

Title: The What and Why of Faculty Development in Higher Education: An In-depth Review of the Literature

Authors: C. Amundsen, P. Abrami, L. McAlpine, C. Weston, M. Krbavac, A. Mundy, M. Wilson

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC)

Introduction

Over a number of years, more than a decade, we have worked together as faculty developers and as researchers investigating various aspects of teaching and learning development in higher education. The initial motivation to undertake this review was a desire to position the work we do with faculty within the broader community of practice. Two years ago, several of the authors of this paper and a few other colleagues undertook the project of writing a book together that explicitly examined our individual and shared understandings about the development of teaching and learning in higher education (Saroyan & Amundsen, 2004). This prompted us to examine the theories and assumptions that underlie our practice as faculty developers, specifically the question of why we go about our work as we do. In all of the years we have worked together, we rarely had in-depth conversations of this nature. We, like many others in this field, were usually more preoccupied with “doing” things than with “thinking” together. Because of our roles as researchers, these conversations had happened more often with co-researchers and graduate students in relationship to specific research projects, than with each other.

The book project led us naturally to begin wondering how others engaged in faculty development understood why they went about their work as they did. What are the theories, assumptions and values that underpin faculty development practices ... and how are these similar to and different from ours? Thus another purpose of this literature review has become the development of an analytic tool that others may use to analyze, evaluate and situate the faculty development activities and programs they design and implement.

Working definition of faculty development.

The term ‘faculty development’ is commonly used to describe activities and programs designed to improve instruction. All three of the previous reviews of the literature that we discuss in the next section adhere to this definition. More recently, the term ‘academic development’ has been used in some of the literature to refer to development activities and programs that more fully address the multiple roles of faculty (instructor, researcher, citizen and scholar within departments, faculties and the wider university community). This definition is based on a more holistic view of the higher education faculty member within his or her institution. Centra (1989) has proposed four possible types of development: personal (interpersonal skills, career development, and life planning issues); instructional (course design and development, instructional technology); organizational (ways to improve the institutional environment to better support teaching); and professional (ways to support faculty members so that they fulfill their multiple roles of teaching, research, and service).

The working definition we have used in this review rests somewhere between these two definitions. We maintained a focus on teaching and/or learning development. We also considered activities and programs that had additional goals. For example, several recent papers describe the development of faculty learning communities where the goals are much broader than teaching or instructional development. We offer greater detail of what we included in this review in a following section where our inclusion-exclusion criteria are explained.

Why another review?

We want to “unpack” both descriptions of and research about efforts to develop university teaching to try and understand why faculty developers undertake their work in the way that they do. We believe that in doing so we will come to better understand the assumptions held about what constitutes effective faculty development, about what constitutes effective teaching and learning in higher education and why these assumptions are held.

The reader may ask why this is important? In a corollary question, Rowland (1999) asks what kinds of pedagogical theory might underline the process of learning about teaching for academics. He explains, “ Unless those who provide such courses [faculty development courses] can begin to answer this question, it is difficult to see how they are likely to achieve the envisaged development of university teaching. Indeed, overcoming the public perception that university teaching is amateurish demands that the processes of developing university teaching be adequately conceptualized” (p. 303). We would agree with Rowland and add that such understanding is key to intellectual growth for faculty developers themselves and to the growth of innovative practice and research in this field.

We realize that undertaking a review of the literature to address this question has limitations. Primary among them is that the published literature cannot be taken to completely or accurately represent current practices in faculty development. Since many faculty developers do not have positions that require research or allow time for it, and since we did not include purely descriptive accounts of programs, we are aware that there are many programs that will not be represented in our review. Also, like Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981) we chose not to include descriptions of practice that use only self-report satisfaction measures to evaluate effectiveness. Weimer and Lenz (1994) did and defended this choice partly on the grounds that practice precedes research and there is a considerable delay, between implementation and exploration and formal documentation.

Another serious limitation to the focus of our review is that even when descriptions of practices are rich in detail and measurements of effectiveness are directly linked to teaching practice, the rationale for the design of the faculty development activity or program is not always explicitly stated.

