. The challenge for the TLC is instead of being everything to everyone; function as an advisor on issues that ultimately support students, and retention and graduate efforts.

Table 14

*Importance of Constraints: Top Four Constraint Functions by Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Important Constraint Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Insufficient resources (people, money, materials).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 51$)</td>
<td>Insufficient number of TLC personnel members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient TLC personnel time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Insufficient resources (people, money, materials).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 5$)</td>
<td>Inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of recognition of the work of the center among administrative leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Insufficient number of TLC personnel members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 27$)</td>
<td>Insufficient resources (people, money, materials).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient TLC personnel time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the work of many TLCs impacts students indirectly, it is the efforts spent with faculty and academic administrators which ensure student success matters will be addressed. Having sufficient resources becomes a major challenge if the TLC is not
viewed or recognized as a viable partner, or is not at the table when institutional decision matters relating to teaching and learning are discussed and planned. To counter these negatives, directors must (Schroeder, 2012), “communicate with appropriate administrators, seek their support, and keep them informed” (p. 159) on matters that are within the mission of the center. Being a change agent means working within to identify those who can be advocates and collaborators to find solutions, funding, and personnel to manage the demands for service.

The next two highest constraints for the directors were “Insufficient TLC personnel time” (questions #3) and “Inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution” (question #10). With a mean score of 3.9, question #3 had 64% of directors scoring this constraint at a high mean of importance. For question #10, a mean score 3.4 was given by 51% of the directors, with 25% of the directors giving a moderate score of importance. Question #10 could be defined as the TLC not having credibility within the institution, or lack of policies or clear directive from the institutional leaders on the work of the center. This creates problems in advancing services or collaborating with academic departments.

The supervisors also had question #10 within their next two highest constraints (mean score of 3.6; 60% of supervisors), but question #8, which is “Lack of recognition of the work of the center among administrative leaders,” was perceived by the supervisors as the other constraint of importance. With almost 60% of the supervisors giving a mean score of 3.6, this constraint becomes a concern as it implies either administrative leaders do not recognize the work and the effect the TLC can have on institutional goals, or the supervisors are concerned that the directors are not
communicating their work to leaders, not taking the initiative to seek support, or not publicizing the work of the TLC. Whatever the reason, this constraint can limit the relevancy of the TLC as a change agent in the minds of institutional leaders.

For the faculty/staff \( n=27 \), their next two highest constraints were “Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center” (question #5) and “Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity” (question #9). Question #5 had a mean score of 3.8 from 63% of the faculty/staff, and question #9 had a mean score of 3.7 from 55.6% of the faculty/staff.

Many TLCs have had to take on the management of technology used in teaching, which can cause difficulty when consulting with faculty on the matters of pedagogy. When the TLC is not recognized as a pedagogical champion or advocate, it runs the risk of being perceived as another information technology unit with no influence on advancing pedagogy, faculty professional development, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The other constraints that rated high mean scores for directors were “Lack of access to administrative decision-making” (question #21) with 47% of directors agreeing, “Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty” (question 7) with 37.3% of directors agreeing, and “Lack of recognition of the work of the center among administrative leaders” (Question #8) with 45.1% of directors agreeing. For supervisors, the other constraints high on their list were “Insufficient TLC personnel time” (question #3) with 50% of supervisors agreeing, “Short-term thinking on achieving lasting and significant outcomes/changes” (question #16) with 40% agreeing, and “Insufficient number of TLC personnel members” (question #2) with 60% agreeing. The faculty/staff
listed “Insufficient TLC personnel time” (question #3) with 63% of the faculty/staff agreeing, “Inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution” (question #10) with 52% agreeing, and “Short-term thinking on achieving lasting and significant outcomes/changes” (question #16) with 44.5% agreeing.

An example of a constraint viewed within the middle constraint level by directors was “Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center” (question #16) with 23.5% perceiving as moderately important and 13.3% perceiving as not applicable in importance. The next two constraints rated in importance by the supervisors was, “Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning” (question #11) with 31.4% rating moderate in importance and 9.8% rating not applicable in importance, and “Institutional priority given to research over teaching and learning activities” (question #6) with 17.7% saying moderately important and 21.6% indicating not applicable in importance.

For the supervisors, the following constraints in the middle level were, (a) “Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision” (question #12) with 20% rating it a low to moderate rating level of importance, (b) “Lack of teaching and learning data required for the center operations” (question #9) with 40% saying moderate to low rating level of importance, (c) “Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning” (question #11) with 40% indicating highest in importance and 20% indicating low in importance, and finally, (d) “Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes” (question #13) with 25% indicating moderate in importance and 50% indicating low in importance.
For the faculty/staff, examples of constraints in the middle were, (a) “Lack of access to administrative decision-making” (question #21) with 33.3% identifying it as moderate importance and 14.8% saying low importance, (b) “Perception that only faculty can improve teaching and learning” (question #14) registered with 33.3% indicating this has a great importance while 37% indicating low in importance, (c) “Lack of teaching and learning data required for the center operations” (question #20) with 25.9% indicating low importance to 11.1% indicating not applicable in importance, and (d) “Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty” (question #7) with 44.4% indicating highest in importance and 33.3% indicating moderate in importance.

Finally, all three roles had some constraints at the bottom of their respective levels.

Table 15

Importance of Constraints: Lowest Four Constraint Functions by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Least Important Constraint Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Lack of teaching and learning data required for the center operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 51)</td>
<td>Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Perception that only faculty can improve teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td>Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of student evaluation systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 27)</td>
<td>Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of student evaluation systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
levels of importance to the operations of the center (see Table 15). These were, (a) “Limited success with external grant and award applications” (question #15), (b) “Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC” (question #19), (c) “Restrictive institutional culture of the university” (question #18), (d) “Inability to complete a cycle of planning and implementation” (question #4), (e) “Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes” (question #13), and (f) “Lack of student evaluation systems” (question #17).

**Constraints of satisfaction.** On the mean scale of satisfaction, the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff specified the internal or external factors that provided great satisfaction for the center to overcome the limits (see Table 16). For the directors (n=49), the three functions that rated the highest satisfaction with the center’s performance to overcome were (a) “Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning” (Question #11) with 54.2% ranking it highest in satisfaction, (b) “Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty” (question #7) with 46.9% ranking it highest in satisfaction, and (c) “Insufficient resources (people, money, materials)” (question #1) with a mean score of 3.2 and 40.8% of directors ranking it highest in satisfaction.

For supervisors (n=5), their top three functions were “Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes” (question #13) with 60% giving it a mean score of 3.8, and 60% of directors ranking it highest in satisfaction. The function “Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center” (question #5) had a mean score of 3.6 with 60% of directors ranking it highest in satisfaction, and “Insufficient resources (people, money, materials)” (question #1) having a mean score of 3.4 with 60% of directors ranking it highest in satisfaction.
Table 16

*Satisfaction of each Constraint of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture with Center’s Performance to Overcome the Limits of these Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Director mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Supervisor mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Overall mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of center by faculty</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient resources</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of alignment of center’s work</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect institutional perceptions</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to relevant technology</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient number of TLC personnel</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of center by leaders</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient TLC personnel time</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to complete a cycle of planning</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception only faculty improve teaching</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate sense of shared direction</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term thinking on achieving change</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over dependence on support from areas</td>
<td>2.5 (0.3)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teaching and learning data</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive institutional culture</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to administrative decision</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of SoTL as research</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policies prohibit work</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional priority given to research</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of student evaluation systems</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited success with external grant</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* s.d. = standard deviation; SoTL = scholarship of teaching and learning

Likert scale: 1 = not applicable and 5 = very high.

For the faculty/staff (n=27), their top three functions were “Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision” (question #12) with a mean score of 3.5 with 55.6% of faculty/staff ranking it highest in satisfaction. The function “Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center”
(question #5) had a mean score of 3.4 with 48.1% of faculty/staff ranking it highest in satisfaction (33.3% saying moderate), and “Insufficient TLC personnel time” (question #3) with a mean score of 3.4 with 50% of faculty/staff ranking it highest in satisfaction (23.1% indicating moderate satisfaction).

Examples of functions that rated moderate satisfaction for all three roles were “Inability to complete a cycle of planning and implementation” (question #4), “Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center” (question 5), “Lack of teaching and learning data required for the center operations” (question #20), and “Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning” (question #21). Examples of functions that rated the least satisfaction for all three roles were “Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity” (question #9), “Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC” (question #19), “Limited success with external grant and award applications” (question #15), and “Lack of student evaluation systems” (question #17).

The constraints the directors face in their work as well as those perceived by the supervisors and faculty/staff range from limitations of resources (technology, people, material, and funding), legal constraints based on the organizational structure and industry, physical location of the unit or the organization, how the manager’s unit is defined and organized based on goals and mission, and the attitude of people to changes in the type of services offered and produced. As seen in the data presented in Table 17, seven unique functions were identified that the three roles ranked as the highest in satisfaction with overcoming the limits on the centers.
Table 17

*Satisfying the Constraints: Top Four Constraint Functions by Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Satisfied Constraint Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Directors (n = 49) | Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty.  
Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning.  
Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision. |
| Supervisors (n = 5) | Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center.  
Insufficient resources (people, money, materials).  
Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision.  
Insufficient number of TLC personnel members |
| Faculty/Staff (n = 27) | Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision.  
Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center.  
Insufficient TLC personnel time.  
Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty. |

Both the supervisors and faculty/staff perceived the function “Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center” (question #5) as common to their satisfaction of overcoming the limitations on the center. If the center is engaged in research and aligning its functions to the best practices in the industry and discipline, then they are better equipped to overcome the incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions. The supervisors and the directors also concurred that the limitations on resources (people, money, materials) was of great satisfaction for them to overcome. There are ways for the directors and supervisors to work together to bridge the gap on insufficient resources, whether by remaining focused on the few things the center can do well, or through budgeting and collaboration with other units to provide assistance and leadership on projects.
The function “Insufficient TLC personnel time” (question #3) challenges the
director to focus and collaborate without stretching too thin on support for projects and
initiatives which the center is involved. The other functions speak to overcoming the
lack of access to relevant technology, recognition of the work of the center, and lack of
alignment with the strategic vision of the institution. These functions speak to the
leadership of the center to ensure alignment with the mission of the institution in order to
be relevant and visible; identify and advocate with others to see problems that can be
addressed; and through collaboration with the central technology unit of the university,
advocate for learning technologies that meets the push for increasing the student body
through on-line learning and teaching.

The constraints that measured the same least mean level of satisfaction for all
three roles were “Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research
activity” (question #9), “Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC”
(question #19), “Limited success with external grant and award applications” (question
#15), and “Institutional priority given to research over teaching and learning activities”
(question #6) (see Table 18). Other functions that measured a low mean satisfaction for
the three roles were “Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to
achieve outcomes” (question #13), “Lack of access to administrative decision-making”
(question #21), and “Lack of student evaluation systems” (question #17).

The participants representing the three roles indicated that these constraints were
not applicable to the satisfaction of performance to overcome the limits for the director.
In all, four unique functions were identified that the three roles ranked as the lowest in
satisfaction with overcoming the constraints of administrative policies and institutional
culture with the center’s performance to overcome the limits of these functions.

Table 18

Satisfying the Constraints: Lowest Four Constraint Functions by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Least Satisfied Constraint Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors (n = 49)</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors (n = 5)</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of access to administrative decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional priority given to research over teaching and learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff (n = 27)</td>
<td>Institutional priority given to research over teaching and learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the TLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of student evaluation systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited success with external grant and award applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four overall lowest choice activities for the three roles were “Administrative policies
that prohibits the work of the TLC” (question #9), “Institutional priority given to research
over teaching and learning activities,” (questions #6), “Lack of student evaluation
systems” (questions #17) and, “Limited success with external grant and award
applications” (question #15).

How directors address the factors that constrain their ability to lead. A
qualitative question posed in section II of the survey asked the respondents identified as
directors to explain how they addressed the factors that constrained their ability to lead
the center. The purpose of this open-ended question was to provide directors the
opportunity to expand on the twenty-one constraints presented to them as limits to
managing the various initiatives undertaken by the center. These constraints ranged from limitations of resources, legal constraints based on the organizational structure and industry, physical location of the unit or the organization, how the manager’s unit was defined and organized based on goals and mission, and the attitude of people to changes to the type of services offered and produced.

The researcher spent time reading through each response to identify themes and patterns that would emerge to answer the research question. The themes were then divided into the following categories: (a) collaboration, (b) advocacy, (c) resources, (d) goals/mission, and (e) communication (see Table 19). The themes are presented from the most frequently cited to the least with each response outlining how the directors approached the challenge of constraints on their leadership and their work.

**Collaboration.** Some key words used by the directors and associated with collaboration were partnerships, alliance, teamwork, group work, and cooperation. Almost 27% of the directors cited this theme as key to overcoming the limits on their
ability to lead. In explaining the outreach to faculty to solicit their support, a director responded that, “I appeal to other faculty, especially those who have benefited directly from the center, to lobby on the center's behalf” and also indicated that, “I incorporate other faculty in decision-making.” The implication is that reaching out to faculty as supporters and having them at the decision-making table was helpful in identifying and overcoming these limits. Other directors spoke about “having a great relationship with the organization” and “work with the administration…so that they understand the constraints and propose possible solutions,” as examples of leadership initiatives used by the directors to achieve change. In matters concerning change, there are units of persons who can be perceived as change barriers, but in reality, there are common factors that make it possible to find solutions. As a director explained, “I have found that leaders on the financial side of the administration are unlikely allies: improving the quality of the education we provide is actually an excellent way to attract students and donors.”

The very leaders who are perceived as barriers have the ability to “alter some of the constraining factors,” this director commented, which leads to an alliance to remove the constraining factors.

By knowing one’s supervisor and what is important to his or her mandate or mission were key examples other directors provided as evidence of how they overcame the constraints on their ability to lead and provide services. As told by a director, “[I had] regular one-on-one meetings with Provost…attendance at leadership events…attendance at academic department meetings.” This provided the means to communicate, to seek the leaders’ support, and inform the leaders of the center’s work. Another director commented,
“I negotiate with the Provost and make sure that I know the overall politics of the institution and I consult with as many people as I can - deans, vice presidents, the president, program directors, faculty, and student life staff. This way I have a fairly wide knowledge base and support from many constituencies.”

Undoubtedly as more connections were made the greater the potential for support from many constituencies and wider the knowledge base.

In the twenty-one constraints that were presented to the three roles (directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff), the matter of insufficient resources (people, money, technology) was one of the more frequently cited functions as highest in constraint. As a way to overcome this constraint, a director commented that, “Collaborations with other units provided me with both the funds needed to implement projects and the people I needed to carry out these projects.” Another director said, “I use research to support the need for more funding.” The ability to collaborate with other units meant new opportunities could become available to move initiatives or improvements forward because of similar interests. As middle managers, these directors showed that “being at the table for university and system-wide initiatives,” as explained by a director, was a key method for advertising the work of the center to the leaders and in so doing, increase funding support.

One constraint that was high on satisfaction on overcoming as a constraint was lack of recognition among faculty. One component of TLCs work is the demand for faculty professional development, but the challenge is getting the faculty to respond, participate, or recognize the center as a collaborator in matters pertaining to service, teaching, and research. In order to address the lack of recognition, one director described
the effort as, “using subversive means...offering a $1,000.00 prize for teaching innovation that demonstrates learning through effective course design and alignment of learning objectives with assessments and evaluation procedures.” Using this relationship with individuals that received this funding, the center was able to gain access to the faculty department, by having that faculty member present his or her work in workshops, other departments, and sometimes gain a provost fellow position (with stipend) for this faculty member to work on institution-wide initiatives. By documenting these successes to the supervisor, the constraint was successfully addressed, and collaborations were made.

**Advocacy.** Being an advocate or working for advocacy means finding a supporter, seeking encouragement, or promoting like-minded projects. From the survey responses, almost 24% of the directors cited this theme as key to overcoming the limits on their ability to lead. Directors of TLCs have multiple priorities or needs that would be better served by having an advocate working hand-in-hand rather than going it alone. As a middle manager, the director has to be fully aware of the mission and institutional mandates of the university to ensure his or her work is aligned with those mandates in order to overcome the limitations on his or her work.

The challenge is in recognizing those limitations early in order to advocate for change, encourage communication with institutional leaders and faculty member, or initiate support for various institution-wide projects. To do so requires being at the decision-making table when the changes are proposed. As one survey participant declared, “[By] getting myself at the table to have a voice on issues that impact teaching and learning at the College, determines how well the CTL can support teaching and
learning.” Getting oneself at the table requires the director to seek audience with the various leaders so as to align the work of the TLC in ways for the TLC to advocate for the projects that are important to the respective leaders. Another participant indicated that he or she was “Respected enough to always have a voice!” Having a voice at the table was used numerous times by several participants to explain how they managed the limitations of access and support.

As on participant described, “I fight tooth and nail for more access to decision-making, for more resources…I also make sure that the success of the center is real and that the faculty are true advocates.” Another participant commented, “We are very fortunate to report to a Vice Provost for Faculty Development, so we have a voice and conduit for information at every important table on campus.” Being an advocate for faculty and having a voice through leaders at the institution creates opportunities not only for alignment with the vision, but also for “increased connection to [the] campus [and] greater access,” indicated another participant. Once those connections with leaders have been developed, then as commented by a participant, “find alternatives or ways around the obstacles…and innovate in ways that sidestep the obstacles or constraints.”

Some participants lamented that their influence was poor to weak. “I have very little power, influence, or voice on this campus. I try to voice concerns to the Asst. Provost in hopes that it will get to those who do have the power and influence,” explained on participant on the challenges and constraints he or she had to address. As one participant summarized, “we can often find ways around the constraints we face, since many of them involve others’ lack of clarity about our mission and scope of work.”
Resources. The resources needed by TLCs are dependent on several factors from faculty needs, department projects, initiatives from the institutional leaders, as well as political directives. The type of resources detailed ranged from people, time, money, technology, buildings, food, incentives, and services. Almost 24% of participants indicated that resources were important to addressing the various factors that constrained their ability to lead the center. Additionally, many of the participants described the constraint of resources as funding. So how did directors address these factors of constraint? As described by a participant, “We have worked hard to vary our source of funding, adding endowment funds, external funding, and service-for-hire, to our mix.” Another participant indicated that the center sought to “Balance funding to match priorities, appeal to deans and provost for ad hoc funding.” At the same time, recognizing that resources such as funding is not limitless, it is important to modify one’s expectation of the variety of projects one can hope to complete. A participant outlined the dilemma commenting that,

“I have requested a larger budget and the administration increased it modestly. Unfortunately, no one can give me more time in the day. There are programs that I would like to initiate, but I don't have the time to do so. I would like to promote my center's services more and increase usage, but I don't have the time to serve more people than I already do.”

