

Positioning the “Rethinking teaching: a course design workshop for professors:” A process-based workshop in a disciplinary framework.

Mary Wilson, Simon Fraser University¹

As faculty developers, we rarely consider how our work is situated in relation to the others. Yet to do so can yield insights into our own practices and assumptions, helping us clarify our intentions and ensure the activities we plan are consistent with those intentions. This paper situates one faculty development initiative. The Rethinking Teaching/Course Design Workshop² is a five-day session offered to faculty members at McGill, Concordia, SFU, the University of Victoria and University of Waterloo. The workshop presents an efficient and structured model for course design. Faculty members, whether they are designing a new course or revamping an existing one, can leave at the end of five days with a detailed course outline based on a sound conceptual framework. Those who complete the workshop are invited to participate in ongoing small-group discussions of teaching and learning, typically held monthly through the academic year.

This paper uses the results of a 2006 characterization of the faculty development literature to position the Workshop within the broad range of faculty development activities. The paper begins with a discussion of the importance of situating our practice, and then briefly describes the process we used to develop the characterization tool, the workshop and the tool itself. In the final sections of the paper, I report the results I found using the tool to analyze the workshop, then explore implications of the use of the tool in other settings..

Background: why situate our practice as faculty developers?

Positioning our practice is not a familiar task for faculty developers, although it is somewhat more common in other educational fields. (See Paulston and Liebman, 1994, for a discussion of positioning practices in comparative education.) Yet the process of considering one’s practice, and particularly the assumptions that underlie it, can be significant. The benefits are both practical and profound. Systematic reflection helps us make sure we are consistent. It introduces us to new ways of thinking about familiar phenomena, and can lead us to challenge our assumptions on various levels. It encourages the recognition of the social context of faculty development and, by extension, of all teaching.

¹I would like to acknowledge the assistance I received from members of the research team in the writing of this paper, in particular Dr. Cheryl Amundsen (SFU) and Dr. Lynn McAlpine (McGill). I welcome additional comments. Please address them to me: mewilson@sfu.ca

² At McGill, the workshop is called the Course Design Workshop. At SFU, it is called Rethinking Teaching.

If our practice is consistent, we are observably doing not only what we say we are doing, but we are embodying our beliefs about effective teaching and learning. Like all professors, faculty developers are simultaneously doing two things when they present a faculty development session. First, they are presenting the content, working with their professor/students to teach some particular aspect of teaching, course creation or class management. Second, they are modeling and embodying their practice. Just as the professor of economics is demonstrating to students how an economist approaches a problem, the faculty developer is on some levels demonstrating the way someone who has thought deeply about teaching approaches a teaching/learning situation. The message in a faculty development workshop is at least partially the practice as demonstrated, not simply the content as explicated. This makes it critically important that our teaching approach and our content are consistent, and situating our practice helps us to do that.

Participants in faculty development sessions may experience lack of consistency between practice, intention and underlying philosophy as confusion. More often, I believe it is felt as something just not quite right – and this sense of discomfiture reduces the likelihood of success for the faculty development initiative on its own terms, whatever those are. Why does this lack of consistency occur? Sometimes it happens simply because those who are delivering faculty development programs do so in a framework they did not design. Sometimes the mismatch simply hasn't been noticed.. Since the evaluation of faculty development programs often consists of little more than participant satisfaction ratings, (review) there may be little motivation for busy faculty development staff to consider the programs they are developing in more depth. Situating our practice requires us to analyze not only our actions, but also our underlying assumptions – hence, the process of reflection required to position our practice may enhance the consistency of our efforts.

Teaching is a complex process that occurs in a particular social context. Professors in departments choose their teaching approaches based on their own experience of their disciplines, but also within the framework of their department and its shared views of teaching, the range of appropriate activities, and the collective understanding of what teaching looks like. As faculty developers, we are often very aware of our own teaching at the level of technique, but may be less aware of our teaching as a social practice. Yet the faculty development units or centers where we work themselves have a culture of teaching, including collective practice and assumptions that underlie and create that culture. Applying the characterization tool helps us to surface those assumptions and identify the practices, while making us more aware of the social context of teaching and of faculty development itself.

