**Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching**

by

Tara Grant Jones

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 7, 2021

Keywords: master teaching, major gifts officer, fundraiser, development, Teacher Behavior Checklist, teaching qualities



Approved by

James E. Groccia, Chair, Prof. Emeritus, Educational Foundations, Leadership, & Technology
James E. Witte, Professor and Chair, Department of Aviation
Daniel Butler, Assistant Dean for Harbert Global Programs and Assoc. Professor, Marketing
Karley Riffe, Assistant Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership, & Technology

## Abstract

This study examined Major Gifts Officers' (MGOs') perceptions of master teaching behaviors exhibited by university faculty. Using an online survey, the Teacher Behavior Checklist was administered to Major Gifts Officers working at Southeastern Conference institutions. Based on their undergraduate experience, fundraisers were asked to rate faculty on the 28 items of the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) using a Likert rating scale (1 = *never exhibited this quality* to 5 = *frequently exhibited this quality*) (Buskist & Keeley, 2018).

Results indicated that MGOs rated master teachers with the following top behaviors: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) confident; (4) promotes critical thinking; (5) accessible; (6) prepared; (7) enthusiastic; (8) respectful; (9) punctuality/manages class time; and (10) effective communicator. This study affirmed the four universal and near-universal principles of excellent teaching (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, and effective communicator) as MGOs in this sample rated those qualities in the top ten list of TBC item means (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Data regarding those who were more enthusiastic about raising faculty support and engaging with faculty imply that there is shared agreement related to creative/interesting and promotes critical thinking which could indicate near universal perceptions of teaching behaviors for the ideal Major Gifts Officer.

In each analysis of this study, Major Gifts Officers rated the professional competency/communication subscale higher than the caring/supportive subscale. MGOs' TBC item rankings and subscale ratings in this study were more aligned with faculty responses than student responses. In comparing MGOs' top ten rated TBC qualities with five faculty samples, there were five shared items: knowledgeable, approachable/personable, promotes critical thinking, enthusiastic, and effective communicator.

In comparing responses of Major Gift Officers with five samples of students in previous studies, two TBC qualities, knowledgeable and enthusiastic, appeared on each top ten list.

Data in this study indicated that the undergraduate experience with faculty can impact future fundraising partnerships and processes. Results suggested that Major Gifts Officers often identify faculty partners for development who exhibit behaviors associated with their undergraduate master teachers. MGOs who identified as more enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support and were more willing to partner with faculty during the fundraising process rated both TBC subscales higher which may indicate a more positive experience with an excellent undergraduate teacher and a greater understanding of the need for this type of philanthropic investment.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to my advisor and committee chair, Dr. James E. Groccia, who agreed to continue to work with me even after his retirement from Auburn University. Dr. Groccia, you were patient with my idea formulation while inspiring me to push harder. I appreciate your positivity and willingness to assist me on this journey.

I also am thankful for my committee members, Dr. Daniel Butler, Dr. James E. Witte, and Dr. Karley Riffe. Dr. Butler, you were a mentor and encourager many years ago during my MBA experience and continue to cheer me on in my goals and career. From my experiences, you are both a master teacher *and* an excellent faculty partner in fundraising activities. Dr. Witte, thank you for being a guiding resource, offering practical tools and advice for the dissertation process. An adult education expert, you understand the needs of the lifelong learner. Dr. Riffe, I appreciate your willingness to join my team and serve as a resource for the higher education administration program. Your commitment to the program will provide long-term value for current and future students.

I am grateful for Dr. Bill Hardgrave who was my boss when I started this journey in Fall 2014 and supported me throughout this process. Always the encourager, I deeply value your advice, wise counsel, and humor. Bill connected me with Dr. Kang Bok Lee who graciously provided feedback for the quantitative analysis. Upon her arrival at the Graduate School, Dr. Maria Witte created processes that were easier to navigate and understand. She genuinely cares for students and always could be counted on to answer to my many questions. Special thanks to my outside reader, Dr. Susan Hubbard. Prior to becoming a dean, she offered to assist me and stayed true to her word, even with her busy schedule.

I am grateful for colleagues who do the wonderful work of higher education fundraising. Helping people realize their philanthropic dreams is a special calling. For the SEC Major Gifts Officers and colleagues who provided feedback to my survey, thank you! Your perceptions of master teachers made this study possible.

I truly appreciate my family's encouragement throughout this process. I want to give huge thanks and kudos to my husband, A.J. Jones, without whom this would not be possible. He was patient and sacrificed time with me so I could achieve this personal goal. To my brother, Dr. Jefferson L. Grant III, the first PhD in the family, thank you for the words of the wisdom and encouragement. You always understood what I was going through.

To my momma and daddy (J.L. and Elizabeth Grant), thank you for instilling in me a love of learning and the will to achieve my goals. Momma, you supported this dream of mine and spurred me on to finish my dissertation in a timely manner. To my dad who is no longer with us, I know that it is more than serendipitous that I will graduate on your birthday, August 7. I only wish you were still here to celebrate with us.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| ANOVA | Analysis of Variance |
| MGO | Major Gifts Officer |
| MANOVA | Multiple Analysis of Variance |
| SEC | Southeastern Conference |
| TBC | Teacher Behavior Checklist |

## Chapter 1: Introduction

As student debt has increased, societal perceptions have led to calls for more accountability and value propositions from higher education institutions. Holmes (2010) described the shift of public higher education funding from "solely state appropriations and tuition to state appropriations, tuition, grants and contracts, and philanthropy" (p. 28). More specifically, after the 2008 recession, "state support for higher education waned dramatically" (Shaker & Borden, 2020, p. 6). As institutions attempt to hold tuition steady even in the face of reductions in state appropriations, philanthropic support continues to gain attention as a potential increase to the typical funding model. According to the TIAA Institute 2020 study, individuals and other entities gave $58.7 billion to higher education in 2018 with alumni contributing $12.2 billion of that total. Colleges and universities rely on philanthropic dollars to fund institutional needs with private support from individuals and foundations being pivotal to accomplishing those priorities (Shaker & Borden, 2020).

In his study, Holmes (2010) stated that "the quality of the education would be significantly limited without the philanthropy component" (p. 28). The competition for philanthropic dollars continues to increase with higher education donors shifting from institution operational support to more tangible community support (Weerts & Hudson, 2009). University leaders have looked to Major Gifts Officers to engage investors to provide scholarship support for students and funds to attract and keep the best faculty, top priorities at many institutions (Holmes, 2010).

With what is perceived as rising costs of higher education, excellence in college teaching is more important than ever. An individual's undergraduate experiences, perceptions, memories, support, and overall satisfaction contribute to one's desire to philanthropically support an

institution (Shaker & Borden, 2020). These experiences are directly associated with faculty behaviors in positive classroom environments. Students who perceived a personalized undergraduate experience developed a sense of identification which leads to an increased likelihood of giving to that organization (Drezner, 2011; Shaker & Borden, 2020). This study attempted to ascertain if a positive undergraduate experience with an excellent teacher also influences the Major Gifts Officer during the fundraising process.

While studies have shown that excellent faculty can impact an alumnus's willingness to make a gift to the institution, there is limited research related to how teaching behaviors affect those who raise philanthropic dollars. Buskist and Keeley (2018) argued that identifying a teaching behavior rather than a quality that can be improved is practical advice to increase a teacher's level of excellence. Realizing that previous research focused on teacher qualities and not behaviors that define excellent teaching, Buskist and colleagues developed an instrument called the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) with the initial purpose to evaluate teaching problems and provide improvements for teaching excellence (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Using the TBC instrument to identify qualities of master teachers, researchers have found that faculty prioritize teaching techniques related to behaviors such as being prepared and being a leading communicator and students valued the more social aspects of the relationship describing valued behaviors such as being understanding and encouraging students (Groccia et al., 2018; Kirby et al., 2018). Undergraduate students valued rapport higher than faculty when asked to identify characteristics found in master teachers (Benson et al., 2005). Specifically looking at faculty demographics, Groccia et al. (2018) discovered that both U.S. and foreign-educated faculty "agreed that being knowledgeable about the topic and being enthusiastic about teaching were the top two qualities of excellent teachers" (p. 86). While there has been research related to master

teachers and various faculty groups across disciplines and institution types (Groccia et al., 2018), there appear to be few, if any, studies that explore the behaviors of excellent teachers in a sample of university staff employees. Understanding the potential implications of perceptions of master teachers from those who raise philanthropic support for the institution may be important as leaders try to increase that revenue stream.

## Statement of the Problem

As state government funding sources continue to shift and decline, leaders at public higher education institutions have come to rely on philanthropic support to fill the gap (Daly, 2013; Farwell et al., 2020; Holmes, 2010). Using 2017 data, Farwell et al. (2020) stated that universities and colleges received $43.6 billion, of which over 44% was given by individuals" (p. 487). Even in 2005 numbers, Wastyn (2009) detailed that "American educational organizations received $36.8 billion from philanthropy" (p. 97) and "11.9 percent of alumni contributed to their alma mater in 2006" (p. 97). As reliance on gifts increases, leaders at higher education institutions have a need to discover how to retain current donors and identify new philanthropic partners for a shifting funding model.

At colleges and universities, Major Gifts Officers raise significant funds for various designations including student support, facilities, programmatic support, and faculty support (Elder, 2010; Farwell et al., 2020). Raising funds for faculty support particularly is challenging. In a thirty-year longitudinal study published by the TIAA Institute in 2020, dollars raised for faculty support consistently has remained around 2% of total charitable giving for higher education (Shaker & Borden, 2020).

Major Gifts Officers rely on faculty and administrators to articulate the university's mission and identify compelling priorities ideas for potential donors (Farwell et al., 2020;

Whitaker, 2007). Often serving as translators for ideas from the academic community, Major Gifts Officers build trust with faculty, administrators, donors, and prospects (Daly, 2013). In addition, MGOs have to work across the institution with internal colleagues to dismantle organizational silos (Elder, 2010). Potential donors may choose to make a gift based on their long-term relationship with the fundraiser or the organization (Alborough, 2017; Drezner, 2011). Creating and sustaining relationships between prospects and donors and academic leaders and administrators takes time (Holmes, 2010). Whitaker (2007) shared that faculty often participate in relationship building with prospects through discussing their academic research and delivering the message of why that work is important to society. Thus, the professor can be a crucial component and partner during the development and fundraising cycle. Understanding how master teachers were influential to their undergraduate experience and why Major Gifts Officers may be influenced to partner with faculty for increased philanthropic support could provide insight into strengthening those relationships and creating opportunities for higher education institutions.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide insight into how perceptions of master teachers impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. The study compared survey responses by Major Gifts Officers employed at institutions in the Southeastern Conference (SEC). Major gifts fundraisers were compared based on years of experience, alma mater status, enthusiasm for raising faculty support, and willingness to partner with faculty to increase philanthropic dollars. The study seeks to expand the body of knowledge of teaching excellence from non-academic employees who work in higher education and provide insight into the professional relationship between MGOs and master teachers. Faculty behaviors experienced by

students in the classroom impact not only Major Gifts Officers' enthusiasm for their work but also alumni donors' potential philanthropic commitments. As the need for private support for higher education increases, there is a call for deeper exploration into what influences donors and the MGOs who assist them. In addition, in better understanding the faculty component in the philanthropic process, Major Gifts Officers can enhance fundraising strategies and programs to ensure an elevated donor experience and increased charitable contributions for the institution.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What Teacher Behavior Checklist qualities do Major Gifts Officers in higher education perceive master teachers demonstrate most?
2. Based on their undergraduate experience with faculty, do these perceptions of teacher behaviors influence Major Gifts Officers to raise funds to support faculty?
3. Based on perceptions of master teachers in their undergraduate experience, does this influence Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process?
4. What similarities or differences exist between Major Gifts Officers' responses and student and faculty responses in prior research of the Teacher Behavior Checklist?

## Significance of the Study

In researching higher education fundraising Peter Dobkin Hall (1992) stated, "No single force is more responsible for the emergence of the modern university in America than giving by individuals and foundations" (p. 403). Thoughtful contemplation and research regarding philanthropy in higher education is critical because of the ever-increasing reliance on private support and the upcoming generational transfer of wealth (Drezner, 2011). Whitaker (2007)

estimated that the scope of the potential transfer of wealth to be between $41 trillion to $73 trillion between 1998 through 2052 with a possible $6 trillion of that amount designated for charities. For the charitable portion of the wealth transfer, fundraisers will play a crucial role in helping donors accomplish their philanthropic goals. Because fundraisers play a vital role in the philanthropic revenue stream for the institution, exploring the influences and thought processes of Major Gifts Officers as they relate to their undergraduate experiences learning from master teachers, may provide insight into ways to increase engagement opportunities with faculty partners (Jones & Castillo, 2017). Colleges and universities that raise the most funds outpace their competitors in student enrollment, rankings, and faculty recruitment and retention. Connecting with faculty and leaders at the institution, MGOs often create and sustain relationships with potential prospects, donors, and alumni. As Breeze and Jollymore (2017) pointed out, "understanding the affinity a donor has with an issue—what they really care about—is essential to finding the common ground, the convergences between the donor's goals and the organisation's needs" (p. 5). Perhaps most significantly, research also has shown that an alumnus's overall satisfaction with the university, including the campus climate and whether he or she felt welcome in the institution, can strongly influence a willingness to make a philanthropic gift with teacher behaviors playing a potentially significant role in these and other possible motivations (Drezner & Garvey, 2016; Evans, 2015; McDearmon, 2010; Vervoort & Gasman, 2017).

This study was needed and is significant in expanding the body of knowledge of the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC). Previous research related to the TBC has focused on students and faculty. To date, literature in this topic area has been limited as it relates to university staff. Typically, the TBC has been administered to faculty and students to gain their

perspectives based on their current situation. This study explored Major Gifts Officers' (MGOs) perceptions of master teachers looking back to the undergraduate experience and how those perceptions influence their current work. It appears that MGOs' ratings of behaviors of master teachers align with previously identified universal principles for teaching excellence. The survey responses of Major Gifts Officers for the TBC instrument can serve as usable insight into master teacher behaviors and how those may influence the philanthropic process.

In addition to expanding the body of knowledge related to the TBC, this study is significant in that it provided theoretical and practical applications for higher education fundraising. Drezner (2011) shared that philanthropic literature in higher education has focused on best practices while research grounded in theory has been limited. Understanding MGOs' undergraduate experiences with master teachers and how that influences the fundraising process is significant. Connecting major gifts prospects and donors with faculty for greater philanthropic opportunities is key to increasing that revenue stream. The hiring process of MGOs can be impacted by understanding the importance of the relationship with faculty and the perceptions of master teachers. As MGOs had positive undergraduate experiences with master teachers, they were more enthusiastic for raising faculty support and more willing to engage faculty in the fundraising process.

## Definition of Terms

These terms are used in this study and defined to provide clarification.

1. Development: the strategic process of identifying the university's priorities and building relationships with those who can philosophically embrace and philanthropically support the mission of the institution (Daly, 2013). The term development has been used interchangeably with fundraising.

2. Major Gifts Officer: the university employee who develops strategies for the identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship of donors who make a philanthropic commitment of at least $25,000.

3. Master Teacher: a faculty who has vast knowledge of a subject and can engage, excite, and inspire students for educational success (Buskist, 2004).

4. Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC): a 28-item checklist to identify qualities and behaviors associated with master teachers (Buskist & Keeley, 2018).

## Organization of the Study

This study is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the study and details the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and definitions of terms. Chapter 2 provides a literature review of the history of higher education fundraising, Major Gifts Officers' characteristics, and the need for increased philanthropic funding for colleges/universities. In addition, Chapter 2 includes an overview of research related to learning and master teachers and results from prior studies related to the Teacher Behavior Checklist. Chapter 3 reports the methods for this study, the instrument used, sample population details, data collection, and data analysis. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the study, conclusions from the findings, implications for higher education fundraising work, research implications related to teacher behaviors, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

# CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

## Introduction

As student debt has increased, societal perceptions have led to calls for more accountability and value propositions from higher education institutions. Holmes (2010) described the shift of public higher education funding from "solely state appropriations and tuition to state appropriations, tuition, grants and contracts, and philanthropy" (p. 28). More specifically, after the 2008 recession, "state support for higher education waned dramatically" (Shaker & Borden, 2020, p. 6). As institutions attempt to hold tuition steady even in the face of reductions in state appropriations, philanthropic support continues to gain attention as a potential increase to the typical funding model. According to the TIAA Institute 2020 study, individuals and other entities gave $58.7 billion to higher education in 2018 with alumni contributing $12.2 billion of that total. Colleges and universities rely on philanthropic dollars to fund institutional needs with private support from individuals and foundations being pivotal to accomplishing those priorities (Shaker & Borden, 2020).

In his study, Holmes (2010) stated that "the quality of the education would be significantly limited without the philanthropy component" (p. 28). The competition for philanthropic dollars continues to increase with higher education donors shifting from institution operational support to more tangible community support (Weerts & Hudson, 2009). University leaders have looked to Major Gifts Officers to engage investors to provide scholarship support for students and funds to attract and keep the best faculty, top priorities at many institutions (Holmes, 2010).

With what is perceived as rising costs of higher education, excellence in college teaching is more important than ever. An individual's undergraduate experiences, perceptions, memories,

support, and overall satisfaction contribute to one's desire to philanthropically support an institution (Shaker & Borden, 2020). These experiences are directly associated with positive faculty behaviors in classroom environments. Students who perceived a personalized undergraduate experience developed a sense of identification which leads to an increased likelihood of giving to that organization (Drezner, 2011; Shaker & Borden, 2020). This study attempted to ascertain if a positive undergraduate experience with an excellent teacher also influences the Major Gifts Officer during the fundraising process.

While studies have shown that excellent faculty can impact an alumnus's willingness to make a gift to the institution, there is limited research related to how teaching behaviors affect those who raise philanthropic dollars. Buskist and Keeley (2018) argued that identifying a teaching behavior rather than a quality that can be improved is practical advice to increase a teacher's level of excellence. Realizing that previous research focused on teacher qualities and not behaviors that define excellent teaching, Buskist and colleagues developed an instrument called the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Appendix A) with the initial purpose to evaluate teaching problems and provide improvements for teaching excellence (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Using the TBC instrument to identify qualities of master teachers, researchers have found that faculty prioritize teaching techniques related to behaviors such as being prepared and being a leading communicator and students valued the more social aspects of the relationship describing valued behaviors such as being understanding and encouraging students (Groccia et al., 2018; Kirby et al., 2018). Undergraduate students valued rapport higher than faculty when asked to identify characteristics found in master teachers (Benson et al., 2005). Specifically looking at faculty demographics, Groccia et al. (2018) discovered that both U.S. and foreign-educated faculty "agreed that being knowledgeable about the topic and being enthusiastic about teaching were the

top two qualities of excellent teachers" (p. 86). While there has been research related to master teachers and various faculty groups across disciplines and institution types (Groccia et al., 2018), there appear to be few, if any, studies that explore the behaviors of excellent teachers in a sample of university staff employees. Understanding the potential implications of perceptions of master teachers from those who raise philanthropic support for the institution may be important as academic leaders try to increase that revenue stream.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide insight into how perceptions of master teachers impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. The study compared survey responses by Major Gifts Officers employed at institutions in the Southeastern Conference (SEC). Major gifts fundraisers were compared based on years of experience, alma mater status, enthusiasm for raising faculty support, and willingness to partner with faculty to increase philanthropic dollars. The study seeks to expand the body of knowledge of teaching excellence from non-academic employees who work in higher education and provide insight into the professional relationship between Major Gifts Officers and master teachers. Faculty behaviors experienced by students in the classroom impact not only Major Gifts Officers' enthusiasm for their work but also alumni donors' potential philanthropic commitments. As the need for private support for higher education increases, there is a call for deeper exploration into what influences donors and the MGOs who assist them. In addition, in better understanding the faculty component in the philanthropic process, MGOs can enhance fundraising strategies and programs to ensure an elevated donor experience and increased charitable contributions for the institution.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

5. What Teacher Behavior Checklist qualities do Major Gifts Officers in higher education perceive master teachers demonstrate most?
6. Based on their undergraduate experience with faculty, do these perceptions of teacher behaviors influence Major Gifts Officers to raise funds to support faculty?
7. Based on perceptions of master teachers in their undergraduate experience, does this influence Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process?
8. What similarities or differences exist between Major Gifts Officers' responses and student and faculty responses in prior research of the Teacher Behavior Checklist?

## A History of Fundraising in American Higher Education

Early American philanthropists were key in both creating and perpetuating higher education institutions. Dating back to the time of the American colonies, individual donors and their philanthropy shaped higher education institutions and present-day fundraising strategies. Because of the precarious funding nature of universities in early years, presidents and academic leaders had to be innovative in order to keep the institution in operation, retain teachers and faculty, and enroll students (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Seen as a higher calling similar to a clergyman, faculty were not well compensated and were expected to raise a portion of the funds for their salaries (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). As a matter of survival, the early universities and colleges were open to various forms of financial support.

**Early American Colleges (1636 – 1789)**

A departure from the way that European universities were primarily funded by royal monarchs establishing educational endowments in the 1200s, early American colleges were funded by in-kind gifts such as building supplies, books, and food from multiple sources including individual donors, governmental entities, and church groups (Cohen & Kisker, 2010; Shaker & Borden, 2020). In 1638, Harvard University became the first American institution to receive an endowment from an individual donor when Reverend John Harvard gave outright money and then left his library and half of his estate to the university (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). In recognition of John Harvard's financial support, the institution bestowed upon him the highest donor honor available – naming the university for him (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). The Harvard gifts set the stage for future donors and led to these being recognized as acceptable forms of educational investments. The Harvard gifts also represent one of the first donor recognitions strategies employed by an American college or university. This decision laid the groundwork for future donor recognition opportunities as Yale University soon followed by naming its institution after Elihu Yale "who donated goods that yielded an endowment of around five hundred pounds, a goodly sum at a time when fifty or sixty pounds might support the entire staff for a year" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 50). Specifically, Yale's gift included "proceeds of nine bales of hay, 417 books, and a portrait of King George I" (Drezner, 2011, p.19).

Not all the Colonial Colleges were able to identify one transformational donor and had to engage with many contributors who could give at lower gift levels. As examples, Williams College raised $14,000 and Amherst raised $50,000 from multiple donors making small contributions (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Led by Benjamin Franklin, twenty-five donors committed about four hundred pounds which was pledged per year for the first five years to start

the College of Philadelphia, now the University of Pennsylvania (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Significant to our modern systems today, this was one of the earliest references to a multi-year pledge commitment.

As a way to pay faculty, the endowed professorship concept was initiated in American higher education in the 1700s. An Englishman, Thomas Hollis, established the first American endowed professorship, the Hollis Endowed Professorship in Divinity, at Harvard University in 1721 (Shaker & Borden, 2020). Following, Yale University was able to fund a faculty member through an endowed professorship. Starting in 1746, "trustees had been accumulating an endowment fund for a professor of divinity" (Perkin, 2007, p. 57). This foresight in identifying potential donors to support faculty alleviated that particular cost from the other necessary required resources for the school.

In *The Harvard Charter* (1650) the university set forth to protect donors' interests and gift designations by establishing how such private investments could be used. The charter allowed for college leadership to conduct meetings "concerning the profits and revenues of any lands and disposing of their goods… and provided that all the said disposings be according to the will of the donors" (Perkin, 2007, p. 127). This was significant because it is an early example of what would become part of the modern-day Donor Bill of Rights (Appendix B). Almost taken verbatim from *The Harvard Charter*, number four in the Donor Bill of Rights states that donors are "to be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given" (Council for Advancement and Support of Education).

***Emergent Nation Era (1790 – 1869)***

College leadership during the Emergent Nation era determined that alumni engagement with the president, faculty, and each other would create cultivation opportunities that might yield

future financial support for the institution. Yale formed a Society of Alumni in 1828, "which contributed $100,000 over the next few years" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 95). In addition to philanthropic asks made by faculty members, private donations were most likely to be solicited by the college president who often was hired because of his charismatic ability to raise funds (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

During the Emergent Nation era, fundraising started being organized in what are now called campaigns. Princeton started a major fundraising campaign in the 1830s with the top donor contributing $5,000 while Columbia secured $20,000 from a contributor (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Some supporters gave farm produce to feed students and others gave library books (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Gifts of real estate from individuals were added as a donation type during this era whereby land was sold and the resulting cash was used to fund the school.

**University Transformation Era (1870 – 1944)**

Philanthropic support continued to increase during the University Transformation era with each individual transformational gift to a university becoming larger than the previous. Naming universities in honor of a significant donor's contribution became a standard recognition practice. As examples to both points, these were significant contributions that resulted in a university naming: Ezra Cornell's gift - $500,000; the Vanderbilt gift - $1 million; Johns Hopkins's gift - $3.5 million; and the Stanford estate gift - $20 million (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Additionally, entities such as "Duke, Clark, Carnegie, Stetson, Vassar, Spelman, and Mellon, either personally or through testaments or foundations, also contributed substantially to the institutions that bear their names" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 171). Gifts at lower, though substantial, levels were recognized with buildings or rooms named in honor of the benefactor.

During the University Transformation era, wealth increased, endowments grew, and building projects boomed (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Accepting restricted gifts from individuals continued to increase during this time as alumni wanted to support their university in a variety of ways. The power of collective alumni emerged when Harvard's class of 1881 created a pooled gift of $113,377 in 1906 (Drezner, 2011). However, widespread solicitation of alumni did not gain popularity until after World War I (Drezner, 2011). In the 1920s, donors expanded their contribution designations at institutions by increasing their gifts for building projects, program support, and current operations (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). This caused a decrease in gifts directed to university endowments. While designated gifts were essential, general funds were critical for a university's operations.

