2008 Engage Adaptation Award:
Technology Enhanced Collaborative Group Work
Evaluation Report
August 2009

Sponsors:
Kathy Christoph, Director, DoIT Academic Technology
Christine Lupton, Engage Program Manager, DoIT Academic Technology

Project Lead:
Cid Freitag, Project Manager, DoIT Academic Technology

Planning Team:
Bruce Barton, DoIT; Jake Blanchard, Engineering; JoAnn Carr, Education; Ron Cramer, DoIT; Timothy Dugdale, DoIT; Cid Freitag, DoIT; David Gagnon, DoIT; Josh Harder, DoIT; Jeffrey Henriques, Psychology; Christine Lupton, DoIT; Paul Oliphant, Engineering; Lindsey Schmidt, DoIT; Karen Tusack, L&S Learning Support Services; Sue Weier, L&S Learning Support Services; Doug Worsham, L&S Learning Support Services

Consultants and Support:
Barbara Bird, L&S Learning Support Services; Bruno Browning, Director, L&S Learning Support Services; Ron Cramer, DoIT; Cheryl Diermyer, DoIT; Timothy Dugdale, DoIT; David Gagnon, DoIT; Les Howles, DoIT; Lisa Jansen, Assistant Director L&S Learning Support Services; Kelly Johannsen, DoIT; Justin Lonsbury, DoIT; David Macasaet, L&S Learning Support Services; Michael Pitterle, Pharmacy; Dennis Rinzel, L&S Learning Support Services; Lauren Shawl, Pharmacy; Catherine Stevens, Education; Doug Worsham, L&S Learning Support Services

Mentors:
Janet Batzli, Letters and Science; Jake Blanchard, Engineering; Michael Connors, Art; Sharon Derry, Education; Greg Downey, Letters and Science; Jamie Henke, Music; Rania Huntington, Letters and Science; Sarah Miller, Agriculture and Life Sciences; Mary Ellen Murray, Nursing

Assessment and Evaluation Lead:
Lindsey Schmidt, DoIT

Project Assistants:
Sarah Chu, Elizabeth Harris, Kevin Harris, John Thomson, Christopher Blakesley

Report Author:
Lindsey Schmidt, DoIT
**Table of Contents**

**Executive Summary** .......................................................... 3

**Award Program Description** ............................................... 4
   - Program Overview .......................................................... 4
   - Program Timeline ......................................................... 4
   - Technology ................................................................. 6

**Evaluation** ........................................................................ 7
   - Purpose ........................................................................... 7
   - Methodology .................................................................... 7

**Analysis of Findings** .......................................................... 9
   - Technology Enhanced Group Work .................................... 9
      - Technology .................................................................... 9
      - Satisfaction ................................................................. 9
      - Use .............................................................................. 11
      - Alleviate Challenges .................................................... 11
   - Pedagogy .......................................................................... 12
      - Facilitating Group Work ............................................... 12
      - Assessing Group Work ................................................ 14
   - Attitudes .......................................................................... 15

**Award Program Details** ...................................................... 16

**Recommendations for Instructors** ........................................ 17

**Awardees** .......................................................................... 18

**Appendix 1 – Student Pre Survey Results** ............................. 19
**Appendix 2 – Student Post Survey Results** ............................. 32
**Appendix 3 – Instructor Pre Survey Results** ........................... 88
**Appendix 4 – Instructor Post Survey Results** .......................... 107
**Appendix 5 – Crosstabulations** ............................................ 158
**Appendix 6 – Group Work Resources** .................................... 171
**Appendix 7 – Consultant Reflection Survey** ............................ 174
The 2008 Engage Technology Enhanced Collaborative Group Work (TECGW) Adaptation Award provided 40 instructors with technical and pedagogical support to implement technology enhanced group projects in their courses. The support included a literature review of research related to group work, pedagogical and instructional technology consultation, evaluation consultation, support for technology tools and services, and hosting community events to share challenges and solutions in facilitating group projects.

The award program was divided into 5 phases: 1) Topic Selection, 2) Planning, 3) Call for Proposal, 4) Implementation, and 5) Dissemination. Evaluation was a key part of each of Phases 2 to 5.

