Proven Faculty Development Tools That Foster the Scholarship of Teaching in Faculty Learning Communities

Milton D. Cox

Miami University

Faculty learning communities have played a key role in the development of the scholarship of teaching and learning at Miami University for over 20 years. This article describes a sequence of developmental steps, evidence of success, and supporting documents and artifacts that can guide faculty developers in a community approach to the development of this scholarship.

Introduction

Two of the most interesting and challenging initiatives at the forefront of faculty development involve the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and faculty learning communities (Cox, in press). These two items are relatively new to faculty development; for example, neither is mentioned in the Wright and O'Neil (1994) international survey of teaching improvement practices. This article outlines the faculty development tools that have been developed over the last 23 years to aid the successful connection and implementation of these two initiatives in the Faculty Learning Community Program at Miami University.

Development, institutionalization, and national recognition of SoTL is now of keen interest. For example, in 1998 the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) began three interrelated approaches (Cambridge, 2001; Hutchings, 2000): the PEW National Fellowship Program for Carnegie Scholars, which brings together nationally selected scholars to carry out SoTL projects in their disciplines; the Teaching Academy Campus Program, in which faculty at an institution come together to determine what SoTL should be on their campus and ways to build a culture that will foster SoTL; and work with professional disciplinary societies to foster SoTL. Miami University's Faculty Learning Communities Program provides a long-term picture of how the first two above approaches can evolve successfully at an institution over a 20-year period.

In the following sections, faculty-learning communities will be briefly reviewed, SoTL issues in relation to Miami's Faculty Learning Communities Program will be discussed, and the faculty development process and enabling artifacts will be provided.

Faculty Learning Communities and SoTL Issues

Faculty Learning Communities

Faculty Learning Communities—their goals, activities, format, examples, outcomes, compensation and rewards, application process and selection criteria, role as change agents, evidence of success, and recommendations for initiation, etc.—are discussed by Cox (2001a). Briefly, each faculty learning community is a cross-disciplinary community of 8-10 faculty engaged in an active, collaborative, year-long curriculum focused on enhancing and assessing student learning, with frequent activities that promote learning, development, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and community. A faculty

participant in any faculty learning community selects a focus course in which to try out innovations, assess resulting student learning, and prepare a course mini-portfolio to report the results. Each participant develops a teaching project, engages in retreats and biweekly seminars, works with student associates, and presents project results to the campus and at national conferences. Evidence shows that faculty learning communities provide effective "deep learning" that encourages and supports faculty to investigate, attempt, assess, and adopt new (to them) methods. In 2001-2002 there are 6 faculty learning communities running at Miami. Four are topic-based (issue-focused): Problem-Based Learning, Technology, U.S. Cultures Course Development, and Ethics Across the Honors Curriculum. The other two faculty learning communities are cohort-based: one for junior faculty, in place for 23 years (Cox, 1995, 1997), and one for senior faculty, in place for 11 years (Cox & Blaisdell, 1995).

The Definition and Meaning of SoTL

The definition and meaning of SoTL is a matter of debate (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Kreber, 2001a; Kreber & Cranton, 2000; Richlin 2001a). Boyer (1990) and Rice (1990) identified and named the concept of "the scholarship of teaching (and learning)" and associated it with scholarly teaching rather than the type of scholarship they defined for the scholarships of discovery, integration, and application. Miami 's Faculty Learning Communities Program interprets scholarly teaching and SoTL as articulated by Richlin (2001a):

> [S]cholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching are closely interrelated.
> However, they differ in both their intent and product. . . . [T]he purpose of
> scholarly teaching is to impact the activity of teaching and the resulting learning,
> whereas the scholarship of teaching results in a formal, peer-reviewed

communication in the appropriate media or venue, which then becomes part of the knowledge base of teaching and learning in higher education (p. 58).

In Miami 's Faculty Learning Communities Program, this has always been the interpretation of SoTL. For example, a Miami junior faculty learning community participant in English wrote the following in her 1980-81 final report (Miami University, 1981):

> My project for the year—to revise and improve my American Literature survey classes—has proved most interesting. At the moment I am still compiling the materials and examining the results of the class that I revised and taught in the Spring. Preliminary indications suggest that the class was one of my most successful thus far at Miami—the students' writing apprehension decreased at a significance rate below the .01 level of confidence, their interest in reading and interpreting literature increased, and their overall abilities to write about literature improved. I have submitted a proposal to present material from my class at a national conference next year, and I am working on an article on combining literature and writing instruction in the classroom (pp. 7-8).

This faculty learning community participant's scholarly approach resulted in SoTL: In 1985 the above project was incorporated into a book, *Literature: Options for Reading and Writing* (Daiker, Fuller, & Wallace, Eds., 1989), now in its second edition, which the faculty learning community participant coauthored with her faculty learning community mentor and a colleague.

Developmental Stages of Individuals

There are several models that attempt to describe an individual's progress toward practicing SoTL. Smith (2001) adapts two models of expertise: Kennedy's (1987) views of expertise and Dreyfus and Dreyfus's (1986) stages of expertise from novice to expert.

Weston and McAlpine's (2001) developmental 3-phase continuum of growth describes a professor's journey toward SoTL. In each phase, processes are listed vertically in the order of less complex to more complex. Vertical (within a phase) and lateral (across phases) movement is possible. In phase 1, growth in one's own teaching, a professor develops a personal knowledge of his or her teaching and students' learning. In phase 2, dialogues with colleagues about teaching and learning, faculty start with conversations in their discipline and move to multidisciplinary engagement, for "It is necessary to get a sense of community before moving into scholarship" (p. 91). This model confirms the effectiveness of faculty learning communities in the development of SoTL. Phase 3, growth in SoTL, covers the same vertical ground as in Table 1 in this article and is explained in the next section. Cox (in press) modifies and refines this model in light of faculty learning community evidence over the years.