The remainder of the paper is organized to provide: a brief introduction to the findings of previous reviews; our problem statement; our review process (data sources, inclusion criteria, search and verification procedures); and outcomes of the search to date.

Previous reviews

Our first step was to read previous reviews of the faculty development literature. We discuss three of them here, Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981), Weimer and Lenze (1994) and Emerson and Mosteller (2000). The stated purpose of the three reviews was primarily to up date the previous review. All three reviews identified different formats of faculty development (e.g., workshops, consultations, mentoring) and discussed their findings within these categories. All three reviews also focused on how the effectiveness of faculty development activities and programs was measured. In this review, we include this information, but take a different focus.

One of the first reviews was conducted by Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981) and was based on seventy-one representative reports published between the mid-1960s and 1980s, and almost exclusively addressing faculty development in American institutions. They found that workshops and seminars were the most common type of faculty development activity. While these ranged from half-day or full day programs to weeklong or longer, the most common was the short 'one-shot' workshop. Levinson-Rose and Menges noted that while workshops and seminars were the most commonly documented approach, they were also the least evaluated and, in their opinion, the least likely to "produce lasting changes in teaching behaviour or lasting impact on students ..." (p. 419).

Thirteen years later, Weimer and Lenze (1994) found largely the same situation in a review of the literature published during the 1980s and again drawing mostly on American sources. Workshops and seminars, they found, remained the most common type of faculty development activity. The incidence of literature addressing individual consultations however increased significantly, most often describing programs that employed student course ratings as a basis for the consultation and as the measure of effectiveness. A new category of instructional development was noted, that of peer review and feedback. Compared with the earlier review, Weimer and Lenze found more description of and variation in the instructional methods used to teach the workshops and seminars with evidence of interactive methods and collaborative strategies in addition to traditional presentation formats. Seminars and workshops included in this review were more likely than those included in the previous one to target specific populations within the university or college (for example new faculty and TAs). Finally, there were accounts of more lengthy workshops and seminars, sometimes with follow-up opportunities and on occasion with attempts to assess the impact of the faculty development intervention in terms of changes in teaching practice and student learning. Weimer and Lenze still found the research on workshop effectiveness to be "meager" (p. 658). It is perhaps not surprising that workshops and seminars that were lengthier also tended to be more systematically and meaningfully evaluated.

The third review, conducted by Emerson and Mosteller, reviewed 103 articles and chapters published between 1990 and 1998, again from primarily US sources. The two earlier reviews included literature describing faculty development practices at the university and college levels. Emerson and Mosteller used even broader inclusion criteria and also included community colleges, professional schools and even two studies from the public school level. The review identified four formats for faculty development: 1) Intervention by professional consultants; 2) Workshops, seminars and courses; 3) Mentoring programs; and 4) Action research, including

classroom research. Of note here is the new format of action research, a type not reported by the previous reviews. Two studies of this format were discussed, both in the context of medical education.

Statement of the problem

We charged ourselves with the following tasks:

1. To update three earlier reviews of the literature by examining faculty development literature from 1994 to the present, identifying the:

- characteristics of faculty development activities reported; and
- measures of effectiveness used.

2. To expand the focus of previous reviews of the literature by seeking to determine the rationale for the design of the faculty development activities and programs.

Method

Data sources

We accessed several databases in structuring our review of the literature between 1994 and 2004, including ERIC and Education-OnLine. ERIC is a database with more than one million abstracts of education related documents and journal articles. Funded by the US Department of Education's Institute of Education, the majority of documents are authored by Americans. Education-OnLine is a freely accessible database of the full text of conference papers, working papers and electronic literature that supports educational research, policy and practice. The British Education Index office is responsible for all aspects of database production including the description of the subject content of literature using terms from the British Education Thesaurus. As would be expected, the majority of texts in this database have British authors. The review of these databases were based on the following three levels of keywords or descriptors:

- I. Workshops; Seminars; Programs; Institutes; Learning Communities;
Classroom Action Research
- II. Higher Education; Post Secondary; University; College
- III. Research; Review

This initial search produced 869 references and was narrowed down to 782 after a quick scan of paper titles. We also conducted a search using a new search tool, GoogleScholar, that produced 1270 references. We reviewed all paper abstracts resulting from these searches and located online or ordered paper copies of all papers that seemed relevant.