Technologies for the award program were evaluated and selected by campus staff using a variety of criteria. Ultimately, the Award supported the use of Drupal, TWiki, and Google Docs. Learn@UW and MyWebspace were also used in the award program and are centrally hosted services. In the event none of the supported technologies matched the pedagogy for a project, Engage staff worked with the instructor to find a solution.

An evaluation of the program was conducted to gather evidence of methods of good practice in facilitating technology enhanced group projects. Engage administered student and instructor surveys to gather data on: attitudes toward group work; methods of good practice in designing, implementing and assessing group projects; and, how and if, collaborative technologies enhance group work and alleviate the challenges of group work. The results of our evaluation, in conjunction with the literature on group work, provide evidence of how task design, group process facilitation, and technology choice influence the success of the group project.

The methods of good practice below, resulting from the instructor, student, and consultant surveys, provide methods of good practice for instructors planning to implement technology enhanced group projects. The results of our award program, in conjunction with the literature on group work, provide evidence of how task design, group process facilitation, and technology choice influence the success of the group project.

Be sure the task is worthy of collaborative group work
- Consider the pedagogical challenge. Will a group add value to the task?
- Specify how the group project aligns with the course learning objectives.

Design the task
- Identify the types of interactions desired (student-student, student-instructor, student-content).
- Identify the tasks students will need to complete.
- Identify challenges students might face. Where have students had problems in the past?
- Choose a technology tool that aligns with the interactions, tasks, and challenges.
- Develop an assessment plan for the process as well as the assigned product.

Prepare students for collaboration
- Communicate the rationale for group work, including why the challenge is worthy of collaborative group work and how the group project relates to course objectives.
- Help your students understand what makes good collaboration.

Do regular assessments of process and product
- Use milestones or check-ins to ensure groups are on the right track.
- Provide students the opportunity to evaluate their group members' contributions to the group project.
Program Overview
The 2008 Engage Technology Enhanced Collaborative Group Work (TECGW) Adaptation Award provided 40 instructors with technical and pedagogical support to implement technology enhanced group projects in their courses. The Engage TECGW Award was selected to address a teaching and learning challenge that was identified by UW-Madison faculty and staff in the 2007 campus Aligning Collaboration Tools With Academic Needs (ACTWAN) survey. As compared to the previous Engage Adaptation Award for Podcasting, the objective shifted from positioning tools for adoption by campus to developing methods of good practice and solutions for addressing the teaching and learning challenges presented by group work. The choice of technology tools to be utilized in courses as part of the award program was seen as a means to an end, not the end itself.

Solve These Top 5 Teaching Challenges*

- How do I deliver lecture materials online?
- How do I use alternatives to traditional assessment and testing?
- How do I offer broader access to course materials? (The Wisconsin idea)
- How do I develop engaging hybrid courses?
- How do I facilitate collaboration and group projects?

Research indicates the manner in which instructors facilitate group projects has a significant impact on the success of the group project (See Appendix 6). Therefore, the TECGW Award combined collaborative technologies and research-based facilitation strategies with the goal of improving the group project experience for students and instructors. To accomplish this objective, Engage provided support to instructors to implement technology enhanced group work. The support included a literature review of the research related to group work (Appendix 6), pedagogical and instructional technology consultation, evaluation consultation, support for technology tools and services, and hosting community events to share challenges and solutions in facilitating group projects. Engage administered student and instructor surveys (Appendices 1-4) to gather evidence of methods of good practice in facilitating technology enhanced group projects. The surveys gathered data on attitudes, project details (i.e. type of project, facilitation strategies, assessment methods), student workflow, and perceived benefit of technology tools for group work. In addition, Engage administered consultant reflection surveys at the end of each semester to gather information on the consulting process and capture methods of good practice that may not have surfaced in the student and instructor surveys. (Appendix 7)

Program Timeline
The award program was divided into 5 phases over the course of approximately three and a half years.
Phase One: Topic Selection (January 2007 - August 2007)
In Spring 2007, the Engage Group implemented a new method for selecting the Adaptation award topic. The process allowed for greater participation by campus groups. The process used was adapted from the New Media Consortium’s Horizon Report process. The steps included:

• STEP ONE: Review of the literature
• STEP TWO: Reflection Questions
• STEP THREE: Round One Voting
• STEP FOUR: Round Two Voting
• STEP FIVE: Campus Conversation on Selected Topics
• STEP SIX: Synthesis and Scoping
• STEP SEVEN: Selection by Engage Faculty Advisory Group

Phase Two: Planning (September 2007 - February 2008)
After the topic was finalized, the planning phase began. Cross-campus teams were formed to address a number of identified tasks. Teams included:

• Pedagogy Team
• Technology Team
• Training/Support Team
• Evaluation Team
• Sustainability Team

Team Leads met regularly to coordinate efforts and keep the award program moving forward. Engage began initiating the campus conversation around ‘Technology Enhanced Group Projects’ through ComETS and Teaching Academy events. The Project Manager also developed the project charter for the award in this phase.

Phase Three: Call for Proposal (March 2008 - June 2008)
The Pedagogy team developed award objectives, teaching stories, selection criteria and the call for applications. All these were shared with the Faculty Advisory Group. Engage continued the campus conversation around the award topic through the Teaching and Learning Symposium and the Teaching Academy Summer Institute. Award applications were submitted between March and June. Instructors were selected by the Pedagogy Team and notified by the Engage Faculty Advisory Board in June. Also, non-awardees were invited to participate in the final phase by testing the methods of good practice in their courses with support of a small stipend and the support of an evaluation consultant.

Phase Four: Implementation (July 2008 - June 2009)

*Results from the 2007 campus ACTWAN survey
Consultant teams were formed around each accepted proposal. Each team included a Lead Consultant, a Support Consultant, an Evaluation Consultant, and the award recipient(s). Consultants met regularly to share strategies and brainstorm solutions and consultative approaches.

Community events took place during the implementation phase. Award recipients and mentors shared their progress and experiences with the community of instructors and support staff over lunch.

**Phase Five:** Dissemination Planning and Implementation (July 2009 - June 2010)
Dissemination events took place in Phases 1-4, including publicity about instructors using collaborative group work in their classes and presentations with partners such as the Teaching Academy, DELTA, and ComETS. Following implementation, a year of dissemination took place to analyze the data and share the evaluative results and methods of good practice developed during the implementation phase. Dissemination events include articles, videos, conference presentations, and campus events.

**Technology**
The technologies supported in the Adaptation Award were drawn from the teaching stories developed by the Pedagogy Team. The Technology Team looked at each teaching story and identified a number of technologies that would support instructional goals in those teaching stories. Both campus supported and third-party technologies were evaluated, including: Learn@UW, MediaWiki, TWiki, Confluence Wiki, Drupal, Moodle, Xythos Wiki, MyWebSpace, Google Docs, WordPress and Blogger. Technologies were evaluated and selected using the following criteria: feature set, group functionality, secure environment, workflow, access controls, file storage, instructor assessment, exporting/archiving, media accommodation, and support for localization. Three technologies were selected: Drupal (the Drupal instances created were called Collaborative Sites), TWiki, and Google Docs. Learn@UW and MyWebspace, centrally hosted services, were also used in the Award. In the event none of the supported technologies matched the pedagogy for a project, Engage staff worked with the instructor to find a solution. Training for consultants was developed around the selected technologies and research on the pedagogy of group work.

**Evaluation**

**Purpose**
The main purpose of Engage’s evaluation was to provide campus with a better understanding of methods of good practice in facilitating group work and how technology can enhance group work and alleviate the challenges of group work. In particular, the evaluation was designed to determine:

- If there was a change in student attitudes towards group work due to the use of technology or due to research-based facilitation strategies.
- If and how collaborative technologies alleviate challenges of group work.
- If and how collaborative technologies enhance the group work process.
- The affordances and drawbacks of various collaborative tools.
- Methods of good practice for designing, implementing, and assessing technology-enhanced collaborative activities.

The evaluation process also provide information on the award format in an effort to determine what worked well for instructors and consultants, and what could be improved for the next Adaptation Award Program.