Ronkowski (1993) describes the development of TA's as scholarly teachers in three categories using three stages. The three categories are from Boyer (1990) and Rice (1990): synoptic capacity, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge about student meaning making. For example, in the third category, stage 1 involves the understanding of student backgrounds, concerns, expectations, and abilities similar to those that TA's themselves have experienced. Stage 2 involves developing and using general teaching strategies and skills to address course content. Stage 3 concerns student learning and experiences with various learning styles and cognitive development. Cox (in press)

provides a model adapted from Perry (1970); Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule (1986); and Baxter Magolda (1992). For example, in stage 1, faculty are in silence, having developed no voice in SOTL, or they are dualistic in that they believe there is only one right way to teach, or that the "teaching experts" have the answers.

Other SoTL Issues

Additional SoTL issues that have appeared in the recent literature also have links to faculty learning communities. Although these take us away from the focus of this article, they are worth noting. They include ways to do SoTL (Hutchings, 2000; Cross & Steadman, 1996; Cross, 1998), the connection of SoTL to practice (Menges & Weimer, 1996; Weimer, 2001), the publication of SoTL (Richlin, 2001b; Weimer, 1993), the assessment of SoTL (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Theall & Centra, 2001), and the relationship of SoTL and teaching portfolios (Hutchings, 1998; Kreber, 2001b).

The SoTL—Faculty Learning Community Connection

Miami 's first faculty learning community was for junior faculty and was initiated in 1979 as a result of a grant from the Lilly Endowment. As part of the Endowment's Teaching Fellows Program during 1979-80 through 1981-82, the Miami faculty learning community incorporated all 5 of the Lilly components: regular group meetings, release time, senior faculty mentors, individual projects, and retreats and conferences (Austin, 1990, 1992; Cox, 1995). Each of these components played a role in the development of SoTL in faculty learning communities at Miami. Viewed in the current construct, the 5 components had the potential of providing community and, thus, support for and peer review of projects (the group meetings), scholarly teaching, time to investigate and

implement a project (release time), experience and advice for scholarly investigations and peer review (senior faculty mentors), potential for SoTL (the teaching projects), and a venue for making public the SoTL (the retreats and conferences).

Fostering SoTL in a faculty learning community involves a sequence of developmental steps. Developed over the years, these faculty learning community steps and their SoTL results are indicated in Table 1. These steps also illustrate the ongoing cycle of scholarly teaching and SoTL (Richlin, 2001a).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The following narrative illuminates the steps in Table 1 and provides documents and examples that enable the intended faculty development.

In step 1 of the sequence, the application for membership in a faculty learning community, one question asks the applicant to indicate his or her initial ideas for an individual teaching and learning project. While this is not a crucial part of the application, it provides an opportunity for the applicant to shape an early vision of his or her project. An individual's project may change once the program is underway and the participant becomes acquainted with SoTL.

Each new participant receives a focus book selected by the faculty learning community coordinator after careful review of the literature (step 2). The focus book provides an introduction to the faculty learning community topic and its scholarship (references) and helps generate seminar topics for the start of the upcoming term. Information about recent focus books selected by faculty learning community coordinators, who are exemplary and talented faculty graduates of faculty learning

communities, are in Cox (2001c). The new members also receive a list of key multidisciplinary books that have been helpful in developing the recent teaching projects of former participants (Cox, 2001b).

In step 3, a discussion about SoTL and its difference from but relation to scholarly teaching takes place at the faculty learning community's opening/closing retreat. Key questions direct the SoTL discussion (see Table 2) (Cox, 1999a). Richlin's (1993, 2001a) diagram of the ongoing cycle of scholarly teaching and SoTL is helpful in explaining and understanding this relationship and difference.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

The faculty learning community retreat participants then focus on their individual teaching and learning projects. Graduating members report on their projects and consult with the new members. For new members searching for feasible and timely topics, the theme tracks of the most recent Lilly Conference on College Teaching can provide insight and direction (see Table 3). An important document distributed and discussed at the retreat is the "Guidelines for the Design and Description of Your Teaching Project" (see Table 4). Although faculty may enter a faculty learning community as excellent scholars in their disciplines, they often are at a loss to design a publishable teaching project. The Guidelines have been developed over the years to meet this need (Richlin, 2001a). A cost/benefit approach to selecting projects is offered by Angelo (2000), whose questions to the project designer include: How costly/difficult is the innovation? How beneficial/valuable is the innovation?

[Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here]

New community members depart the opening retreat more prepared to work through and write up the items in step 4 of Table 1. They are also ready to attempt placing their project in the context of their teaching and other components of their faculty learning community. This document is their initial learning plan. The guidelines for and an example of an initial learning plan are in Appendixes A and B, respectively. An example of a Teaching Project Description at this pre-consultation stage is in Appendix C.

Step 5 of the sequence, which occurs early in the first term, provides the first opportunity for the community to share their initial drafts of teaching projects. Another key element at this point is the consultation with an outside reviewer and consultant who is experienced with scholarly teaching and SoTL (and the difference between them). In just a 20-minute individual consultation, an expert can provide valuable insights for a "new and budding" scholar in the SoTL field. At this point, participants are ready to move through step 6, working on their project during the academic year.

In step 7, the faculty learning community participants make public their teaching scholarship. They are often concerned about presenting SoTL, a "discipline" in which they are novices. After all, it took them years of graduate work to become experts in their disciplines. The document in Appendix D on suggestions for engaging in SoTL addresses these concerns and provides guidelines for the initial presentations; it has been most helpful in encouraging the "making public" part of SoTL. Presentations are peer reviewed, and feedback is incorporated into the next phases of the project. A list of recent presentation titles from the various communities is in Cox (2001c), and titles of SoTL

publications from Miami faculty learning community participants from various disciplines are in Cox (in press).

