Becoming an Educational Developer: A Canadian University Perspective

by

Jeanette Louise McDonald

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
Graduate Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

Becoming an Educational Developer: A Canadian University Perspective
Doctor of Education 2011
Jeanette Louise McDonald
Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education
University of Toronto

Abstract

This study sought to understand how individuals come to be educational developers, specifically, their individual and collective journeys toward entry to the profession, the drivers and conditions that shape developer pathways, a sense of how practitioners characterize their developer role and conceive the field overall, and, finally, the point at which they come to associate with the field and identify with what they do. To explore and examine these questions, a qualitative study was undertaken with a subset of the development community. Eighteen Canadian university educational developers, all formally associated with a campus-wide or discipline-based teaching and learning unit, were invited to share their stories. Drawing upon the metaphor of journey to conceptualize the research and storytelling process, and framing the analysis and discussion from a career development and community of practice perspective, the process of becoming an educational developer was revealed.

Two trajectories to educational development were identified: (1) those coming from outside higher education and (2) those transitioning from within their academic institution. Various conditions, situational factors, social encounters, or drivers, often serendipitous in form, influenced their journeys, with some participants experiencing more direct paths to the profession and others encountering more twists and turns. Select types of individuals (gatekeepers, distractors, mentors, enablers) also significantly impacted their pathways. Participants characterized their developer role broadly

(facilitator, connector, consultant, champion, change agent) and conceived educational development along service, professional, and academic lines. Commitment to the profession and their role solidified within two to four years upon entry.

Currently, the field of educational development operates without any formalized career structures to guide entry to or facilitate advancement within the profession. As the community continues to grow and situate itself within the higher education landscape, identifying what attracts developers to the field, their individual pathways, as well as how and when they come to associate with the profession, especially in the absence of socialization and induction strategies, is crucial.

With limited research examining the process of becoming a developer and the attraction of working in the field, this study provides a basis from which to continue to examine questions associated with growing and sustaining an emergent profession.

Acknowledgements

How do I begin to acknowledge all those individuals who have contributed to the successful completion of my doctoral journey? There have been so many along the way – colleagues, family members, friends, acquaintances, my committee, and my supervisor – people who have made a profound difference from their simple words of encouragement to their steadfast support and belief in my ability to succeed and finish.

An enormous thanks to my supervisor, Professor Sandra Acker, who took me on at a critical time in my studies, provided thoughtful advice and welcomed support, connected me to a community of student peers (my lifeline), and saw me through to the end of my journey. Special thanks goes also to my other committee members: Professor Linda Muzzin who provided critical feedback and reflective commentary and Professor Tony Chambers who first helped me craft my study questions and directed me early in the research process.

Of course, I could not have completed my studies had I not had the support of my husband and immediate family to encourage me, give me time and space to write and think, and manage the day-to-day commitments of being a wife, mother, daughter, sister, and friend. To my colleagues and friends, I thank you for your patience, good wishes, and understanding for missed opportunities to connect socially and professionally.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank the study participants who shared their career histories with me, the educational development community who welcomed me as a member of its profession, and the various educational developer colleagues who inspired

me through their stories to explore, in a formal sense, what is involved in becoming a Canadian university educational developer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

CHAPTER ONE: SETTING THE CONTEXT 1
INTRODUCTION 1
MY STORY, MY PATHWAY 2
BACKGROUND CONTEXT OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 8
RESEARCH QUESTIONS 12
RATIONALE 12
THESIS OVERVIEW 14

CHAPTER TWO: SITUTATING CANADIAN UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 16
INTRODUCTION 16
DEFINING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 16
CANADIAN EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES AND UNITS – THEN AND NOW 21
THE ROOTS OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN CANADA 27
BECOMING AN EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPER: WHAT DO WE KNOW? 40
SUMMARY 44

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY 46
INTRODUCTION 46
PURPOSE 47
RESEARCH DESIGN 47
Data sources 51
Sample selection 52
Recruitment 52
Participant profile 55
Interview design and process 59
Interview guide and protocol 61
AN INSIDER'S PERSPECTIVE 62
ANALYSIS 65

CHAPTER FOUR: MAPPING THE JOURNEY 69
INTRODUCTION 69
THE ROLE OF CHANCE, HAPPENSTANCE, AND SERENDIPITY IN THE CAREER JOURNEY 69
PARTICIPANT PROFILE 73
EARLY CAREER GOALS 74
LEARNING ABOUT EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: EARLY EXPOSURE 78
OBSTACLES TO ENTRY AND PARTICIPATION IN THE FIELD 86
Entering the field 86
Participating in the field 88

INFLUENTIAL PEOPLE 94
Gatekeepers 98
Distractors 100
Mentors 102
Enablers 105
SUMMARY 110

CHAPTER FIVE: PREPARING FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 111
INTRODUCTION 111
SITUATING THE DEVELOPERS' PREPARATORY LEARNING EXPERIENCES 111
CONFERENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING ATTENDANCE 113
TEACHING EXPERIENCE 116
READING 121
GRADUATE STUDENT INVOLVEMENT 123
Application to practice 124
Opportunity access provided through graduate school attendance 125
Professional development and personal fulfillment 126
Credibility 127
FORMER WORK EXPERIENCE 130
PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 132
INTERACTION WITH DEVELOPER COLLEAGUES 133
UNIQUE EXPERIENCES 134
SUMMARY 134

CHAPTER SIX: CONCEPTUALIZING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 136
INTRODUCTION 136
CONCEPTIONS OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPER ROLE 136
Facilitator 138
Connector 139
Consultant 141
Champion 143
Change agent 146
THE RELATIONAL ELEMENT 149
CONCEPTIONS OF THE FIELD OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 150
CHANGING CONCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 153
Early conceptions 153
Current conceptions 154
ANSWERING THE QUESTION 155
THE IMPACT OF CONTEXT 159
SUMMARY 161

CHAPTER SEVEN: IDENTIFICATION WITH AND COMMITMENT TO EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 163
INTRODUCTION 163
THE TIPPING POINT: INITIAL COMMITMENT 163
ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE FIELD: FACILITATING AND SUSTAINING COMMITMENT 171

Community 172
Satisfaction 178
BEING AN EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPER: IDENTIFICATION AND CONSOLIDATION 182
From co-ordinating to building 182
Validation by others 184
Socialization into the field and developer role 185
Deepening developer identity 188
SUMMARY 190

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE RESEARCH JOURNEY – LOOKING BACK, MOVING FORWARD 191
INTRODUCTION 191
THE RESEARCH JOURNEY 192
STUDY FINDINGS: A BRIEF SUMMARY 194
SECTOR IMPLICATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS 199
Training and development needs of educational developers 200
Situating educational development 200
Credentialing and credibility 201
The relational element 202
FUTURE AREAS OF RESEARCH: SOME RECOMMENDATIONS 203
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS 205

REFERENCES 207

APPENDIX A: LETTER OF INVITATION 219

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM 222

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE 226

APPENDIX D: FIELD NOTE TEMPLATE 232

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4.1: PARTICIPANT PROFILE 74

TABLE 4.2: INFLUENTIAL PEOPLE: TYPE AND DESCRIPTOR 96

CHAPTER ONE: SETTING THE CONTEXT

Introduction

This study was designed to ascertain how individual practitioners engaged in educational development activities with either a campus-wide or discipline-based teaching and learning centre came to be educational developers. Currently, the field (used interchangeably with profession and community of practice) of educational development has no career structures (e.g., credentials, unifying professional development scheme) to guide entry to or facilitate advancement within the field. As the profession continues to grow and situate itself within the higher education landscape, it is crucial to identify what attracts developers to the field, their individual pathways as well as how and when they come to associate with the profession, especially in the absence of socialization and induction strategies. To address these concerns, I conducted semi-structured qualitative interviews with 18 Canadian university educational development practitioners. Using the metaphor of journey and drawing upon the community of practice and career exploration literature, I analyzed the data and report my findings in this dissertation.

This chapter provides context for the study, beginning with my own story, in which I outline how I came to be an educational developer and chose the field of educational development as my career home. The telling of my story speaks to the journey I underwent and my attempts to understand what shaped my career explorations and those of my developer peers. The metaphor of journey used here to convey my story and that of the participants, not to mention the interview process itself, reflects what Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) refer to as the "interviewer-traveler," someone who

"wanders through the landscape and enters into conversations with people he or she encounters...asking questions and encouraging them [the participants] to tell their own stories of their lived world" (p. 48). In fact, it was the sharing of my story with colleagues and my peers sharing their stories with me that intrigued and moved me to formally examine how development practitioners arrive at educational development's doorstep. And, like the study participants, my story was characterized by chance and serendipity as well as personal awareness of and readiness to respond to the opportunities afforded to me (and them). Following the telling of my story, I provide a brief summary of the Canadian educational development scene, a topic expanded upon in greater detail in Chapter two. Lastly, I outline my guiding research questions, my study rationale, and an overview of the thesis chapters.

My Story, My Pathway

I am an educational developer. I am engaged in educational development activities at a campus-wide teaching centre at Wilfrid Laurier University, a mid-sized publically-funded primarily undergraduate Ontario institution. I work individually and collectively with other academics and professional staff across the university to support and champion teaching and learning at an individual (e.g., students, academic staff, faculty), group (e.g., departments, committees), and institutional level. My scope of practice is broad in focus and defined along academic lines, that is, teaching, scholarship, and service. Through these interweaving paths, I support faculty and graduate students in their various professional roles (e.g., personal, career, instructional development); design and deliver programs, resources, and services; consult with academics, administrators, and committees (e.g., curriculum, teaching awards, educational technology); contribute to

the development of institutional policy (e.g., academic integrity, classroom use of mobile technology); engage in the scholarly inquiry of teaching and learning as well as my own professional practice; mentor new educational developers; network and create community; identify opportunities to effect change; and so on. The list goes on, reflecting the evolving nature of the field, changing institutional mandates, external dictates (e.g., quality assurance, accountability), and, of course, the individual needs and interests of students and faculty – our clients and colleagues.

I began working in the field of educational development in 1996 as a graduate student at the University of Guelph's Office of Teaching Support Services. Having completed my applied science degree in Child Studies at this university, I looked to the same institution to pursue a graduate program with an educational focus. This search led me to apply for and be accepted into the Master's of Science Rural Extension Studies program. I chose this program for its concentration on non-formal adult education, having realized during my undergraduate degree that while I was interested in working in an educational setting, I preferred working with adults versus teaching young children.

At the start of my graduate program and my position with Teaching Support Services, I was not aware of educational development as a community of practice or a professional enterprise of scholars and practitioners that I could one day explore as a viable career path. My needs and interests were more basic. I needed a job to support me during my academic studies. My entry to the field, however, was not completely serendipitous. Facilitative conditions and factors set the stage for my involvement. For example, my master's degree was in non-formal adult education, I liked working in a university setting, I had a history of and interest in teaching, and my thesis supervisor

knew I was looking for a job. That my thesis supervisor also worked part-time for the Office of Teaching Support Services as a program coordinator, and as there was both a need for and funds available at the time to provide for a graduate service assistantship in support of centre programing, by chance, opened the door for my entry to the field even though I did not realize it at the time. Upon starting in the position, I had no idea what the instructional development unit of Teaching Support Services did; that there was a professional field of practice called educational development with models, approaches, theories, and a scholarly literature guiding the field and its practitioners; what my positional roles or responsibilities would encompass; or that others were engaged in educational development activities outside my institution on a regional, national, and international basis. To me, it was a job, one of several I had on the go at the time. Realization and awareness of educational development as a career option came later, much later.

During my eight-year tenure at the University of Guelph, my roles and responsibilities within the instructional development unit evolved as I moved from graduate student, to professional staff member, and, finally, to manager of the instructional development unit itself. As a graduate service assistant, I performed many duties: basic administrative tasks, researching the teaching and learning literature, recommending purchases for the unit's resource library, and participating in centre activities and day-to-day operations to name a few. During the same period, though not all at once, I also worked as a teaching assistant for a first year introduction to higher learning course, as a learning skills programmer, as a research assistant, and as a peer helper supervisor. These activities combined, together with my graduate program

experience (which included taking adult education, program planning and evaluation courses) and my conducting of original research on barriers and challenges to implementing collaborative learning in the undergraduate curriculum (see Dayman, 1999), seeded my interest in educational development and led to the creation of an entry level position in 1998 as the Instructional Development Unit's first Resource Centre Coordinator.

Through the guidance and support of my centre peers and unit director, I was apprenticed into the field, taking on more and more responsibility, becoming more familiar and comfortable with my educational developer role and client base, more embedded in the academic structure and culture of the university, more familiar with the educational development literature, and more knowledgeable and skilled at my practice. At the same time, I also began to engage the larger development community as I started to attend and host regional instructional developer meetings and participate in and eventually present at national teaching and learning and educational development type conferences. During my tenure at the University of Guelph, my positions evolved from that of Teaching Resource Coordinator, to Educational Development Coordinator, to Instructional Development Manager.

In February 2003, I joined Wilfrid Laurier University as the Manager of Instructional Development and Distance Education, having been invited to apply and interview for the position. As the position title suggests, I played a dual role of educational developer and instructional designer at a management level. This duality continued until changes at our institution in 2005, brought about by the incoming Vice President: Academic and Provost, led to greater investment in and emphasis on

supporting teaching and learning, and hence a refocusing of my position on educational development alone. Today, I serve as Manager of Educational Development within a multi-unit office (Teaching Support Services) of which educational development is one of several interconnected units that includes educational technologies, online learning, part-time studies, quality assurance, and continuing education.

At the time of writing this dissertation, I was also nearing the end of a four-year term as the Vice Chair of Communications on the executive committee of the Educational Developers Caucus (EDC), a national body representing educational developers and a constituent group of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE). A decade and a half after entering the field, my developer role continues to evolve and change in response to institutional mandates, centre directions, client needs, and external dictates (e.g., supporting the university's educational quality assurance program). I likewise continue to grow as a developer and contribute to the field through scholarship, teaching, service, and active participation.

My foray into the field of educational development represents one of many pathways (see Stefani, 1999 and Wilcox, 1997b for two other personal accounts) where no common educational requirements or formal career structures currently exist – what Lynn McAlpine (2006) calls "academic structures" – to facilitate awareness of, entry to, and advancement within the field. My study of the literature and discussions with fellow educational developers suggested to me at the time that this was an under-researched area that warranted further exploration in a scholarly manner. Indeed, understanding how individuals come to enter the field and identify with their developer role and community of practice, I thought, would help situate the field as it continues to evolve and achieve

status within the Canadian university landscape – one of many emergent professional occupations (e.g., admissions and recruitment, study skills, student affairs) in service to the project of teaching and learning. More important, I considered this study a timely endeavour given the establishment of the Educational Developers Caucus in 2003 and the passing of its bylaws in 2006 (Mighty, 2006). The EDC bylaw document articulates the mandate of the Caucus and its nine aims, several of which are central to this study: (1) to advance and evolve the field and (2) to professionalize the developer role and the position itself. The EDC defines itself as:

> a community of practice with a mission to work within the aims and structure of the STLHE to facilitate the advancement and evolution of educational development as a field of practice and scholarship by coordinating communication, networking, professional development opportunities, and advocacy strategies. (Educational Developers Caucus [EDC], 2006, p. 1)

With my academic mission firmly in place, I began to explore various literatures (e.g., educational development, higher education, teaching and learning) and purposefully engage developer colleagues at different points in their careers to ascertain the history of educational development in Canada, the evolution of development practices and conceptualizations of the field, and the approach I might take to studying pathways to the educational development profession. More important, as documented in brief at the start of this chapter, I began to reflect on my own career pathway, which I conceptualized as a journey. What follows in the rest of this chapter is some background information on the field of educational development (see Chapter two for an in-depth examination), my guiding research questions, and my study rationale.

Background Context of Educational Development

Over the last five decades, educational development "has progressed from an informal set of instructional improvement activities to a scholarly field of study and practice" (McDonald & Stockley, 2008, p. 213). It now comprises a broad range of services, resources, programs, and initiatives designed to advance and support teaching and learning at multiple levels (organizational, departmental, and individual) as well as the multi-faceted roles of university faculty, administrators, and graduate students. During its 50-year history, educational development has matured (Wright & Miller, 2000), moving from the periphery to the mainstream of academic institutions (Kahn & Baume, 2003; Kahn, 2004). More recently, it has cemented itself within the higher education landscape as developers increasingly take on leadership (Taylor, 2005), organizational development, and change management roles (Dawson, Mighty, & Britnell, 2010; Schroeder, 2011). In other words, educational development has or is, rather, coming of age (Knapper, 1998; Lee, Manathunga, & Kandlbinder, 2008).

Collectively, the field has organized itself formally both here in Canada and across the globe. This movement is evidenced by the establishment of regional, national, and international development organizations. Two of the earliest national networks to have formed in the 1970s include the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) and the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD) in the United States (McDonald & Stockley, 2008). Almost 20 years later, the International Consortium of Educational Development (ICED) was founded such that today there are 25 national networks associated with it (Grant, Healey, & Taylor, 2011), more than double the number from when it was first founded in 1993 and

held its second international meeting in 1995 (International Consortium of Educational Development [ICED], 2011). Fast forward another decade and we see the establishment of Canada's own national network, the Educational Developers Caucus of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Formed in 2003, it provides a national voice and a means to connect the growing number of regional development networks of which there are now six (Educational Developers Caucus [EDC], 2011a).

Like other specialized occupations in Canadian higher education (e.g., student services, research services), the educational development movement evolved in response to a variety of internal drivers (e.g., institutional positioning, program reviews, faculty accountability) and external forces such as institutional response to government policy and funding directives, reports questioning the quality of higher education (see Smith, 1991), calls for accountability, an increasingly diverse student population, growing sophistication of educational technology, and the explosion of research on teaching and learning in higher education (e.g., authentic assessment, learner/ing-centredness, collaborative learning methods).

A search of the educational development literature, position titles, and centre names further points to a range of terms used to label and identify what developers do, for example, *academic, instructional, faculty,* and *educational development*. This range in terminology reflects regional jurisdictions and developer preferences, but also various models, areas of program focus, centre structures, and institutional and faculty needs (see Fraser, Gosling, & Sorcinelli, 2010; Gillespie, Hilsen, & Wadsworth, 2002; Riegel, 1987; Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). In Canada, we use the term *educational development,* recognizing its generic and more inclusive qualities encompassing of the

breadth and diversity of the scope and location of development practice. The use of the term educational development also reflects the terminology used by our national association, the Educational Developers Caucus, and our international body, the International Consortium of Educational Development.

At the same time, the educational development literature base has grown from an early focus of reporting on program types, centre activities, development models, and effective approaches, to one that now includes the scholarship of teaching and learning and the study of educational development itself. The scholarly focus on the field and its practitioners represents a departure from an early (about 1970s onward), but continuing emphasis on developing and supporting teaching and learning (Åkerlind, 2005). This scholarly focus also reflects our expanding scope of practice and individual developer roles as we respond to institutional and external drivers. As our practice expands and the field becomes more embedded within and important to the higher education landscape, the need for scholarly study and a deeper understanding of the field and its practitioners is ever more pressing.

Developers themselves comprise a truly eclectic group of professionals (Weimer, 1990). They have varied educational backgrounds (Chism, 2008), disciplinary allegiances, academic ranks (e.g., faculty member, professional academic staff member, graduate student), types of appointments (e.g., full-time, part-time, contractual, seconded, permanent), position titles (e.g., director, consultant, coordinator, specialist) and responsibilities, orientations to practice (Land, 2001, 2003, 2004), institutional values, local contexts, career motivations, and pathways into the profession (see Fraser, 1999, Stefani, 1999; Wilcox, 1997b). Their rich diversity reflects the absence of a prescribed

pathway (e.g., credentials) or a developer position profile that like other more established occupations and professions characterizes the practitioner role.

The number of new individual educational developers entering the field is growing also. This not only reflects my personal observations at regional association meetings and national annual conferences of the EDC, but also the outcomes of a recent study of Canadian and American educational developers by Mary Deane Sorcinelli and her colleagues (2006). In their survey of development practitioners, they discovered that more than 50 percent of developers from consultant to director have five or fewer years of work experience in the field, suggesting that educational development programs, in general, are growing. As more countries such as Norway, Sweden, and Britain "require some form of initial training for university teachers" (Baume, 2006, p. 57) and various initiatives at the local (e.g., the involvement of Ontario-based educational developers in supporting and implementing undergraduate and graduate degree level expectations) and international level come into play (e.g., the Network of European Tertiary Level Educators [NETTLE] project[1]), the call for more educational developers to enter the field to support these initiatives will be greater than ever before.

So where does this leave those of us who call ourselves educational developers? If, we are to continue to grow as a field and respond to and support the evolving needs of the academic community, the educational development "sector" needs (Fraser et al., 2010) to better understand its own self, identifying what attracts people to the field, their pathways into the profession, and their journeys toward becoming educational developers. By doing so, we can better attract and advance professionals to and within the

[1] The NETTLE project is a European Union funded initiative that "aims to develop European-wide academic frameworks within which to equip educators in higher education with the competencies and skills necessary to provide effective and validated support for learners" [NETTLE, 2005].

field as well as prepare them to meet the expectations and requirements of their dynamic role within their institutions and the sector overall. Through these efforts, we not only contribute to evolving the field, but also to advancing our knowledge about the profession and its practitioners, and hence the scholarship of educational development.

Research Questions

Reflecting the context outlined above and what is feasible within the scope of this study, the overarching research question is: *How do individuals come to be educational developers?* Toward answering this main question, four supporting sub-questions are examined.

1. What processes and practices do educational developers undertake to navigate entry into the field of educational development?
2. What external incidents or situational factors shape the pathways of developers into the field of educational development?
3. How do educational developers conceive of educational development?
4. At what point in their journey do they begin to think of themselves as educational developers?

These questions will be addressed through a review of the literature, semi-structured interviews with a subset of members from the Canadian university educational development community, and qualitative analysis of the data.

Rationale

Aside from any personal interest in learning more about the field of educational development and developers themselves, there are several valid contributions this research can make as previously suggested.

First and foremost, this research will contribute to the scholarship of educational development and the growing international body of educational development literature that has evolved over the last 50 years from a primary focus on program types, effective practices, development models, and teaching improvement activities. This study's focus on how people navigate entry to the profession, come to think of themselves as educational developers, and conceive of educational development as a whole will add another layer of insight and understanding to the study of the field and its practitioners, which until relatively recently, a dearth of literature of this kind has existed.

Second, this research will build upon the work of other Canadian scholars who have worked to document and understand educational development and its practitioners as the field has evolved both here in Canada and across the globe. While Canadian educational developers and researchers have documented the history of the field in Canada as well as its growth in numbers, centre practices, and demographics, what is missing in the documented literature is a sense of how individual practitioners and educators have come to be and know about educational development. Personal study of the literature suggests that each country has its own history and situational factors that have shaped its growth, and while there is overlap in some areas of influence, there are nuances unique to each region that need to be researched and understood to evolve and move forward in a manner that is dynamic, contextually relevant, and situationally appropriate.

Finally, and most important, the outcomes of this research have the potential to support the growth of Canadian educational development and its practitioners at a crucial time in its evolution. It is only in the last five to ten years that the Canadian educational

development community has organized itself formally into a cohesive group with the formation of the Educational Developers Caucus of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. As noted previously, the EDC was founded in 2003 and constituted in 2006 (Mighty, 2006) with the passing of its bylaws. This study has the potential to inform all nine bylaw aims (see Chapter two for a complete list) of the Caucus, but specifically the "advancement and evolution of educational development as a field of practice and scholarship" and to contribute to "a national forum where emerging and problematic educational development issues can be candidly discussed" (EDC, 2006, p. 1).

By understanding how Canadian educational developers assume their professional role (i.e., navigate their way into the field, conceptualize the field, and establish themselves within it), the community is in a better position to respond to their needs and advance the field.

Thesis Overview

The remaining chapters, as a whole, provide a narrative of how I engaged in the research process and what I learned from my study. Chapter two situates educational development within a Canadian university setting, providing history and context to appreciate how the field has grown and what is missing in the study of educational development. Chapter three details the study's design and acknowledges my "insider" perspective as a member of the educational development community. My use of the metaphor of journey is also situated. Chapter three further provides a brief introduction to my theoretical framework that I expand upon in the individual chapters. The next four chapters parallel the research questions previously outlined. Chapter four maps the

participants' journeys noting their trajectories, individual contexts, influential people, and barriers to entering the field. A set of participant tables profiling the trajectories of the participants and their years of work experience in the profession are also provided. These tables will aid the reader in following the threads of each participant's journey. Chapter five reports on the activities and experiences the participants identified as being helpful in learning about and becoming educational developers, while Chapter six speaks to developer conceptions of the field and their practitioner role. Chapter seven responds to the last of the four research questions, profiling various conditions and factors that positioned educational development as a viable career option and identifying various elements which solidified when and how the participants came to associate with their developer role. Finally, Chapter eight summarizes key findings, outlines study limitations, provides recommendations for future research, and offers directions toward continued growth and solidification of the field.