**Methodology**

The data that follow were collected through pre- and post- student and instructor surveys (Appendices I-4), which included both open- and close-ended questions. The instructor pre-survey measured attitudes toward group work assignments prior to the Engage Award. The instructor post-survey measured attitudes toward group work assignments following the Engage Award, gathered individual project details, and provided feedback on the award format. The student pre-survey measured attitudes toward group work prior to the Engage award, determined challenges encountered in past group projects, and gauged previous experience using collaborative technologies for group work. The student post survey measured attitudes toward group work following the Engage Award, gathered specific project details, and sought evidence of how collaborative technologies and instructor facilitation methods influenced the common challenges of group work.

Instructors and Teaching Assistants who did their collaborative group project in the fall, were emailed a link to the pre-survey in early September 2008 and were emailed a link to the post survey in December 2008. Instructors who did their projects in the spring, were emailed a link to the same pre- and post-surveys in January and May 2009. Lastly, instructors who completed the project in the summer were emailed a link to the pre- and post surveys in May and August 2009. Reminders were sent to the instructors 1 and 2 weeks after the initial email invitation and the surveys were kept open for approximately 3 weeks. A total of 50 instructors were invited to participate in the surveys. Thirty-nine instructors completed the pre-survey, 42 completed the post-survey and 36 completed both. The data from both surveys were exported to SPSS for analysis. The quantitative data were analyzed in SPSS and the qualitative data were coded and analyzed by hand.

Similarly, students completed pre- and post- surveys at the start and end of the semester. One of the instructors taught a year-long course, and the students in this course took the pre-survey in the Fall and the post survey in the spring. Each instructor was sent a draft of the pre- and post-surveys and had the opportunity to add questions specific to their course to one or both survey(s). Of the 34 instructors whose students participated in the pre- and post-surveys, 12 of them chose to add questions to one or both of the survey(s) for their course. After the instructor approved the surveys, they were entered into a web survey tool, SurveyMonkey. The links to the student surveys were sent to the instructor and the instructor sent the link to the students in an email or posted it to their course website. Reminders were sent to students 1 or 2 times after the initial invitation and the survey remained open for 2-3 weeks, depending on the course. A total of 1360 students were invited to participate in the surveys. Nine hundred and forty-nine students completed the pre-survey, 802 completed the post-survey, and 660 completed both. The data from all the surveys were exported to SPSS and combined into one file for analysis. The quantitative data were analyzed in SPSS and the qualitative data were coded and analyzed by hand.
In this section we present and analyze responses to select survey questions. The mean is reported for the answers where appropriate and percent frequencies are
pictured in a corresponding chart. For open-ended questions, the top responses are reported and tag clouds of the qualitative data are pictured.

**Technology Enhanced Collaborative Group Work**

**Technology**
To obtain feedback on the role of technology in alleviating the challenges of and enhancing group work, we asked questions in both on satisfaction with the technology, how the technology was used for group work, and how the technology alleviated challenges of group work. Certain items were asked in the pre- and post-surveys and a paired-sample t-test or one way ANOVA was used to measure change over the course of the semester. Overall, students and instructors reported high levels of satisfaction with the technologies and provided a variety of ways technology can alleviate challenges of group work.

**Satisfaction with Technology(ies)**
Both the student and instructor surveys included questions to provide an indication of satisfaction with the collaborative technologies. The first set of data are based on a 7-point likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).
- The mean student response of enjoyment using collaborative technologies increased significantly from the pre- to post- survey, from 4.39 to 4.55. (Fig. 1)
- Student agreement that technology tools make completing group assignments easier increased significantly from pre- to post-survey, from 5.00 to 5.28. (Fig. 2)
- Students and instructors agreed on the post surveys, groups benefited from using technology tools, with respective means 5.73 and 5.67. (Fig. 3)

- Students and instructors agreed on the post surveys, technology enhanced the quality of the group product, with respective means 5.60 and 5.58. (Fig. 4)
Students and instructors agreed on the post surveys, technology tools make group work more convenient, with respective means 5.55 and 5.44. (Fig. 5)

Students and instructors were glad the technology tool was incorporated in the course, with respective means 5.12 and 5.89. (Fig. 6)

The following data on satisfaction with technology are on a 5-point scale (0-4). The percentages and means are reported for the students who used each technology. Therefore, the N varies for each technology.