At this point we took the keywords we had used in the searches (listed above) and reworked them to produce inclusion-exclusion criteria. These have been refined several times since. One of the first significant refinements was the exclusion of literature at the college or technical/vocational school levels. Our inclusion-exclusion criteria appear as Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Rationale for inclusion-exclusion criteria: We used the formats of faculty/teaching development programs and activities identified in the 3 previous literature reviews and added ‘programs’, ‘institutes’ and ‘learning communities’ based on our reading of the current literature. We initially included all higher education contexts descriptive of academic institutions. We later excluded literature that focused on the college context, community (2-year) colleges and vocational/technical schools because as we read these papers, it became apparent that these contexts were quite different in terms of faculty roles from our primary interest of the research university context. In this way, our review is a departure from some previous reviews. As with some previous reviews, we are excluding papers without data (that is purely descriptive reports) and also those that present only participant satisfaction ratings in keeping with the critique offered by previous literature reviews, which suggested that measures of effectiveness must go beyond these simple ratings.

Our inclusion-exclusion criteria also allow for the inclusion of conceptually based papers as well as those that are empirically based. Although we have treated these conceptual papers similarly in our process, that is using the same note taking format and attempting to categorize them, they are not included in this paper given the incomplete stage of our review. We do plan to integrate the conceptual papers in our full review as we have come to recognize that many of them describe thinking that may be “ahead” of practice and potentially will have an effect on future practices and research in faculty development.

We have completed the reading of the papers yielded by the search of several large databases as well as relevant conference papers collected by members of our research team. We have not yet finished the manual review of 12 journals that we have identified as most relevant to our review. In selecting these journals, we made sure to include English language journals that publish authors from a number of countries in addition to the United States. This is another way in which our review differs from previous reviews. Table 2 provides a summary of the current status of our search.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Search and verification strategies

We developed a note taking worksheet that each of us fills in as we read. The categories of this tool are listed below and focus on the two major purposes of our literature review: 1) Collect and update information similar to past reviews, and 2) Determine the underlying rationale for the design of the faculty development activity or program.

- Bibliographic information
- 2-3 sentence abstract
- Keywords (based on an agreed upon list)
- Type of faculty development activity (including length, particular groups of participants, etc.)
- Focus or goal of the faculty development activity

- Measures of effectiveness and results
- Theoretical or conceptual underpinnings of the faculty development activity
- Philosophies/beliefs/values about what constitutes effective faculty development
- Philosophies/beliefs/values about what constitutes effective teaching and/or learning in higher education
- View of the instructor within the institution
- Contributions of the paper to understanding of faculty development
- Quality of literature review; citations for to follow up
- Other comments

We chose to use a very low level of inference in regards to the rationale for the design of the faculty development activities and programs. We look for explicit references to theories, conceptual frameworks or research evidence. This is also the case with philosophies, beliefs or values about effective faculty development practices or instructional practices.

Our process has been to meet weekly and discuss papers team members think, according to our inclusion-exclusion criteria, should be considered for inclusion in our review. If based on the discussion the paper seems a likely candidate, one other team member reads it and brings it back to the meeting the following week. If two readers agree, the paper is considered as ‘verified by the research team’. Papers are entered into an EndNote database exclusive to this review as they are verified by the team.

Over the last six months, we began to see conceptual categories emerging in terms of the underlying rationale for the design of the faculty development activities described in the papers we were reading. We have refined our descriptions of these categories over time. It should be noted that these categories refer to the underlying rationale for the design and most always the principal FOCUS of the faculty development activity or program. More recently we have attempted to refine them even more by findings examples and non-examples of each category among the papers we have read. The team members who did not do the reading acted as external auditors in the refinement of the categories (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997). Our process and the procedures undertaken and revisions to them have been documented in a codebook drawing on an example used by another research team who conducted a meta-analysis of the distance education literature (Bernard, Abrami, Lou, Borokhovski, Wade, Wozney, Wallet, Fiset & Huang, 2004).