During the University Transformation era, attitudes towards who should attend college started to shift. Creating an elevated society, people began acknowledging that "worthy students from less-wealthy families should not be barred and that students from wealthy families should attend because the country benefited when poor and rich people alike became enlightened" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 170). As private donations continued to help some of the colleges and universities survive in early years, a variety of funds helped provide support for students. Societal expectations for who should attend college coupled with institutions' need for increased student enrollment created a situation in which a plan was needed to attract an additional student segment type. While student scholarship support was not prevalent in the early years of American higher education, the need for increased enrollment in the 1870s and 1880s called for institutions to provide incentives for students to attend (Perkin, 2007). Initially funded by the institutions themselves, student support became a recognized need in which donors could participate.

Expanded student access to higher education provided another gift type opportunity in 1900. The push for coeducation at the University of Rochester led to a fundraising challenge for interested female students. Women could attend if they raised "100,000 to pay for additional faculty and classroom space and imposed a two-year deadline for raising those funds" (Perkin, 2007, p. 479). Even though the goal was reduced to $50,000, the women were short $8,000. Susan B. Anthony sought pledges and eventually committed a $2,000 life insurance policy (Perkin, 2007). When the University of Rochester accepted this gift as a commitment towards the fundraising goal, a new gift type was born.

**Mass Higher Education Era (1945 – 1975)**

The time period from 1945 to 1975 has been described as the golden age of higher education. During the Mass Higher Education era, student access and enrollment expanded, and faculty salaries increased. The role of the president shifted from one of academic oversight to bureaucracy management. Because state and federal funding for higher education research and student support increased sharply during this time, the proportion of gifts and endowment earnings as part of total revenue declined for private institutions from 23% to 19% and remained a steady 3% of the total for public institutions (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Partly due to changes in tax laws, philanthropic support from individuals and organizations increased tenfold during this era with gifts from corporations and foundations showing noteworthy growth (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Private institutions revived campaigns during this time with Harvard announcing a $82 million fundraising initiative and Stanford creating a $100 million campaign (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

**Consolidation Era (1976 – 1993)**

The Consolidation era was marked by decreased funding from federal and state governments. Federal funds as a percentage of total revenue fell from 16% in 1975 – 1976 to 12% in 1992 – 1993 with state funding falling from 31% to 24% during that same time period (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Because state funding did not keep pace with rising enrollments, students felt the financial impact through an increase in tuition coupled by a shift of federal aid from grants to loans. Dollars associated with philanthropic support remained steady as a proportion of total revenue with endowment earnings as a consistent 2% and gifts increasing slightly from 5% in 1975 – 1976 to 6% in 1992 – 1993 (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Philanthropic gifts from foundations and corporations were restricted for specific purposes and discretionary gifts declined (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

**Modern Era - Fundraising and Development Offices (1994 - present)**

During the Modern era, fundraising became more professionalized with the chief development officer positioned among the university's senior administration (Drezner, 2011). Fundraising strategies shifted from the responsibility of the university president in early American institutions to professional fundraisers or Major Gifts Officers in the Modern era (Shaker & Borden, 2020). Higher education fundraising became an administrative investment that has grown and expanded in recent decades with research showing that larger staff sizes, increased solicitations, and expanded resources for fundraising and alumni engagement resulted in enhanced alumni giving (Shaker & Borden, 2020). Regarding structure, Development Offices or Advancement Offices are categorized as either centralized, decentralized, or a hybrid model (Drezner, 2011).

Generally, there are four gift designation allocations or "buckets" that higher education donations are categorized: student support (fellowships and scholarships); faculty support (professorships and chairs); facility support (new buildings and renovation for capital projects); and program support (athletics, internships, library resources, study abroad, university priorities, etc.). Gifts are categorized as either unrestricted giving, utilized for the institution's greatest needs or as restricted giving with the use designated by the donor (Drezner, 2011). Endowment gifts are designed to last in perpetuity and often are designated for student scholarships or for faculty support through endowed professorships or chairs (Drezner, 2011). In the Modern era, donors shifted interest towards supporting students with financial need, expanding technology, and faculty research (Shaker & Borden, 2020). In addition, trends indicated that donors began giving more gifts for restricted purposes and less for institutional unrestricted gifts (Shaker & Borden, 2020).

While there continue to be multiple sources of financial support for American colleges and universities, it is evident that individual donors significantly impacted our higher education institutions. Through philanthropic passion and institution loyalty, individuals have chosen to support universities through a variety of gift designations and gift types. Ever in survival or growth mode, universities have been flexible in their acceptance of various gifts.

## Major Gifts Officer Profile

Because of the increasing need of private support, higher education institutions moved to employing professional fundraisers in order to maximize that revenue stream. By choosing to fundraise for a college or university versus a non-profit organization, Major Gifts Officers possess a commitment to the mission of higher education. Having an undergraduate degree is a

hiring requirement for frontline fundraisers working in higher education. Thus, MGOs have experience with faculty in the classroom prior to beginning their role.

Elder (2010) found that fundraisers enjoy inspiring investors to partner with faculty and administrative leaders in achieving a compelling vision for the university. Major Gifts Officers are motivated by doing meaningful work and by having passion for advancing higher education (Farwell et al., 2020). In addition, MGOs are self-motivated and respond well to having their work measured and valued (Elder, 2010; Farwell et al., 2020). When asked to identify qualities and skills of outstanding fundraisers, Jones and Castillo (2017) found that Major Gifts Officers identified having integrity, belief in the mission, being organized, having excellent communication skills, and being knowledgeable about fundraising techniques were keys to success.

Jones and Castillo (2017) found that fundraising was not an obvious career choice for many current MGOs, and much is still unknown about the ways in which fundraisers find this career path. Much like a teacher or faculty member, fundraising can be seen as a professional "calling". While philanthropy and non-profit degree programs are on the rise, frontline fundraisers come from a variety of undergraduate majors. Exploring how MGOs working in higher education are influenced by master teachers during their undergraduate careers may aid in understanding their willingness to raise funds for faculty support and their level of enthusiasm to partner with faculty during the fundraising process. Strengthening relationships between faculty and MGOs creates opportunities for increased philanthropic support for the institution.

### Fundraising Theoretical Frameworks – Donors' Engagement and Motivation

While Major Gifts Officers, university leaders, and faculty have roles in the philanthropic process, donors who choose to give to an institution have unique reasons for their engagement

and participation. Drezner (2011) referenced several fundraising theoretical frameworks from economics, psychology, and sociology to explain donors' motivations for giving. As one example, the identification model theory explains that "a donor's experiences lead to his or her personal moral ideology, which affects participation in an organization based on belief in the group's mission" (Drezner, 2011, p. 50). Drezner (2011) referenced that "increased student involvement in institutional activities positively affected alumni giving" (p. 56). Relationship marketing theory describes the strategy of creating and maintaining relationships with alumni and individuals to sustain their engagement and contributions to the organization (Drezner, 2011). Especially related to large leadership gifts, MGOs forming authentic relationships with donors is key to lifetime engagement and giving to the institution (Drezner, 2011).

Organizational identification theory explains that alumni are more likely to make contributions to the institution when there was a positive experience with a mentor and overall satisfaction with the student experience (Drezner, 2011). Mael and Ashforth's (1992) Model for Organization Identification exhibited that having an excellent relationship with an academic mentor can provide motivation for a donor to contribute to their alma mater (Drezner, 2011). Drezner (2011) referenced research that found that "some donors gave to their undergraduate institution in appreciation of a faculty mentor" (p. 61). In addition, alumni who participated in internships and visited with faculty outside the classroom were more likely to make a philanthropic gift to the institution. The importance of positive learning and interaction experiences with faculty as it relates to philanthropic giving can be associated with the accessible, approachable, encourages, and rapport behaviors in the Teacher Behavior Checklist.

Philanthropic behaviors are related to learning theories and have crossover with how knowledge is gained in the college classroom. Drezner (2011) referenced that giving behaviors

result from three types of learning: (1) modeling, which includes observing actions of others, (2) cognitive learning, which involves contemplation and discussions, and (3) experiential learning, which includes participating in the act. While one theory does not capture all aspects of philanthropic behavior, the combination of several theories informs fundraising strategy approaches utilized by Major Gifts Officers. Donors may choose to make gifts because they are engaged with people at the institution, observe others' philanthropic habits, and experience opportunities in which they can impact the organization (Drezner, 2011). Theoretical frameworks applied to understanding fundraising are closely tied to learning theories in that the act of philanthropy is social, cognitive, experiential, and modeled (Drezner, 2011).

## Learning Theories and College Teaching

The experience in the classroom is significant both while the student is a current undergraduate and when he or she becomes an alumnus or an alumna. The memories of those college faculty are long-term and important. As Mael and Ashforth's (1992) Model for Organization Identification exhibited, when alumni had a positive student experience at the institution and had an academic mentor, the likelihood of a philanthropic gift to the alma mater increased (Drezner, 2011). Part of the student experience occurs in the classroom with faculty. Research has been conducted on how students learn and how college faculty can teach students effectively (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Groccia, 2012; Groccia, Ismail, & Chaudhury, 2014; Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin, 2014; Kenner & Weinerman, 2011). Before college faculty can further develop their teaching, one must first consider how people learn. Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) reviewed six learning theories that inform how faculty teach in higher education institutions in the United States: behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, humanism, transformational learning, and andragogy. Related to college teaching and learning, Chickering

and Gamson (1987) found seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education: meaningful engagement between students and faculty, collaboration among students, active learning opportunities, relevant and prompt feedback, time focused on task, elevated expectations for performance, and understanding diverse ways of learning. These principles inform how faculty can best engage college students in the learning process and align with evidence-based teaching (EBT) processes and outcomes (Buskist & Groccia, 2011). All EBT opportunities involve active learning and contribute to increased student engagement, maximized student learning, and elevated critical thinking skills (Buskist & Groccia, 2011).

Theories combined with a model inform teaching approaches for learning outcomes. Groccia (2012) referenced and built on Lowman's Two-Dimensional Conceptualization of Effective College Teaching model which focused on the teacher creating intellectual excitement in the classroom and developing rapport with students. Groccia's Model for Understanding Teaching and Learning begins with learning outcomes as the foundation for creating content and delivery methods (Groccia, 2012). Groccia's (2012) research illustrated that self-awareness is key as faculty plan for ways to engage students in the learning process and explore the various learning needs of students in a class. The instructional process includes the teacher, student, learning process and context, and the course content (Groccia, 2012).

Understanding adult learning is complex and relies on many theories. The father of adult education, Malcolm Knowles, created a learner-focused approach for helping adults learn that acknowledges life experiences as part of the learning process (Halx, 2010). The term andragogy was developed to explore the distinct characteristics of adult learners and the need to focus on the learning *process* in addition to the content (Kenner & Weinerman, 2011; Reynolds et al., 2013). A student's self-awareness is a key element in developing critical thinking skills and is

an important element of understanding adult learning (Halx, 2010). Explaining adult learning strategies, Kenner and Weinerman (2011) utilized previous research regarding three theories: tacit theory, informal theory, and formal theory. The tacit theory framed that adults "gain metacognitive skills from peers, teachers, and the local culture" (Kenner & Weinerman, 2011, p. 89). Learning is not separated from cultural practices and context. Informal theory describes that adults gain skills through workplace experiences while formal theory occurs when new knowledge is created through academic proficiency (Kenner & Weinerman, 2011). In researching non-traditional college students, Kenner and Weinerman (2011) referenced the four principles that Knowles developed as characteristics of adult learners: (1) They are self-directed; (2) Their experience is part of their identity; (3) They are ready to learn; and (4) They are task motivated. In addition, Kenner and Weinerman (2011) referenced that the "adult learner is also likely to desire a greater sense of cooperation between the student and teacher as they proceed through the educational process" (p. 89). Applying adult learning strategies emphasizes the development of critical thinking skills (Halx, 2010).

Theories, models, and research have informed the following conclusions: (1) Learning is a social, community endeavor; (2) Learning is influenced by both student and teacher expectations; (3) Information has to be processed and practiced; (4) Feedback facilitates learning; (5) Each person's learning process is individual and different; (6) Emotions play a vital role in learning. Understanding these learning principles and applying appropriate content delivery methods to undergird these conclusions can assist faculty in developing their teaching which increases the student learning experience. In addition, improved teaching positively impacts future alumni engagement and partnership opportunities with fundraisers.

**Learning Is a Social, Community Endeavor**

Providing historical context to the value of interactive group learning, Groccia, Ismail, and Chaudhury (2014) pointed to "the writings of John Dewey (1963) who suggested that education should be viewed as a social enterprise in which all individuals have opportunities to contribute and to which all feel a responsibility" (p. 94). Meaning, both students and teachers have responsibilities and are sources in the learning process. In researching learning communities, Hesse and Mason (2005) highlighted that "knowledge is constructed by humans through social interaction" (p. 30) and that students learn when they have meaningful connections through conversations and group work. People have a need to belong, and this is no different in the learning process. In researching student belonging and engagement, Masika and Jones (2016) highlighted Wenger's social theory of learning which includes active participation and practice with others as the foundation for learning. Working with others and talking through concepts creates relationships in the students' communities and fosters a sense of belonging (Masika & Jones, 2016). Additionally, Masika and Jones (2016) found that group work with shared goals and students forming self-supporting groups, either in person or online, led to increased confidence and feelings of belonging to the course. Learning communities were developed based on the belief that learning is a social process augmented by quality relationships with others (Hesse & Mason, 2005). Increased student collaboration, learning partnerships, interactive group learning, and belonging to a peer community augment learning outcomes and student success (Groccia, Ismail, & Chaudhury, 2014; Halx, 2010; Hesse & Mason, 2005; Masika & Jones, 2016).

Research has shown that collaborative learning is vital and includes intentional sharing between students and faculty (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Halx, 2010). As an example, Halx

(2010) explained that reflection type activities allow students and faculty to connect. Hesse and Mason (2005) shared that developing pedagogical approaches that rely on social interaction such as collaborative learning, problem-based learning, and service learning can assist faculty in improving their methodologies and teaching skills and can further connect them with their peers. Additionally, Groccia, Ismail, & Chaudhury (2014) referenced case-based learning (CBL) as an active and social strategy that engages students and teachers as each teaches by working through the problem.

**Learning Is Influenced by Both Student and Teacher Expectations**

Chickering and Gamson (1987) found that setting high expectations for both faculty and students results in better performance. Halx (2010) shared that if undergraduates experience adult learning techniques, they can rise to those high expectations. Buskist (2004) found that excellent teachers communicate high standards and expectations to students while providing support and encouragement. Self-efficacy informs our attitudes, behaviors, and performance. Henritius et al. (2019) pointed out that as technology advances, students expect universities and faculty to offer more flexibility and individualized learning plans. Especially for first-year students, Hendry and Jukic (2014) asserted that interactively explaining expectations prior to an assignment is key to students understanding the learning and assessment processes. Christie et al. (2008) presented evidence that a lack of clear expectations can negatively impact students' learning experiences. Quinlan (2016) proposed that being clear about high expectations for students and believing that students can achieve strengthen the teacher-student trust relationship. Further, Hendry and Jukic (2014) referenced that if teachers assess beyond what students are expected to learn, the student-teacher relationship can be harmed.

Quinlan (2016) suggested that students' expectations of learning outcomes and the value they place on the importance of those goals impact their motivation. In addition to explaining expectations, Hendry and Jukic (2014) found that students gained a greater understanding of expectations when teachers showed them how they graded an exemplar assignment. Through this participatory grading process, the student received visual and auditory queues that allowed them to construct knowledge around what comprised an excellent assignment answer.

**Information Has to be Processed and Practiced**

Learning is not completed just by listening to new information. Groccia (2012) described that cognitive learning theory allows for students to construct knowledge through hands-on experiences and discussions. Learning builds on previous knowledge and experiences and involves "doing". Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin (2014) referenced that a tenet of behaviorism theory suggests that people learn when they practice and engage in learning tasks. Wanner (2015) extended the notion that active engagement and student learning are critical for "effective and meaningful learning and achieving many academic and other outcomes such as better critical thinking skills" (p. 155). Liu and Olson (2011) concluded that experiential learning opportunities like client-based projects increase students' learning and motivation by allowing them to practice concepts in a safe space.

Wanner (2015) illustrated a Just-in-Time Teaching application by having students prepare a PowerPoint slideshow based on questions related to the course content prior to the class meeting. Reviewing the students' PowerPoint presentations allowed the instructor to determine levels of understanding and empowered students since they were directing their learning (Wanner, 2015). This evidence-based teaching exercise allowed students to process the information and was positive for their learning (Wanner, 2015). Another active learning activity

that allows students to practice concepts and enhance understanding is through role-play. Rao and Stupans (2012) described that role-play increases students' listening skills and problem-solving abilities which contributes to cognitive learning.

Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) summarized that constructivist learning theory is based on practice and problem solving. Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) referenced that projects that utilize solving real-world problems increase student motivation. Rao and Stupans (2012) referenced Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) which is built on providing students with hands-on experiences so that they can practice concepts learned in class. Examples of experiential learning include case studies, service learning, internships, and consulting projects (Rao & Stupans, 2012). Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) presented another constructivist application for the classroom that includes reflective writing which underscores the importance of processing information for greater understanding. As part of the experiential learning process, reflecting on the activities and connecting those with learning outcomes is a crucial aspect for student development (Liu & Olson, 2011).

**Feedback Facilitates Learning**

Wanner and Palmer (2018) shared that assessment and feedback are primary motivators for student learning. Feedback comes from a variety of sources which include faculty, peers, family members, and external project partners. Research has shown that assessment feedback particularly is helpful in shaping independent learning for first-year students entering college (Crimmins et al., 2016; Dowden et al., 2013). However, studies have indicated that students who are early in their academic careers may not fully understand the feedback process and may need positive encouragement so they appropriately can process the assessment (Dowden et al., 2013; Ryan & Henderson, 2018).

Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) communicated that people best learn when they know if their efforts were correct or incorrect. Chickering and Gamson (1987) shared that prompt feedback focuses learning by giving students suggestions for improvement. Using a consulting project as a teaching method, Liu and Olson (2011) found that students appreciated immediate assessment from executives regarding project recommendations and shared that the external feedback was an important component in their learning and professional development. Dowden et al. (2013) conveyed that students want personalized feedback and desire that it be "specific and timely, that supportive feedback eases first-year student's transition to university" (p. 351). Dowden et al. (2013) found that as students were working through assignments, they appreciated being able to refer to a rubric so they could assess their work prior to sharing with the teacher.

Feedback is not limited to a one-way transmission from faculty to student. With a shift towards a more learner-centered environment and as content delivery options become more flexible, the use of self-assessment and peer-assessment has gained popularity (Wanner & Palmer, 2018). Self-assessment allows students to reflect on their work and identify areas for improvement while peer-assessment provides an opportunity for students to help and learn from each other (Wanner & Palmer, 2018). Wanner and Palmer (2018) shared that there is momentum for moving away from "assessment *of* learning (summative assessment), not only towards assessment *for* learning (formative assessment), but also assessment *as* learning" (p. 1033) which allows for students to be more participatory in the process. Wanner and Palmer (2018) found evidence that self-assessment and peer-assessment help students develop critical and reflective skills and accept additional responsibility for their learning. These critical skills are important as students participate in life-long learning after graduation.

Crimmins et al. (2016) demonstrated that written, reflective, and dialogic feedback (WRDF) enhanced the learning process while improving the teacher-student relationship. While time intensive, the (WRDF) model provides for written feedback, student reflection activities, and two-way discussion combined with active learning opportunities (Crimmins et al., 2016). These strategies lead to increased engagement and rapport between faculty and students which in turn positively impact learning. Dowden et al. (2013) and Ryan and Henderson (2018) found that feedback was best received when the student perceived that the instructor provided a supportive learning environment and when there was a positive relationship established.

**Each Person's Learning Process is Individual and Different**

Chickering and Gamson (1987) shared that there are many paths for learning and that students have diverse styles for processing information. Students come to the learning environment having different backgrounds, experiences, abilities, and learning styles. Steinbach (1993) developed a quiz that provides insights for students to understand their preferred learning style as visual, auditory, or kinesthetic. The purpose of such assessments is to maximize learner's strengths and minimize weaknesses. Kenner and Weinerman (2011) indicated framing that an activity or assignment can be adapted to different learning styles assists adult learners in self-directing their participation process. Developing creative assignments that allow students to connect with the material through individual approaches reinforces learning outcomes and deepens student engagement (Reynolds et al., 2013).

In reviewing learning theories, Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) shared that teachers should provide alternative delivery methods since students learn in different ways. Because people learn in different ways, teachers can design multiple learning opportunities with varied delivery methods utilizing several sensory modalities. Active learning techniques allow

students to engage in activities which develop their skills and enhance higher order thinking (Cook & Babon, 2017). Regardless of learning style, Cook and Babon (2017) found that weekly online quizzes, an active learning technique, enhanced engagement and increased understanding by helping students stay on track with the material giving even the most introverted students the avenue to participate with the content. This use of technology allowed for increased communication and feedback for student-directed learning. While the primary goal of active learning is to increase student comprehension, Cook and Babon (2017) added that having students who are engaged and participatory in the classroom is a benefit for faculty, providing a much needed boost in academic activities.

**Emotions Play a Vital Role in Learning**

Emotions play an important role in college teaching, learning, and student development. While previous research regarding emotions and higher education has been limited, there is an increased interest in exploring these learning theories (Postareff et al., 2017; Quinlan, 2016). Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin (2014) referenced that the humanistic learning theory focuses on students' needs and emotions with the teacher providing a safe learning environment that promotes independence and self-acceptance. Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin (2014) further explained that the humanistic learning approach spotlights the importance of the teacher-student relationship in the learning process. Quinlan's (2016) research supported four relationship types that involve emotions and learning: (1) a college student's relationship with the subject, (2) the teacher-student relationship, (3) students' relationships with other students, and (4) students' relationships with themselves. Quinlan (2016) concluded that when appropriately cultivated, these relationships can produce positive emotions and strengthen student learning. Postareff et al. (2017) pointed out that positive emotions have an impact on

learning strategies and achieving learning goals. Research has indicated that excitement and enjoyment regarding a subject can lead to deeper learning and increased self-efficacy for the student (Buskist, 2004; Quinlan, 2016). Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin (2014) explained that for the humanistic learning approach, faculty create a supportive atmosphere to encourage collaboration while reducing competition among students. Buskist (2004) suggested that demonstrating care and concern for students strengthens the partnership in the learning process.

Dowden et al. (2013) shared that emotions are related to learning and are impacted by students' perceptions of instructor feedback. Ryan and Henderson (2018) referenced that critical comments from faculty or authority figures can lead to a negative emotional response towards learning and diminish student motivation. Postareff et al. (2017) referenced that negative emotions can have a negative impact on self-regulation, performance, and learning. Quinlan (2016) connected emotions to learning because "education is relational, and emotions are central to relationships" (p. 102).

Emotions are crucial to the transformative learning approach. Researchers have explained that transformative learning theory builds on a student's disorienting emotional response to unanticipated events that leads to changes his/her worldview and an awareness that there is an opportunity to transform society (Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin, 2014; Quinlan, 2016). Groccia, Nickson, Wang, and Hardin (2014) referenced the work of both Jack Mezirow and Paolo Freire in transformative learning which requires both deep personal reflection, consciousness-raising, and a strong student-teacher relationship to guide this process. Previous studies have indicated that students' emotions and feelings can impact how they act or perform (Dowden et al., 2013; Postareff et al., 2017; Quinlan, 2016).

Learning theories and fundraising process have similarities. Inviting alumni and others to philanthropically engage in furthering the institution's mission is social and a community endeavor that involves faculty and Major Gifts Officers. As learning is influenced by both student and teacher expectations, there are shared expectations between the donor, faculty, and fundraiser regarding the gift's impact on the university. Each alumnus or donor has a unique experience that shapes the engagement and the gift with the emotional connection to the institution or university employee as key to the process. Much like the student learning process, fundraising partnerships require honest feedback and communication and an intentional focus on the relationship.

## Defining Teaching Excellence and Effectiveness

Calls for better prepared graduates and increased teaching effectiveness have created opportunities to improve the higher education student experience (Groccia & Buskist, 2011). Campbell et al. (2004) referenced that teaching effectiveness is exemplified by values and a framework of "an ethic of care, an ethic of competence, and an ethic of professional commitment" (p. 455). Henklain et al. (2019) shared that effective teaching occurs when the content that students learn in the classroom allows them to solve future problems outside of the classroom. Buskist and Groccia (2011) posited that active learning techniques in evidence-based teaching (EBT) contribute to effective teaching, improved student learning, and increased critical thinking skills. Buskist and Groccia (2011) shared that excellent teaching is comprised of the joy of learning and elevated levels of student learning. A component of teaching excellence involves faculty who "have mastered the subject knowledge" (Gurung et al., 2018, p. 14). Young and Shaw (1999) found that excellent and effective teachers respected students, were concerned for student learning, and demonstrated the value of that course. Campbell et al. (2004) suggested

that teaching effectiveness includes creating opportunities for independent learning and providing a classroom environment for inclusiveness.

