

1.	<b>Applicant Information</b>
	Cheryl Amundsen, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC, Canada, V5A 1S6, (778) 782-4853, e-mail: camundsa@sfu.ca
2.	<b>Overview—</b>
	<p><b>Descriptive Title:</b> The Faculty Development Literature: A Characterization of Practice and the Thinking Underpinning Practice</p>
	<p><b>Project description and intended outcomes:</b> In January of 2007, I and the research team that I led, found ourselves in the enviable position of having completed the research tasks we were required to carry out for a SSHRC grant entitled, <i>A faculty development approach that focuses on learning for the effective integration of technology in higher education</i>. We had some funds left and some good will from the graduate students and faculty on the team to continue working. We decided to embark on a project that addressed what we perceived as a gap in the literature – a review of the faculty development literature with an eye to going beyond simply describing practice and including the thinking or reasoning underpinning educational development practice. This was an ambitious project and in hind sight, probably too ambitious given that the available funding ended in 2007. However, we made amazing progress and I have since been trying to find some funding to finish up what we started. As a literature review is not considered to be “research”, the usual funding sources known to me are not available.</p> <p>Our purpose for conducting this literature review was to examine the theories, assumptions and values that underpin development practices and to determine how these were similar to and different from our own. Thus a <b>primary outcome</b> of this project is the development of an analytic tool that we and others may use to analyze, evaluate and situate different educational development activities and programs. The reader may ask ‘why this is important?’ We would argue that such understanding is key to intellectual growth for educational developers themselves and to the growth of innovative practice and research in our field.</p> <p>To date we have developed and refined inclusion/exclusion criteria and searched several online databases, relevant journals and the “grey” or unpublished literature from 1994 to 2007. This search process has produced more than 2000 abstracts for review. We make a decision about whether to read the paper based on the abstract – so far we have read 415 papers. Each paper is read by at least two individuals and a decision is made (based on our inclusion/exclusion criteria) whether or not to include the paper in the review. A detailed account of the methodology of the review is included in a paper developed for the recent ICED conference in Salt Lake City and is available at: <a href="http://www.educ.sfu.ca/research/amundsen/">http://www.educ.sfu.ca/research/amundsen/</a></p> <p>As we reviewed the literature, we began to see certain characteristics of thinking about faculty development and the design of initiatives that seemed to cluster together, that is, they often were all evident in a particular description of a development initiative. As we recognized this, we began to name these clusters of characteristics. We have so far, five firm clusters and have named them as: Skill focus; Approach focus; Process focus; Discipline focus and Institutional focus (see ICED paper for a full description at: <a href="http://www.educ.sfu.ca/research/amundsen/">http://www.educ.sfu.ca/research/amundsen/</a>). Two others seem to be emerging:</p>

Scholarship of teaching and learning focus and Mentor focus, but they are still quite tentative and have not yet stabilized. As we read, we are continually refining these clusters of characteristics, what we now refer to as 'characterizations'. Generally, we find that a paper most often fits best with one of the identified characterizations – we have come to call this the focus of the paper. Often however, a paper has an identifiable focus, but we also find evidence of one or more aspects listed under other characterizations. It is not our intention to argue for or support one or more of these characterizations above others. Our purpose is to provide new insight into practice, in this case the practice of educational development.

*Activities to be completed and anticipated timeline (based on a start date of Sept. 1, 2008)*

1. Update found literature to include that from 2008 (completed by 10/31/08)
2. Finish reading and characterizing literature (completed by 1/31/09)
3. Reread and review all papers included in the review because the characterizations have emerged over time and earlier papers may not have been considered in light of all aspects associated with all characterizations. (completed by 30/4/09)
4. Decide how to represent the review (narrative, Tables, Figures etc.) and develop the primary paper to be published – submit paper (completed by 30/6/09)
5. Develop and submit a second paper focusing on the evaluation methods described in the papers (completed by 1/9/09)

#### **Scholarship:**

We build on three previous reviews of the faculty development literature: Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981), Weimer and Lenze (1994) and Emerson and Mosteller (2000). We also consulted a fourth review (Steinert, Mann, Centeno, Dolmans, Spencer, Gelula & Predeaux, 2006), one with a single focus on faculty development in medical education, as we found the description of the methodology extremely useful to our process. The stated purpose of the first three reviews was primarily to identify different formats of faculty development (e.g., workshops, consultations, mentoring) and how the effectiveness of these was measured. In our review, we include this information, but take an additional focus on the thinking underlying practice, as described above. We are also, different from the previous reviews, including all English language publications, not just those from North America.