Finding other avenue for resources such as funding is another method suggested by a participant who said, “Always being asked to do more with less, so making the time for tasks like grant writing to pursue additional resources is important.” Still another participant challenged others to take a long-term view on the issue of resources by
advising, “Take a longer-term view. Resources, at nearly all centers are constrained, so each year I make requests that I don’t expect will be fulfilled, but anticipate that the requests are planting seeds for future budget years.”

A participant identified staff time as a resource that was constrained in how much work could be managed. By seeking to protect staff time, this participant indicated “We might make more headway in certain areas if we chose to do less (choose a narrower focus/interpretation of our mission).” Understanding how to use the resources one has to work with helps the director to balance the things that need to be accomplished versus those things that limit what the director can accomplish with his or her center.

**Goals/Mission.** Key terms that support the goals/mission are objectives, aims, task, charge, and assignment. Close to 17% of participants identified with this theme in response to the survey question. Based on the culture of the institution, a participant commented that, “We have operated in a resource constrained environment for so long that we simply do not worry about all that and keep moving forward into new programs.”

Being focused on the mission of the institution, and recognizing the potential obstacles to achieving the mission, allowed this director to concentrate on the important aspects of his or her responsibility.

To remain focused also meant having the data to show the institutional leaders how the TLC has supported the mission of the institution. In the words of a participant, “By providing data-driven assessment of the value of our services, to argue for our mission and process,” he or she was able to show evidence of his or her work. Like all other constraints, the director as the leader, has to help others in the TLC remain focused during the constraints that challenge the staff. As commented by a participant, “We keep
our overarching goals in mind and by constantly re-purposing ourselves and our resources and by shifting responsibilities around among staff and our faculty consultants we are able to work around our constraints.”

Even in the midst of remaining focused, some directors acknowledged that the politics and the culture created other constraints that affected their ability to keep their focus on the goals/mission. A participant described this challenge as “leadership micromanaging the teaching center and all other campus programs.” In that type of climate, as a middle manager, the recourse for that director was to constantly “manage the program as well as possible, to offer reasoned explanations of the center's policies, and to document everything I do.” One of the roles of a teaching and learning center is to serve the academic side of the institution in advocating strength of pedagogy and assessments. Being able to show the performance data of the center and its effect on the success of students will hopefully show the institutional leaders how the work of the TLC work is aligned with the goals/mission of the institution.

**Communication.** Finding the right way to send the right message is important for any unit to announce and advertise the outcome of its work. Approximately 10% of participants identified this theme as important to overcoming the factors that constrained their ability to lead his or her center. As shown in the previous theme of advocacy and collaboration, being able to communicate the work of the TLC to various constituents in the university was important to generate support and alliances. As the director, one has to show the data to create awareness and trust. A participant described his or her constraint as “a misunderstanding of the Center's core purposes, mission, and goals by others around campus. We…communicate our mission and strategic plan clearly…and to
provide evidence of our value.” Another participant explained the value of communicating the work of the TLC through, “Documentation in a variety of venues such as Annual Report, budget planning. Using my ‘voice’ in formal and informal structures. Bringing in faculty through information sharing at faculty meetings and with our Advisory Board.”

By sharing or communicating the work of the TLC, another participant shared that “I approach my superior with data that illustrates the impact the constraints are having on the center's quality and quantity of output.” The participant also commented that, “I prioritize needs to ensure the most significant constraints are addressed first.” It is those needs that must be managed so as to overcome the constraints that can potentially limit the director as they lead the center.

**Addressing the effect of administrative policies on the center: constraints.**

The next qualitative open-ended question asked the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff to describe the effect administrative policies had on changing the constraints on the center. The researcher read each of the responses to identify primary themes. The primary themes were divided into the following categories to answer the research question on the effect administrative policies had on the constraints that affected the center; (a) restrictive policy, (b) supportive policy, (c) don’t know of any policy, and (e) no policy.

From these four themes, it was determined that restrictive policy and no policy were primary themes covering constraints. Insufficient allocation of resources, heavy faculty workload, lack of support for adjuncts, and budget constraints were examples of constraints. Other examples identified from the responses of participants were a climate
of fear, resistance to change, lack of faculty incentives, incoherent vision, and no strategic planning. The responses from the participants identified the effect administrative policies had on the TLC, the types of policies, and how these policies either increased or reduced the constraints on the performance of the directors and the functions of the TLC. For the restrictive policies, the sub-themes identified were; (a) introduction of large courses, (b) faculty workloads, (c) faculty professional Development, and (e) Technology and Teaching.

Restrictive policy. The percentages of directors who indicated examples of restrictive policies which had an effect on the constraints affecting the center were 37% of the total respondents. Almost 75% of the supervisors perceived restrictive policies having an effect on the constraints faced by the center. For the faculty/staff of the center, approximately 42% perceived restrictive policies having an effect on the constraints on the center.

Introduction of large courses. A topic that was cited by many of the participants was introduction of large courses and its effect on student evaluations, retention, and success efforts. As budget cuts affected institutions, large courses were created in an effort to increase funding opportunities for the institution, which led to policies guiding student progression, retention, and graduation. The policy of student evaluations of teaching was described by one participant as “a terrible policy as it assessed nothing”. As noted also by this participant, “Policies for demanding student progression, retention, and graduation have impacted the center in many ways. We must provide programs to help with these issues, but faculty are only asked to volunteer to participate.”
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Another participant commented that, “Administrative policies emphasized student ratings (customer satisfaction) over student learning and academic rigor.” The effect as described by this participant, were the creation of “student ratings,” that all faculty had to submit as teaching review. The use of student ratings was devised to gauge the effectiveness of the faculty teaching, but at the same time the leadership exerted no pressure for the faculty senate rules to submit evidence of learning to be followed.

The result was faculty coming to the TLC due to the pressure to address their ‘teaching problem’ in an effort to increase ‘student ratings’. The value of student achievement program policy support is invaluable only if there is buy-in from all concerned persons to participate and contribute. In all these programs, insufficient resources and weak leadership can cause frustrations, which lead to resistance to participate.

*Faculty workloads.* The increase in large courses and large course redesign efforts affects not only the TLC, but also faculty workload. As indicated by a participant, “Faculty workloads are high so there is a perception that no time is available for faculty development.” The result is that faculty attendance at faculty professional development events and workshops was low as faculty dealt with their heavy teaching responsibilities. The value of having administrative policies, which provide support and incentives, creates a working culture of excellence and value for all concerned. A participant described the positive effects of support policies over restrictive policies as, “Our promotion and tenure policies require that faculty be excellent in either teaching or research or service, and satisfactory in the other two.”
As a result, the participant reported that faculty who were struggling came often to the TLC for assistance, faculty who were excelling came to share their skills or learn more, and those faculty in the middle came to the center because everyone else was coming. One participant cautioned that the options for faculty development can be perceived in a negative way if “our center's trainings are used as gate keepers for other departments.” The lack of administrative policies can reduce participation in professional development activities because “there is no enforcement or encouragement of participation and follow through for faculty,” commented one participant. However, the effect of mandatory or enforced participation can cause resistance to participate.

*Faculty professional development.* While the purpose of faculty professional development is to provide opportunities for excellence in teaching and hopefully advancement in rank, the opposite can occur. As described by one participant, “we had a Dean of a College mandate that her faculty attend two of our program offerings over the course of the year. While our attendance at the events increased, I also had disgruntled faculty (mainly part-time) who were attending.” The results of restrictive policies lead to resistance to change.

The institutional leaders usually develop the creation of policies. There is much value in ensuring that, as many constituent members of the organization are part of the discussion and at the decision-making table. A participant described his or her experience as “Center responsible for strategic initiatives; center responsible for student ratings of instruction; director not included in shared governance faculty committees.” A vacuum of no clear policy or one of restrictive policy created by distributive leadership leads to each department doing its own thing. Several participants reported how several
teaching and learning initiatives were started with no input from the TLC, resulting in “no clear, coherent vision for learning,” was how another participant described the outcome.

In another comment, a participant described the effect of a yearly faculty evaluation policy initiative being created without the participation of the TLC, that out of a questionnaire with 32 questions given to faculty, only one question had the word ‘teaching’ in it. Commented the participant, “thus faculty concluded that research and publication is what matters and what is being rewarded, so attending teaching workshops is not a high priority.”

*Technology and teaching.* Administrative policies that affect the use of technology in teaching and learning were also mentioned in the responses from participants. A participant described this as, “Significant institutional funding and staffing for instructional television courses without pedagogical training for the modality.” The lack of clear direction and policy resulted in on-line course initiatives being developed without any input from the TLC, no requirements for faculty development in teaching these courses, or no instructional quality standards were also some of the deficiencies resulting from incoherent, restrictive or having no policies.

*No policy.* The effect of having no policy related to constraints affecting administrative policies creates large challenges for directors of TLCs, as there are no guiding standards or criteria to follow. Every successful organization has levels of policy, which allows employees and leaders to have a structure upon which the organization and its units are able to follow. The perception from a participant underlined this dilemma by comments that described an absence of policies. As stated by
the participant, “the absence of important policies and the administration's reluctance to write policies that would provide needed structure and organization and relevancy to the office,” created an issue of leadership for the center. For the no policy theme, a sub-theme that was identified was lack of faculty professional development.

*Lack of faculty professional development.* For the TLC to champion initiatives such as faculty professional development, policies that motivate, encourage “or require faculty development activities” would be helpful, stated another participant. The result of policies that encourage faculty professional development can be a powerful motivator to faculty. An illustration of having such a policy was described by a participant as, “Our current administration that values faculty development…Provost created the position of Vice Provost for Faculty Development…our center is integrally involved and committed to major initiatives of our university, such as the Strategic Plan and the Quality Enhancement Plan [QEP].”

**Addressing the effect of institutional culture on the center: constraints.** The effect of institutional culture on the center was the next qualitative open-ended question presented to the three roles to determine the effect of culture on the constraints faced by the director. The researcher spent time reading through each of the responses and to identify primary themes that were then divided into the following categories to answer the research question on the effect institutional culture had on the constraints on the center; (a) limiting, (b) supportive, and (c) uncertain. The limiting category defined the topic of constraints on the center and was used as the main topic area for this discussion. From the primary themes, sub-themes related to constraints were identified as; (a) lack of direction, (b) lack of services, and (c) weak leadership.
**Limiting culture.** In this section, the limiting theme was discussed by identifying how the sub-themes of lack of a mission, lack of services, and weak leadership were constraints due to a limiting institutional culture. Approximately 51% of directors identified institutional culture as a limiting situation which affected the performance of the center. Almost 25% of supervisors identified institutional culture as limiting, while 62% of the faculty/staff provided examples where institutional culture was limiting. The three sub-themes of mission, services, and leadership identified the ways where a limiting institutional culture had the most effect on the mission of the center, the policies or lack of policies on leadership, focus, and faculty incentives.

**Lack of direction.** This sub-theme identified by participants described how having no mission for teaching, lack of policies, weak leadership and focus, and an institutional culture that created conflicting messages could be limiting or constraining on the performance of a TLC. The value of having a mission is in providing direction, standards, and expectations of results. The opposite can lead to the devaluation of one initiative over another causing resentment or reduction in participation. A participant offered the following response on the issue of devaluation of teaching by commenting, “A devaluation of teaching and overemphasis of research has caused new hires to not value teaching or even be very good at it (and don't care if they're good).” This type of culture devalues some of its members over another resulting in conflicting messages about the mission of the institution.

The issue of motivation is also a cause and effect of lack of mission. In describing the result of a limiting and challenging culture, a participant commented that “the lack of administrator's willingness and ability to embrace innovative methods makes
it difficult to advocate for them from the ground up.” The weak leadership example a leader sets creates a dissonance when initiatives are being proposed within the institution. Seeking the support of the faculty and staff will be challenging to motivate them in this type of limiting culture. As offered by a participant, “Weak leadership = Weak participation.” Requiring faculty to undergo any faculty professional development will be undermined by the weak administration seen by all.

In this regard, some participants felt that conflicting messages from leadership enabled interference with innovation and continuous improvements. As offered by a participant, on one hand “Our continuous improvement culture supports innovation, study, training, and risk-taking.” However, because of independence by disciplines and departments the individuality created “interference with regular free flow of good ideas and deep discussions across campus.” The result as described by the participant was “a significant portion of faculty not interested in efforts towards promoting teaching excellence or recognition.” It is important that the mission presents a unified statement around the goals and objectives of whatever project or policy being presented. Other comments from a participant shared the fact that “Lack of serious, shared governance. It's all lip service and everyone knows it. Incompetent staff that are shuffled around or just left alone.” Having an administrative culture that limits the value of shared governance potentially can lead to a lack of focus on the mission and direction of the center.

*Lack of services.* The sub-theme of lack of services was identified by participants as focusing only on research, having a weak faculty professional development program, and heavy teaching load acting as punishment for faculty. These conflicting messages could be limiting or constraining on the performance of the TLC. The response from a
participant was succinct in pointing out that “In most units at our institution, funded disciplinary research is ‘all that counts’.” As described in greater detail, the “research-focus only attitude” created difficulties with “efforts to change teaching practice and especially SoTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) work more difficult to advocate for and persuade faculty to spend time on.”

For the TLC to provide services that support the faculty in their research, service, and teaching, all services needed to be given the same effort in professional development. Another participant noted the growing rewards for research and publication over the demise of “rewarding excellence in teaching.” As pointed out by this participant, “For many institutions of higher education, the reward of research and publication continues to be valued higher than advancing teaching and learning.” The reason offered for this trend is seen in the ease of quantifying the reward of research and publication, whereas “good teaching is more troublesome” to quantify and evaluate, short of student evaluations.

The culture of research-focus only also perpetuates the belief that “Teaching is viewed as a burden for those who are research-focused,” was the comment offered by a participant. Such a culture dictates, “Only faculty can have teaching expertise.” This creates conflict with members of the TLC whose mandate is to provide faculty professional development regarding pedagogy, on-line course development and delivery, as well as other instructional and active learning methodology. Another participant summed up the conflict with the comment that, “Faculty who are not good researchers are given heavy teaching loads as punishment.” In this way teaching as a service was seen as a punishment for lack of research production and publication. As summarized by
a participant, “Our faculty [members] have heavy workloads, making it difficult for them to participate in educational development.”

Weak leadership. The sub-theme of weak leadership within a limiting administrative culture was identified by participants as fostering resistance to change, silos in decision making, and creating a lack of funding due to an inability to set goals for the various mission of the institution. The TLC is always challenged to understand the mission and goals of the various departments from whom it seeks collaboration or cooperation. As commented by a participant, “The culture of department and individual independence is strong. When we work on University wide initiatives we must keep this in mind.” The competing interests from various faculty units also caused limitations based on the culture. Offered a participant, “Our campus has [a] strong bargaining unit, so every innovation becomes discussion about extra payment faculty will receive to learn about and [be] trained in new pedagogies and methods.”

The need for change in attitude to pedagogical methodology is affected by resistance to change based on the perception of the value of teaching. A participant observed that on the issue of teaching, student evaluation ruled the decisions. “The best teachers are those loved by their students. Our students are too poorly prepared to meet the demands of college-level instruction. Lecture-recitation teaching is what students want.”

The competing interests from faculty units can be a result of decentralization in decision-making or having silos based on needs and wants. One participant mentioned that the lack of leadership support caused a lack of desire for change from faculty. “Silos of faculty do not participate due to the perception of relevance. Deans not reaching out to
ask for help.” The result is that “Any improvement in instruction isn't due to policy but the instructors’ interest in becoming a more effective instructor.” This speaks to a lack of leadership and direction for the mission of the institution. For the TLC to overcome these limiting factors due to institutional culture, will require a major change from all constituents to seek greater clarity and offer effective leadership as a means to overcome the constraints affecting the TLC.

Summary of constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture.

The directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff members of TLCs surveyed in this study perceived that the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture on the directors and the centers were considerable due to the breadth of limitations facing their performance. The three roles perceived a difference in the constraints, based on the functions that were important versus those functions that gave the greatest satisfaction in overcoming the limitations. For the constraints that were seen as important, the three roles perceived insufficient resources, insufficient number of TLC personnel, inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose, and lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as a research activity as key functions. Other top functions identified were lack of recognition of the work of the center among administrative leaders and incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center.

The top constraints that were perceived as providing the highest satisfaction to overcoming the limitations on the TLC were limitations of resources, lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty, lack of access to relevant technology, and lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision. Other top functions perceived were incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the
role/function of the center, and insufficient number of TLC personnel members. Based on the importance and satisfaction of constraints, there was some uniformity in both except for the functions, inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose and lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision, being different.

The quantitative data analyzed from the survey provided information from the three roles as to which constraints was important and, based on the institutional culture and administrative policies, provided the director with the direction to satisfy the respective stakeholders. The directors identified various strategies to overcoming these constraints on their leadership and work. These strategies comprised collaboration, advocacy, resources, goals/mission and effective communication.

The three roles perceived several themes which described how constraints of administrative policies affected the performance of the center. Policies were identified as comprising restrictive policies and having no policies as largely responsible for constraining the center. From these themes several sub-themes were identified and offered as ways to overcoming the limitations on the center. Restrictive policies were identified as introduction of large courses, faculty workloads, the lack of faculty professional development and policies that affect the efficient use of technology in teaching. For the sub-theme of no policy, a lack of faculty professional development opportunities was identified as a constraint affecting the performance of TLCs.

The qualitative analysis of the effect of institutional culture on the constraints on the center, identified limiting culture as the primary theme, with the sub-themes related to constraints comprising lack of direction, lack of services, and weak leadership. The qualitative data allowed the three roles the opportunity to provide in-depth comments to
show the effect institutional culture and administrative policies would have on the constraints for services on the TLCs.

**Choices available to the Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers given the Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture**

The choices placed on the work performance, job responsibilities, and leadership of the directors of teaching and learning centers affects the extent to which they are able to provide direction for the work of the center, ensure adequate personnel support, all the while supporting the educational initiatives of their institution. The supervisor of the director of the TLC sets the initiative that is important, and the director directs and provides the support to the faculty/staff of the TLC to guide the work of the center. Both the director and faculty/staff accomplish the initiatives based on the mission and goals of the institution.