CHAPTER TWO: SITUATING CANADIAN UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This chapter is designed to situate educational development within a Canadian university context and provide a foundation on which to appreciate the remaining chapters that seek to address the research questions outlined in Chapters one and three. In keeping with this goal, the following sections comprise this chapter: (1) defining educational Development, (2) Canadian educational development practices and units – then and now, (3) the roots of educational development in Canada, and (4) becoming an educational developer.

Defining Educational Development

Educational development is one of many umbrella terms used by developers across the world to label what we do (Fraser, 1999; Knight & Wilcox, 1998). Karron Lewis, for example, a well-known developer in the United States, uses the term *faculty development*, defining it as "systematic efforts to increase the effectiveness of faculty in all their professional roles" (1996, p. 26). Other terms variously used across the globe include *staff, academic* (e.g., Britain, Australia, South Africa), *educational* (e.g., Australia, Canada, Britain), *instructional* (e.g., Canada) and *professional* (e.g., Australia, Britain) development. The literature is rich with examples of books, journals, articles, and chapters incorporating these terms into their titles. Indeed, the regional references listed above reflect my review of the educational development literature and my observance of the jurisdictional origins of the authors, their research participants, and their publishing sources. A selection of these sources, include:

- *International Journal for Academic Development,*
- *Journal of Faculty Development,*
- *Directions in Staff Development* (Brew, 1995),
- *The Scholarship of Academic Development* (Eggins & Macdonald, 2003),
- *Exploring Academic Development in Higher Education: Issues of Engagement* (Elvidge, Fraser, Land, Mason, & Matthew, 2003),
- *A Guide to Faculty Development* (Gillespie et al., 2010),
- A *Guide to Staff and Educational Development* (Kahn & Baume, 2003),
- *Educational Development: Discourse, Identity and Practice* (Land, 2004),
- *Pathways to the Profession of Educational Development* (McDonald & Stockley, 2010),
- *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present* (Sorcinelli et al., 2006), and
- *Understanding Staff Development* (Webb, 1996a).

As noted previously, Canadian practitioners have used the terms *instructional* or *faculty* development to name what they do, reflecting the audience of their program and individual attentions and the instructional design aspects of teaching and learning (Wilcox, 1998). The former (i.e., instructional development) is consistent with many committee and unit titles of the time and their program foci (see Survey of Provision for Academic Staff Development, 1980), while the latter (i.e., faculty development) reflects the term's broader use in the North American development literature (Riegle, 1987). Today, the term *educational development* is increasingly used. Its adoption in Canada reflects the formation of the Educational Developers Caucus in June 2003 (Mighty, 2006) at which time the development community re-evaluated its choice of terms used to conceive the profession. Recognizing the growing breadth of programs, practices, and conceptualizations of the field; the development goals and approaches broadly associated

with it; and the expanding client base (individual, committee, institution) of the profession – educational development was selected for its more "generic" and "inclusive" qualities (Wilcox, 1998). Support for a single more inclusive title is echoed internationally by the International Consortium of Educational Developers and by individual developers and educational scholars (see Andresen, 1996; Baume & Baume, 1994; Boud & McDonald, 1981; Clegg, 2009; D'Andrea & Gosling, 2001; Fraser, 1999; Fraser, Gosling, & Sorcinelli, 2010; Gosling, 1996) around the world by their very use of these terms in their scholarly writing and communities of practice.

The origins of many terms and practices commonly associated with educational development (particularly in North America) can be attributed to Jerry Gaff, William Bergquist, and Steven Phillips. They were among the first to conceptualize the field and offer a typology, model, or categorization of change activities on which to build development programs. These models or approaches, as Bergquist and Phillips (1977) noted, were "based on Goodwin Watson's belief that change can be seen as taking place in the areas of *structure* – organization, use of space, authority – *process* – human interaction, communication – and *attitude* – values, assumptions, philosophies" (p. 6). While each category or approach identified differs in its level and target group of development (Diamond, 2002), they overlap in their shared goal of improving the quality of education (Wright, 2002).

Bergquist and Phillips' (1975a) early model proposed three integrated components: personal development (attitude), instructional development (process), and organizational development (structure). They later extended this model to encompass community development, "a concern with the entire environment of an institution" (1977,

p. 6) and grew their definition of faculty development overall to incorporate "issues beyond the level of individual institutions" (1977, p. 6). Gaff (1975) similarly proposed three streams of focus for development: faculty (attitude), instructional (process) and organizational (structure). Gaff's faculty category maps onto Bergquist and Phillips' personal category and additionally includes practices aimed at improving teaching behaviour (Centra, 1976). The variation between programs and their associated activities reflect an early realization by educational researchers (see Bergquist & Phillips, 1975a, 1975b, 1977; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Gaff, 1975; Lindquist, 1978; Millis, 1994) that the chosen intervention of an institution must reflect the local culture and context to be successful, hence, the considerable variation of program and centre structures across institutions (Diamond, 2002) and the plethora of terms associated with development practices.

Even with the use of more a generic descriptor of the field, there is still a lack of consensus among developers in respect to what the terms mean and how they are used. For example, in an Australian study of academic developers' conceptions of the profession, Kym Fraser (2001) asked her participants to name the terms they used to identify themselves and to outline whether they perceived these terms to be different or the same in meaning and practice. What she found was that different terms were used by practitioners to describe their various roles and that these terms were often underpinned by institutional factors (i.e., role or position such as instructional designer, academic staff developer). She also discerned that while some developers used the terms staff, educational, and academic interchangeably, others saw them as being quite different from one another, even "diametrically opposed." However, while the participants variously

identified themselves or their roles by different terms and definitions, they all shared a central goal of advancing and supporting the quality of teaching by academics. Clegg (2009) reaffirmed this value commitment in her work, stating that "educational development is a project committed to improvement and innovation, and one imbued with strong value commitments to students, their learning and the quality of teaching" (p. 409).

This goal of improving the quality of education is consistent with the various understandings of educational development reported in the development literature. For example, Knight and Wilcox (1998) define educational development as the "systematic pursuit of the improvement of teaching in higher education" (p. 98). Broader still, Wilcox (1998) identifies the term educational development as a "generic" and "inclusive" descriptor of the field as a whole that has as its goal the improvement of quality education through the advancement of educational knowledge and practice. Rowland (2003) defines academic development as "the development of academic practice," the latter of which "includes research as well as teaching, and the learning which results from both" (p. 2). Finally, Hounsell (1994 as cited in Macdonald, 2003, p. 3) views educational development as being concerned with "sustaining and enhancing the quality of learning and teaching within the institution." While no one person in the field would deny that improving the quality of teaching and learning is germane to our mission, others question its breadth as well as to what and to whom educational development (or its many namesakes) applies.

Depending on the regional jurisdiction, the term in use, and the different activities and approaches associated with it, educational development may be applied to different

categories of people, to select faculty and student roles, and to various organizational goals and communities. For example, Webb (1996b) defines educational development as part of staff development, the latter of which includes research, administration, management, community services, and policy formation. Fraser (2001) associates the use of staff development to include academic and non-academic staff, the term academic development with faculty and their teaching and research roles, and the term educational development with teaching whether at the individual, departmental, faculty/college, or institutional level. Finally, Crow, Milton, Moomaw, and O'Connell (1976) define faculty development as "the total development of the faculty member – as a person, as a professional and as a member of an academic community" (p. 3).

We may never have 100 percent agreement on how these terms are conceived or where the bounds of educational development begin and end. As Rowland (2003) reminds us, as more and different voices contribute to the discourse on educational development, achieving a common language will become increasingly difficult.

Canadian Educational Development Practices and Units – Then and Now

Just as there is no one way to define educational development or achieve excellence in university teaching (Konrad, 1983), there is no one way to *do* educational development. Program mandates, organizational structures, staffing compositions, and position profiles vary across universities, reflecting local contexts (e.g., university mission, resources), institutional needs (e.g., faculty retention and renewal, quality teaching and learning), as well as external (e.g., accountability measures, professional accreditation, trends in higher education) and internal drivers (e.g., institutional positioning, niche marketing). We see this not only in program approaches (as noted

above), but in delivery structures as well. Sorcinelli and her associates (2006) most recently reported on several structures in their survey of American and Canadian developers. They include a centralized unit or centre serving the entire institution, what Hicks (1999) calls a central model, an office functioning as a clearinghouse for programs and offerings sponsored by the institution, a committee charged with supporting faculty development efforts, and single academic programs overseen by an individual administrator or faculty member charged with its responsibility. Other documented structures designed to meet general and specific faculty needs include special purpose centres (e.g., discipline-focused, department-specific), something akin to a what Hicks (1999) calls a dispersed model as well as multi-campus cooperative programs designed to serve several campuses at once (Wright, 2002). Hicks (1999) identified two other models in addition to those already mentioned: (1) a mixed model, which combines the best of both a central and discipline-focused approach and (2) an integrated model, which is "holistic" in form and leverages the capacity of a mixed model. Many of these structures are typical of the Canadian development scene though the central model as suggested by the work of Sorcinelli and her colleagues (2006) continues to be the dominant structure (54%) for campus-wide units.

The activities which comprise the various development programs and approaches likewise vary. The sabbatical is perhaps the oldest form of faculty development support (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). Other initiatives and programs have evolved since the inception of educational development in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The early development literature broadly reported on the various kinds of programs and their success factors; different models, frameworks, and activities in practice; and

organizational structures (see Centra, 1976; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Erickson, 1986; Shore, 1974; Toombs, 1975). The limited Canadian literature has focused on reporting how many institutions have offered what types of pedagogical services. A summary of these surveys follow.

Bruce Shore and Janet Donald (1974) were the first to document the availability and scope of pedagogical services in Canada. They began with a 1973 survey of colleges, universities, and agencies. At that time, only 13 universities reported offering instructional development initiatives of limited regularity. Donald and Shore (1976) followed up with a more comprehensive survey in 1975-1976 with the goal of establishing "what centres and offices existed to promote the improvement of teaching and learning, and to open up channels of communication among the people involved in this work" (as cited in Donald, 1986, p. 78). Of those to respond, 22 universities representing all regions of Canada reported the availability of pedagogical services. The most common development activity reported was the workshop; the second most common activity was research (e.g., course evaluation, comparing teaching methods, individualized instruction). Others, though less common in nature, included the offering of instructional development grants, the production of teaching and learning newsletters, and the availability of resource libraries or documentation centres.

The University of Manitoba study surveyed institutions involved in the provision of teaching services for faculty between the years of 1979-1980, identifying 23 universities across the nation (Survey of Provision for Academic Staff Development, 1980). Services varied and included: circulation of an instructional newsletter, grant programs, workshops aimed at teaching skill development, research on the evaluation of

teaching, and, in some cases, orientations for new faculty and support for graduate teaching assistants. Little difference in the number of institutions offering pedagogical supports or the breadth of activities and services was reported compared to the previous study by Donald and Shore (1976).

Abraham Konrad's (1983) survey a few years later identified 30 universities offering some form of organized faculty support (e.g., committee, program, centre). Like previous studies, the most commonly reported activities included workshops and seminars and instructional services. The former (i.e., workshops) varied in length and offering (e.g., one-time to a series) and addressed topics such as instructional techniques, testing practices, and new or different curricular approaches. The latter (i.e., services) focused on developing and evaluating teaching skills (e.g., classroom visitations, peer consultations), constructing tests (e.g., with the aid of specialist), and using instructional technology. Other miscellaneous and less common practices included the offering of instructional development grants and faculty exchange programs. Overall, instructional improvement initiatives versus personal or organizational development initiatives were the main focus of the documented support activities (Konrad, 1983).

Ten years after her first survey, Janet Donald (1986) re-surveyed Canadian universities to determine how much had changed. Comparatively, her results demonstrated little change in the four years since Konrad's (1983) survey and little more in the 10 years since she and Bruce Shore implemented their first survey. What little had changed, Donald (1986) characterized as being "qualitatively subtle." The number of universities reporting development activities compared to those documented in Konrad's (1983) study remained constant, as did the provision of development activities and

programs. Similarly, the focus on improving instruction and developing teaching skills versus initiatives focused on learning continued to be the dominant practice (Sullivan, 1986 as cited in Donald, 1986). What did stick out as being new was the provision of teaching and learning type courses or programs for graduate students (ten versus one) and the establishment of awards for teaching excellence (six versus none).

Following Konrad's and Donald's work, in 1992, Susan Wilcox (1998) conducted a survey of documented development practices. While the focus of her Ontario-based study was directed more toward developers themselves, she noted at the time that 14 of the 16 universities in the province reported having educational development programs, and that of these 14 universities, 10 had established teaching centres. In terms of development practices, their variety was greater and more pronounced. Activities not already mentioned, but reported by Wilcox (1998) in her study, comprised: peer consultations, teaching assistant development programs including mini courses on teaching, and special project work (e.g., the first year experience). Project work, which includes research and other scholarly practices, is a now an established activity of most centres, and is included as accepted reference material in guidebooks on educational development, for example, Kahn and Baume's (2003) publication: *A Guide to Staff and Educational Development*.

More recently, a group of educational developers focused their efforts on "describing the demographics and practices of Canadian post-secondary (university and college) educational development centres, with the overall intention of gathering and compiling sharable information" (Simmons et al., 2008, p. 1). Through cross-country consultation with the educational development community and a survey of centre

directors and development staff between the years of 2008 and 2009, a database of centre practices, which is available from the EDC website (www.edcaucus.com), was compiled. Of the centre directors who replied, 21 completed the survey in full and were included in the database. An analysis of the data set revealed that the scope of individual and centre practices, as noted above, has solidified, with an ever increasing number of centres playing a role in supporting and contributing to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) through (1) the provision of grants and awards (e.g., for travel to conferences, projects); (2) collaborative SoTL initiatives with professors, departments, and other developers; (3) advising on classroom research; and (4) presenting and publishing in scholarly forums. This scholarly focus is consistent with an analysis of Canadian teaching centre websites documenting SoTL activities (Woodhouse & Force, 2010), the positioning of SoTL as one of STLHE's strategic goals (Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education [STLHE], 2011a), and the Society's recent introduction of the *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.

The scope of development practices implemented by teaching and learning centres, likewise, is broader than ever before. Not only do instructional units and its practitioners serve academic staff and students, but also administrators, departments, the organization as a whole, and the educational development sector. The breadth and diversity of development practices as well as the delivery structures and programs in which development practices are embedded reflect the ever increasing demands placed on them by educational stakeholders (e.g., government and society) and their centre and institutional contexts.

The Roots of Educational Development in Canada

As previously noted, educational development in Canada took root during the late 1960s and early 1970s following a similar yet unique path taken by other countries such as Britain, Australia, and the United States (Shore, 1974; Wilcox, 1997a). It took hold "at a particular period in time, in response to certain conditions specific [to] university settings…[and was] promoted by individuals with particular backgrounds, skills and interests" (Wilcox, 1997a, p. 1). Those times, locations, persons, and conditions helped shape educational development in Canada (Wilcox, 1997a) as it endeavoured "to find a place, a rationale, [and] a secure anchoring point for the prescriptions and practices…[it] produces" (Webb, 1996a, p. 7).

Before educational development was formalized in Canada, innovative individuals championed its cause. A 1973 poll, the first of its kind in Canada, estimated that more than 270 offices and individuals at Canadian colleges, universities, and agencies were offering pedagogical services of some kind (Shore & Donald, 1974). It was not until the opening of Canada's first teaching unit in 1968 at McGill University, the Centre for Learning and Development (Survey of Provision for Academic Development Staff, 1980), that Canada symbolically entered the educational development scene. Others followed their lead such that by 1974 there were units and committees dedicated to instructional improvement at more than 13 universities and 65 colleges across Canada (Shore, 1974). Shore reckoned that these numbers were "undoubtedly underestimated" (1974, p. 46), but at least began to paint an early picture of educational development across the country. Quebec institutions were initially more active in establishing pedagogical support units and services, perhaps because of their early formation of an instructional

development community called the Comité interuniversitaire des Services de pédagogie, otherwise, centre openings initially were irregular at best (Shore, 1974). West of Ontario innovative individuals supported instructional development efforts with some units established in the late 1970s, while east of Quebec the Atlantic Institute of Education provided instructional development services to regional colleges and universities as part of its extended mandate (Shore, 1974). Today, the Faculty Development Committee (which first met in 1989) of the Association of Atlantic Universities (AAU) continues this role, positioning itself as follows.

> The Committee facilitates teaching enhancement at AAU member institutions through promoting regional workshops, seminars and symposia on faculty development themes, and serving as a clearinghouse for faculty development information. The Committee established, and now serves as the selection committee for the AAU's annual awards for excellence in teaching and instructional development. (Association of Atlantic Universities [AAC], 2011)

Shore (1974) described the growth of pedagogical services in Canada as irregular at best. Ontario as a whole was slower than Quebec in taking formal measures to support teaching by establishing units and an educational development community, but made advances in the late 1970s with the establishment of the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development or OUPID (Elrick, 1990; Shore, 1974; Wilcox, 1997a). The origins of the program can be attributed to Bernard Trotter, who in 1970 submitted a report – *Television and Technology in University Teaching* – to the Committee on University Affairs (CUA) and the Council of Ontario Universities or COU[1] (Elrick, 1990; Main, Berland, &

[1] The Council of Ontario Universities or COU works closely with various levels of government to address a wide range of issues affecting the provincial higher educational landscape. It is governed by a council

Morand, 1975; Wilcox, 1997a). In his report, Trotter recommended "a fundamental review of the universities' instructional processes and recommended establishing a Centre where faculty from the 16 institutions could learn to develop teaching" (Elrick, 1990, p. 65). After two years of negotiations, a program approach was agreed to by the COU and the CUA, leading to the creation of a provincially-funded program for Ontario institutions that would "assist faculty members in Ontario universities and the universities themselves in improving [by systematic means] the effectiveness and efficiency of their instructional processes" (Main et al., 1975, p. 8).

In 1973, OUPID opened its doors with the initiation of its grant program (Elrick, 1990). The provision of grants was seen as the mainstay for achieving program aims, while the *OUPID Newsletter* functioned to connect and update the educational development community about OUPID initiatives (Main et al., 1975). Examples of projects and activities funded by OUPID, included: (1) research initiatives, study leaves, and conference attendance to develop expertise in instructional development; (2) development of instructional materials; and (3) train-the-trainer type workshops (Elrick, 1990; Wilcox, 1997a). OUPID operated for many years before government funding came to an end and the program ceased to exist beyond 1980. In their independent review of OUPID, Main and his associates (1975) reminded the educational development community that "the programme from the very beginning was not seen as an everlasting one. It was to exist partly to stimulate university activity and partly to focus the attention of…faculty [and universities]…on the improvement of university teaching" (p. 10). Elrick's (1990) assessment of OUPID suggests its impact on participating individuals may

---

comprised of the heads (i.e., president or principal) and an academic colleague of each of its 20 member institutions and one associate member institution (Council of Ontario Universities [COU], 2011).

have been significant, but argued that its impact on developing teaching overall was limited. She cited several reasons, including: a poorly articulated plan, limited funds, and a mismatch between OUPID methods and faculty conceptions of good teaching. Despite its shortcomings, the legacy of OUPID was substantial.

OUPID served to legitimize and value educational development, in other words, something worthy of spending time and money towards its advancement (Wilcox, 1997a). Indeed, after its demise, many faculty members and educational developers continued to meet. Those individuals whose university had a permanent instructional unit took it in turn to host an annual meeting at which to network and share best practices (Wilcox, 1997a). The first was held in 1981 at the University of Guelph; successive meetings took place annually at Lakehead University, the University of Windsor, and the University of Western Ontario (Knapper, 1985). This hub of activity laid the foundation for the establishment of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Desiring something more formal with a national focus and a more inclusive membership, steps were taken by this early development community to found the Society. The annual meeting of the developers provided a mechanism to establish its organization. In keeping with this mandate, they rebranded their next annual meeting in 1985 as the fifth annual conference of the STLHE (Knapper, 1985). To fund the Society, a small registration fee was charged for attending the conference, which in 1985, attracted over 70 faculty participants (Wilcox, 1997a). With the money and interest generated by the conference, STLHE solidified itself as a national organization, growing steadily over time both in membership and influence across Canada.

Today, STLHE has over a thousand members, representing a cross-section of constituents from higher education: faculty, administrators, educational developers, students, educational technologists, and instructional designers (STLHE, 2011b). STLHE has further refined its vision and strategy, identifying 10 goals to guide its direction, seven of which are listed below:

- to support and advance teaching and learning in higher education,
- to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and networking opportunities,
- to provide opportunities for professional development,
- to facilitate and disseminate research on teaching and learning,
- to recognize and reward contributions to teaching excellence, educational leadership, innovation, service and mentorship in higher education,
- to collaborate with like-minded teacher and student groups and organizations in Canada and abroad, [and]
- to shape, influence and lead policy decisions that enhance teaching and learning in higher education at local, national and international levels. (STLHE, 2011a)

With these strategic goals in mind, in 2010, STLHE initiated a new online publication: the *Canadian Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* (CJSoTL), adding to its growing collection of publications, including: the *Green Guides* series and the *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching* or CELT series.

Now in its 26th year, the annual conference of the STLHE, held at different institutions across the country (i.e., moving east, central, west, central, east), has and continues to forge a national teaching and learning community. From its early days, the Society's success was such that it attracted the attention of 3M Canada's president, a

president who at the time desired to do something to value and recognize university teaching (Wilcox, 1997a). What resulted from this early interest was the founding of the 3M Teaching Fellowship program, a national program that recognizes excellence in teaching and educational leadership, and has since honoured more than 250 university professors across Canada (STLHE, 2011c). Like OUPID and STLHE, the 3M Teaching Fellowship program served "to legitimize teaching and educational development work, and to raise the profile of STLHE" (Wilcox, 1997a, p. 19). In the wake of centre closures and staffing reductions in the late 1970s and early 1980s, a period of institutional restructuring (Jones, 1997), the establishment of STLHE was most timely in building a pan-Canadian community of faculty and development practitioners committed to the educational enterprise of quality teaching and learning. Since the inception of the 3M Fellowship program, STLHE has developed other awards and forged strategic partnerships, advocating for teaching and learning nationally and internationally.

A sampling of other national organizations and special interest groups to enter the higher education scene and make valuable contributions toward the study and legitimization of higher education, the field of educational development, and teaching and learning in general, include: (1) the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), (2) the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), (3) the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education (CSSHE), and (4) the EDC. A number of regional groups have likewise evolved and entered the higher education domain, influencing and promoting, for example, the scholarship of teaching and learning and hence educational development. The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) is one such example that reflects my provincial domain. The contributions and impact of these

national and regional groups are outlined below.

CAUT is Canada's national association of university faculty associations. Founded in 1951, it represents more than 65,000 teachers, librarians, researchers, and other academic professionals (Canadian Association of University Teachers [CAUT], 2011), and plays an "important role in terms of collecting and disseminating information on Canadian faculty…[and monitoring] federal government activities and lobb[ying] for changes related to the interests of its members" (Jones, 1997, p. 193). CAUT provides a national newspaper to its membership, the *CAUT Bulletin*, offers a range of services (e.g., legal, training and education), and grants a number of awards and scholarships. It also provides "information on Association activities, federal and provincial government policy, research activities, and provides a forum for debate on higher education issues" (Jones, 1997, p. 193). In terms of teaching and learning, CAUT made an early and valued contribution to the international educational development scene with its publication of *The CAUT Guide to the Teaching Dossier: Its Preparation and Use* (Shore et al., 1986). Also referred to as the teaching portfolio, the teaching dossier is a recognized pedagogical tool by faculty and educational developers alike. Dossiers have been institutionalized by universities across North America in association with the tenure and promotion process, and like my own institution, Wilfrid Laurier University, written into the collective agreements of its full- and part-time faculty members and librarians. Many books and articles have been published on teaching dossiers since the CAUT guide was first published in 1981. Peter Seldin's work in this area is well known and recognized across the globe (see Seldin, 1995, 2002, 2004). His latest publication in collaboration with Elizabeth Miller extends the concept of the teaching dossier to include all three

facets of academic life (i.e., teaching, research, service) in an integrated whole: *The Academic Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Documenting Teaching, Research, and Service* (Seldin & Miller, 2009).

The AUCC was established in 1911, initially under a different name (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada [AUCC], 2011), and has as its mandate "to facilitate the development of public policy on higher education and to encourage cooperation among universities and governments, industry, communities, and institutions in other countries" (AUCC, 2011). A national organization, the AUCC regularly organizes "meetings of the chief executive officers of its member institutions, lobbies federal government agencies and monitors federal policies, and is actively involved in coordinating and promoting international and collaboration activities" (Jones, 1997, p. 192). It also publishes many resources and publications (e.g., directories, magazines, brochures, reports, fact sheets) for targeted client groups: students, researchers, the media, guidance counselors, businesses, and faculty (AUCC, 2011). And, like CAUT, it provides a key publication for its membership called *University Affairs*, disseminating "news, commentary, in-depth articles on a wide range of topics, and career advice for academics" (AUCC, 2011). The AUCC is also actively engaged in higher education communications, research, and information-sharing. In 1991, the AUCC commissioned the "Smith Report" or the *Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education* (Smith, 1991). This report is most familiar to early Canadian educational developers and to the higher education scene in general. One of its key recommendations called for higher education institutions to provide significant base funding in support of faculty development activities, educational development units, and pedagogical

innovations (Smith, 1991). Greater attention in support of higher education research also factored prominently in the report (Jones, 1997). It is noteworthy that *Maclean's* magazine published its first comparative ranking of Canadian universities in the same month as the Smith Report, both of which served to focus considerable public and institutional attention on teaching and learning, providing yet another means to validate and advance the work of educational developers.