Finally situating our practice encourages us to reflect on our assumptions about the work we do. Looking at the practices of others, particularly when those practices are effective and different from our own, reminds us that there are many ways to teach and learn.

Turning to the literature to situate our practice.

There are many varieties of faculty development initiatives reported in the literature. Some are extensive, institute-wide initiatives, involving whole departments or faculties. Others are one-on-one consulting sessions, aimed at assisting individual professors who wish to make some sort of improvement in their teaching. Some are merely described and do not provide much detail about for example, why the initiative was designed as it was and whether or not it was effective in some way. Others (such as the Workshop) have been extensively explored by their developers. Because the available descriptions are so different in depth and focus, it is difficult to begin to situate one's practice without undertaking a systematic comparison.

Beginning in 2004, we have been involved as a research team in an examination of the literature of faculty development. The literature review project developed from the work done by the authors of *Rethinking teaching in higher education* in the creation of that book. As they worked together to articulate their understanding of their work, they began to wonder about others' practice, and the assumptions and values that underpin faculty development. The goal of the literature review process was to try and understand why faculty developers approach their work in the way they do.

For the authors, this work is based on a desire to better understand the assumptions held about what constitutes effective faculty development, and what constitutes effective teaching and learning in higher education. This concern echoes that of Rowland, who writes:

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).

Beyond reflecting on the purposes of our own research group's practice, we hoped the literature review would create a useful tool for other faculty developers to use for reflection. We believe we have done this. Through the process of systematically reviewing the faculty development literature, we have come to see differences between faculty development initiatives. These differences may be found in underlying philosophy, in views of what constitutes effective teaching and learning, and views of what constitutes effective faculty development. Applying the characterization scheme we have developed to our own work is a reasonable first step in testing its effectiveness.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is twofold: it is to use the tool to situate the Workshop as a faculty development initiative, and also to reflect on the value of the literature characterization as a tool for situating faculty development activities in general.

The Course Design Workshop: an overview

The Workshop is a five day session, designed for university professors who are committed to developing a new course, or revamping an existing one. The workshop is lead by instructors and co-instructors, assisted by graduate students in education. The instructors are mostly very experienced professors who have significant experience of both faculty development and teaching in subject areas, and who have taught the workshop several times. The co-instructors are newer to the process. All are faculty members. Most have taken the workshop as participants within the last year or two. Co-instructors may ultimately become workshop instructors as they gain experience.

Each of the five days follows a similar pattern. In the morning, the whole large group meets for instructional and discussion sessions on the focus for the day. In the late morning, the group divides into small groups, each facilitated by an instructor and a co-instructor. Participants work on the relevant component of their course throughout the morning, generally meeting with one or more of their peers to exchange feedback. In the afternoon, participants present their work to their peers in videotaped mini teaching sessions. They receive both written and verbal feedback from peers, and incorporate that feedback into their work prior to the next day's session. The foci of the five days are:

- Day 1 – course content – concept mapping
- Day 2 – anticipated learning outcomes
- Day 3 – instructional approaches
- Day 4 – evaluation of learning
- Day 5 – evaluation of teaching

Day 1 – focus on course content

The workshop begins with development of a concept map. Making and presenting the map encourages professors to articulate for themselves and their peers the critical components of the course for student learning and the relationship between the components. This articulation requires a strong focus on student learning, and a deep understanding of the way in which knowledge is built up in the discipline – what must be understood first, before more complex components can be understood.

In the large group session for day 1, at least two of the co-instructors present the concept maps they developed when they attended the workshop as participants. Typically, they share multiple versions of the same map, explaining the changes in their thinking represented by the changes in the maps. Further samples are provided in participant materials. The maps are usually hand drawn, and often incorporate some visual representation appropriate to the subject matter. Since they have not been prepared using computer software, they are very individual representations of each professor's understanding of course content.