At this point, we have four conceptual categories and have named them as: Skills-focus; Method-focus; Process-focus; Discipline-focus.

Outcomes of the review to date

In this section we describe the four conceptual categories. Each description is followed by what we consider to be one solid example of that category. There are faculty development activities and programs for which the underlying rationale is a combination of categories, but we have decided to first consider examples that have one main focus in the hope that this will allow us to more precisely define the categories.

Conceptual Categories and Examples

1. Skills focus

Characteristics of the faculty development activity or program. Faculty development activities and programs with a skills focus aim to support faculty to overcome particular problems in teaching as identified by student ratings of their course or by themselves. Generally the problems identified involve observable teaching actions (e.g., preparation and organization, feedback to students) or skills (e.g., presentation skills, discussion facilitation) (Saroyan & Amundsen, 2001). The most common formats for skills-focused faculty development is a short topical workshop or individual consultations with teaching centre staff.

Rationale for the design of the faculty development activity or program. The rationale for undertaking this type of faculty development is that observable teaching actions and skills are central to effective teaching and fundamental to how one's teaching is perceived by students. These actions and skills have been identified by a considerable body of research concerning the development of student ratings of teaching and undertaken mostly between 1970 and 1990, (Abrami, d'Apollonia, & Cohen, 1990; Marsh, 1987). Building on this work are a number of studies that investigate the effectiveness of workshops and consultations that concentrate on particular teaching techniques and skills (Penny & Coe, 2004; Cohen, 1980).

Measure(s) of effectiveness used. The most common measure of effectiveness has been, as lamented in both of the earliest reviews of the literature (Weimer & Lenze, 1994; Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981), simply the satisfaction ratings of instructors seeking help. Individual consultations, however, are more likely than skill-focused workshops to use student course ratings (pre-post consultation) to measure effectiveness.

Example: Piccinin, S. (1999). How individual consultation affects teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 79, 71-83. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Description. Professors seek assistance from a faculty support centre at the University of Ottawa (Canada) with challenges they themselves identify in their teaching performance. The focus is on assisting the faculty member to overcome particular problems in teaching. Three different versions of consulting are described:

- 1) *Feedback-Consultation.* One interview in which the consultant discusses the professor's concerns.
- 2) *Feedback-Consultation-Class Observation.* Same as #1, but adding an observation of the professor's class followed by one or more debriefing sessions.
- 3) *Feedback-Consultation-Class Observation-Student Feedback.* Same as #2, but also gathering student feedback about issues of concern followed with one or more consultation sessions with the professor.

Rationale. The rationale provided in the study for the design of this faculty development activity is constructed on the basis of several literatures. Some of the literature that discusses the benefits of feedback on practice is cited (for example, Erickson, 1986) as well as discussions of the benefits of personal consultation (for example, Brinko and Menges, 1997)

and essential components of this type of faculty development (for example, Morrison, 1997). Empirical research using student course ratings as a measure of effectiveness in assessing the effects of individual consultations is reviewed (for example, Marsh and Roche, 1993). The purpose of this paper was to contribute to the literature by investigating the effectiveness of different types of personal consultation.

Measure(s) of effectiveness. The standard student course rating form at this university was used. The rating form is composed of twelve items. The items deal with: course organization, workload, marking of tests and assignments, feedback provided on learning progress, professor's knowledge of subject matter, ability to convey the subject matter effectively, professor's preparation, ability to stimulate interest, rapport with the class, availability, and two general ratings of the course and the instructor.