Kennedy (2007) introduces the term "conceptual review" which she places in contrast to "systematic" review (primarily characterized by meta-analysis). She considers conceptual reviews to include integrative reviews, theoretical reviews, methodological reviews, and historical reviews. Her purpose for grouping these types of reviews as conceptual reviews is that "these approaches share an interest in gaining new insights into an issue." (p. 139). We consider our review to be a conceptual review because we are interested in gaining new insights, but also because the majority of literature relevant to faculty development is composed of qualitative research and conceptual discussions and therefore not appropriate for a meta-analysis.

As a part of what we consider to be the 'scholarly development' of this review, we have consulted with educational developers all along the way. We presented the in-progress review at the Faculty Development and Evaluation SIG of AERA at a very early stage to gather feedback about the usefulness of what we were doing and the process we were following. More recently, I have presented the characterizations that have emerged from the review to date at both EDC (February, '08) and ICED (June '08), again to gather impressions about the usefulness of this thinking and to gather feedback

about this process.

**Rationale:**

This review has already prompted those of us involved in it to reflect on our own practice as an educational developer, but as stated earlier, the primary outcome of this project is the development of an analytic tool that may be used to analyze, evaluate and situate different educational development activities and programs. One of the limitations of our work on this review has been that the underlying rationale for the design of faculty development activities is not always explicitly described in the literature. So an additional and hoped for outcome of our review is that educational developers will be called on to be explicit about why they do what they do. We believe that this disposition is consistent with work that is judged to be of scholarly significance and more importantly will contribute to a deeper understanding of what informs our practice. Just as we ask faculty members to understand why they teach as they do and how it supports student learning, we must ask ourselves why and how we expect our work to support teaching and learning development.

Our review directly advances the first section of the EDC Professional Development Plan namely, "ED as a field of practice and scholarship". Certainly it will provide an opportunity for educational developers to become acquainted with a wide range of relevant literature and through that a view of some best practices. Most importantly, if we achieve our goal of developing an easy to use analytical tool, it will provide an opportunity for critical reflection on practice. I see this review as also being related, through the papers included in our review, to two other sections of the PD Plan: "Understanding Academic/Disciplinary Cultures and Practices" and the "Scholarship of Teaching and Learning".

**Dissemination—**

As the committee can appreciate, the work of conducting a literature review of this nature and scope cannot be undertaken by one person. My intention is to recognize the contributions of all who have worked on it through co-authorship of at least two publications, as described above. Possible journals are Review of Educational Research, International Journal of Academic Development (IJAD) and Learning and Instruction (journal of the European Assoc. for Research in Learning and Instruction). We also plan to present the analytical tool aspect of the review at the 2009 meeting of STLHE.

**References Cited:**

- Emerson, J. D., & Mosteller, F. (2000). Development Programs for College Faculty: Preparing for the Twenty-first Century. Educational Media and Technology Yearbook, 25, 26-42.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2007). Defining a literature. Educational Researcher, 36(3), 139-147.
- Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R.J. (1981). Improving college teaching: A critical review of research. Review of Educational Research, 51(3), 403-434.
- Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Predeaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. Medical Teacher 28(6), 4976-526.
- Weimer, M., & Lenze, L. F. (1991). Instructional interventions: A review of the literature on efforts to improve instruction. In J. Smart (Ed.), Higher education: Handbook of theory and research (Vol. 7, pp. 294-333). New York: Agathon.

<b>3.</b>	<b>Budget</b>
	<p>Only one budget item is requested – that of a Research Assistant (RA). This is necessary in order to continue with our review process using at least two readers, and support will be needed to update the literature to include 2008 and to ready the paper for publication. The three faculty members (Lynn McAlpine, Cynthia Weston and Phil Abrami) will continue in a consultative basis offering feedback on the characterization process and the draft publication. The specific tasks of the RA will be:</p> <p>1) Search for relevant literature from 2008; 2) Maintain and update the RefWorks database; 3) Read selected papers and meet regularly with Cheryl Amundsen (the second reader) to make decisions about inclusion in the review and fit with in the characterization format; 4) Consult about data representation.</p> <p>115 hours of RA time @ \$20.00/hour = \$2300.</p> <p>8% benefits = \$200.</p> <p>Total requested - \$2500.</p>