The function called choices placed both on the work of the center and the performance of the director is guided by what Stewart (1982a) defined as “activities that the jobholder can do, but does not have to do” (p. 9). For the director, these choices of activities are determined by the level of personnel support in the TLC and whether those choices support initiatives that are valued by the faculty and are worth doing depending on the support of policies and culture. The quantitative responses from the directors on the choices provided an outline of projects or initiatives important to the work of the TLC and how satisfied the directors were with the performance of the center to meet those needs (see Table 20).
Table 20

Outline of Types of Choices available to Teaching and Learning Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supporting accreditation efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supporting policy and procedures that include reward and recognition schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing broad support of academic ideas across the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Piloting new technology/teaching innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Providing student support efforts (orientation, retention, student peer learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Supporting mentoring of faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Providing technical training to implement educational technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Leading faculty learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Supporting institutional policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative responses from the directors outlined the choices they made to match how best staff members contributed to the center. The quantitative responses from the supervisor and the faculty/staff provided their perception of evaluating the effectiveness of the director to make a decision on supporting the different choices. The qualitative responses from all three roles determined the effect of administrative policies and institutional culture on the choices that were considered by the center.
Within the quantitative questions, 19 activities were provided to respondents as a series of choices considered by the director which had an effect on the center’s performance and their leadership effectiveness. By ranking these activities as highest, moderate, least, and not applicable in importance and satisfaction, the mean responses from the three groups (D, SU, and F/S) were analyzed to look at the mean rating of importance and satisfaction. It must be noted that the survey had responses of high and very high for the importance and satisfaction levels for the demands, constraints, and choices activities. The “not applicable” values were noted as a means of gauging which, if any choice of activity, participants felt were not applicable to choices in which the TLCs should be involved. Additionally, the 19 choice activities were divided into groups of three representing the mean highest, mean moderate, and mean least important and satisfied choices. The quantitative analysis allowed for statistical frequency and percentage values to be calculated to show most frequently cited choice activity based on the roles.

**Choices of importance.** Within the 19 choice activities, the directors \((n=47)\) specified that the choices of “Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum” (question #7), “Piloting new technology/teaching innovation” (question #8), “Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum” (question #3), and “Leading faculty learning communities” (question #18) were the top four choice activities measuring the highest importance of choice they and the TLC choose to do (see Table 21). Choice activity #7 rated a mean score of 4.7 with 100% of the directors giving it the highest importance in all the choice activities. The activity choice #8, received a mean score of 4.0 with approximately 77% of the directors giving it highest importance and 17% indicating
Table 21

*Importance of each Choice of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture with Center’s Performance to make a Decision on these Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Director mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Supervisor mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Overall mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting innovation of pedagogy</td>
<td>4.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>5.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting new technology/teaching</td>
<td>4.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.7 (0.6)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the delivery of courses</td>
<td>3.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>4.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading faculty learning communities</td>
<td>3.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support of academic ideas</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting institutional policies</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting policy and procedures</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting mentoring of faculty</td>
<td>3.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting peer evaluation</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting programs reward teaching</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting accreditation efforts</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting productive relationships</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical training</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring reliable ET</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing blended and on-line courses</td>
<td>2.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing non-teaching and learning PD</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing academic workloads</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/support of academic faculty</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student support efforts</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* s.d. = standard deviation; PD = Professional Development; ET = Educational Technology

Likert scale: 1 = not applicable and 5 = very high.

For question #3, this choice activity received a mean score of 3.9 with 77% of directors indicating highest importance and almost 11% indicating moderate importance. For choice activity #18, the directors rated it a mean score of 3.7 with 100% of the directors giving it the fourth highest importance in all the choice activities.
For survey participants who identified themselves as supervisors \((n=5)\) their four highest choice activities were similar to that of the directors. Choice activity #7 rated a mean score of 5.0 with 100% of the supervisors giving it the highest importance of all the choice activities. The choice activity #8 received a mean score of 4.7 with 100% of the directors giving it highest importance.

For question #3, this choice activity for the supervisors received a mean score of 4.0 with 80% of directors indicating highest importance. The fourth highest choice activity of importance “Providing technical training to implement educational activities” (question #14) for the supervisors, differed from that of the directors. In all, 80% of the supervisors rated this choice activity of highest importance with a mean score of 4.0, while 20% rated it of moderate importance.

For the faculty/staff participants \((n=23)\), they rated the same four choice activities similar to that of the directors. The choice of “Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum” (question #7) rated a mean score importance of 4.4 by almost 96% of the faculty/staff. The choice activity “Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum” (question #3), received a mean rating of 4.3 by 93% of the faculty/staff participants. The choice activity “Piloting new technology/teaching innovation” (question #8), was rated at 4.0 by 78% giving it highest importance. Almost 17% of the faculty/staff gave question #8 a moderate importance of activity the director could have chosen to do. The fourth choice activity “Leading faculty learning communities” (question #18), had a mean score of 3.9 by 83% of the faculty/staff, with 13% giving this choice a low importance rating of activity that the director chose to do.
The activities that the director of the TLC chooses to do is dependent on whether the work they are tasked to do fits within the priorities of the TLC, aligns with the mission and mandate of the center, and affects the group (the faculty) which has responsibility for the teaching and learning initiatives within the university. Some examples of the work a TLC manages consists of advancing innovation in teaching and learning and enhancing current or new courses to be delivered in different modalities such as on-line and blended course delivery.

As the leader of the TLC, the director has to display effective leadership to focus on the important and relevant activities mandated by the institutional leadership so as to not extend the center and its resources beyond what can be reasonably managed. The performance of the center will be dictated by the members of the TLC focusing on the key functions it has been given to ensure success and relevancy within the institution.

The other choice activities that were rated at high mean scores by the directors were “Supporting mentoring of faculty” (question #11) with 68% giving it a highest rate of importance and 13% moderate importance, and “Providing broad support of academic ideas across the university” (question #6) with 64% giving it a highest rate of importance and 15% moderate to low in importance. For the supervisors, the other choice activities that were rated at high mean scores were “Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum” (question #3) with 80% giving it a highest rate of importance and 20% low importance, “Supporting policy and procedures that include reward and recognition schemes” (question #5) with 80% giving it a highest rate of importance and 20% low importance, and “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings”
(question #6) with 80% giving it a highest rate of importance and 20% moderate importance.

For the faculty/staff role, the choice activities that were rated at high mean scores were “Leading faculty learning communities” (question #18) with 83% giving it a highest rate of importance and 13% low importance, “Supporting institutional policies” (question #19) with 65% giving it a highest rate of importance and 35% moderate importance, and “Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research” (question #4) with 65% giving it a high to very high rate of importance and 35% moderate importance. As seen in Table 22, the top four choices the director, the supervisor, and the faculty/staff perceived with what the TLC could do but choose not to do, were similar across the three roles, except for choice activity of “Providing technical training to implement educational technologies” (question #14) which the supervisor perceived was an important choice the director should make a decision to do. The supervisor did not perceive choice activity “Leading faculty learning communities” (question #18) as an important choice activity for the director to pursue.

For the choice activities that rated moderate in importance for the three roles, there were seven choice activities that measured within this range of functions. Analyzing the top four activities for the directors, approximately 49% of the directors rated the choice activity “Supporting institutional policies” (question #19, mean score of 3.4) as a high activity of importance in what they choose to do, “Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching” (question #10, mean score of 3.4) was next, “Supporting accreditation efforts” (question #1, mean score of 3.3) with 45% of directors rating it as a moderate choice activity of importance, followed by “Supporting policy and
procedures that include reward and recognition schemes” (question #5). Approximately 51% of directors rated this as a high choice activity in this range (mean score of 3.3).

The choice activity of “Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research” (question #4) had 10.6% of directors giving it a “not applicable” choice rating, 15% of directors giving it a not applicable as a choice, and 27% of the directors giving it a “not applicable” as a choice activity.

Table 22

Importance of Choices: Top Four Choice Functions by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Important Choice Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 49)</td>
<td>Piloting new technology/teaching innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading faculty learning communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Supervisors   | Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum.                   |
| (n = 5)       | Piloting new technology/teaching innovation.                        |
|               | Providing technical training to implement educational technologies.|
|               | Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum.                   |

| Faculty/Staff | Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum.                   |
| (n = 23)      | Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum.                   |
|               | Piloting new technology/teaching innovation.                        |
|               | Leading faculty learning communities.                               |

For the supervisor role, 60% of the supervisors rated question #19 as moderate in importance with what they choose to do (mean score of 3.6), followed by 60% of the supervisors rating the activity “Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching” (question #10, mean score of 3.4) as moderate in choice activity. Approximately 20% of supervisors rated “Supporting accreditation efforts”, question #1 as low in choice activity.
in this range (mean score of 3.0). The next choice activities in the moderate range of choice activities for the supervisors was “Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching” (question #15) with 60% of the supervisors rating it as moderate with a mean score of 3.6, and the choice activity of “Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research” (question #4), with 40% of the supervisors rating this choice activity as a low rating of importance (mean score of 3.0).

Approximately 48% of faculty/staff members rated question #10 as moderate in importance as a choice activity to do (mean score of 3.4) and 61% of faculty/staff rated question #1 as moderate in importance of choice (mean score of 3.6). For the faculty/staff, 52% of this group rated “Supporting policy and procedures that include reward and recognition schemes” (question #5) as moderate in importance as a choice activity with a mean score of 3.4. The other three choice activities in the moderate range of choice activities for the faculty/staff were “Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching” (question #15) with 43% of the faculty/staff selecting it with a mean score of 3.3. The choice activity of “Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research” (question #4) had 65% of the faculty/staff rating this choice activity as high in importance as a choice activity for the director and the TLC to do (question #4, mean score of 3.8).

Choice activities were rated as least in importance by directors in making a decision to do (see Table 23). These were, “Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty and staff” (question #2, mean score of 2.7), choice activity “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings” (question #12, mean score of 2.5), “Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies”
Table 23

*Importance of Choices: Lowest Four Choice Functions by Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Least Important Choice Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies. Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments. Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution. Providing student support efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n = 49</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty/staff. Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution. Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments. Providing student support efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n = 5</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty/staff. Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution. Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments. Providing student support efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n = 23</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(question #13, mean score of 2.4), and “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #17, mean score of 2.3).

Choice activities that were selected as least in importance by supervisors in making a decision to do were, “Supporting accreditation efforts” (question #1, mean score of 3.0), “Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research” (question #4, mean score of 3.0), “Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments” (question #16, mean score of 1.8), and “Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty and staff” (question #2, mean score of 2.8).

For the faculty/staff, choice activities that were selected as least in importance in making a decision to do were, “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings” (question #12, mean score of 3.1), “Developing balanced academic workloads
for faculty teaching commitments” (question #16, mean score of 2.9), “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #17, mean score of 2.6), and “Providing student support efforts (orientation, retention, student peer learning, and mentoring)” (question #9, mean score of 2.4).

Choices of satisfaction. On the mean scale of satisfaction, the three roles selected seven choice activities as the highest in satisfaction in functions to do (see Table 24). In analyzing the top four choice activities for the directors (n=46), 67% of the directors selected “Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum” (question #7, mean score of 3.9) as the highest in satisfaction of choice activity they choose to do. The next highest choice activity of satisfaction for directors was “Supporting accreditation efforts” (question #1) with approximately 67% of directors indicating being satisfied with the center’s performance in making a decision to do this activity (mean score of 3.6).

The next two choice activities that were selected by the directors were “Piloting new technology/teaching innovation” (question #8) and “Supporting institutional policies” (question #19). For question #8, almost 61% of the directors selected this activity with a mean score of 3.6. For question #19, almost 67% of the directors selected this activity with a mean score of 3.5. The other choice activities that were rated at high mean scores of satisfaction by the directors were “Leading faculty learning communities” (question #18) with 50% giving it a highest rate of importance and 15% low importance. “Providing broad support of academic ideas across the university” (question #6) was the next activity with 50% giving it a highest rate of importance (mean score of 3.3) and 11% moderate satisfaction, and “Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum” (question
#3) with 39% giving it a high rate of satisfaction. Approximately 41% of the directors rated it moderate to low in satisfaction of choice activities to do.

Table 24

_Satisfaction of each Choice of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture with Center’s Performance to make a Decision on these Functions_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Director mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Supervisor mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff mean (s.d.)</th>
<th>Overall mean (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting innovation of pedagogy</td>
<td>3.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting accreditation efforts</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the delivery of courses</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting new technology/teaching</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting institutional policies</td>
<td>3.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading faculty learning communities</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical training</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support of academic ideas</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting productive relationships</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting mentoring of faculty</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring reliable ET</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing non-teaching and learning PD</td>
<td>3.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting policy and procedures</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting programs reward teaching</td>
<td>3.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing blended and on-line courses</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting peer evaluation</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.7 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/support of academic faculty</td>
<td>2.5 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student support efforts</td>
<td>2.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing academic workloads</td>
<td>2.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* s.d. = standard deviation; PD = Professional Development; ET = Educational Technology

Likert scale: 1 = not applicable and 5 = very high.

For the supervisors (n=5), the choice activities that were rated at high mean scores of satisfaction were “Providing technical training to implement educational technologies” (question #14) by 40% of supervisors with a mean score of 3.8 (40% moderate satisfaction), followed by “Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies”
(question #13) by 80% of supervisors with a mean score of 3.8. The choice activity “Supporting accreditation efforts” (question #1) was selected by 40% of the supervisors (mean score of 3.6). For 40% of the supervisors, “Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum” (question #7) was also selected as highest in satisfaction of choice with a mean score of 3.2. For the supervisors, 50% perceived question #8 as next highest in choice activity (mean score of 3.2). The other choice activities that the supervisors gave ratings of high mean scores of satisfaction were “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings” (question #12) with 40% giving a high rate of satisfaction and 60% moderate satisfaction and “Piloting new technology/teaching innovation” (question #8) was the next activity with 50% of supervisors rating this question a high rate of satisfaction and 20% moderate to low satisfaction. The choice activity “Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum” (question #7) was next with 40% of supervisors rating this activity high in satisfaction and 40% moderate satisfaction. Approximately 40% of the supervisors gave “Supporting institutional policies” (question #19) a moderate rate in satisfaction (mean score of 3.2), with 20% rating this choice activity as least in satisfaction.

For the faculty/staff (n=23), the choice activities that were rated at high mean scores of satisfaction were “Piloting new technology/teaching innovation” (question #8) with 43% rating the activity a high rate of satisfaction and 39% moderate satisfaction (mean score of 3.5). The choice activity “Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies” (question #13) had a high rate of satisfaction by 52% of the faculty/staff and 22% moderate satisfaction, while “Leading faculty learning communities” (question #18) was rated by 35% of faculty/staff with a high rate of satisfaction and 43% moderate
satisfaction. For question #7, 59% faculty/staff rated this question also as high in satisfaction of a choice activity to do (mean score of 3.7), and 56% of faculty/staff members rated question #1 high in mean satisfaction with their perception of choices of functions that were completed (mean score of 3.6). For 52% of faculty/staff, they rated this choice activity (question #19) as highest in satisfaction for them, while 35% of faculty/staff rated this question as moderate in satisfaction with a mean score of 3.6.

As seen in Table 25, the top four choices of satisfaction the director, the supervisor, and the faculty/staff they perceived what the director could do but choose not to do, were similar across the three roles. For two functions namely, “Providing technical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Satisfied Choice Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum. Supporting accreditation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piloting new technology/teaching innovation. Supporting institutional policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Providing technical training to implement educational technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies. Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting accreditation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting accreditation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting institutional policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
training to implement educational technologies” (question #14) and “Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies” (question #13), the supervisor rated these as similar in satisfaction choice activities that the director made a decision to pursue.

For the choice activities that rated moderate in satisfaction for the three roles, six choice activities were within this range of functions. Analyzing the top four, the choice activity “Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty and staff” (question #2, mean score of 3.1) was rated by 48% of directors as a moderate choice activity of satisfaction in what they choose to do. Approximately 20% of the supervisors rated it of moderate satisfaction (mean score of 2.8). For the faculty/staff, question #2 was rated as least in satisfaction as a choice activity (mean score of 2.8).

Next activity in moderate satisfaction for directors was “Promoting productive relationships between teaching and research” with 43% moderate rating in this range (question #4, mean score of 3.1), while 40% of supervisors rated a moderate choice activity in this range (mean score of 3.0). Approximately 50% of faculty/staff members rated question #2 as moderate satisfaction as a choice activity to do (mean score of 3.2).

The third choice activity in the moderate range for the directors was “Supporting policy and procedures that include reward and recognition schemes” (question #5, mean score of 3.0), which 30% of directors rated a moderate choice activity of satisfaction. Approximately 40% of supervisors rated question #5 as low in choice satisfaction (mean score of 2.8), and 52% of faculty/staff rating question #1 as moderate in satisfaction of choice (mean score of 2.9).

The fourth choice activity in moderate satisfaction that the three roles selected was, “Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching” (question #15).
Approximately 26% of directors rated this choice activity high in this range (mean score of 3.0), but 80% of the supervisors rated question #5 as moderate in their choice activity of satisfaction to do (mean score of 2.8). For the faculty/staff, 43% of this group rated question #15 as moderate in satisfaction as a choice activity with a mean score of 2.9. The other two choice activities in the moderate range of satisfaction for the directors were “Supporting mentoring of faculty” (question #11) and “Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching” (question #10).

Question #11 had 46% of directors rated this choice activity as moderate to low with a mean rate of 2.9, 60% of the supervisors rating this choice activity moderate to low in satisfaction with a mean score of 3.2, and 51% of the faculty/staff rating the activity as moderate to low in satisfaction with a mean score of 3.2. Question #10 received a moderate rate of satisfaction by 30% of the directors, but 60% of the supervisors rated this choice activity as a low to not applicable in satisfaction as a choice activity (mean score of 2.2). Almost 51% of the faculty/staff rated this choice activity as moderate to low in satisfaction as a choice activity for the director to do (mean score of 2.9).

Some of the choice activities that were rated as least in satisfaction for the directors in making a decision to do were, “Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings” (question #12, mean score of 2.4), “Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies” (question #13, mean score of 2.3), “Providing student support efforts” (question #9, mean score of 2.3), and “Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments” (question #16, mean score of 2.1) (see Table 26). The choice activities that were rated as least in satisfaction as perceived by supervisors in
making a decision to do were, “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #17, mean score of 2.4), “Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching” (question #10, mean score of 2.2), “Providing student support efforts (orientation, retention, student peer learning, and mentoring)” (question #9, mean score of 1.8), and “Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments” (question #16, mean score of 1.4).

Table 26

Satisfying the Choices: Lowest Four Choice Functions by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Least Satisfied Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing student support efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing student support efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty/staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing student support efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the faculty/staff, choice activities that they rated as least in satisfaction as a choice activity to do were, “Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty/staff” (question #2, mean score of 2.8), “Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments” (question #16, mean score of 2.6), “Providing student support efforts (orientation, retention, student peer learning)” (question #9, mean score of 2.4), and “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution” (question #17, mean score of 2.3). The four overall lowest choice activities for the three roles were “Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching,” “Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution,” “Providing student support efforts,” and “Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments.”

**How directors align the choices they make with how staff members can best contribute.** Within part II of the survey, the participants who identified themselves as directors were asked a qualitative open-ended question to classify the strategies they used to match their choice of activities to how the faculty/staff members of the TLC could best contribute. Almost 44% of the directors provided responses detailing how they addressed the choices of activities with how the faculty/staff could best contribute based on their leadership of the TLC, supporting the constituents of faculty/staff members of the TLC, how the faculty engaged in teaching and learning activities, as well as the initiatives received from their supervisor.