2. Method focus

Characteristics of the faculty development activity or program. The focus of faculty development activities or programs assigned to this category gives prominence to a particularly valued teaching and/or learning method or approach (for example, cooperative learning). There is great internal consistency in the way the valued method or approach is represented in the faculty development activity or program. Generally, facilitators provide readings and discuss them with participants to provide a basis for understanding the method or approach and why it is valued. At one extreme, facilitators use only the valued method or approach to teach the faculty development participants based on the reasoning that they will best learn to use it with their students by experiencing it themselves. A more moderate position finds facilitators modeling the valued method or approach multiple times during the faculty development activity or program.

Rationale for the design of the faculty development activity or program. In making a case for the valued method or approach, it is described as being particularly important for or supportive of certain types of learning (e.g., critical thinking, problem-solving). Citations to the theoretical or conceptual literature in which the valued approach or method was first described are generally cited. Empirical research investigating the effectiveness of the valued strategy or method in relationship to the desired learning is also often cited.

Measure(s) of effectiveness. The effectiveness of faculty development activities in this category center on how faculty thinking or valuing of the method or approach changes over time, how faculty members implement their learning about the method or approach into their own teaching and the challenges in doing so. More comprehensive programs (i.e., longer and with more complex goals) tend to use an action research design and rely on multiple ways of tracking effectiveness (e.g., pre-post questionnaires, action plans, classroom observations).

Example: Murray, I. & Savin-Baden, M. (2000). Staff development in problem-based learning. *Teaching in Higher Education* 5(1), 107-126.

Description. This paper describes a faculty development program in a nursing faculty at the University of Dundee (Scotland). Problem-based learning (PBL) was adopted (apparently as a top-down initiative) in response to a review of the nursing curriculum. A detailed

description of how the curriculum was adapted to fit a PBL approach is provided. The faculty development program to support the curricular change was accomplished in two phases. Phase one consisted of an orientation to PBL and was characterized by reading and debate. Phase two was planned and carried out with the expressed purpose of training faculty to be PBL facilitators.

Rationale. PBL is described as becoming an increasingly popular method of learning in higher education, especially in professional schools. Several reports from the UK that recommend a movement toward more learner-centered and problem-based teaching are cited. The benefits of PBL are described as “Putting learning rather than teaching centre-stage ... enabling students both to learn their subject and to gain high-level competencies, transferable skills and complexity skills” (p. 107).

Effectiveness. A number of procedures were used to determine the effectiveness of the faculty development program: 1) individual action plans were developed to implement PBL in courses; 2) open-ended pre-post questionnaires were administered to determine what participants valued and did not value about PBL; 3) a questionnaire was administered to determine “role readiness” to implement PBL; 4) the design of actual curriculum components was evaluated against PBL criteria. The discussion of findings focuses on the ways in which faculty's pedagogical stance (view of selves as teachers) enhanced or made difficult their adoption of the PBL role, and on ways that the introduction of PBL could be done more effectively. The authors of this paper seek to contribute to what they found to be a dearth of literature examining the processes and outcomes of PBL faculty development programs and faculty's perspectives of such programs.

3. Process focus

Characteristics of the faculty development activity or program. Faculty development activities and programs in this category focus on the process of learning to teach which is recognized as being complex and multi-faceted. It is maintained that this learning process is facilitated or not in part by assumptions and prior beliefs held about teaching and learning. While these activities and programs are often designed around collaborative work in collegial groups, the central process centers on examining one's own thinking about teaching and teaching practice and through this reflective process, achieving pedagogical growth. Teaching support groups, Classroom research studies and Faculty Learning Communities are typical formats.

Rationale for the design of the faculty development activity or program? One or more theories from the field of Education that focus on the process of teaching development or more broadly, professional development form the explicit rationale for the way the activity or program is designed and carried out. Mezirow's (1981) theory of transformational learning and Schön's (1987) theory of reflective practice are examples.

Measure of effectiveness. Multiple measures are used to track changes in thinking about teaching and changes in teaching practice that can be attributed to the program. These include pre-post questionnaires, interviews, teaching projects, and journals. Some consider student learning outcomes and perspectives.

Example: Sandretto, S., Kane, R., & Heath, C. (2002). Making the tacit explicit: A teaching intervention program for early career academics. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 7(2), 135-145.