In the Young and Shaw (1999) study, the authors referenced that effective teachers were viewed as "knowledgeable about subject matter, were organized and prepared for class, and demonstrated enthusiasm" (p. 674). In contrast, students described teachers as ineffective when "assignments are unclear, lectures are disorganized, and tests require memorization of definitions and a myriad of specific facts" (McKeachie, 1997, p. 1221). Young and Shaw (1999) explained that students' ratings of teachers correlated with faculty personality traits. Those instructors who were rated as charismatic and expressive received higher reviews for teacher effectiveness (Young & Shaw, 1999). Moore and Kuol (2007) referenced that the ability and willingness to communicate positively correlated with teaching effectiveness. In a study that included alumni feedback, Yair (2008) found that former students identified an excellent teacher as one who had passion, enthusiasm, integrity, and creativity. Moore and Kuol (2007) conducted research with recent graduates and found that alumni appreciated and remembered the student-focused aspects of the experience versus the subject-focused teaching techniques of effective teachers.

## History of the Study of Excellence in College and University Teaching

Comprehending how master teachers impact fundraising activities involves understanding learning processes and how faculty approach teaching strategies in the classroom. As college faculty balance the three areas of teaching, research, and outreach, studies have been conducted to determine how excellence in college and university teaching is defined (Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Campbell et al., 2004; Gurung et al., 2018; Keeley et al., 2006; Kirby et al., 2018; McKeachie, 1997; Young & Shaw, 1999). McKeachie (1997) pointed out that because students are the ones most impacted by teaching quality, research regarding teaching excellence will

continue to be important. Through the years, master teachers have been recognized as winners of teaching awards, through faculty surveys, and from interviews (Gurung et al., 2018). Buskist et al. (2002) referenced a study of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) professor award winners and found those master teachers were organized, had high expectations, offered office hours, and explained clear grading standards. Keeley et al. (2006) cited research that found that master teachers were identified through analysis of student evaluations, empirical studies, and through reflective writing of other excellent teachers. In addition, Gurung et al. (2018) referenced research regarding anecdotal information that showed that taking risks, displaying a positive attitude, and listening to students were aligned with descriptions of master teachers. Buskist et al. (2002) found that master teachers are able to: (1) inspire students to learn; (2) assist students in learning the material; (3) show students that learning is interesting; and (4) infuse joy in the learning process. Kirby et al. (2018) referenced Loman's work which described excellence in college teaching as being categorized in two ways: "teachers' technical skills and their personality and communication skills" (p. 21). Gurung et al. (2018) explained that there are many books that describe how to be an excellent teacher through effective course design, syllabus creation, and teaching methods.

As researchers have worked to understand excellence in college and university teaching, different models have emerged. To better understand what defines a master teacher, Buskist et al. (2002) developed the 28-item Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) to identify the desired characteristics and associated behaviors that resonate with students and faculty. The TBC was designed to give faculty a roadmap on how to become a master teacher by building on behavioral strengths and focusing on improving areas of weakness. Keeley et al. (2006) further defined the TBC as having two dimensions of behaviors: caring and supportive actions and professional

competency and classroom skills. Combining opportunities for improving both technical teaching expertise and relationship building behaviors, the TBC has been found to be an effective tool for improving college teaching (Buskist et al., 2002).

As an additional example, in 2011, a task force developed the Model Teaching Competencies (MTC) which identified six criteria of teaching excellence: training, syllabi, instructional methods, course content, assessment process, and students' evaluation of teaching (Gurung et al., 2018). All six components for excellent teaching found in the Model Teaching Competencies "significantly correlated with the Teacher Behavior Checklist" (Gurung et al., 2018, p. 15). In particular, training and subject knowledge from the MTC correlated with the TBC's items of being knowledgeable and mastering a topic (Gurung et al., 2018). While the Model Teaching Competencies included elements of the teaching process, it did not capture the key observable behaviors of excellent teachers as found in the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Gurung et al., 2018).

## Evolution of the Teacher Behavior Checklist

Building on previous research as explained by Gurung et al. (2018), Kirby et al. (2018) described the history of the Teacher Behavior Checklist. In sharing the origin of the Teacher Behavior Checklist, Buskist and Keeley (2018) found that while there was literature associated with descriptions of teaching excellence, there was not extensive research that showed behaviors and characteristics of master teachers and associated behaviors for developing teaching. In order to identify and provide guidance for how to become a master teacher, Buskist and colleagues developed the Teacher Behavior Checklist in 2002 (Buskist et al., 2002; Keeley et al., 2006). As an initial step, Buskist asked undergraduate students to each list three qualities of master teachers which resulted in forty-seven qualities (Kirby et al., 2018). Then, asking other students to

review and provide feedback to that list, researchers requested that those undergraduates describe behaviors associated with those qualities which were compiled to the list of twenty-eight behaviors comprising the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Appendix A) (Buskist et al., 2002; Kirby et al., 2018). Administering the TBC to a new sample of psychology undergraduate students and additional faculty, Buskist et al. (2002) found the two groups "agreed on six of the Top 10 qualities: being knowledgeable, being enthusiastic, being respectful, having realistic expectations, being approachable and personable, and being creative and interesting" (Kirby et al., 2018, p. 22). While there was agreement on six items, faculty emphasized behaviors associated with teaching techniques and students highlighted behaviors related to the learner-teacher relationship (Buskist et al., 2002). This iterative process and early results created the findings through which other researchers have replicated their TBC studies.

Buskist and Keely (2018) referenced the original purpose of the development of the Teacher Behavior Checklist instrument was to teach others to teach well. McKeachie (1997) pointed out that reviewing ratings of specific behaviors with faculty versus general characteristics resulted in greater improvement in teaching. By identifying behaviors of excellent teachers, measuring the extent of how teachers were behaving in the classroom, and then providing guidance on how to improve someone's teaching were the hallmarks of the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Keeley et al., 2006, Kirby et al., 2018).

**Teacher Behavior Checklist Ratings, Reliability, and Validity**

As part of its evolution, Keeley et al. (2006) utilized the TBC as a teaching assessment tool. Adding instructions and a Likert scale to capture ratings, the Teacher Behavior Checklist became a more effective instrument to evaluate teaching (Kirby et al., 2018). The original Likert scale ratings ranged "from 1 = *My teacher always exhibits/has exhibited these behaviors*

*reflective of this quality* to 5 = *My teacher never exhibits/has never exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality*" (Kirby et al., 2018, p. 22).

Keeley et al. (2010) confirmed that the Teacher Behavior Checklist "differentiated students' perceptions of their teachers, with better teachers receiving higher ratings" (p. 19). Using the generalizability theory, Keeley et al. (2010) found that "individual differences among students and their use of the items had little effect on the overall variability of TBC ratings" (p. 18-19). Henklain et al. (2019) underscored content validity of the TBC and referenced that even though there are cultural differences among research participants, the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers have been accepted internationally. Keeley et al. (2006) referenced that the Teacher Behavior Checklist has been found to have "excellent construct validity and reliability, underscoring its potential as a tool for assessing teaching" (p. 84). In particular in the study, Keeley et al. (2006) found that the Teacher Behavior Checklist was psychometrically sound with high internal reliability and test-retest reliability.

Keeley et al., (2016) referenced that the TBC instrument has been found to have "good internal consistency, ($\alpha$s = .90 to .95; Keeley et al., 2006), test-retest reliability (*r*s = .68 to .72; Keeley et al., 2006), and interrater reliability (ICCs = .68 to .91)" (p. 176). Using the individual scores for the 28 behaviors and the scores from the three scales, a teacher's strengths and weaknesses were pinpointed as a path for improvement (Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Gurung et al., 2018; Keeley et al., 2006). Keeley et al. (2006) suggested that teachers utilize the lower ratings of the individual items in order to identify which classroom behaviors they need to improve. Keeley et al. (2006) advocated that because there are not normative scores from the data, teachers can use the ratings to improve their teaching and can "compare their performance relative to themselves" (p. 90).

## Characteristics of Master Teachers

Henklain et al. (2019) pointed out that studies of the Teacher Behavior Checklist have interchangeably utilized various terms such as “excellent teacher”, “good teacher”, and “master teacher” to describe an effective teacher. Keeley et al. (2006) referenced that master teachers can be described as passionate, well prepared, creative, and approachable. Keeley et al. (2016) found that excellent teachers place enthusiasm as the most important quality of a master teacher. During the process of developing the TBC, Buskist et al. (2002) illustrated that master teachers have passion and enthusiasm for the subject and for teaching. From one study, Gurung et al. (2018) stated that master teachers possessed similar traits including being “enthusiastic, sociable and friendly, organized, conscientious, and optimistic” (p. 12). Kirby et al. (2018) stated the definition of a master teacher “as a teacher from whom students have learned much and enjoyed the learning process” (p. 21). Buskist (2004) shared principles of effective teaching and characteristics of master teachers which included: focusing on critical thinking, having current content, being enthusiastic, making learning fun, showing care and concern for students, taking risks, testing for learning, and establishing high expectations.

Master teachers were described as displaying a love of the subject matter and utilizing active-learning techniques (Gurung et al., 2018). Not only experts in the subject, it has been found that master teachers employ various instructional methods and skills including interteaching, collaborative learning, developing student-teacher rapport, listening, and technological expertise (Gurung et al., 2018). Kirby et al. (2018) referenced studies that found that faculty who had a detailed syllabus, designed a learner-oriented syllabus, and organized small student groups for learning opportunities were perceived as being excellent teachers by scoring higher on the Teacher Behavior Checklist behaviors. Gurung et al. (2018) wrote that

master teachers possessed the ability to inspire and allocated time for their students. Benson et al. (2005) pointed out that master teachers create a learning environment and caring atmosphere by showing concern, smiling, and knowing students' names. McKeachie (1997) referenced that when students believe that teachers care, they tended to give faculty higher ratings.

**Importance of Rapport**

Campbell et al. (2004) found that in order to have effective teaching, there must be respect and rapport between the student and the teacher. In one study, Benson et al. (2005) referenced definitions of rapport as "a relationship, especially one of mutual trust or emotional affinity" and "a relation; connection; an especially harmonious or sympathetic relation" (p. 237). In another study, rapport was defined as positive faculty interaction with students which increased their intellectual excitement and enjoyment of the course, motivating them to explore additional independent learning (Keeley et al., 2006). An important component of effective teaching, Wilson et al. (2010) confirmed that rapport is related to student learning with positive outcomes such as attentiveness and increased class attendance. Keeley et al. (2016) found that award-winning teachers placed rapport higher than faculty in previous studies which suggests that excellent teachers place more importance on cultivating relationships with students. Buskist et al. (2002) found that rapport builds trust between the teacher and the student which leads to approachability and a comfortable learning environment.

Benson et al. (2005) studied students who self-reported having rapport with teachers and compared those with students who did not experience rapport. Benson et al. (2005) explored results from a study that found that 42% of students placed rapport in the top 10 qualities of master teaching while only 7% of faculty members listed this attribute in their top 10 list. When rapport was established, Benson et al. (2005) discovered that students had a positive experience

with the teacher, the course, and an increased desire to further their academic engagement. Further, teachers who had rapport with students found that attendance and attention in class increased and students were more apt to define their experience to effective teaching (Benson et al., 2005; Buskist, 2004). Keeley et al. (2016) affirmed that rapport behaviors are positively connected to increased student motivation and higher perceptions of learning. Kirby et al. (2018) shared results from a study involving responses from national-award winning teachers that showed they rated rapport and preparedness higher than non-award-winning faculty. An important takeaway was that master teachers placed a higher value on creating and sustaining supportive behaviors towards students (Kirby et al., 2018).

### Student and Faculty Perceptions of Excellent Teachers

Understanding the literature regarding master teachers provides a foundation for reviewing studies about the Teacher Behavior Checklist. In identifying student and faculty perceptions of behaviors of excellent teachers, Groccia et al. (2018) found that these "can serve as a window into viewing and understanding appropriate current and future instructional activities, and can guide academic development activities to enhance student learning" (p. 85). Excellent teachers understand that their behaviors impact students' motivation in the learning process (Keeley et al., 2016). Buskist and Keeley (2018) found that, for the most part, faculty and students have similar perceptions of excellent teachers. However, there were slight differences in that faculty underscored the importance of professional competency while students emphasized the caring and supportive characteristics (Keeley et al., 2016). Buskist (2004) found that faculty placed higher importance on teaching techniques while students chose the learner-teacher relationship as most crucial. These findings were identical with those found by Groccia

et al. (2018) in that students focused more on the care and supportive subscale while faculty identified more with the items from the professional competency subscale.

In a study that compared responses from pharmacy faculty and pharmacy students at select SEC institutions, Groccia et al. (2018) found that the two groups agreed on six qualities of teaching excellence: "being approachable, being confident, being an effective communicator, being enthusiastic, being knowledgeable, and being respectful" (p. 89). Groccia et al. (2018) referenced that pharmacy faculty and students at Auburn University agreed on eight behaviors: "being approachable, being confident, being an effective communicator, being encouraging, being enthusiastic, being knowledgeable, being prepared, and having realistic expectations" (p. 89). Auburn University pharmacy faculty and students aligned with overall responses from the SEC except for including being encouraging, being prepared, and having realistic expectations. Being respectful was an overall response from SEC pharmacy faculty and students but was not a top agreed upon behavior from Auburn University respondents. Looking at responses from the University of Florida in particular, faculty and students agreed on eight items: "being approachable, being knowledgeable, being an effective communicator, being enthusiastic, being confident, being respectful, presenting current information, and being creative" (Groccia et al., 2018, p. 89). The two items that University of Florida faculty and students agreed upon but were not included in the overall SEC responses were presenting current information and being creative. While these two groups at the University of Florida identified some differences, they mostly chose items from the TBC's caring and supportive subscale (Groccia et al., 2018).

In another study involving nursing faculty and students at a SEC land-grant public university, researchers found that there was agreement on "five of the Top 10 qualities of excellent teaching: being knowledgeable, being approachable, being enthusiastic, being an

effective communicator, and having realistic expectations" (Groccia et al., 2018, p. 90-91) with being knowledgeable and being approachable as the top two behaviors. Respondents from the nursing study and the pharmacy study agreed on four qualities: "being knowledgeable, being approachable, being an effective communicator, and being enthusiastic" (Groccia et al., 2018, p. 91). Comparing samples of faculty and students in four studies, researchers found that the top four behaviors – "being knowledgeable, being enthusiastic, being an effective communicator, and being approachable – were chosen by all respondents across all studies regardless of discipline, country of first higher education degree, or faculty or student status" (Groccia et al., 2018, p. 92).

Researchers have tested the Teacher Behavior Checklist instrument across a variety of respondent demographics (Kirby et al., 2018). Responses from Estonian students showed that being knowledgeable and enthusiastic were the most valued behaviors exhibited by excellent teachers (Kirby et al., 2018). In the study with Estonian students, Kirby et al. (2018) shared that researchers found that younger students emphasized rapport while older students' responses focused on behaviors that were similar to faculty respondents. When comparing foreign versus U.S.-educated faculty's perceptions of teaching excellence, Kirby et al. (2018) referenced a 2017 study by Ismail and Groccia that showed 80% agreement in top qualities by the two groups with U.S.-educated faculty rating enthusiasm higher. Discoveries from a study in Groccia et al. (2018) reinforced the idea that faculty from historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) are inclined to be more supportive of students when they found that "HBCU faculty ranked being accessible, approachable, and caring higher than faculty from primarily white institutions" (p. 26).

Zayac and Lenhard (2018) applied the TBC to a student sample at a university located in central Germany. Noting that student evaluation of faculty is a newer concept in that culture, Zayac and Lenhard (2018) found that German students had higher ratings for behaviors on the caring and supportive subscale with the professional competency subscale comprising lower ratings. This was in keeping with ratings for the caring and supportive subscale from students studying in American universities (Keeley et al., 2006). For this study in Germany, students rated these as top behaviors for master teachers: "realistic expectations of students/fair testing and grading, approachable/personable, effective communicator, respectful, knowledgeable about subject matter, confident, accessible, provides constructive feedback, creative and interesting, prepared, and enthusiastic about teaching and about topic" (Zayac & Lenhard, 2018, p. 71). The authors noted that because of the German structure of education, students could have rated having realistic expectations of students/fair testing and grading as higher because of their experience with this system (Zayac & Lenhard, 2018).

In a study of Chinese college students across three disciplines (chemical engineering, psychology, education), Liu et al. (2016) found there was agreement on five top qualities of master teachers: respectful, knowledgeable, confident, strives to be a better teacher, and realistic expectations. While there was general agreement across the disciplines for the top qualities, the chemical engineering students placed more emphasis on teacher behaviors such as being prepared, being on time, and managing the class versus their psychology or education peers (Liu et al., 2016). Because there was student agreement on five top qualities of master teachers across the three majors, selection of these teacher behaviors may be influenced by Chinese culture and the educational system (Liu et al., 2016).

## Universal Principles of Teaching Excellence

Even comparing various Teacher Behavior Checklist responses from students and faculty across demographics and institution types, universal and near-universal principles of teaching excellence have emerged. Reviewing various TBC studies, Buskist and Keely (2018) identified "two universal principles of excellent teaching: being knowledgeable about the subject matter and being enthusiastic about the topic and teaching more generally" (p. 98). Keeley et al. (2016) found in a TBC study of award-winning psychology teachers that they placed enthusiasm as the top quality of teaching excellence. In identifying universal principles of excellence in college and university teaching, Buskist and Keeley (2018) reviewed 12 faculty-focused studies and 14 studies of students' perspectives. The faculty-based studies were administered in the United States, Saudi Arabia, Brazil, and Columbia and included teachers working at public and private institutions, HBCUs, two-year colleges, and four-year research institutions. For the Teacher Behavior Checklist faculty studies, Buskist and Keeley (2018) found there was universal agreement in the top three behaviors for excellent teaching: "being knowledgeable about the subject matter, being enthusiastic about the topic and teaching, and promoting critical thinking and intellectual stimulation" (p. 99). In fact, in nine of the 12 faculty-based studies, being knowledgeable was rated as the most important behavior (Buskist & Keeley, 2018).

The 14 student-focused studies were conducted in the United States, Canada, Japan, Estonia, China, Brazil, Columbia, and Germany and included institutions such as public and private institutions, two-year colleges, and four-year research institutions (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). There was only one behavior, being knowledgeable about subject matter, that was identified "as a Top 10 item across all fourteen studies (100%), and students ranked it as the top

quality in five of those studies" (p. 100). In 12 of the student studies, being enthusiastic about the topic and teaching was the next most selected Top 10 behavior (Buskist & Keeley, 2018).

Based on analysis of the twenty six studies with faculty and student, Buskist and Keeley (2018) confirmed that being knowledgeable about the subject and being enthusiastic about the topic and teaching appear to be universal principles associated with excellent teaching. The next near-universal principles shared by faculty and students included "being approachable and personable (faculty – 86%; students – 79%) and being an effective communicator (faculty – 86%; students – 79%)" (Buskist & Keeley, 2018, p. 103). Because there appeared to be consensus of universal or near-universal principles of excellent teaching between faculty and students across a variety of demographics and educational settings in multiple studies, the Teacher Behavior Checklist seems to be a useful tool for assisting faculty in improving their teaching (Buskist & Keeley, 2018).

## Application of the Teacher Behavior Checklist

Because there are universal or near-universal principles of master teaching that have resulted from research with the Teacher Behavior Checklist, practical applications have emerged (Kirby et al., 2018). As the TBC developed, the instrument was used both "as a student evaluation of teaching (SET) and as a research tool" (Buskist & Keeley, 2018, p. 97). Gurung et al. (2018) referenced that the usefulness of the TBC for evaluating teaching increased when the instrument was adjusted to a questionnaire format. Keeley et al. (2006) added a Likert rating scale which provided additional data regarding how often faculty engaged in certain behaviors. The TBC has been used in studies to examine how a learner-oriented syllabus and course content and delivery methods increase student ratings of faculty (Kirby et al., 2018). However, while Henklain et al. (2019) agreed that student evaluations of faculty should be a component in

improving teacher effectiveness, the Teacher Behavior Checklist and other SET tools should not be used in decisions related to promotions or firings.

As an application for the Teacher Behavior Checklist, understanding students' culture and major can inform interpretations of student evaluation of teaching (SET) and opportunities for connection in the classroom (Liu et al., 2016). As a specific cultural application, Zayac and Lenhard (2018) posited that examining the behaviors that German students value in teachers could help reduce the dropout rate in Germany's higher education system. When used as an evaluative tool, the TBC allows for faculty to determine weaknesses and improve on those 28 behavioral anchors (Keeley et al., 2006; Kirby et al., 2018). This practical application provides individual teachers with specific feedback and guidance on how to adopt behaviors in the classroom to increase teaching effectiveness and student learning. As a research tool, the TBC has been used to gain insight into faculty and student perspectives of what makes a master teacher (Buskist & Groccia, 2018; Kirby et al., 2018). The Teacher Behavior Checklist has contributed to research through the identification of universal principles of master teacher behavior: being enthusiastic and being knowledgeable. The Teacher Behavior Checklist has added insights in improving college teaching and increasing student learning in higher education.

## Becoming a Master Teacher

As research on teaching excellence and the TBC continues to grow, there are numerous resources for faculty who aspire to become a master teacher. Buskist (2004) outlined three steps a professor can take to become a master teacher: (1) read the literature about master teachers; (2) implement principles of effective teaching; and (3) assess teaching effectiveness by comparing behaviors to learning outcomes. Keeley et al. (2016) found that master teachers have broad and complex definitions of excellent teaching and place emphasis on a wider range of characteristics

which newer faculty should be encouraged to explore and emulate. In addition to traditional teaching techniques, aspiring master teachers should focus on preparedness and developing rapport with students (Keeley et al., 2016). Buskist et al. (2002) concluded that by faculty exhibiting welcoming behaviors, students' motivation, performance, and attendance increased.

Incorporating results from the TBC research specifically, Buskist et al. (2002) summarized that faculty can become master teachers by not only improving technical teaching behaviors but also by combining those with a focus on rapport-building actions such as learning students' names, showing respect, being approachable, and demonstrating care and concern for students. Because students and other master teachers place importance on the learner-teacher relationship, faculty should pay special attention to cultivating rapport with students (Buskist, 2004; Keeley et al., 2016). While research has shown that each of the 28 characteristics and behaviors in the TBC is important, a new college professor should first prioritize being knowledgeable about the subject and displaying an enthusiastic demeanor in the classroom. These resulting universal principles from TBC research, which were developed from responses from faculty and students, serve as guiding standards for new and experienced teachers. A new teacher can compare TBC responses from his/her students over multiple academic terms to determine progress towards improving the 28 behaviors. Becoming a master teacher takes intentional effort, with priority actions related to expanding subject knowledge, understanding students' learning styles and need for a supportive environment, and accepting students' desire for a caring learner-teacher relationship.

## Limitations of The Teacher Behavior Checklist

While there are universal and near-universal principles of what makes a master teacher, the Teacher Behavior Checklist only allows for faculty to compare their strengths and

weaknesses relative to themselves and does not provide an opportunity for comparison against others (Keeley et al., 2006). While many researchers agree that there are multiple behaviors that contribute to someone being recognized as an effective or master teacher, there is not consensus on how *many* attributes are needed for an evaluation to be valid (Gurung et al., 2018). Thus, while a teacher may identify and improve behaviors in their areas of weakness according to the TBC, there is not a prescriptive number of characteristics that confirm when someone is considered a master teacher.

There are limitations related to how respondents understand survey instruments in general (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009) and the TBC response values in particular (Kirby et al., 2018). While the use of the Likert rating scale has provided important data from the TBC instrument, a study showed that providing specific and clear instructions to participants was one way to mitigate biases in responses (Kirby et al., 2018). Regarding limitations of the TBC tool, for those recent TBC studies that utilized a Likert rating scale, researchers created a response range that lists 1 as *never exhibits this quality* to 5 as *frequently exhibits this quality*. To test the instrument, the ratings could be reversed to 1 as *frequently exhibits this quality* to 5 as *never exhibits this quality*.

Based on several previous studies, it appears that the behaviors in the TBC instrument usually are listed in alphabetical order. Altering the order of behaviors for future surveys might present different results or affirm previous findings. There seem to be many quantitative studies of the TBC, but qualitative studies are not as easily found. Perhaps qualitative studies with students, faculty, and others could yield additional information on the TBC behaviors.

While research has been conducted with a few undergraduate academic disciplines such as education, engineering, and nursing, many of the early studies focused on students enrolled in

psychology courses. In reviewing the TBC as a student evaluation tool (SET), Liu et al. (2016) found that details regarding discipline and student culture impact the evaluation of results. Thus, additional undergraduate and graduate disciplines should continue to be included in TBC research.

The Teacher Behavior Checklist has been administered to current students and faculty who are working in the profession. There is limited TBC research as it relates to perceptions of master teachers from those individuals who had prior experiences with faculty in the classroom. Additional research is needed to determine if the universal principles hold true when individuals and alumni are asked to reference master teachers' behaviors from their undergraduate experiences.

While previous research related to the Teacher Behavior Checklist has focused on students and faculty across disciplines and institution types (Groccia et al., 2018), literature is limited as it relates to university staff members' perceptions of the behaviors of master teachers. Understanding the potential implications of perceptions of master teachers from those who raise philanthropic support for the institution may be important as academic leaders attempt to increase that revenue stream. Responses of Major Gifts Officers for the TBC instrument can serve as usable insight into master teacher behaviors and how those may influence the philanthropic process. Understanding how master teachers impacted their undergraduate experience and why MGOs may be influenced to partner with faculty for increased philanthropic support could provide insight into strengthening those relationships for higher education institutions.