For the responses, which identified expertise as a strategy, 33.3% of the directors reported seeking TLC members with specific skill sets to bring knowledge and expertise to the various projects. On the theme of alignment, 20.5% of directors used alignment as
a way to ensure balance and alliance between the needs of the institution and the choice of activities the departments sought to deliver. For the collaboration theme, 15.4% of the directors responded on the need for relationships and cooperation between departments where there was congruence between the mission and the projects of the TLC. For the theme on responsibility, directors cited the challenge of having no staff or minimal staff which determined their level of involvement in various choice activities. For the delegation theme, being able to delegate functions and projects determined how many choice activities were either taken on or ignored. Data collected from the qualitative question guided the responses used to explain and support the answer to this research question. The researcher read each of the responses to identify primary themes which were then divided into the following categories to answer the research question;

(a) matching expertise to responsibilities, (b) alignment with institutional priorities, (c) collaborative communication, (d) leadership responsibility, and (e) delegation of tasks. These primary themes are presented from the most frequently cited to the least.

**Matching expertise to responsibilities.** The theme of expertise, as described by the directors, looked at the proficiency and capabilities of faculty/staff members of the TLC to match the choices of activities they could best contribute. As commented a director, “Over time we have evolved a division of labor among the staff.” The division of labor accounted for the varied responsibilities the faculty/staff managed within the TLC. Examples of the responsibilities were instructional projects such as technology implementation initiatives, instructional design consultations with faculty involved in teaching and learning design, multimedia projects, and program support responsibilities. By looking at the activities that were defined as choice functions, the director was able to
make a decision to accept or not accept doing the function based on the expertise available within the TLC. As suggested by the director, “If you don't see a choice in this list, that means we are probably not making the choice.”

To be able to make a decision whether to accept a choice activity based on expertise, a strategy employed by another director was described as, “to consider the strengths of each employee.” This means understanding what skill set the faculty/staff of the TLC has in order to best provide the resources and support needed for the choice activity to be done. Thus, the director indicated that, “[One has] to consider what has to get done and matching that with the best person for the job - ensuring each person's workload is reasonable.” Understanding the talents of employees means the leader is able to match the right project with the right expertise to challenge team members to do excellent work without creating frustrations with the choice activity.

Leaders are persons who understand their team members and know their unique abilities. As commented by a director, “I lead a team where each has unique talents we align with our offerings based on faculty and institutional needs.” The director must know the expertise of the team members to ensure that their abilities are sufficient to serve projects needed by the institution and its members. “I leverage based upon skill set which is directly proportional to the job title,” is how another director explained. As with many TLCs, having sufficient staff to manage and support the varied projects is a challenge to meet. Seeking outside expertise is one strategy that a director explained was used but implementing it was not sufficient. “We successfully tap into the expertise of the whole campus-individuals with particular expertise as well as partnering with other units.”
Using expertise within the institution to partner on workshops and initiatives was also a method used to meet the choice activity. Even though the staff complement of this director was small and expertise was limited, the unit sought to use self-education as a means of strengthening the expertise through research, conferences, articles, and discussions with outside experts with the expertise in the particular choice activity. As indicated by the director, “Perhaps once a year we bring in outside expertise, but we find those short-term fixes do not significantly change behavior/culture.” For any TLC to make a sustained effort at meeting the choice needs, having internal expertise is better for future growth of the unit.

**Alignment with institutional priorities.** The strategy of alignment is based on positioning the expertise of the faculty/staff with that of the priorities of the institution. One director commented, “Align choices with existing ability to meet new programs and our capacity to grow into them. A big part of this is also being aligned with university priorities.” For the director to know those priorities, a deep level of communication and discussion has to take place with the different units to know what is essential to their mission. Another director explained alignment as “Listening to my colleagues about their expertise and interests and to my administration and academic unit leaders about their needs and goals.” This alignment of interests will then guide what projects are essential to each unit so that practical decisions can be made in the best interests of all concerned.

In the words of a director, “I am very pragmatic and stick to those things that the linked faculty [member] wants to focus upon.” This pragmatism helped this faculty create various projects that emphasized the topics that were important to the faculty and
guide the tasks the TLC would support. Examples of some of the focus topics were “A celebrate teaching week, concentrated workshops, and information technology focused upon teaching.” As a result of the alignment, expertise from other entities such as faculty, student life, the library, advising, and the office of information technology were involved in delivering these topics of interest.

The work of the TLC and the choice activities selected to be supported by the director has to be guided by the institutional mission and direction from institutional leaders. A strategy shared by a director was that, “Through the center's strategic plan as well as with the direction from the Provost's office,” this alignment helped to determine the types of functions that were supported by the TLC. Another strategy to ensure alignment was in planning the yearly goals that would be completed. While set goals can constrain the number of work, this time of alignment meant the TLC would be intentional in what it could accomplish and complete. As explained by a director, “We have chosen to commit to 6 goals for the coming year, being certain that our personnel can meet those goals.”

Additionally, aligning the work of the TLC with that of the institution creates balance for the unit to be able to complete the choice activities. As shared by a director, “I align the choices I make with the strategic plan of the institution, and with the faculty feedback on what they would need support.” To be able to provide the level of alignment and meet the needs of the faculty, the TLC members must remain current regarding research on the instructional and pedagogical methods within the discipline. A strategy another director employed was “To cultivate and support a culture of learning and willingness to learn” among the members of the TLC. Not every project or process may
be known to the members of the TLC, but as the director indicated, “Being willing to figure out how to get it done,” created a culture of willingness to try.

The ‘willingness to try’ strategy does create another issue, which is the issue of time. Having the means and sufficient time to learn, to research, to understand within the time limits to deliver results can restrict ones’ ability to attend to projects which have institutional priorities. To ensure alignment, there has to be a balance between knowing the strengths of the TLC members, understanding the institutional priorities, and keeping continual focus on the internal TLC priorities.

**Collaborative communication.** For TLCs that are small in staff, communication and collaboration are very important strategies that should be used to match the choices of activities directors make to match how the faculty/staff members of the TLC could best contribute. A director explained that his or her small staff of two co-directors constantly talk and assign duties, and if the part-time members were not there to attend to a specific project, they collaborated to get it done. As explained in greater detail by another director, “With limited staff, I rely on collaborations across campus. I draw expertise for workshops from faculty, administrators, and staff in multiple departments.”

Using resources from other departments helped to provide support in areas that the limited resources of the TLC was not be able to reach.

Collaboration can also be facilitated when the director leads by example, facilitating the same behavior within the unit. As explained by a director, “I facilitate a collaborative atmosphere among [TLC] members where they can assess how best to contribute to each of our responsibilities.” Another director shared best practices of such a strategy where the TLC created faculty/staff committees with responsibility for key
choice initiatives. Examples of these committee responsibilities were giving advice on supporting on-line teaching, peer review of on-line teaching, support for SoTL across the institution, and advice on planning and promotion of the programs offered by the TLC.

Good leaders facilitate teamwork through inviting contributions and ideas from members of the team in an effort to generate ownership of the initiatives and the work of the unit. As explained by the director, “I share the rationale of the choices we need to make, as well as the outcomes/goals we need to achieve.” The director commented that this sharing of ideas allowed each member to provide, “Their contribution and ideas to identify the best methods for making that work happen.” This strategy not only creates buy-in to the work, but as the director noted, “also a shared sense of purpose. My team knows that ‘we’ are building what we build, it isn't ‘me’.”

Another director shared a similar strategy by describing that the staff discussed new initiatives and supporting various projects that were in the institution’s strategic plan. “My staff can then choose how they want to contribute to the upcoming projects,” explained the director on the importance of collaboration with the TLC. The use of faculty volunteers was another method on collaboration strategy shared by a director. First the faculty/staff of the TLC worked on projects based on their strengths and skill sets, followed by volunteers for support. The director indicated that finding money for course buyout, as a means to have faculty fellows for support would help “to work on a particular project that we need to do.”

Leadership responsibility. The overall responsibility of the TLC rests on the leadership skills of the director to know which projects and initiatives are important as choices to do or not to do. Being responsible and in charge may be making choices when
the director is the only faculty/staff member in the TLC. As shared by a director, “I am a one-person office. I make the choices and carry them out the best I can.” Time can be a challenge in the case of a one-person unit, as described by a director, “I try to address the needs of the moment but then rarely have time to plan ahead.” Being the only person in the unit also means the director is still responsible for the choice activity being addressed. “The choices I make are either solo or in collaboration with whomever is involved in making the choice,” was how another director explained the challenge of having limited number of team members in the unit.

*Delegation of tasks.* The final theme identified by directors described how these leaders allocated or assigned the choice activities based on institutional priorities, skill sets of TLC members, and the knowledge-based information available to the team. As explained by a director, “We engage in intensive strategic planning each year…with clear goals to which the teams are held accountable.” Having frequent and managed staff meetings helped another director use the strategy of delegation in an effective manner. “We have a staff meeting once per week to discuss priorities and how staff efforts were contributing to address those,” was how this director described his or her approaches to faculty support on projects and consultations.

Another director described his or her leadership style as “Arranger” which supported the managing of projects and arranging people, skill sets, resources, and deadlines. Another strategy used was the alignment of projects with passions of team members. As outlined by a director, “I always try to give people a chance to pursue projects they are driving that align with their passions and skills.” By identifying the knowledge and skills team members had when tasks were being divided, the right persons
were assigned to the right tasks. There are challenges with tasks that no one wants to do, “But we try to divide those up and leave time for projects and initiatives people care about,” was how this director ensured balance in the way work was delegated to each team member in the TLC.

**Addressing the effect of administrative policies on the center: choices.** The next qualitative open-ended question asked the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff, to describe the effect administrative policies had on the choices faced by the center. From the responses to the question, the researcher identified primary themes. The primary themes were then divided into the following categories to answer the research question on the effect administrative policies had on the choices that affected the center; (a) restrictive policies, (b) supportive policies, (c) don’t know of any policy, and (d) no policy. From these four themes, it was determined that ‘supportive policy’ and ‘restrictive policy’ were the primary themes covering choices. Examples of types of choice activities affected were (a) emphasis on research, (b) course evaluation, and (c) distributed administration.

**Supportive policy.** The percentages of directors who indicated examples of supportive policies that had an effect on the choices affecting the center was 40%, while none of the supervisors identified any policy having an effect on the choices faced by the center. For the faculty/staff of the center, almost 47% perceived supportive policies having an effect on the choices on the center. For the supportive policy, sub-themes identified were, (a) teaching and technology, (b) professional development, (c) support for adjunct faculty, and (d) student or course evaluations.
Teaching and technology. A topic cited by participants was projects that combined teaching practices and technology integration. While TLCs seek to focus their instructional consultation on the pedagogical side of teaching and learning, the use of technology is a choice function of pedagogy that has to be supported. A participant described the TLC “managing this new classroom space which has allowed innovative practices to be experimented with and faculty to observe these practices.” This project was created from institutional priorities and policies that targeted the use of classroom spaces for introducing active learning techniques.

By managing this activity, other opportunities for professional development occurred leading to more faculty seeing the expertise of the TLC as important to their teaching and learning. Another participant described how institutional policies associated with student success and retention led to the creation of first-year general education courses to support those goals. This choice activity became very important to the TLC because of the institutional priorities placed on the project. As shared by the participant, “[The TLC and faculty] identified the essential ingredients that will lead to student success.” The resulting goal of this project was to “ensure that students will be retained.”

Professional development. Faculty professional development is usually focused on the full-time faculty resulting in little to no focus on part-time and adjunct faculty. TLCs, especially those minimally staffed, are challenged to provide support to part-time and adjunct faculty due to constraints of resources, people, and time. The choice to support part-time and adjunct faculty is left as a choice for the TLC to develop and provide. As shared by a participant, “Evaluation of faculty is required (differences for
tenured vs. non-tenured). This has led to a request by department chairs to have training on how to effectively evaluate faculty.”

Support for adjunct faculty. An administrative policy which supports part-time and adjunct faculty pushed the TLC of this participant to engage in this choice activity to provide professional development to this group. Another participant shared that “Policies enable and support on-campus professional development events, and the TLC works with full campus support to implement the best programs we are able to provide.” However the participant noted that “Growing financial constraints are close to causing a reduction in support of off-campus faculty professional development.” Even with this choice activity supported by the policy, reduction in financial support caused challenges in the TLC being able to support this group.

Student or course evaluation. Another choice activity that caused a TLC to provide support due to administrative policy was student evaluation. As described by a participant, “All students have the right to provide feedback on all classes and instructors.” In an effort to support faculty in deciphering the results, the participant commented, “Our teaching center provides consultation with many instructors to interpret their students’ feedback and provide alternate and additional data to support improvement.” Peer review was another example provided of supportive policy having an effect on choice activities. As described by the participant, “Our center has worked with many units to develop appropriate, useful, and humane systems for peer review.” Still another example provided was that of institutional changes of class periods from quarters to semesters. The result, as described by the participant was, “This decision led
us to develop curriculum and course design institutes, to cope with the massive short-
term need, and discovered a large long-term desire for this work.”

The choice activity of student learning and outcomes was another example cited by participants. As commented by a participant, “The center is involved with faculty development activities associated with Quality Enhancement Plans.” The result is the TLC became engaged in activities such as student engagement strategies, improving student communication skills, and focus on “the role of strategies that improve student learning to increase retention and accelerate progress toward timely graduation.” While course evaluations are the domain of academic units, a participant described an indirect benefit to the TLC of this administrative policy describing “Required course evaluations certainly drive some traffic to our center.”

Another participant described this development as “Faculty discusses their evaluations with their chair person, who may recommend that they attend faculty development workshops to improve their performance.” A participant described how, as peer evaluations increased due to student course evaluations, “Center staff has developed significant, research-based expertise in this area.” This meant the TLC had “to develop appropriate, useful, and humane systems for peer review,” to support the faculty as the student evaluation data was being used by academic departments on personnel performance decisions.

Restrictive policy. The percentages of directors who indicated examples of restrictive policies which affected the choices on the center was 37%, while 75% of the supervisors perceived restrictive policy as having an effect on the choices faced by the center. For the faculty/staff of the center, almost 88% of this group perceived restrictive
policies as affecting the choices on the center. The sub-theme of over-emphasis on research and a lack of allocation of resources indicated that the ability of the TLC to engage in the various functions identified as choices was determined by the structure of the institution to be supportive and the level of emphasis placed on each choice activity the director could choose to do. For the restrictive policy, the sub-themes identified were over-emphasis on research and lack of allocation of resources.

*Over emphasis on research.* The policy of research emphasis had an effect over teaching by affecting the choice activities of a TLC. As commented by a participant, “Development of [a] strategic plan to support faculty innovation. Documentation emphasizes research innovation, not course design/teaching.” Hence, the external body tasked to ensure congruence with the policy reviewed the TLC, but the external body did “not provide a response or communicate their reaction to [the] review.” Research is part of the three responsibilities of faculty with the other two being service and teaching.

A participant described the challenge of choosing between the choice of teaching versus the greater expectations of research production as, “That sort of administrative policy does the opposite - that is, it would not increase the use of effective instructional practices, but encourage faculty to devote less time to teaching and more to basic research.” As noted by some participants, while there has been an increasing emphasis on innovation and innovative teaching, “Discussions of ‘innovation’ are often divorced from the research on teaching and learning.” In the view of a participant, there may be choices of “focusing on increasing the use of effective instructional practices but, to a large extend, [innovation] goes to increasing the use of technologies for teaching.”
Lack of allocation of resources. The type of resources indicated in the qualitative responses described human, material, and monetary resources. The director had to gauge the ability of his or her TLC to engage in various activities/functions based on the number of staff members as well as access to material and monetary resources to support the functions of the colleges. Even if the center was able to provide this support, the “Administration does not mandate consistency across colleges, which makes it more difficult for the TLC when interacting with those colleges,” was the response provided by a participant to show how a restrictive policy indirectly affected the work of the TLC. For the director, having a policy that supports funding allows the TLC to be able to engage in functions that support its mandates.

The opposite, however, reduces the effectiveness of the TLC and the director. As commented by a participant, “[Lack of] allocation of resources by school and department leaves the CTL in a funding limbo, requiring substantial entrepreneurship on the part of the director.” The issue of resources, human, materials, and money is felt by the higher education [HE] institutions, which one participant described as causing unintended consequences. “Few resources, little integrated thought to innovation, and changes in HE” was how this participant described the effect of a lack of allocation of resources.

Another participant described the issue of allocating resources as affecting the goals of the institution to push for financial increases by offering/increasing on-line courses. “No carry-over of budget from fiscal year to fiscal year. Limitation to undergraduate education. Strong push for increasing on-line course delivery,” was described by the participant of the move to increase the financial resources of his or her institution. To show the effect of such changes in offering courses, a participant
commented that there was a “Development of strategic plan to support faculty innovation. Documentation emphasizes research innovation, not course design/teaching.” The participant then described the resulting effect as, “Stated goal to support an increase in teaching with technology, but does not provide resources (personnel, budget, etc.) to meet stated academic technology needs.” Even though a supportive policy or a strategic plan was put in place to support faculty innovation, the lack of allocation of sufficient resources led to a restrictive policy hindering the academic technology needs.

Other participants described other units involved in teaching and learning initiatives receiving institutional support with resources but not being held accountable for faculty professional development or no requirement for instructional design input. A participant described this as “Significant institutional funding and staffing for iTV [instructional television] courses without pedagogical training for the modality.” The result of this lack of accountability meant the TLC was left out of this function due to a restrictive policy that “Mandated the growth of on-line course offerings without qualified & knowledgeable leadership, no strategic plan, no requirements for faculty training, and no requirement for instructional design input.”

**Addressing the effect of institutional culture on the center: choices.** The effect of institutional culture on the center was the next qualitative open-ended question presented to the three roles to determine the effect of culture on the choices faced by the director. As noted before, institutional culture is defined as “deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organization or its work” (Kezar & Eckel, 2002, p. 438). From
the responses received to this question, the researcher identified primary themes that were divided into the following categories to answer the research question on the effect institutional culture had on the choices faced by the center; namely limiting and uncertain culture.

**Limiting culture.** Responses from participants described how having a limiting culture prevented the TLC and the director from performing positively to meet the choices affecting their constituents. This challenge reduced the ability of the TLC to be aligned with the mission and goals of the institution which focused on student success, supporting faculty in their teaching and learning, and being effective in the management of the purpose of the institution. Approximately, 51% of the directors cited examples of a limiting culture which affected their TLCs, while 63% of faculty/staff cited limited culture as having an effect on the choices on their TLC. For the supervisors, 25% cited limiting culture as affecting the TLCs. A total of 29 comments from directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff formed the body of responses describing a limiting culture as affecting the directors and the TLC. Sub-themes related to limiting culture on choices for the directors were then developed which are described as challenges of devaluation of teaching and challenges to teaching being highly valued and respected.