Description: This paper describes a faculty development program designed for new science faculty at the University of Otago (New Zealand) who met once a week for two hours over a ten-week period. Two types of activities characterized the sessions. The first emphasized personal work supported by interaction with other participants, activities like: readings, discussions, journal writing, developing a personal teaching history and eventually a philosophy of teaching. The other found participants watching videotapes of effective science instructors (identified in Phase I of this research) teaching and then reflecting on their teaching. The new science faculty members then engaged in the same activity they had seen modeled: watching videotapes of themselves teaching and engaging in reflection.

Rationale. This article identifies Argyris and Schon's (1974; and Schon, 1987) concepts of "espoused theories of action" and "theories in use" as the focus of the faculty development program. This work and the work of others who have identified differences in public school teachers' espoused beliefs and teaching practice (for example, Thompson, 1992) informed the design of this faculty development program. They state: "We built the program on the assumption that once the novice instructors were aware of any discrepancies between their professed aims and intentions [espoused theories of action] and their teaching practice [theories in use] they would then take steps to lessen that discrepancy." (p. 136). They list four goals of the faculty development program. To encourage instructors to:

- 1) investigate the personal, or themselves as teachers;
- 2) articulate their aims and intentions in the classroom;
- 3) make their tacit theories about teaching and learning explicit; and
- 4) develop habits of reflective practice that could serve them well throughout their careers as academics. (p. 136)

Measure of effectiveness. Multiple procedures were used to document both the espoused theories of action and theories-in-use of the participants. These included, semi-structured interviews, repertory grid interviews, videotaped teaching episodes and stimulated recall interviews based on the videos, and a survey of the perceived value of the program. An inductive approach of data analysis was used to determine the effectiveness of the program. This was roughly organized around 3 questions: influence on current and future practice, development of reflective practice, and participant assessment of the program.

4. Discipline focus

Characteristics of the faculty development activity or program. The format of these activities or programs is generally small groups composed of colleagues from the same discipline or across disciplines. In these groups, professors are encouraged to make explicit their understanding of knowledge development or learning in their disciplines; use this understanding to develop their own teaching and to critique the perspectives and understandings of their colleagues. Of particular note is that the design is meant to draw on and use the expertise, values, and

perspectives professors bring through their subject matter understanding rather than target instructional thinking or skills where they are less explicitly knowledgeable.

Rationale for the design of the faculty development activity or program. It is maintained that a professor's discipline is a point of identification or reference and is therefore an inherently interesting (from the point of view of the professor) starting point from which to consider teaching. The beginning premise is that the structure of knowledge and the nature of learning vary between disciplines and therefore generic approaches to teaching have limited usefulness. Critique is a central activity as it is seen to be consistent with academic life.

Measure of effectiveness. What is noted and documented is professors' increased ability to articulate and explain their approach to teaching with reference to the values and perspectives of their discipline and to demonstrate how this links to teaching. Teaching projects and portfolios are used.

Example: Rowland, S. (1999). The role of theory in a pedagogical model for lecturers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education* 24, 3, 303-14.

Rowland, S. & Barton, L. (1994). Making things difficult: Developing a research approach to teaching in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 19(3), 367-374. (The 1994 paper describes the faculty development program with some rationale for its design and the 1999 paper elaborates on the latter.)

Description. This faculty development program centered on the activity of critique, a scholarly activity seen as common to and rooted in all disciplines. Participants engaged in critique of the readings, critique of each other's ideas and perspectives and critique of their reflections on their own teaching. This faculty development program was structured as a 2-year M.Ed. program for new lecturers at Sheffield University (Britain), purposely drawn from a range of disciplines. It was developed in part as a response to a national imperative to improve higher education teaching. Between weekly sessions, participants read texts related to teaching and learning from the field of Education as well as from other fields and were encouraged to, "make observations and interpretations of their own teaching, try out different strategies in light of these and develop their own ongoing [teaching] projects" (p. 369). Six aims for this program were identified:

1. To make practice public.
2. To understand how students in various disciplines perceive their learning experience and the subject matter.
3. To develop the educational values which lie at the heart of educational practice within the disciplines.
4. To develop a research community to test new ideas in teaching.
5. To relate teaching to research.
6. To develop strategies for self-evaluation.