In the small groups, participants begin the process of designing their own concept maps. Working with sticky notes, they arrange and rearrange content in a way that makes sense to them, and that they feel will make sense to their students. Later in the morning, they work in pairs to explain the content either to a paper or to one of their group facilitators.

In the afternoon, each participant presents their concept map, now drawn on an overhead, to the rest of the small group. They receive feedback from their peers on the map, and also on their presentation.

The map forms the basis for the rest of the week's work, which continues in the same pattern. In subsequent days, participants develop anticipated learning outcomes for students. They design strategies to teach concepts and help students achieve the outcomes. They develop evaluation plans, both for their students and for their teaching. Throughout the week, considerable time is given to the presentation of projects under development, and peer feedback on these projects. Participants critique each one another's work from their own perspective, and offer feedback on course design as well as presentation skills.

By the end of the week, many participants have developed a solid course outline, including plans for activities and evaluation. Many participants subsequently choose to participate in an ongoing follow-up group, meeting monthly to develop course planning and other teaching issues with peers throughout the year.³

About the literature review/characterizations

The characterizations of faculty development that form the basis of the tools used to analyze the Workshop were developed through a systematic review of a sample of the peer reviewed faculty development literature from 1996 to the present. We have characterized faculty development initiatives reported in the literature according to their major focus, identifying this focus by considering factors such as the philosophical underpinnings of the project, the evaluation of the project, and the authors' views of what constitutes effective faculty development and effective teaching. We have identified five categories in sufficient detail to apply them to this analysis. We have named the categories as follows:

- Skills-focused
- Approach focused
- Process focused
- Approach focused
- Institutional/dissemination focused
- Disciplinary focused

³ The follow-up group has not always been offered as part of the Workshop. It has been part of the process at SFU for the last two years.

For each characterization, we identified key features that differentiate the characterization from others. The focus in the key features is the developers' stated assumptions, the design of the activity and its evaluation. Table 1 presents the characterizations developed through the literature review process. Each characterization begins with identification of the key features, then a narrative description of the focus of the initiatives.

Table 1: Characterization of the faculty development literature	
Skills-focused	
Key features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on observable behaviours • Focus on teaching techniques • Evaluation of success is based on change in student perception of discrete observable skills. • Largely generic, not discipline based • May be based on empirical findings in rating literature.
<p>The focus is practical and functional—skills-based; techniques for teaching are emphasized. The idea is that there are a number of generic teaching skills that once mastered, improve instruction. Individual consultations based on student evaluation typically fall under this category.</p>	
Approach focused	
Key features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trying to teach people to teach using a particular methodology /strategy/approach • Integrity, coherence, integration in the blending of the actions that make up the approach • Has an underlying rationales, particular theoretical or ideological basis • Measured by how well/consistently the approach is adopted by teachers who have been trained in the approach (e.g. consistency, frequency of uptake, evidence of approach). • Design of the training models the approach

The focus is a particular valued teaching and learning strategy and a theoretical (from the field of Education) or research-based rationale is provided. This valued strategy is the basis for either the design of the faculty development activity itself (e.g., the FD activity is a problem-based learning activity) or the content of the FD activity (teaching profs to use problem-based learning with students) or both. The measure of success is (at least in part) the adoption of the valued approach. If technology related, the pedagogical approach is understood as separate from technical training. An approach is a focus for teaching, which may include the use of various methods. (For example, problem-based learning may include various different methods. Student-centred learning may include various different methods. Certain methods would actually be excluded because they did not match the theoretical basis of the approach.)

Process focused

Key features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption is that reflection leads to conceptual change which in turn leads to change in teaching behaviour. • Design of activity is to prompt and support individual reflection • Draws on reflection literature (e.g., Schon, Mezirow...) • Usually a collegial element to aid individual reflection • Evaluation is usually of individual change at conceptual or action level or both (e.g. a qualitative nature and comes from interviews, narratives, change on perception of teaching scales).
---------------------	--

The focus is on the process that professors engage in to learn about teaching. That process centers on examining one’s own practice. One or more theories from the field of Education is the explicit rationale for the way the FD activity is designed and carried out. These FD programs are based on group work or group plus individual work; collegiality is usually an important aspect. Teaching support groups, Classroom research studies and Faculty Learning Communities are examples of typical formats.