The ongoing cycle of SoTL development for the faculty learning community project may continue once the faculty learning community participant has graduated from his or her faculty learning community. As step 9 in the sequence indicates, internal teaching grant support is available to members for doing further investigation (Cox, 2001b).

Evidence of Success

In addition to producing their SoTL products, faculty learning community participants rate the SoTL part of the faculty learning community experience highly in their reports and evaluations of their faculty learning community experience. For example, results from the question "Estimate the impact of the community on you with respect to each of the following components," where 1 indicates a very weak impact and 10 a very strong impact, yield an impact rating of 8.1 for the teaching project. The table of ratings for the 8 common faculty learning community components across all communities up through 1999-2000 is in Cox (2001a). More recent results are in Cox (2001c). A similar analysis of 11 faculty learning community faculty development outcomes indicates that three of them, "your view of teaching as an intellectual pursuit," "your understanding of and interest in the scholarship of teaching," and "your perspective of teaching, learning, and other aspects of higher education beyond the perspective of your discipline" rank second, third, and fifth on the list with respect to the impact that members' faculty learning community had on developing that outcome. This table is in Cox (2001a); the ranking has not changed through the 2000-01 faculty learning communities.

Another measure of the program's success is seen in the results of a year 2000 survey of faculty learning community participants to determine how their faculty learning community participation influenced student learning in their classes. One question asked the participants to "Circle the number in front of each item that indicates the degree of change in student learning due to a change in your attitude as a result of your faculty learning community participation." Table 5 indicates how the 8 items were ranked, with the mean response and percentage of those respondents selecting the item. SoTL ranks an impressive second and was selected by 92% of the 50 respondents.

[Insert table 5 about here]

Other affirmations of the program's success come from the awarding of grants to support dissemination of Miami's Faculty Learning Communities Program to other campuses. A grant from the Ohio Board of Regents (the state governing board for public institutions of higher education) has supported the initiation of faculty learning communities for early-career faculty at 7 institutions to date. A 3-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) is supporting the development of 12 faculty learning communities at each of five institutions, a project just underway in 2001-02.

Implications for Faculty Development

It is clear that faculty-learning communities support the effective development of SoTL. Community is a necessary phase in the Weston and Alpine (2001) model of individual development. Although at Miami the development of SoTL is embedded in the Faculty Learning Communities Program, at other institutions—for example, at Indiana University

11

(Thompson & Nelson, 2000)— it is the reverse: Community comes as a result of a SoTL initiative.

Faculty-learning communities and a community approach to SoTL are not generally recognized by most faculty developers, however. Instead, individual consultations and campus-wide workshops are the usual approach (Cox, 1999b). Kreber (2001c) recommends 5 approaches to faculty development and SoTL: Introduce department-wide collaborative action research in the discipline with assistance from faculty developers; allow faculty to negotiate contracts to focus on SoTL for a number of years, including leaves to support their SoTL investigations; base workshops and seminars on pedagogical research; establish departmental reading circles on SoTL in the discipline and encourage team teaching; and base courses on college teaching and learning on a SoTL model. Healy (2000) also argues for a disciplinary approach. While there is potential for developing community in some of these departmental approaches, it is not the main theme or focus of the initiatives.

Kreber's (2001c) approaches also engage the question about taking departmental and/or campus-wide approaches to faculty development. Both are important. The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) initiative tends to involve both, and in addition an approach involving professional disciplinary societies. Table 6 indicates the advantages, challenges, and disadvantages that developers face when considering these three options for developing SoTL at their institutions.

[Insert table 6 about here]

No matter which mixture of approaches are selected for the development of

SoTL, community must play an important role, and the SoTL-faculty learning

community connection has a record of success.

References

Angelo, T. A. (2000, November). *Twenty years of teaching and learning: Tracing trends,*

teasing out lessons, and looking ahead. Paper presented as Part II of the closing

plenary at the 20th annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, OH.

Austin, A. E. (1990). *To leave an indelible mark: Encouraging good teaching in research*

universities through faculty development. A study of the Lilly Endowment's teaching

fellows program 1974-1988. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College.

Austin, A. E. (1992). Supporting junior faculty through a teaching fellows program. In

M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 73-

86). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1992). *Knowing and Reasoning in College: Gender-Related*

Patterns in Students' Intellectual Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Belenky, M. B., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's*

ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton,

NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cambridge, B. L. (2001). Fostering the scholarship of teaching and learning:

Communities of practice. *To Improve the Academy, 19,* 3-16.

Cox, M. D. (1995). The development of new and junior faculty. In W. A. Wright and Associates (Eds.), *Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies for higher education* (pp. 283-310). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Cox, M. D. (1997). Long-term patterns in a mentoring program for junior faculty: Recommendations for practice. *To Improve the Academy, 16,* 225-268.

Cox, M. D. (1999a, November). *The teacher as scholar of teaching: What, how, why?* Paper presented at the Faculty Development Seminar for the College of Nursing at the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH.

Cox, M. D. (1999b). Peer consultation and faculty learning communities. In C. Knapper & S. Piccinin (Eds.), *Using consultants to improve teaching* (pp. 39-49). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 79. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cox, M. D. (2001a). Faculty learning communities: Change agents for transforming institutions into learning organizations. *To Improve the Academy, 19,* 69-93.

Cox, M. D. (Ed.). (2001b). *Teaching communities, grants, resources, and events: 2001-02.* Oxford, OH: Miami University.

Cox, M. D. (2001c). *Sourcebook 2001: Designing, implementing, and leading faculty learning communities.* Oxford, Ohio: Miami University.

Cox, M. D. (in press). Fostering the scholarship of teaching and learning through faculty learning communities. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching.*

Cox, M. D., & Blaisdell, M. (1995, October). *Teaching development for senior faculty: Searching for fresh solutions in a salty sea.* Paper presented at the 20th annual Conference of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, North Falmouth, MA.