Rationale. The authors argue that discourse related to teaching in higher education has been dominated by "technical rather than critical perspectives" (p. 370, 1994). Therefore, this faculty development program was built to "raise fundamental questions concerning pedagogy – the relationships between teacher, student and subject matter – within the particular social

[disciplinary] context, rather than merely focus on the ‘how to do it’ of teaching skills” (p. 369, 1994). The authors argue furthermore that critique is fundamental to academic discussion and critical to fostering understanding because it allows different disciplinary values or underlying theories to emerge. The discussion cites psychologist Rogers (1977) and the philosopher Habermas (1972) and their work regarding the democracy of true discourse. The authors assert, “The basis of their [the lecturer’s] values, their sense of their own expertise, and their identity, are likely to derive largely from their disciplinary field. It may therefore be this disciplinary context, rather than their limited knowledge of the field of education [resulting from their reading], which would provide the basis for their educational understanding. The differences between their disciplinary contexts would then stimulate critique in relation to these ideas” (p. 312, 1999). It is the public sharing and critique of these disciplinary-based values and perspectives that leads to growth in one’s teaching practice.

Measure effectiveness. Ongoing feedback was provided on developing teaching projects. The value and effectiveness of the critique sessions were formally noted and both this and the developing teaching projects were used to inform the ongoing process in a sort of action research design. A portfolio was used to document the experiences of participants in the program and the effects of this on their teaching. A final survey queried participants about the successes and failures of the program. Long-term follow up noted that some participants became involved in and/or initiated teaching development activities within their departments and within the broader institution.

Discussion and Next Steps

In this paper we have reported on the steps undertaken to update and expand three earlier reviews of the literature on faculty development practices. Our goal has been to go beyond descriptions of activities and measures of effectiveness by seeking the reasons why the faculty development activity or program is designed and implemented as it is. What theories, assumptions and values underpin practice?

This has been a difficult task because the underlying rationale for the design of faculty development activities is not always explicitly described in the literature. We want to encourage explicitness because we believe that it is consistent with work that is judged to be of scholarly significance and more importantly will contribute to a deeper understanding of what informs our practice. Just as we ask faculty members to understand why they teach as they do and how it supports student learning, we must ask ourselves why and how we expect our work to support teaching and learning development.

At a result of our analysis to date, we have proposed four conceptual categories that distinguish among faculty development practices based on the nature of the assumptions and values underlying them. We do not attach a value to these categories; one is not more effective, complex or recommended than another. Rather, they are intended to represent what has emerged from our search of the literature to date. Thus, another outcome of this investigation has become the development of an analytic tool and language that others may use for self-examination, assessment and situating of personal approach and the approach of their teaching centre or unit.

Our search and analysis process will continue until we feel reasonably sure that we have considered, if not included, literature that meets our criteria and until our attempt to describe the rationales underlying current faculty development practice (as described in the published literature) becomes well defined. We will continue to carefully document the themes that emerge from papers that fall into in each category. We will also begin to document in more detail than we have the context in which and for which faculty development activities are designed as a possible additional way to understand differences in our categories. Our codebook will continue to be used to document our ongoing process, revisions to it and our impressions as we proceed.