*Challenges of devaluation of teaching.* The choice of work the TLC can do but not have to do is guided by an understanding of the primary mission and goals of the institution relating to teaching and learning. The mission and goals determine how the resources of the TLC will be used in supporting the various projects the institutional leaders see as necessary and important. Having a supportive culture encourages the center to participate as “this is a means to meet and interact with faculty in all
departments/disciplines,” was how a participant described the culture of teaching at the institution. Additionally, the prospect of participating in scholarly inquiry of student learning, which increases the advancement of the practice of teaching, can be a valued choice of participation between faculty and the center.

As explained by one participant, “An emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration on our liberal arts campus helps to encourage center participation, as this is a means to meet and interact with faculty in all departments/disciplines.” This choice of activity, lead to a culture of support for teaching, where “SoTL [scholarship of teaching and learning] is valued, which encourages center participation in SoTL-linked activities,” concluded the participant. Institutional beliefs also affect the type of activities a TLC will choose to engage in outside of the primary mandates in support of faculty professional development. A participant described the beliefs of their institutional culture as “A desire to primarily serve undergraduate and selective graduate programs.” This led to a call for the institution to “Measure course outcomes with assignments for higher quality pedagogy and accreditation,” was the comment from the participant.

The result was that the TLC became engaged in projects to increase the quality of teaching for stronger student learning outcomes. Limiting cultures can also cause the TLC to make a choice on supporting one project over another. The competition between teaching and research was described by a participant as a challenging “effort to change teaching practice and cause SoTL work to be more difficult to advocate for and persuade faculty to spend time on.” In an effort to change the perception that in graduate education the only outcome is to reproduce the dissertation adviser (as in all graduate students will become tenure track faculty), the TLC of this participant made the choice to
work closely with the graduate school and graduate teaching assistant coordinators. The
result of this collaboration, as stated by the participant, was to “advocate for including
teaching and other professional skills as a part of graduate education.”

*Challenges to teaching not highly valued or respected.* As institutions address the
attention to academic integrity and information literacy, TLCs find themselves
collaborating with units such as the graduate school to call attention to students having
the knowledge and skills of those components. One participant described the choice their
TLC made to participate in “leadership initiatives to promote a culture of assessment.”
While persons within the institution resisted the call for assessment competency the
participant indicated that “I’ve taken the approach that assessment simply informs
decisions about teaching and stuck to that philosophy.”

The result of this choice to participate was an “emphasis on active learning and
student engagement and consistent attention to using evidence to make decisions about
teaching and learning.” Additionally, the participant noted that “The institutional
attention to academic integrity guides choices about workshop topics and web content.”
Hence the TLC began managing an academic plagiarism checker technology tool that
emphasized the learning component rather than a policing effort and advocated with other
units for resources on increasing information literacy skills. As a result of choosing to be
part of this change initiative, the director of the TLC was “asked to participate in task
forces and provide leadership to increase retention by focusing on quality of student
learning.”

Having an institutional culture that values teaching can extend the choices of
projects a TLC becomes involved with to include non-professional development
initiatives such as faculty awards and recognition. An example of this was explained by a participant as working with “General education to ensure that courses meet category outcomes” for program and course assessments. Another example was the TLC “work[ing] with committees that award faculty development travel awards,” though the center was not responsible for the funding. The result of choosing to work in these non-teaching and learning projects was that the “center is included in a number of curricular change projects to manage projects and to ensure faculty and departmental support for those changes,” was how the participant explained how the TLC became a partner in the decision-making for curricular change initiatives.

Within teaching institutions, research is valued highly because the rewards (journal articles) and promotion through research funding can be easily identified and counted. The recognition of balancing teaching and research needs led the TLC of this participant to choose to support a faculty learning community by “organizing a weekly writing circle and an annual summer writing event” as a means of using research to guide faculty to the other programs (teaching and learning) offered by the TLC.

**Uncertain culture.** Responses from participants described how an uncertain culture created a greater value being placed on research meant little to no support on teaching effectiveness. Additionally, when institutional leaders do not support professional development on teaching and learning initiatives, this can lead to uncertainty and anxiety on faculty work resulting in a lack of improvement on the academic experience. In all, 11% of the directors cited examples of an uncertain culture affecting their work, while 50% of the supervisors perceived an uncertain culture affected the TLCs and the work of the directors. Approximately 17% of responses from faculty/staff
members cited uncertain culture as having an effect on the choices on their TLC. A total of seven comments from directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff formed the body of responses describing a limiting culture as affecting the directors and the TLC. Sub-themes related to uncertain culture were lack of value of teaching and institutional uncertainty.

Lack of value of teaching. For the responses from the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff, a lack of value in teaching resulted in uncertainty of the TLC to meet the functions that were choices in which to participate. Having an institutional culture that presented uncertainty in the teaching effort of faculty was described by a participant as “Emphasis on research over teaching results in teaching having less importance in tenure decisions.” Even though teaching and learning is an important facet of higher educational institutions, another participant commented that “Intro courses are best handled by pre-tenure and part-time teachers. Of course, the opposite is true, but this belief is hard to shake.” This type of culture affects the TLC in identifying the faculty who are likely to use their resources and services. As explained by a participant, “The Center is for pre-tenure people. After that, who needs it?”

Institutional uncertainty. The responses from the three roles on this sub-theme identified lack of services, a resistant institutional culture, and a lack of policies as resulting from uncertainty within the culture of the institution. A participant described the anomaly of an institutional culture that supported the “teaching and learning function of the TLC,” but then “There are those who use the services heavily, but that is a small group. Others would probably know little of what is offered.” The changes in the structure and visibility of the institutional leaders also greatly affect the work functions of
the TLC. A participant described the issue as “Our institutional culture currently reflects a lot of uncertainty and anxiety because of pending retirements of the president, provost, and CFO (at virtually the same time). Uncertain what the future of the center looks like.”

Undoubtedly, this type of turnover affects how easily the TLC is able to make a decision to engage in activities that are seen as choice functions. Another participant also described a similar situation of uncertainty due to leadership changes as,

“We have had constant turnover at the top of academic affairs (at the VP, provost, or associate provost level), which has made it very difficult to set priorities and think strategically about goals for educational and faculty development in terms of big-picture institutional priorities.”

For another participant, this uncertainty can come from a lack of policies, as he or she cindicated, “I honestly wish our administrators did have policies (bad course evaluations you must visit the [TLC] center for example) because I think it would motivate many faculty to improve their teaching.” This lack of policies can result in a lack of focus and direction, which in turn causes, “Many tenured faculty [to] have zero intentions of improving their instruction or learning about new technologies or pedagogical strategies and without administrative encouragement it will more than likely be business as usual,” was how the participant described the result of uncertainty in the institutional culture.

**Summary of choices of administrative policies and institutional culture.** The responses from the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff perceived that the choice of activities a TLC had to consider participating in or not to participate in was dependent on the level of support provided by the policies and culture of the institution. The three roles described the effect their administrative policies and institutional culture had on the work
of the TLC as providing resources, personnel, and knowledge-based support to strengthen the institutional initiatives of their respective institutions. By understanding the choice activities available to the TLC, the director and the center can measure which choice activity can be supported without undermining the core mission and goals of the center.

The quantitative data on choice activities indicated a high level of satisfaction for the directors and the TLC were varied from the choice activities of importance. The three roles perceived a difference in the choices, based on the functions that were important versus those functions that gave the greatest satisfaction in participating on these functions. For the choices that were seen as important, the three roles perceived supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, piloting new technology/teaching innovation, and improving the delivery of courses and curriculum, as top choice functions to participate. Other top choice functions of importance were leading faculty learning communities, and providing technical training to implement educational technologies.

The top choices perceived by the three roles as providing the highest satisfaction to making a decision to participate for the TLC were supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, supporting accreditation efforts, and piloting new technology/teaching innovation. Other top choice functions of satisfaction were supporting institutional policies, providing technical training to implement educational technologies, ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies, and improving delivery of courses and curriculum. Based on the importance and satisfaction of choices, there was some uniformity in both except for the functions, supporting institutional policies, supporting accreditation efforts, and ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies, being different.
The analysis of the qualitative data allowed for more in-depth comparisons of the effect institutional culture and administrative policies would have on the choices of services on the TLCs. The directors offered suggestions on ways of addressing how best they could align the choices with how best their staff members could contribute to the mission and goals of the TLC. Themes identified from the responses allowed the researcher to describe the strategies the directors implemented to match activities to expertise and knowledge of the team members in the TLC.

The effects of administrative policies and institutional culture on the choice activities chosen by the center were also analyzed based on qualitative data provided by the three roles. The themes that were identified from the effects of administrative policies were described as emphasizing research, course evaluation, and distributed administration. The participants described their perception of policies as ranging from supportive policies, restrictive policies, not knowing about any policies, to no policies. By remaining focused on the mission of the institution, and ensuring the goals of the institution and the center are in alignment, the director will be able to focus their efforts on increasing the satisfaction of supporting and meeting those choices.

**Chapter Summary**

Within Chapter Four, the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data (mixed-methods approach) collected, as well as the researcher’s bias and background information, identified the critical descriptions needed to form conclusions for this research study. The quantitative data allowed for statistical analysis of the demands, constraints, and choices from administrative policies and institutional culture to be identified, which affected the leadership of the directors of TLCs and how they best
managed their unit. The importance of each demand, constraints, and choices, and the satisfaction with which the directors were able to complete these activities were analyzed.

The mixed-methods approach of the research study allowed for the perspectives of the three roles to describe the actions of the director in the social setting of providing teaching and learning support to faculty in higher education. The overall descriptive study allowed for twenty-four tables of data to be created showing the perception of demands, constraints, and choices from the three target groups (director, supervisor, and faculty/staff member) itemizing priorities of functions deemed most important and eliciting the highest satisfaction from the respondents. Information from supervisors of the directors and faculty/staff members of the TLCs was analyzed to identify perceptions of how the directors managed the demands, constraints, and choice activities, which affected their leadership decisions.

The qualitative data provided major theme categories which resulted from the data analysis of the director’s perception of how the issue of demands affected his or her work performance. The major themes were (a) demands on the director’s position, (b) constraints on his or her ability to lead, and (c) choices faced by the director with how best the team members can best contribute. From these categories the sub-themes of (a) partnerships, (b) priorities, and (c) performance emerged to provide in-depth qualitative information to address both the quantitative data and the three research questions.

The resulting information from the sub-themes provided a rich, thick, and deep description of the effect administrative policies and institutional culture had on the demands on the director’s work within the respective TLC. The effect of administrative
policies was divided into the category of (a) restrictive policy and (b) supportive policy. The theme, supportive policy, was perceived by the participants, as the primary theme for demands on the TLCs and the directors. These supportive policies were described as (a) large course redesigns, (b) faculty professional development, (c) use of technology in teaching and learning, (d) confidentiality policy, (e) adjunct support, (f) curriculum policy, (g) faculty recognition, (h) allocation of resources, (i) quality enhancement planning (QEP) for program certification, (j) emerging forms of scholarships (SoTL and Scholarship of Engagement), (k) student engagement, (l) course evaluation, (m) faculty workloads, and (n) faculty mentorship. Sub-themes of supportive policy were identified as (a) teaching infrastructure, (b) TLC responsibilities, (c) student success initiatives, (d) faculty professional development, (e) course evaluation, (f) faculty orientation and mentoring, and (g) work life balance.

For the effect of institutional culture on the demands on the center and the director, primary themes which were identified were, (a) limiting, (b) supportive, and (c) uncertain. From these, the supportive culture theme was perceived to be the main topic in the survey responses from the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff members. Sub-themes of supportive culture were identified as support for funding and equal focus on research and teaching.

The qualitative data provided major theme categories which resulted from the data analysis of the director’s perception of how the issue of constraints affected his or her work performance to overcome. The participants identified as directors identified the themes of (a) collaboration, (b) advocacy, (c) resources, (d) goals/mission, and (e) communication, as factors that were integral to overcoming the constraints on his or her
leadership and work performance (see Table 19). Within each of these themes, the participants identified as directors provided several examples which guided how they overcome the challenge of constraints on their leadership and work.

The constraints of administrative policies were identified by the participants to identify the limitations on the work of the directors to overcome the constraint functions. For the constraints of institutional culture on the center and the director, primary themes identified were (a) restrictive policy, (b) supportive policy, (c) don’t know of any policy, and (e) no policy. The themes of restrictive policy and no policy were perceived as the primary themes describing constraints of administrative policies. The sub-themes of restrictive policies, were identified as (a) introduction of large courses, (b) faculty workloads, (c) faculty professional Development, and (e) Technology and Teaching. The sub-theme, lack of faculty professional development, was identified as the primary example of the no policy theme.

For the effect of institutional culture on the constraints on the center and the director, primary themes which were identified were (a) limiting, (b) supportive, and (c) uncertain. As an example of constraints, the limiting culture was identified as the primary theme. From this theme, sub-themes were identified as (a) lack of direction, (b) lack of services, and (c) weak leadership. The challenge of overcoming the limitations of a limiting culture depended on director, supervisor, and faculty/staff to seek for clarity in purpose and mission, and encourage effective leadership as a means to transform the work of the center.

The qualitative data provided major theme categories which resulted from the data analysis of the director’s perception of how the issue of choices affected his or her
decision to contribute or participate in the various teaching and learning initiatives within the respective institutions. The participants identified as directors identified the themes of (a) matching expertise to responsibilities, (b) alignment with institutional priorities, (c) collaborative communication, (d) leadership responsibility, and (e) delegation of tasks as key to making the decision to engage in the choice activities or to ignore those activities.

The choices of administrative policies were identified by the participants to describe how policies affect the choices for the directors to choose to do. For the choices of administrative policies on the center and the director, primary themes identified were; (a) restrictive policies, (b) supportive policies, (c) don’t know of any policy, and (d) no policy. From these four themes, it was determined that ‘supportive policy’ and ‘restrictive policy’ were the primary themes. The sub-themes of supportive policies were identified as (a) teaching and technology, (b) professional development, (c) support for adjunct faculty, and (d) student or course evaluations. The sub-themes identified for restrictive policies were over-emphasis on research and lack of allocation of resources.

For the effect of institutional culture on the choices on the center and the director, primary themes which were identified were limiting and uncertain. From the limiting theme, sub-themes identified were challenges of devaluation of teaching and challenges to teaching being highly valued and respected. The challenge of choosing to engage in a limiting culture depended on director, supervisor, and faculty/staff advocate for meaningful change through activities that supported the mission and the work of the center. From the uncertain culture sub-themes were lack of value of teaching and institutional uncertainty.
Within Chapter Five, a general overview of the study will be presented and findings relevant to the research questions will be discussed. The implications of the challenges faced by directors of TLCs will be reviewed, as well as the limitations of the research study. The implications for directors of TLCs will be recommended and implications for further research on meeting the demands, constraints, and choices of administrative policies and institutional culture will be proposed.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary

Introduction

The responsibility of the leaders of the teaching and learning centers is to engage and support faculty in their scholarly, teaching, and service responsibilities in accordance with the mission, policies, and practices of the higher education institution. These leaders function in a middle-manager role, are not able to set policy, but are challenged to ensure the policy is successfully implemented and accepted by all faculty.

The function of teaching and learning centers is to support teaching and learning initiatives such as individual consultations, seminars and workshops on teaching methods and issues; orientation programs for new faculty, administration of grant competitions to stimulate teaching improvements, and publications and websites with both basic and cutting edge information about teaching and student learning. By preparing the leaders of TLCs to be change agents and supporters of the educational, service, and research initiatives, these “middle managers” will be better able to manage the demands, constraints and choices that challenge their leadership. The result is to develop institutional leaders with a clear vision for their institution, and a strong understanding of their specific roles in the change process.

This research study sought to explore the demands, constraints, and choices of administrative policies and institutional culture on the leadership of the director of teaching and learning centers (TLCs) within higher education institutions using a mixed-methods approach to the research. Chapter Five presents an overview of the information
presented in the first three chapters, plus findings from the mixed-methods data analysis in Chapter Four. The final section of this chapter will present the limitations of the research study and implications for further research in this field.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the demands, constraints, and choices faced by mid-level leaders of the primary teaching and learning centers in higher education institutions, through a mixed-methods examination of the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff members of TLCs. The effect of administrative policies and institutional culture on the leadership of the centers was also investigated to understand the importance of the major activities and services provided by the centers, and the level of satisfaction in providing the services.

As leaders of a unit primarily leading the professional development support provided to faculty within institutions of higher education, the directors of TLCs must understand the different knowledge, skills, dispositions, and ability needed beyond just being managers (Gardiner, 2005). Based on the perceptions from the three roles, this study would improve the understanding of how best directors can lead the centers to be effective despite the demands, constraints, and choices of administrative policies and the institutional culture.

**Design and Procedures**

The researcher identified the organization known as the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD) in Higher Education to receive a survey for this research study. The POD Network, comprising approximately 1,800 members as stated on their website, supports a network of faculty and teaching assistant developers,
faculty, administrators, consultants, and others who perform roles in teaching and learning in higher education (POD Network, n.d.). While the dataset from the POD Network membership included members from many countries, only the members from schools identified and classified through the United States Carnegie’s basic classification (McCormick & Zhao, 2005) of associate, baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral/research institutions of higher learning, with additional members coming from community colleges, for-profit and non-profit organizations, were chosen for the study.

The data collected for this study was from a survey distributed through the POD Network to members who self-identified themselves as directors of TLCs, supervisors of the directors, and faculty/staff members of TLCs. The survey consisted of quantitative and qualitative questions which sought to determine the perceptions from the three roles. The leadership challenges the directors faced was based on the demands, constraints, and choices of administrative policies and institutional culture from their respective institutions.

The quantitative questions assessed attitudes toward various faculty teaching and learning initiatives. Questions gauging the demands, constraints, and choices which affected the director’s ability to learn and manage their unit were also addressed. The qualitative questions allowed participants to provide detailed answers as a means of explaining their knowledge and feelings as to how the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture affected the leader of teaching and learning centers. Demographic data to understand the experience and educational level of the three roles was also assessed.
The analysis of the data was followed based on the process outlined in Chapter Three. The data received was anonymous for participants and the institutions. The qualitative data was read by the researcher, and themes from participants’ responses were itemized and collated. In Chapter Four, potential bias of the researcher was identified and discussed, as well as noted within the research findings. The analysis and synthesis of the collected data from the survey was based on Stewart’s (1976) Theory of Demands, Constraints, and Choices.

Summary of Findings

Demands on the Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers

The responses given by the three roles perceived the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture as demands high in importance to the function of the TLC, and demands that gave the director and the TLC the highest satisfaction in providing support and resources. The quantitative responses from the three roles showed similarities in the demands that were greatest in importance to those that were not applicable. The top demands that rated greatest in importance covered providing professional development opportunities for the faculty, increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings, projects for improving the institutions teaching and learning performance, improving the quality of courses and curriculum, providing adequate resources (personnel, funding, technology, etc.), and developing and implementing teaching and learning policies and plans.