Cross, K. P. (1998). Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching. In
T. Angelo (Ed.), *Classroom assessment and research: An update on uses,*
approaches and research findings (pp. 5-12). New Directions for Teaching and
Learning, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. P., & Steadman, M. H. (1996). *Classroom research: Implementing the*
scholarship of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daiker, D., Fuller, M., & Wallace, J. (Eds.). (1989). *Literature: Options for reading and*
writing. New York: Harper & Row.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind over machine: The power of human*
intuition and expertise in the era of the computer. New York: Free Press.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation*
of the professoriate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Healey, M. (2000). Developing the scholarship of teaching in higher education: A
discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research & Development, 19* (2), 169-
189.

Hutchings, P. (Ed.) (1998). *The course portfolio: How faculty can examine their*
teaching to advance practice and improve student learning. Washington, DC:
American Association for Higher Education.

Hutchings, P. (Ed.) (2000). *Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching*
and learning. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of
Teaching.

Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999, September/October). The scholarship of teaching:
New elaborations, new developments. *Change, 31* (5) (pp. 11-15).

Kennedy, M. (1987). Inexact sciences: Professional education and the development of

    expertise. *Review of Research in Education, 14,* 133-167.

Kreber, C. (Ed.). (2001a). *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of*

    teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 86. San Francisco:

    Jossey-Bass.

Kreber, C. (2001b). Designing teaching portfolios based on a formal model of the

    scholarship of teaching. *To Improve the Academy, 19,* 285-305.

Kreber, C. (2001c). The scholarship of teaching and its implementation in faculty

    development and graduate education. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited:*

    Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching (pp. 79-88). New Directions for Teaching

    and Learning, No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kreber, C., & Cranton, P. A. (2000, July/August). Exploring the scholarship of teaching.

    The Journal of Higher Education, 71 (4), 476-495.

Menges, R. J., Weimer, M., & Associates. (Eds.). (1996). *Teaching on solid ground:*

    Using scholarship to improve practice (pp. xi-xxii). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miami University. (1981). *Lilly post-doctoral teaching awards program end-of-the-year*

    report, January 1-May 8, 1981. Oxford, OH: Author.

Perrry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years.*

    New York: Holt Reinhart.

Rice, E. (1990, Winter-Spring). Rethinking what it means to be a scholar. In L. Ekroth

    (Ed.), *Teaching excellence: Toward the best in the academy.* Stillwater, OK: POD

    Network.

Richlin, L. (1993, November). *The ongoing cycle of scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching.* Paper presented at the 13th annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, OH.

Richlin, L. (2001a). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 57-68). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richlin, L. (2001b, November). *Making public the scholarship of teaching. Part 1: Designing publishable projects. Part 2: Presenting and publishing the scholarship of teaching.* Paper presented at the 21st annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, OH.

Ronkowski, S. A. (1993). Scholarly teaching: Developmental stages of pedagogical scholarship. In L. Richlin (Ed.), *Preparing faculty for new conceptions of scholarship* (pp. 79-90). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, R. (2001). Expertise and the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 69-78). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Theall, M., & Centra, J. A. (2001). Assessing the scholarship of teaching: Valid decisions from valid evidence. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 31-43). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, S., & Nelson, C. (2000, November). *Scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL): Programs, progress, problems, and prospects.* Paper presented at the 20th annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, OH.

Weimer, M. (1993, November-December). The disciplinary journals of pedagogy. *Change, 25* (6), 45-51.

Weimer, M. (2001). Learning more from the wisdom of practice. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 45-56). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weston, C. B., & McAlpine, L. (2001). Making explicit the development toward the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 89-97). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wright, W. A., & O'Neil, M. C. (1994). Teaching improvement practices: New perspectives. *To Improve the Academy, 13*, 5-38.

Table 1
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) – Faculty Learning Community (FLC) Connection
A Sequence of 10 Developmental FLC Steps and SoTL Results

Step 1: Application for FLC membership

- Applicants prepare a response to a question asking for preliminary ideas about an individual teaching and learning project.

Results: Addressing an observation—perhaps in an uninformed or indirect way—about a problem or opportunity in the teaching><learning ™ connection

Step 2: Early planning for the FLC

- FLC coordinator selects a community focus book that includes extensive references connected to the FLC topic. For a listing of books by community, see Cox (2001c).

Results: Connecting the FLC to the knowledge base of SoTL

Step 3: The opening/closing retreat before the start of the year

- Coordinator, new, and graduating members discuss meaning and examples of scholarly teaching, SoTL, and the ongoing cycle of scholarly teaching and SoTL (see Table 2).
- FLC coordinator distributes and discusses the focus book, multidisciplinary book list for optional readings, (for listing, see Cox, 2001b) and information about "hot" topics in SoTL as evidenced by Lilly Conference theme tracks (table 3).
- Coordinator, new, and graduating members discuss the "Miami University Guidelines for the Design and Description of a Teaching and Learning Project" (Table 4) (Richlin, 2001a, pp. 66-67).
- Graduating members present their projects to the new members and then consult in breakout groups.
- The new community plans the first-term activities and seminar and retreat topics.

Results: Making public through peer authority the ongoing cycle, scholarly teaching, and SoTL; guiding SoTL research; connecting to a more extensive literature

Step 4: Participants prepare for and start the year

- Each community member selects one course he or she is teaching in the upcoming term to be a focus course.
- Each participant searches for and reads articles to inform his or her teaching and learning in the focus course and project.
- Each individual designs and writes a description of his or her teaching and learning project.
- Each individual prepares an initial learning plan, placing his or her teaching and learning project in context with other FLC components and activities.