References

- Abrami, P.C., d'Apollonia, S., & Cohen, P.A. (1990). Validity of student ratings of instruction: What we know and what we do not. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 219-231.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bernard, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Lou, Y. Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Wozney, L., Waiet, P.A., Fiset, M., & Huang, B. (2004). How Does Distance Education Compare to Classroom Instruction? A Meta-Analysis of the Empirical Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 379-439.
- Brinko, K.T., & Menges, R.J. (Eds). *Practically Speaking: A Sourcebook for Instructional Consultants in Higher Education*. Stillwater, Okla: New Forums Press, 1997.
- Centra, J. A. (1989). Faculty evaluation and faculty development in higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 155-179). New York: Agathon Press. As cited in Menges, R. J., & Austin, A. E. (2001). Teaching in higher education. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.)(pp. 1122-1156). Washington DC: AERA.
- Cohen, P.A. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. *Research in Higher Education*, 13, 321-341.
- Erickson, G. R. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. *To Improve the Academy*, 5, 182-196.
- Emerson, J. D., & Mosteller, F. (2000). Development Programs for College Faculty: Preparing for the Twenty-first Century. *Educational Media and Technology Yearbook*, 25, 26-42.
- Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and Practice*. (Translation: J. Viersal). London: Heinemann.
- Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A Guide to conducting consensual qualitative research, *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25(4), 517-572.
- Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R.J. (1981). Improving college teaching: A critical review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), 403-434.
- Marsh, H.W., & Roche, L. (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 217-251.

- Marsh, H.W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11(3), 253-388.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education*, 32(1), 3-27.
- Morrison, D.E. (1997). Overview of instructional consultation in North America. In K.T. Brinko and R.J. Menges (eds.), *Practically Speaking: A Sourcebook for Instructional Consultants in Higher Education*. Stillwater, Okla: New Forums Press.
- Penny, A.R., & Coe, R. (2004). Effectiveness of consultation on student ratings feedback: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(2), 215-53.
- Rogers, C. (1977). *Carl Rogers on Personal Power*. London: Constable.
- Rowland, S. (1999). The role of theory in a pedagogical model for lecturers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education* 24(3), 303-14.
- Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (Eds.) (2004). *Rethinking Teaching in Higher Education: From A Course Design Workshop to a Framework for Faculty Development*. Virginia: Stylus Publishing.
- Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (2001). Evaluating university teaching: Time to take stock. *Assessment and Evaluation*, 26(4), 341-353.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, A.G. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In D.A. Grouws (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning* (pp. 127-146). New York: Agathon.
- Weimer, M., & Lenze, L. F. (1991). Instructional interventions: A review of the literature on efforts to improve instruction. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 7, pp. 294-333). New York: Agathon.

The authors and members of our research team:

Cheryl Amundsen is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia.

Philip C. Abrami is Professor, Director, and Research Chair at the Centre for the Study of Learning and Performance (CSLP) at Concordia University in Montreal, Quebec.

Lynn McAlpine is Professor in the Dept. of Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

Cynthia Weston is Professor in the Dept. of Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

Marie Krbavac is a M.A. student in the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia.

Amrit Mundy is a M.A. student in the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia.

Mary Wilson is a Ph.D. student in the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia.

Table 1. Inclusion-exclusion criteria

Include	Exclude
FD formats: Workshops; Seminars; Courses; Programs; Institutes; Learning Communities; Classroom Research; Individual consultations	
Contexts: Higher Education; University	College level; Vocational or technical contexts
Empirical studies	Descriptions of practice with no data or only participant satisfaction ratings
Conceptual papers	
Reviews	

Table 2. Summary of the Identified Literature to Date.

Journal/Database	Abstracts Read	Articles Read	**Included based on 1 reader	***Verified by research team	Identified as potential inclusions -- to be read
Education On-Line	490	25	3	1	
Google Scholar	1270	30	7		
ERIC	292	47	2		
Active Learning in Higher Education	Review not complete	1			
*Adult Education Quarterly		2	2	1	
*Higher Education		11	1	1	
*Higher Education Quarterly		1	1		
Higher Education Research and Development	Review not complete				
Innovative Higher Education	Review not complete				
International Journal of Academic Development	Review not complete			1	57
*Journal of Higher Education		15	2		
*New Directions in Teaching Learning		2		1	35
Research in Higher Education	Review not complete			1	
*Studies in Higher Education		18	3	1	
*Teaching in Higher Education		13	8	1	
Conference papers not found		2	1	1	

in databases					
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

*** The abstracts of all articles published between 1994 (or from 1st volume of the journal) and 2004 were read.**