As was noted in the discussion on demands, the main purpose of a TLC is supporting the faculty in their teaching, advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning, and incorporating the use of technology to enhance course materials and
delivery (Sorcinelli et al., 2005). The perceptions of the importance of demands from the supervisors differed slightly in one demand, which was increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings. This function was moderate to least important for the directors and faculty/staff. This could be seen as not important as a demand function from faculty, but rather from the institution. The supervisors are probably more concerned with this demand due to goals of the institution and the pressure directors of TLCs will face in meeting this demand function.

The demands on satisfaction of fulfilling the various services were similar to the demands of importance. For the three roles, the top four demands that provided the highest satisfaction were providing professional development support for faculty and professional staff, conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning, improving the institution’s teaching and learning performance, and improving the quality of courses and curriculum. It is interesting that the demand function, providing adequate resources, was perceived as high for a demand of importance as well as a demand of satisfaction. The provision of resources such as personnel, funding, and technology is always a challenge based on the resources afforded to TLCs and number of projects it supports. The director is tasked with managing these resources so as to meet both the needs of faculty and the institutional leaders in addressing the various teaching and learning initiatives taking place across the university and college.

A total of eighteen work demands provided to the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff participants identified the functions which affected the director’s leadership of the TLCs and his or her performance. Both the importance and satisfaction of meeting the demands were identified to show how the demands of administrative policies and
institutional culture affected the directors and the TLC performance in delivering these functions (see Figure 2). From these functions the three roles of participants rated the respective demand functions that they perceived to be high in importance and satisfaction to deliver on the work of the TLC and on the performance of the director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The demands that rated greatest in importance to deliver were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• providing professional development opportunities for faculty and professional staff,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• providing adequate resources (personnel, funding, technology, etc.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing and implementing teaching and learning policies and plans, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• projects that go towards improving the institutions teaching and learning performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The demands that rated greatest in satisfaction to deliver were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• providing professional development support for faculty and professional staff,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• providing adequate resources (personnel, funding, technology, etc.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improving the institutions teaching and learning performance, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improving the quality of courses and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Demand Functions of Greatest Importance and Satisfaction*

The directors offered suggestions on ways of addressing the demands on their position that covered building partnerships with institutional leaders and departments through needs assessment, understanding the politics within the institution so as to perform to the best of all the interests, and prioritizing the projects that needed to be addressed over those that are of lesser importance. The strength in building partnerships with other units enabled the director to develop connections through being an advocate for what faculty and academic colleges deemed important to their mission. If directors
were able to understand the needs of their institution, then being able to provide the appropriate support would help to mitigate the demands they faced. Responses from directors indicated “coming in from the margins” as a way to explain how their TLC took the time to understand the institutional politics of their university and college, and ensured that the work of the TLC was being advertised as congruent with the mission and goals of their institution. Understanding the culture and priorities of the institution helped some of the directors to build connections with faculty, and other academic and administrative units to manage, and position the TLC so as to meet the demands and create satisfaction in providing the resources and services from the TLCs.

Partnerships was perceived as a way to ensure the TLC was providing solutions to support what the faculty were demanding and ensured that this demand met the function of the TLC. The issue of personnel performance, which addressed work life balance of the director so as not to be too stretched in what one can do, versus what one would like to do, was another suggestion offered by directors. Being willing to collaborate with other units was another suggestion on the delivery of workshops, projects, and initiatives to build alliances for success.

The performance of the director and TLC was affected by how well the directors dealt with the work life balance in their lives so as to manage the demands. Work life balance was described by participants in the survey as the stress caused by either being a department of one, or working “too many hours to strive for more interpersonal interactions with various groups across campus” which affected their personal lives. The directors perceived work life balance as critical in managing both the culture and the politics as they met the demands of performing the work they had to do.
Having supportive policies helped directors in collaborating with other units as they performed their work. Supportive policies that were suggested were those that provided a supportive teaching infrastructure, policies that helped to define the TLC responsibilities, and policies for student success initiatives. Other policies identified were those supporting faculty professional development, course evaluation, faculty orientation and mentoring, and policies that advocated for a work life balance.

The effect of institutional culture on the demands affecting the TLC was perceived as behaviors and shared values that advocated for funding for the TLC and supporting an equal focus on research and teaching for faculty. This support allows the work of the TLC to be aligned with the mission and goals of the institution, supports student success initiatives, supporting faculty in strengthening their teaching and learning skills, and guides the TLC in being effective in the management and purpose of the goals of the institution.

**Constraints on the Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers**

The quantitative data analyzed from the survey provided information as to the type of constraints, and how institutional culture and administrative policies either supported or inhibited the ability of the TLC to deliver the necessary services for the institution. The survey responses received by the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff, perceived the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture as comprising constraints that were high in importance to the function of the TLC, and constraints that gave the director and the TLC the highest satisfaction in overcoming the limitations to their support and resources to faculty and the institution. Based on the quantitative
analysis of responses, it was determined that there were seven key functions that presented the most satisfaction for overcoming the limits on the centers.

For the constraint functions which affected the performance of the director and the work of the TLCs, twenty one constraint functions were provided to the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff participants to identify the tasks which acted as limits on the director’s leadership of the TLCs and his or her performance. Both the importance and satisfaction of meeting the constraints were identified to show how the limits to what they can do affected their work performance, leadership, and work life balance. From these functions the three roles of participants rated the respective constraint functions that they perceived to be high in importance and satisfaction on the work of the TLC and on the performance of the director (see Figure 3).

**IMPORTANT:**
The constraints that rated greatest in importance to overcome were:

- insufficient resources and insufficient TLC personnel time,
- insufficient number of TLC personnel members,
- inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution,
- lack of recognition for the work of the center among faculty, and
- incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center.

**SATISFACTION:**
The constraints that rated greatest in satisfaction to overcome were:

- lack of access to relevant technology,
- lack of recognition for the work of the center among faculty,
- insufficient resources and insufficient TLC personnel time,
- incorrect or outmoded perceptions of the role of the TLC, and
- over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes.

*Figure 3. Constraint Functions of Greatest Importance and Satisfaction*
The key functions that all three roles agreed with regarding satisfaction were:
(a) lack of access to relevant technology, (b) lack of recognition for the work of the center among faculty, (c) insufficient resources, (d) insufficient TLC personnel time, (e) incorrect or outmoded perceptions of the role of the TLC, (f) over-dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes, and (g) lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision. Additionally, the responses from supervisors perceived the lack of recognition of the scholarship of teaching and learning as a research activity as a high constraint of importance for TLCs and the directors. These key functions had agreement from the three roles. For this type of culture (lack of recognition of the center among faculty) to be changed, a culture of emphasizing the mission of the institution would need to be created through advocacy and an understanding of the institutional priorities for teaching and learning. The directors, in their responses, showed that having strong collaboration among faculty and departments, advocacy for faculty initiatives, the support of resources based on the goals/mission of the institution, and ensuring strong communication among all constituents, reduces the constraints that affect the director in his or her performance and leadership.

Based on themes from the qualitative data, restrictive policy and no policy were the primary themes that described the type of constraints faced by TLCs. Examples of constraints provided were (a) insufficient allocation of resources, (b) heavy faculty workload, (c) lack of support for adjuncts, (d) climate of fear, (e) resistance to change, (f) lack of faculty incentives, (g) incoherent vision, (h) no strategic planning, and
(i) budget constraints. The effect of addressing these constraints potentially offered ways to improve the working outcomes of constituents and to increase the quality in standards for faculty teaching, research, and service. The directors offered suggestions on ways of addressing these constraints as encouraging collaboration between other units, administrative leaders, and faculty to reduce the constraints of providing services, such as faculty professional development and resources.

Other suggestions from the directors identified being an advocate or finding support from influential persons or units toward overcoming limits on their ability to lead the center. Finding adequate or needed resources through collaboration with other units or being involved in university initiatives were some of the suggestions made by the directors. As always, being in alignment with the goals and mission of the institution is always important to maintaining relevancy with the institution. Finally, communicating the “right message” was a suggestion made by the directors as a way to communicate the work of the TLC to the institution.

The effect of institutional culture on the center also created constraints on performance on the director and the center. A lack of focused mission, insufficient services, and weak leadership were identified by the three roles as negative culture behavior that limited the performance of the director and the center. For these cultural constraints to be removed, a change in the mission of teaching has to occur. Several participants noted the overarching emphasis on research and the devaluation of teaching meant faculty who saw value in teaching were either undervalued by their units or the institution, or were given heavy teaching load as a form of punishments. This type of culture behavior could result in a lack of recognition for the work of the center among
faculty if the message from the administration conflicted with the goals of the TLC. The lack of recognition of teaching could also create a reduction in interest for professional development from faculty with the teaching and learning initiatives.

**Choices on the Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers**

The responses received by the three roles of directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff perceived choices of administrative policies and institutional culture as comprising choice functions that were high in importance to the work of the TLC, and choice functions that gave the director and the TLC the highest satisfaction in engaging in work they did not have to do to provide support and resources to faculty and the institution. The quantitative data analyzed from the survey provided examples and information from multiple participants in the field of teaching and learning as to the choice activities that were important to a TLC and based on the institutional culture and administrative policies, which choice activity the TLC would choose to provide opportunities to deliver their services toward satisfaction for their institution and for the center. The responses from the three roles showed similarities in the choices that were greatest in importance to those that were not applicable.

For the choice functions which affected the performance of the director and the work of the TLCs, nineteen choice functions were provided to the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff participants to identify the choice tasks the director and the TLC choose to do. Both the importance and satisfaction of meeting the choice functions were identified as a choice decision on supporting the different functions. From these functions the three roles of participants rated the respective choice functions that they
perceived to be high in importance and satisfaction on the work of the TLC and on the performance of the director (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Choice Functions of Greatest Importance and Satisfaction](image)

Some of the top choice activities that were rated greatest in importance by the three roles were (a) supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, (b) piloting new technology/teaching innovation, (c) improving the delivery of courses and curriculum, and (d) leading faculty learning communities. For the directors, some choice activities of importance chosen by this group that differed from the supervisors and the faculty/staff as greatest in importance for them were supporting mentoring of faculty and supporting academic ideas across the university. For the supervisors, top choice activities of importance that differed from the directors and the faculty/staff were (a) supporting policy and procedures that include reward and recognition schemes, and (b) increasing
the number of blended and on-line course offerings. For the faculty/staff, other top choice activities of importance for this group that differed from the directors and supervisors were supporting institutional policies and promoting productive relationships between teaching and research. Both the directors and the faculty/staff perceived the choice activity of leading faculty learning communities as a choice of importance.

Similar choice activities of satisfaction perceived by the three roles were (a) supporting accreditation efforts, (b) supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, (c) piloting new technology/teaching innovation, and (d) improving the delivery of courses and curriculum. For the director, other choice activities that they perceived of satisfaction to provide support were supporting institutional policies and leading faculty learning communities. For the participants identified as faculty/staff, other choice activities they perceived as greatest in satisfaction for the director were (a) supporting institutional policies, (b) ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies, and (c) leading faculty learning communities.

By engaging in this choice activity, the TLC was able to increase their access to academic departments and faculty who had not participated in the services offered by the TLC. Other examples of choice activities affected by administrative policy were student and course evaluations, and development activities associated with quality enhancement planning (QEP). On the other hand, there were restrictive policies that constrained the TLC such as policies that increased emphasis on innovation and technology, causing faculty to perceive technologies as being more important than pedagogy.

Suggested strategies from the qualitative responses given were expertise of personnel, aligning skills to projects, and collaboration with other departments, units, and
experts for resources and support. Other strategies offered were the directors understanding their responsibilities and how best to lead, the issue of delegation as a strategy for allocating and assigning projects based on the institutional priorities, and the proficiency and knowledge-base of the members responsible for the project. By choosing to contribute to functions that were seen as a choice activity, participants described the effect administrative policies had on their TLC and director as providing other opportunities to deliver resources and services that were central to their mission and goals. For example, a choice activity one TLC engaged in was an active learning classroom which had been instituted from a policy of student engagement, and emerging forms of scholarship of teaching and learning.

Participants perceived the culture of emphasizing research over teaching as one of the ways the function of teaching was being devalued within the institution. The perceptions of institutional culture affecting the choice activities afforded to TLCs were described as the devaluation of teaching, due to the institutional prioritization of research having a greater weight in importance over spending time on using technology to enhance course content and integrating innovative pedagogical techniques in the classroom and in blended and on-line courses.

Conclusions

The structure of this research study was organized around three research questions, which guided the researcher, and the quantitative and qualitative data collected. From each of the research questions, responses and observations are addressed followed by a conclusion from the data presented. Both the findings from the
quantitative and qualitative data were used to support the findings gained from the responses from the directors, the supervisors, and the faculty/staff members.

1. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture?

As discussed in Chapter Four, the responses from the directors, the supervisors, and the faculty/staff members of TLCs, indicated a strong recognition of the type of demands placed on the directors of TLCs. All three roles demonstrated examples and patterns of the type of demands, the extent to which the directors were able to provide direction for the work of the center and advocate for adequate personnel support, while supporting the educational initiatives of their institution. Similarities in the demands from the three roles showed the functions which were highest in importance to those that were not applicable.

The continual research of best practices allows the director to gauge and compare his or her work to research findings and to observe the performance of other directors and TLCs in an effort to learn and use techniques which have had some measure of success in other institutions. These best practices also provide the director with tools to equip his or her direct reports to be well-informed about the various methodologies being used in the field which will be of benefit in the performance of their work. As seen in the data presented (see Table 6), seven unique functions were identified that the three roles ranked as the highest in satisfaction with overcoming the demands on the centers.

Additionally, the three roles identified the level of demands that administrative polices and institutional culture had on the ability of the directors to carry out the functions that had to be addressed by their unit. An in-depth analysis of the quantitative
responses identified the effect institutional culture and administrative policies had on the demands for services from TLCs. Several suggestions offered by directors identified the effect demands on their position had on building partnerships with institutional leaders and departments. These suggestions were creating a needs assessment which would prioritize the projects that need to be addressed over those that are less in importance, and managing the ability of the TLCs and its members to perform as they supported the demands from the faculty and the institution.

2. For leaders of teaching and learning centers, what are the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture?

Based on the quantitative data analyzed from the survey, detailed information was assembled from the three roles as to which constraints were important and based on the institutional culture and administrative policies, which opportunities were offered for satisfaction of services for both stakeholders and the center. Based on the quantitative data analyzed in Chapter Four, the responses from the three roles surveyed for this study perceived the constraints on the TLC as comprising (a) limitations of resources (people, money, and resources), (b) personnel constraints based on the time and project responsibilities, and (c) the apparent lack of recognition of the center among administrative leaders.

The quantitative responses from the three roles showed similarities in the constraints that were highest in satisfaction to those that were not applicable. The three roles differed in the functions they perceived as offering the highest satisfaction for the director to meet the constraints on the center. The key constraint functions identified from the respondents were (a) insufficient resources, (b) insufficient TLC personnel time,
(c) lack of access to relevant technology, and (d) lack of recognition for the work of the center among faculty. Other functions identified by the three roles were (a) incorrect or outmoded perceptions of the role of the TLC, (b) over-dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes, and (c) lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision.

The qualitative data presented allowed the director, supervisor, and the faculty/staff members of TLCs the opportunity to provide in-depth comments on which effects, constraints from institutional culture, and administrative policies had on the services offered by TLCs. The directors provided several suggestions on addressing these constraints as encouraging collaboration between other units and being an advocate toward overcoming limits on their ability to lead the center. Finding adequate or needed resources through collaboration with other units or being involved in university initiatives were some of the suggestions made by the directors.

3. Given the demands and constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture, what are the choices available to leaders of teaching and learning centers?

Within Chapter Four, the responses from the directors, the supervisors, and the faculty/staff members of TLCs, indicated a strong recognition of the type of choices of functions that the directors of TLCs could choose to engage and support. The quantitative data on choice activities providing the highest satisfaction for the directors and the TLC were varied from the choice activities of importance. Additionally, the highest choice activities of satisfaction perceived by the three roles were also widely different. The similar choice activity of satisfaction perceived by the three roles were
(a) supporting accreditation efforts, (b) supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, (c) piloting new technology/teaching innovation, and (d) improving the delivery of courses and curriculum.

For the director, other main functions that provided the highest satisfaction was (a) providing support for institutional policies, (b) creating and supporting faculty learning communities, and (c) supporting of initiatives across the institution. For the supervisors, other activities they perceived as high in choice satisfaction for the director and the TLC were piloting new technology/teaching innovation and providing technical training to implement educational technologies. For the participants identified as faculty/staff, other choice activities they perceived as highest in satisfaction for the director were (a) supporting institutional policies, (b) ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies, and (c) leading faculty learning communities.

The directors offered suggestions on ways of addressing how best they could align the choices with how best their staff members could contribute to the mission and goals of the TLC. Themes identified from the responses allowed the researcher to describe the strategies the directors implemented to match activities to expertise and knowledge of the team members in the TLC. The three roles identified the choice functions that administrative polices and institutional culture had on the ability of the director to manage the functions that the directors could choose to do by their unit. By keeping focused on the mission of the institution, and ensuring the goals of the institution and the center are in alignment, this would allow the director to focus his or her efforts on increasing the satisfaction of supporting and meeting these choices.
Discussion

A review of the literature as it pertained to the demands, constraints, and choices on the leadership of middle managers (the directors), the challenges faced by teaching and learning centers (TLCs) in higher education, and the impact of administrative policies and institutional culture on the work of TLCs, appeared to relate to the perceptions from the responses from the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff members of TLCs. Over the past ten years, as reported by Allen and Seaman (2011), the rate of growth in the number of on-line course offerings and enrollment has risen by ten times that of the rate in all higher education. This represents real competition between universities to gain new students in markets they never thought possible to enter. To meet this need, TLCs often lead the effort to equip faculty with the skills, knowledge, and resources necessary to support the mission of their institution.

While previous research on the work of Rosemary Stewart’s Theory of Demands, Constraints, and Choices (Lowe, 2003) addressed the unique ways in which managers carried out their work and the various ways the work was accomplished, no literature could be found addressing the demands, constraints, and choices faced by leaders of TLCs within the higher education setting. A literature review conducted by Bryman (2007) offered findings on behaviors associated with effective leadership in higher education at the department head level which was similar to responses provided by the directors, supervisors, and faculty/staff of TLCs.