The CSSHE was founded in 1970 with a mandate "to promote scholarship related to postsecondary education through publications and scholarly conferences" (Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education [CSSHE], 2011). Its establishment helped legitimize Canadian higher education at a time when it was newly emerging as a scholarly field of study (Jones, 1997). The Society's mandate is met in part with its publication – the *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* – which between 1971 and 1994 published 37 articles specifically related to teaching and learning (Wilcox, 1997a). Many of these publications were prepared by educational developers and educational researchers committed to the study of teaching and learning and educational development, including a selection of authors already mentioned in this chapter (see Donald, 1986; Elrick, 1990; Konrad, 1983). Today, there are many more avenues for educational scholars and developers to publish their scholarly findings. A more recent journal to enter the public domain, publishing its first issue in 2009, is the *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*. Today, the *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* continues to be a well-respected journal, providing a peer-reviewed forum to share the products of scholarship by the higher education community, including educational developers.

With calls for educational reform; criticisms by parents, government, and educational associations; and reports questioning the quality of higher education (see Cunsolo, Elrick, Middleton, & Roy, 1996; Donald, 1986; Smith, 1991; Tiberius, 1995; Wilcox, 1998; Wright & O'Neil, 1995), there has been an explosion of interest in and the study of teaching, learning, and educational technology as universities have striven to respond to calls for action. Since 1991, the number of publications on college and university instruction, including best practices, has risen steadily, doubling in 1996 alone (Kezar, 1999). As a result, the last 15 years have witnessed the implementation of many new innovative teaching approaches (e.g., inquiry/problem-based learning), not to mention a change in the way we talk about student learning and classroom instruction (Hansen & Stephens, 2000). For example, it is not uncommon to hear terms such as *learning communities*, *learner-centredness*, *knowledge construction*, and *lifelong learning* – terms rooted in the learning paradigm (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Many of the above mentioned innovations have and continue to be spearheaded or championed by educational developers through their own contributions to or drawings from the educational literature (in support of their individual learning and professional practice) or in collaboration with faculty and academic departments.

The quality concerns noted above came to a head in the 1990s. We saw early evidence of these concerns by way of comparative rankings of post-secondary institutions in response to demands by educational consumers (i.e., parents and students), the implementation of formally (e.g., Alberta and Ontario) and informally adopted key performance indicators, and, at the end of the decade, a new approach focused not on measures of educational inputs and outputs, but on the assessment of the student learning

experience (Finnie & Usher, 2005). The latter took the form of the National Survey of Student Engagement or NSSE, which was piloted for the first time in 2000 (Finnie & Usher, 2005). Each of the developments noted above served to focus institutional attention on teaching and learning, and hence educational development.

These developments combined, along with the growing sophistication of educational technology, helped to situate the importance of educational development initiatives and reinvestment in educational development as a whole. As noted previously, the Smith Report backed this direction with its recommendation that "faculty development activities should receive a fixed, substantial portion of the university budget, with money made available to expand instructional development offices (or create them where they do not exist) and to fund pedagogical innovations" (Smith, 1991, p. 65). The primacy of teaching and learning units was further reinforced by Wright and O'Neil's (1995) international survey of educational developers from various ICED member nations and a Canadian survey of university educators and administrators conducted by the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education (CICUE), Janet Donald, and Alenoush Saroyan (1991). From a list of 36 items, those surveyed by Wright and O'Neil (1995) ranked 'a centre to promote effective instruction' third overall (and in Canada) in its potential to improve the quality of instruction at university campuses. Recognition of teaching in the tenure and promotion process and reinforcement by administrative deans and chairs of the importance of teaching responsibilities ranked first and second respectively. On a similar note, CICUE, Donald and Saroyan identified teaching centres as being key to institutional efforts to assess and support quality teaching.

Today, educational developers and development units play a central role in supporting and advancing teaching, learning, and policy development as well as educational development

practice and scholarship at the individual, departmental, institutional, and sector level. Educational development practitioners are also increasingly engaged in leadership roles within their institutions as change agents, advocates, and organizational developers (Schroeder, 2011; Taylor, 2005). Indeed, the field and its community of practitioners, now more than ever before, are proactive in responding to and advancing issues and trends affecting higher education (e.g., in Ontario, the implementation of the undergraduate degree level expectations[2]). Most important, Canadian educational developers now have a national organization and voice to situate, recognize, and advance the field. As noted previously, the Educational Developers Caucus was established in June 2003 and solidified in June 2006 with the passing of its by-laws (Mighty, 2006). The Caucus bylaws define educational development as a community of practice working within the aims and structure of the STLHE with a mandate that is guided by the following aims:

> 3.2.1 to strengthen the position of STLHE as the professional/academic organization of choice for educational developers, and particularly for those practicing in Canada;
> 3.2.2 to pursue the aims of STLHE with particular attention to their application in educational development contexts;
> 3.2.3 to provide leadership in the professionalization of the educational development role;
> 3.2.4 to foster the advancement and evolution of educational development as a field of practice and scholarship;
> 3.2.5 to create a national forum where emerging and problematic educational development issues can be candidly discussed;

[2] Undergraduate degree level expectations "elaborate the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills that have been widely, yet implicitly, understood" (Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents, 2005). In other words, they articulate the expectations appropriate for a given degree in terms of both discipline specific and generic knowledge and skills. These expectations were approved by the Council of Ontario Universities in December 2005 and are now widely adopted by Ontario universities as part of their quality assurance framework(s). A like set of degree level expectations exist for graduate programs.

> 3.2.6 to create a collegial network within which information, strategies, and resources can be shared;
> 3.2.7 to facilitate communication among educational developers who are members of STLHE;
> 3.2.8 to provide professional development opportunities for experienced, new and potential educational developers; and
> 3.2.9 to advocate, through STLHE, for educational development issues at a national level. (EDC, 2006, pp. 1-2)

Through individual and collective effort, new members both within and outside college and university settings are joining the educational development community. This is evidenced by the number of new and seasoned (or 'seasoning' - a term used by Becker & Strauss [1956] to refer to "the acquiring of requisite knowledge and skills" p. 254) developers attending the EDC's annual conference; the number of members participating in the EDC listserv, now over 350 strong; the number of regional groups across Canada supporting local communities of practice of which there are no less than six (EDC, 2011a); and the number of new centres opening across the country. This growth is consistent with the findings of Sorcinelli and her colleagues' (2006) survey of Canadian and American developers, confirming that on average 56 percent of developers with positions from coordinator to director are new to the field having five or fewer years of work experience.

More recent to the higher education scene is the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO). Established through the HEQCO Act of 2005, the Council is an independent body of the government of Ontario (Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario [HEQCO], 2011), which has as its mandate to:

> conduct independent research, evaluate the postsecondary education system and provide policy recommendations to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities with a view to enhancing the quality, access and accountability of higher education in Ontario. (HEQCO, 2009)

With this mandate in mind, over the last five years, HEQCO has forged partnerships and collaborations with educational institutions and organizations, college and university academics and administrators, and the educational development community. To this end, the Canadian educational development sector as well as individual educational developers have benefitted considerably. Consistently they are recognized and called upon to share their knowledge and expertise, to conduct research independent of and collaboratively with HEQCO (through participation in their grant program and calls for study participants), and to network and connect in the joint enterprise of supporting and advancing teaching and learning and a quality education system. Evidence to the latter was most recently demonstrated by the attendance of Richard Wiggers, HEQCO's Research Director, at the annual conference of the Educational Developers Caucus in February 2011 at Algoma University, Sault Ste. Marie. His participation is symbolic of the importance and position of educational development in the Ontario and Canadian higher education scene and shows how far the field has come since its inception almost 50 years ago. These are exciting times for educational developers as they individually and collectively strive to build capacity and presence within the Canadian higher education landscape!

Becoming an Educational Developer: What Do We Know?

As noted above, the educational development community is comprised of a richly diverse group of educational developers (Weimer, 1990). This diversity can be attributed to many factors, including the current and potential routes into the field (Gosling,

McDonald, & Stockley, 2007; Hicks, 1997; Stefani, 1999; Wilcox, 1997a) and the absence of formal career structures (McAlpine, 2006; Moses, 1987) to articulate requisite credentials and to induct and socialize educational development practitioners. As Wilcox (1998) found in her survey of Ontario educational developers, most lacked an awareness of the field until they entered into the higher education arena, suggesting limited visibility or cachet outside post-secondary settings.

Upon entry to the field, the diversity of individual practitioners is further fragmented (Land, 2004), hence the lack of a common position profile. Conditions contributing to this circumstance include but are not limited to: centre staffing and delivery structures (Wright, 2002), position requirements (Dawson, Britnell, & Hitchcock, 2010; Wright & Miller, 2000), organizational priorities and individual faculty needs (Sorcinelli et al., 2006), and program mandates. Developers themselves have different educational (Chism, 2008; Hicks, 1997; Knapper, 1998) and disciplinary (Fraser, 1999; Chism, 2008) backgrounds; skill and knowledge bases (Kahn & Baume, 2003; Stefani, 2003); institutional values; professional identities, expertise, and discourses (Land, 2004); and career motivations (Isaacs, 1997).

The impact of this diversity both individually and contextually is manifested in a multiplicity of ways including, for example, individual approaches to development practice. In studying educational developers in the United Kingdom, Land (2001, 2003, 2004) identified 12 different orientations to practice. These orientations, he claims, represent “analytical categories” that reflect the “attitudes, knowledge, aims, [and] action tendencies of educational developers in relation to the contexts and challenges of their practice” (2004, p. 13). For new developers then, especially those with limited knowledge

of the field, discovering their own orientations to practice as well as navigating their role, their institution, and the community of educational development overall is an early and ongoing challenge as they engage the profession.

Beyond our professional approach to development work, there is variation also in when developers transition to educational development. Graf, Albright, and Wheeler (1992), for example, identified three different groups of developers coming into the field: (1) graduate students fulfilling assistantships, (2) experienced faculty members serving as development specialists, and (3) professional staff hired specifically for their expertise. Depending on their career path, these individuals may enter the field by choice or by chance (Isaacs, 1997). Reflecting centre and staff structures, they might also work in full-time, part-time, or temporary arrangements and have different skills, knowledge, abilities, and competencies coming into their positions. In comprehending this variety, Wright and Miller's (2000) analysis of director and developer level job postings is helpful, suggesting that the trend in staff arrangements is generally moving toward full-time appointments with staff who are increasingly new to their roles (Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

As Isaacs (1997) suggests, those who from the start make educational development their career of choice may initially enter into junior appointments and work their way up, learning their profession on-the-job.This was certainly my case as outlined in Chapter one. Wilcox (1998) highlights another option, consistent with one of Graf and his colleagues' (1992) categories mentioned above, that is, those who enter the field because of their training and expertise in an area valued by the profession (e.g., instructional design, educational technology, curriculum development, program evaluation). Then, too, there are those individuals who choose educational development

later in their careers, migrating into the field after first having established themselves elsewhere, for example, as successful teachers (Isaacs, 1997). Sell and Chism's (1991) work suggests that the above mentioned structures and entry points each have benefits to the field. Full-time professionals bring stability, continuity, and commitment to the profession; faculty, who work part-time or in temporary full-time arrangements, because of their status and respect, can often engage harder-to-reach populations; while graduate students can be mentored into the field and trained on-the-job as future developers at a reasonable cost to the centre.

A concern that comes with the diversity of the field and its practitioners is the absence of common educational credentials and a foundational understanding of the field (i.e., its models, approaches, scope of practice, philosophical underpinnings). No doubt, regardless of their entry point or professional status, individual developers potentially bring a wealth of practical knowledge about teaching and learning to their positions. What they may lack, however, is a basic theoretical background to make full use of that practical knowledge (Isaacs, 1997). Toward this end, various development organizations around the world have stepped up to fill this gap, providing foundational and ongoing learning opportunities to new and seasoned developers. The POD Network in the United States, for example, offers a week-long institute for new faculty developers as well as pre-conference workshops targeted at newcomers attending their annual conference. STLHE and the EDC in Canada likewise do the same. Most recently, the EDC initiated two separate institutes for new and seasoned developers at their 2011 annual conference (EDC, 2011b).

Aside from organization-based professional learning, we know that many developers take it upon themselves to engage in self-directed learning, drawing upon a variety of sources and opportunities to prepare them for and aid them in their developer roles. Documented examples include: (1) conference and association meeting attendance; (2) reading the educational (or other) literature; (3) networking and learning from peer mentors; (4) apprenticeships; (5) short courses and formal course work, and (6) previous work and graduate student experiences (Chism, 2008; Sorcinelli et al., 2006). Chapter five outlines various activities and pursuits study participants likewise engaged in.

Such individual and organizational efforts to prepare practitioners for the profession and to create a foundation on which to build their knowledge and expertise move us ever closer toward building a unified professional development scheme that not only clarifies the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by developers (see Chism, 2008), but also the level at which these competencies need to be achieved (see Dawson, Britnell, & Hitchcock, 2010). As the field continues to evolve, thought and dialogue as to how and what the best combination of formalized study and a continuing professional development strategy (recognizing the diversity of its members) should look like is needed.

Summary

This chapter sought to provide a basis on which to appreciate the history of educational development as we know it as well as a context for understanding the shaping structures and diversity of practitioners that comprise the Canadian educational development scene. What is still unclear and what this study specifically aims to address is how various individuals come to be educational developers. What draws them to the

field? What is significant about their journeys that can help us understand their pathways as well as attract and sustain future developers? How do practitioners conceive of educational development? And, in the absence of formalized career structures, how and when do such practitioners begin to think of themselves as educational developers? Chapter three details how I propose to empirically address these questions from my insider perspective as an educational developer informed by the theoretical frameworks of career exploration and communities of practice. These frameworks build upon the metaphor of journey that comes with mapping how the various individuals in this study came to be educational developers.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

While the field of educational development has evolved and situated itself more securely in the higher education landscape, and research on its study and practice continues to grow, little is understood about practitioners themselves, particularly the journey they undertake to become educational developers and the person-specific (i.e., individual decisions and motivations) and context-specific circumstances (i.e., situational factors, serendipitous incidents, and institutional/educational conditions) which shape their pathways to the professions. I have emphasized that in the absence of any formal career structures (such as common education credentials, an accrediting body, professional development requirements) to attract potential developers, facilitate entry to the field, and advance within one's career, understanding how individuals come to be educational developers and identify with the field is key. By studying a subset of the developer community, this ethics approved research study aimed to bridge the gap in the knowledge and understanding of educational development practitioners who comprise the Canadian university educational development scene. The following sections of this chapter outline the study's purpose, its guiding study frameworks, the associated research design, the insider perspective I brought to the study as a member of the educational development community under study, and the analysis process I undertook to make sense of the data and draw conclusions from my research findings.

Purpose

As noted above, this study was initiated to inform my personal, professional, and sector level understanding of educational development and its practitioners by examining how they: (1) navigate entry (or their pathway) into the field, (2) develop and articulate their understanding of educational development and their developer role, and (3) come to associate with educational development as a profession. The overarching research question guiding this study's design was: *How do individuals come to be educational developers?* Four supporting sub-questions evolved from this larger question:

1. What processes and practices do educational developers undertake to navigate entry into the field of educational development?
2. What external incidents or situational factors shape the pathways of developers into the field of educational development?
3. How do educational developers conceive of educational development?
4. At what point in their journey do they begin to think of themselves as educational developers?

Research Design

To examine these questions in greater depth, I chose to undertake a qualitative study that was exploratory in focus. I felt this was important given both the limited study of individual practitioners and the availability of documented research in the literature about educational developer career pathways (as indicated in Chapter two). I also wanted to be constructive in reporting what I learned about their journeys to ensure a richness of data. Indeed, it was the very conversations I had with colleagues about their journeys throughout my own educational development career that I found so interesting and wanted, therefore, to capture in a meaningful and scholarly way. Patton (2002) and

Krathwohl (1998) position such exploratory qualitative studies as being central to labeling, defining, and naming phenomena by means of probing how individuals come to perceive and interpret their experiences, that is, their lived experience. Indeed, this naming process was vital to piecing together participant stories and the various incidents, conditions, people, and motivations toward understanding, making sense of, and appreciating their journeys.

During the study, I very much came to see the data collection and analysis stages as an integrated, sense-making process – a journey unto itself. I was, as I noted in Chapter one, what Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) call an interviewer-traveller. From this perspective, I journeyed amongst my educational development peers, asking questions and inquiring of their stories toward becoming educational developers (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). As a result, I not only gained new knowledge about developer pathways, but as Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) suggested could happen, I underwent a "process of reflection" that led to "new ways of self-understanding" (p. 49). As a member of the community under study, this outcome was personally and professionally rewarding, serving to validate further my use of the metaphor of journey[1] in approaching this study and in relating the experiences of the participants.

To further situate and inform the design of this study, my own understandings, and the significance of the projects findings, I drew upon two sets of literature. Using the metaphor of journey to think about the process of becoming and identifying as a developer, I turned to the career development literature, in particular, the notions of "serendipity" and "chance." Betsworth and Hansen (1996, p. 93) define serendipity as

[1] Metaphor of Journey - "a process of understanding one kind of thing by means of another, thereby highlighting possible new aspects of a kind" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 49).

"events that were not planned or predictable, but that had a significant influence on an individual's career." Comparatively, Cabral and Salomone (1990, p. 6) describe chance occurrences as "the particular people who influence an individual, as well as the timing and context within which life events occur." As the above definitions suggest and as Williams and her colleagues (1998) further supported, "the interaction between such events and the person's 'readiness' to incorporate chance events into his or her career decisions" (p. 379) cannot be overlooked. Indeed, in reporting my findings, I highlighted those contexts, conditions, and people that shaped the participants' journeys and their responses to them, including internally motivated actions or behaviours toward achieving their developer career goals. In Chapter four, an opening section further situates the career development literature, providing a foundation on which to report and analyse the participants' individual journeys toward becoming educational developers.

Likewise, when discussing when and how educational developers began to associate with their role and the field of practice at large, I drew from the community of practice literature predicated on the work of Etienne Wenger (1998) and Jean Lave (1991, with Wenger), who collectively coined the term "community of practice" (though each gives credit to the other). According to Wenger and his colleagues (2002), communities of practice represent "groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (p. 4). In this sense, "the community acts as a living curriculum for the apprentice" (Wenger, 2006) as its members navigate their way in whatever it is they are learning collectively. In this research study, the community was the Canadian university educational development sector (local, regional, national), the

apprentice was the individual educational developer, and the curriculum under study was the how and what of educational development. Chapter seven builds on Wenger's concept of community of practice, providing a framework on which to report and analyse study findings regarding the participants' commitment to and identification with the field and their developer role.

Briefly, communities of practice are comprised of three distinct elements: the domain, the community, and the practice. The domain element "creates common ground and a sense of common identity" (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, p. 27). Membership "implies a commitment to the domain, and therefore a shared competence that distinguishes members from other people" (Wenger, 2006). The community "creates the social fabric of learning" (Wenger et al., 2002, p. 28). Within the community "members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. They build relationships that enable them to learn from each other" (Wenger, 2006). As members of such communities, they are practitioners with "a shared repertoire of resources: experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing recurring problems – in short a shared practice" (Wenger, 2006). These elements together contribute to a sense of developer identity and shared values, solidifying their commitment to the field.

In the following sections, I outline and describe my data sources, my participant pool and associated selection strategies, and the recruitment process. I further provide a participant profile, detail the study's interview design and implementation procedures, and discuss the interview guide and protocols. Next, I recognize my insider status as a member of the population under study, including its pros and cons. Lastly, I document the steps involved in the analysis process. In so doing, I acknowledge the measures taken to

ensure the "trustworthiness" of my findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These measures align with many of the strategies associated with Guba's (1981) four criteria of trustworthiness: (1) credibility (e.g., using recognized research methods, triangulation, reflective commentary), (2) transferability (e.g., offering background information to set the study context), (3) dependability (e.g., providing a detailed description of one's methods for the purpose of replication), and (4) confirmability (e.g., recognizing study shortcomings).

Data sources. To address the study's main research question, I selected three ways to collect data. In light of the rich conversations I previously enjoyed with my colleagues, I determined that semi-structured one-on-one interviews would be the best and primary source of data to connect with and learn from educational development practitioners. By access I mean both the mode and ease of communication (i.e., face-to-face or telephone) as well as the authenticity and sharing of their lived experience – their journey. Supplementing the interviews, I asked each participant to share a copy of their curriculum vitae. These documents were helpful in both confirming and providing details mentioned in brief or not at all during the interview (e.g., positions, titles, education), and in constructing a timeline by which to situate and piece together the happenings of each developer's journey. This process was particularly helpful for getting a sense of those participants whose pathways to the profession were less direct and more complex (i.e., involving multiple jobs, several career roadblocks, and/or a long career history). Finally, I prepared field notes following each interview to capture observations, insights, and follow-up questions. The following subsections outline and describe how the data were collected and the study unfolded.

Sample selection. A purposive sample (Patton, 2002) of educational developers of varied ages, years of experience, sex, geographic location, and professional status was sought for this study. The participant pool was limited to developers working either in discipline-based teaching and learning units or campus-wide teaching and learning centres within Canadian universities. A university versus a sector-wide higher education institutional context was selected given my professional and educational familiarity with this setting, my long-standing membership (more than 10 years) in the educational development community, and the historical prominence of Canadian educational development in universities.

For the purposes of this study, an educational developer was defined as anyone (e.g., administrator, faculty member, graduate student, professional staff member), who at the time of their interview, was (1) formally connected (e.g., employed, contracted) with a centre and (2) actively engaged in development activities, which could be at different levels (i.e., individual, departmental, institutional, sector), with a range of audiences (e.g., graduate students, professors, administrators, committees), in a variety of capacities (e.g., consultant, program designer, facilitator, change agent), and for varied purposes (e.g., curriculum design, teaching support, policy development, organizational change). This definition is purposefully broad, reflecting the many variations in position structures, job responsibilities, staffing arrangements, and centre and institutional contexts in which developers of today are embedded. Refer to Chapter eight for a brief discussion on insiders and outsiders of the educational development sector.

Recruitment. Patton (2002) emphasizes the importance of selecting "information-rich" cases for "in-depth" study of the issues at hand. As such, a master list

of potential participants was assembled from three strategic sources: (1) the *Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) Networking Guide 2006-2007*, (2) the Educational Development Offices (EDO) Profiler website (www.tss.uoguelph.ca/edop)[2], and (3) the staffing pages of Canadian university teaching and learning centre (campus-wide or discipline-specific) websites. The latter were identified via the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada's (AUCC) organizational website (http://www.aucc.ca/can_uni/our_universities/index_e.html). These sources were selected to ensure a comprehensive yet diverse list of educational developers from which to select a sample of participants (Patton, 2002).

Individually, each recruitment source was selected for specific reasons. The STLHE is a national organization whose membership is comprised of educators, technologist, students, and administrators committed to enhancing and advancing teaching and learning within and across the country. Their organizational networking guide (now available online from a password-protected site) not only includes STLHE members, but also members of its constituent groups of which the EDC is one such group (constituted in 2006). More important, the STLHE membership registration form, from which the networking guide is derived, asks individuals to self-select their primary occupation from a predetermined list of occupations, including that of educational developer.

The EDO Profiler website was selected at the time because it not only reflected developers who were EDC members in good standing with STLHE, but also those individuals who self-selected to add themselves to the password-protected site. Finally,

[2] The Educational Development Offices Profiler website is now defunct. In its place, we now have the Educational Developers Caucus website (www.edcaucus.com).

the staff pages of centre websites were chosen as they served to identify active developers who were formally associated with educational development units. To my benefit, the latter source included developer position titles, contact information, and, in some cases, biographical and work history background information. Other names were added to the list as recommended by the interview participants themselves. Together, these recruitment strategies helped ensure a cross-section of Canadian developers with varied years and types of experience in the field.

In total, more than 100 individuals were identified and included on the master list of potential participants. From this list, a subset of educational developers was selected based on their sex, geographic location (eastern, central, and western Canada), centre status (campus-wide/discipline-specific), years of experience in the field, and individual work histories. To aid in categorizing their years of experience working in the profession, I turned to the survey work of Mary Deane Sorcinelli and her colleagues (2006) to distinguish between new (five years or less), mid-career (6-10 years of experience), and seasoned educational developers (more than 10 years of experience). Aiming for a heterogeneous sample (not a representative one) and based on what I could find out about potential participants (e.g., from searching staff pages of centre websites, executive pages of teaching and development organizations, membership pages of educational organizations, and my first-hand knowledge), the original list was distilled down to 23 candidates.