## Learning Implications Beyond the Classroom

While successful student learning and effective college teaching are known to be intertwined, the undergraduate experience has implications that go beyond the classroom. It seems impractical for a professor to attempt to improve his or her teaching without understanding the student learning process and long-term outcomes. Improving teaching behaviors can lead to future partnerships with Major Gifts Officers and increased alumni engagement in the future.

Research has shown that the learning process is social, influenced by expectations and feedback, and individualized (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Groccia, Ismail, & Chaudhury, 2014; Halx, 2010; Henritius et al., 2019; Hesse & Mason, 2005; Quinlan, 2016; Wanner & Palmer, 2018). Learning also is an active process which should be practiced (Cook & Babon, 2017; Groccia, Nickson, Wang, & Hardin, 2014; Masika & Jones, 2016; Liu & Olson, 2011). While there are the practical aspects of learning that involve the cognitive processing of information, emotions play a key role in learning (Postareff et al., 2017; Quinlan, 2016). Understanding how all these theories and concepts inform the approach to effective college teaching is vital to a professor who desires to develop his or her teaching. Buskist (2004) found that at a minimum, students expect master teachers to be enthusiastic, caring, intentional, flexible, knowledgeable, well-prepared, and hardworking. Showing genuine concern for students' learning and academic performance not only builds rapport but is a core principle of becoming a master teacher (Buskist, 2004).

While students expect these teaching behaviors while they are in the classroom, MGOs also value similar characteristics in their faculty partners. Tenets of the learning process have shared components with the fundraising cycle. While there is limited research in this area,

MGOs anecdotally have shared that faculty who are enthusiastic, knowledgeable, caring, and approachable are ideal partners and resources to engage alumni, prospects, donors.

In addition to faculty setting high academic standards, students have expectations for their teachers in the learning process. Self-assessment and peer-assessment build critical thinking skills (Wanner & Palmer, 2018). Students want individualized plans, a positive relationship with faculty, and a supportive environment in which to learn (Dowden et al. 2013; Henritius et al., 2019; Ryan & Henderson, 2018). Similarly, MGOs and donors desire to work with faculty who can assist with specialized engagement opportunities. As faculty consider the characteristics students desire from a teacher to maximize the learning process, one must determine how to authentically display behaviors that support those expectations. College teachers who recognize students' different learning styles and experiences and adapt teaching techniques to enhance the cognitive process are better positioned to become master teachers. As an additional outcome to delivering an exceptional classroom experience, those master teachers are highly valued as partners in the philanthropic process.

# CHAPTER 3: Methods

## Introduction

As student debt has increased, societal perceptions have led to calls for more accountability and value propositions from higher education institutions. Holmes (2010) described the shift of public higher education funding from "solely state appropriations and tuition to state appropriations, tuition, grants and contracts, and philanthropy" (p. 28). More specifically, after the 2008 recession, "state support for higher education waned dramatically" (Shaker & Borden, 2020, p. 6). As institutions attempt to hold tuition steady even in the face of reductions in state appropriations, philanthropic support continues to gain attention as a potential increase to the typical funding model. According to the TIAA Institute 2020 study, individuals and other entities gave $58.7 billion to higher education in 2018 with alumni contributing $12.2 billion of that total. Colleges and universities rely on philanthropic dollars to fund institutional needs with private support from individuals and foundations being pivotal to accomplishing those priorities (Shaker & Borden, 2020).

In his study, Holmes (2010) stated that "the quality of the education would be significantly limited without the philanthropy component" (p. 28). The competition for philanthropic dollars continues to increase with higher education donors shifting from institution operational support to more tangible community support (Weerts & Hudson, 2009). University leaders have looked to Major Gifts Officers to engage investors to provide scholarship support for students and funds to attract and keep the best faculty, top priorities at many institutions (Holmes, 2010).

With what is perceived as rising costs of higher education, excellence in college teaching is more important than ever. An individual's undergraduate experiences, perceptions, memories,

support, and overall satisfaction contribute to one's desire to philanthropically support an institution (Shaker & Borden, 2020). These experiences are directly associated with faculty behaviors in positive classroom environments. Students who perceived a personalized undergraduate experience developed a sense of identification which leads to an increased likelihood of giving to that organization (Drezner, 2011; Shaker & Borden, 2020). This study attempted to ascertain if a positive undergraduate experience with an excellent teacher also influences the Major Gifts Officer during the fundraising process.

While studies have shown that excellent faculty can impact an alumnus's willingness to make a gift to the institution, there is limited research related to how teaching behaviors affect those who raise philanthropic dollars. Buskist and Keeley (2018) argued that identifying a teaching behavior rather than a quality that can be improved is practical advice to increase a teacher's level of excellence. Realizing that previous research focused on teacher qualities and not behaviors that define excellent teaching, Buskist and colleagues developed an instrument called the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) with the initial purpose to evaluate teaching problems and provide improvements for teaching excellence (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Using the TBC instrument to identify qualities of master teachers, researchers have found that faculty prioritize teaching techniques related to behaviors such as being prepared and being a leading communicator and students valued the more social aspects of the relationship describing valued behaviors such as being understanding and encouraging students (Groccia et al., 2018; Kirby et al., 2018). Undergraduate students valued rapport higher than faculty when asked to identify characteristics found in master teachers (Benson et al., 2005). Specifically looking at faculty demographics, Groccia et al. (2018) discovered that both U.S. and foreign-educated faculty "agreed that being knowledgeable about the topic and being enthusiastic about teaching were the

top two qualities of excellent teachers" (p. 86). While there has been research related to master teachers and various faculty groups across disciplines and institution types (Groccia et al., 2018), there appear to be few, if any, studies that explore the behaviors of excellent teachers in a sample of university staff employees. Understanding the potential implications of perceptions of master teachers from those who raise philanthropic support for the institution may be important as leaders try to increase that revenue stream.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide insight into how perceptions of master teachers impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. The study compared survey responses by Major Gifts Officers employed at institutions in the Southeastern Conference (SEC). Major gifts fundraisers were compared based on years of experience, alma mater status, enthusiasm for raising faculty support, and willingness to partner with faculty to increase philanthropic dollars. The study seeks to expand the body of knowledge of teaching excellence from non-academic employees who work in higher education and provide insight into the professional relationship between MGOs and master teachers. Faculty behaviors experienced by students in the classroom impact not only MGOs' enthusiasm for their work but also alumni donors' potential philanthropic commitments. As the need for private support for higher education increases, there is a call for deeper exploration into what motivates donors and the MGOs who assist them. In addition, in better understanding the faculty component in the philanthropic process, MGOs can enhance fundraising strategies and programs to ensure an elevated donor experience and increased charitable contributions for the institution.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What Teacher Behavior Checklist qualities do Major Gifts Officers in higher education perceive master teachers demonstrate most?
2. Based on their undergraduate experience with faculty, do these perceptions of teacher behaviors influence Major Gifts Officers to raise funds to support faculty?
3. Based on perceptions of master teachers in their undergraduate experience, does this influence Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process?
4. What similarities or differences exist between Major Gifts Officers' responses and student and faculty responses in prior research of the Teacher Behavior Checklist?

## Research Design

This study examined Major Gifts Officers' perceptions of master teaching behaviors exhibited by university faculty. Marsh (1984) shared that surveys should be developed based on a literature review and have theoretical and logical construction. Following the research design and review of existing literature from previous TBC studies, a survey was chosen because of the efficiencies and effectiveness for gathering responses and comparing data (Buskist et al., 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Edge, 2019; Groccia et al., 2018). Researchers who employ survey instruments attempt to generalize results from a sample and apply them to a larger population (Simone et al., 2012). Quantitative research engages a scientific method and has a positivist paradigm in which the researcher hopes to determine the facts and find cause-and-effect relationships that can be generalizable to a population (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009).

Using an online survey, the Teacher Behavior Checklist was administered to MGOs working at Southeastern Conference institutions. Based on their undergraduate experience with a master teacher, fundraisers were asked to rate faculty on the 28 items of the Teacher Behavior Checklist using a Likert rating scale (1 = *never exhibited this quality* to 5 = *frequently exhibited this quality*) (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Participants also were asked to answer additional questions related to years of experience in the profession, their willingness and enthusiasm for raising faculty support, and their willingness and enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development process, and if they currently work at the institution from which they received an undergraduate degree. Created by utilizing Qualtrics software, the survey was sent to participants via e-mail.

## Instrument

The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) is a 28-item instrument designed to determine qualities and behaviors of master teaching (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Keeley et al. (2006) found that the Teacher Behavior Checklist was psychometrically sound with high internal reliability and test-retest reliability. Wiersma and Jurs (2009) defined internal reliability as the "extent that data collection, analysis, and interpretations are consistent given the same conditions" (p. 9). Keeley et al., (2016) referenced that the TBC instrument was found to have "good internal consistency, ($\alpha$s = .90 to .95; Keeley et al., 2006), test-retest reliability (*r*s = .68 to .72; Keeley et al., 2006), and interrater reliability (ICCs = .68 to .91)" (p. 176). Kayes (2005) shared that reliability measures the "internal consistency of an instrument across similar scale items" (p. 251).

In an analysis of the behaviors within the TBC instrument, Keeley et al. (2006) identified three scales: "a Total Scale, a Caring and Supportive Subscale, and a Professional Competency

Subscale" (p. 97). The caring/supportive subscale includes behaviors such as being flexible, accessible, and understanding while the professional competency subscale includes qualities such as effective communicator, knowledgeable, and confident (Gurung et al., 2018).

The survey for this study was comprised of two sections. In the first section, participants were asked to use a five-point Likert scale to rate each behavior in the Teacher Behavior Checklist (1 = *never exhibited this quality* to 5 = *frequently exhibited this quality*) based on their experience with a master teacher as an undergraduate student. The behaviors of the TBC were listed in alphabetical order. In the second section, participants were asked to share their years of development experience, their willingness and enthusiasm for raising faculty support, their willingness and enthusiasm to engage faculty in the fundraising process, and if they currently work at the institution from which they received an undergraduate degree.

## Participants

The participants for this study included Major Gifts Officers currently working at Southeastern Conference (SEC) institutions. The researcher reviewed online staff directories to determine who worked with donors at the major gifts level. Using publicly available information on the various websites, the researcher collected e-mail addresses and utilized those to send the participation request and electronic survey. Surveys were distributed to fundraisers working at 13 of the 14 SEC institutions. Because Texas A&M University did not list e-mail addresses in online staff directories, that institution was excluded from this study.

## Data Collection and Procedures

The research proposal was approved by Auburn University IRB (IRB #20-569 EX 2012). Approved forms are included in Appendix C. In research about survey instruments, Etchegaray and Fischer (2010) communicated that reliability is the degree to which "responses to survey

items are consistent" (p. 133). For this study, the researcher asked a few subject matter experts to serve as a pilot group to answer the survey questions and provide feedback prior to administering the survey to the sample. Then, the researcher e-mailed the electronic survey to the population of SEC MGOs with a requested deadline for completion. Additional reminder e-mails were sent to increase the response rate.

No identifiable data were collected, and participants could choose to exit the survey at any time. Data were collected in January 2021 and downloaded from Qualtrics to IBM SPSS Statistics 26. Based on professional titles that would indicate Major Gifts Officer type responsibilities, the population size was 510 as of December 2020. This survey yielded 117 responses (estimated response rate of 23%). Simone et al. (2012) affirmed that prior to sampling the population, the researcher should decide on confidence level (typically 95%) and the potential sampling error. Related to confidence in the data, Roberts and Russo (1999) stated that "the larger the number of scores in a sample, the smaller the standard error and the more likely the mean of the population has been accurately estimated" (p. 17).

Of the 117 responses, 26 reported their years of experience working in development between 0 and 5 years (22.2%), 33 reported development experience between 6 and 10 years (28.2%), 22 reported 11 – 15 years of development experience (18.8%), 14 reported work experience between 16 and 20 years (12.0%), 16 reported working in development for 21 – 25 years (13.7%), and 6 reported having 26 or more years of experience working in development (5.1%). Because of sample size, years of experience segments were combined into two groups: those with 0 – 10 years of experience in development and those with 11 or more years of experience. There was almost a 50/50 split of those who reported that they currently work at the

institution from which they received their undergraduate degree versus those who do not work at their undergraduate alma mater.

Table 3.1 Respondents' Demographics Statistics

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Years in Profession** | | | (100%) |
| | 0 – 5 years | 26 | 22.2 |
| | 6 – 10 years | 33 | 28.2 |
| | 11 – 15 years | 22 | 18.8 |
| | 16 – 20 years | 14 | 12.0 |
| | 21 – 25 years | 16 | 13.7 |
| | 26+ years | 6 | 5.1 |
| **Alumnus/alumna of current institution** | | | |
| | Yes | 58 | 50.4 |
| | No | 57 | 49.6 |

## Data Analysis

### Research Question 1

To determine the qualities and behaviors that Major Gifts Officers perceive master teachers to demonstrate most, mean ratings were calculated to rank order the 28 TBC items from highest to lowest. A top-ten list was developed from the highest TBC item means. Within-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine differences in mean ratings (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). The TBC items were combined into the caring/supportive and professional competency/communication subscales (Keeley, et al., 2006). A paired samples *t*-test was used to compare means for the subscales.

### Research Question 2

To explore the level of willingness and enthusiasm to raise philanthropic support for faculty, participants were listed in two groups based on attitudinal responses and means for each TBC item were compared using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and univariate

tests (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Using the same participant groups, the caring/supportive and professional competency/communication subscale means were compared. In addition, a linear regression test was used to determine if the undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between ratings for the caring/supportive and professional competency/communication subscales and the enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support.

**Research Question 3**

To study the level of willingness and enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process, participants were combined into two groups based on opinion responses on three survey questions with means for each TBC item compared using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and then univariate tests (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Using those participant groups, the caring/supportive and professional competency/communication subscale means were compared. An additional linear regression test was used to determine if the undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between the ratings of the caring/supportive subscale and the professional competency/communication subscale and their enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development process.

**Research Question 4**

To investigate elements of research question four, comparisons were made between Major Gifts Officers' top-ten list of TBC items and top-ten lists from earlier studies (Buskist et al., 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Edge, 2019). These studies were selected because of similarities in survey method with data comparisons to the original TBC study by Buskist et al. (2002). Using participant groups related to years in the profession and alumnus status of

working at their current institution, the caring/supportive and professional competency/communication subscale means were compared.

## Limitations

Using a survey to measure opinion can be difficult. Because a convenience sample was used, there is at least self-selection bias in that the respondents chose to participate. In researching students' evaluations of university teaching, Marsh (1984) shared that in a construct approach, "one validates not a test, but the interpretation of data arising from specific applications, as responses may be valid for one research purpose but not for another" (p. 708). A component of score reliability assumes that the question means the same thing to each respondent, the possible responses mean the same thing to each person, and each respondent would give the same answer if in a situation with the same conditions (Simone, et al. 2012). For this study and data collected, the researcher assumed these aspects of score reliability, but this could be a potential limitation.

While e-mail distribution for the survey was practical from cost and time perspectives, there was an opportunity for a lower response rate (Simone, et al. 2012; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Because of the sample size of MGOs in this study, there is a limitation related to generalizability to larger fundraiser populations. An additional limitation is the use of the Likert scale for rating the items. With Likert scale options, there is a possibility that participants rate all items the same (Keeley et al., 2016). However, respondents in previous TBC research were able to differentiate items and this was the case for MGOs who participated in this study.

## Summary

This chapter described the research approach, research design, data collection, analysis, and limitations of the study. After receiving the e-mail request to participate, 117 SEC Major

Gifts Officers comprised the sample of the population. A 5-point Likert scale was utilized to collect responses and additional data came from supplemental questions. Demographics from those who responded were shared. The analyses of results are outlined in Chapter 4.

# Chapter 4: Results

## Introduction

As student debt has increased, societal perceptions have led to calls for more accountability and value propositions from higher education institutions. Holmes (2010) described the shift of public higher education funding from "solely state appropriations and tuition to state appropriations, tuition, grants and contracts, and philanthropy" (p. 28). More specifically, after the 2008 recession, "state support for higher education waned dramatically" (Shaker & Borden, 2020, p. 6). As institutions attempt to hold tuition steady even in the face of reductions in state appropriations, philanthropic support continues to gain attention as a potential increase to the typical funding model. According to the TIAA Institute 2020 study, individuals and other entities gave $58.7 billion to higher education in 2018 with alumni contributing $12.2 billion of that total. Colleges and universities rely on philanthropic dollars to fund institutional needs with private support from individuals and foundations being pivotal to accomplishing those priorities (Shaker & Borden, 2020).

In his study, Holmes (2010) stated that "the quality of the education would be significantly limited without the philanthropy component" (p. 28). The competition for philanthropic dollars continues to increase with higher education donors shifting from institution operational support to more tangible community support (Weerts & Hudson, 2009). University leaders have looked to Major Gifts Officers to engage investors to provide scholarship support for students and funds to attract and keep the best faculty, top priorities at many institutions (Holmes, 2010).

With what is perceived as "rising costs" of higher education, excellence in college teaching is more important than ever. An individual's undergraduate experiences, perceptions,

memories, support, and overall satisfaction contribute to one's desire to philanthropically support an institution (Shaker & Borden, 2020). These experiences are directly associated with faculty behaviors in positive classroom environments. Students who perceived a personalized undergraduate experience developed a sense of identification which leads to an increased likelihood of giving to that organization (Drezner, 2011; Shaker & Borden, 2020). This study attempted to ascertain if a positive undergraduate experience with an excellent teacher also influences the Major Gifts Officer during the fundraising process.

While studies have shown that excellent faculty can impact an alumnus's willingness to make a gift to the institution, there is limited research related to how teaching behaviors affect those who raise philanthropic dollars. Buskist and Keeley (2018) argued that identifying a teaching behavior rather than a quality that can be improved is practical advice to increase a teacher's level of excellence. Realizing that previous research focused on teacher qualities and not behaviors that define excellent teaching, Buskist and colleagues developed an instrument called the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) with the initial purpose to evaluate teaching problems and provide improvements for teaching excellence (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Using the TBC instrument to identify qualities of master teachers, researchers have found that faculty prioritize teaching techniques related to behaviors such as being prepared and being a leading communicator and students valued the more social aspects of the relationship describing valued behaviors such as being understanding and encouraging students (Groccia et al., 2018; Kirby et al., 2018). Undergraduate students valued rapport higher than faculty when asked to identify characteristics found in master teachers (Benson et al., 2005). Specifically looking at faculty demographics, Groccia et al. (2018) discovered that both U.S. and foreign-educated faculty "agreed that being knowledgeable about the topic and being enthusiastic about teaching were the

top two qualities of excellent teachers" (p. 86). While there has been research related to master teachers and various faculty groups across disciplines and institution types (Groccia et al., 2018), there appear to be few, if any, studies that explore the behaviors of excellent teachers in a sample of university staff employees. Understanding the potential implications of perceptions of master teachers from those who raise philanthropic support for the institution may be important as leaders try to increase that revenue stream.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide insight into how perceptions of master teachers impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. The study compared survey responses by Major Gifts Officers employed at institutions in the Southeastern Conference (SEC). Major gifts fundraisers were compared based on years of experience, alma mater status, enthusiasm for raising faculty support, and willingness to partner with faculty to increase philanthropic dollars. The study seeks to expand the body of knowledge of teaching excellence from non-academic employees who work in higher education and provide insight into the professional relationship between Major Gifts Officers and master teachers. Faculty behaviors experienced by students in the classroom impact not only Major Gifts Officers' enthusiasm for their work but also alumni donors' potential philanthropic commitments. As the need for private support for higher education increases, there is a call for deeper exploration into what motivates donors and the Major Gifts Officers who assist them. In addition, in better understanding the faculty component in the philanthropic process, Major Gifts Officers can enhance fundraising strategies and programs to ensure an elevated donor experience and increased charitable contributions for the institution.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What Teacher Behavior Checklist qualities do Major Gifts Officers in higher education perceive master teachers demonstrate most?
2. Based on their undergraduate experience with faculty, do these perceptions of teacher behaviors influence Major Gifts Officers to raise funds to support faculty?
3. Based on perceptions of master teachers in their undergraduate experience, does this influence Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process?
4. What similarities or differences exist between Major Gifts Officers' responses and student and faculty responses in prior research of the Teacher Behavior Checklist?

Table 4.1 Sample Demographic Results

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Years in Profession** | | | (100%) |
| | 0 – 5 years | 26 | 22.2 |
| | 6 – 10 years | 33 | 28.2 |
| | 11 – 15 years | 22 | 18.8 |
| | 16 – 20 years | 14 | 12.0 |
| | 21 – 25 years | 16 | 13.7 |
| | 26+ years | 6 | 5.1 |
| **Alumnus/alumna of current institution** | | | |
| | Yes | 58 | 50.4 |
| | No | 57 | 49.6 |

## Analysis

### Research Question One

Research question one was stated as, what Teacher Behavior Checklist qualities do Major Gifts Officers in higher education perceive master teachers to demonstrate most? From

descriptive statistics, mean ratings were calculated to rank order the 28 behaviors and qualities from highest to lowest. The top-ten qualities for the entire sample of Major Gifts Officers are: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) confident; (4) promotes critical thinking; (5) accessible; (6) prepared; (7) enthusiastic; (8) respectful; (9) punctuality/manages class time; and (10) effective communicator.

Table 4.2 Overall Mean Ratings and Rankings for TBC Qualities and Behaviors

| | **Mean** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | 4.59 | 1 |
| Approachable/Personable | 4.42 | 2 |
| Confident | 4.42 | 3 |
| Promotes Critical Thinking | 4.42 | 4 |
| Accessible | 4.41 | 5 |
| Prepared | 4.38 | 6 |
| Enthusiastic | 4.37 | 7 |
| Respectful | 4.37 | 8 |
| Punctuality/Manages Class Time | 4.35 | 9 |
| Effective Communicator | 4.34 | 10 |
| Good Listener | 4.29 | 11 |
| Establishes Goals | 4.27 | 12 |
| Promotes Class Discussion | 4.24 | 13 |
| Provides Constructive Feedback | 4.23 | 14 |
| Presents Current Information | 4.22 | 15 |
| Encourages/Cares | 4.20 | 16 |
| Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous | 4.11 | 17 |
| Understanding | 4.10 | 18 |
| Realistic/Fair | 4.09 | 19 |
| Creative/Interesting | 4.08 | 20 |
| Authoritative | 4.06 | 21 |
| Rapport | 4.05 | 22 |
| Professional | 4.04 | 23 |
| Flexible/Open-Minded | 3.92 | 24 |
| Technologically Competent | 3.83 | 25 |
| Sensitive/Persistent | 3.81 | 26 |
| Humble | 3.73 | 27 |
| Strives to Be a Better Teacher | 3.69 | 28 |

Within-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine differences in mean ratings between the 28 Teacher Behavior Checklist items to determine if the relative distance between items is statistically significant (Kahane, 2008). Mauchly's test was significant, $\chi^2_{377} = 724.696$, $p < 0.001$. Using Greenhouse-Geisser correction, significant differences were detected in TBC item ratings $F_{14.7, 1231.5} = 12.14$, $p < 0.001$. Pairwise comparisons are reported in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3 Pairwise Differences in Mean Ratings for SEC Major Gifts Officer Sample

| | **TBC Quality** | **Mean** | **Std Deviation** | **Pairwise Comparison** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Accessible | 4.41 | 0.747 | > 10; 13; 25; 26, 27 |
| 2 | Approachable/Personable | 4.42 | 0.746 | > 10; 13; 25; 26; 27 |
| 3 | Authoritative | 4.06 | 0.746 | < 4; 14 |
| 4 | Confident | 4.42 | 0.677 | > 3; 5; 10; 12; 13; 22; 25; 26; 27 |
| 5 | Creative/Interesting | 4.08 | 0.892 | < 4; 6; 8; 14; 19; |
| 6 | Effective Communicator | 4.34 | 0.739 | > 5; 10; 13; 25; 26; 27 |
| 7 | Encourages/Cares | 4.20 | 0.822 | > 13; 26 and < 14 |
| 8 | Enthusiastic | 4.37 | 0.684 | > 5; 10; 13; 22; 25; 26; 27 |
| 9 | Establishes Goals | 4.27 | 0.756 | > 13; 25; 26; 27 |
| 10 | Flexible/Open-Minded | 3.92 | 0.919 | < 1; 2; 4; 6; 8; 14; 15; 19; 21; 24 |
| 11 | Good Listener | 4.29 | 0.838 | > 13; 25; 26 and <14; |
| 12 | Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous | 4.11 | 0.866 | < 4; 14; and > 13 |
| 13 | Humble | 3.73 | 1.007 | < 1; 2; 4; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 12; 14; 15; 16; 18;<br>19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 28 |
| 14 | Knowledgeable | 4.59 | 0.578 | > 3; 5; 7; 10; 11; 12; 13; 17; 20; 22; 23; 25;<br>26; 27; 28 |
| 15 | Prepared | 4.38 | 0.726 | > 10; 13; 25; 26; 27 |
| 16 | Presents Current Information | 4.22 | 0.860 | > 13; 25; 26 |
| 17 | Professional | 4.04 | 0.940 | < 14 |
| 18 | Promotes Class Discussion | 4.24 | 0.768 | > 13; 25; 26; 27 |
| 19 | Promotes Critical Thinking | 4.42 | 0.716 | > 5; 10; 13; 22; 25; 26; 27; 28 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Provides Constructive Feedback | 4.23 | 0.771 | > 13; 25; 26 and < 14 |
| 21 | Punctuality/Manages Class Time | 4.35 | 0.716 | > 10; 13; 25; 26; 27 |
| 22 | Rapport | 4.05 | 0.854 | < 4; 8; 14; 19; 24 |
| 23 | Realistic/Fair | 4.09 | 0.858 | > 13; 26 and < 14 |
| 24 | Respectful | 4.37 | 0.746 | > 10; 13; 22; 25; 26; 27 |
| 25 | Sensitive/Persistent | 3.81 | 0.886 | < 1; 2; 4; 6; 8; 9; 11; 14; 15; 16; 18; 19; 20; 21; 24 |
| 26 | Strives to Be a Better Teacher | 3.69 | 0.970 | < 1; 2; 4; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 14; 15; 16; 18; 19; 20; 21; 23; 24 |
| 27 | Technologically Competent | 3.83 | 0.944 | < 1; 2; 4; 6; 8; 9; 14; 15; 18; 19; 21; 24 |
| 28 | Understanding | 4.10 | 0.852 | > 13 and < 14; 19 |

all *p*s < .05

The ANOVA results confirm that there are significant differences in mean ratings of the TBC qualities from the Major Gifts Officer sample. For example, the TBC quality, knowledgeable, was rated as the highest quality (M = 4.59) and was rated statistically higher than fifteen of the other qualities. The TBC quality, confident, was rated third overall (M = 4.42) and was rated statistically higher than nine of the other qualities. For the three bottom ranked qualities, there were statistically differences in those ratings: sensitive/persistent (M = 3.81), ranked 26$^{th}$, and statistically rated lower than 15 TBC qualities; humble (M = 3.73), ranked 27$^{th}$, and statistically rated lower than 19 TBC qualities; and strives to be a better teacher (M = 3.69), ranked 28$^{th}$, and statistically rated lower than 17 TBC qualities.