Results: Connecting SoTL to teaching practice; consulting the literature; choosing an intervention

Step 5: Seminars and retreat

- Coordinator prepares and distributes and members read a booklet containing initial learning plans, focus course syllabi, and teaching and learning projects.

- An external consultant familiar with the difference between scholarly teaching and SoTL reads the members' teaching and learning projects and meets with each individual to sharpen research design.
- Each community member makes a short presentation to the FLC about his or her project, and the group discusses each project, making suggestions.

Results: Making public SoTL for peer review

Step 6: Working on the project during the year

- Participants investigate other pedagogical areas, looking for connections to project.
- Individuals carry out their teaching and learning projects.
- Student associates and mentors (for junior faculty) consult
- Participants assess student learning and other project outcomes.
- Coordinator, participants, and community consult about project outcomes.

Results: Progressing along the ongoing cycle; moving from scholarly teaching toward SoTL; "conducting systematic observation, documenting observations, analyzing results, obtaining peer evaluation, identifying key issues, synthesizing results" (Richlin, 2001a, p. 59).

Step 7: Presentations during the second term

- Individuals, teams, and perhaps the entire community present their work at a campus-wide teaching effectiveness retreat.
- Presenters incorporate feedback from peers in the audience at the campus sessions.
- Individuals, teams, and perhaps the entire community present at a national conference.
- Presenters incorporate feedback from the audience at the national conference.

Results: Presenting SoTL; peer evaluation

Step 8: The Opening/Closing Retreat at the end of the year

- Graduating members present their projects to and consult with the new incoming community members.

Results: Teaching, mentoring, and making public SoTL

Step 9: Continuation of the project during the summer or the upcoming year

- Each individual on his or her own may apply for and use a Miami small grant or summer fellowship to continue his or her project.

Results: Engaging in another round of the ongoing cycle

Step 10: Publication

- Each participant, team, or community may prepare a manuscript about the project for publication in a refereed multidisciplinary or disciplinary journal.

Results: Adding to the knowledge base of SoTL

Table 2
Faculty Learning Communities: Questions to Ask About
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

1. What is the scholarship of teaching?
   What is scholarly teaching?
   What is excellent teaching?

2. How do I get started?

3. What are the resources at my institution? (examples at Miami University)

   Committee for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching: Small Grants (submit anytime) and Summer Fellowships (due October 16)

   Teaching Effectiveness Library: 102 Roudebush Hall

   Journal on Excellence in College Teaching: On line: <http://ject.lib.muohio.edu/>

4. Will the publication or presentation be valued for P & T? Do I put it under teaching or scholarship?

5. What topics are "hot?"

6. Where do I present it and publish it?

Table 3
What SoTL Areas Are Hot: 2001 Lilly Conference Theme Tracks
(at least 5 sessions on each topic)

1. Assessment

2. Cognitive Development

3. Community in Teaching & Learning

4. Creativity

5. Critical Thinking

6. Diversity/Multiculturalism

7. Early-Career Faculty

8. Ethical/Moral Issues

9. Group Learning

10. Learning Styles

11. Motivation

12. Portfolios

13. Problem-Based Learning

14. Reading

15. Research & Teaching

16. The Scholarship of Teaching & Learning

17. Science/Science Teaching

18. Service Learning

19. Student-Centered Learning

20. Teams/Teamwork

21. Technology (Electronic)

22. Web-Based Opportunities

23. Writing

Table 4
Faculty Learning Communities:
Guidelines for the Design and Description of Your Teaching Project

1. *The problem or question*

   What is the problem (or opportunity) you wish to address with your project?

   Describe what you see in your students' behavior that you wish to change, for example, aspects of content (e.g., test scores), process (e.g., ability to work in a group), or climate (e.g., morale). Be as specific as possible about what you have seen.

   List the learning objectives that students will be able to achieve better after you implement your project. Put them in active statements, such as, "After completing this course, you will be able to define (analyze, identify, etc.). . . .

2. *Context*

   What have others done (at Miami or elsewhere) to address this problem? Early in the program you may not have much of an answer here; in fact, investigating the literature may be part of your project. What topics will you investigate on databases such as ERIC?

3. *Proposed Solution*

   How do you plan to solve the problem or answer the question? Describe what you will do to change/improve the behavior you described in number 1 above.

   Are you doing anything differently than others have attempted? Why or why not? Why do you propose that your approach will succeed better than prior attempts or will work better with your students or course?

4. *Evaluation*

   How will you determine the success and effectiveness of your solution and the impact of your project? Do you plan to determine pre- and post-results? How will you know that the behavior of your students has changed/improved? Note: You may not be able to obtain your results by the end of your year. However, you should have a plan in place to evaluate your project and report on the results. Remember, "You cannot save by analysis what you bungled by design" (Richard Light, in *By Design*).

5. *Timeline*

   What are the dates of project initiation and completion for each step of your design, implementation, and evaluation?

Table 5

Degree of Change in Student Learning Due to a Change in Attitude as a Result of Faculty Learning Community Participation

0	1	2	3	4
Students learned **less**.	**No change** in students' learning.	Students learned **more** to a **small** degree.	Students learned **more** to a **medium** degree.	Students learned **more** to a **great** degree.