Face-to-face meetings were rated the most helpful tool to group success, with 88.3% of students reporting f2f meetings as extremely or quite helpful and mean 3.44. (Fig. 7)

Email, discussion boards, and wikis were the next highest rated tools, with means 3.41, 2.46, and 2.49 respectively. (Fig. 7)

Only 12.6% of students and 2.4% of instructors ranked this group project as worse than previous group projects they were involved in.

Lastly, when asked if they would use the technology again, 74.4% of instructors responded yes.
In the post-survey, students were provided with a matrix of technology tools and collaborative activities (i.e. editing a document). Students used the matrix to report how they used each technology for the group project. The number of students using a specific technology ranged from 702 (email) to 80 (discussion boards). The data below are based on the number of students who reported use of each tool (i.e. 78.8% of the students who used email reported using it to coordinate face-to-face meetings).

- Email was the most used technology, with 87.5% of students reporting use. (Fig. 8)
- Email and social networking sites are the most frequently used tools for coordinating face-to-face meetings, 78.8% and 53.9% respectively.
- Chat and email are the most frequently used tools for coordinating online, synchronous meetings, 34.3% and 28.1% respectively.
- Collaborative Sites, wikis, email, and Google Docs are the most used tools for writing and editing group documents, 60.1%, 59.2%, 58.8%, and 57.6% respectively.
- Email and wikis are the most used tools for creating and editing group presentations, 50.1% and 33.7% respectively.
- Email, Google Docs, and discussion boards are the most frequently used tools for brainstorming and organizing resources, 52.7%, 51.6%, and 57.5% respectively.
- Email and MyWebspace are the most used tools for sharing files, 72.2% and 60.1% respectively.
- Wikis and collaborative sites are the most used tools for peer editing and critique, 65.3% and 58.5% respectively.

**Technologies Alleviate Challenges**

Students reported convenience, reducing the need to meet face-to-face, providing a common place to store work and information, and making communication easier as the top 4 ways technology alleviated the challenges of group work. (Fig. 9)
**Pedagogy**
As part of the award process, Engage staff and mentors researched methods of good practice in facilitating group work. This research was shared by staff and mentors with instructors through community events, the Engage website, and consultations with Engage staff. Coupled with the introduction of collaborative technologies, many instructors implemented new facilitation techniques and assessment strategies in their group projects. Therefore, we included items on the surveys to obtain feedback on the role of facilitation and assessment in making group projects a success.

**Facilitating Group Work**
- In congruence with the literature, students who knew how the group project related to course objectives were significantly more likely than their peers to report they learn more effectively in groups (Fig. 10), and see value in group assignments (Fig. 11). The same students were less likely than their peers to rate the group project as worse than past group projects (Fig. 12).
- Instructors reported, providing guidance/training on how to work in groups, implementing an individual grade component, providing clear objectives for group work, and using a collaborative technology as the top 4 transformations to the way they facilitated this group project. (Fig. 13)
Similarly, students who were given guidance on how to work in groups were more likely than their peers to report they learn more effectively in groups (Fig. 14). This same group of students was less likely than their peers to rate the group project as worse than past group projects (Fig. 15).

Students indicated more satisfaction with the group project when they were spending more time per week working on it individually or with their group (Fig. 16). This finding aligns with the literature which suggests student satisfaction with group work is related to the difficulty of the task (Appendix 6).

Students were asked what was done in the course to make the group project more successful or enjoyable. The top 4 student responses were: frequent instructor availability, clear guidelines and expectations, flexibility in choosing a topic and/or work strategy, and time in class to work on the project. (Fig. 17)

Similarly, when students were asked what was missing from the project that would have been helpful, the top response was more guidance/regular check-ins. (Fig. 18)
Assessing Group Work

- Student agreement that evaluations of each other by group members should be calculated into final grades increased significantly from pre- to post-survey, with respective means 4.88 and 5.04, indicating students want the opportunity to provide feedback on their group members. (Fig. 19)

- Students and instructors agreed on the post-surveys, students appreciated the opportunity to evaluate their group member’s contributions to the group project, with respective means 5.63 and 5.43. (Fig. 20)

- Students and instructors reported, students felt free to provide honest feedback, with respective means 5.72 and 5.23. (Fig. 21)

- However, students and instructors were uncertain if individual contributions to the group project increased as a result of the peer evaluations, with respective means 4.34 and 4.53. (Fig. 22)