Disciplinary focused:

Key features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective teaching will be different depending on the discipline. • Have to provide a rationale, which is usually based on the structure of knowledge • Intellectually one identifies with one’s discipline • Disciplinary understanding is the foundation on which to link/build knowledge of teaching and learning (they don’t come as blank slates) • Activities are characterized by scholarly discussion
---------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation is based mostly on reflection – the ability to articulate why you are doing what you are doing
<p>The perspective is that a professor’s discipline is a point of identification or reference and that the structure of knowledge varies between disciplines. Professors are encouraged to make explicit their understanding of learning (linked to teaching) in their disciplines; use this understanding to develop their teaching and to critique the perspectives and understandings of colleagues in their own discipline or other disciplines. Teaching development is designed from this perspective. Important here is the fact that professors identify strongly with and are highly expert in regards to disciplinary thinking --- so this operates from the perspective of the expertise they bring rather than what they are deficient in.</p>	
Institutional focus/dissemination focus	
Key features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diffusion/dissemination, spread • Infrastructure strategic planning • Assumes that thing to be diffused is good for everyone • Evaluation is about success of diffusion, not about teaching development • Top down approach
<p>Articles in this category proceed from the assumption that for development of teaching and learning to occur, there must ideally be an infrastructure and resources in place on an institutional (or beyond the institutional – sector-wide, or national, or state, or provincial) level to ensure and support implementation. The emphasis here is on the diffusion process. Often these articles draw on the change literature (organizational change and change) and the dissemination of innovation literature to think about ways in which the diffusion can be supported.</p>	

Method

It is important to position myself, before I report my approach to this analysis. I have been involved in the literature review that developed the characterizations as a Ph.D. student. In addition, I participated in an offering of the Workshop held at Simon Fraser University in the spring of 2005 as an assistant. Since that time I have attended meetings of the SFU follow-up group, recording notes of the meetings and also contributing to the conversations. Besides my role as a student, I have worked in faculty development at the British Columbia Institute of Technology (BCIT) since 2000. In that time I have conducted approximately 20 four-day Instructional Skills Workshops, either on my own

or with colleagues, and participated in a range of other faculty development initiatives including face-to-face and online workshops, and ongoing consultations.

The purpose of this paper is, again, to use our characterization of the literature (outlined in Table 1) to analyze the Workshop which has been offered by senior members of the research team for several years, and which was documented in the book *Rethinking teaching in higher education: from a course design workshop to a faculty development framework*.

To develop our characterization of the literature, we used descriptions of faculty development programs from peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed conference proceedings. For this analysis, I had more in-depth information to work with. Most importantly, I was able to draw on the book *Rethinking teaching*. Since one of the authors' purposes in writing the book was to explore their own faculty development assumptions, this was a rich source of data. I also drew on my experience at the SFU Workshop in April of 2005, and on my experience of the follow-up faculty discussion groups throughout 2005-2006.

I used a coding sheet (included as Appendix 1) developed as part of the literature review process to review the book. I read the chapters of the book in which the faculty developers outlined their approach – the first introductory chapters, plus the five chapters expanding on the approach over each of the four days. Whenever I found a statement that indicated congruence with one of the characteristics from any category, I marked that category on the coding sheet, marked the instance in the book and made a note of the page number.

Finally, I reviewed the instances I had identified in the text and recorded (using direct quotes) examples of the evidence I had found for each category. When I found multiple examples that indicated particular key features, I selected the one that seemed to most clearly exemplify the assumption inherent in the key feature. I did not count the number of references indicating a particular characteristic. (This is consistent with our practice in the broader characterization of the literature. We did not attempt to code for frequency, but rather simply looked for the presence of evidence of a particular characteristic.)

Once I had identified the exemplar statements, I reflected on my own experience of the workshop and considered whether the activities I saw (and participated in) embodied the assumptions identified in the text.