A purpose of research question one was to explore if Major Gifts Officers rate teaching qualities and behaviors associated with the caring/supportive subscale and the professional competency/communication subscale differently. The TBC items were combined into the subscales caring/supportive (items 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 28) and

professional competency/communication (items 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 24, and 27) (Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Keeley, et al., 2006).

The researcher used a paired samples *t*-test to determine which subscale mean was higher. There was a significant difference in mean ratings ($t_{1232} = -5.622$, $p < .001$). Average ratings were significantly higher on the professional competency/communication ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.787$) than they were on the caring/supportive subscale ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.852$). In this sample, Major Gifts Officers rated behaviors on the professional competency/communication subscale higher than behaviors on the caring/supportive subscale.

**Research Question Two**

Research question two was stated as, based on their undergraduate experience with faculty, do these perceptions of teacher behaviors influence Major Gifts Officers to raise funds for faculty support? Two survey questions were used to explore willingness and enthusiasm to raise philanthropic support for faculty.

*Willingness to Raise Funds for Faculty Support*

For survey question 31, Likert scale ratings 1 and 2 for the responses for "My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes does not influence my willingness to raise funds for faculty support" and "My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes somewhat influences my willingness to raise funds for faculty support" were combined into one group: Somewhat Influences My Willingness to Raise Faculty Support. This combined group was compared against those who responded with a Likert rating 3 that "My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes definitely influences my willingness to raise funds for faculty support" referred to as Definitely Influences My

Willingness to Raise Faculty Support in Table 4.4. The one participant who responded "I did not have an excellent professor in my undergraduate experience" was excluded from this analysis.

Table 4.4 Major Gifts Officers' Opinion Responses
Willingness to Raise Funds for Faculty Support

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **If you had at least one professor who positively impacted your UNDERGRADUATE experience, how does that influence your WILLINGNESS to actively raise funds for faculty support? (Q31)** | | (117) | (100%) |
| **Rating 1** | My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes DOES NOT influence my willingness to raise funds for faculty support. | 21 | 17.9 |
| **Rating 2** | My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes SOMEWHAT influences my willingness to raise funds for faculty support. | 34 | 29.1 |
| **Rating 3** | My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes DEFINITELY influences my willingness to raise funds for faculty support. | 61 | 52.1 |
| **Rating 4** | I did not have an excellent professor in my undergraduate experience. | 1 | 0.85 |

There was not an overall statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's willingness to raise funds for faculty support, $F_{28, 55} = 1.394$, $p = .145$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.585$, partial $\eta 2 = .42$. However, univariate tests indicated there were statistically significant differences between the two groups for the following behaviors: (1) accessible ($F_{1, 82} = 6.864$, $p = .010$); (2) creative/interesting ($F_{1, 82} = 11.835$, $p < .001$); and (3) encourages/cares ($F_{1, 82} = 6.071$, $p = .016$). For each of the three behaviors, the mean rating was higher for those who responded

that experience with an excellent professor in an undergraduate class definitely influences a willingness to raise funds for faculty support.

Table 4.5 Significant Differences in TBC Item Means
Willingness to Raise Funds for Faculty Support

| | **Undergraduate Experience Definitely Influences (n = 61)** | | **Undergraduate Experience Somewhat Influences (n = 55)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **accessible** | 4.58 | .613 | 4.17 | .845 |
| **creative/interesting** | 4.27 | .818 | 3.61 | .934 |
| **encourages/cares** | 4.31 | .719 | 3.86 | .961 |

*all *p*s < .05

Using the same two groups, mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' undergraduate experience with faculty and their current willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support. Those Major Gifts Officers who had at least one teacher who positively impacted their undergraduate experience and responded that the experience definitely influences their willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who responded that an outstanding undergraduate professor somewhat influences their willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support. Mean subscale ratings for those who are definitely influenced by an undergraduate master teacher were (M = 4.20) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.33) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales for those who are definitely influenced by their undergraduate experience to raise faculty support ($p < .001$).

Subscale mean ratings for those who responded that positive experience with an undergraduate professor somewhat influences their willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support were (M = 4.08) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.25) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There also was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales by those who responded that they are somewhat influenced by a faculty in their undergraduate experience ($p < .001$). The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher than the caring/supportive subscale by both groups.

Table 4.6 Differences in Subscales by Undergraduate Professor Influence and Willingness to Raise Funds for Faculty Support

| | **Undergraduate Experience Definitely Influences ($t_{654} = -3.864$)** | | **Undergraduate Experience Somewhat Influences ($t_{567} = -4.206$)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.20 | .810 | 4.08 | .893 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.33 | .740 | 4.25 | .828 |

*all *p*s < .001

*Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support*

For survey question 33, Likert scale ratings 1, 2, and 3 were combined to form a group called Not as Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support with Likert scale ratings of 4 and 5 combined in a group called Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support. Separating Major Gifts Officers into two groups based on attitudinal responses for enthusiasm to raise philanthropic support for faculty, means for each TBC item were compared using multivariate

analysis of variance (MANOVA). MANOVA analysis is used when there is more than one dependent variable (Kahane, 2008).

Table 4.7 Major Gifts Officers' Opinion Responses
Enthusiasm for Raising Faculty Support

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Assuming you can work on a variety of fundraising initiatives, how enthusiastic are you to RAISE FUNDS for faculty support? (Q33)** | | (117) | 100 |
| **Rating 1** | never enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support | 2 | 1.7 |
| **Rating 2** | | 5 | 4.3 |
| **Rating 3** | | 39 | 33.3 |
| **Rating 4** | | 39 | 33.3 |
| **Rating 5** | enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support | 32 | 27.4 |

In comparing the two groups and Between-Subjects Effects, there was not an overall statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's level of enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support, $F_{28, 56} = 1.047$, $p = .430$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.656$, partial $\eta^2 = .34$. However, univariate tests indicated there were statistically significant differences between the two groups for the following behaviors: (1) creative/interesting ($F_{1, 83} = 3.985$, $p = .049$); (2) knowledgeable ($F_{1, 83} = 4.661$, $p = .034$); (3) promotes critical thinking ($F_{1, 83} = 4.535$, $p = .036$); and (4) punctuality/manages time ($F_{1, 83} = 5.821$, $p = .018$). For each of these four behaviors, the mean rating was higher for those who responded that they are more enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support.

Table 4.8 Significant Differences in TBC Item Means for Level of Enthusiasm to Raise Funds for Faculty Support

| | **Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support** | | **Not as Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **creative/interesting** | 4.14 | .980 | 3.74 | .790 |
| **knowledgeable** | 4.67 | .516 | 4.38 | .697 |
| **promotes critical thinking** | 4.55 | .610 | 4.24 | .741 |
| **punctuality/manages time** | 4.47 | .612 | 4.12 | .729 |

*all *p*s < .05

Using the same two groups, mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support. Those Major Gifts Officers who reported higher levels of enthusiasm to actively raise funds for faculty support had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who responded with less enthusiasm to actively raise funds for faculty support. Mean subscale ratings for those who are enthusiastic to raise faculty support were (M = 4.17) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.32) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales for those who are enthusiastic to raise faculty support ($p < .001$).

Subscale mean ratings for those who responded that they are not as enthusiastic to actively raise funds for faculty support were (M = 4.08) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.22) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales by those who responded that they are not as enthusiastic to raise faculty support ($p = .002$). The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher than the caring/supportive subscale by both groups.

Table 4.9 Differences in Subscales by Enthusiasm to Raise Funds for Faculty Support

| | **Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support ($t_{748}$ = -4.834)** | | **Not as Enthusiastic to Raise Funds for Faculty Support ($t_{484}$ = -3.173)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.17 | .861 | 4.08 | .837 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.32 | .778 | 4.22 | .795 |

all *p*s < .05

An additional test was conducted to review if Major Gifts Officers' undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between the ratings of the caring/supportive subscale and the professional competency/communication subscale and the enthusiasm ratings to raise funds for faculty. Enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support was selected as the dependent variable with the caring/supportive subscale ratings and the professional competency/communication subscale ratings as the independent variables. The moderator was undergraduate experience with an excellent professor and control variables were working at alma mater, total years in the profession, and gift threshold.

Both models for the linear regression test were statistically significant: caring/supportive subscale ($F_{12, 100}$ = 2.552, $p$ = .006) and professional competency/communication subscale ($F_{12, 100}$ = 2.338, $p$ = .011). The undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between ratings for the caring/supportive subscale and the enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support and accounted for about 14% of the variance in enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support ($R^2$ = .234, Adj. $R^2$ = .143). The undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between

ratings for the professional competency/communication subscale and the enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support and accounted for about 13% of the variance in enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support ($R^2$ = .219, Adj. $R^2$ = .125).

Table 4.10 Undergraduate Experience with Faculty and Enthusiasm to Raise Funds for Faculty Support

| **Variable (Unstandardized Coefficient *B*)** | **Enthusiasm to Raise Funds for Faculty Support (n = 113)** | |
|---|---|---|
| **Caring/supportive subscale ratings** | -0.969 (0.485)<br>*t* = -1.996<br>*p* = .049 | |
| **Professional competency/communication ratings** | | -1.001 (0.549)<br>*t* = -1.824<br>*p* = .071* |
| **Undergraduate experience** | -1.825 (0.784)<br>*t* = -2.328<br>*p* = .022 | -1.930 (0.913)<br>*t* = -2.114<br>*p* = .037 |
| **Caring/supportive subscale ratings x Undergraduate experience** | .0519 (0.193)<br>*t* = 2.686<br>*p* = .008 | |
| **Professional competency/communication ratings x Undergraduate experience** | | 0.520 (0.214)<br>*t* = 2.428<br>*p* = .017 |
| **Adj $R^2$** | 0.14 | 0.13 |

*$p$ > .05 but < .10

**Research Question Three**

Research question three asked, based on perceptions of master teachers in their undergraduate experience, does this influence Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process? Three survey questions were used to ascertain willingness and enthusiasm to engage faculty in raising philanthropic support.

*Faculty Partners in Development Activities*

For survey question 32, the Major Gifts Officers who responded that "the faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities seem to share SOME of the behaviors and

qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience" were compared with those who responded "the faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities seem to share MANY of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience".

Table 4.11 Major Gifts Officers' Opinion Responses
Faculty Partners Share Qualities with Excellent Teachers

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **As a major gifts fundraiser, do your best faculty partners in development activities share similar behaviors and qualities as excellent teachers in YOUR undergraduate experience? (Q32)** | | (115) | |
| **Rating 1** | The faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities DO NOT seem to share many of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience. | 0 | 0.0 |
| **Rating 2** | The faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities seem to share SOME of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience. | 33 | 28.7 |
| **Rating 3** | The faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities seem to share MANY of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience. | 80 | 69.6 |
| **Rating 4** | I did not have an excellent professor in my undergraduate experience. | 2 | 1.7 |

There was a statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's perception that their faculty partners in development shared qualities of their master teacher from their undergraduate experience, $F_{28, 53} = 1.9701$, $p = .017$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.490$, partial $\eta 2 = .51$.

Additional tests indicated there were statistically significant differences between the two groups for the following behaviors: (1) accessible ($F_{1, 80} = 10.152$, $p = .002$); (2) effective communicator ($F_{1, 80} = 4.692$, $p = .033$); (3) encourages/cares ($F_{1, 80} = 10.972$, $p = .001$); (4) enthusiastic ($F_{1, 80} = 8.426$, $p = .005$); (5) establishes goals ($F_{1, 80} = 4.113$, $p = .046$); (6) promotes critical thinking ($F_{1, 80} = 5.713$, $p = .019$); and (7) provides constructive feedback ($F_{1, 80} = 6.956$, $p = .010$). For each of the seven behaviors, the mean rating for the item was higher for those who responded that faculty with whom they currently partner in development activities seem to share MANY of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from their undergraduate experience. Table 4.12 displays mean differences for TBC qualities between the two groups of Major Gifts Officers.

Table 4.12 Significant Differences in TBC Item Means
Faculty Partners in Development Activities Share Qualities with Excellent Teachers

| | **Share MANY Qualities** | | **Share SOME Qualities** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **accessible** | 4.57 | .092 | 4.00 | .152 |
| **effective communicator** | 4.47 | .090 | 4.09 | .148 |
| **encourages/cares** | 4.30 | .104 | 3.64 | .171 |
| **enthusiastic** | 4.52 | .084 | 4.05 | .139 |
| **establishes goals** | 4.40 | .091 | 4.05 | .150 |
| **promotes critical thinking** | 4.53 | .086 | 4.14 | .142 |
| **provides constructive feedback** | 4.42 | .091 | 3.96 | .150 |

*all *p*s < .05

Using the same two groups, mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' response regarding if current faculty partners in development activities share qualities with their undergraduate professor. Those Major Gifts Officers who responded

that their faculty partners in fundraising had many of the same qualities as excellent teachers in their undergraduate experience had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who responded with that their faculty partners only had some of the same qualities. Mean subscale ratings for those who responded that their faculty partners in fundraising had many of the same qualities as master teachers in their undergraduate experience were (M = 4.18) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.36) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales for those who perceived that their current faculty partners in development activities shared many qualities as master teachers from their undergraduate experience ($p < .001$).

Subscale mean ratings for those who responded that their current faculty partners in fundraising had some of the same qualities as master teachers from their undergraduate experience were (M = 3.91) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.15) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales for those who responded that their current faculty partners in fundraising only had some of the same qualities ($p < .001$). The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher than the caring/supportive subscale by both groups.

Table 4.13 Differences in Subscales
Faculty Partners in Development Activities Share Qualities with Excellent Teachers

| | **Share MANY Qualities ($t_{858}$ = -5.700)** | | **Share SOME Qualities ($t_{342}$ = -4.655)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.18 | .857 | 3.91 | .901 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.36 | .757 | 4.15 | .830 |

all *p*s < .001

*Enthusiasm for Engaging Faculty in the Development Process (Q34)*

For survey question 34, the researcher utilized MANOVA to analyze Major Gifts Officers' level of enthusiasm for engaging faculty in the development process. Likert scale ratings were combined to form two groups – Not as Enthusiastic for Engaging Faculty (ratings 1, 2, and 3) and More Enthusiastic for Engaging Faculty (ratings 4, and 5).

Table 4.14 Major Gifts Officers' Opinion Responses
Level of Enthusiasm for Engaging Faculty

| | | **n** | **%** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Rate your enthusiasm for ENGAGING faculty in the development and fundraising process. (Q34)** | | (116) | |
| **Rating 1** | never enthusiastic to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process | 1 | 0.86 |
| **Rating 2** | | 9 | 7.76 |
| **Rating 3** | | 29 | 25.0 |
| **Rating 4** | | 42 | 36.2 |
| **Rating 5** | enthusiastic to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process | 35 | 30.2 |

There was not a statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's level of enthusiasm for engaging faculty in the development process, $F_{28, 56} = 1.502$, $p = .097$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.571$, partial $\eta 2 = .429$. However, univariate tests indicated there were statistically significant differences between the two groups for the following behaviors: (1) creative/interesting ($F_{1, 83} = 5.163$, $p = .026$); (2) knowledgeable ($F_{1, 83} = 3.818$, $p = .054$); (3) promotes critical thinking ($F_{1, 83} = 3.971$, $p = .050$); (4) strives to be a better teacher ($F_{1, 83} = 7.352$, $p = .008$); and (5) understanding ($F_{1, 83} = 5.411$, p = .022). For each of the five behaviors, the mean rating was higher for those who responded that they have a higher level of enthusiasm for engaging faculty in the development and fundraising process. Table 4.15 displays mean differences for TBC qualities between the two groups of Major Gifts Officers.

Table 4.15 Significant Differences in TBC Item Means
Level of Enthusiasm to Engage Faculty

| | **More Enthusiastic to Engage (n = 77)** | | **Not as Enthusiastic to Engage (n = 39)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **creative/interesting** | 4.15 | .125 | 3.40 | .157 |
| **knowledgeable**** | 4.65 | .083 | 4.39 | .104 |
| **promotes critical thinking** | 4.54 | .093 | 4.24 | .116 |
| **strives to be a better teacher** | 3.92 | .129 | 3.36 | .161 |
| **understanding** | 4.23 | .119 | 3.79 | .149 |

**all *p*s < .054

Using these two groups, mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' level of enthusiasm for engaging faculty in the development process. Those who were more enthusiastic to engage faculty had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those

who were not as enthusiastic to engage faculty in development work. For those who were more enthusiastic to engage with faculty, mean subscale ratings were (M = 4.22) for the caring/supportive category and (M = 4.33) for professional competency/communication behaviors. There was a significant difference in the mean subscale ratings for those who were more enthusiastic to engage with faculty ($p$ = .002). For those who were not as enthusiastic to engage with faculty, mean subscale ratings were (M = 3.99) for caring/supportive and (M = 4.18) for professional competency/communication. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales by those who were not as enthusiastic to engage with faculty ($p$ < .001). The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher by both groups.

Table 4.16 Differences in Subscales by Enthusiasm for Engaging Faculty

| | **More Enthusiastic to Engage ($t_{804}$ = -3.049)** | | **Not as Enthusiastic to Engage ($t_{421}$ = -4.073** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.22 | .807 | 3.99 | .900 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.33 | .754 | 4.18 | .838 |

all $p$s < .05

An additional test was conducted to review if Major Gifts Officers' undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between the ratings of the caring/supportive subscale and the professional competency/communication subscale and their enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development process. Enthusiasm to engage faculty was selected as the dependent variable with the caring/supportive subscale and the professional competency/communication subscale as the independent variables. The

moderator was undergraduate experience with an excellent professor and control variables were working at alma mater, total years in the profession, and gift threshold.

Both models for the linear regression test were statistically significant: caring/supportive subscale ($F_{12, 100} = 2.259$, $p = .014$) and professional competency/communication subscale ($F_{12, 100} = 1.866$, $p = .048$). The undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between ratings for the caring/supportive subscale and the enthusiasm to engage faculty and accounted for about 12% of the variance in enthusiasm to engage faculty ($R^2 = .213$, Adj. $R^2 = .119$). The undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between ratings for the professional competency/communication subscale and the enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support and accounted for about 9% of the variance in enthusiasm to engage faculty ($R^2 = .183$, Adj. $R^2 = .085$).

Table 4.17 Undergraduate Experience with Faculty and Enthusiasm to Engage Faculty in Development Activities

| **Variable (Unstandardized Coefficient *B*)** | Enthusiasm to Engage Faculty in Development Activities (n = 113) | |
|---|---|---|
| **Caring/supportive subscale ratings** | -1.160 (0.497)<br>*t* = -2.336<br>*p* = .022 | |
| **Professional competency/communication ratings** | | -1.031 (0.567)<br>*t* = -1.818<br>*p* = .072* |
| **Undergraduate experience** | -2.473 (0.802)<br>*t* = -3.083<br>*p* = .003 | -2.356 (0.943)<br>*t* = -2.499<br>*p* = .014 |
| **Caring/supportive subscale ratings x Undergraduate experience** | 0.634 (0.198)<br>*t* = 3.208<br>*p* = .002 | |
| **Professional competency/communication ratings x Undergraduate experience** | | 0.578 (0.221)<br>*t* = 2.612<br>*p* = .010 |
| **Adj $R^2$** | 0.12 | 0.09 |

*$p > .05$ but $< .10$

*How Often Faculty are Engaged in Fundraising (Q35)*

The researcher utilized MANOVA to analyze responses of Major Gifts Officers by how often they engage faculty in the development process. Likert scale ratings were combined to form two groups – Not Frequently Engaging Faculty (ratings 1, 2, and 3) and Frequently Engaging Faculty (ratings 4, and 5).

Table 4.18 Major Gifts Officers' Opinion Responses for Q35

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **How often do you engage a faculty member in development/fundraising activities? (Q35)** | | (113) | 99.9 |
| **Rating 1** | I rarely ask faculty to assist with development/fundraising efforts and activities | 7 | 6.2 |
| **Rating 2** | | 17 | 15.0 |
| **Rating 3** | | 32 | 28.3 |
| **Rating 4** | | 27 | 23.9 |
| **Rating 5** | I frequently ask faculty to assist with development/fundraising efforts and activities | 30 | 26.5 |

There was not a statistically significant difference in ratings based on how often Major Gifts Officers engage faculty in the development process, $F_{28, 54} = 1.150$, $p = .323$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.627$, partial $\eta 2 = .373$. However, univariate tests indicated there were statistically significant differences between the two groups for the following behaviors: (1) knowledgeable ($F_{1, 81} = 6.038$, $p = .016$); (2) promotes critical thinking ($F_{1, 81} = 10.304$, $p = .002$); and (3) punctuality/manages class time ($F_{1, 81} = 6.547$, $p = .012$). For each of the three behaviors, the mean rating was higher for those who responded that they more frequently engage faculty in the development and fundraising process. Table 4.19 displays mean differences for TBC qualities between the two groups of Major Gifts Officers.

Table 4.19 Significant Differences in TBC Item Means
Frequency of Engaging Faculty

| | **Frequently Engaging (n = 77)** | | **Not Frequently Engaging (n = 39)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **knowledgeable** | 4.71 | .089 | 4.39 | .095 |
| **promotes critical thinking** | 4.67 | .098 | 4.18 | .104 |
| **punctuality/manages class time** | 4.50 | .100 | 4.13 | .106 |

*all *p*s < .05

Mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' frequency of engaging faculty in the development process. Those who engaged faculty more often had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who did not engage faculty as often. Mean subscale ratings for those who frequently engage with faculty during the fundraising process were (M = 4.17) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.35) for professional competency/communication grouping. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales for those who more frequently engage faculty ($p < .001$). Subscale mean ratings for those who did not frequently engage with faculty were (M = 4.12) for the caring/supportive subscale and (M = 4.23) for the professional competency/communication subscale. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales by those who did not frequently engage with faculty ($p = .002$). The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher than the caring/supportive subscale by both groups.

Table 4.20 Differences in Subscale by How Often Faculty are Engaged in Fundraising

| | **Frequently Engaging ($t_{602}$ = -5.355)** | | **Not Frequently Engaging ($t_{597}$ = -3.086)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.17 | .839 | 4.12 | .869 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.35 | .769 | 4.23 | .795 |

all *p*s < .05

**Research Question Four**

Research question four was stated as, what similarities or differences exist between Major Gifts Officers' responses and student and faculty responses in prior research of the Teacher Behavior Checklist? The following top-ten qualities were rated highest by Major Gifts Officers: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) confident; (4) promotes critical thinking; (5) accessible; (6) prepared; (7) enthusiastic; (8) respectful; (9) punctuality/manages class time; and (10) effective communicator.