Yukl (2001) described a demands, constraints, and choices model as the reliance a leader had with his or her direct reports based on the interactions and the demands the direct reports made on the leader. In her work on demands, constraints, and choices as
part of organizational dynamics, Stewart (1976) described this as situational influences that determined the behavior of the leaders, and the choices made depending on the demands and constraints they face in their work. The description of the demands, constraints, and choices faced by the leaders described in Table 1 supports the perceptions of the three roles in this study, and the effect administrative policy and institutional culture can have on addressing the demands, constraints, and choices on the leadership of TLCs.

As discussed in Chapter Two, a number of leadership theories were reviewed for this study, so as to gain an understanding of the challenges faced by TLCs and how leaders, especially middle managers, are able to effectively lead and manage their scope of responsibility in higher education institutions. As the mandates from the educational leaders continue to advocate student success and retention (van Ameijde, Nelson, Billsberry, & van Meurs, 2009), the quality of curriculum and courses is one of many primary focuses on the work demand of the director to meet these institutional needs.

These middle managers are constantly balancing changing situations brought by the academic culture, policy, and politics of their institution to advocate for educational change and faculty professional development. Stewart’s (1976) work on demands, constraints, and choices provided a strong framework and to be an effective lens to inform this study. While this study used a survey and a mixed-methods approach to collect and analyze the data, a more appropriate method of data gathering was felt to be more conducive to study this subject area, which will be addressed in the implications for future research section later in this chapter.
Demands of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture

Based on the responses from the three roles, the demands of administrative policies and institutional culture on the directors were seen as substantial and challenging. Because the supervisor of the director provides guidance on the initiatives that are important, it was important that the director be fully conversant with the mission and goals of the institution. Knowing the value of the goals of the institution enables the director and the center to be aware of the various demands on their work, which in turn dictates the job that they had to do.

Both of these two work demands showed commonality in perception by all three roles, and supports the main purpose of a TLC, which is supporting the faculty in their teaching, advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning, and incorporating the use of technology to enhance course materials and delivery (Sorcinelli et al., 2005). As the TLC unit is charged with supporting and advising on the issue of quality in the delivery of teaching within the classroom, on-line, and blended modality, the support and knowledge of teaching and learning based on research methodology is vital to increase the expertise of the faculty. By utilizing active teaching and learning practices, the hope is that this knowledge will benefit the transfer of learning for all students.

Professional development builds awareness, skill-level, and knowledge required to reach stated goals for student teaching and learning (Diamond, 2005). As faculty go through professional development programs such as workshops, seminars, conferences, and instructional consultations with the professional faculty/staff of the TLC, faculty learning communities and mentorship increases their levels of awareness and exposure to different models of teaching and active learning techniques.
The perceptions of the demands of importance from the supervisors differed slightly in one demand, that of increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings, which the supervisors perceived as important to the financial needs of the institution. Other demands that were perceived highest in importance were providing adequate resources (personnel, funding, technology, etc.), and developing and implementing teaching and learning policies and plans. The ability of the faculty/staff members to meet these needs is dependent on what Herman (2013) described as the number of TLC staff, the frequency and variety of faculty professional development programs that can provide this level of support. Schroeder and Associates (2012) in a study on enabling and impeding factors affecting directors noted that, center staffing resources was “selected by more than 50% of director respondents” (p. 99) as impeding their institutional involvement.

In contrast, the demand for “recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning” (question #5) registered a greater mean of importance for both the director and the faculty/staff. This fact is supported by a recognition by TLCs of the value of scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) research as an activity that “contributes to excellence in teaching and scholarly teaching by building a foundation of theory-based and rigorously tested techniques that educational developers and university instructors can use” (Hoessler, Britnell, & Stockley, 2010, p. 83). Hubball & Burt (2006) discussed whether in academia, SoTL should be considered in the same way as service, research, and teaching, through peer-interview of exemplary curricula and/or teaching practices, pedagogical grant applications, manuscript publications, and curriculum development initiatives among others.
The faculty/staff members are in a unique position of almost daily contact with academic faculty as they support the various teaching and learning projects and initiatives that take place across the institution. The faculty/staff members of the TLC understand that the demand of SoTL and faculty development provide critical support to the work of faculty in their teaching and service learning responsibilities, and thus recognize the great demands and needs from faculty to assist and guide their teaching and assessment activities. The faculty/staff members perceived these two demands as being more important of a demand than increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings or researching best practices. As seen in research from Sorcinelli et al. (2005), faculty development and the various consultation practices are of high priority because of the needs and concerns for support being brought to them by faculty to meet their increasingly challenging and multifaceted faculty role.

The demand of increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings is not surprising as the outlook seen by the supervisor would be on a macro level that coincides with the mission and vision of a higher education institution that is seeking to meet the various mandates given by their respective political and educational leaders, as well as public and private constituents. Indicators of this satisfaction would be in the form of feedback from faculty who participated in workshops and received support through one-on-one consultations, department projects on large course redesigns, and on-line/blended course development. Other initiatives such as scholarship of teaching and learning have resulted in successful grant funding and research papers, and providing program assessment and service learning initiatives. By conducting research on best practices in teaching and learning, services such as faculty orientation for professional
development, being identified as a unit that champions for the advancement of teaching, providing workshops on the effective and appropriate use of technology in teaching and learning, and projects supporting adjunct faculty would also facilitate this level of satisfaction observed by the director.

The qualitative data provided a deeper analysis from the three roles as to the effect institutional culture and administrative policies had on the demands placed on the directors of TLCs. By being an advocate for what faculty and academic colleges deem important to their mission, helps to develop important connections. Managing ones’ performance with a positive work life balance, allows the director to not be stretched too thin in what one can do, versus what one would like to do. Being willing to collaborate with and promote programs with other units, as suggested by Neal and Peed-Neal (2010) was another suggestion on the delivery of workshops, projects, and initiatives to build alliances for success.

The effect administrative policies and institutional culture had on TLCs was summarized from the survey responses showing how supportive policies and culture can increase or reduce the demands on the TLC and the director (see Tables 27 and 28). As indicated by Neal and Peed-Neal (2010), understanding the institutional culture requires directors and administrators to “study the culture for clues about the values, assumptions, beliefs and ideologies that shape the institutional environment and the power structure” (p. 99) of their respective institution. The advantage of having a supportive institutional culture creates opportunities for working with the important demands which increase the satisfaction of finding solutions to those demands.
Constraints of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture

The respondents surveyed in this study perceived the constraints of administrative policies and institutional culture on the directors and the centers as considerable in the breadth of limitations facing their performance. Seven key functions were identified as offering the most satisfaction for overcoming the limits on the centers. Having a supportive institutional culture (Kezar & Eckel, 2002), allows all three roles to know the important constraints based on the institutional mission, which in turn increases the likelihood of reducing the limitation on the TLC (see Tables 27 and 28). The responses from the directors indicated strong collaboration among faculty and departments, advocacy for faculty initiatives, identifying resources to meet the goals/mission of the institution, and seeking for effective communication with all constituents, as activities that gave the director high satisfaction in removing the constraints that limited their work.

The challenge of working with administrative policies that potentially constrain the performance of the center was determined by whether having a restrictive policy, supportive policy, don’t know of any policy, or no policy had any effect on the work of the TLC and the leadership of the director (see Tables 27 and 28). Undoubtedly, all three roles pointed to several examples of policies that correlated with the quantitative data. Restrictive policy and no policy were the primary themes that identified the type of constraints faced by TLCs. Examples of such constraints were (a) insufficient allocation of resources, (b) heavy faculty workload, (c) lack of support for adjuncts, (d) climate of fear, (e) resistance to change, (f) lack of faculty incentives, (g) incoherent vision, (h) no strategic planning, and (i) budget constraints. The effect of addressing these constraints provided directors with different methods to strategically lead for changing the outcomes.
for their constituents, and increasing the quality in standards for faculty teaching, research, and service. Rooke and Torbert (2005/2011) described the strategist leader as “adept at creating shared visions across different action logics, which encourage both personal and organizational transformations” (p. 148). The ability to seek for change in policies that create strong collaboration among faculty and departments and advocacy for faculty initiatives, is a strong trait of the strategist role that directors should utilize toward seeking the support from their supervisors. Influencing all employees (staff and faculty) to meet the institution’s goals (Northouse, 2010) will ensure buy-in from the faculty/staff members of the TLCs to promote ethical practices and behavior which align with and to the vision of the institution. As explained by Marquardt (2011), having a shared vision gives the staff and institution “stars to steer by” (p. 61).

The effect of institutional culture on the center also created constraints on the performance of the director and the center. A lack of focused mission, insufficient services, and weak leadership were identified by the three roles as negative culture behavior that limited the performance of the director and the center. In the book, *Coming in from the Margins*, Schroeder and Associates (2012), insisted that TLCs responded to leadership challenges and institutional changes by advocating emphasis on learning, instructional and faculty development, and the impact technology can have on teaching and learning. The purpose and initiatives of the TLC is to support a learning organization dedicated to educating the organization as to the potential problems, inviting assistance, and being part of the change process. For these cultural constraints to be removed, a change in the mission of teaching has to occur. Schroeder and Associates (2012) advised that directors or middle managers needed to “raise awareness of the need to change” (p.
158), through seeking administrative support, publicizing the center’s data of performance, identifying persons who care about the problem, and getting all interested parties to work on finding solutions. Several survey participants noted the overarching emphasis on research and the devaluation of teaching meant faculty who saw value in teaching were either undervalued by their units or the institution, or were given heavy teaching load as a form of punishment.

A conflicting message from administration can create a lack of recognition for the work of the center among faculty due to institutional uncertainty in the direction of the mission of the TLC. This potentially leads to a reduction in interest for professional development on teaching and learning initiatives. A mission-driven culture would need to be created through advocacy and an understanding of institutional priorities for teaching and learning. Neal and Peed-Neal (2010) described methods to understanding the mission of an institution as, “learning how the institution operates as a social organism” (p. 100) so that the programs and services of the TLC can correspond with the goals and directives of the institution.

A supportive institutional culture provides opportunities for increasing the satisfaction of reducing the limitation on the TLC. For this type of culture to be changed, a mission-driven culture would need to be created through advocacy and an understanding of institutional priorities for teaching and learning. The TLC being seen as a proponent of quality teaching and pedagogical standards will allow for dialogue on consistent approaches to course evaluation, assessments, and best practices for teaching and learning. All important factors toward student retention and graduation; a responsibility all TLCs bear in their mission and goals.
Choices of Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture

The survey responses from the three roles identified several choice activities a TLC had to consider in which to participate or not to participate. These choice activities or functions were dependent on the level of support provided by the policies and culture of the institution. Schroeder and Associates (2012) noted that the view of the role of the TLC and the work of the director, primarily “programming, consulting, providing support and resources” (p. 102), did not match the actual work or role performed. Instead, all manner and choices of institutional initiatives were carried out to support the mission and goals of the university and college. In describing the effect institutional culture and administrative policies and institutional culture had on the work of the TLC, the three roles identified providing resource, personnel, and knowledge-based support to strengthen the institutional initiatives as important to their respective institutions.

The choice functions analyzed from the quantitative data were based on the institutional culture and administrative policies which the TLC could choose to deliver their services toward satisfaction for their institution and for the center. Similarities in the choices from the three roles were noted to be highest in importance versus those that were not applicable. Some of the top choice activities that were rated highest in importance were (a) supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, (b) piloting new technology/teaching innovation, (c) improving the delivery of courses and curriculum, and (d) leading faculty learning communities.

The support of mentoring of faculty and advocating different initiatives on teaching and learning and faculty development were highest in importance for the directors. For the supervisors, their top choice activities of importance were supporting
policy and procedures, such as reward and recognition schemes and blended and on-line course offerings. For the faculty/staff, their top choice activities of importance were supporting institutional policies and encouraging creative connections between research and teaching. For the directors and the faculty/staff, the choice activity of leading faculty learning communities was their top choice of importance.

In analyzing the top choice activities of importance of fulfilling the various services versus the top choice activities of satisfaction across the three roles, it was noted that the perceptions of choices were mostly similar for the directors and the faculty/staff. Both roles perceived the following choice activities as similar in importance and satisfaction: (a) supporting innovation of pedagogy and curriculum, (b) piloting new technology/teaching innovation, (c) leading faculty learning communities, and (d) improving the delivery of courses and curriculum. For the supervisors, they perceived providing technical training to implement educational technologies, ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies, and increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings as other great choice activities of satisfaction for the director.

**Effect of Administrative Policies**

Stone (2012) suggested that “people respond to policy issues not only according to whether they perceive the costs or benefits but also whether they think the policy affects them strongly or only weakly” (p. 238). In the survey responses, suggested strategies for aligning the work of the director with the administrative polices were developing the expertise of personnel, aligning skills to projects, and collaboration with other departments, units, and experts for resources and support. Other strategies offered to the directors were creating a supportive culture in the TLC that would remove
obstacles from their team members work efforts. The issue of delegation as a strategy for allocating and assigning projects based on the institutional priorities can potentially increase the proficiency and knowledge-base of the members responsible for projects. The effects of administrative policies on the choice activities chosen by the center were also analyzed based on qualitative data provided by the three roles (see Table 27).

The themes that were identified from the supportive effects of administrative policies were described as (a) student success initiatives, (b) professional development, (c) course evaluations, and (d) teaching infrastructure. The participants described their perception of polices as ranging from supportive policies, restrictive policies, not knowing about any policies, to no policies. By choosing to contribute to functions that were seen as a choice activity, participants described the effect administrative policies had on their TLC and director as providing other opportunities to deliver resources and services that were central to their mission and goals.

The demand of recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning as a research activity can facilitate initiatives to facilitate in-depth discussions on ways to facilitate and initiate new paradigms on teaching and learning; for organizational and institutional change efforts (Schroeder and Associates, 2012). On the other hand, responses from the three roles perceived that there were restrictive policies that constrained the TLC such as policies which introduced large courses, an over-emphasis on research over teaching, increasing faculty workloads, and lack of allocation of resources, to policies that increased emphasis on innovation and technology, causing faculty to perceive technologies as being more important than pedagogy.
Table 27

**Effect of Administrative Policies: Demands, Constraints, and Choices on Directors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Policy</th>
<th>Restrictive Policy</th>
<th>Don’t Know Any</th>
<th>No Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Infrastructure</td>
<td>Introduction of Large Courses</td>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC Responsibilities</td>
<td>Student or Course Evaluations</td>
<td>Teaching Initiatives</td>
<td>Teaching Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Initiatives</td>
<td>Faculty Professional Development</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Teaching and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Teaching and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or Course Evaluations</td>
<td>Over-emphasis on Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation/Mentoring</td>
<td>Faculty Workloads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Technology</td>
<td>Lack of Allocation of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect of Institutional Culture**

The perceptions of institutional culture affecting the demands, constraints, and choice activities afforded to TLCs were described by the survey participants as comprising organizational culture that was supportive, limiting, or uncertain (see Table 28). A supportive culture, in the words of a participant, provides the TLC with the “means to meet and interact with faculty in all departments/disciplines.” Neal and Peed-Neal (2010) described the challenges of promoting the programs of TLCs as dependent...
on understanding the institutional culture of the organization, grounding programs into the mission and goals of the institution. To do this means targeting the specific constituencies that are supportive and will participate based on the subculture to which they belong. The center will then be seen as a unit which encourages participation, seeks to develop collaboration among disparate disciplines, and advocates for the choice activities such as SoTL toward broadening the reach of teaching and learning for all members within the institution.

Table 28

*Effect of Institutional Culture: Demands, Constraints, and Choices on Directors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Culture</th>
<th>Limiting Culture</th>
<th>Uncertain Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Support</td>
<td>Lack of Direction</td>
<td>Lack of Value of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Focus of Teaching/Research</td>
<td>Lack of Services</td>
<td>Institutional Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devaluation of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching not Valued or Respected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the culture becomes limiting or uncertain, it can reduce the value of seeing teaching as important as research. The result of a limiting culture creates a lack of service and direction for the TLC which reduces the ability of the director to propose for change in how the TLC is viewed or what service is offered for the faculty. Added to this is the challenge of motivating faculty, especially adjunct faculty, to participate in this type of culture environment that a participant described as weak leadership that makes it
difficult to “embrace innovative methods to advocate for them from the ground up.” Participants perceived that the culture of emphasizing research over teaching was one of the ways teaching was being devalued within the institution. Having a supportive institutional culture (Schroeder and Associates, 2012) provides opportunities for the director and the TLC to know the choice activities, which are important as well as provide the highest satisfaction in providing the services.

The result of weak leadership is seen in decentralized management that leads to disparities in resources and also resistance to change when change is necessary. Schroeder and Associates (2012) described three factors that are important to the director being able to lead and participate in organizational development opportunities. The three factors were skills, knowledge, and expertise, which allowed the director to be “at the institutional planning table” (p. 123). The result creates “a collaborative leadership structure engaged in resolving large institutional concerns” (p. 123). A limiting culture creates conflicts in areas that should be collaborative and fosters competing interests which does not service the wider audience of faculty, students, and community members who are affected by the institution. A limiting culture not only enables a lack in valuing teaching as a worthwhile exercise, but also perpetuates the institutional uncertainty in knowing how the mission and goals of the institution meet the needs of the constituents in the mission of teaching and learning.

**Implications for Practice**

The quantitative and qualitative results from this study have potentially strong implications for directors of TLCs in understanding the challenges that come with leading such a dynamic unit that fosters the teaching and learning mandate of the higher
education institution. A TLC’s primary mission is that of providing faculty professional development opportunities to faculty and staff engaged in teaching and learning. As stated by Diamond (2005), faculty professional development provides faculty, administrators, and staff with the necessary knowledge and skills essential to reaching the stated goals of delivering course materials for student teaching and learning. Providing professional development to faculty and staff engaged in teaching is essentially a human resource activity that necessitates professionals trained in this area to successfully deliver this type of development. While many of the respondents indicated having a master’s/doctoral degree, few were in the field of psychology or related human resource discipline.

The directors of TLCs need mentors and professionals with experience in leadership, management, and human relationships, to gain experience and training in this field. Documentation in training, dealing with policies, politics, and understanding the effect of institutional culture will be needed to empower the directors to be leaders in their field. Organizations such as the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD Network) in Higher Education and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) are two examples of professional groups dedicated to supporting persons in the instructional technology and systems discipline in gaining the needed support. Based on the services noted on their websites, both groups provide professional development and management cohort educational opportunities to helping persons gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to organize, manage, and lead instructional technology units. Both organizations also provide evidence-based research and methodology to assist persons interested in leading TLCs to be mentored,
trained, and guided within their field of responsibility (POD Network, n.d.; Conn & Gitonga, 2004; AECT, n. d.).

Another sorely needed practice is that of higher education institutions providing training on how those identified as middle managers, can be effective in their role and position. As was noted before, these directors of TLCs are faced with challenges ranging from justifying, defending, and showing relevance of the center’s effort to the mission of the university, to securing funding for the center’s existence. As many are former faculty, existing faculty or staff members who have risen to this management role, they are placed in the situation of middle managers in higher education (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2005). As noted by the directors and faculty/staff respondents, large majorities of these two roles indicated that they were sometimes to never being included or consulted in discussions or decisions.