Findings

This workshop primarily represents a process-focused faculty development initiative. As indicated in Table 2, evidence for each of the characteristics of a process-focused initiative were found in the book that describes the workshop. Most of the components

were apparent at various points throughout the five days of the workshop, and were stated explicitly in the text.

Almost as strong as the process focus, though, is a disciplinary focus that frames the activities of the workshop. To some extent, the disciplinary focus is an inevitable outcome of the course design and development process the participants are engaged in. Since the work of the workshop is course development, the disciplinary focus of each professor is apparent from the beginning. As Table 3 shows, evidence for most of the key features of the disciplinary characterization was also found in the book and in my reflections on the workshop and the ongoing follow up activity in the small group.

Table 2: Evidence that the workshop is process-focused

Note: Pages referenced are from *Rethinking Teaching in Higher Education*. In each case, I selected quotes that exemplified the key feature as closely as possible: many more statements exemplifying the same feature are found in the text.

Key feature: Assumption is that reflection leads to conceptual change, which in turn leads to change in teaching behaviour.

Evidence from book: "The intensive Workshop provides professors with an opportunity to discuss and reflect on their teaching and initiate changes to enhance the quality of student learning." (p. 3)

Evidence from observation: In the small group follow up sessions, participants comment on how their thinking about teaching has changed since they participated in the workshop. They at times jokingly refer to themselves as "converts" to a new view of teaching, one focused on successful student learning.

Key feature: Design of activity is to prompt and support individual reflection.

Evidence from book: "We consider the process of reflection as the glue that holds together knowledge, perspectives, and actions. Reflection supports and encourages the continual realignment of these components and is the mechanism for instructional decision making." (p. 25)

Evidence from observation: The reflective process is a focus of the workshop. Every evening, participants go home with a video of their micro teaching session and the feedback that followed it. They spend their evenings reflecting on the feedback and their experience of the day, and incorporating it into their concept maps, course learning outcomes and other course components. There is often considerable change apparent between the days of the workshop. In their presentations participants frequently comment on the ways in which they reflected on the feedback they had received, and how that reflection informed the changes they made.

This focus on reflection continues in the small groups and sometimes leads professors to explore systematic approaches to the study of their own teaching. For example, two

professors currently active in the small group at SFU intend to conduct studies in the coming year on aspects of their own teaching.

Key feature: Draws on reflection literature (e.g. Schon, Mezirow, Cross)

Evidence from book: All are cited.

Key feature: Includes a collegial element to aid individual reflection.

Evidence from book: “One of the observations we have made in conducting this Workshop is that many participants have not had much opportunity to examine their own teaching and discuss teaching with colleagues. Many describe discussions about teaching in their departments as being perfunctory – not really discussions at all. Others report that the teaching norms are quite explicit in their units, and there is little interest in thinking outside them. So the workshop is for some the first time they have engaged in a teaching development activity as an intellectual endeavor, enriched by discussions with colleagues who are also grappling with the intricacies of course design and teaching.” (p. 50)

Evidence from observation: The collegial element is and is critical to the successful functioning of the ongoing small group, as well as to the workshop. Participants see each other as colleagues, and identify the opportunity to work with faculty in other departments as a major benefit of participation.

Key feature: Evaluation is of individual change at conceptual or action level or both (e.g. a qualitative nature and comes from interviews, narratives, changes on perception of teaching scales).

Evidence from book: Four of the chapters of the book are narratives written by Workshop participants, some of whom have participated in the workshop for many years as participants and as co-instructors. Each narrative describes the participant’s initial reaction to the course, and experience in continuing to refine a course based on ongoing reflection and in some cases participation in the ongoing followup group.

Table 3: Evidence that the Workshop is disciplinary-focused

Key feature: Effective teaching will be different depending on the discipline.

Evidence from book: “Participants are probed in ways that help them to articulate their own evolving ideas about what meaningful learning is in their disciplinary context, what a reasoned approach to teaching might be.” (p. 5)

Evidence from observation: Workshop organizers ensure that the co-instructors and faculty present in each group represent a broad spectrum of disciplines. Throughout the sessions, instructors and co-instructors point out instances of disciplinary difference or similarities. In the feedback sessions, participants may ask for feedback from the perspective of another scientist, or from the perspective of someone outside the sciences. Disciplinary differences are seen as adding value to the discussion.