Individual participants were contacted by way of a formal letter of invitation, requesting their participation in the study. Appendix A contains a copy of the invitation letter. The letter was printed on institutional letterhead from the Ontario Institute for

Studies in Education and mailed to each interviewee's institutional address. Those individuals who contacted me by telephone or by email as directed in their letter of invitation or who replied positively to a follow-up communication (if no reply was received within seven days of mailing) were sent two copies of the consent form (see Appendix B) and a copy of the proposed interview topics to review in advance of us meeting (see interview guide in Appendix C for a list of topics and proposed questions). A mutually agreed upon meeting date, time, and location (if face-to-face) for each interview was arranged at the time of contact. In all but two cases, interviews took place by telephone between July and October 2007; the remaining two took place at an event for new faculty developers just prior to this period. Once a date and time was confirmed, participants were asked to return a signed copy of the consent form in advance of their interview. They were also reminded to forward a copy of their curriculum vitae, which was requested in the informed consent document, provided they felt comfortable sharing this information. All those contacted (23 in total) agreed to participate. Due to timing and availability, however, only 18 were interviewed. All interviews were conducted in English, my language of proficiency.

Participant profile. Based upon the participants' responses to the demographic questions, their individual curriculum vitas (if provided), and the interviews as a whole, I constructed a participant profile identifying their trajectories to the field. In Chapter four, these data are presented in table form to aid the reader in navigating the stories of each participant as they are interwoven into a narrative of the next four chapters.

As noted previously, the trajectories and backgrounds of educational development practitioners, especially in the absence formalized career structures, are diverse – eclectic

even (Weimer, 1990). The group of developers who participated in this study was no different. Of the 18 educational developers engaged in development activities at 16 different Canadian university teaching and learning units, all of whom spoke English, two were based in discipline-specific units and 16 were situated in campus-wide offices. The participants ranged in age from their early thirties to their late fifties with the majority (14 of 18) dispersed almost equally among three specific age groups: 36 to 40, 41 to 45, and 51 to 55 years of age. Twelve of the 18 participants were women and all but five of the total sample was Canadian born. Geographically, they were dispersed across the country over three different regions: east (Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland), central (Ontario, Quebec), and west (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia). Of the total sample, three participants were situated in eastern Canada, nine came from central Canada, and the remaining six resided in western Canada. No one was interviewed from any of the three territories or the province of Quebec[3]. All participants had advanced degrees in a range of disciplines (e.g., sciences, arts, humanities, social sciences) with 11 of the 18 having completed a doctorate by the time of their interview and five others in various states of completion. The remaining two participants had already withdrawn from their respective doctoral programs by the time of their interview.

Experience in the field at the time of each developer's interview varied across the group. Drawing upon the categorization of experience (by years) used by Sorcinelli and

[3] On my distilled list of 23 potential participants, there were at least two Anglophone developers from Quebec who responded to my letter of invitation and agreed to participate in the study. Due to timing, availability, and other constraints, however, interviews with these two individuals did not take place. As a result, there was an absence of participants from Quebec. My lack of French language skills (speaking/reading) further complicated my ability to connect with Francophone institutions and individual developers. No conscious decision was made to exclude potential participants from any region of Canada.

her colleagues (2006), five of the participants were categorized as new or recently new (five or fewer years in the field), eight were classified as experienced (six to 10 years in the field), while the remaining five were identified as seasoned educational developers (more than 10 years in the field). In terms of career mobility, less than one third of the group (28%) had experience working in two or more centres and all but three participants held full-time appointments, the majority of which was (89%) at the professional staff versus faculty level. To preserve anonymity, position titles have been omitted from the participant profile. Likewise, pseudonyms have been assigned to each participant.

From amongst the 18 participating developers, two distinct trajectories into the field of educational development were identified: (1) those coming initially from outside higher education and (2) those already embedded in a university context. For the six participants who initially came from outside a post-secondary setting (Charlotte, Norah, Karen, Sarah, Fida, and Paul), educational development represented a second, third, and even fourth career move, albeit within an education-related stream. Of this group, all had some mixture of instructional and administrative backgrounds as well as professional, organizational, and/or curriculum development experience in a formal or non-formal educational or corporate training context. While two of the six members in this group also briefly worked in higher education before moving into educational development – Paul and Fida – they were not included in the second group of participants (i.e., those individuals who transitioned internally from within their institutions) as neither originally started their respective careers in a university setting. Paul, for example, and only after returning to graduate school later in life to complete his doctorate, moved into a post-secondary setting to continue his career. In the case of Fida, an interest in teaching and a

desire for flexible work arrangements (i.e., part-time, choice, convenience, availability) saw her engaged in educational activities in multiple settings (e.g., continuing education, private schools, colleges), which at the time of her interview happened to be in a university locale.

The remaining 12 participants (67%), as noted above, transitioned to educational development from within their academic institutions, all having started their careers in a higher education setting. Within this group, three clusters of participants were identified: three initially came from the faculty ranks (two tenure-track – Sean and Tony, one limited term - Tara), three others (Celine, Victor, Edward) made lateral moves from various professional, administrative, instructional and/or advising positions, while the remaining six entered directly from graduate school or a post-doctoral fellowship (Ellen, Lila, Kendra, Miranda, Beverly, and Dan).

The above two trajectories reflect the pathways of each participant and their eventual awareness of educational development as a career option, including the timing of this awareness and their readiness and willingness to transition to the profession. Here, Thielens' (1957) examination and classification of the pathways of law students to professional school and the profession itself offers a useful typology by which to further characterize the two trajectories and their associated sub-clusters, that being, "early deciders" and "late deciders." With the exception of the graduate students and post-doctoral fellows, who were introduced to and participated in educational development activities early in their career preparations (early deciders), the majority of the participants were late deciders, having previously worked in one or more occupations or professions before entry to the field of educational development. Chapter four provides a

narrative or picture of the various career paths of the individual participants, providing a backdrop to understand their decisions to enter the field earlier versus later in their career paths.

Interview design and process. The interviews took place over a five-month period and ranged in length between 45 to 90 minutes. To prepare for the interview, participants received an advance copy of the interview topics. This approach, I believe, helped them reflect upon their career history and more accurately recount their pathways into the profession as they responded to the questions. Even so, their stories rarely unfolded in a linear fashion or chronological order, suggesting that reflecting-on-action (Schön, 1983) was in progress during the interviews as they relived and made sense of their individual journeys.

The conversational style and the loosely structured nature of the interviews provided flexibility to probe for depth, ask additional questions, clarify responses, and order my inquiries in keeping with the natural flow of conversation – what Kahn and Cannell (1957) refer to as "conversations with a purpose" (p. 149). Indeed, it was more natural for me, especially as many of the participants were my professional colleagues, to weave planned and unplanned questions throughout the dialogue versus step them in a linear fashion as we talked. It was not uncommon, therefore, for the participating developers to skip back and forth between questions in relating their journeys or for me to revisit an earlier topic of conversation. For the most part, this approach proved advantageous in creating openings to probe other topics or clarify areas previously addressed at a surface level or not at all.

In keeping with the interview guide, each conversation began with me thanking the developer for agreeing to participate. I also asked if they had any questions about the interview process or how I intended to incorporate their data into the final data-set and write-up. Next, I confirmed their consent to audio-record the interview and to share a copy of their curriculum vitae with me if they had not already forwarded one electronically. Finally, I provided a brief overview of the study and what I hoped to gain from the experience both personally and professionally.

As an "insider" (see Acker, 2000; Banks, 1998; Evered & Louis, 1981; Griffith, 1998; Merton, 1972) of the community under study, I had little or no difficulty in establishing rapport either in person or over the telephone. Not only were the interviewees genuinely interested in the topic and the results of my findings, but in all cases except one, I knew the participants by name or association as a fellow colleague and member of the Canadian educational development community. Oftentimes, our conversations continued post-interview, fostering future contact (e.g., informally at conferences) and continued interest in the pathways topic. In some cases, the interview ended with requests for a reading list of books and articles on educational development or post-interview email exchanges.

Following each interview, individual field notes using a standard form (see Appendix D) were prepared. Sample notes included observations about how the participants responded to various questions (e.g., tone, pauses, clarification, focus), whether or not they shared any concerns about something said in confidence during the interview (as there were a few who used the interview as a cathartic experience), how I might craft an inquiry or transition better between questions, and/or what new questions

or items for discussion, resulting from the interview at hand, might I include in successive interviews. Upon completion of the field notes for each interview, a transcript was prepared from the digital recording and a copy forwarded to the participant for review and comment (if requested via their letter of consent)[4]. This process completed the interview cycle.

Interview guide and protocol. The interview guide was designed to ensure a consistent starting and end point to the interview, while allowing for flexibility in the flow and line of questioning (e.g., integration of new questions and topics, exploration of emerging tangents). A pilot interview was conducted with an educational developer colleague to test the interview guide and to practice and prepare for the interview phase of the study. Feedback from the test participant helped to refine the order of topics, the individual questions, and the potential probes, not to mention hone my interview skills. The data collected from the test participant were not included in the study.

The guiding questions and probes within each topic area were developed based upon my cull of the educational literature, feedback from my developer colleagues (not included in the sample), and the study's primary research questions and guiding theoretical frameworks. In one case, contact was made with an international educational development scholar to procure a copy of the survey questions used in two different, but related studies with Australian academic developers (see Fraser 1999, 2001). Any questions replicated or adapted for use in this study were done so with the author's permission. The development of interview questions ahead of time did not preclude those

[4] Not one of the participants who requested a copy of their interview transcripts contacted me about its contents. In one case, a participant voluntarily followed-up from their interview with an email, providing additional information on and perspective about their journey. In another case, I contacted a participant during the analysis phase to clarify a few points in question (e.g., timing of events, role and impact of a peer, nature of a relationship), thereby ensuring the trustworthiness of the data and my interpretation of it.

that emerged during the interview itself, nor, as specified above, did they dictate a specific order other than the one used to open each interview and the demographic questions used to bring each conversation to a close.

Aside from the demographic and background information requested, four topic areas with three to 10 sub-questions or probes were developed. They included: (1) conception of and participation in educational development, (2) conception of the educational developer role, (3) one's institutional context, and (4) pathways and transitioning to educational development. As directed by my research questions and the study's exploratory approach, the interview questions were crafted to identify critical incidents, assess the importance and meaning of people and events identified, determine participant knowledge and understanding of educational development, and gauge practitioner commitment to the field. These sub-questions served as probes for discovering what the participants, from their perspective, considered relevant and meaningful in their pathways to the profession, including identification with their developer role and the field of educational development as a whole.

An Insider's Perspective

As a member of the Canadian university educational development scene, I brought an insider perspective to the table as someone with "lived familiarity with the group being researched" (Griffith, 1998, p. 362). My insiderness provided access and entry to the participant community (though Ball [1990] and Griffith [1998] remind us that neither are the same, nor that entry necessarily guarantees access to the target group); an ease of rapport with the interviewees (especially on the phone) through a familiarity by name, reputation, ongoing collegial contact, or a combination of all three; and a special awareness and appreciation of the issues, perspectives, knowledge (tacit and formal), and

so on valued by the development community. James Banks (1998) would call me an "indigenous-insider," what Sandra Acker (2000) describes as "someone from the community, perceived as a legitimate member by others, and promoting the well-being of that community through the research" (p. 195).

The status of being one of the "tribe" (Becher, 1989) proved invaluable during the interview process. As Acker (2000) likewise found in her interviews with fellow faculty members, I enjoyed "a richness against which to frame the interview[s]" (p. 191). Indeed, I was often able to make connections between and to various people and events either because they were shared experiences or I knew of the individual at hand and/or was familiar with the event being referenced. Another researcher from outside the developer community may have had to ask for clarification in these instances, if they even picked up on their existence or significance in the first place. Because of my insiderness, I also knew when to probe further if I thought there was more to a situation or experience (e.g., knowledge of teaching centre history, staffing arrangements, centre structure). Likewise, I was able to appreciate the context in which most things were said and pick up on nuances that were not explicitly stated, but communicated nonetheless. If not overtly addressed during the interview, these kinds of instances were captured in my post-interview field notes for later consideration. Finally, I found the interviews insightful and reinforcing of my own journey into educational development.

As much as being an insider was a benefit, I found myself at times having to pull back from various conversations when I began to pursue an issue that had more personal versus research value. I also had to be cautious not to legitimize some experiences over others, impose my language or work history on the participant, or be leading in my

transitions between or introductions to various questions or probes. I brought this same cautionary lens forward during the analysis phase. While I had context on my side to situate and appreciate interview findings, I had to be careful not to privilege some voices over others in the perspectives and experiences selected for inclusion in the reporting of my findings, for example, the quotations chosen to illustrate or make a point (Acker & Feuerverger, 2003). Finally, I had to be mindful of providing a balanced portrayal of each participant's journey as I dissected and re-crafted their combined stories in a meaningful way. This task was not always easy or possible as some participants provided less versus more detail in response to various interview questions. In a few select cases, data were not included as their reporting, given the limited sample size, would have compromised the anonymity of the participant. Likewise, where identifying information in a select quotation was apparent, efforts to censor the data were made.

I am conscious, too, that because most of the participants knew of me by name or association in a personal or professional capacity that there may have been occasions when specific details about a situation or experience were omitted either because they were thought to be known to me or reference to specific events or people were not made due to individual forgetting or discomfort. That at least three participants used the confidentiality of the interview to share how they felt about individuals in their respective workplaces or their take on educational development in Canada as a whole suggested to me that a foundation of trust existed between us and that the accountings of their pathways to the profession were honest and open. A researcher from outside the educational development community may not have experienced the same spirit of sharing, trust, or openness.

Analysis

Not unlike my master's thesis experience (see Dayman, 1999), my analysis of the data was a drawn-out, muddy process as I constructed meaning from the participants' stories. The first step toward analysis involved the transcription of the 18 interviews from digital audio to the printed word. This was completed as close to verbatim as possible to capture not only the content of the interviews, but also the flow and tone of each conversation. The latter was further captured by including and making note of long silent pauses, facial expressions, interviewee comments, and general contextual observations (e.g., difficulty answering the question/time needed to reflect before answering) in my post-interview field notes and when I revisited the digital audio files.

Once the transcribing process was completed, I read through the transcripts multiple times, some while listening to the audio recording, making corrections and notes in the margins as I went along (e.g., preliminary codes and cross-case references). This process served to re-orient me to the data given the time passed between when I originally interviewed the participants, prepared my field notes, and transcribed the recordings, and when I returned to the data and began coding. It also symbolized the beginning of an arduous process of "bringing order, structure and interpretation to the mass of collected data" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 150). What followed next was a process of identifying emergent codes from the data set and then testing those codes across the transcripts. Through this process, the list of more than 30 identified codes, culled from reading, thinking about, and reflecting on the transcripts was grouped, refined, collapsed, and reduced to a set of more manageable categories by which to

organize the data in a meaningful way – one that connected back to my guiding research questions.

Leading up to a point where I actually achieved a tangible and trustworthy set of codes, I experimented with different ways to work with the data. In some cases, I created tables with participant data, that is, excerpts from the interviews with contextual points in parentheses. In other cases, because of the complexity of their journeys, it became necessary to create a storied timeline or narrative, noting when certain events happened, who was involved, what the conditions and context were at the time, and the actions and behaviours of the developer. The developers' curriculum vita or CVs proved helpful in the preparation of these distilled documents, bringing me ever closer to making sense of the data, but not yet in a position to begin writing. Patton (1990) refers to this individualized story writing process as case analysis, "a process of identifying, coding, and categorizing the primary patterns in the data" (p. 381). This combined process allowed me to identify, test, and apply the evolving set of codes with greater clarity and confidence.

Once I had a sense of each person's journey and a working set of codes, I clustered the codes into related themes by which to embark on the next stage of data management. Using select interview questions and the identified themes as the headings by which to reorganize the data, I began the tedious process of working through each set of transcripts to cut-and-paste select passages and direct quotations under each document heading. Using the comments feature in Microsoft Word, I further documented personal insights, contextual notes (to keep quotes in context once removed from the transcripts), analytical comments, observations, and questions. The outcome of this process provided

me with a set of documents in condensed form that matched the data to the themes in order of each participant. For example, under the heading of influential people, I had quotations, summarized notes, and my personal comments listed by each participant's pseudonym such that all the data related to the given theme, in this case influential people, was listed in one place. From there I was able to analyse the data by topic in greater depth, looking for similarities and differences across individuals and between and within groups. Sometimes I distilled the data further into a one or two-page summary document; other times, I created charts, matrices, or tables to delve deeper for patterns across level of experience and trajectory into the field (e.g., from outside or within higher education), or simply to group like data. These organizing tools provided a starting point for crafting individual chapter sections and, in some cases, evolved into formal tables within specific chapters. Table 4.2 (Influential People: Type and Descriptor) found in Chapter four is the end product of one such example. This table went through several iterations starting with a list of more than 10 different descriptors or labels of influential people and ended with four categories into which several coded types of significant individuals were further merged and condensed.

From the 15 themed documents eventually created, I prepared my data and discussion chapters, weaving in insights from my personal experience and the literature as well as a critical analysis of my findings. In so doing, the intersections across and between the themes became clearer. Wherever possible, participants were quoted directly to maintain accuracy and richness of content. Quotations thought to be revealing of a participant's identity were omitted or modified (without changing the meaning or intent) to permit use. In this, it was sometimes necessary to leave out specific details such as

timelines, specific events, and/or contextual identifiers to avoid potential connections being made between what was reported and the participant reporting it. As often as possible, identifying information was replaced by generic references, for example, “a middle-career developer from a doctoral institution in central Canada reported that….” Upon completion of the data chapters, I revised and updated Chapter two and crafted my concluding chapter.

In the following chapter, I begin the process of reporting study findings, mapping the individual and collective pathways of the study participants.

CHAPTER FOUR: MAPPING THE JOURNEY

Introduction

This chapter addresses two of the four sub-questions outlined in Chapters one and three, that is: (1) *What processes and practices do educational developers un/intentionally undertake to navigate entry into the field of educational development* and (2) *What external incidents or situational conditions shape the pathways of developers into the field of educational development?* Specifically, this chapter maps the collective journeys of the study participants and provides a context to situate and appreciate the remaining chapters, beginning with a synthesis of the career development literature as it relates to career exploration. Next, an integrated biographical table is provided, distilling the information provided from the participant profile in Chapter three into a reference tool for the reader. The table is intended to familiarize the reader with the backgrounds of each participant and their assigned pseudonyms. These pseudonyms are referenced extensively in this chapter and in those that follow. The remaining sections of the chapter report on the participants' early career goals, how and when they became aware of educational development, the obstacles they experienced during their journey toward entry and participation in the field, and the role and type of influential people who facilitated or side-railed their pathways to educational development.

The Role of Chance, Happenstance, and Serendipity in the Career Journey

Different theories and perspectives offer a lens by which to understand and appreciate the career exploration process – what I call the journey. Psychological theories and models such as the trait-factor approach attribute career choice and decision-making

to individual action (Rojewski, 1999) and are conceived predominantly in occupational terms whereby occupational selection is assumed mostly to have taken place prior to entering the workforce (Rothstein, 1980). Consistent with the work of Frank Parsons, who is credited as the "father of career counseling" in the career development field (Mitchell, Levin, & Krumboltz, 1999, p. 116), the trait-factor approach matches the abilities and traits of individuals to specific job environments - occupations (Bright & Pryor, 2005; Rojewski, 1999). This approach to career development and exploration is criticized for being linear, rational, deterministic (Guindon & Hanna, 2002), and static with little account for chance but for that of error (Bright & Pryor, 2005).

Indeed, in the dynamic contexts in which people live today and explore careers across their lifespan, chance cannot be discounted. We clearly see this with the participants in this study. Sociological perspectives are helpful in this respect and contrast to psychological ones in that career exploration and career choice are linked to socio-environmental factors that can "facilitate or constrain an individual's action" (Rojewski, 1999, p. 268). Within this framework, chance is acknowledged as being one piece of the puzzle. Both the "lifespan approach" and the "career opportunity model" bridge psychological and sociological perspectives. The former "recognizes the influences of both the individual and contextual factors on decision-making" (Cabral & Salomone, 1990, p. 14), while the latter "holds that individuals use opportunity situations to make career choices, and that each opportunity situation is evaluated in terms of the individual's current situation rather than some previously established set of goals" (Rothstein, 1980, pp. 340-341). A chaos based approach offers yet another and more

recent lens within the career development and counseling literatures to examine career exploration and decision-making. Specifically, chaos theory:

> deals with reality as individuals experience it as richly complex, nonlinear, and serendipitous [and]...points to some of the neglected realities of career decision-making, such as chance, unpredictability, the limits of knowledge at the point of decision-making, the limitations of goals, and the nonlinearity of change. (Bright & Pryor, 2005, pp. 302-303)

On the career development continuum of career decision-making and exploration, deterministic, rational, and linear approaches (more traditional) are positioned at the one end and chaos-based theories and approaches (more contemporary) are situated at the other. I lean more toward the latter in examining the pathways of the study participants, specifically, the planned happenstance approach, which acknowledges chance encounters and advocates for a career decision-making and exploration approach that involves both planfulness and happenstance (Cabral & Salomone, 1990). As Bandura (1982) contends, "the unforseeability and branching power of fortuitous influences make the specific course of lives neither easily predictable nor easily socially engineered" (p. 749). To that end, Mitchell and her colleagues (1999) recommend development of five specific skills in order to ready individuals to recognize and respond to chance encounters: (1) curiosity, (2) persistence, (3) flexibility, (4) optimism, and (5) risk-taking. For, it is "the skills and interests people cultivate [that] determine the circles in which they move and hence the kinds of social encounters they are most likely to experience" (Bandura, 1982, p. 750). In mapping the participants' journeys below, I highlight how and when these five skills are actualized.

As evidenced in this study, and as suggested by more chaos-based understandings of career development, we know that careers are influenced by a host of elements, including: parental, social, and environmental factors; age and gender; political and economic climates; individual interests and abilities; geography and so on (Bright & Pryor, 2005; Zikic & Hall, 2009). Duffy and Dik (2009) highlight two other external influences on the career development process, namely, spiritual and religious factors and social service motivations. These elements, individually and collectively, can have positive or negative impacts, serving either to enable or trigger one's career exploration and decision-making or create barriers and challenges to it. Summarizing the literature cited in relation to both privileged and less advantaged adult populations engaged in career exploration, Zikic and Hall (2009) identified six categories or types of barriers of which to be mindful: (1) person-centred (i.e., gender, age, skills, abilities, interests, personal traits), (2) situation-centred (i.e., located within one's immediate work or sociocultural environment), (3) access discrimination (taking place upon one's entry to an occupation or organization), (4) treatment discrimination (experienced post-entry, affecting career exploration within one's work context), (5) career indecision, and (6) relationships (e.g., peers, friends, family, other). Many of these barriers played out in the pathways of each study participant, particularly, the last category associated with relationships and the various individuals that constitute them. The final section of this chapter speaks directly to the influence of specific individuals on the participants' journeys, both positive and negative.

For purposes of clarity and to reflect the different usage of terms in the career development literature, *chance, happenstance,* and *serendipity* are defined below,

expanding upon what was briefly outlined in Chapter three. Chance events are defined as "unpredictable events or encounters that have an impact on career development and behaviour" (Rojewski, 1999, p. 269). Bandura (1982) adds to this understanding, defining a chance encounter "as an unintended meeting of persons unfamiliar to each other" (p. 748). Further still, Cabral and Salomone (1990) as well as Rojewski (1999) acknowledge the importance of, not only people, but also the timing and context in which these life events and encounters occur. Other terms such as happenstance – "an unplanned event that measurably alters one's behaviour" (Miller, 1983, p. 17) – and serendipity – unanticipated developments or events of significance to one's career (Betsworth & Hansen, 1996) – are used interchangeably here and in other chapters. Whatever the term, Bandura (1982) reminds us that "some chance encounters touch people only lightly, others leave more lasting effects, and still others branch people into new trajectories of life" (p. 749). This occurrence is reflected in the pathways reported in this chapter and in those that follow.

Participant Profile

The participant profile outlined in Chapter three is recreated here in table form. As explained earlier, not all demographic or developer details are included in order to preserve participant anonymity and confidentiality and to mitigate providing peripheral information of limited value. Participant data are grouped below by their trajectory into the field and by years of experience in the profession. Pseudonyms are used in place of the participants' real names.