Table 4.21 SEC Major Gifts Officers' Top 10

| | | **Mean** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|
| PC | Knowledgeable | 4.59 | 1 |
| PC | Approachable/Personable | 4.42 | 2 |
| PC | Confident | 4.42 | 3 |
| CS | Promotes Critical Thinking | 4.42 | 4 |
| CS | Accessible | 4.41 | 5 |
| PC | Prepared | 4.38 | 6 |
| CS | Enthusiastic | 4.37 | 7 |
| PC | Respectful | 4.37 | 8 |
| PC | Punctuality/Manages Class Time | 4.35 | 9 |
| PC | Effective Communicator | 4.34 | 10 |

To address research question four, comparisons were made between Major Gifts Officers' top-ten list and top-ten lists from previous studies of student and faculty (Buskist et al., 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Edge, 2019). These studies were selected because of similarities in survey method. Data also were compared to data from the original student and faculty study by Buskist et al. (2002). In comparing responses of Major Gift Officers with five samples of students in previous studies, only two TBC qualities, knowledgeable and enthusiastic, appeared on each top ten list. Based on analysis of multiple TBC studies of faculty and students, Buskist and Keeley (2018) confirmed that being knowledgeable about the subject and being enthusiastic about the topic and teaching appear to be universal principles associated with excellent teaching. Major Gifts Officers in this study rated knowledgeable as the top TBC quality with enthusiastic as the seventh rated quality. Three TBC items (approachable/personable, respectful, and effective communicator) appeared on the Major Gifts Officers' list and four out of five (83%) of the student samples' lists in Table 4.22. Only one TBC item, punctuality/manages class time, appeared on the Major Gifts Officers' list but did not appear on any of the lists for the five student samples. Four TBC items (knowledgeable, approachable, respectful, and enthusiastic) appeared on both the Major Gifts Officers' top ten list and the original undergraduate student study top ten list by Buskist et al. (2002).

Table 4.22 Comparison of Major Gifts Officers and Selected Student Top-Ten Lists

| **Jones (2021) Major Gifts Officers** | **Edge (2019) Graduate students** | **Ford (2017) Public university students** | **Noll (2017) Public university students** | **Keeley et al. (2012) Private liberal arts college** | **Buskist, et al. (2002) undergraduate students** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Accessible | Realistic expectations/ fair |
| Approachable/ personable | Enthusiastic | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable |
| Confident | Respectful | Realistic expectations/ fair | Realistic expectations/ fair | Confident | Understanding |
| Promotes critical thinking | Confident | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable | Approachable/ personable |
| Accessible | Effective communicator | Enthusiastic | Enthusiastic | Respectful | Respectful |
| Prepared | Promotes critical thinking | Respectful | Understanding | Enthusiastic | Creative/ interesting |
| Enthusiastic | Provides constructive feedback | Tie: Confident and Encourages/ cares | Happy/positive/ humorous | Effective communicator | Happy/positive/ humorous |
| Respectful | Realistic expectations/fair | | Encourages/ cares | Prepared | Encourages/ cares |
| Punctuality/ manages class time | Good listener | Understanding | Flexible/open-minded | Good listener | Flexible/open-minded |
| Effective communicator | Prepared | Accessible | Strives to be a better teacher | Promotes critical thinking | Enthusiastic |

In addition to the universal teaching principles of knowledgeable and enthusiastic, Buskist and Keeley (2018) found the next near-universal principles shared by faculty and students are being approachable/personable and being an effective communicator. Those two near-universal qualities were rated in the top ten by Major Gifts Officers in this study with being approachable/personable ranked as the number two quality. In comparing Major Gifts Officers' top ten rated TBC qualities with five faculty samples, there were five shared items: knowledgeable, approachable/personable, promotes critical thinking, enthusiastic, and effective communicator. Of these five shared items, four of these (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, and effective communicator) are considered universal or near-universal principles of excellent teaching (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). The TBC item,

prepared, appeared on the Major Gifts Officers' list and four out of five (83%) of the faculty samples' lists with respectful appearing on the Major Gifts Officers' list and three out of five faculty lists (67%.) Seven TBC items (knowledgeable, enthusiastic, promote critical thinking, prepared, approachable/personable, effective communicator, and respectful) appeared on both the Major Gifts Officers' top ten list and the original faculty study top ten list by Buskist et al. (2002).

Table 4.23 Comparison of Major Gifts Officers and Selected Faculty Top-Ten Lists

| **Jones (2021) Major Gifts Officers** | **McConner (2017) U.S.-educated faculty - HBCUs** | **Ford (2017) Multiple 4-year research university faculty** | **Keely et al., (2016) National Award-Winning Faculty** | **Ismail (2014) U.S.-educated faculty multiple institutions** | **Buskist, et al. (2002) faculty** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Enthusiastic | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable |
| Approachable/ personable | Enthusiastic | Enthusiastic | Strives to be a better teacher | Enthusiastic | Enthusiastic |
| Confident | Approachable/ personable | Promotes critical thinking | Creative/ interesting | Creative/ interesting | Promotes critical thinking |
| Promotes critical thinking | Creative/ interesting | Effective communicator | Knowledgeable | Promotes critical thinking | Prepared |
| Accessible | Effective communicator | Strives to be a better teacher | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable |
| Prepared | Encourages/cares | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator |
| Enthusiastic | Promotes critical thinking | Prepared | Respectful | Encourages/ cares | Respectful |
| Respectful | Accessible | Respectful | Encourages/ cares | Punctuality/ manages class time | Creative/ interesting |
| Punctuality/ manages class time | Confident | Confident | Prepared | Accessible | Presents current information |
| Effective communicator | Prepared | Creative/ interesting | Tie: Rapport and Promotes critical thinking | Promotes class discussion | Realistic expectations/ fair |

*Years in the Profession*

Major Gifts Officers were separated into groups based on number of years in the development/fundraising profession. Eight TBC items were ranked in the top-ten by both groups

of professionals: (1) accessible; (2) approachable/personable; (3) confident; (4) enthusiastic; (5) knowledgeable; (6) prepared; (7) promotes critical thinking; and (8) respectful. For those who have worked less than 10 years in the profession, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) confident; (3) punctuality/manages class time; (4) respectful; and (5) accessible. For those who have worked 11 or more years in the profession, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) promotes critical thinking; (4) enthusiastic; and (5) prepared. Both groups of development professionals ranked knowledgeable as the top behavior. Major Gifts Officers who have worked more than 11 years in the profession identified three of the four universal or near-universal qualities (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, and enthusiastic) in their top five behaviors while those who have worked in the profession 10 years or less identified only one of the universal and near-universal qualities in the top 5 (knowledgeable).

Table 4.24 Differences in TBC Item Means and Rankings by Years in Profession

| | **Mean 11+ years** | **11+ years RANK** | **Mean 0 - 10 years** | **0 - 10 years RANK** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accessible | 4.37 | 6 | 4.46 | 5 |
| Approachable/Personable | 4.47 | 2 | 4.37 | 9 |
| Authoritative | 4.05 | 18 | 4.07 | 23 |
| Confident | 4.29 | 9 | 4.54 | 2 |
| Creative/Interesting | 4.02 | 20 | 4.14 | 19 |
| Effective Communicator | 4.37 | 7 | 4.30 | 11 |
| Encourages/Cares | 4.16 | 16 | 4.24 | 14 |
| Enthusiastic | 4.39 | 4 | 4.36 | 10 |
| Establishes Goals | 4.27 | 11 | 4.26 | 12 |
| Flexible/Open-Minded | 3.91 | 24 | 3.93 | 25 |
| Good Listener | 4.18 | 15 | 4.40 | 7 |
| Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous | 3.96 | 22 | 4.24 | 15 |
| Humble | 3.59 | 28 | 3.86 | 26 |
| Knowledgeable | 4.57 | 1 | 4.61 | 1 |
| Prepared | 4.38 | 5 | 4.39 | 8 |
| Presents Current Information | 4.21 | 14 | 4.23 | 16 |
| Professional | 3.95 | 23 | 4.12 | 21 |
| Promotes Class Discussion | 4.30 | 8 | 4.18 | 17 |
| Promotes Critical Thinking | 4.39 | 3 | 4.44 | 6 |
| Provides Constructive Feedback | 4.21 | 13 | 4.25 | 13 |
| Punctuality/Manages Class Time | 4.21 | 12 | 4.48 | 3 |
| Rapport | 3.98 | 21 | 4.12 | 20 |
| Realistic/Fair | 4.09 | 17 | 4.09 | 22 |
| Respectful | 4.27 | 10 | 4.47 | 4 |
| Sensitive/Persistent | 3.80 | 25 | 3.82 | 27 |
| Strives to Be a Better Teacher | 3.66 | 27 | 3.72 | 28 |
| Technologically Competent | 3.71 | 26 | 3.95 | 24 |
| Understanding | 4.04 | 19 | 4.17 | 18 |

Mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' number of years in the development profession. Those who have worked in the development profession for

0 – 10 years had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who had worked in the profession for 11 or more years. For those who were in the 0 – 10 years working group, mean subscale ratings were (M = 4.16) for the caring/supportive category and (M = 4.34) for professional competency/communication behaviors. There was a significant difference in the mean ratings for the subscales by those who reported working in the profession for 10 or less years ($p < .001$). In addition, there was a significant difference in the mean subscale ratings for those who have worked for 11 or more years in the development profession ($p = .003$). For those who reported working in the profession for 11 or more years, mean subscale ratings were (M = 4.11) for caring/supportive and (M = 4.22) for professional competency/communication. The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher by both groups.

Table 4.25 Differences in Subscale by Years in Profession

| | **11 and More Years ($t_{608}$= -3.026)** | | **10 Years and Less ($t_{622}$ = -4.964)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.11 | .835 | 4.16 | .870 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.22 | .791 | 4.34 | .778 |

All *p*s < .05

*Work at Alma Mater*

Major Gifts Officers were asked to identify if they currently work at their undergraduate alma mater. Major Gifts Officers were separated into two groups based on their responses: currently work at alma mater and do not work at alma mater. Eight TBC items were ranked in the top-ten by both groups: (1) accessible; (2) approachable/personable; (3) confident; (4)

enthusiastic; (5) knowledgeable; (6) prepared; (7) promotes critical thinking; and (8) respectful. For those who currently work at their alma mater, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) promotes critical thinking; (3) confident; (4) prepared; and (5) accessible. For those who do not work at their alma mater, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) effective communicator; (4) accessible; and (5) confident. Both groups of development professionals ranked knowledgeable as the top behavior. Major Gifts Officers who currently work at their alma mater identified only one of the universal and near-universal qualities in their top 5 (knowledgeable) while those who do not work at their alma mater identified three of the four universal or near-universal qualities (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, and effective communicator) in their top five behaviors.

Table 4.26 Top 10 By Alma Mater Type

| **Work at Alma Mater Top 10** | **Don't Work at Alma Mater Top 10** |
|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable |
| Promotes Critical Thinking | Approachable/Personable |
| Confident | Effective Communicator |
| Prepared | Accessible |
| Accessible | Confident |
| Punctuality/Manages Class Time | Respectful |
| Approachable/Personable | Enthusiastic |
| Enthusiastic | Promotes Critical Thinking |
| Respectful | Good Listener |
| Establishes Goals | Prepared |

Mean ratings for each subscale were calculated based on Major Gifts Officers' response regarding their current institution. The mean ratings for each subscale were similar for both groups. For those who currently work for their undergraduate alma mater, mean subscale ratings were (M = 4.13) for the caring/supportive category and (M = 4.30) for professional competency/communication behaviors with significant differences in those mean subscale

ratings ($p < .001$). For those who reported that they do not currently work for their alma mater, mean subscale ratings were (M = 4.15) for caring/supportive and (M = 4.27) for professional competency/communication with significant differences in those mean subscale ratings ($p = .002$). The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher by both groups and the differences in subscale ratings for both groups were significant.

Table 4.27 Differences in Subscales by Work at Undergraduate Alma Mater

| | **Work at Alma Mater ($t_{623} = -5.024$)** | | **Do Not Work at Alma Mater ($t_{608} = -3.127$)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **Caring/Supportive** | 4.13 | .872 | 4.15 | .833 |
| **Professional Competency/Communication** | 4.30 | .772 | 4.27 | .802 |

all *p*s < .05

Previous studies found that faculty placed higher importance on the professional competency/communication subscale and students emphasized the caring/supportive subscale (Buskist, 2004; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Groccia et al., 2018; Keeley et al., 2016). In each analysis of this study, Major Gifts Officers rated the professional competency/communication subscale higher than the caring/supportive subscale. Major Gifts Officers' TBC item rankings and subscale ratings in this study were more aligned with faculty responses than student responses.

# CHAPTER 5: Discussion and Conclusion

## Introduction

This study explored Major Gifts Officers' perceptions of master teaching. Chapter 1 introduced the study and detailed the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, definitions of terms, and organization of the study. Chapter 2 provided a literature review which included the history of higher education fundraising, Major Gifts Officers' characteristics, and the need for increased philanthropic funding for colleges/universities. In addition, Chapter 2 also included an overview of research related to learning and master teachers and results from prior studies related to the Teacher Behavior Checklist.

Chapter 3 described the methods for this study, the instrument used, sample population details, data collection, and data analysis. This study was organized to seeks answers to these research questions: (1) What Teacher Behavior Checklist qualities do Major Gifts Officers in higher education perceive master teachers demonstrate most?; (2) Based on their undergraduate experience with faculty, do these perceptions of teacher behaviors influence Major Gifts Officers to raise funds to support faculty?; (3) Based on perceptions of master teachers in their undergraduate experience, does this influence Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process?; and (4) What similarities or differences exist between Major Gifts Officers' responses and student and faculty responses in prior research of the Teacher Behavior Checklist?

The data analysis and findings of the study were presented in Chapter 4. This chapter described demographics and associated responses of the sample. Data analysis was conducted based on Major Gifts Officers' reported enthusiasm and willingness to raise faculty support and

to engage faculty in the fundraising process. In addition, similarities and differences of responses were compared based on years in the profession and status of working at the institution of undergraduate degree.

Chapter 5 summarizes the study, conclusions from the findings, implications for higher education fundraising work, research implications related to teacher behaviors, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

## Summary of Results

Approximately 510 Major Gifts Officers at SEC institutions were contacted and asked to participate in this study. The survey yielded 117 responses (estimated response rate of 23%). Of the 117 responses, 26 reported their years of experience working in development between 0 and 5 years (22.2%), 33 reported between 6 and 10 years (28.2%), 22 reported 11 – 15 years of experience (18.8%), 14 reported experience between16 and 20 years (12.0%), 16 reported working for 21 – 25 years (13.7%), and 6 reported having 26 or more years of experience working in development (5.1%). Because of sample size, years of experience segments were combined into two groups: those with 0 – 10 years of experience in development and those with 11 or more years of experience. About 50% of the respondents reported that they currently work at the institution from which they received their undergraduate degree.

### Research Question One

Exploring Research Question One provided an overall list of Major Gifts Officers' perceptions of behaviors exhibited by a master teacher during their undergraduate experience. The top ten highest rated TBC items according to Major Gifts Officers in this study are: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) confident; (4) promotes critical thinking; (5) accessible; (6) prepared; (7) enthusiastic; (8) respectful; (9) punctuality/manages class time; and

(10) effective communicator. Of this overall top-ten list, seven behaviors are from the professional competency/communication subscale (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, confident, prepared, respectful, punctuality/manages class time, and effective communicator) and three qualities are from the caring/supportive subscale (promotes critical thinking, accessible, and enthusiastic). Mean ratings and pairwise comparisons of TBC items were analyzed. Using a paired samples t-test for analysis, MGOs rated behaviors on the professional competency/communication subscale higher than behaviors on the caring/supportive subscale.

**Research Question Two**

Research Question Two was answered by analyzing the willingness and enthusiasm to raise philanthropic support for faculty by combining participants into two groups based on attitudinal responses. Means for each TBC item were compared using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and then the caring/supportive and professional competency/communication subscale means were compared. To determine if the undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between the ratings of the caring/supportive subscale, the professional competency/communication subscale, and their enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development process, a linear regression test was utilized.

There was not an overall statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's willingness to raise funds for faculty support. However, there were statistically significant differences between the groups for the following TBC items: accessible, creative/interesting, and encourages/cares. The mean ratings for these three behaviors were higher for those who responded that experience with an excellent professor in an undergraduate class definitely influences a willingness to raise funds for faculty support. Major Gifts Officers

who had at least one teacher who positively impacted their undergraduate experience and responded that the experience definitely influences their willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who responded that an outstanding undergraduate professor somewhat influences their willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support.

There was not an overall statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's level of enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support. However, there were statistically significant differences between the groups for the following TBC items: creative/interesting, knowledgeable, promotes critical thinking, and punctuality/manages time. The mean ratings for these four behaviors were higher for those who responded that they are more enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support. Major Gifts Officers who reported higher levels of enthusiasm to actively raise funds for faculty support had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who responded with less enthusiasm to actively raise funds for faculty support. The professional competency/communication subscale was rated higher than the caring/supportive subscale by both groups. The undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between ratings for the caring/supportive subscale, ratings for the professional competency/communication subscale, and the enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support.

**Research Question Three**

To answer Research Question Three, the researcher analyzed Major Gifts Officers' willingness to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process by comparing perceptions of current faculty partners' exhibited behaviors, level of enthusiasm for engaging with faculty in the development process, and how often faculty are engaged in fundraising

activities. Based on opinion responses for each of the three survey questions, participants were combined into two groups with means for each TBC item compared using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and then univariate tests. To determine if the undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between the ratings of the caring/supportive subscale, ratings of the professional competency/communication subscale, and their enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development process, the researcher used a linear regression test.

There was a statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's perception that their faculty partners in development shared qualities of their master teacher from their undergraduate experience. Additional tests showed statistically significant differences between the two groups for seven behaviors (accessible, effective communicator, encourages/cares, enthusiastic, establishes goals, promotes critical thinking, and provides constructive feedback), with the mean rating for each item being higher for those who responded that faculty with whom they currently partner in development activities seem to share MANY of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from their undergraduate experience versus those who shared that faculty with whom they currently partner in development activities seem to share SOME of the behaviors. MGOs who responded that their current faculty partners share many of the same qualities of a master teacher during their undergraduate experience had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who responded that faculty partners share some of the same qualities as excellent teachers in their undergraduate experience.

There was not a statistically significant difference in ratings based on a Major Gifts Officer's level of enthusiasm for engaging faculty in the development process. However, there were statistically significant differences based on the level of enthusiasm to engage faculty with

the following behaviors: creative/interesting, knowledgeable, promotes critical thinking, strives to be a better teacher, and understanding. For each of the five behaviors, the mean rating was higher for those MGOs who responded that they have a higher level of enthusiasm for engaging faculty in the development and fundraising process. MGOs who were more enthusiastic to engage faculty had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who were not as enthusiastic to engage faculty in development work. The undergraduate experience with an excellent professor had a positive influence on the relationship between ratings for the caring/supportive subscale, ratings for the professional competency/communication subscale, and the enthusiasm to engage faculty in the development process.

There was not a statistically significant difference in ratings based on how often MGOs engage faculty in the development process. However, based on how often faculty are engaged in development, there were statistically significant differences related to the following behaviors: knowledgeable, promotes critical thinking, and punctuality/manages class time. For each of the three behaviors, the mean rating was higher for those who responded that they more frequently engage faculty in the development and fundraising process. MGOs who engaged faculty more often had higher mean ratings for both subscales than those who did not engage faculty as often.

**Research Question Four**

To answer Research Question Four, participants' responses for the TBC items were compared to previous studies involving students and faculty. Major Gifts Officers first were compared to students from three studies (Buskist et al., 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Edge, 2019). In comparing responses of MGOs with five samples of students in previous studies, only two TBC qualities, knowledgeable and enthusiastic, appeared on each top ten list. These results align with findings by Buskist and Keeley (2018) that being knowledgeable about the subject and

being enthusiastic about the topic seem to be universal principles associated with excellent teaching. Additionally, three TBC items (approachable/personable, respectful, and effective communicator) appeared on the Major Gifts Officers' list and four out of five (83%) of the student samples' lists. When comparing Major Gifts Officers' responses to those of graduate students, there were seven agreed upon behaviors from the two top ten lists: knowledgeable, confident, promotes critical thinking, prepared, enthusiastic, respectful, and effective communicator (Edge, 2019).

Table 5.1 Comparison of Major Gifts Officers and Graduate Student Top-Ten Lists

| **Jones (2021)**<br>**Major Gifts Officers** | **Edge (2019)**<br>**Graduate Students** |
|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable |
| Approachable/personable | Enthusiastic |
| Confident | Respectful |
| Promotes critical thinking | Confident |
| Accessible | Effective communicator |
| Prepared | Promotes critical thinking |
| Enthusiastic | Provides constructive feedback |
| Respectful | Realistic expectations/fair |
| Punctuality/manages class time | Good listener |
| Effective communicator | Prepared |

In comparing Major Gifts Officers' top ten rated TBC qualities with previous faculty studies, there were five shared items: knowledgeable, approachable/personable, promotes critical thinking, enthusiastic, and effective communicator. Of these five shared items, four of these (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, and effective communicator) are considered universal or near-universal principles of excellent teaching (Buskist & Keeley, 2018).

Table 5.2 Comparison of Major Gifts Officers and Selected Faculty Top-Ten Lists

| **Jones (2021) Major Gifts Officers** | **McConner (2017) U.S.-educated faculty - HBCUs** | **Ford (2017) Multiple 4-year research university faculty** | **Keely et al., (2016) National Award-Winning Faculty** | **Ismail (2014) U.S.-educated faculty multiple institutions** | **Buskist, et al. (2002) faculty** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | Enthusiastic | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable |
| Approachable/ personable | Enthusiastic | Enthusiastic | Strives to be a better teacher | Enthusiastic | Enthusiastic |
| Confident | Approachable/ personable | Promotes critical thinking | Creative/ interesting | Creative/ interesting | Promotes critical thinking |
| Promotes critical thinking | Creative/ interesting | Effective communicator | Knowledgeable | Promotes critical thinking | Prepared |
| Accessible | Effective communicator | Strives to be a better teacher | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable |
| Prepared | Encourages/cares | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator |
| Enthusiastic | Promotes critical thinking | Prepared | Respectful | Encourages/ cares | Respectful |
| Respectful | Accessible | Respectful | Encourages/ cares | Punctuality/ manages class time | Creative/ interesting |
| Punctuality/ manages class time | Confident | Confident | Prepared | Accessible | Presents current information |
| Effective communicator | Prepared | Creative/ interesting | Tie: Rapport and Promotes critical thinking | Promotes class discussion | Realistic expectations/ fair |

In comparing MGOs working at SEC institutions with samples of faculty and students teaching and studying at SEC institutions, there were four shared items: knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, and effective communicator. Again, these behaviors align with the universal and near-universal principles of excellent teaching as found in research by Buskist and Keeley (2018). Specifically comparing ratings of SEC Major Gifts Officers and SEC pharmacy faculty, there are eight shared behaviors rated in the two top ten lists: knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, effective communicator, confident, promotes critical thinking, prepared, and respectful.

Table 5.3 Comparison of Major Gifts Officers and SEC Faculty and Student Top-Ten Lists

| **Jones (2021) SEC Major Gifts Officers (13 institutions, n = 117)** | **Ford (2017) SEC Universities Pharmacy Faculty (10 institutions, n = 211)** | | **Ford (2017) SEC Universities Pharmacy Students (4 institutions, n = 213)** | **Noll (2017) SEC University Nursing Students (1 institution, n = 89)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable | | Knowledgeable | Knowledgeable |
| Approachable/ personable | Enthusiastic | | Effective communicator | Approachable/ personable |
| Confident | Promotes critical thinking | | Realistic expectations/ fair | Realistic expectations/ fair |
| Promotes critical thinking | Effective communicator | | Approachable/ personable | Effective communicator |
| Accessible | Strives to be a better teacher | | Enthusiastic | Enthusiastic |
| Prepared | Approachable/ personable | | Respectful | Understanding |
| Enthusiastic | Prepared | | Tie: Confident and Encourages/ cares | Happy/positive/humorous |
| Respectful | Respectful | | | Encourages/ cares |
| Punctuality/ manages class time | Confident | | Understanding | Flexible/open-minded |
| Effective communicator | Creative/ interesting | | Accessible | Strives to be a better teacher |

When comparing top ten lists of other samples, SEC Major Gifts Officers had the greatest number of behaviors in common with SEC pharmacy faculty (8) and graduate students from a SEC university (7). The next greatest agreement of top behaviors was from select faculty samples (5), SEC pharmacy and nursing students (4), and then select samples of undergraduate students (2).

Table 5.4 Comparison of Shared Behaviors in Top Ten Lists with Jones (2021) SEC Major Gifts Officers

| **Ford (2017) SEC Universities Pharmacy Faculty** | **Edge (2019) SEC University Graduate Students** | **Combined Faculty Studies Buskist, et al. (2002); Ford (2017); Ismail (2014); Keely et al., (2016); McConner (2017)** | **SEC Student Studies Ford (2017); Noll (2017)** | **Combined Student Studies Buskist, et al. (2002); Edge (2019); Ford (2017); Keeley et al. (2012); Noll (2017)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| Knowledgeable<br>Approachable/personable<br>Enthusiastic<br>Effective communicator<br>Confident<br>Promotes critical thinking<br>Prepared<br>Respectful | Knowledgeable<br>Confident<br>Promotes critical thinking<br>Prepared<br>Enthusiastic<br>Respectful<br>Effective communicator | Knowledgeable<br>Approachable/personable<br>Promotes critical thinking<br>Enthusiastic<br>Effective communicator | Knowledgeable<br>Approachable/personable<br>Enthusiastic<br>Effective communicator | Knowledgeable<br>Enthusiastic |

The data were further analyzed based on years in the profession and whether the Major Gift Officer currently works at the institution for which he/she received an undergraduate degree. For those who have worked less than 10 years in the profession, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) confident; (3) punctuality/manages class time; (4) respectful; and (5) accessible. For those who have worked 11 or more years in the profession, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) promotes critical thinking; (4) enthusiastic; and (5) prepared. Both groups of development professionals ranked knowledgeable as the top behavior.