Key feature: Have to provide a rationale, which is usually based on the structure of knowledge.

Evidence from book: “The process of developing a course “concept map” obliges participants to be explicit about why they choose particular content, what are the important concepts, and how concepts are related to one another. For many participants, focusing on a conceptual rather than topical representation of their course is a new way of thinking about course content.” (p. 7)

Key feature: Intellectually one identifies with one’s discipline.

Evidence from book: “Usually there are four small groups of six participants, grouped to provide a mix of disciplines, years of teaching experience, and genders. The rationale for this grouping is that in a multidisciplinary setting, professors are respected as subject matter experts and a focus on student learning is not diverted by contrasting views of a particular content area or department politics.” (p. 9)

Key feature: Disciplinary understanding is the foundation on which to link/build knowledge of teaching and learning.

Evidence from book: “... many professors consider themselves subject experts and scholars rather than teachers or even teacher-scholars within their discipline. We take this reality very seriously and readily acknowledge that one’s area of expertise is a matter of professional self-identity, often expressed in terms of the disciplinary affiliation – such as “geographer” or “linguist” or “physicist.” We think that a more balanced role between subject-matter expert and teacher might be obtained if the attributes of scholarship were also extended to teaching.” (p. 16)

Evidence from observation: The initial development of the concept map positions the participants as experts in the eyes of their colleagues. Discussions of teaching throughout the week are always contextualized, since they are always focused on the teaching of a particular concept to a particular class of students – they are never simply discussions of teaching in general.

Key feature: Activities are characterized by scholarly discussion.

Evidence from observation: As the course outlines are built throughout the week, discussion moves between the concepts initially presented, the outcomes hoped for, and the teaching and evaluation strategies associated with them. Participants challenge each other to articulate the ways in which the activities will provide students with opportunities to achieve the learning outcomes, and to demonstrate their knowledge. The basis for the discussion is the professor’s identification of core concepts for the course.

Key feature: Evaluation is based mostly on reflection - -ability to articulate why you are doing what you are doing.

Evidence from observation: Success in this Workshop is largely measured by the extent to which participants feel they have developed a useful and workable outline, or the basis for one.

Comparing raw apples and *tarte tatin*⁴?

Our research group has often found it challenging to find articles in the faculty development literature in which authors detail the theoretical foundation from which they work, and explain how their practice embodies the theory. The Workshop, by contrast, has been extensively studied and documented. Documentation includes the book used as the evidence for this paper and several articles. This wealth of materials makes it much easier to characterize this workshop than it is to characterize a workshop described in a single article. The ease with which I was able to identify components in this workshop occurred partly because the motivation for the book that formed my primary data source was a desire to explore the meaning of the Workshop and make its theoretical underpinnings explicit, and partly because as a member of the research team it was easy for me to ask questions and clarify assumptions as necessary. Certainly the data available is rich – it is important to remember that this does not mean that practice by others is less rich, just that it is generally less extensively documented. In addition to this extensive documentation, my own access to workshop developers and participation in one offering of the workshop and its follow-up, gives me a perspective difficult to gain for one who has not participated.

Of course for faculty developers who use this tool to characterize their own practice and assumptions, the situation will be similar. It will always be easier to find evidence for key features in the work we do ourselves than it is to discover them in the published literature. This is not really a limitation of the tool – simply part of the difficulty of comparing activities in which one has participated with those known only through the literature.

Conclusions and future directions

I had two primary purposes in writing this paper: first, to use the tool we developed to situate the Workshop as a faculty development initiative, and second to reflect on the value of tool itself for situating faculty development initiatives.

Using this tool as a way to analyze the Workshop has been useful. In particular, it has allowed me to differentiate between the assumptions underlying the Workshop as described in this paper and other faculty development workshops I have delivered. It has been a reminder that similar actions can flow from various different types of underlying assumptions, and that to truly understand the focus of a faculty development initiative, it is important to be aware of the assumptions that guide its development, rather than just the actions themselves.