%	$\overline{X}$	Item
98	3.3	Your general enthusiasm about teaching and learning
92	3.2	Your appreciation of teaching and learning as an intellectual pursuit: scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching
94	3.2	More reflective
88	2.9	More comfortable
90	2.8	More confidence
90	2.7	Revitalization
92	2.9	Inspiration
86	2.7	Courage to teach
2	4	Other: More connections to other faculty
2	4	Other: Write my own PBL problems
2	4	Other: Dynamic class participation
2	4	Other: Respect of regional campus teaching by Oxford faculty
2	4	Other: Introspection
2	3	Other: Capacity to reuse and to research on topic of instruction
2	4	Other: Examples from industry
2	4	Other: Ability to help more non-white students

Table 6
Developing SoTL: Three Approaches for Developers

	Campus-Wide Multidisciplinary Approach	Campus-Wide Department Approach	Approach Involving Specific National Disciplinary Organizations
The Faculty Developer's Approach/Role	Traditional role: Coordinating campus-wide workshops, communities, consultations, and TA development—the traditional role.	Working individually with departments: department chairs, committees, etc.	"Connecting" departments to national SoTL disciplinary initiatives (awareness; helping initiate such activities locally).
Advantages	Developing future faculty leaders who may return to their departments to ferment, then lead, change and perhaps become department chairs. Providing safe support and campus community for faculty who are isolated in their departments.	Cutting right to departments, the location where there must be success in the long run, where the key rewards and prestige are located—the fastest way to initiate SoTL in cooperating departments.	Focusing the "pressure" from national disciplinary organizations to motivate departmental change.
Challenges	Getting faculty to go back and promote initiatives in their departments. Making faculty aware of risks. Moderating faculty loyalty to their disciplines and departments and increasing commitment to interdisciplinarity and campus-wide programs.	Developing committed department chairs and faculty. Finding faculty qualified, motivated, and rewarded to lead SoTL departmental efforts. Overcoming total focus on the scholarship of discovery. Encouraging department rewards for publishing SoTL.	Becoming familiar with national SoTL initiatives in all disciplines, then getting departments to consider and join them.
Disadvantages	Taking time to trickle down to departments. Perhaps putting faculty at risk when they return to their departments (e.g., SoTL publications not valued).	Working with some uninterested or hostile departments and department chairs. Results fragmented, uneven across departments.	Having no direct connections with SoTL leaders in national disciplinary organizations.
Relationships with Administrators	Needed and often found: Support and praise from provosts and presidents who favor SoTL.	Concern: Opposition from department chairs and deans who do not favor broadening the concept of scholarship and who find value only in traditional discovery scholarship in the discipline.	Needed: Connection with a SoTL liaison in each national disciplinary organization.

Appendix A

Miami University Alumni Teaching Scholars Community
Alumni Teaching Scholar Initial Learning Plan

FORMAT AND HINTS

Your initial learning plan provides an opportunity for you to reflect on and plan your strategies and activities for the year. Your plan should be three to four pages in length. It is an initial plan and, hence, not set in stone; you may change it later. Before you proceed, you may wish to review your Alumni Teaching Scholar (ATS) application form. You should discuss your plan with your mentor and department chair and/or coordinator. The initial learning plans will be assembled in a booklet that will be shared with program participants at the Berea Retreat. Please submit your plan to Milt Cox by September 5. This early date is necessary to prepare and distribute the booklet before the Berea retreat. Thank you.

1. List your ATS **goals** and **objectives** for the year.

    As you ponder and write about items 2-8 below, indicate how they may help you meet your goals and objectives.

2. List the courses you are teaching this semester and how you plan to teach them; identify a **focus course** and include its **syllabus** as a separate document.

    Select one course each semester to focus on with respect to the ATS Program. You may wish to try out strategies or techniques discussed in ATS seminars. Perhaps this course will be part of your teaching project. For this course, schedule a midterm SGID with Gail Johnson, Applied Technologies. Please send your syllabus for this course to Milt by September 7. We will collect these in a booklet to share with the group. At the end of the first semester, you can revise this syllabus, indicating changes made, successes and failures, etc. This may help you start a course teaching portfolio.

3. Indicate how you plan to interact with your **mentor.**

    A structured approach with scheduled meetings is best for most mentoring pairs. Robert Boice (1992), in his chapter on "Lessons Learned About Mentoring," indicates three outcomes of his research on mentoring pairs: (1) frequent nudges to meet regularly helped ensure pair bonds; (2) left to themselves, most mentoring pairs displayed disappointingly narrow styles; and (3) mentors assumed the role of interventionist with reluctance.

    Thus, it's up to you and me to provide the nudges and expand the discussion. The semester can slip away unless you plan your mentoring interaction carefully. Possible activities include visits or audits of each other's classes; attending seminars together; exchanging and discussing videotapes or Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) visits; partnerships in the style of the New Jersey "Partners in Learning" Program; luncheon or informal meetings to discuss teaching, contraries raised in seminars, university politics, the profession, etc. Plan to attend some Lilly Conference sessions with your mentor. To avoid narrow styles, try a broad variety of activities.

    Please use the "**mentor log/journal**" that is enclosed. This will help you structure and plan meetings, reflect on your mentoring experiences, and provide a record for your interim and final reports.

(over)

4.   Describe your plans for interacting with your **student associate(s)**.

    See the enclosed "Information About Student Associates," that describes opportunities for working with your student(s). Use the student log/journal.

5.   Describe your **teaching project(s).**

    Prepare this section of your initial learning plan as a separate document. Use the format described in the enclosed "Guidelines for the Design and Description of Your Teaching Project."

    Choose something you can complete by the end of the year, and keep it simple. On the other hand, select a teaching challenge of interest to you and your discipline or in general; plan for a result that would be appropriate to share with colleagues in a department seminar, at Miami's Teaching Effectiveness Retreat, or at a Lilly Conference. Your participation in the ATS Program gives you a license to experiment. Identify the problem you wish to solve and your objectives, your proposed solution, and the assessment you will use to determine the extent to which you have solved the problem and met your objectives. Prepare and stick to your time line. You may wish to use your $125 in program funds here. If you have additional expenses, apply for a CELT Small Grant of up to $300. Consider a CELT Summer Fellowship for completion of an extended project; applications for next summer are due October 31.