For the respondents identified as supervisors of the directors, the majority reported that the directors were included in the discussions and decisions concerning teaching and learning. This difference of perception from the middle managers with institutional involvement (Schroeder and Associates, 2012) in the initiatives of their institution indicates a need for these emerging educational leaders to participate in the development of the goals and discussion activities that involve projects on teaching and learning at their institution. Schroeder and Associates (2012) showed that the leadership of the center, the institutional leadership, the institutional priorities, and the mission of the center are critical in enabling the directors to participate in the institutional initiatives and projects. It is important for the supervisors to not only provide clear objectives for the center, but also ensure that the directors have opportunities to provide their voice and
be an integral part of the discussion and decision making where applicable.
Transformational academic leaders create policies that reduce constraints leading to
better working outcomes and quality in standards such as teaching, research, and service.

In Table 1, an adaptation of Stewart’s (1976) organizational dynamics research
described examples of the demands, constraints, and choices facing the work of leaders
of TLCs. Each of the functions provide ways of identifying the challenges and limits that
directors of TLCs will face, and how best to address these challenges. If new and
emerging directors are able to consider how demands, constraints, and choices will affect
their work, then they will be better equipped to be leaders of change, and advocate for
faculty and the institution. On the demands side, understanding how to manage
performance and behavioral demands from TLC members as well as faculty and
administrators will help the director manage the demands on the jobs that have to
complete.

On the constraint side, awareness of the legal, ethical, and professional constraints
that can limit the effectiveness of the center, and damage the perception administrators,
faculty, and staff have of the role of the center, will determine the effectiveness of
managing the factors, internal or external, that limit what the director can do. For the
choice functions, if the director has the knowledge to focus his or her attention on
creating collaboration between competing interests, colleges, departments and university
project initiatives, then this leader will be better able to influence others to participate in
activates that the director can do, but does not have to do. Training, awareness, and
professional development are important to the success of the center and the director.
Higher education institutions have begun to increase their course offerings as they look to different modalities to increase their student size, without extending their “brick and mortar” space. This increase of course offerings results in the introduction of blended and on-line teaching, course transformation efforts, research through scholarship of teaching and learning for grant funding, collaborative writing initiatives, teaching statistics, and student learning. This presents a challenge for the center director to be able to meet these increasing needs from the institution even as the number of faculty/staff members is stagnant or reducing.

In discussing the pathways taken by those in the profession of educational development, MacDonald and Stockley (2008) described educational development as progressing from an informal set of instructional improvement activities to a scholarly field of study and practice. The scope of this practice has broadened to include a range of services, resources, programs, and initiatives covering curriculum development, action research, and mentoring. All designed to advance and support educational effectiveness in higher education and support the growth of faculty and staff who are in the role of directors of teaching and learning centers. The development of potential persons (administrator and faculty/staff) to be future leaders of TLCs depends on their commitment to the profession of educational development, and willingness by the institution to provide the necessary training and leadership development to equip these future leaders to be effective in the role of director of a TLC.

A statistic (McDonald & Stockley, 2010) from Pathways to the Profession of Educational Development cited only 60% of directors holding both a faculty and administrative/director title. This research finding also indicated that faculty becoming
center directors has begun to change. The analysis of the quantitative data from the
survey indicated that the director’s previous positions ranged from university
administrators (24%), faculty (61%), and staff (12%). It would be helpful for institutions
as they increase the various projects and institutional initiatives around teaching to have
committed directors and staff members within the TLCs. Having dedicated personnel
within the center with the required depth of knowledge across multiple disciplines would
provide the necessary teaching, research, and active leadership support.

While department heads within colleges and directors of TLCs are middle
managers in higher education institutions, the directors of TLCs are required to have a
wide depth of knowledge across multiple disciplines. At the same time, the directors are
being pulled into many initiatives that are important to other disciplines but not
necessarily critical to the TLC. Being able to maintain an active role with these varied
constituents, while dealing with the demands, constraints, and choices from the
administrative policies and institutional culture, will necessitate a leader qualified and
able to lead without being overwhelmed. Whether the director is a faculty or staff
member, training on performance demands and wide knowledge on the scholarship and
literature on teaching will be important to the success of the director of the TLC. Both
existing and new directors of TLCs will be able to use these findings to guide how they
manage the demands, constraints, and choices on their work and the center, and to
understand what role institutional culture and administrative policies determine the
success of the support and services they provide.
Implications for Future Research

This study has examined the leadership challenges faced by directors of TLCs based on the demands, constraints, and choices of administrative policies, and the institutional culture of their respective higher education institution. The perceptions from three important roles or personnel associated with TLCs, namely directors, supervisors of the directors, and faculty/staff members of TLCs, made it possible to gain an understanding of these challenges confronted by the directors. A weakness of this study was the methodology of using an on-line survey comprised of quantitative and qualitative questions to gather data from respondents. Stewart’s (1982a) theoretical framework advocated using interviews and observations as a means of gathering data to support the type of demands, constraints, and choices that the leaders faced in managing their locus of control.

In other previous work, Stewart’s 1968 work (Kroeck, 2003) utilized “intensive face-to-face and telephoning interview methods, analysis of diaries, group discussions, case analysis, and structured observation methodology” (p. 204). For future research, researchers could engage in personal observations with directors, supervisors of directors, and faculty/staff members of higher education institutions in different regions of the United States, categorized by the Carnegie-classification of colleges and universities. By using interviews, observations, and analysis of documentation, a rich, thick, and deep analysis of data would provide a richer description of the effects administrative policies and the institutional culture has on the demands, constraints, and choices on the directors of TLCs.
Stewart’s (1976) leadership theory of demands, constraints, and choices as a research framework was useful to understanding the effect that institutional culture and administrative policies can have on the leadership of the directors, and was very instrumental in understanding their effect on the leadership of TLCs. While no other research was found that addressed demands, constraints, and choices on directors of TLCs, research on middle managers in higher education and corporate organizations was found that provided strong evidence of the validity of Stewart’s framework.

More research will be needed to ascertain the perceptions of supervisors and faculty/staff on the type of leadership qualities directors will need to be successful in managing and leading their unit. The type of leadership needed could be supervision that actively works to remove obstacles to work processes so as to empower employees and staff members to successfully complete their work responsibilities. As described by Northouse (2010) the path-goal theory of leadership pushes leaders to focus on the center’s vision for the institution, while removing obstacles from staff members in order for the work to be completed.

Based on the survey responses from the directors, supervisors, and the faculty/staff members, the findings indicate a full understanding of the challenges administrative policies and the institutional culture have on the director’s leadership. The directors are encouraged to understand the mission and goals of their institution as a means of guiding their TLC along the same trajectory. This in turn will guide present and future directors to identify programs in providing professional development support, collaboration, strong scholarship of research in teaching and learning, so as to maintain the quality in the delivery of teaching and learning for faculty and students.
There are concerns within the TLC community of POD on the challenges facing TLCs and their directors. These concerns are directed at the reduction in funding facing many TLCs, the over-emphasis of technology over pedagogy in the mandate given to TLCs, the possibility of closure of TLCs within higher education institutions, and policies and goals which continue to place greater emphasis on research over teaching. These are concerns present and future leaders of TLCs must remain aware, and will necessitate forging strong alliances with other units and administrative leaders to ensure the TLC will continue to remain relevant and current in the mission of the respective institutions.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A

Survey for Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers in Higher Education

Part I – Background Information

1. Please classify your institution based on the basic Carnegie Classification Category.

(See definition of Carnegie Classification at http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php)

- Associate College
- Doctorate-granting University
- Master's Colleges and University
- Baccalaureate Colleges
- Special Focus Institution
- Tribal College

2. To which unit does your teaching and learning center report?

- Academic Affairs
- Information Technology Services
- Office of the Provost
- Library
- Other
  Please specify Other: __________________________________________

3. Does your institution have a primary teaching and learning center?

- Yes
- No
  If No, explain the designation of the center. ________________________

4. Many higher education institutions name the center other than teaching and learning center. What is the official name of your center? (Do NOT provide the name of your institution)
5. How many years has your institution had a teaching and learning center?

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- Over 20 years

6. Has your center recently been restructured?

- Yes
- No

If Yes, how long ago?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 to 2 years
- 3 to 4 years
- 5 to 6 years
- 7 years or longer

7. Please indicate the services your center provides to the institution (Check all that apply).

- Faculty development
- Instructional development
- Organizational development
- Faculty learning communities
- Writing support
- Scholarship of teaching and learning
- Using technology in teaching and learning
- Classroom teaching evaluation
- Large course redesign
- iPad implementation
- Graduate teaching and mentoring
- Student evaluation of teaching
- Other. Please specify Other: _______________________
8. Indicate your position in relation to the teaching and learning center.

   - Director (Continuing/Interim/Acting)
   - Supervisor of the Director (Associate Vice President/Provost/Dean/other senior administrator)
   - Faculty/Staff member in the center

9. Please indicate your Director Position status:

   - Continuing
   - Interim
   - Acting
   - Other
     Please specify Other: ______________________________

10. How long have you been the Director/Leader (interim, acting, or other) of the Center?

   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 to 2 years
   - 3 to 4 years
   - 5 to 6 years
   - 7 years or longer

11. What is the current number of center employees in each of the following categories?

    - Full-time Academic Staff (faculty)
    - Part-time Academic Staff (faculty)
    - Full-time Professional Staff
    - Part-time Professional Staff
    - Staff appointed for special projects
    - Faculty appointed for special projects
    - Any other Center Staff

    Total
12. If you were the Director/Leader (interim, acting, or other) of a teaching and learning center at another university, state the length of time in that position.
   - N/A
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 to 2 years
   - 3 to 4 years
   - 5 to 6 years
   - 7 years or longer

13. Please indicate on the following continuum the degree to which you as the Director of the center, are routinely included in relevant decision-making activities concerning teaching and learning at your institution.

   Never Consulted/Included  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Always Consulted/Included

14. Before you became an administrator of a teaching and learning center, you were:
   - Administrator
   - Faculty
   - Staff
   - From corporate organization
   - From non-profit organization

15. Please indicate your official title as supervisor to the director of the teaching and learning center:
   - Vice President
   - Chief Information Officer
   - Provost
   - Associate Provost
   - Dean
   - Associate Dean
   - Other
   Please specify Other: ___________________________
16. Please indicate on the following continuum the degree to which you as the Supervisor, routinely include the Director of the center in relevant decision-making activities concerning teaching and learning at your institution.

Never Consulted/Included  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Always

Consulted/Included

17. How long have you supervised the director of the teaching and learning center?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 to 2 years
- 3 to 4 years
- 5 to 6 years
- 7 years or longer

18. Please indicate your official title as a faculty/staff member of the teaching and learning center:

- Associate Director/Interim or Acting Associate Director
- Instructional Specialist
- Instructional Designer
- Instructional Consultant
- Instructional Technologist
- Faculty Developer
- Provost Fellow
- Faculty Fellow
- Other
  Please specify Other: _____________________________
19. How long have you been a faculty/staff member of the teaching and learning center?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 to 2 years
- 3 to 4 years
- 5 to 6 years
- 7 years or longer

20. Please indicate on the following continuum the degree to which you as a faculty/staff member of the center, are routinely included in relevant decision-making activities concerning teaching and learning at your institution.

Never Consulted/Included 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Always

Consulted/Included

Part II – Demands, Constraints, and Choices of Leadership

This study explores employee and supervisor perceptions of the demands, constraints, and choices faced by directors of teaching and learning centers. The study includes the terms demands, constraints, and choices to distinguish the primary motivators for evaluating leadership effectiveness. Demand is defined as what anyone in the job has to do. Constraints are defined as internal or external factors that limit what the jobholder can do. Choices are defined as optional activities the jobholder can do, but is not required to do.

21. Please rate the IMPORTANCE of each Demand and how SATISFIED you are with your center’s performance in meeting these functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A Low Medium High Very High</td>
<td>N/A Low Medium High Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Improving your institution’s teaching and learning performance
- Providing adequate resources (technology, personnel, books, etc.)
- Improving teaching experience for graduate students
- Developing/implementing teaching and learning policies and plans
- Recognizing scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity
- Providing professional development for faculty and professional staff (workshops and consultations)
- Improving the quality of courses and curriculum
- Implementing large courses redesign
- Implementing effective educational programs
- Researching best practices in teaching and learning
- Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings
- Implementing and supporting all educational technology
- Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching
- Providing funding for faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences
- Promoting constancy of restructuring
- Supporting academic workload balance of faculty teaching commitments
- Providing institutional research data for accreditation
- Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution

22. Please rate the IMPORTANCE of each Constraint and how SATISFIED you are with the center’s performance to overcome the limits of these functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A Low Medium High</td>
<td>N/A Low Medium High Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Insufficient resources (people, money, materials)
- Insufficient number of TLC personnel members
- Insufficient TLC personnel time
- Inability to complete a cycle of planning and implementation
- Incorrect or outmoded institutional perceptions of the role/function of the center
- Institutional priority given to research over teaching and learning activities
- Lack of recognition of the work of the center among faculty
- Lack of recognition of the work of the center among administrative leaders
- Lack of recognition of scholarship of teaching and learning as research activity
- Inadequate sense of shared direction/purpose of the center within the institution
- Lack of access to relevant technology for teaching and learning
- Lack of alignment of the work of the center with the university’s strategic vision
- Over dependence on support from other institutional areas to achieve outcomes
- Perception that only faculty can improve teaching and learning
- Limited success with external grant and award applications
- Short-term thinking on achieving lasting and significant outcomes/changes
- Lack of student evaluation systems
- Restrictive institutional culture of the university
- Administrative policies that prohibits the work of the university
- Lack of teaching and learning data required for the center operations
- Lack of access to academic decision-making

23. Please rate the IMPORTANCE of each of these Choices and how SATISFIED you are with the center's performance to make a decision on these functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A Low Medium High Very High</td>
<td>N/A Low Medium High Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Supporting accreditation efforts
- Supporting institutional policies
- Providing non-teaching and learning professional development for faculty and staff
- Improving the delivery of courses and curriculum
- Promoting productive relationship between teaching and research
- Supporting policy and procedures around reward and recognition schemes
- Providing broad support of academic ideas across the university
- Supporting innovation between pedagogy and curriculum
- Piloting new technology/teaching innovation
- Providing student support efforts (orientation, retention, student peer learning, and mentoring)
- Supporting peer evaluation in classroom teaching
- Supporting mentoring of faculty
- Increasing the number of blended and on-line course offerings
- Ensuring reliable operation of educational technologies
- Providing technical training to implement educational technologies
- Supporting programs to recognize and reward excellent teaching
- Developing balanced academic workloads for faculty teaching commitments
- Contributing to the recruitment and support of academic faculty for the institution
- Leading faculty learning communities
Three Questions for Directors Only:

The next 3 questions are for the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC)

24. As the Director of the teaching and learning center, considering the functions above, how do you address the *demands* of the position?

25. As the Director of the teaching and learning center, considering the functions above, how do you align the *choices* you make with how your staff members can best contribute?

26. As the Director of the teaching and learning center, considering the functions above, how do you address the factors that *constrain* your ability to lead your center?

Two questions for all survey participants:

The next two questions look at the effect of administrative polices and institutional culture on the TLC

(To be completed by all survey participants)

Please describe the effect of administrative policies on your center. (Give three examples of such policies).

Please describe the effect of institutional culture on your center. (Give three examples of culture)
Part III

- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-25 years
- 26-30 years
- 31+ years

27. What is your general area of expertise?
   - Arts
   - Business
   - Computing
   - Education
   - Engineering
   - Health
   - Law
   - Social Science
   - Science
   - Other

28. Please specify Other: ____________________________

29. What is your current age?
   - 20 to 24
   - 25 to 34
   - 35 to 44
30. What is your gender?
   o Male
   o Female

31. What is the level of education you have completed?
   o 2-year College Degree
   o 4-year College degree
   o Master’s degree
   o Doctoral degree
   o Professional Degree (JD, MD)
   o Other

   Please specify Other: ________________________________

32. Optional – any additional information:

   If you were uncertain about any element of the survey and had to make assumptions in your responses, we would like for you to explain in the box below.

   This completes the research survey. Thank you for your participation.
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UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

Informed Consent Form

Title of the Study: Examination of Leadership Challenges faced by Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers in Universities based on Administrative Policies and Institutional Culture

Principal Investigator: Dr. Cynthia MacGregor (phone: 417-836-6046) (email: CMacgregor@MissouriState.edu)

Student Researcher: Bruce Richards (email: bervzb@mail.missouri.edu)

Introduction
This study attempts to collect information from administrative leaders, faculty, staff members, and directors of TLCs about the demands, constraints, and choices faced by directors of teaching and learning centers based on the challenges of administrative policies and institutional culture.

Procedures
You will be asked to complete an on-line survey comprised of three sections. The first section of the survey will look at the institutional information and the services provided by the teaching and learning centers. The second section of the survey will address the demands, constraints, and choices faced by mid-level leaders of teaching and learning centers in higher education. The effect administrative policies and institutional culture had on the leader will also be examined to explore potential impact on the leadership
effectiveness of the centers. The third section of the survey will assess participants’
demographic information (e.g., sex, administrative position, faculty rank, locus of
appointment, education). The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes or less.
Questions are designed to determine perception, role, and relationship with teaching and
learning centers. This questionnaire will be conducted with an on-line Qualtrics-created
survey.

**Risks/Discomforts**

Risks are minimal for involvement in this study. We do not anticipate any risks to you
from participation in this study.

**Benefits**

The benefit of participating in this study is you will be contributing to the knowledge of
research on the demands, constraints, and choices faced by leaders of teaching and
learning centers and how an institution’s administrative policies and institutional culture
affects the direction of the TLC.

**Confidentiality**

All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential and will only be reported in
an aggregate format (by reporting only combined results and never reporting individual
ones). All questionnaires will be concealed, and no one other than the primary
investigator and the researcher listed below will have access to them. The data collected
will be stored in the HIPPA-compliant, Qualtrics-secure database until it has been deleted
by the primary investigator.

**Compensation**

There is no direct compensation for this study.
Participation

Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your academic status, or standing with the university. If you desire to withdraw, please close your Internet browser and notify the principal investigator at this email: (CMacgregor@MissouriState.edu).

Questions about the Research

You may ask any questions about the research at any time. If you have questions about the research after reading this consent form we ask you to contact the Principal Investigator Dr. Cynthia MacGregor at CMacgregor@MissouriState.edu or 417-836-6046. You may also contact the student researcher, Bruce Richards at bervzb@mail.missouri.edu.

Questions about your Rights as Research Participants

If you have questions you do not feel comfortable asking the researcher, you should contact the MU Campus Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office at (573) 882-9585.

I have read, understood, and printed a copy of, the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study (please choose one).

Yes    No
VITA
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