Through the analysis, I have come to see that the characterization of the literature we have developed is useful for situating our practice as faculty developers. However,

⁴ Tarte tatin – a classic French apple dessert, somewhat more complicated than an apple pie

applying the tool raises some additional questions worthy of further consideration. First, as we characterized the literature, we spoke often of the emphasis of particular faculty development initiatives. In the case of the Workshop, for example, the emphasis is on process, although there is also a strong disciplinary component. I am confident that these two categories can belong together: that there is nothing inherently contradictory about a focus that simultaneously recognizes the centrality of disciplinary orientation to the work of teaching, and values individual reflection as a means to develop a more sophisticated approach. This kind of overlap, however, would not be consistently possible across all categories. For example, it would not be possible for a coherent faculty development program to insist on the primacy of generic teaching skills and simultaneously focus on the centrality of discipline and the potential differences in effective teaching between disciplines. It is interesting to consider the extent to which categories might exist in harmony with each other, and the extent to which they might be mutually exclusive.

Second, just as the Workshop described asks participants to develop a coherent approach to course development and teaching, using this tool challenges us as faculty developers to ensure the approach we use is coherent. In the hurried world of faculty development, there is often little perceived opportunity to reflect on our assumptions, or to clarify them. We may assume that our practice reflects or embodies our assumptions, but in fact there are frequently many possible interpretations for actions – and many possible instructional actions that can express each assumption. Taking the time to analyze one workshop was an excellent reminder for me of the importance of articulating my assumptions as a faculty developer not only for myself, but for the faculty members with whom I work.

Appendix 1

An article is categorized based on its PRIMARY EMPHASIS. The key ideas that primarily characterize and differentiate the categories are listed at the beginning of each category:

Skills-focused	
	Observable behaviours
	Teaching techniques
	Evaluation of success is based on change in student perception of discrete observable skills.
	Largely generic, not discipline based
	May be based on empirical findings in rating literature.
Approach focused	
	Trying to teach people to teach using a particular methodology /strategy/approach
	Integrity, coherence, integration in the blending of the actions that make up the approach
	Has an underlying rationales, particular theoretical or ideological basis
	Measured by how well/consistently the approach is adopted by teachers who have been trained in the approach (e.g. consistency, frequency of uptake, evidence of approach).
	Design of training models the approach being taught
Process focused	
	Assumption is that reflection leads to conceptual change which in turn leads to change in teaching behaviour.
	Design of activity is to prompt and support individual reflection
	Draws on reflection literature (e.g., Schon, Mezirow...)
	Includes a collegial element to aid individual reflection
	Evaluation is of individual change at conceptual or action level or both (e.g. a qualitative nature and comes from interviews, narratives, change on perception of teaching scales).
Disciplinary focused	
	Effective teaching will be different depending on the discipline.
	Have to provide a rationale, which is usually based on the structure of knowledge
	Intellectually one identifies with one's discipline
	Disciplinary understanding is the foundation on which to link/build knowledge of teaching and learning (they don't come as blank slates)
	Activities are characterized by scholarly discussion

	Evaluation is based mostly on reflection – ability to articulate why you are doing what you are doing
Institutional focus/dissemination focus	
	Infrastructure strategic planning
	Assumes that thing to be diffused is good for everyone
	Evaluation is about success of diffusion, not about teaching development
	Top down approach
	Includes focus on human resources development
	Draws on the literature of change and organizational change

References

Paulston, Roland and Martin Liebman. 1993. "The Promise of a Critical Postmodern Cartography." Occasional Paper Series, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. August 1993. APS Conceptual Mapping Project, Research Report No. 2.

Rowland, Stephen & Barton, Len (1994) Making things difficult: developing a research approach to teaching in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol 19 #3

Saroyan, Alenous and Cheryl Amundsen, eds. 2004. *Rethinking teaching in higher education: from a course design workshop to a faculty development framework*. Stylus Publishing: Sterling, Virginia.