6.   Describe your plans to involve the **scholarship of teaching.**

    For one aspect of your participation in the program, consider teaching innovations and experiments to improve the learning of your students (again, the Program gives you a license to do this). Plan to evaluate innovations—their impact on your students' learning. Your method for evaluation may be simple but should be thought out carefully ahead of time; a good reference is the book *By Design* (Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990). If you are interested in classroom assessment techniques, Angelo and Cross's (1993) book, *Classroom Assessment Techniques*, is a good source of ideas. You could present these ideas at February's Teaching Effectiveness Retreat, at Lilly-West, and perhaps publish your results.

7.   Describe your **use of funds** ($125).

    Indicate your ideas with "ballpark" costs here.

8.   Indicate your **time line.**

    Write it out and stick to it—time passes quickly—especially the opportunity to meet with mentors, student associates, and to complete teaching project tasks. In your time line, include stages of project completion, mentoring activities, etc. Share this timeline with your mentor and student.

References

Angelo, T.A., & Cross, K.P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boice, R. (1992). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 51-61). New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Light, R. J., Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (1990). *By design: Planning research on higher education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ALUMNI TEACHING SCHOLARS LEARNING PLAN

Glenn Stone, Family Studies and Social Work

1. **ATS Goals and Objectives for the Year**
   - to learn new ways to engage students in class
   - to learn more about cooperative learning theory
   - to be able to apply cooperative learning techniques in my classes
   - to find ways to use cooperative learning techniques to help students learn how to use technology in social work practice
   - to meet faculty from other areas and discuss teaching

2. **Courses Taught this Semester:**
   I am only teaching *FSW 162: Men in Families* this semester. My focus course during Spring 2001 is *FSW 395: Research and Evaluation in Social Work and Family Studies.*

3. **Mentor:**
   I plan to meet with my mentor, William Berg (PHS), throughout the semester to discuss my course handouts, Web site, lecture topics, and experiential exercises. I will be asking for his critical feedback on the quality of these materials. I will also invite him to attend a class period to observe and evaluate my teaching style. It is also my plan to share the results of my SGID with him as well as the feedback I receive from my student associate.

4. **Student Associate:** My student associate, Heather Morton, will make at least 1 visit to my class to observe my teaching techniques. She is also reviewing my course handouts and the course Web-based materials available through the course home page. We are also meeting outside of class to discuss her observations. Heather has had me in two courses as a student, and she plans to use this experience to provide me with constructive feedback.

5. **Teaching Project** (see attached document)

6. **Scholarship of Teaching:** I plan to read materials on cooperative learning theory and strategies. I hope to develop ways to better evaluate student reaction to cooperative learning techniques. I'm particularly interested in how cooperative learning may help students overcome their attitudes related to advanced computer technology and its use in social work practice.

7. **Funds:** I plan on using my funds to purchase books and a notebook computer to assist in technology instruction within class.

8. **Timeline:**

<u>September</u>:
   - Meet with faculty mentor to discuss our meeting schedule, to give him copies of course materials and Web-based information, and to set up objectives for our meetings.
   - Meet with student associate to discuss our meeting schedule, to give her copies of course materials and Web-based information, and to set up objectives for our meetings.
   - Develop course homepage.
   - Begin working on teaching project.

- ◆ Videotape class.
- ◆ Review relevant books, articles, etc., on cooperative learning theory and strategies.
- ◆ Begin planning cooperative learning strategies and technology-based assignments for FSW 395.

October
- ◆ Continue working on my teaching project and continue reviewing information on cooperative learning.
- ◆ Schedule SGID for FSW 162.
- ◆ Discuss the results of the SGID with my faculty mentor.
- ◆ Discuss the results of the SGID with my student associate.
- ◆ Have student associate visit my class.
- ◆ Have faculty mentor visit my class.
- ◆ Continue course home page development.
- ◆ Continue developing cooperative learning strategies within computer lab assignments for FSW 395.

November
- ◆ Continue working on teaching project.
- ◆ Continue meeting with my faculty mentor.
- ◆ Continue meeting with my student associate.
- ◆ Redesign syllabus for FSW 395 to incorporate new strategies.

December
- ◆ Assess benefits of cooperative learning strategies, particularly related to use of technology.
- ◆ Student associate completes focus groups within my class.
- ◆ Continue meeting with faculty mentor and student associate—discuss results of assessment with them.

January - May 2000
- ◆ Implement strategies in FSW 395.
- ◆ Implement evaluation strategies for FSW 395.
- ◆ Continue meeting with mentor and student associate.

Appendix C

Miami University Alumni Teaching Scholars Community Teaching Project
Processes and Outcomes of Teaching for Reflective Practice Using Service-Learning Pedagogy
Joan Fopma-Loy, Nursing

Design and Description of Teaching Project

1. The problem or question

Those faculty teaching students in applied fields, such as nursing, social work, and teaching, are called upon to assist students in applying understanding and judgment to problems that are increasingly complex and highly situational (Peterson, 1995). Effective practice in this reality of the "swampy lowland" (Schon, 1983, p. 42) of situations of deep societal concern requires the formulation and continual reshaping of a critical rationale for practice. As Brookfield (1995) asserts, this rationale is not only a professional necessity, but is essential psychologically and politically as well. Yet, traditionally, education has not focused on enhancing the abilities essential to reflective practice. Students are often unable to articulate those factors affecting practice decisions and their cognitive processes in making clinical judgments. Students must be guided through processes of examining assumptions, identifying societal and professional contexts underlying assumptions and behaviors, discussing implications of unexamined assumptions and behavior, and creating new ways of being and doing. What pedagogies best facilitate the development of these abilities and processes underlying the development of these abilities so that professional growth continues? After completing the course, students will be able to:
   1. Comprehend the meaning and value of critical reflection to professional expertise and citizenship.
   2. Identify personal levels of reflection and methods of enhancing levels of reflection.
   3. Analyze structures and processes that facilitate development of their ability to reflect critically on experience.