Table 4.1: Participant Profile

Pseudonym	Years in Field	Age Group	Sex M/F	Degree Status	Entry Status (primary)	Unit Type	Units Worked
Trajectory Into Field: Initially From Outside Higher Education							
Charlotte	≤5	51-55	F	MA	Professional/Educator	Campus-wide	1
Norah	6-10	56-60	F	PhD	Professional/Educator	Campus-wide	1
Karen	6-10	51-50	F	MA	Professional/Educator	Campus-wide	1
Sarah	6-10	41-45	F	PhD	Professional/Educator	Discipline-based	1
Fida	>10	51-55	F	MA	Professional/Educator	Campus-wide	3
Paul	>10	56-60	M	PhD	Professional/Educator	Campus-wide	2
Trajectory Into Field: From Within a University Context							
Tara	≤5	36-40	F	PhD	Faculty Member	Campus-wide	2
Tony	≤5	41-45	M	PhD	Faculty Member	Campus-wide	1
Ellen	≤5	31-35	F	PhD	Grad. Student/Post-doc	Campus-wide	1
Celine	≤5	36-40	F	MA	Professional Staff	Campus-wide	1
Sean	6-10	51-50	M	PhD	Faculty Member	Campus-wide	1
Lila	6-10	36-40	F	PhD	Grad. Student/Post-doc	Campus-wide	1
Kendra	6-10	36-40	F	MA	Grad. Student/Post-doc	Campus-wide	1
Victor	6-10	36-40	M	MA	Professional Staff	Campus-wide	3
Miranda	6-10	31-35	F	PhD	Grad. Student/Post-doc	Campus-wide	2
Beverly	>10	41-45	F	PhD	Grad. Student/Post-doc	Campus-wide	1
Dan	>10	51-55	M	MA	Grad. Student/Post-doc	Campus-wide	1
Edward	>10	41-45	M	PhD	Professional Staff	Discipline-based	2

Early Career Goals

Asked about their vocation, many identified an early interest in teaching, training for a helping profession, preparing for an academic position, and/or some other field of study or professional practice. No one mentioned educational development and only a handful of participants did not articulate a specific calling. Those passionate about teaching identified an interest in it at different points in their lifespan. Miranda, for example, a graduate student upon entry to the field, started teaching at a young age. My "interest in teaching has always been there, since I was a kid. I think I first taught when I

was 12 years old and I started teaching swimming lessons to the neighbour's kids." Her interest in formal teaching was reinforced throughout her undergraduate and master's programs, having experienced excellent teachers during both and having ventured into teaching at the onset of graduate school. "As soon as I started TAing, I just took to it and loved it and wanted to do more." Paul, too, spoke of an early interest in teaching. "I knew I wanted to be a teacher. In my high school yearbook, it says, ambition: 'high school teacher.'" Paul attributed his interest in teaching to his mother, who gave him a sense that "teaching is a wonderful thing." It helped, too, that Paul "liked the school environment" and thought it was a place that he could be happy in for the rest of his work life. Indeed, his entire career history is connected to teaching, learning, curriculum, and professional development in a variety of educational contexts.

Others came to be involved in teaching by chance and circumstance. Fida, for example, who transitioned to educational development later in her career, did not start out with the intention of entering the teaching profession, rather, she "happened into a teaching job" by way of necessity. When both Fida and her spouse were at the start of their careers, her husband's job situated them in a somewhat remote town with limited employment opportunities for someone with a graduate degree such as hers. However, once having experienced teaching, she admitted: "teaching went from being the last thing I'd ever countenanced, to being the only thing I wanted to do." Beverly, too, developed an interest in teaching only after she discovered a passion for her subject matter and a desire to share that passion with others. It was this desire that prompted her to reply to an advertisement in a local newspaper, inviting applicants to offer noncredit courses of interest to the community. While her first teaching stint was in a non-formal setting, the

positive feedback she received from course participants reinforced a budding interest and commitment to teaching – so much so that she almost went to teachers' college versus academia (the path which ultimately led her to the field of educational development upon completion of her doctorate). Positive feedback from others about Edward's teaching likewise kindled an interest in, and purposeful study of, his instructional approach. "I was identified very quickly as someone who knew and practiced teaching well [and as such]…I started asking a lot of questions about effective teaching." These early efforts primed Edward to become involved in educational development activities at a peripheral level (e.g., to co-lead an instructional workshop at one institution and be invited to lead another at a second institution), eventually leading to an invitation to apply for a part-time developer position at his alma mater.

Of interesting, most of those who identified a vocation for academia or an academic track (faculty or otherwise) were not completely committed to it as a career. In some cases, it seemed they did not know what else to do or what other options were available. Lila, who entered educational development as a graduate student, expressed this sentiment.

> I was on [an academic] track, and, as far as I was aware, most people in my area went into academics, so I kind of thought that was a like path I would [follow], probably becoming a faculty member. [I knew] I didn't want to get into industry…[another] common path.

Others were less enamoured with all that was expected of being a faculty member. Sarah commented on this point specifically.

> After that [my post-doctorate], I was trying to figure out what it was I wanted to do. I knew I didn't want to go the next step, which was running my own research program, so I was looking at [other] possible options.

These options led Sarah away from higher education to a corporate training setting until an opportunity later in her career facilitated re-entry to a post-secondary institution in the capacity of an educational developer.

Ellen, in contrast, took a more practical stance to preparing for the professoriate. Having briefly worked in a non-formal education setting before returning to graduate school to pursue a post-graduate degree, she strategically gave thought to other career avenues should academia not pan out. In this regard, she commented: "I was preparing to be a faculty member…[but I also] did a little bit of preparation for training, knowing that you can't always get a job as a faculty member. So, I took [various] courses…[and] taught courses to undergraduates." While Ellen "loved teaching," from her perspective, "academia was only about doing research." As such, she tried "to do things that would help [her] do more teaching" and prepare her for an alternate career path (if necessary) that would marry her early interest in teaching and training with her love of travel and her discipline.

Aside from specific vocational aspirations and goals, many participants also identified the importance of personal values and commitments as being facilitative of their journey toward becoming an educational developer. Lila, for example, who came to educational development during her doctoral years, reflected that "as an undergraduate I wanted to do something that actually mattered, had impact [and] that affected people." This goal prompted her initially to explore a professional role in the field of health and wellness until one of her undergraduate professors convinced her to enter graduate studies, a path that turned out to her liking and set her on a traditional academic course. Edward, too, from the outset, valued the idea of helping people. He attributed this

sentiment to his upbringing, particularly his father, commenting that "at a young age I guess I picked up his values or maybe it was part of who I am, and people helping skills is very much of who I am." Charlotte, also a latecomer to the field from outside higher education, likewise noted the importance of and her lifetime dedication to helping others. "I was committed to giving people the tools that they needed to take care of themselves….I've always been client-oriented…[and] very committed to the self-help movement." Miranda, a self-professed teacher, also wanted to "offer something" to her fellow teaching assistants, having witnessed their instructional struggles where she herself had excelled. Others emphasized serving and supporting students. Norah, a long-time educator before entering educational development, identified a focus on student success as her "driving energy," something she attributed to coming from a place of "teaching as a vocation rather than a job."

Taken as a whole, the participants' early vocational aspirations, especially as they related to teaching, combined with a personal ethos of helping others (students, colleagues, clients), seeded a latent receptiveness to an educational development trajectory (which, as will be explained in later chapters, places an emphasis on the relational and community aspects of development work) even though participant awareness of field, at the time, was limited or nonexistent.

Learning about Educational Development: Early Exposure

More often than not, contact with their institution's centre for teaching and learning represented the participants' initial point of introduction to educational development. Contact, however, did not equate with awareness of educational development as a field of study and practice with models, theories, approaches, and a

literature base underpinning its existence – that came later. Instead, participants first came to know about their centre, and eventually the field, under various conditions, through chance encounters with colleagues, as a result of their own internal motivations (i.e., needs and interests), and/or through externally driven contexts. Examples from a cross-section of participants, reflecting both groups of developers (i.e., those who transitioned from within their university and those who came from other occupations outside higher education) are provided below. The first set of examples reflects the experience of participants who entered directly from graduate school and/or who dabbled as a student and came back to educational development as a professional. The next set reflects two of the three faculty participants, while the final set reflects both those who came from outside higher education initially and those who transitioned from within their academic institutions.

The participants who started out in educational development during graduate school or their post-doctoral fellowship (Lila, Kendra, Miranda, Ellen, Beverly, Dan), or who dabbled in it as a graduate student, but came back to it later from another point of entry (Tara – faculty member; Victor – university staff), learned about their institution's teaching and learning centre, and hence acquired an inkling of educational development as a field of practice and more distantly a career path, through a student peer, a professional colleague, an external communication, or through their own efforts to access instructional supports or professional development opportunities in their role as teaching assistant, instructor and/or graduate student. Their motivations to connect with such a unit reflected an interest in teaching and personal development combined, for some, with a fear of teaching itself and/or not wanting to be a bad teacher. Whatever the case, the

underlying facilitative event, condition, or person connecting them to a teaching unit in the first place, and for many, engaging in development activities early on, was the opportunity to teach, provided either through the availability and funding of their graduate teaching assistantship or being asked to teach or direct a course by a colleague or their thesis supervisor (for reasons of sabbatical, research commitments, or other circumstances).

For the majority in this group, connection via peer association represented their point of initial contact with a teaching and learning unit. For Lila, it was a combination of attending a session offered by a peer during her institution's teaching assistant conference and this same peer "raving" about a graduate teaching course offered by the university's teaching centre. "She loved it, raved about it!...So I decided that I really had to take this course." From there, Lila was "hooked," taking every workshop, seminar, or short-course that she could until she became involved in the delivery of centre activities, supporting and offering services and programs that she herself had benefitted from. Other facilitative conditions included her own first dismal teaching assistantship experience, which she described as "a deep-end throw [that]…didn't go the way I wanted it to" and a desire to do things "better." She explained:

> [Teaching] was something I was never interested in doing. In fact, I was scared of it. Standing in front of people, especially teenagers, is intimidating,…but as a graduate student you had to. So, I figured if I have to do it, I at least don't want to be as bad as some of my teachers.

These conditions combined (i.e., a chance encounter with a peer and a dismal teaching experience) along with Lila's own curiosity and persistence, two of the five skill sets that Mitchell and her colleagues (1999) propose are necessary to

identifying and taking action in response to chance encounters, facilitated Lila's first steps toward a career in educational development.

The same "sink or swim" feeling was a motivating factor for Kendra to seek out help. She, too, learned about her university's teaching centre and its instructional supports from a fellow graduate student in the same doctoral program. She noted: "like most students, I was beginning a term scared out of my brain….I had some ideas for how to do it better and what I didn't want to do, but not really knowing what to do." In contrast, Miranda, who "loved" teaching and took to it from an early age, proactively sought out the instructional unit on her campus, wanting both to learn more about the unit and instruction, and to help her fellow teaching assistants. Tara, one of the faculty-identified participants who engaged with educational development during graduate school, also proactively sought her institution's teaching centre. Whereas Miranda loved teaching, however, Tara hated it. She explained: "when I first started teaching, I really hated it. The problem was I just had no clue what I was doing…no help, no advice, nothing! So, I had originally gone to the centre to go to their workshops." Here, too, are examples of persistence, risk-taking, and in the case of Miranda, optimism, in their decisions to seek out a teaching unit and ultimately a path to educational development (Mitchell et al., 1999).

Beverly's situation was similar to other study participants mentioned above in that an academic colleague was pivotal to linking her with the university's teaching centre. In her case, however, the link was not for instructional purposes, but rather to apply for an educational developer position. Past connections with this associate and previous university work experience prompted Beverly's colleague to direct her attention to the

educational developer position posting in the first place, knowing she had an attractive mix of knowledge, skills, experience, and institutional networks appropriate for the job. Coincidently, Beverly herself had just become aware of the centre's existence, having received a promotional flyer from the office about a unique instructional program that they were offering. That she even saw the flyer was serendipitous, as it was through her thesis supervisor, who at the time was going on sabbatical and whom asked her to teach a course in his absence, that gave her access to a departmental mailbox in the first place and thus the centre advertisement.

Teaching (as a sessional instructor or teaching assistant) or the influence of a peer were not the only reasons the developers in this study sought out their institution's teaching centre, thereby, making first contact. Ellen became aware of her campus centre because she was required to take a course that only the teaching centre offered. While her initial impetus to contact the centre was external, Ellen's interest in teaching and training kept her coming back. Victor, likewise, did not intentionally seek out his centre. An interest shared by Victor and his fellow graduate students in gaining access to "professionalism or professionalization skills…to navigate the job market," led him to approach his department on the matter. Coincidently, a larger initiative spearheaded by his institution's Dean of Graduate Studies, in partnership with his institution's teaching centre, saw the creation of discipline-based teaching assistant developer positions, a role Victor quickly undertook, predicating future involvement in educational development on a part-time basis at one institution and in a full-time capacity at another. Again, curiosity and perhaps optimism (Mitchell et al., 1999) played a role in the decision-making of

Victor, leading to first contact with his institution's instructional unit and, later in his career, a formal position in educational development.

For Sean and Tony, two of the three participants who came to educational development from the faculty ranks (see Tara's story above, the third faculty member), they learned about their institution's centre, and hence the field of educational development, by way of happenstance. Contact was predicated on their already existing engagement in scholarly teaching, and for Sean, on discipline-based professional development activities he provided for graduate students in his department. In the case of Tony, overhearing a chance conversation on the subject of teaching between the former director of his university's teaching unit and another professor, prompted him to engage the conversation, asking them questions about his latest evaluation project. Through information and contacts he received as a result of connecting with these academic peers, he connected and established a relationship with his institution's teaching and learning unit.

Whereas Tony sought out his institutional teaching unit, Sean's unit called upon him directly, asking him to host a campus-wide workshop for new and returning teaching assistants. He came to their attention through a colleague, who had previous centre connections, and who worked with Sean in the same department. These chance encounters combined with other situational happenings and personal motivations set Tony on a path to find individuals who shared his "interest in teaching…[desiring] a place to go and learn about, but also just to talk about teaching." Likewise, Sean's experience led to him offering workshops for his centre's annual conference for teaching assistants. From there, he went from "overseeing how the conference ran, interfering and

rearranging it…to building up different programs." Once more, curiosity and perhaps risk-taking (at least for Tony) aided Sean and Tony in making decisions about and taking action toward their formal involvement in educational development.

For the developers who initially came from outside the field itself and higher education generally (Charlotte, Norah, Karen, Sarah, Fida, and Paul), educational development represented a second, third, and even fourth career path through which to apply their transferable knowledge and skills gained from years of professional practice. For those identified in Chapter three (and at the beginning of this chapter) as professional staff and institutional educators (Celine, Victor and Edward), educational development represented an extension of their university based careers, albeit in different roles. Regardless of their trajectories, their motivations to leave or augment their existing positions and areas of professional practice, whether they started from within or outside higher education, reflected a host of reasons: (1) a desire to move on to the next phase of their career (challenge of something new), (2) a need to get out of their current position (often for reasons of dissatisfaction), and/or (3) the necessity of another job (i.e., as they experienced the end of their contract, multiple part-time arrangements to equal full-time work). These reasons suggest that something was missing from their current work arrangements that necessitated change even if it did not happen right away or initially through their own efforts. Certainly, the reasons given above are opposite to the intrapersonal and environmental factors associated with workplace happiness identified by Henderson (2000).

In all but one case, working in a teaching and learning centre was *not* the participant's primary goal, nor was it the outcome of careful career planning measures. In

fact, only a handful was actively looking for work for reasons noted above; the remaining participants found theirs by way of chance. For Celine and Karen, it was a colleague within their individual professional networks who directed their attention to their respective job postings. In Karen's case, for example, her colleague not only pointed out the posting, but explained what the work of an educational developer involved. Paul came across the job announcement he first applied to via his regular perusal of *University Affairs* – a publication he relied upon to remain current with topical issues and trends in higher education. In both cases, he and Celine, like others in the group, saw immediate linkages to their positions at hand. Paul, for example, upon reading the posting for his job, said to himself, "this is me, this is totally me." Celine likewise said to herself: "as soon as I read the job description, I [knew]…it was something I really wanted to do." Others, like Edward, who was invited and encouraged to apply for his first official developer role in light of past centre performance (i.e., guest workshop leader), institutional connections, and/or judged abilities, experienced the same kind of associations.

From the examples noted above, already there is a sense that happenstance played an early role in the participants' awareness of educational development. More so, and as Mitchell and her colleagues (1999) would agree, the participants demonstrated both a measure of receptiveness and responsiveness to chance encounters (e.g., curiosity, persistence, risk-taking, optimism, and flexibility), moving them to take action and ultimately embrace a career in educational development.

Obstacles to Entry and Participation in the Field

The pathway to educational development for some participants was fraught with various trials and roadblocks, while others experienced a more direct route with fewer twists and turns. Shaping factors associated with each participant's journey came in many forms: (1) influential people (e.g., family, peers, department chairs), (2) graduate programs (the structure and the people involved), (3) teaching centre conditions, (4) departmental and institutional contexts, (5) personal motivations and interests, and (6) individual responses to external happenings. These factors are reflected in the six types of barriers summarized by Zikic and Hall (2009) as outlined at the beginning of this chapter. As we see in the remaining sections of this chapter, relational influences are consistently referenced, reflecting the participants' everyday "contextual milieu" and the role these relational influences played "not only as sources of social support but also as barriers to healthy career exploration" (p. 185). The following subsections provide an overview of the types of obstacles participants experienced toward their entry to and participation in the field.

Entering the field. Reflecting their graduate student context at the time of entry to the field, Lila, Miranda, and Kendra each expressed frustration at the roadblocks they experienced with their attempts to engage in educational development activities. They cited various reasons, including: the structure of their graduate program, the whims of their thesis supervisor, and/or the direction of their academic department or program chair. Lila, for example, related how near impossible it was to schedule the graduate teaching course offered by her institution into her regular coursework. Not only was it difficult to do, but at the time, it was considered "extra credit" versus part of her

traditional program of study – a situation which has since changed as evidenced by the need for and support of the development of graduate professional skills (Canadian Association of Graduate Studies, 2008). And while her supervisor was very supportive of teaching, he was also very practical in wanting her to focus her efforts and finish her program. These experiences combined necessitated flexibility, commitment, and a measure of optimism on Lila's part to continue to access educational development activities, factors which were foundational to embracing the profession as a full-time career and distancing herself from an academic trajectory.

Miranda likewise experienced resistance to her involvement in teaching development activities – something she loved and continued to engage with even in the face of controversy and risk to her academic well-being. As she put it:

> My PhD supervisor was not happy about it at all, not even a little bit….It was a constant fight with him. The only way I was able to do it was to truthfully lead a double life…where I couldn't talk to him about my teaching and learning stuff at all. If I was going to do a workshop, you know, it was sneak out the front door type of thing.

Kendra, too, worked for her institution's teaching unit during her graduate student years, experiencing discouragement from her disciplinary peers and department as a whole. Just as Miranda and Lila had to make a conscious decision about pursuing development work, so did Kendra. She spoke of the struggle she experienced.

> It [my centre] was such a lovely place to be and very supportive….People had similar ideas around teaching that I did. Within my department, I found it really discouraging. Teaching and being a good teaching assistant and really working on those skills was not something they valued. Here it was valued. It was something that was really important to me and that felt comfortable and positive.

In all three cases mentioned above, participant love of teaching, attending and offering teaching development opportunities, and being involved with their institution's campus-wide instructional unit enabled them to persist in spite of pressures they experienced to focus their efforts on a more traditional academic stream. Indeed, had they not persisted, engaging with the people and experiences that brought them closer to educational development, they may not have realized, just as Lila did, that "you could do this full-time and get paid for it." Their persistence speaks to a strong internal locus of control, "the degree to which people perceive positive or negative events as being a consequence of their own actions, and hence under personal control" (Rojewski, 1999, p. 272) and a strong self-concept, which Cabral and Salomone (1990) suggest, in its various manifestations, "acts as filters through which the individual perceives events and people in his or her contexts" (p. 9), guiding individual response to them. Others less enabled, that is, lacking the skills (flexibility, curiosity, persistency, optimism, risk-taking) proposed by Mitchell and her colleagues (1999) to identify and act upon chance opportunities, may not have been able to act with the same measure of commitment and purpose.

Participating in the field. Even after entering the field of educational development, the study participants encountered obstacles to their ongoing participation. Tara, who entered the field full-time from the faculty ranks, but who participated in educational development activities as a graduate student, experienced roadblocks at the outset of her career. While Tara's first development contract as a graduate student gave her a taste for development work, the nature of the position was such that it was one year only and designed specifically to rotate new student developers in and out of the job (a

structural/situational barrier). Fortunately for Tara, she had a positive working relationship with the centre director and its staff, and was hired to continue work on another specific project. She explained:

> They wanted to turn that position over to different people, so what they did because they wanted to keep me and I wanted to stay, was they created a new position for me…to help other people develop discipline-specific workshops for their teaching certificate [program].

Sadly, this contract also came to an end, requiring Tara to return to her discipline and finish her doctorate without any formal or official connection with the centre.

Even though centre conditions (i.e., contract work, limited funding) did not facilitate an ongoing centre relationship, it seeded an interest to pursue development work on a full-time permanent basis. As such, when an educational developer position later became available at the same institution where she had completed her doctorate and started teaching – Tara seized upon it. Unfortunately, while her application was received positively and she interviewed well for the position, she did not get the job. Subsequent conversation with the centre director led her to believe that the committee felt she was going places with her discipline research and should stick with that direction – as if they knew more than she did and perceived "that's where her heart was kind of thing." With the committee's decision final, Tara's sustained participation in the field ended until a future opportunity presented itself at a different institution.

Tony and Sean, the other two participants who entered the field as academics, struggled with departmental and institutional contexts that required them to negotiate how they engaged in development activities and their formal relationship with their institution's teaching unit. Tony, for example, having established a connection with his

campus' instructional unit and teaching community, began to engage with other academics about teaching, learning, and technology. He accomplished this connection through dual means. Informally, he sought opportunities to engage other faculty to talk about teaching. "I enjoy teaching and I took it seriously. And I perhaps spent far too much time thinking about it, preparing for it…and gravitating to those that speak your language." Formally, he took on a faculty associate role (in addition to his academic role) for which he was hired to "participate in activities that investigate the effectiveness of technology, advocacy, and the use of it in teaching….It was an opportunity to do some other [scholarly] work that was not [discipline] related." At the same time, he negotiated with his department to pursue a master's program in educational technology (he already had a doctorate) before health matters negated this option. Tony's interest in scholarly teaching and development activities was such that he explored whether he could integrate these activities more concretely into his contracted responsibilities as an academic. "There was an attempt by me to renegotiate what I do…redefine my area of interest to stay within the school and succeed." As Tony explained:

> I had no intention of becoming an educational developer, I just wanted to do work on teaching, scholarly teaching and that kind of thinking within my discipline and to teach more within my discipline and, perhaps, become a better practitioner of teaching [within my subject area].

Regrettably, upon inquiring, he learned "there was no support" for change and that if he chose to pursue this avenue, his tenure application might be put in jeopardy. This situation reinforced for Tony how "the value of research far out-weighs teaching – it's poor cousin." It also led him to explore other career options, which eventually saw Tony

marry his interests in teaching, research, and service with his discipline and educational development endeavours.

Sean, too, experienced tension between his interest and engagement in educational development at the campus-wide and discipline levels. While his institution at one point considered a blended position between the two, it was decided that the structure and requirements of his academic position would make it difficult. At this point, Sean had to make an important decision, one that led him to enter into an arrangement where he continued his involvement with his institution's teaching centre, but at a level above and beyond his full-time discipline work. "I've always retained full-time [status] in my department and approximately…half-time in the centre….I elected to do it…[that is] take the extra money and just work a bit longer." While it meant greater effort on his part, the contractual nature and type of development activities he performed allowed him the flexibility he needed to accommodate both positions. Not everyone in Sean's position would be willing or able to make this same kind of commitment. His choice, however, is not uncharacteristic of the passion that educational developers hold for their work, nor the multiple discipline groups or communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991;Wenger, 1998, 2006; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002) with whom they identify and hold membership status.

Other developers who transitioned to educational development, both from within and outside of higher education, similarly encountered issues associated with their developer position, their centre context, and/or the colleagues with whom they worked. The following examples speak to the importance and influence of one's centre context, peers, and director with respect to workplace satisfaction and career development, further

highlighting two of the six barriers Duffy and Dik (2009) noted earlier, those being, shortages of funding and inequity and discrimination.

Charlotte, for example, a private consultant for many years before entering the field, stated how frustrating and stressful it was to work for a centre she perceived to be amidst constant turmoil and transition. She described her context as being "under a constant state of reorganization" where "territoriality and fear" prevailed and "nobody shared anything." The lack of "a community of colleagues" from which to learn with and from was compounded by limited centre funding to attend conferences at which educational development practitioners typically converge, thereby, adding to her sense of isolation.

Fida also had to contend with political, personal, and positional tensions in her quest to persist and advance within educational development. Early in her development career, she experienced tension among her love of teaching (which she did in tandem with her development work for several years), her desire to spend more time with her family, and a need for fulfillment in her developer role (her first at the time). As she put it:

> I wanted to revitalize myself. I was beginning to feel the work I was doing was becoming a bit routine….We had reached a sort of comfortable financial stage as a family, and I wanted to spend more time with my daughter…. It was very much a personal decision rather than a professional decision.