- Likewise, student agreement that project grades should be a combination of the quality of the final product and individual contribution to the group project (each group member may receive a different grade) increased significantly from pre- to post- survey, with respective means 5.49 and 5.63. (Fig. 23)
Attitudes

In addition to gathering feedback on the collaborative technologies and group work pedagogy, we were interested in measuring student’s attitudes towards group work because the 2007 ACTWAN survey showed student satisfaction with group projects was low. One of the goals of the award program was to make group projects more productive and less dreadful for students. We asked a series of questions to gauge student’s attitudes toward group work in the pre- and post-survey. We saw significant differences in some areas, which suggests students had a positive group work experience during this award. However, we cannot be certain if the change in attitudes is due to the collaborative technologies, the pedagogy, or the quality of the class.

- Student agreement that they see value in group assignments increased significantly from pre- to post-survey, with respective means 5.21 and 5.38. (Fig. 24)
- Student agreement that finding time to meet with their group is a challenge of group work decreased significantly from pre- to post-survey, with respective means 5.77 and 5.63. (Fig. 25)
- Student agreement with the statement “in group projects, I end up doing all the work” also decreased significantly from pre- to post-survey, with respective means 4.18 and 3.78. (Fig. 26)

Award Program Details
We also collected more general information about the award program from the instructors. In an effort to continuously improve Engage awards and our campus services, we are interested in understanding what is most valued by the faculty and instructors we serve.

- Instructors indicated the top reasons they applied for the Engage TECGW award were: to try a new teaching tool, address a teaching challenge, and to make group work more convenient for students. (Fig. 27)
- The top three most useful aspects of the award program were: consultations with program staff, reading and hearing about how other campus instructors are facilitating group work, and talking with other campus instructors about group work. This suggests instructors value the personal nature of the award and the community that develops around the award topic. (Fig. 28)
- When instructors were asked what worked well as a result of the award, the top 3 responses were: trying a new technology, trying a new facilitation technique, and consultations with program staff. (Fig. 29)
Methods of Good Practice

The list of suggestions below, resulting from the instructor and student surveys, provide methods of good practice for instructors planning to experiment with technology enhanced group projects. The results of our award program, in conjunction with the literature on group work, provide evidence of how task design, group process facilitation, and technology choice influence the success of the group project. The recommendations follow.

Be sure the task is worthy of collaborative group work
- Consider the pedagogical challenge. Will a group add value to the task?
- Specify how the group project aligns with the course learning objectives.

Design the task
- Identify the types of interactions desired (student-student, student-instructor, student-content).
- Identify the tasks students will need to complete.
- Identify barriers students might face. Where have students had problems in the past?
- Choose a technology tool that aligns with the interactions, tasks, and challenges.
- Develop an assessment plan for the process as well as the assigned product.

Prepare students for collaboration
- Communicate the rationale for group work, including why the challenge is worthy of collaborative group work and how the group project relates to course objectives.
- Help your students understand what makes good collaboration.

Do regular assessments of process and product
- Use milestones or check-ins to ensure groups are on the right track.
- Provide students the opportunity to evaluate their group mates' contribution to the group project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Parrish</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Connors</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Paustian</td>
<td>Bacteriology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Eggert</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Guo</td>
<td>Civil Engineering/Nelson Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Ciucci</td>
<td>Communicative Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine Connor</td>
<td>Communicative Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Miller</td>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Peterson</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Halverson</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gillian-Daniel</td>
<td>Engineering Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rik Hunter</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Fiorenza</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Zuengler</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Nakaue</td>
<td>English - FIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Olson</td>
<td>Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Armbrecht</td>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Prantil</td>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Love</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Korpi</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Hilgendorf</td>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Benedict</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Kuhrasch</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Holden</td>
<td>LaFollette School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Davis Jr.</td>
<td>Languages and Cultures of Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Alexander</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Downey</td>
<td>Library and Information Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Meyerand</td>
<td>Medical Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Henke</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Treves</td>
<td>Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi Delagrange</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Lutz</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Pellino</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Zahner</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Martin</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gervey</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Allen</td>
<td>Scandinavian Studies/History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teri Balser</td>
<td>Soil Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>