2. Context

Theoretically, this project builds on the work of scholars such as Baxter-Magolda and King and Kitchener (1994), who have furthered my understanding of the cognitive development of undergraduates and factors that may foster or impede this development. The literature on service learning as pedagogy also provides as foundation for my teaching and this project. In reading much of this literature prior to this year and during he past summer, several questions warranting further investigation were noted. Bradley (1995), who developed criteria for assessing levels of reflective judgment based on the work of King & Kitchener, stated that his model needed to be tested by instructors in different types of courses. Bradley (1995) also asserted that "measurements of change in students' reflective levels over the development of their personal learning summary, in which they are reflecting critically on their learning throughout the semester." Students will also be completing weekly reflections in which they are drawing connections between their experiences and central course concepts. With written student permission, I may also use selected excerpts to address project questions.

3. Participants

Participants in this project will be all students enrolled in NSG 311, Health Promotion Across the Lifespan, fall semester 1997 and spring semester 1998, and all students enrolled in NSG 441, Aging: Current Perspectives and Issues. This will enable me to compare processes and outcomes in a course of nursing majors (NSG 311) and a thematic sequence course in which students come from a variety of majors (NSG 441). While the journal questions and final reflection paper will differ somewhat, the fundamental issues addressed (reflection on service learning and on self as a learner) will be the same across courses. I anticipate that the combined enrollment in these three classes will be approximately 100 students.

I am using or adapting methods to develop critical reflection described in the service learning literature. My project may be different in the degree to which processes and outcomes are being evaluated.

4. Evaluation

See above. Evaluation is a major component of the project.

5. Timeline

June – August-
Review literature.
Redesign NSG 311, embedding critical reflection assessment/evaluation strategies and teaching strategies.
Submit study to University Research Comm. – Protection of Human Subjects for approval.
Get NCR forms made.

September-
NSG 311 begins. Students complete initial assessment. Rough analysis of results to modify teaching strategies as needed.
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.
Begin redesign of NSG 441 for Spring semester.
Apply for CELT Small Grant?

October-
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.
Continue redesign of NSG 441 for Spring semester.
Apply for CELT Summer Fellowship Grant?

November-
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.
Continue redesign of NSG 441 for Spring semester.
Initial analysis of Student Process Analysis of Critical Reflection

December-
Initial analysis of student final assessment.
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.
Complete redesign of NSG 441 for Spring semester.

January-
Students complete initial analysis (NSG 311 and NSG 441). Rough analysis of results to modify teaching strategies as needed.
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.

February-
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.

March-
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.
Initial analysis of student final assessment.

April-
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.

May-
Initial analysis of student final assessment.
Weekly analysis of Classroom Critical Incident Forms.
Journaling of any impressions from student weekly reflections.

Appendix D

Miami University Faculty Learning Communities

Suggestions About Presentations at Teaching and Learning Conferences:
Engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching

Background

Individual or small-group presentations at the Teaching Effectiveness Retreat, First Tuesday Seminars, and Lilly Conferences are 40 to 45 minutes in length, and 75 minute time intervals are also available at Lilly-West. Your audience will include people from a variety of disciplines.

You, An Expert?

You may have concerns about presenting about teaching and learning on campus and at a national teaching conference. After all, it takes years to become qualified in your discipline. However, the topic of teaching and learning in higher education is a new discipline where there are relatively few experts. All instructors are welcome to share innovations that add to the growing, but small, knowledge base of teaching and learning in higher education. (The discipline of K-12 education is much more established, so don't confuse the two.)

The culture at these retreats and conferences is supportive, not competitive. They are not the same as disciplinary conferences where often one's role becomes critical and competitive. You will find that your audience will be helpful and positive in offering suggestions and references for your further investigation. They will welcome you to a community that is developing the scholarship of teaching.

Topic Selection

Teaching project

Consider a progress report that includes your initial problem or opportunity, your proposed solution, and what you have done so far. If you have learning outcomes from the first semester, that is a bonus. If the results are disappointing, they are still worth reporting so that others may modify a try at the same thing. Those in your audience may have suggestions, and that "helpful, contributing feeling" is a positive one for an audience member.

Seminar topic

If there is a teaching and learning topic from a seminar or experience that has interested you, do some background reading and present on it, for example, decentering your classroom, student intellectual development, writing, using group work, etc. This might be particularly interesting as a team presentation in which more than one discipline is involved.

(over)

Joint Presentations

With colleague, mentor, and/or student associate

Consider the possibility of presenting with one of your learning community colleagues, your mentor, and/or your student associate. In this case, we might be able to fund your team member's journey to a Lilly Conference.

Presentations by the entire faculty learning community

The whole group may wish to do a presentation about the Community or your group experience as, for example, a junior faculty member, a senior faculty member, learning about a topic such as problem-based learning across several disciplines, etc.

Presentation Strategies

Handouts

Be sure to have handouts that include any overheads or PowerPoint. To make your presentation scholarly, include references to articles or books you have cited or read in order to learn what others have done or what has helped form your solutions to a teaching problem or opportunity.

Time for questions and discussion

Be sure to allow 25% of your time for this. Audience members want to share their experiences with you and the group. Sometimes people say that this is the most important part of your session. Take a deep breath and sacrifice content for dialogue.

Model your topic

If your topic is learning in groups, include a small-group activity in your session; if it is about classroom assessment techniques, include one in your session.

Include student work

If your session is about writing, include some student writing; if it is about student intellectual development, include some student work illustrating movement on some scale; if it is about using the Web, include some student reports.

Assessment

Your session will be evaluated by the participants. Use this feedback to improve your presentation for the next time.

Publication

Consult your learning community coordinator as to the suitability of writing up your session as a manuscript for a referred journal or an article in a teaching magazine. Milt Cox, Editor-in-Chief, and Gregg Wentzell, Managing Editor, the *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching,* are good consultants here.