These conditions combined led Fida away from educational development until a family move to another part of the country facilitated re-entry at another institution where she held multiple positions including that of educational developer. Here again, Fida

embraced her work for several years until centre conditions (i.e., staffing, recognition, leadership, and support issues), albeit different this time, were such that she "couldn't do one more thing," feeling "exhausted," "unhappy," and "unsupported" in an environment where she felt university administration "was not generally hospitable to a teaching and learning centre." Needing to get out, she examined her mobility options within educational development and found a position at another institution of a more senior level where she could effect change. In making this move and achieving this next step in her career, she experienced "a feeling of validation" for who she was and what she was capable of doing.

Beverly, who entered educational development at the end of her graduate program, acknowledged two areas of tension within her work that had less to do with her developer position and more to do with her centre context and institutional directions. The former came in the form of funding. As Kendra, Fida and Charlotte also experienced, the lack of available centre funding limited who from among their staff could semi-regularly access or attend conferences where educational developers converge to network and share their scholarship and practice. In terms of conference participation, Charlotte acknowledged how the power and positioning of the "few" in her centre dictated which conference opportunities were even communicated to the group and who got to attend them at all. Given the importance of the larger developer community to becoming socialized and oriented to the field, this lack of opportunity cannot be overstated. Second to the issue of funding, Beverly acknowledged the "push – pull" she felt in navigating between individual and centre directions and dictates coming from above (i.e., senior administration). While not without opportunity, she felt that "top-down" mandates to

develop certain programs or policies sometimes countered the "relational" aspects of her work at the individual and small group level – an aspect that Beverly, like others in the study sample, communicated was an important and valued part of their work. Chapter six discusses participant conceptions of their developer role and the field as a whole, emphasizing the importance of the relational element in what they do.

Institutionally, Paul and Tony spoke of systemic inequities associated with movement between academic departments and educational development centres, and how initially these inequities limited their career options and choices. In their case, differential credit and status in valuing the years of service of faculty and professional staff appointments was problematic.

The examples above capture the layers and complexities of various factors (i.e., people, conditions, contexts) impacting entry to and participation in the field of educational development. They also highlight the need for developers to be aware of and ready to respond to chance encounters and facilitative opportunities by employing one or more of the five skills identified by Mitchell and her colleagues (1999) as being key to furthering the career exploration process. The following section highlights the shaping role (good and bad) of individuals on developer pathways.

Influential People

As the above sections suggest, a range of individuals (e.g., family members, centre directors, graduate supervisors, student peers, colleagues, and others) associated with each participant's journey played significant and varied roles in their trek toward becoming educational developers. Four broad categories of influential people were identified from the data: (1) gatekeeper, (2) distractor, (3) mentor, and (4) enabler. Table

4.2 below describes each category of individual and offers a description of their role and impact on the developers' pathways (e.g., creating, influencing, and/or situating contextual influences and chance encounters). In some cases, the impact was more direct, resulting in a first or permanent position in the field and the start of a fruitful developer career; for others the impact was distractive or delaying, requiring greater effort on the part of the developer to navigate side roads and make their way back to educational development.

Parallel categories of influential people can be found in the career development literature. For example, in their study of men and women who had previously experienced major career change, Young and Rodgers (1997) observed four types of significant individuals: allies, mentors, witnesses and models – all of whom were deemed supportive, catalytic, and empowering of change. According to Young and Rodgers (1997), "allies were people who would support, validate, and affirm aspects of the emerging identity structure" of the participants at hand (p. 179). Allies included spouses, family members, friends and professionals who offered "unconditional support" (e.g., listening). In this study, allies bridged the enabler and mentor categories. Mentors differed from allies in Young and Roger's study, just as they did from enablers in this study through their championing role. "They were closer to the action, and they were often in a position of influence in terms of aspirations of the participants…[by way of their] roles of sponsor, advisor, and role model" (p. 180)." Mentor relationships were "relationships of context and convenience, and they tended to come and go" (p. 180), whereas ally relationships were more enduring. Witnesses, on the other hand, were people "who had observed and commented favourably on a congruent talent or

personality trait" (p. 180) of the participant, and like allies, occupied "diverse roles" in their lives (e.g., family, friends, lover, teacher, counselor, other). As such, their "moment of impact was often brief, but the meaning extracted from the interaction…powerful and timeless" (p. 180). Finally, models provided participants an opportunity to observe and engage with others who reflected their yet unacknowledged "organized principles" – personality traits or the "essence" of who they were or were aspiring to be (p.171). The model category in this study is merged with the mentor group.

Table 4.2 Influential People: Type and Description

Category Type	**Description**
Gatekeeper	Someone who purposefully restricts access to or devalues the worth of teaching, learning and/or educational development activities during the participant's journey.
Distractor	Individuals, often family members or the family unit, who's interests or needs either distract, take precedence over, or stall the interests and/or career goals of the developer.
Mentor	Someone who believes in the developer and their abilities, socializes them into the field, grows and builds his/her capacity as a developer, fosters a positive environment in which to embrace educational development activities, as well as fosters interest in and campaigns for teaching and educational development.
Enabler	Someone who connects the developer with a person of interest or importance, a teaching and learning centre and/or an opportunity for knowledge and skill development; facilitates conditions for change; and/or leads the developer in/directly down the path to educational development. Often, but not always, a pre-existing relationship between the developer (to be) and the individual at hand, may exist.

Consistent with the career development literature, this study documented the importance and potential of various people (family, friends, work peers, professional colleagues, mentors) and the relationship structures to which these individuals belonged,

as being impactful on career decision-making, career choices, career change, and career exploration (Bandura, 1982; Betsworth & Hansen, 1996; Blustein, Prezioso, & Schultheiss, 1995; Duffy & Dik, 2009; Rojewski, 1999; William et al., 1998; Young & Rodgers, 1997; Zikic & Hall, 2009, and others). In his study on the role of chance in the lives of individuals with learning disabilities, Rojewski (1999), for example, reiterated that "educational institutions and professionals undoubtedly play a role in determining the types of chance events…likely to [be] encounter[ed], as well as the impact these situations have on career behavior" (p. 274). This was indeed the case of the participants who entered educational development as graduate students or who dabbled during graduate school, but entered the field permanently later in their careers. Likewise, Williams and her colleagues (1998), in their study of counseling psychologists, documented the importance of having a support system (e.g., friends, family, work peers, advisors, mentors, other) to respond to chance events and various encounters. On a similar note, Duffy and Dik (2009), in examining external influences on the career development process, postulated that of the four categories they identified, "family expectations and needs" had the greatest potential for impact on career choices and career decisions given their shaping role on individual values and interests and the often pressing needs of the family unit. Drawing on attachment theory, Blustein and his colleagues (1995) pointed to the role of "close affectional ties" and how these ties "serve to provide the experience of felt security" (p. 416) at home and at work, which in turn can facilitate exploration. This process of exploration can "lead to greater levels of…knowledge about work and social competence" (p. 416) and, as a result, can be used to navigate work and educational settings.

Examples from the participants below document and illustrate each category of individual as described in Table 4.2. The examples also speak to and reinforce the often enabling, obstructive, and/or grounding role the career development literature suggests various people can play in how individuals respond to chance encounters and situational factors.

Gatekeepers. These individuals took many forms. Their level of impact varied by participant, current situational factors, and timing of events. Ultimately, the outcome of such persons led the participants to stay the course and either re/enter or advance within the field of educational development. Examples of four kinds of gatekeepers (e.g., thesis supervisor, department chair, centre director, senior administrator) experienced by the participants across their lifespans are outlined below.

As previously acknowledged, many participants who engaged with educational development during their years as a graduate student or post-doctoral fellow identified their thesis supervisor as someone who created roadblocks to their entry and participation in the field. Miranda, as noted earlier, had to live a "double life" during her doctoral program because her supervisor neither endorsed nor condoned her involvement and participation in all things related to teaching development. For her, it was a constant fight – one that pushed her to acknowledge that "it's a real power struggle…for what you really want to do with your career and what the culture forces on you." At considerable risk to herself, Miranda chose to lead this double life, allowing her to finish her doctorate while at the same time participate both in the scholarship of teaching and learning as well as various educational development activities. Even when she shed her student status and continued as a post-doctorate fellow at another university, she still received "flak" from

her immediate discipline colleagues for choosing to involve herself with the institution's teaching and learning centre. She persisted though, embracing educational development as her primary occupation following completion of her fellowship.

Ellen, too, had to make some tough decisions during graduate school about her choice to engage with teaching and educational development activities. In her case, both her department chair and those individuals involved in directing her graduate program, put up hurdles that she had to maneuver around. Those in charge of her program, for example, continued to schedule the department's mandatory graduate orientation during the university's teaching assistants conference, while Ellen's chair discouraged her participation in a future faculty program, saying to her: "don't bother…you've taught a lot." During the interview, Ellen conveyed how she felt about her academic department, commenting on how little they did, if anything, to promote teaching development of its graduate students, assuming that as scholars of its discipline, with lots of opportunities to instruct as teaching assistants, they could communicate well and hence did not require professional development. In both cases described above, Ellen went against the status quo to participate in development activities. While in the end she could not take part in the future faculty initiative due to family responsibilities, she strategically found ways to access resource materials and growth experiences of similar value to those she would have encountered in the original program.

Closer to home, a few participants implicated their centre director (though by no means the norm) as the one who kept them from fully embracing and enjoying educational development. Fida, for example, spoke of one director, who from her perspective failed to support her or provide the necessary leadership and management for

the centre and its staff to flourish. This experience contrasted significantly with her first developer position at another institution where she described her director as "dynamic" and "exciting to work with" – someone who valued her contributions and invited her to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Given her current circumstances and in light of her former developer experience, Fida re-evaluated what was important to her to be happy and fulfilled in her work activities, thereby compelling her to leave her position and the institution. Her absence from the profession was short-lived, however, with her successful application to a full-time, senior level educational developer position at a new institution – one she continues at today.

Beyond centre directors, some participants pointed to the influence of senior university administrators in helping or hindering educational development efforts and centre goals. Dan, a seasoned developer who started in the field during his graduate student years, illustrated this circumstance best, having experienced both sides of the coin at different points throughout his career. As he noted during the interview, "one comment can unwind a lot of [our hard work]….They can say the right things and provide the resources to make that concrete, or not….It's just the flavour of the month." In other words, one's centre standing can be subject to the whims of academic administrators, putting the agency and integrity of individual developers (and their respective teaching and learning centres) at risk. At the same time, depending on the substance and circumstances of the situation, such whims can also serve as leverage points to move individual and centre agendas forward.

Distractors. Unlike gatekeepers, distractors, as previously described, were not purposeful in their intent to stall or distract participants in their pathways to educational

development. In this study, distractors consisted of participant spouses and/or the family unit as a whole. In Victor's case, the progression of his marital partner, both in completing her graduate schooling sooner and receiving offers for academic positions before him, moved Victor away from his home institution where he first became involved in educational development activities. While the move initially distanced him from participating in and facilitating educational development initiatives, not to mention his degree, the break from his doctoral studies (in which his interest was lagging somewhat anyway) forced him to contemplate other employment and development options that he might not have considered otherwise or with much conviction. This pause eventually saw Victor re-enter educational development and establish a firm interest and commitment to pursuing it as his primary role when a position became available closer to home at another institution.

Paul, at one point in his career, found that he, too, had to limit his advancement opportunities in order to respect family wishes to stay in one place (i.e., be close to immediate family, enable children to finish school). While initially restrictive, the positions he pursued in the interim situated him well for a more senior level developer role at another institution, one whose values and commitments to teaching and learning aligned more closely to his own. Tony likewise found himself having to balance family needs (i.e., staying at their current home and city locale) with his own career goals, resulting in him staying in a department that was less than hospitable and in turning down offers for academic positions at other institutions. In so doing, he explored different routes closer to home and was perhaps more receptive to other options outside of his academic role and discipline. As such, when a full-time educational developer position

became available at his home institution's teaching and learning centre, a place he already had connections with and felt quite at home, he applied for, interviewed, and accepted the offer of employment. With this move, he entered a new chapter in his career journey – one that he found fulfilling and meaningful, and continues in today.

Whereas Paul and Tony were forced to stay in one place due to family commitments, Fida was relocated multiple times by her spouse's career, the result of which was the cobbling together of multiple contracts (including development work) to obtain full-time employment. While Fida enjoyed the diversity and flexibility of teaching and development work combined, it kept her from pledging full-time and identifying with educational development (or any other career choice for that matter) as her primary area of interest and professional focus. Eventually, however, work and family contexts were such (i.e., not restraining or necessitating change – see section above) that she was finally in a position to make career decisions that met her professional needs and interests alone. In so doing, she cast off a life-time of part-time, contractual appointments in a variety of educational settings and ultimately commit to educational development as her primary career.

Mentors. In contrast to the obstacles presented by gatekeepers and distractors, many participants highlighted the importance of various individuals in shepherding them in their educational and career journeys as well as connecting them to and advancing them within the field. Edward, for example, in contrast to Fida's experience above, spoke of the positive influence of his director. He commented: "she saw my potential and then she just pushed me in the right directions….We'd come back together and talk about it [his latest initiative] and she'd give me more advice." Karen, too, appreciated the

mentoring and support she received, especially as she was new to higher education and her developer role specifically. She described what her director did as "modeling." She also emphasized the importance of "talking…with him about faculty roles and responsibilities." In this, she "learned about [both]…side[s] of the house from what he was doing," becoming involved in "university committees,…projects and initiatives" herself until everything began to "unfold" in a way that made sense to her. Victor, too, spoke positively about his director. "For years I've watched her lead in a way that helps people feel like they can achieve their best or help people identify what they're good at." Celine, not having the benefit of experienced colleagues to turn to internally, acknowledged the mentoring and support she received from the larger educational development community and from one experienced centre director in particular.

Lila also picked up on the capacity building and enabling factor of centre directors, identifying these two qualities as being central to their leadership role. With respect to her own unit director, she commented: "I think he values risk-taking very strongly, and he also has a philosophy that you hire people that you trust, and if you trust them, you let them try [things]…and give them…support." The sense of caring and cohesion her director created among the staff reaffirmed, for her, that development work was "not just a job, [but]…something we all care about deeply." Beverly, too, spoke of the capacity building role of her director, stating: "I kept getting asked to do more and more things, to take on a special project that needed to be done right away, and to apply for some special funding,…things with greater and greater responsibility." Beverly believed that in being timely, responsive, and consistently good at what she did that she positioned herself well for future advancement. Indeed, her efforts paid off when her

immediate director retired and she was asked by senior administration to serve as acting director. Likewise, when the new director came on board, he saw to it that her position was eventually made permanent, full-time, and positioned at a more senior level (versus full-time contractual).

Miranda echoed the importance of working with a team of caring and committed individuals, pointing to the positive role they played in connecting her with the field of educational development early in her career. My developer colleagues, she commented, "pulled me into, you know, STLHE and going to conferences, getting in the community. And the more I got into the community, the more I liked the work, the people who were there, and what was going on." Tara, too, appreciated how her director both encouraged her to embrace the scholarship of teaching and learning in relation to her discipline as well as attend conferences and network with the broader educational development community. These supports, she felt, made all the difference to enjoying her job (now her primary career) within an academic sphere, which is how she conceived her role. Refer to Chapter six for more information on conceptions of the field.

The theme of working together or teamwork was further reinforced by Kendra as she reflected upon and articulated the importance of her job structure and the centre staff to her participation in the field. She explained: "I think as a facilitator there was a lot of mentoring…[W]e would always work in pairs so there was a lot of support…[and] a team atmosphere." The positive environment and team structure was underpinned, she said, by a director whose "direction and chief philosophy was that the more people we have and the more resources we have [through these people], the better [positioned we are]…to serve [our] community."

Perhaps Ellen captured best the importance and leadership of a centre director and one's unit colleagues in welcoming, socializing, orienting, and helping new developers gain knowledge of and confidence in their practice, not to mention championing and advocating for teaching and learning in general. She shared:

> I learned a lot through mentoring. [My director] is a really wonderful mentor and I learned a lot. I continue to learn a lot from her about what the field is all about, how she does things, and how she works with faculty…[and] from the…faculty associates in our office…. [It's] the most collaborative place I've worked.

Enablers. These individuals differed from mentors in that there was often a pre-existing relationship with the developer (loosely or directly connected), upon which opportunities or conditions leading to growth and capacity building, and ultimately a career in educational development, were predicated. Lila, for example, never would have gone to graduate school, and hence learned about and engaged in development activities, if an undergraduate professor had not encouraged her to apply with a promise to see her masters' degree completed in one year if she found it not of her liking. Lila's decision to attend graduate school was life-changing in terms of her ultimate career choice, even if at the time, she did not realize this to be the case. Indeed, it was her graduate experience (the facilitative condition/event) that provided her with various teaching opportunities and connected her with the teaching centre and its director (also her former graduate teaching instructor) – first as a participant and later, upon invitation, as a student aide. The latter experience created an interest in and passion for development work, including a desire to help others. It also primed her for when a full-time position became available at her institution's teaching centre (in this case senior administration coming together to

provide funding and positioning to expand the centre and hire full-time developers), to apply for, interview, and accept employment as a developer, thereby symbolizing her official and permanent entry into the field.

In Dan's case, his love of teaching and use of simulation and role play in the classroom created a chance connection with a faculty consultant at his university's instructional support unit. This consultant, like Dan, engaged in similar innovative course practices. By nature of their shared interests, a professional relationship ensued which included regular and informal exchanges about teaching, and, eventually, an invitation by his colleague (soon to be director) to offer a workshop for the centre. The relationship, which predicated the workshop invitation, initiated a history of involvement with the instructional unit, first by association and later as a centre consultant. Again, Dan's professional colleague was key to him engaging with educational development. When the departure of a staff member advanced Dan's colleague to the position of centre director, an opening was created to which Dan was invited to apply. Dan acknowledged that the intervention of his colleague was primary to his career journey. He explained: "had it [the job] not been open at the time and …[had his friend] not suggested to actually apply, I never would have…. It made sense, [but] I wasn't looking for a job, I was still working on my thesis." Again, timing, peer connections, and willingness, albeit with prompting to make the move, pushed Dan in a new direction and a new career.

Reflecting upon her journey, Tara identified a pre-established connection (not to mention a timely chance meeting) with one of her undergraduate professors as being significant to her developing an awareness of and interest in development work.

> It so happened that a professor that I had known in [my] undergraduate [years] and kept in touch with, ended up being an Associate Director at the

> centre….[When] this position came up, he said to me in passing one day, 'oh, you'd be really good for this. I'd like to work with you, you know, you'd really enjoy this.'

While Tara had had contact with her university's teaching centre previously for instructional support purposes, she had never before considered exploring anything further. The invitation to apply for the one-year graduate student developer contract created an awareness of educational development as a scholarly field of study and practice, and situated it as a viable career option within academia – one that eventually saw her fully embrace it full-time at another institution of her choice.

Edward identified a number of individuals who facilitated and laid the groundwork for his entry to the field. As noted previously, his father was foundational to instilling an ethos of "helping people" – a value he takes seriously and sees alignment with in his educational development work. Others along the way included faculty colleagues from multiple institutions. These individuals consistently reinforced what a good teacher Edward was, instilling in him a desire to examine and develop his instructional practice in a more scholarly way. These messages, combined with other opportunities to come his way (e.g., co-presenting with a colleague for an instructional workshop), created an awareness of Edward, by others in the field, thereby positioning him to become involved in development activities and be invited to apply for a half-time developer position at another institution. This appointment represented his first formal connection to educational development and the foundation of his career in the field to come.

Ellen, like Edward, had a family connection (albeit quite different) to development activities and practices by way of her spouse (also a student at the time, but

a few years ahead of her). Already experienced in training and interested in professional development as an alternative career path to academia, her spouse introduced her to various resources and programs available from the university's teaching centre that he himself had already accessed. This introduction, combined with the example of how a graduate student peer could bridge her discipline knowledge in a teaching and learning unit, created an inkling of other career possibilities in academia and an awareness of the scope of practice and diversity of developers who enter the field.

For Victor, as already detailed, personal interest and initiative to see discipline-specific graduate student professional development made available (while still a graduate student himself) intersected with a broader campus initiative led by the Dean of Graduate Studies. This initiative sought to fund and support department-based teaching assistant developers across the institution. As one of the first individuals to hold such a position, Victor forayed into development work for the first time. It was this combination of individual effort and the dean's timing that facilitated an interest in the field and a formal connection to the university's instructional support unit. From there, the groundwork for Victor was set such that when a colleague directed his attention to and suggested that he apply for a posted developer position at his new institution, he seized upon the opportunity even though it increased his workload beyond a regular full-time appointment (i.e., one of several positions he held at the same time).

Like Victor, other study participants similarly identified individuals who directly or indirectly impacted their journey toward becoming an educational developer. For Kendra, Lila, and Miranda, it was a graduate peer who played the facilitating or connecting role. Indeed, these enablers (as noted before) often represented first contact

with a teaching and learning centre, creating a peripheral awareness of the field and incentive for early (and prolonged) engagement. For others, it was a faculty, staff, or professional colleague within their immediate network that connected them to the field. More often than not, the latter group of enablers led directly to their first major or permanent developer role. For Tara, a faculty member who transitioned from within academia to educational development, it was the sharing of her resume between academic administrators that solicited an invitation to apply for and subsequently engage in educational development practice – full-time and as her primary focus. For Karen, Beverly, Victor, and Dan, it was a professional colleague who made them aware of and either encouraged or invited them to apply for a developer position. In the case of Tony (an academic), it was a casual inquiry to a centre acquaintance about a posted development job that produced the response: "Why don't you apply?" Even though the submission date had passed and he had not quite committed himself to making a career shift, with permission from the centre director to submit late, he took the plunge and applied, thereby changing the direction of his career path forever.

Less directly, various individuals known to the participants played an influential role in preparing them for development work prior to them even knowing about it or contemplating a future in the profession. Beverly, for example, acknowledged the significance of a job she had while pursuing her doctorate that positioned her well for a career in educational development. In this case, it was her supervisor's spouse (also an academic) who suggested to Beverly that she apply for the director position of a summer program at her doctoral institution. For Beverly, the job created an extensive faculty network, awareness of institutional and political structures as well as program

coordination and supervisory skills – all of which came in handy when she made the commitment to and applied for her first educational developer position.

Paul likewise pointed to several positions he previously held outside higher education that predicated his development career, not to mention the impactful role of several key mentors and colleagues associated with these jobs, enabling and encouraging him to seek out opportunities to develop himself and advance his career.

Summary

From the examples detailed above, one can appreciate the impactful nature of various individuals and specific events on the career paths of the participants. Seemingly unrelated happenings or personal connections, the timing of these occurrences, and the awareness and readiness of the participants to take action revealed how influential various people and happenings were to their individual career journeys. In the following chapter, the mapping process continues with a summary and discussion of what the participants identified as being helpful (e.g., experiences, training, education) in their efforts to learn about and become educational developers, whether intentional in form or deemed valuable upon later reflection.

CHAPTER FIVE: PREPARING FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This chapter extends the mapping exercise begun in Chapter four with respect to the participants' early and informal professional learning. In recounting their journeys toward becoming educational developers and engaging the field as a whole, the study participants identified various activities and experiences they acknowledged as being helpful in preparing them for and carrying out their developer role before both and after entry to the field. In total, eight unique categories of activities and experiences were identified. Ordered from most to least referenced, they include: (1) conference and organizational meeting attendance, (2) teaching experience, (3) reading, (4) graduate school involvement, (5) former work experience, (6) personal and professional development, (7) interaction with developer colleagues, and (8) other unique experiences. Each category is discussed below, highlighting examples, impact, and tensions as well as influential factors and people germane to the preparation process. The chapter begins with a brief section situating the categories and the participants' learning experiences.

Situating Developers' Preparatory Learning Experiences

While the participants were not asked directly to articulate what they did to educate themselves or to identify what contributed to preparing them for their developer role (though it was a potential probe in the interview guide – see Appendix C), this information nonetheless came out in the interview process. In recollecting their individual journeys, the participants reflected upon and identified different activities and experiences, which for them, predicated early development of their educational

development expertise. It was this "act of attention" which enabled them to distinguish between those occurrences that contributed to their professional learning from those that comprised their everyday experiences, and hence accord them meaning and value (Schultz, 1967 as cited by Eraut, 2004). In the absence of a formalized professional development scheme and the growing number of individuals entering the field (Sorcinelli et al., 2006), identifying the types of experiences and activities that facilitate developer competence and capacity for educational development practice is essential (Chism, 2008).