Major Gifts Officers who have worked in the development profession between 0 – 10 years had higher mean ratings for 22 of 28 TBC items and both subscales than those who had worked in the profession for 11 or more years. There were five qualities that Major Gifts Officers who have worked for 11 or more years rated higher: approachable/personable, effective communicator, enthusiastic, establishes goals, and promotes class discussion. The behavior

realistic/fair had the same mean score for both groups. Regardless of number of years working in development, Major Gifts Officers in both groups rated the professional competency/communication subscale higher than the caring/supportive subscale.

In comparing responses for Major Gifts Officers who currently work at their undergraduate alma mater and those who do not, there were eight TBC items that were ranked in the top-ten by both groups. However, the order of the top five rated qualities varied. For those who currently work at their alma mater, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) promotes critical thinking; (3) confident; (4) prepared; and (5) accessible. For those who do not work at their alma mater, the top five behaviors were: (1) knowledgeable; (2) approachable/personable; (3) effective communicator; (4) accessible; and (5) confident. Major Gifts Officers who currently work at their alma mater identified only one of the universal and near-universal qualities in their top 5 (knowledgeable) while those who do not work at their alma mater identified three of the four universal or near-universal qualities (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, and effective communicator) in their top five behaviors.

## Discussion

Prior TBC studies utilized samples comprised of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty to analyze perceptions of teaching behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers (Buskist et al., 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Edge, 2019). This study was the first to administer the TBC instrument to non-academic staff working in higher education. Further, Major Gifts Officers were asked to think back to their undergraduate experience with an excellent teacher versus many studies which asked participants to rate teaching behaviors based on current experiences. Findings indicate that MGOs in this sample rated the four universal and near-universal principles of excellent teaching (knowledgeable, approachable/personable,

enthusiastic, and effective communicator) in the aggregated top ten list of TBC item means (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Further, data in this study illustrated that the undergraduate experience with faculty had a positive influence on the ratings for the two subscales and the enthusiasm to raise faculty support and to engage faculty. Findings in this study indicated that faculty behaviors and perceptions of the classroom experience matter. In reviewing Major Gifts Officers' attitudinal responses related to levels of willingness and enthusiasm for raising funds for faculty support and for engaging faculty in development activities, there are implications that the undergraduate experience with faculty can impact future fundraising processes.

**Willingness and Enthusiasm to Raise Funds for Faculty Support**

Raising funds for faculty support can be challenging. According to a thirty-year longitudinal study by the TIAA Institute in 2020, philanthropic gifts designated for faculty support continue to remain around 2% of total giving to higher education institutions (Shaker & Borden, 2020). Major Gifts Officers who answered that the undergraduate experience definitely influences their willing to raise faculty support had higher ratings for both subscales and significantly higher ratings for the behaviors of accessible, creating/interesting, and encourages/cares. Of these three behaviors, two are found on the caring subscale (accessible and encourages/cares) which could mean that having access to faculty and believing that they care are important qualities that influence the willingness to raise faculty support. These findings could indicate that the undergraduate experience with an excellent teacher has a long-term impact both for attitudes of fundraisers and future fundraising dollars. Further, identifying Major Gifts Officer candidates who had a positive undergraduate experience with an excellent faculty member could signify that they are more likely to embrace fundraising initiatives related to this gift type.

Major Gifts Officers who reported a higher level of enthusiasm for raising funds for faculty support had higher ratings for both subscales and significantly higher ratings for the behaviors of creative/interesting, knowledgeable, promotes critical thinking, and punctuality/manages class time. Three of these behaviors (creative/interesting, knowledgeable, promotes critical thinking) appeared on top ten lists in the five faculty samples that were compared (Buskist et al., 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Edge, 2019). This could imply that Major Gifts Officers who are more enthusiastic to raise funds to support faculty value similar teacher behaviors as other faculty. Further, the creative/interesting behavior was found to be statistically rated higher for those who reported a higher level of enthusiasm for raising funds for faculty support and for those who responded that the undergraduate experience definitely influences their willing to raise faculty support. While the creative/interesting behavior is found statistically higher for these two groups of MGOs and in the top ten for faculty in five samples, it was ranked as number 20 in the full sample in this study. It could be that those MGOs who had a positive undergraduate experience with faculty and are more enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support place a higher value on the creative/interesting behavior. Perhaps articulating this particular teacher behavior to prospects and donors allows for an easier conversation related to philanthropic support for faculty. MGOs who reported that their experience with an excellent professor in their undergraduate classes definitely influences their willingness to raise funds for faculty may have implications for those who wish to improve their teaching and for identifying Development professionals who may embrace fundraising for this gift type.

**Willingness and Enthusiasm to Engage Faculty in Fundraising**

Major Gifts Officers choose to partner with certain faculty during the fundraising process. There was a statistically significant difference in TBC ratings based on a MGO's

perception that their current faculty partners share many of the qualities (versus some of the qualities) as an excellent teacher during the undergraduate experience. In addition, there were seven behaviors that were found to be rated significantly higher by those who identify that the current faculty partners share many of the same qualities (accessible, effective communicator, encourages/cares, enthusiastic, establishes goals, promotes critical thinking, and provides constructive feedback). Of these seven behaviors, five are found on the caring/supportive subscale (accessible, encourages/cares, enthusiastic, promotes critical thinking, and provides constructive feedback). Further, those who responded that their current faculty partners share many of the qualities as excellent undergraduate teachers had higher ratings for both subscales with the professional competency/communication subscale as the greater of the two. With five of the seven behaviors on the caring/supportive subscale as statistically significant for this group comparison, this could imply that MGOs choose to partner with faculty who exhibit caring behaviors for students, colleagues, and alumni. In addition, the findings that MGOs choose to currently partner with faculty who exhibit many of the same qualities as those of their excellent undergraduate teachers suggest that observed behaviors in the classroom influence future partnerships outside the classroom.

## Universal Principles of Master Teaching

In a comparison with SEC pharmacy faculty, SEC Major Gifts Officers in this study agreed on eight top TBC behaviors (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, effective communicator, confident, promotes critical thinking, prepared, and respectful). The alignment of these two groups particularly is encouraging because the fundraising partnership opportunities are great. Comparing top ten lists, Major Gifts Officers in this sample agreed with multiple faculty samples on five top TBC behaviors (knowledgeable, approachable/personable,

promotes critical thinking, enthusiastic, and effective communicator) further supporting the universal and near-universal principles of excellent teaching. MGOs agreed with Auburn University graduate students on seven top behaviors and had two top behaviors in common with undergraduate students.

Major Gifts Officers who were more willing and enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support and were more enthusiastic to engage faculty in the fundraising process had significantly higher ratings for the creative/interesting behavior. In addition, the promotes critical thinking quality was rated significantly higher by Major Gifts Officers who believed their current faculty partners shared many qualities as excellent teachers, were more enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support, were more enthusiastic to engage faculty, and frequently engage faculty in the development process.

## Implications

Previous studies which utilized the Teacher Behavior Checklist focused on responses from undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty. This study was the first to include non-academic staff working in higher education. In addition, Major Gifts Officers in this sample were asked to think back to excellent teachers from their undergraduate experience and consider their current partnerships with faculty. This study affirmed the four universal and near-universal principles of excellent teaching (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, and effective communicator) as MGOs in this sample rated those qualities in the top ten list of TBC item means (Buskist & Keeley, 2018). Data in this study indicated that the undergraduate classroom experience with faculty has potential long-term implications which can impact future fundraising partnerships and processes.

**Implication One**

Results showed that MGOs who identify as more willing and enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support rated both subscales higher which may indicate a more positive experience with an excellent undergraduate teacher and a greater understanding of the need for this type of philanthropic investment. When interviewing candidates for frontline fundraiser positions, asking applicants to describe an undergraduate professor who made a positive impact on their academic career may provide insight into their understanding of this gift type and their potential desire to raise funds to support faculty. This screening question may provide an additional filter and decision point in the Major Gifts Officer hiring process.

**Implication Two**

Data from this study indicated that those Major Gifts Officers who identify as more enthusiastic to engage faculty in the fundraising process rated both subscales higher which may indicate a more positive experience with a master teacher in the undergraduate classroom. Because the creative/interesting behavior was found to be significantly higher in those MGOs who are more willing and enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support and more enthusiastic to engage faculty, this could be a particular quality in which university teachers might want to consider reviewing and improving. In addition, the promotes critical thinking behavior was discovered to be significantly higher in those MGOs who were enthusiastic to raise faculty funds and to engage faculty. Data regarding those who were more enthusiastic about raising faculty support and engaging with faculty imply that there is shared agreement related to creative/interesting and promotes critical thinking which could indicate near universal perceptions of teaching behaviors for the ideal Major Gifts Officer. Asking Major Gifts Officers to share examples of how an excellent undergraduate teacher was creative and encouraged

critical thinking would provide insight into how they might approach their fundraising strategies when engaging faculty in the development process.

**Implication Three**

It appears that some Major Gifts Officers identify faculty partners for development who exhibit behaviors associated with those from their undergraduate master teachers. MGOs who believe that their current faculty partners share many qualities as an excellent teacher in their undergraduate experience rated both subscales higher than those who believe their faculty partners only share some of those qualities. These results may indicate that faculty have influence on former students long after they graduate. The impact of a positive classroom experience may extend to opportunities for additional faculty engagement and potentially increased philanthropic support for the institution. In coaching MGOs to more closely work with faculty, leaders can suggest that they identify a faculty member as a partner in the fundraising process who seems to share many qualities of their most effective or favorite college teacher.

**Implication Four**

Data from this study affirm the universal and near-universal qualities found in master teachers. Major Gifts Officers' perceptions of excellent teaching were aligned with faculty responses in previous studies. MGOs in this study had the highest agreement with SEC pharmacy faculty for top TBC behaviors. This is a positive indicator that MGOs and faculty have shared expectations and values as it relates to behaviors associated with excellent teachers. These common perceptions of top teaching behaviors should create opportunities for collaboration and partnerships. In every analysis of subgroups of MGOs in this study, the professional competency/communication subscale was statistically rated higher than the

caring/supportive subscale. Perhaps, items on the professional competency/communication subscale become more important as individuals gain additional career experience and maturity.

## Limitations

While e-mail distribution for an online survey was practical from cost and time perspectives since Major Gifts Officers were from thirteen SEC institutions located in ten states, there was an opportunity for a lower response rate (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Because a convenience sample was used, there is at least self-selection bias in that the respondents chose to participate. A potential liability of this study could be the utilization of the Likert scale to measure the TBC perceptions. There is a possibility that a participant might score all TBC items the same (Keeley, 2006; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). However, there were variations in TBC item means in this study. A component of score reliability assumes that the question means the same thing to each respondent, the possible responses mean the same thing to each person, and each respondent would give the same answer if in a situation with the same conditions (Simone, et al. 2012). For this study and data collected, the researcher assumed these aspects of score reliability, but this could be a potential limitation. Additionally, MGOs' memories of their undergraduate experiences and associated teaching behaviors may not be as accurate as those students and faculty who are currently in the classroom environment.

## Recommendations for Future Research

While there have been TBC studies conducted with undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty populations, this study is the first to examine perceptions of master teachers with non-academic staff working in higher education. Future studies can be conducted to involve other non-academic staff in higher education including those who are alumni

engagement specialists, university financial professionals, facilities/operations leaders, and human resources managers.

While this study focused on Major Gifts Officers working at SEC institutions, future research could be completed with fundraisers who work outside of these universities to determine if there are universal or near-universal principles related to this employee type. The TBC can be administered to MGOs working at similar institutions in other conferences and those at liberal arts or private colleges. Having a larger sample size would provide more generalizable results. Further, it would be interesting to explore MGOs' perceptions of master teachers by utilizing a cohort longitudinal study to determine if opinions change with additional career experience (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). While this study asked attitudinal questions regarding willingness and enthusiasm to raise funds for faculty support and to engage faculty in the development process, the researcher did not ask participants to identify their fundraising productivity. While assumed to be true, do higher levels of willingness and enthusiasm to raise faculty support and engage faculty in the fundraising process translate to securing larger philanthropic gifts for the institution?

With MGOs utilizing virtual engagement strategies during the COVID-19 pandemic, did their willingness to engage faculty with prospects and donors increase, decrease, or remain the same? Did using technologies such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, WebEx, etc. cause MGOs to rethink who they chose as faculty partners in the fundraising and development process? And, if so, did these faculty partners exhibit universal/near universal master teacher behaviors both in the virtual classroom and in the virtual development engagement meetings?

In exploring Major Gifts Officers' perceptions of master teachers in this study, the survey instrument listed TBC items alphabetically with Likert scale rating options. Randomly

generating the order of the TBC items in the survey or employing a qualitative approach would be ways to further examine MGOs' perceptions of master teachers' behaviors.

To understand how excellent teachers impact the fundraising process, a TBC study of donors who make gifts of $25,000 or more to higher education would be ideal. Would donors' top rated teacher behaviors align with those of Major Gifts Officers and/or faculty top ten lists? Since most donors who give at this higher level do not work at the institution but are at least involved in some campus events and activities, would their perceptions of master teacher behaviors differ from MGOs, faculty, and students? Future research might focus on donors who make gifts for faculty support versus donors who give to other designations such as support for students, programs, and facilities.

## References


Alborough, L. (2017). Lost in translation: A sociological study of the role of fundraisers in mediating gift giving in non-profit organisations. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *22*(4). doi:10.1002/nvsm.1602

Benson, T. A., Cohen, A. L., & Buskist, W. (2005). Rapport: Its relation to student attitudes and behaviors toward teachers and classes. *Teaching of Psychology*, *32*(4), 35. doi:10.1207/s15328023top3204_8

Breeze, B., & Jollymore, G. (2017). Understanding solicitation: Beyond the binary variable of being asked or not being asked. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *22*(4). doi:10.1002/nvsm.1607

Buskist, W. (2004). Ways of the master teacher. *Association for Psychological Science, 17* (9) 23-26. Retrieved from: http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/uncategorized/ways-of-the-master-teacher.html

Buskist, W., & Groccia, J. E. (2011). Evidence-based teaching: Now and in the future. *New Directions For Teaching & Learning*, 2011(128), 105-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.473

Buskist, W., & Groccia, J. E. (2018). The future of student engagement: The future of student engagement. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2018*(154), 109–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20296

Buskist, W., & Keeley, J. W. (2018). Searching for universal principles of excellence in college and university teaching: Searching for universal principles. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2018*(156), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20321

Buskist, W., Sikorski, J., Buckley, T., & Saville, B. K. (2002). Elements of master teaching. In S. F. Davis, & W. Buskist (Eds.). *The teaching of Psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 27-39). Psychology Press.

Campbell, R. J., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, R. D., & Robinson, W. (2004). Effective teaching and values: Some implications for research and teacher appraisal. *Oxford Review of Education*, *30*(4), 451–465. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305498042000303955

CASE - Donor Bill of Rights. (n.d.). Retrieved July 25, 2017, from http://www.case.org/Samples_Research_and_Tools/Principles_of_Practice/Donor_Bill_of_Rights.html

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 3–7.

Christie, H., Tett, L., Cree, V. E., Hounsell, J., & McCune, V. (2008). 'A real rollercoaster of confidence and emotions': Learning to be a university student. *Studies in Higher Education*, *33*(5), 567–581. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802373040

Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. Jossey-Bass.

Cook, B. R., & Babon, A. (2017). Active learning through online quizzes: Better learning and less (busy) work. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *41*(1), 24–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2016.1185772

Crimmins, G., Nash, G., Oprescu, F., Liebergreen, M., Turley, J., Bond, R., & Dayton, J. (2016). A written, reflective and dialogic strategy for assessment feedback that can enhance student/teacher relationships. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *41*(1), 141–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.986644

Daly, S. (2013). Philanthropy, the new professionals and higher education: The advent of directors of development and alumni relations. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, *35*(1), 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.727701

Dowden, T., Pittaway, S., Yost, H., & McCarthy, R. (2013). Students' perceptions of written feedback in teacher education: Ideally feedback is a continuing two-way communication that encourages progress. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(3), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.632676

Drezner, N. D. (2011). Philanthropy and fundraising in American higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. https://doi:10.1002/aehe.3702

Drezner, N. D., & Garvey, J. C. (2016). LGBTQ alumni philanthropy. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45, 52S–71S. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1177/0899764015597780.

Edge, J. M. (2019). *Graduate students' perceptions of master teaching*. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University).

Elder, S. D. (2010). Recruiting, training, and retaining high-performance development teams. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2010*(149), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.384

Etchegaray, J. M., & Fischer, W. G. (2010). Understanding evidence-based research methods: Reliability and validity considerations in survey research. *HERD: Health Environments Research & Design Journal*, *4*(1), 131–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/193758671000400109

Evans, K. G. (2015). *Contextual conditions related to the undergraduate experience and the nature of alumni involvement: A qualitative study*. *(*Masters Thesis). https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1907

Farwell, M. M., Gaughan, M., & Handy, F. (2020). How did we get here? The career paths of higher education fundraisers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *30*(3), 487–507. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21397

Ford, C. R. (2016). *Identifying effective teaching behaviors of pharmacy faculty master teachers.* (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University).

Groccia, J. E. (2012). A model of understanding university teaching and learning. In J. E. Groccia, M. A. T. Alsudairi, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective* (pp. 3–13). Sage Publishing.

Groccia, J. E., & Buskist, W. (2011). Need for evidence-based teaching. *New Directions For Teaching And Learning*, (128), 5-11. DOI: 10.1002/tl.463

Groccia, J.E., Ismail, E., & Chaudhury, S.R. (2014). Interactive group learning. In B.F. Tobolowsky, T. Skipper, T. Vakos (Eds.), In *Paths to learning: Teaching for engagement in college* (pp. 93-113). The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Groccia, J. E., Ismail, E. A., McConner, M., Ford, C. R., & Noll, K. (2018). Perceptions of excellent teachers: International, HBCU, and health professions perspectives: perceptions of excellent teachers. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2018*(156), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20320

Groccia, J. E., Nickson, S., Wang, C., & Hardin, H. (2014). Historical overview of learning theories. In B.F. Tobolowsky, T. Skipper, T. Vakos (Eds.), In *Paths to learning: Teaching for engagement in college* (pp. 31–45). The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Gurung, R. A. R., Richmond, A., & Boysen, G. A. (2018). Studying excellence in teaching: The story so far: studying excellence in teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2018*(156), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20312

Hall, P. D. (1992). Teaching and research on philanthropy, voluntarism, and nonprofit organizations: A case study of academic innovation. *Teachers College Record*, 93(3), 403–436.

Halx, M. D. (2010). Re-conceptualizing college and university teaching through the lens of adult education: Regarding undergraduates as adults. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *15*(5), 519–530. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.491909

Hendry, G. D. and Jukic, K. (2014). Learning about the quality of work that teachers expect: Students' perceptions of exemplar marking versus teacher explanation. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *11*(2), 1-10.

Henklain, M. H. O., Haydu, V. B., Carmo, J. S., Muniz, M., & Perez, W. F. (2019). Expanding the evidence of content validity for the Teacher Behavior Checklist using the IRAP: TBC's content validity using the IRAP. *The Psychological Record*, *69*(2), 205–214. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40732-019-00334-9

Henritius, E., Löfström, E., & Hannula, M. S. (2019). University students' emotions in virtual learning: A review of empirical research in the 21st century. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(1), 80–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12699

Hesse, M., & Mason, M. (2005). The case for learning communities. *Community College Journal*, 30–35.

Holmes, R. J. (2010). The challenge of funding fundraising. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2010*(149), 27–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.378

Jones, J. A., & Castillo, E. A. (2017). The fundraiser's journey: A developmentally informed, grounded theory analysis. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *22*(4), e1584. https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1584

Kahane, L. H. (2008). *Regression basics*. SAGE.

Kayes, D. C. (2005). Internal validity and reliability of Kolb's learning style inventory version 3 (1999). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *20*(2), 249–257. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-005-8262-4

Keeley, J., Furr, R. M., & Buskist, W. (2010). Differentiating psychology students' perceptions of teachers using the Teacher Behavior Checklist. *Teaching of Psychology*, *37*(1), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280903426282

Keeley, J. W., Ismail, E., & Buskist, W. (2016). Excellent teachers' perspectives on excellent teaching. *Teaching of Psychology*, *43*(3), 175–179. https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628316649307

Keeley, J., Smith, D., & Buskist, W. (2006). The Teacher Behaviors Checklist: Factor analysis of its utility for evaluating teaching. *Teaching of Psychology*, *33*(2), 84–91. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top3302_1

Kenner, C., & Weinerman, J. (2011). Adult learning theory: Applications to non-traditional college students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *41*(2), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2011.10850344

Kirby, L. A. J., Busler, J. N., Keeley, J. W., & Buskist, W. (2018). A brief history of the teacher behavior checklist: A brief history of the teacher behavior checklist. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2018*(156), 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20313

Liu, S., Keeley, J., & Buskist, W. (2016). Chinese college students' perceptions of excellent teachers across three disciplines: Psychology, chemical engineering, and education. *Teaching of Psychology*, *43*(1), 70–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628315620888

Liu, J., & Olson, D. (2011). Putting business students in the shoes of an executive: An applied learning approach to developing decision making skills. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *6*, 142–27. https://doi.org/10.46504/06201101li

Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *76*(5), 707–754. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.5.707

Masika, R., & Jones, J. (2016). Building student belonging and engagement: Insights into higher education students' experiences of participating and learning together. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *21*(2), 138–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1122585

McDearmon, J. T. (2010). What's in it for me: A qualitative look into the mindset of young alumni non-donors. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, *10*(1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1057/ijea.2010.3

McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, *52*(11), 1218-25.

Moore, S., & Kuol, N. (2007). Retrospective insights on teaching: exploring teaching excellence through the eyes of the alumni. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *31*(2), 133-143. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770701267598

Noll, K. (2017). *Baccalaureate nursing student and faculty views of effective teaching*. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University).

Perkin H. (2007). History of universities. In J. J. F. Forest, P.G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education*. (Vol 18, pp. 159-205). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4012-2_10

Postareff, L., Mattsson, M., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Hailikari, T. (2017). The complex relationship between emotions, approaches to learning, study success and study progress during the transition to university. *Higher Education*, *73*(3), 441–457. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0096-7

Quinlan, K. M. (2016). How emotion matters in four key relationships in teaching and learning in higher education. *College Teaching*, *64*(3), 101–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2015.1088818

Rao, D., & Stupans, I. (2012). Exploring the potential of role play in higher education: Development of a typology and teacher guidelines. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *49*(4), 427–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.728879

Reynolds, C., Stevens, D. D., & West, E. (2013). "I'm in a professional school! Why are you making me do this?" A cross-disciplinary study of the use of creative classroom projects on student learning. *College Teaching*, *61*(2), 51–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2012.731660

Roberts, M. J., & Russo, R. (1999). *A student's guide to analysis of variance*. Routledge.

Ryan, T., & Henderson, M. (2018). Feeling feedback: Students' emotional responses to educator feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(6), 880–892. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1416456

Shaker, G. G., & Borden, V. M. (2020). How donors give to higher education: Thirty years of supporting U.S. college and university missions. *TIAA Institute Research Dialogue*,

(158), 1-56. Retrieved from https://www.tiaainstitute.org/publication/how-donors-give-higher-education-0

Simone, S, Campbell, C. M., & Newhart, D. W. (2012). Measuring opinion and behavior. In R. D. Howard, G. W. McLaughlin, W. E. Knight, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of institutional research* (pp. 502-522). Wiley.

Steinbach, R. L. (1993). *The adult learner: Strategies for success*. Crisp Publications.

The Charter of 1650. (n.d.). *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century*, 1-25. doi:10.4159/harvard.9780674337367.c4

Vervoort, A. & Gasman, M., (2016). An exploration of giving among gay male college alumni. *Journal of Education and Training Studies 4*(5), 123-138. doi:10.11114/jets.v4i5.1298

Wanner, T. (2015). Enhancing student engagement and active learning through just-in-time teaching and the use of PowerPoint. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *27*(1), 154–163.

Wanner, T., & Palmer, E. (2018). Formative self-and peer assessment for improved student learning: The crucial factors of design, teacher participation and feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(7), 1032–1047. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1427698

Wastyn, M. L. (2009). Why alumni don't give: A qualitative study of what motivates non-donors to higher education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, *9*(2), 96-108. doi:10.1057/ijea.2009.31

Weerts, D., & Hudson, E. (2009). Engagement and institutional advancement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2009*(147), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.359

Whitaker, K. (2007). Powering Up, Philanthropically. *Academic Questions*, *20*(2), 154–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12129-007-9008-8

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2009). *Research methods in education: An introduction*. Allyn and Bacon.

Wilson, J. H., Ryan, R. G., & Pugh, J. L. (2010). Professor–student rapport scale predicts student outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, *37*(4), 246–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/00986283.2010.510976

Yair, G. (2008). Can we administer the scholarship of teaching? Lessons from outstanding professors in higher education. *High Education*, 14.

Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *Journal of Higher Education*, *70*(6), 670-686.