Each of the eight categories described below highlight the early insights and knowledge gained by the participants, reflecting the informal (i.e., implicit, unintended, opportunistic, unintended learning) versus the formal end of the learning spectrum (Eraut, 2004). Drawing upon Reber's understanding of the concept, Eraut defines *implicit learning* as "the acquisition of knowledge [gained] independently of conscious attempts to learn and in the absence of explicit knowledge about what was learned'" (2004, p. 250). He contrasts *implicit learning* with *reactive learning*, which is intentional and tends to occur "in the middle of the action when there is little time to think" (p. 250) and *deliberative learning*, which is goal-oriented and represents a devotion of time and effort toward acquiring new knowledge and skills. We see evidence of all three types of learning in the examples provided below. Chapter seven further picks up on the theme of professional learning in reference to both communities of practice and with identifying with and committing to one's developer role and the field of educational development as a whole.

Conference and Organizational Meeting Attendance

The experience and opportunity to attend conferences and special meetings of professional associations and organizations at the regional, national, and international level was mentioned most often (89%) by the participants. This finding is not inconsistent with a much larger multinational survey of more than 560 educational developers in which the study author identified attendance at a teaching and learning conference (less so an educational developer type conference or formal coursework) second only to reading in terms of gaining entry-level content knowledge (Chism, 2008). Sorcinelli and her colleagues (2006), in their survey of Canadian and American developers, similarly found that the development opportunities and resources provided by various professional associations were not only informational, but also influential on developer practice.

In this study, it was interesting to note various factors at play that seemed to influence when, who, and how often some participants were able to attend meetings and conferences. In some cases, centre funding, internal unit politics, and/or centre leadership limited who could access and attend such events. This proved to be the case for at least three participants (Kendra, Charlotte, and Beverly) who worked in larger multi-unit centres. Others who engaged in development work may have experienced these conditions also, but did not explicitly state them in their interview. The fact that Tara, for example, did not an attend educational conference or association meeting until she began her first full-time permanent developer appointment, even though she had engaged in development work during and after graduate school, suggests this may be the case. Fortunately, once a full-fledged developer, her director encouraged her to attend various

conferences (e.g., STLHE, EDC, POD) to get to know the community and engage with other developers.

Those study participants who were privileged to attend conferences during their graduate program or post-doctoral fellowship, pointed to key individuals facilitative of their participation. Miranda, for example, noted that it was her immediate centre colleagues, including those with whom she engaged in scholarly research (educational development related), who were vital to her initial conference attendance. "[They] pulled me into, you know, STLHE, and to going to conferences and getting into the community." In the case of Victor, his involvement in a collaborative project with a faculty member resulted in the opportunity to co-present at STLHE and meet esteemed members of the Canadian teaching community, specifically 3M National Teaching Fellows.

Beyond graduate school, Sean pointed to professional colleagues as being key to attending developer events. One of his first was encouraged by a discipline peer, who like him, had one foot in the development world and one foot in the discipline world. This individual urged him to attend his first non-disciplinary conference on the topic of "graduate student training," an area he was already involved in directly at the discipline- and campus-wide levels. In another instance, Sean's centre director asked him to attend an annual meeting of instructional development officers, thereby introducing him to the larger development community. Of special note, Sean said he never would have thought to participate in such an event or associate with such a community if his director had not requested he attend on her behalf. Having said this, he was glad for the opportunity, becoming "interested" in learning more about educational developers, what they did and

represented, and how he could contribute to and take away from his association with them.

Where Sean was encouraged to attend a non-disciplinary educational conference for the first time, Edward and Sarah, the two developers in the study situated in discipline-based units, talked of attending discipline-based education conferences for a change (in addition to general teaching and learning or development conferences and meeting). Again, for Edward at least, motivation to attend came in part from others in the community who were interested in his scholarship. To this, he commented: "I've been asked now to present on a number of different areas [such as the] scholarship of teaching and learning." Others, like Ellen, who practices her discipline directly in her development work, said she attended both discipline-specific and general teaching, learning, and development type conferences.

Some developers, particularly those engaged in the profession for some time (mid to late career), talked of the importance of attending international events such as ICED and the annual conference of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia or HERDSA (teaching, development, and scholarly related). Lila and Dan each spoke to this directly. Lila, for example, commented: "[it] helped me realize some of the assumptions I'm making and see that there are different models working [in] different ways, as well as different pressures.…I found that very useful." Dan, too, commented that it was "a nice change,…a different group, a different mindset. [Really], the same general job, but different approaches, different concerns. It's just nice to step out of the Canadian context."

The remaining participants who mentioned conferences and special meetings indicated that they only began attending such gatherings once they started in their permanent developer role. This group included most of the developers who came from outside higher education and some of those transitioning from within.

In terms of impact, conference and meeting attendance provided opportunities to: (1) engage with and learn about various communities (e.g., development, teaching and learning, educational technology, educational research, other disciplines); (2) become familiar with current issues, trends, and practices impacting higher education and educational development; (3) learn about the field (e.g., models, centre structures, sector histories, development issues); (4) gain specific knowledge and awareness of "what other colleagues do" and the issues and topics being explored at their centres; and (5) make connections and maintain contact with discipline colleagues and development peers. Karen captured nicely many of the benefits associated with conference and meeting attendance.

> STLHE has been a huge one, that's the signature conference, you know, for me. And, of course, the EDC has been hugely helpful. Even those informal IDO [instructional development officer] meetings…where you come home with just one more idea...have been very helpful for my own professional development…and [for] mentorship.

Teaching Experience

Second to conference and meeting attendance was former and current teaching experience either as a university faculty member, a graduate teaching assistant, a corporate trainer, or as an educator in a non-formal learning setting (undertaken by 83% or 15 of the 18 participants). Credibility with the academic community rather than the

actual knowledge and skills gained from teaching was cited most often as the underlying reason for its importance, whether expressed directly or indirectly in relation to legitimacy concerns, instructional perspective (i.e., teaching and learning issues, students of today), rapport building with clients, or confidence to perform one's role. Chism (2008) likewise found this to be the case, but in reference to previous experience or status as a faculty member, which of course includes teaching. The examples below speak to the various perspectives held by study participants regarding the value of teaching experience in preparing them for and in performing their developer role.

Lila and Victor's experiences captured what many participants intimated with respect to legitimacy and credibility. Lila commented, "I think it helps. It makes a difference. It makes…[our work] more credible… [and] easier to address some of the legitimacy concerns if you have taught." More directly, Victor commented, "we get credibility by talking about the teaching we've done.…That's not necessarily a good thing…but it is actually kind of helpful to breaking down some of those walls, if they exist." Lila and Victor's comments highlight underlying tensions associated with development activities where educational development is defined in service versus academic terms, and where developer positions are structured as professional staff versus faculty appointments.

Moving away from credibility and legitimacy concerns alone to the perspective gained through teaching (e.g., knowing about students of today), Dan, Norah, and Tara each highlighted the following in their interview conversations.

> You have to keep teaching. I don't think you have to teach every term all the time, but…I find I have to make reference to the things that I do with students….It helps ground what I do. (Dan)

> You need to be in the classroom…to understand what…issues…need addressing in the current modern classroom. If you have been out of the classroom for five years, it can be hard to have your finger on what students are like, because they're different. It's a very different classroom. (Norah)

> I think if I get too far away from [the] classroom,...it's very easy to give people advice about what they should do in their classroom. But when you're actually there yourself, it reminds you of how difficult it is to implement some of these things. (Tara)

In terms of building relationships and opening doors with individual client groups during consultations and workshops, Tara, Paul, and Kendra each highlighted what teaching experience meant to them. Tara, for example, commented on how much it made her job easier when she could weave into conversations statements such as, "well, the time I had…a student who…" These personal accounts, she felt, held "a lot of weight for people" because they could see that "you've been there, you've done that. You know how it feels so you understand what I'm saying." Not only that, but she believed she could make greater headway in what faculty and others chose to share with her. To this end, she said: "it [teaching experience] helps people tell me things that they might not otherwise" have told me. Likewise, Paul, in living his belief that "the relational element is the starting point" for all things educational development felt that it helped "to have a certain amount of expertise in the act of teaching and all that goes around that." As to self-assurance and the performance of one's work, Kendra, whose teaching experience in her words was "limited," indicated that having "personal experience would help with…[her] confidence…and give [her]…another level of understanding" to engage others in her day-to-day practice.

Beyond building rapport with clients and developing confidence in the practice of educational development, other participants, namely Sarah and Edward, questioned how developers could do their job in the absence of teaching experience. To this end, Sarah emphasized the following.

> I think the foremost thing is lots of hands-on teaching experience. I think it is very difficult to develop teaching or educational tools of any kind if you haven't had any experience delivering education…[or] coming at it from a learner's point of view.

Edward was much more direct in his stance on teaching experience. "How can I be a faculty developer when I'm not practicing the skill set?"

It may be that Sarah and Edward's respective developer positions and individual centre contexts are defined in such a way that teaching is central to their roles and responsibilities. Indeed, not all developer positions are created equal. Different centre structures and institutional circumstances shape job expectations and, hence, the associated knowledge, skills, and abilities required to be effective in what they're asked to do (Wright, 2002).

Aside from the factors already stated above, Tara questioned if she and other educational developers have the time to do the kinds of teaching expected of academics (i.e., faculty members).

> Even though I realize a lot of educational developers don't [have teaching experience], to me, I think it's kind of bonus that I've had the amount of teaching experience that I've had….[Having said this,] I certainly don't want to take on three courses a year or anything like that.

So, while there is agreement that teaching experience is important, how much and how recent one's teaching should be, if one even has time to do it given their dynamic scope of practice, is still collectively undecided.

Dan's solution to gaining instructional experience involved looking inward to his centre, and the prospects to be realized within and through partnerships and initiatives with other academic departments. He also defined teaching more broadly to include short courses and intensive centre programming that involved his staff (e.g., graduate teaching course, teaching certificate program, other) as teachers, facilitators, and models of good instructional practice. As Karen noted, much can be passed on and shared with others from "book knowledge" and the recounting of what one has heard about or observed directly from "other people's struggles."

Beyond an individual context, Sean positioned the role and importance of teaching experience more broadly, recognizing that the scope of developer practice across the profession, while shared on many levels within institutions, varies also in degree, type, and form. He explained:

> I don't see that everything about educational development is teaching people new skills, and so I think there is a role for people within the sector to come from a more theoretical approach.…I think the one focus is that everybody is going to be a facilitator rather than an instructor.

On a similar note, Tara recognized that even though having instructional experience and three letters (PhD) behind her name was beneficial to her directly that this may not be the case for all developers. Hence, she acknowledged that "different individuals will need different knowledge, skills, and experience to come into educational development." Paul spoke to this as well, noting that educational developers could still be "skilled" in their

practice without the benefit of teaching, but that it could potentially make their jobs "harder."

As the field continues to grow and respond to the pressing challenges of higher education (e.g., technology, accountability, and quality assurance), differentiating between the various levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities across developer career stages is ever more pressing (Dawson, Britnell & Hitchcock, 2010).

Reading

Following teaching experience, reading the scholarly literature and practical how-to materials as well as monitoring various organizational listservs and other web-based sources was mentioned next most often by study participants (67% or 12 of 18). In Chism's (2008) much larger study, reading was cited as the number one source for gaining entry level content knowledge of the field. Sorcinelli and her colleagues (2006) similarly highlighted the centrality of various literatures, not only as a source of information about the sector, but also as a major influence on developer practice. The top three literatures referenced most often by developers in their study were those focused on college teaching and learning, faculty development, and higher education. The examples below illustrate and provide context for the reading of various sources (scholarly and practical) toward acquiring professional knowledge and engaging in development practice.

Reflecting back to the start of their careers, some participants commented on the influence of their centre director (e.g., Lila and Sean) in pointing them to read certain materials foundational to learning about the profession. Others mentioned various types of materials (e.g., books, journal articles, listservs, centre newsletters) and the foci of

these sources (e.g., developmental, educational, discipline-specific, other) in relation to various project work or to client consultations. Speaking to project work, Sean spoke of following.

> I've done a lot of reading of the educational literature….The fact that [my director] was in…[education] meant that she…was familiar with the culture, the speak, and the literature, and it meant that I could pick-up a lot more from her than I would have done otherwise.

In reference to client consultations, Kendra commented that she turned to the literature in response to what people needed from her at the time. Edward, meanwhile, highlighted how specific sources of literature were instrumental to the relational and strategic sides of his job. In reference to one specific theory, he noted how he integrated what he had learned into the basic tenets of his developer approach. The description below illustrates this point.

> [I get to] know the environment and the people. I just try to know them first of all and [then] try to build trust with them, to understand them, and [to] try to understand where they're coming from and what their needs are.

This philosophy of practice speaks to Edward's ethos of "helping people," a philosophy he says has evolved since childhood into a guiding life principle. Others still noted the growing range of literatures they turned to, both seasoned developers (i.e., more than 10 years) and those working across disciplines. Dan, for example, an experienced developer in a senior administrative role, noted that he increasingly turned to areas such as "cultural anthropology" to inform his thinking and practice." Fida, meanwhile, a developer who initially came from outside higher education, delighted in discovering a literature base that addressed issues and topics she deemed important and which she had previously

talked about with her fellow teaching colleagues in her previous instructor role. In reference to her first developer position, she mentioned the following:

> [When my director] asked me to…put together a library…I started to read the literature. I found that I was very receptive to this and I thought, "my goodness, you know, here's someone else articulating and in a scholarly way the kinds of conversations, informal conversations I'd been having for a number of years."

As noted in the conferences and meeting attendance section above, the scholarly and practical sources referenced by the participants aided them on several fronts: (1) guiding and informing their philosophy and approach to practice; (2) gaining knowledge of and insight to different methods, ideas, and approaches to development work or issues; (3) being more reflective (i.e., making you question what you do and why); and (4) informing different aspects of developer responsibilities and general development practice.

Graduate School Involvement

Cited almost as often as the benefits of drawing upon various scholarly and practical sources was the value-added experience of the participants' graduate student involvement (by 61% of participants). This was the case also in Chism's (2008) study, whereby previous work experience (e.g., teaching, staff development in primary and secondary school settings) and graduate level schooling (i.e., courses, workshops, apprenticeships) were deemed valuable by developers for the transferable skills they gained. In this study, the participants identified several knowledge and skill outcomes associated with their graduate work: (1) application of subject matter (i.e., coursework, research) to practice; (2) the opportunity to teach, (e.g., as a sessional contract instructor

or teaching assistant), do research, and engage in early development work; (3) professional development opportunities and personal fulfillment (versus for career advancement at all or alone); and, of course, (4) credibility and status. Examples of each of these outcomes are highlighted in the subsections below.

Application to practice. On various levels, many of the participants appreciated what they learned and gained by applying and practicing their discipline knowledge directly or indirectly in their development work. Given that all the participants had advanced degrees and most (11 of 18) had completed a doctorate or achieved all-but-dissertation status (5 of 18) by the time of their interview, this finding is not surprising. For Lila, her coursework and doctoral research gave her a particular "lens" and "knowledge" that turned out to be "valuable" in ways she never expected, that is, understanding specific teaching behaviours and explaining student behaviour to teachers. Miranda likewise mentioned how her "coursework had a lot of emphasis on learning and memory and learning processes," which she was able to "unquestionably" apply to her day-to-day work (e.g., consultations, teaching, program development). Karen, too, noted the insights she gained about her practice and the reflective benefits that came with the structure of her doctoral program. She commented:

> A lot of theory has been quite helpful [in]…helping me understand…[my] practice in context….It's also reaffirmed for me that…practice is a really important component of learning….[My program also] allowed me the time,…structure, and the requirement to engage in reflective practice at a much deeper level than I would [have] if I wasn't a student….Being able to do the readings and then think about it myself allow[ed] me to come at what I'm…[doing] with much more conviction.

And through Ellen, we saw how practitioners can both apply and live the discipline they are trained for, within an educational development sphere, when one's position is intentionally crafted to do so. As Ellen put it, "I do very much what I learned in my PhD,…[not as] a faculty member or trainer, [but]…in my position as an educational developer."

Opportunity access provided through graduate school attendance. In terms of opportunity access, several participants referenced their graduate experience not just for what they learned and could apply to their job, but also what prospects it afforded them, for example: (1) collaborating with faculty and developers on various projects and initiatives, (2) developing research skills, (3) taking a turn at teaching (including teaching assistantships), (4) discovering educational development, and (5) providing a basis of confidence to perform their developer role.

As previously mentioned, Victor noted that he was able to attend his first STLHE conference and meet other teachers and educators as a result of a collaborative project with a faculty member. On a similar note, Kendra and others discovered a passion for teaching and a community of "like-minded" people as participants in and/or as providers of educational development programming. Through her graduate student developer role, Miranda connected with centre colleagues who valued applied research. Through these associations, she became involved in the scholarship of teaching and learning for the first time. Tara spoke of the "perspective" and "skill sets" she gained during graduate school and how she now applies both to her educational development scholarship, thereby bridging her discipline and development worlds. "[I] have broadened my understanding of education…my [own] discipline, and the different tools [we] all bring" from our

respective backgrounds. Norah, on the other hand, spoke of the edge over others that came with having a doctorate, not to mention the foundation it provided both in terms of her overall confidence and her ability to perform as a newly minted developer. In her words:

> I don't think I would have survived this job without [my doctorate]. I don't think I would have had the confidence or the level of thinking necessary to do really well in the job without having done it.…[In fact,] I don't think I would have gotten the job to begin with….I think they were really thrilled when someone applied for [the position]…who had a PhD. I think that kind of won it [over others] on the basis of my degree.

Professional development and personal fulfillment. Aside from the application of their subject matter to their practice, the development of various knowledge and skill sets, and the opportunities afforded to them by participating in graduate education overall, for a handful of participants (all originally from outside higher education), they spoke to the personal and professional development aspects of their doctoral experience. Coming back to Norah, it was revealing that she referred to her doctoral experience as a "gift" to herself, one that provided a backdrop to her professional and personal life.

> My…[doctoral] experience was a gift to me….I did it…to determine my own professional identity and my own personal identity.…I didn't do it strategically to position myself anywhere….[It] was a midlife gift to myself. I've just felt totally grounded since I've done my thesis.

Likewise, Karen positioned her doctoral experience as a professional development opportunity.

> I have a job I really like. It [the PhD] is not for a career. It's because it allows me in a sense to fully investigate things that I should be doing for my job anyway. It's a form of professional development for me.

And Celine, like Karen, saw tangible links between her doctoral program and her role in the larger development community.

> I love my [developer] job and it's become, you know, it's a huge part of my life. It's not just nine to five for me….Finding a Ph.D. program that allowed me to stay in my work,…research what I do, and contribute back to the community was part of the reason I chose to do a Ph.D.

Credibility. As with teaching experience, the participants (whether they had completed a doctorate or not) almost unanimously spoke of the creditability a PhD could or had afforded them in their interactions with others. Edward, for example, likened his PhD to a "shingle." In terms of first impressions and positioning, he commented:

> When you first come to meet the people, it's good to have…the "shingle" so you can wave it in front of them.…It gives you the status you need right off the bat.…When I'm working with professionals, they like it because they can walk around and…introduce me as Dr. X to their colleagues and it does help from their perspective.

Kendra, a midcareer developer who has since put her doctorate on hold, likewise agreed. "I think the PhD, the title, helps to sort of set that [relationship] right from the beginning." Dan, on the other hand, while acknowledging that "there are times when [he is working] with some pompous people that [he] would like to strut a PhD in front of them," felt that he did not need one to do his job and perform it well.

On a more realistic note, Beverly, a teacher and developer of many years, who herself has a doctorate, acknowledged that individuals with PhDs are perceived differently than others without such credentials (e.g., a master's degree). "The reality is,…whether it's true or not, is that someone who has a PhD after their name [is]…thought of as having certain skills that someone without [a doctorate] doesn't

have." While in some situations this may be the case, in Beverly's experience, she acknowledge that "some of the developers [she has]…most looked up to, didn't have a PhD." For her, developer competence and expertise comes from a "mixture" of experience, some education, and the developer's institutional and centre context – the piece that directs what is valued and required to do one's job.

Picking up on the tensions associated with having a doctorate (or not), Tara, a former faculty member, related:

> I have to say that having a PhD…has been really helpful in the sense that I often get faculty in my office for consultations, who, I think, partly because I'm a woman, partly because…I look younger [than my age, and] sometimes [because] I get the…"you are sort of lowly service administrator position"…[think they] don't really have to treat you with any respect or regard….When I get people in my office that have that attitude, which drives me nuts,…I'll try to…subtly [weave my doctorate] into the conversation….It's disgusting, but the tone of the conversation and the way they treat me totally changes. So I am forever grateful that I have my PhD.

While Tara's experience may be more extreme than that of other study participants, it was not an uncommon sentiment among the group. Karen, for example, spoke of the "currency" (i.e., cultural capital) of having a PhD.

> Now that I'm doing my PhD,…it's leveling the field, it's credentials, it's academic currency because, I mean, let's face it,…the university is the only place in which a PhD counts for anything as opposed to deliverables or accountability or all the rest of it.

To the extent that credentials alone are not indicative of the success of an educational developer, Edward would agree with Karen's position. When "it comes…down to the

individual. You can have a PhD and be totally ineffective,…but you can have a master's degree and just be incredibly powerful [at] helping people." So, just as Beverly concluded above, effectiveness as an educational developer is not perceived as being hinged on formal credentials alone, but in the ability of individuals to harness their knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to productively and strategically apply themselves to their practice.

In terms of career advancement, a few developers, both new and mid-career, spoke of the potential a PhD offered toward progression in the field. Celine, having worked in a higher education setting all her professional career, commented:

> I know I always want to work in a university, and I know I always want to work with faculty, but having a PhD, I think, will open doors for me that…might be closed right now. It's a bit of a credibility issue.

Similarly, Karen expressed:

> I think for me, my place within this kind of role in higher education, I do find that I'm lacking something because I don't have a PhD and a regular course that I teach, and that separates me from the people that I'm meant to be serving….I don't see myself doing a PhD for many, many years to come,...[which] could affect my work here….There's not so many directors up there that don't have PhDs.

The tensions alluded to above point to a need to consider, individually and collectively, the necessity and place of a doctorate for developers as part of a professional development scheme. Is it "academic currency" alone that matters or is there educational and professional value to having a doctorate? Celine pointed to the power of a doctorate to potentially "open doors." Karen acknowledged its potential to "level the playing field," while Norah spoke to the "confidence" and "knowledge" her doctorate provided. On a

cautionary note, Edward pointed to the potential "superficial credibility" of a PhD, noting, as did Beverly, that preparation and effectiveness rest in being able to apply one's knowledge, skills, ability to their development practice.

Former Work Experience

As with their graduate school involvement, just over half the participants (56%) credited previous work experience as facilitative of their participation in and preparation for educational development. Again, Chism (2008) found this to be the case in her study as well. More often than not, the participants' former work histories provided foundational knowledge and skills as well as perspective and confidence in what they did and do as developers. This can be seen with Tony, a former faculty member, who spoke of the perspective his previous academic role provided him as a developer.

> It's what you sort of absorb, glean…[or] figure out for yourself in a lot of ways….I've taught quite a bit and I've taught as a new faculty member coming into the system. I know what it's like to try to start a research program and do all this other stuff at the same time. I've supervised graduate students, the whole thing….I can identify with these individuals.

Norah likewise acknowledged the importance of previous career roles given the structure and responsibilities associated with her specific position. "I think the piece that's benefited me most in faculty development work has been my experience in leadership positions as an organizer, administrator, facilitator, [and] initiator." More generally, Charlotte spoke of her own "self-professional development" and "consulting experience" as being foundational to her work, while Celine and Beverly each credited their considerable student and individual work histories at the their respective institutions as being primary. Celine, for example, commented: "I've been a student here for a very long

time….With the exception of being a faculty member I've sort of had the range of experiences." Beverly, in addition to the knowledge and skills she developed as a student and employee (e.g., as an instructor and program director), spoke of the "awareness" she garnered of her campus as well as the "huge networks" she developed as a result of her long and varied work history.

For Karen and others (such as Paul and Norah), the act of doing educational development made them realize that they had already been doing such work (albeit with a different audience) in their former professional roles, hence, their immediate association with and interest in educational development upon learning about it and entering into the field. Karen spoke to this realization openly.

> I had been an educational administrator for a number of years in a school for adults, so upon reflection, I realized that I was doing educational development work….I had a large teaching staff and so I was offering professional development opportunities for that teaching staff, but didn't realize it was educational development.

For others still, educational development extended the opportunity to do, in full or in part, what they had previously done and liked doing. Fida, a teacher and educator with experience in multiple instructional settings, reinforced this point directly. "Partially [educational development] was something new,…a chance to get in at the ground level…and learn right from the outset. I think that [is what] really attracted me,…[but also] working with faculty on teaching…something…[I am] very interested in."

Entry to the field of educational development, then, helped the participants to reflect upon and articulate not only what they were able to transfer and extend to their new profession, but also realize, especially those transitioning from outside a higher

education setting, that their former career histories included aspects of educational development and that this work history helped facilitate their commitment to the profession. Chapter seven elaborates on this point with a discussion of professional commitment.