Zayac, R. M., & Lenhard, W. (2018). Characteristics of master teachers: German university students' perceptions of high-quality instruction: characteristics of master teachers. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2018*(156), 67–74. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20318

## Appendix A: Teacher Behavior Checklist

| Item | Teacher Qualities | Associated Behaviors |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Accessible | posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information |
| 2 | Approachable/personable | smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments |
| 3 | Authoritative | establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice |
| 4 | Confident | speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly |
| 5 | Creative and interesting | experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone |
| 6 | Effective communicator | speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples |
| 7 | Encourages and cares for students | provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows student names |
| 8 | Enthusiastic about teaching and about topic | smiles during class, prepares interesting class activities, uses gestures and expressions of emotion to emphasize important points, and arrives on time for class |
| 9 | Establishes daily and academic term goals | prepares/follows the syllabus and has goals for each class |
| 10 | Flexible/open-minded | changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate |
| 11 | Good listener | does not interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making |
| 12 | Happy/positive attitude/humorous | tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students |
| 13 | Humble | admits mistakes, never brags, and does not take credit for others' successes |
| 14 | Knowledgeable about subject matter | easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples |
| 15 | Prepared | brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion |
| 16 | Presents current information | relates topic to current, real-life situations; uses recent videos, magazines, and newspapers to demonstrate points; talks about current topics; uses new or recent texts |
| 17 | Professional | dresses nicely (neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties) and no profanity |
| 18 | Promotes class discussion | asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class |
| 19 | Promotes critical thinking/intellectually stimulating | asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/activities |
| 20 | Provides constructive feedback | writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking |
| 21 | Punctuality/manages class time | arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 22 | Rapport | makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class |
| 23 | Realistic expectations of students/fair testing and grading | covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate |
| 24 | Respectful | does not humiliate or embarrass students in class, is polite to students (says thank you and please, etc.), does not interrupt students while they are talking, does not talk down to students |
| 25 | Sensitive and persistent | makes sure students understand material before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding |
| 26 | Strives to be a better teacher | requests feedback on his/her teaching ability from students, continues learning (attends workshops, etc. on teaching), and uses new teaching methods |
| 27 | Technologically competent | knows now to use a computer, knows how to use e-mail with students, knows how to use overheads during class, has a Web page for classes |
| 28 | Understanding | accepts legitimate excuses for missing class or coursework, is available before/after class to answer questions, does not lose temper at students, takes extra time to discuss difficult concepts |

## Appendix B: Donor Bill of Rights

### Donor Bill of Rights

Philanthropy is based on voluntary action for the common good. It is a tradition of giving and sharing that is primary to the quality of life. To assure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the not-for-profit organizations and causes they are asked to support, we declare that all donors have these rights:

1. To be informed of the organization's mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes.
2. To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization's governing board, and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgment in its stewardship responsibilities.
3. To have access to the organization's most recent financial statements.
4. To be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given.
5. To receive appropriate acknowledgment and recognition.
6. To be assured that information about their donations is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law.
7. To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature.
8. To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers, employees of the organization or hired solicitors.
9. To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.
10. To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful and forthright answers.

*The text of this statement in its entirety was developed by the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel (AAFRC), Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP), Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), and adopted in November 1993.*

## Appendix C: IRB Approval Form and Supporting Documents

**The Auburn University Institutional Review Board**
Office of Research Compliance – Human Subjects
307 Samford Hall
334-844-5966, fax 334-844-4391, hsubjec@auburn.edu

**Investigators**: By accepting this IRB approval for this protocol, you agree to the following:

1. No participants may be recruited or involved in any study procedure prior to the IRB approval date or after the expiration date. (PIs and sponsors are responsible for initiating Continuing Review proceedings via a renewal request or submission of a final report.)

2. ***All protocol modifications*** will be approved in advance by submitting a modification request to the IRB unless they are intended to reduce immediate risk. Modifications that must be approved include adding/changing sites for data collection, adding key personnel, and altering any method of participant recruitment or data collection. Any change in your research purpose or research objectives should also be approved and noted in your IRB file. The use of any unauthorized procedures may result in notification to your sponsoring agency, suspension of your study, and/or destruction of data.

3. ***Adverse events or unexpected problems*** involving participants will be *reported within 5 days* to the IRB.

4. A ***renewal*** request, if needed, will be submitted three to four weeks before your protocol expires.

5. A ***final report*** will be submitted when you complete your study, and before expiration. Failure to submit your final report may result in delays in review and approval of subsequent protocols.

6. ***Expiration*** – If the protocol expires without contacting the IRB, the protocol will be administratively closed. The project will be *suspended* and you will need to submit a new protocol to resume your research.

7. ***Only the stamped, IRB-approved consent document or information letter will be used*** when consenting participants. Signed consent forms will be retained at least three years after completion of the study. Copies of consents without participant signatures and information letters will be kept to submit with the final report.

8. You will not receive a formal approval letter unless you request one. ***The e-mailed notification of approval to which this is attached serves as official notice***.

All forms can be found at http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/protocol.htm

**INFORMATION LETTER**
**for a Research Study entitled**
**Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching**

**You are invited to participate in a research study entitled Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching.** The purpose of this study is to provide insight into how faculty may impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. Major Gifts Officers currently working at an SEC institution are asked to participate. For the purposes of this survey, a master teacher is defined as an outstanding faculty member who had a positive impact on your undergraduate academic experience.

This study is being conducted by **Tara Grant Jones**, doctoral candidate, in the Auburn University Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology under the direction of **Dr. James E. Groccia**, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University. You are invited to participate because you are listed on your SEC institution's website as having a title that indicates you are currently working with major gifts donors in some capacity.

**What will be involved if you participate?** Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to answer a few demographic questions. Based on your undergraduate experience with faculty, you will be asked to rate 28 teaching qualities and behaviors on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale. Your total time commitment will be approximately 5-7 minutes.

**Are there any risks or discomforts?** There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this survey. Participation is completely voluntary. You will not receive compensation for your participation nor will there be a direct benefit or cost for your participation.

**If you change your mind about participating**, you can withdraw at any time by closing your browser window. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Once you have submitted anonymous data, it cannot be withdrawn since it will be unidentifiable. Your decision about whether to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University or the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology.

**Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous.** You will not be asked to provide any identifiable information (i.e., your name or institution). Information collected through your participation may be published in a dissertation, professional journal, or presented at a professional meeting.

**If you have any questions about this study**, please contact Tara Jones at 334.703.8272 or tara.jones@auburn.edu or Dr. James Groccia at 334.844.4460 or groccje@auburn.edu

**If you have questions about your rights as a research participant**, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone at (334) 844-5966 or email at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION ABOVE, YOU CAN DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER FOR YOUR RECORDS.

**Recruitment E-mail**
**for a Research Study entitled**
**Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching**

Dear SEC Fundraising Colleague,

In addition to working as an Associate Vice President for Constituent Development at Auburn University, I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study entitled **Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching.** The purpose of this study is to provide insight into how faculty may impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. This short **survey will take approximately 5-7 minutes to complete**.

Participants are asked to rate 28 teaching qualities and behaviors based on the extent to which master teachers display each quality and its accompanying behavior. For the purposes of this survey, a master teacher is defined as an outstanding faculty member who had a positive impact on your undergraduate academic experience. Participants are asked to respond to a series of demographic questions. Please click the website link below to go to the survey website.

Survey Link: SEC Fundraiser Survey
Or https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_daSu88S1dmz5qPH

Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and involves minimal personal risk. You will not receive compensation for your participation. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses. Attached is a copy of the participant **information letter** for your review. If you have any questions about this survey, please email me at tara.jones@auburn.edu or Dr. James Groccia at groccje@auburn.edu.

I appreciate your time and ask that you **consider completing this survey by Friday, January 15**. It is through your participation that we can better understand the teaching qualities and behaviors that Major Gifts Officers value most.

Thank you.

Tara Jones
Principal Investigator
Ph.D. Candidate
Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Auburn University

Dr. James E. Groccia
Faculty Advisor
Professor Emeritus
Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Auburn University

Auburn University Human Research Protection Program

# EXEMPTION REVIEW APPLICATION

For information or help completing this form, contact: **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE,**
**Location:** 115 Ramsay Hall **Phone:** 334-844-5966 **Email:** IRBAdmin@auburn.edu

**Submit completed application and supporting material as one attachment to IRBsubmit@auburn.edu.**

## 1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

**Today's Date** 12.4.2020

**a. Project Title** Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching

**b. Principal Investigator** Tara Grant Jones Degree(s) _____
Rank/Title Graduate Student Department/School Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Phone Number 334.703.8272 AU Email jonestg@auburn.edu

**Faculty Principal Investigator (required if PI is a student)** Dr. James Groccia
Title Professor Emeritus, Higher Education Department/School Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Phone Number 334.844.4460 AU Email groccje@auburn.edu

**Dept Head** James W. Satterfield Department/School Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Phone Number (334) 844-3060 AU Email jws0089@auburn.edu

**c. Project Personnel** (other PI) – Identify all individuals who will be involved with the conduct of the research and include their role on the project. Role may include design, recruitment, consent process, data collection, data analysis, and reporting. Attach a table if needed for additional personnel.

**Personnel Name** _____ Degree (s) _____
Rank/Title _____ Department/School _____
Role _____
AU affiliated? ☐ YES ☐ NO If no, name of home institution _____
Plan for IRB approval for non-AU affiliated personnel? _____

**Personnel Name** _____ Degree (s) _____
Rank/Title _____ Department/School _____
Role _____
AU affiliated? ☐ YES ☐ NO If no, name of home institution _____
Plan for IRB approval for non-AU affiliated personnel? _____

**Personnel Name** _____ Degree (s) _____
Rank/Title _____ Department/School _____
Role _____
AU affiliated? ☐ YES ☐ NO If no, name of home institution _____
Plan for IRB approval for non-AU affiliated personnel? _____

**d. Training** – Have all Key Personnel completed CITI human subjects training (including elective modules related to this research) within the last 3 years? YES ☑ NO ☐

**The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from**
12/01/2020 to ----------
**Protocol #** 20-569 EX 2012

**e. Funding source** – Is this project funded by the investigator(s)? ☑ YES ☐ NO
Is this project funded by AU? ☐ YES ☑ NO If YES, identify source _____
Is this project funded by an external sponsor? ☐ YES ■ No If YES, provide the name of the sponsor, type of sponsor (governmental, non-profit, corporate, other), and an identification number for theaward.
Name N/A Type _____ Grant # _____

**f.** List other AU IRB-approved research studies and/or IRB approvals from other institutions that are associated with this project.
N/A

**2. Mark the category or categories below that describe the proposedresearch:**

☐ 1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices. The research is not likely to adversely impact students' opportunity to learn or assessment of educators providing instruction. 104(d)(1)

■ 2. Research only includes interactions involving educational tests, surveys, interviews, public observation if at least ONE of the following criteria. (The research includes data collection only; may include visual or auditory recording; may NOT include intervention and only includes interactions). **Mark the applicable sub-category below (i, ii, or iii).** 104(d)(2)

■ (i) Recorded information cannot readily identify the participant (directlyorindirectly/linked); **OR**
- surveys and interviews: no children;
- educational tests or observation of public behavior: can only include childrenwhen investigators do not participate in activities being observed.

☐ (ii) Any disclosures of responses outside would not reasonably place participant at risk; **OR**

☐ (iii) Information is recorded with identifiers or code linked to identifiers and IRB conducts limited review; no children. **Requires limited review by the IRB.***

☐ 3. Research involving Benign Behavioral Interventions (BBI)** through verbal, written responses (including data entry or audiovisual recording) from adult subjects who prospectively agree and ONE of the following criteria is met. (This research does not include children and does not include medical interventions. Research cannot have deception unless the participant prospectively agrees that they will be unaware of or misled regarding the nature and purpose of the research)
**Mark the applicable sub-category below (A, B, or C).** 104(d)(3)(i)

☐ **(A)** Recorded information cannot readily identify the subject (directly or indirectly/linked); **OR**

☐ **(B)** Any disclosure of responses outside of the research would not reasonably placesubject at risk; **OR**

☐ **(C)** Information is recorded with identifiers and cannot have deception unless participant prospectively agrees. **Requires limited review by the IRB.***

☐ 4. Secondary research for which consent is not required: use of identifiable information or identifiable bio-specimen that have been or will be collected for some other 'primary' or 'initial' activity, if one of the following criteria is met. Allows retrospective and prospective secondary use. **Mark the applicable sub-category below (I, ii, iii, or iv).** 104(d)(4)

☐ (i) Biospecimens or information are publically available;

☐ (ii) Information recorded so subject cannot readily be identified, directlyorindirectly/linked; investigator does not contact subjects and will not re-identify thesubjects;OR

☐ (iii) Collection and analysis involving investigators use of identifiable health information when use is regulated by HIPAA "health care operations" or "research or "public health activities and purposes" (does not include biospecimens (only PHI and requires federal guidance on how to apply); OR

☐ (iv) Research information collected by or on behalf of federal government usinggovernment generated or collected information obtained for non-researchactivities.

☐ 5. Research and demonstration projects which are supported by a federal agency/department AND designed to study and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs;(iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs. (must be posted on a federal web site). 104(d)(5) (must be posted on a federal web site)

☐ 6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The research does not involve prisoners as participants. 104(d)(6)

***New exemption categories 7 and 8: Both categories 7 and 8 require Broad Consent.*** (Broad consent is a new type of informed consent provided under the Revised Common Rule pertaining to storage, maintenance, and secondary research with identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens. Secondary research refers to research use of materials that are collected for either research studies distinct from the current secondary research proposal, or for materials that are collected for non-research purposes, such as materials that are left over from routine clinical diagnosis or treatments. Broad consent does not apply to research that collects information or biospecimens from individuals through direct interaction or intervention specifically for the purpose of the research.) **The Auburn University IRB has determined that as currently interpreted, Broad Consent is not feasible at Auburn and these 2 categories WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED at this time.**

***Limited IRB review* – the IRB Chairs or designated IRB reviewer reviews the protocol to ensure adequate provisions are in place to protect privacy and confidentiality.**

****Category 3 – Benign Behavioral Interventions (BBI)* must be brief in duration, painless/harmless, not physically invasive, not likely to have a significant adverse lasting impact on participants, and it is unlikely participants will find the interventions offensive or embarrassing.**

## 3. PROJECT SUMMARY

**a. Does the study target any special populations? (Mark applicable)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Minors (under 18 years of age) | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Pregnant women, fetuses, or any products of conception | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Prisoners or wards (unless incidental, not allowed for Exempt research) | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Temporarily or permanently impaired | ☐ YES ☑ NO |

**b. Does the research pose more than minimal risk to participants?** ☐ YES ☑ NO

*Minimal risk means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or test. 42 CFR 46.102(i)*

**c. Does the study involve any of the following?**

| | |
|---|---|
| Procedures subject to FDA regulations (drugs, devices, etc.) | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Use of school records of identifiable students or information from instructors about specific students. | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Protected health or medical information when there is a direct or Indirect link which could identify the participant. | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Collection of sensitive aspects of the participant's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior or alcohol use. | ☐ YES ☑ NO |
| Deception of participants | ☐ YES ☑ NO |

**4. Briefly describe the proposed research, including purpose, participant population, recruitment process, consent process, research procedures and methodology.**

Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching. This study examines major gifts officers' perceptions of master teaching behaviors exhibited by university faculty. Using an online Qualtrics survey, the Teacher Behavior Checklist will be administered to major gifts officers working at Southeastern Conference (SEC) institutions. Based on their undergraduate experience, fundraisers are asked to rate faculty on the 28 items of the Teacher Behavior Checklist using a Likert rating scale. Recruitment will be through e-mail requests using publicly available information from university websites. An Information Letter will be included in the e-mail. Quantitative methods will be used to analyze responses.

**5. Waivers**

**Check any waivers that apply and describe how the project meets the criteria for the waiver. Provide the rationale for the waiver request.**

- ☐ **Waiver of Consent (Including existing de-identified data)**
- ☑ **Waiver of Documentation of Consent (Use of Information Letter)**
- ☐ **Waiver of Parental Permission**

**All retrospective information will be de-identified.**

An on-line information letter will be reviewed by potential participants and if they choose to participate, no signatures are obtained; instead, consent is indicated by assessing the on-line survey. Participants may choose to participate and may exit the survey at any time. All participants are adults so there is no need for parental permission.

6. **Describe how participants/data/specimens will be selected. If applicable, include gender, race, and ethnicity of the participant population.**

Major gifts officers working at Southeastern Conference institutions comprise the pool of participants. Recruitment will be through e-mail requests using publicly available information from university websites.

7. **Does the research involve deception? ☐ YES ☒ NO If YES, please provide the rationale for deception and describe the debriefing process.**

8. **Describe why none of the research procedures would cause a participant either physical or psychological discomfort or be perceived as discomfort above and beyond what the person would experience in daily life.**

The Qualtrics online survey asks adults to recall qualities and behaviors of excellent or master teachers from their undergraduate experiences. Because major gifts officers work in higher education and with faculty on a daily basis, this survey instrument and questions should not cause physical or psychological discomfort.

9. **Describe the provisions to maintain confidentiality of data, including collection, transmission, and storage.**

There will be no participant names or institutions collected during the survey process. Collected data will be stored on Auburn University's secure drives.

10. **Describe the provisions included in the research to project the privacy interests of participants (e.g., others will not overhear conversations with potential participants, individuals will not be publicly identified or embarrassed).**

Participants will complete the survey at a time and location convenient to them.

11. **Will the research involve interacting (communication or direct involvement) with participants?** ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO If YES, describe the consent process and information to be presented to subjects. This includes identifying that the activities involve research; that participation is voluntary; describing the procedures to be performed; and the PI name and contact information.**

This e-mail will be sent to potential participants.

Dear SEC Fundraising Colleagues,

In addition to working as an Associate Vice President for Constituent Development at Auburn University, I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study entitled Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching. The purpose of this study is to provide insight into how faculty may impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. This short survey will take approximately 5-7 minutes to complete.

Participants are asked to rate 28 teaching qualities and behaviors based on the extent to which master teachers display each quality and its accompanying behavior. Participants are asked to respond to a series of demographic questions. Please click the website link below to go to the survey website.

Survey Link:

Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and involves minimal personal risk. You will not receive compensation for your participation nor will there be a direct benefit or cost for your participation. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your

12. **Additional Information and/or attachments.**

**In the space below, provide any additional information you believe may help the IRB review of the proposed research. If attachments are included, list the attachments below. Attachments may include recruitment materials, consent documents, site permissions, IRB approvals from other institutions, etc.**

Attachments include:
- Information letter
- Recruitment e-mail
- Survey questions
- CITI certificates

**Principal Investigator's Signature** Tara Jones Digitally signed by Tara Jones Date: 2020.12.04 13:07:50 -06'00' **Date** 12.4.2020

**If PI is a student,**
**Faculty Principal Investigator's Signature** James E. Groccia Digitally signed by James E. Groccia DN: cn=James E. Groccia, o=Auburn University, ou=EFLT, email=groccje@auburn.edu, c=US Date: 2020.12.04 14:15:15 -06'00' **Date** 12-04-2020

**Department Head's Signature** James Satterfield Digitally signed by James Satterfield Date: 2020.12.04 14:52:37 -06'00' **Date** 12/4/2020

**INFORMATION LETTER**
**for a Research Study entitled**
**Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching**

**You are invited to participate in a research study entitled Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching.** The purpose of this study is to provide insight into how faculty may impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. Major Gifts Officers currently working at an SEC institution are asked to participate.

This study is being conducted by **Tara Grant Jones**, doctoral candidate, in the Auburn University Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology under the direction of **Dr. James E. Groccia**, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University. You are invited to participate because you are listed on your SEC institution's website as currently working with major gifts donors.

**What will be involved if you participate?** Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to answer a few demographic questions. Based on your undergraduate experience with faculty, you will be asked to rate 28 teaching qualities and behaviors on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale. Your total time commitment will be approximately 5-7 minutes.

**Are there any risks or discomforts?** There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this survey. Participation is completely voluntary. You will not receive compensation for your participation nor will there be a direct benefit or cost for your participation.

**If you change your mind about participating**, you can withdraw at any time by closing your browser window. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Once you have submitted anonymous data, it cannot be withdrawn since it will be unidentifiable. Your decision about whether to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University or the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology.

**Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous.** You will not be asked to provide any identifiable information (i.e. your name or institution). Information collected through your participation may be published in a dissertation, professional journal, or presented at a professional meeting.

**If you have any questions about this study**, please contact Tara Jones at 334.703.8272 or tara.jones@auburn.edu or Dr. James Groccia at 334.844.4460 or groccje@auburn.edu

**If you have questions about your rights as a research participant**, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone at (334) 844-5966 or email at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION ABOVE, YOU CAN DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER FOR YOUR RECORDS.

**Recruitment E-mail**
**for a Research Study entitled**
**Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching**

Dear SEC Fundraising Colleagues,

In addition to working as an Associate Vice President for Constituent Development at Auburn University, I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study entitled **Major Gifts Officers' Perceptions of Master Teaching.** The purpose of this study is to provide insight into how faculty may impact the fundraising/development process in higher education. This short **survey will take approximately 5-7 minutes to complete**.

Participants are asked to rate 28 teaching qualities and behaviors based on the extent to which master teachers display each quality and its accompanying behavior. Participants are asked to respond to a series of demographic questions. Please click the website link below to go to the survey website.

Survey Link:

Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and involves minimal personal risk. You will not receive compensation for your participation nor will there be a direct benefit or cost for your participation. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses. Attached is a copy of the participant **information letter** for your review. If you have any questions about this survey, please email me at tara.jones@auburn.edu or Dr. James Groccia at groccje@auburn.edu.

I appreciate your time and consideration in completing this survey. It is through your participation that we can better understand the teaching qualities and behaviors that Major Gifts Officers value most.

Thank you.

Tara Jones
Principal Investigator
Ph.D. Candidate
Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Auburn University

Dr. James E. Groccia
Faculty Advisor
Professor Emeritus
Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Auburn University

**Block 2**

**Based on YOUR experience as an UNDERGRADUATE student**, please respond to each of the following items by rating the extent to which master teachers displayed each quality and the accompanying behaviors using a 1 (master teachers never exhibited this quality) to 5 (master teachers frequently exhibited this quality). For the purposes of this survey, a master teacher is defined as an outstanding faculty member who had a positive impact on your academic experience.

**Default Question Block**

Accessible (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Approachable/Personable (Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Authoritative (Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Creative and Interesting (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Effective Communicator (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Encourages and Cares for Students (Provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows student names)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic (Smiles during class, prepares interesting class activities, uses gestures and expressions of emotion to emphasize important points, and arrives on time for class)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals (Prepares/follows the syllabus and has goals for each class)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Flexible/Open-Minded (Changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, a allows students to do make-up work when appropriate)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Good Listener (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students)

| 1 - never exhibited this | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| quality | | | | this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Humble (Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Knowledgeable About Subject Matter (Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Prepared (Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Presents Current Information (Relates topic to current, real-life situations; uses recent videos, magazines, and newspapers to demonstrate points; talks about current topics; uses new or recent texts)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Professional (Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Promotes Class Discussion (Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating (Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/activities)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
| O | O | O | O | O |

Provides Constructive Feedback (Writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Punctuality/Manages Class Time (Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Rapport (Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading (Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Respectful (Does not humiliate or embarrass students in class, is polite to students [says thank you and please, etc.], does not interrupt students while they are talking, does not talk down to students)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Sensitive and Persistent (Makes sure students understand material before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Strives to Be a Better Teacher (Requests feedback on his/her teaching ability from students, continues learning [attends workshops, etc. on teaching], and uses new teaching methods)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Technologically Competent (Knows now to use a computer, knows how to use e-mail with students, knows how to use overheads during class, has a Web page for classes)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Understanding (Accepts legitimate excuses for missing class or coursework, is available before/after class to answer questions, does not lose temper at students, takes extra time to discuss difficult concepts)

| 1 - never exhibited this quality | | | | 5 - frequently exhibited this quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

**Block 1**

Please respond to the following questions.

If you had at least one professor who positively impacted your undergraduate experience, how does that influence your willingness to actively raise funds for faculty support?

| 1 - My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes DOES NOT influence my willingness to raise funds for faculty support. | 2 - My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes SOMEWHAT influences my willingness to raise funds for faculty support. | 3 - My experience with an excellent professor in my undergraduate classes DEFINITELY influences my willingness to raise funds for faculty support. | 4 - I did not have an excellent professor in my undergraduate experience. |
|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O |

As a major gifts fundraiser, do your best faculty partners in development activities share similar behaviors and qualities as excellent teachers in YOUR undergraduate experience?

| 1 - The faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities DO NOT seem to share many of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience. | 2 - The faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities seem to share SOME of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience. | 3 - The faculty with whom I currently partner in development activities seem to share MANY of the behaviors and qualities of excellent teachers from my undergraduate experience. | 4 - I did not have an excellent professor in my undergraduate experience. |
|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O |

Assuming you can work on a variety of fundraising initiatives, how enthusiastic are you to raise funds for faculty support?

| 1 - never enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support | | | | 5 - frequently enthusiastic to raise funds for faculty support |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Rate your enthusiasm for ENGAGING faculty in the development and fundraising process

| 1 - never enthusiastic to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process | | | | 5 - enthusiastic to engage faculty in the development and fundraising process |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

How often do you engage a faculty member in development/fundraising activities ?

| 1 - I rarely ask faculty to assist with development/fundraising efforts and activities | | | | 5 - I frequently ask faculty to assist with development/fundraising efforts and activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O | O | O | O | O |

Do you currently work at the institution from which you received your undergraduate degree?

- O Yes
- O No

How many TOTAL years have you worked in higher education fundraising?

With what gift threshold do you primarily work?