Personal and Professional Development

Beyond previous work experience, at least half of the participants acknowledged former training and development opportunities engaged in throughout their professional lives as being supportive of their developer role. Many, for example, identified the opportunities extended to them from within their teaching centre and upon entry to the field as foundational to their development career. Examples already mentioned include workshops provided by their centre peers and their unit's teaching certificate program. These types of training provided them a learner perspective and a form of orientation to the sorts of development work they themselves would eventually offer to others. Ellen's director, for example, was very intentional in doing just that. Others still spoke of taking courses out of personal and professional interest that were available through their home institutions. Lila, for example, spoke of a "conflict management" course (and others) she had taken as well as an interest in learning more about "organizational development."

Aside from institutional opportunities, various participants identified training opportunities afforded to them via their former work settings. Sarah mentioned this directly: "I had opportunities to do professional development…[such as] train-the-trainer courses…[and] develop[ing] online user…and classroom educational materials." More generally, Sean noted his "trial and error" approach to teaching through which he identified instructional best practices. Miranda, on the other hand, spoke of the

professional development funds she gained access to by way of her union membership while sessional teaching during her post-doctoral fellowship. Through the availability of these funds she was able to purchase teaching and learning resources and attend conferences and association meetings. So, again, these activities and opportunities contributed to a web of experiences and hence skill and knowledge development toward building capacity as an educational developer.

Interaction with Developer Colleagues

As previously noted, connection and engagement with professional colleagues was deemed significant to the participants' involvement in the field of educational development. In reference to training and development specifically, thirty-three percent of participants directly associated their peers with preparing them for their developer role. Reference was often made in association with conference attendance and/or listserv membership where conversations with their colleagues proved insightful. In this regard, some participants mentioned that contact with their peers afforded them the opportunity "to find out about issues" of immediate importance and to learn about what others were doing in relation to new programs and services being developed at their respective centres. Collaboration with peers on various projects was also judged to be helpful. Such an experience, for example, contributed to a broadening of Tara's understanding of how her own academic discipline and its tools could be and are connected to her educational development practice. Celine, too, spoke of the immersive approach she took upon entering the field, connecting with others in order to learn about and prepare for her new career direction. "One of the first things that I did…in my first two weeks…was just call a whole bunch of different centres and talk to people about what they did." One centre

director in particular, she noted: “was very gracious and invited me out to come and tour her centre, and sort of mentored me, and talked to me about what they do and how.”

It was these kinds of connections that sustained the participants in their work and attracted them to the field in the first place. Chapters six and seven each pick up on the relational and collegial aspects of educational development, both of which participants deemed attractive about the profession.

Unique Experiences

Lastly, the participants mentioned unique experiences and happenings that seeded and informed their developer role whether realized at the time of its occurrence or credited later for its strategic value. Fida, for example, highlighted the insights she gained about students of today and their specific issues through conversations with her teenaged daughter. Karen, meanwhile, spoke of her travel days following her master’s program when she taught for the first time and discovered a passion for teaching – a passion which ultimately set her on a career path in education. Reflecting back, Edward recounted a time as a young person when he lived and worked with a community for a year, learning much about how to navigate and mediate within and between groups and how to: “understand difficult situations, how to handle [yourself], how to find [out] who the chiefs are, how to get on their side, and how to use them to get into the group.”

Summary

The picture painted above suggests that multiple experiences, development opportunities, and credentials helped to prepare and facilitate capacity for and confidence in the participants’ abilities to perform their roles and responsibilities as prescribed by their position profile, their teaching unit, and their institutional context. We learned, too,

that some types of experiences and accomplishments, mainly teaching and doctoral status, were fraught with tension, reflecting individual and institutional perceptions of their merit and function at a personal, professional, and sector level. These tensions necessitate mediation by the community and its practitioners as the field continues to evolve and respond to change and, hence, to individual and organizational needs.

As earlier suggested, the development of a professional development scheme that recognizes the multiple entry points and career lifespan of educational developers holds promise. Already we see this happening in a scholarly way through the identification of requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities of developers (see Chism, 2008) and the differentiation of these competencies and capacities (see Dawson, Britnell & Hitchcock, 2010) across the career stages of educational development (e.g., from graduate student developer through to associate vice president teaching and learning).

In response, professional and sector associations (e.g., POD, SEDA, EDC) are increasingly providing institutes, workshops, conferences, and accrediting frameworks to meet the training and support needs of the profession. Likewise we are seeing graduate programs purposefully oriented to careers in educational development. Together these and other mechanisms have and continue to facilitate entry to the field and progression through the ranks, while at the same respecting the various trajectories and diverse attributes of potential developers.

In the following chapter, the participants' conceptualizations of the field and their developer role are examined.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCEPTUALIZING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This chapter addresses one of the four guiding sub-questions outlined previously in Chapters one and three, that is: *How do educational developers conceive of educational development?* During the interview process, I differentiated between educational development in general and the educational developer role specifically. I did so by asking two separate questions: (1) What does *being an educational developer* mean to you (their developer role)? and (2) What does *educational development* mean to you (the field of practice)? I was interested in knowing if the developers saw a distinction between their role and the profession as whole given the potential influence of situating factors such as the directives of teaching and learning centres and their academic institutions. The following sections of this chapter reveal what I learned about the participants' understanding of the field and their developer role in response to these two questions. Connections to the literature and how educational development is conceived more broadly are woven into the narrative.

Conceptions of their Educational Developer Role

An analysis of the participants' responses revealed that they engaged in various roles, practices, and processes that were broad in scope and multi-faceted. In fact, they used more than 30 descriptors to identify and explain what they do in their everyday practice. I clustered these descriptors into five broad categories (facilitator, connector, consultant, champion, and change agent), expanding on them below with (1) a brief explanation of each grouping, (2) examples of specific terms used by the participants to

describe what they do and how they approach their practice, and (3) illustrative quotations appropriate to the category under discussion.

Of interest, the categories and the associated participant examples mirror a number of the 12 orientations to academic development practice identified by Ray Land (2004) identified in his well referenced study based on interviews with educational developers from the United Kingdom. These orientations include: managerial, political strategist, romantic (ecological humanist), vigilant opportunist, researcher, professional competence, reflective practitioner, internal consultant, modeler-broker, interpretive hermeneutic, and discipline-specific. He situated these orientations as forms of "strategic conduct" (2004, p. 13) used to navigate and make sense of the various "contexts and terrains" (p. 13) in which educational developers practice. More specifically, he described these orientations as "analytic categories that include the attitudes, knowledge, aims and action tendencies of educational developers in relation to the contexts and challenges of their practice" (2004, p. 13). These orientations, he noted, are neither "fixed" nor indicative of "innate" personal attributes; one is not "a 'romantic developer' but rather 'a developer with a romantic orientation'" (2004, p. 6). Educational developers, therefore, do not operate solely from one orientation alone, but from multiple orientations (Land, 2001, 2004) each mediated, for example, by: (1) the developer's institutional, centre, and situational context; (2) the stakeholders involved; (3) positional responsibilities; (4) personal values and beliefs; and (5) individual professional and academic identity. Again, the same can be said of participants in this study, noting as Land did that "the complexity of the field inevitably implies variety of practice" (2004, p. 127). Let us now examine the modes of operation and approaches that the developers in this study employed.

Facilitator. Of all the descriptors, the terms *facilitator* or *facilitating* were used most often by the participants to describe what they do, how they identify themselves, and/or how they approach their practice. Other words clustered into this category included *leading* and *administrating*. These two terms were included either because participant use directly referred to or implied a facilitative process, strategy, or role. For the purposes of this study, the term *facilitator* is used here to describe a skill, role, strategy, or process that educational developers associate with or employ in their day-to-day practice. Sample participant comments reveal variations on the theme of facilitation – both the role and the process.

Sean, for example, used the metaphor of driving to describe his developer role. "I think the focus is that everybody is going to be a facilitator rather than an instructor. You're…the vehicle to make things happen, so you're not going to be the driver." Sean's take suggests that developers play an important role in working with respective clients whether at the individual, committee, departmental, and/or institutional level, but that developers themselves are not solely directive of the process or final outcome. It can either be a shared journey with one's client or more hands-off. On this note, Lila spoke of how she led lightly, but in a facilitative way: "part of what we're doing is leading, and a facilitator also can lead gently, [even] subversively. It's not a push [but rather]…'Where do you think is the best place to go?' and then 'How do we help people get there?'"

Victor also seemed to employ facilitation as a strategy, recognizing that developers alone cannot do and know everything that falls within their diverse scope and location of practice. "We're facilitators of a process, not holders of expert knowledge. We can't know it all." Celine and Ellen, too, acknowledged this predicament (i.e., one

cannot know it all), highlighting two strategies they employ to build capacity and meet the needs of those involved in the situation at hand: (1) collaborating strategically with others (e.g., faculty members, other educational developers, other campus units) and (2) turning to the literature for information, insight, and direction.

Picking up on the relational aspects of development work (another common theme), Edward hinted at the importance of building relationships in the facilitation process. "It's more than just giving help, it's listening to what their needs are, and so one-on-one facilitating." Speaking more broadly to educational developers as a whole, and what helps with facilitation in the first place, Paul suggested, as previously noted, that developers need to possess certain qualities. "I think an educational developer should embody a personality and a demeanor which leads to a facilitation of a relationship of confidence with the faculty member, [where] the relational element is the starting point." Coming back to one of the other descriptors included in this category, Karen characterized the administrative side of her work as encompassing of "one-on-one or going in and facilitating discussions amongst colleagues, and those sorts of things." These examples speak to the varied application of facilitation, reflecting individual contexts and varied levels of developer experience and expertise in the field.

Documented by Wright & Miller (2000) in their analysis of position descriptions more than a decade ago, the facilitative process and the role of facilitator continues to be a mainstay of development work (Taylor, 2005) across the career span (i.e., entry, senior, director, associate vice president) of developers (Dawson, Britnell, & Hitchcock, 2010).

Connector. This category clustered select descriptors together, including *mediator/ing*, *matchmaker/ing*, *networker*, *collaborator/ing* and *talent coordinator*. These

terms were referenced in several of the participant's quotations and reflect the description crafted to capture this category, that being, someone who connects individuals or groups of individuals with other resource people and/or information in a strategic and meaningful way both for their clients and themselves. This category also parallels Land's (2001, 2004) modeller-broker orientation to practice, particularly the brokering side of the two components as illustrated by the examples listed below.

Lila picked up on the networking aspect of educational development. "We connect them [our clients] up with resources or people." Fida, meanwhile, likened her to role to that of a talent coordinator. "I often find myself being in a matchmaker situation. So I think we're sort of talent coordinators, putting people together in meaningful situations." In a similar manner, Edward used the term mediating to describe the role he plays in connecting others, that is, "mediating their needs toward whomever it is that can provide them with resources, finding common ground for the people to collaborate. It's all part of…making the person feel like they're part of the process." Taking direction from her clients, Kendra spoke to the responsiveness of her role, which often required assessing their needs and connecting them with others. "I do what people need me to do, so that might be providing leaders, making connections, [or] discussing what they're doing or what they want to do."

While on the surface, the role of connecting clients with resource information or people may seem simple in task, it belies the importance of existing developer networks and established working relationships (e.g., through collaborations and partnerships), not to mention those still be to be cultivated across the multiple levels within and outside their institutions. As Sorcinelli and her colleagues (2006) rightly point out, we are in the

"age of the network" – an age where "faculty, developers, and institutions are facing heightened expectations, and [where] meeting these expectations will require a collaborative effort among all stakeholders in higher education" (pp. 4-5). For educational developers, this will require skill and finesse. As I discovered in my interviews with the participants, the art and science of connecting people was reflective of their ability to facilitate effectively as well as their collective histories in collaborating with colleagues, clients and departments; valuing previous and institutional roles or positions that connected them with various community members; and a constant surveillance of their institutional and higher education context.

Consultant. The role of consultant or the consultancy process builds upon the connecting and facilitative abilities of the developer. A sense of this meaning appears in the quotations and descriptors associated with the category of consultant. This category incorporated the greatest number of descriptors, including the terms: *coach/ing, advisor/ing, guide/ing, mentor/ing, helper/ing, counsellor/ing* and *teacher/ing.* As such, the term *consultant* is used here to refer to the one-on-one or group supports provided by developers on whatever issue, topic, or concern brought before them. The experience is relationally focused and predicated on building trust, listening, questioning, and supporting the client in and at whatever level is needed. Select quotations below capture the range of contexts in which the participants applied a consultative approach.

As a self-identified athlete, Tony used the metaphors of counselor and coach to describe what he does and how he engages clients in a consultative fashion. As he put it:

> The first thing I do is listen, right? If someone comes in, you just figure it out. You listen. You help them. I don't know how many times people have come in and they don't know why they're coming in, right? So, it's about

> listening, it's about being perceptive enough to ask pointed questions or perhaps not so pointed questions to help the individual come to a place where there's agreement about why they're here and what kind of support they require. So, there's a huge part of counseling to that, there's coaching.

As previously acknowledged, Tony picked up on the relational theme underpinning what developers do in their daily practice.

Being sensitive to the contexts from which her clients come, Tara, too, reinforced the importance of listening and perception. "You really have to listen and you really have to give the right advice for their department, their level in the university." Likewise, Celine spoke of her work as one of guiding faculty in a nondirective way, recognizing that the development aspects of her job go beyond teaching and learning alone. "It's about guiding people through as opposed to telling them what to do. It's about opening people's eyes to the options, not only what they can do that is innovative in their teaching, but also for themselves…[both] career development and professional development." Charlotte, more generally, spoke of the consultative approach she took in her specific scope of practice. "I support faculty in the design and realignment of their courses. I consult with them on their teaching practice, whatever falls within that domain."

The category of consultant, as it is used here, is consistent with the development literature (see Dawson, Mighty, & Britnell, 2010; Land, 2004; Wright & Miller, 2000), a literature which seeks to identify the roles, skills, knowledge, and dispositions of developers. It also parallels the counseling model of educational development proposed by Boud and McDonald (1981) and mirrors the personal development component of Bergquist and Phillips' (1975a) model previously referenced in Chapter two. What is

different now or perhaps emphasized more in the consultative process is the level at which this process takes place – individual to be sure (e.g., graduate student, faculty member, administrator), but also with committees, departments, the institution, and the sector as a whole. This is expressed in several of the orientations to practice proposed by Ray Land (2001, 2004) and in the examples highlighted above. Indeed, the category of consultant bridges three of Land's orientations to practice: (1) the romantic, which has an "emphasis on quasi-counselling" (2004, p. 51) and "individual development" (p. 53); (2) the reflective practitioner, which has as its focus the development of individual clients and "involves consultation with peers and the 'understanding' that is sought through monitoring, evaluation, and triangulation" (p. 94); and (3) the internal consultant, which has as its focus specific groups of people such as departments and curriculum committees, and involves facilitation of as well as navigation between the perceived needs and wants of these groups versus that of the institution, one's teaching and learning unit, or even the individual developer. Of the three orientations referenced here, the latter one (i.e., internal consultant) speaks to the contestable aspects (the politics) of development, aspects that Graham Webb (1996a, 1996b) has spoken to and suggested developers need to be mindful of, ensuring that certain perspectives or world views are not privileged over others, their own included. For it is not up to educational developers to decide what is right or wrong for any one individual or group, but rather to present their client(s) with options, provide context, reveal inconsistencies, offer an outsider (neutral) perspective, and so on.

Champion. Several descriptors were used to characterize the championing role that developers embrace in their individual practice, including: *advocate, promoter,*

enabler, *validator*, and, of course, *champion*. Reflecting these descriptors, the term *champion* is used her to define someone who validates and brings voice to a quality, issue, or concern in support of teaching and learning. The quotations highlighted below provide tangible examples of the championship role developers play both at the macro level of the institution and the micro level of the individual.

Norah, for example, positioned a mainstay of what she and other educational developers do as campaigning for the teaching and learning project – something to be collectively shared within and outside the academic community versus individually owned (Palmer, 1998). She said, "it's not about promoting us [the centre]. It's about promoting teaching and learning....I see educational development as absolutely key to the future success of universities." Dan, too, spoke to this matter, thinking of his own children's experience of higher education:

> It's an opportunity for me and others like me to influence what happens to universities and how students learn. And for me that has potential. It has power. It has promise because part of what I was trying to do was to see if I couldn't get things ready and better for them.

At the level of the individual, Celine not only spoke of supporting faculty members in their educational, personal, and professional endeavours, but also applauding their respective achievements. "Really, [it's] about assisting faculty with advancing their teaching, considering new ideas, looking at innovative ways of teaching, delivering curriculum, and engaging with the students, but also celebrating their accomplishments."

Building on his coaching metaphor, Tony emphasized the need for "championing what they [that is, faculty] do well, recognizing it and talking about it, giving value to it, but in addition to that, talking about where to go next and how." Sean, likewise,

characterized what he does as a "case of encouraging people to recognize that they're doing a lot of relevant work themselves, making sure they know that they're not alone, and to help them recognize and believe [in what they're doing]." Victor further distinguished the importance of honouring individual clients, and like Tara above, being appreciative of their specific contexts. "What I try and do is help people see that I'm honouring where they're coming from, honouring their disciplinary knowledge and background….So, it's getting the balance right between generic and discipline specific stuff." Taylor (2010) theorizes that when working in the disciplines, it is not enough for educational developers to "know about" the disciplines, one has to "know in" the disciplines as well (p. 60). From her perspective, as educational developers increasingly span multiple boundaries and work with ever more diverse groups of individuals, grounding disciplinary knowledge specific to the situation at hand will better serve them in their practice.

The role of developers in championing individual faculty members (and others), supporting them in whatever it is they do, creating self-awareness of their individual merits, and promoting and celebrating teaching and learning as a whole, speaks to a "value commitment" (Gosling, 2010, p. 91) toward teaching and learning in community and the ongoing educational development project of "improvement and innovation…one imbued with strong value commitments to students, their learning and the quality of teaching" (Clegg, 2009, p. 409). It is also reminiscent of two of Land's (2001, 2004) orientations to practice: political strategist and professional competence. A political strategist orientation builds on the developer's networks and informal contacts to position them, their centre, and others for an "organizational cause" (e.g., effective teaching and

learning), one that is predicated "on strategic action" versus "formal reporting channels" (Land, 2004, p. 23). A professional competence orientation, at the individual level, has as its focus the "technical and professional competence" (p. 85) of academics, seeking to build their confidence, while at the same time helping them to identify what they do and what it is about the guidance and support they receive that is potentially useful to their instructional practice.

The knowledge that there exists a persistent need and desire to make teaching public, valued, and foundational to what universities are all about is not new. Over the years, educators and scholars have acknowledged and documented this challenge in the literature – at different levels, from different perspectives, and for various means (see Boyer, 1990; Christensen Hughes & Mighty, 2010; Lerch, 2005; Palmer, 1998). Educational organizations have likewise done the same. Recognizing the need to advocate at a national level, the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, Canada's national teaching and learning association and parent organization of the Educational Developers Caucus, originally positioned advocacy as one of its four strategic directions.

Change agent. The fifth and final category into which a subset of the 30 plus descriptors, mentioned at the start of this section, was clustered is that of *change agent*. Sample descriptors for this category include: *leading change*, *planting seeds* and, of course, *change agent*. Reflecting participant perspectives and practices, the descriptor of *change agent* is used here to define a role, process, or competency associated with educational development work that is goal, change, and/or alignment oriented either at an

individual or institutional level. The quotations highlighted below reflect the participants' comfort with the term and its varied applications.

Fida sets the stage for the importance of facilitating change and contributing to the university with her metaphor of planting seeds, and from there, asking strategic questions. She further recognized the need to alter how she and other educational developers position themselves in their work in order to affect change within their practice and across their institution.

> I think we have to see ourselves more in leadership roles now. We have to see ourselves as helping our universities change, and change in strategic, incremental, and appropriate ways because I think we are more change agents than handmaidens.

Miranda, too, saw value in working for change at the institutional level, but only so far as the missions of those involved were aligned. In her words:

> I think believing in the institution that you work for is a very big part of that too. Feeling aligned with the long-term planning and goals of the institution and wanting to work towards that, or if you don't feel aligned with it, then working towards changing it or making your voice heard.

She further noted that "it is important to be realistic about what you're dealing with and how to go forward with the culture and restrictions that are there, but at the same time to push the envelope and force a little bit of change," which she acknowledged "takes an awful lot of energy and courage."

More at an individual level, Dan noted his comfort level with the term change agent and how he works to accomplish change through individual faculty. "Change agent is a term I'm very comfortable with. You hope to have a chance to open up somebody….I'm working harder through faculty. I really do think learning is about

change, and change is not easy." Edward, in reflecting on how he would like to be remembered as an educational developer, commented: "at the end, when I leave this planet, [I want to]…to be remembered for something I've created or the people I've helped to change. Bottom line, I want to be a change agent, a catalyst to help people more." In other words, Edward wants to be remembered for his efforts designed to make a difference in the lives of others.

That the developers in this study identified change agency as part of their work reflects an emergent need and a desire to champion and advocate for teaching and learning both individually and collectively. Fletcher and Patrick (1998) articulated this need almost a decade and a half ago, recognizing the potential role of developers in supporting their institutions in "rethinking their missions and their purpose" (p.43). Others have similarly identified this need (Land, 2004; Sorcinelli et al., 2006; Taylor, 2005). Most recently, Dawson, Britnell, and Hitchcock (2010) documented the perceived competencies of practitioners (as identified by a subset of the developer community) across developer career stages (i.e., entry, senior and director level), identifying "advocate and change management agent" (p. 13) most often at the director level. More broadly, the involvement of developers in change management signals movement away from the "age of the teacher," reminiscent of development work in the 1960s and 1970s, to the current "age of the network," where developers are involved in initiatives core to their institutions and where faculty development, if it is to be successful, is shared across the university campus (Brew, 2002; Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

The Relational Element

At the heart of being an educational developer is the relational element of educational development practice. This was evident in several instances as discussed in each of the categories noted above. Fida, for example, reinforced the relational aspect of her work with passion, saying:

> No matter how professional we become, if we don't have that social capital, [the rest] doesn't matter. It's the community we create on campus and being in on the ground level, helping faculty find balance, making sure [they]…don't atrophy [or] do it alone.

On a related note, Karen emphasized the importance of:

> making a difference on a human level, [recognizing that] institutional cultures will change and the whole research teaching agenda will change, but the bottom line is that…supports and relationships [are] established with people who are working for a common goal, which is to improve student learning.

Edward, too, believed that the relational process began with establishing trust and included an element of strategy. As he put it:

> So I just get to know them [his clients – individuals and groups] first of all and try to build trust with them and try to understand where they're coming from and what their needs are....Part of the secret of being successful is finding the chiefs [the leaders] in the area.

Victor likewise emphasized the foundational element of fostering sound relationships across client groups.

> To me, this field is all about relationship building. If you build the relationships well, the expertise and all that stuff that people come to rely

> on you for, it just flows naturally. It's so much about relationship building and good will and trust.

From Ellen's perspective, part of the relationship building process involves being attentive to client needs, the various options and approaches to address the situation at hand, and open lines of communication:

> [It's about] figuring out what helps…faculty succeed and then figuring out how to get them there. That's partly training and partly being innovative and engaging them,…focusing them on academic excellence. A lot of that is still teaching, but there are other aspects to that too, and I think essential in all of that is communication.

As the five categories and the associated examples provided by the developers clearly suggest, educational development work is predicated on the relational. It serves as an entry point to build capacity, collaborate with strategic partners, engage the university and institutional constituents, create community, contribute to something bigger than themselves, and, as Brew (2002) and Sorcinelli et al. (2006) point to – share the work of faculty development collectively across the institution. More important, and as discussed in Chapter seven, the relational aspect of development work was identified by developers as being an attractive aspect of engaging in educational development work and the larger community of practice.

Conceptions of the Field of Educational Development

Moving beyond the developer role to conceiving educational development in general, many of the participants initially spoke of it simply as a "helping service" (Tara), "finding ways to help people the most with their teaching and learning related work" (Beverly), "promoting teaching and learning on the campus" (Norah), or "a service-oriented thing" (Tony) where learning is the end goal. These narrow conceptions reflect

the service role of educational development units to faculty, students, and the university as a whole, and bely the emergent role of educational developers as organizational developers – agents of institutional change (Schroeder, 2011) and as academic leaders (Taylor, 2005).

More broadly, some like Victor, Edward, Fida, and Kendra saw educational development as a "community or field of practice" and as "a profession." Kendra, in particular, characterized her community at the local level (i.e., centre or institutional) though she acknowledged it could be bigger.

> [It's] a particular community that I work with and work for and in most cases that's [my institutional] teaching community, whatever's involved in that. It might be faculty and teaching assistants, it might be staff, it might be undergraduate students,…but it also goes broader, beyond the institution.

Others, like Paul, described educational development as "a growth process in which the actors and the conditions, the structures, the organizations, and the activities all work towards making teaching more effective in measurable, tangible ways at an organizational or institutional level." Paul's definition picks up on the evolutionary and progressive aspects associated with the concept of development (Webb, 1996b).

Within an academic sphere, some also characterized educational development along academic lines (see Taylor, 2005), reflecting their discipline training, the flexibility and encouragement of their director to define their development work more broadly (i.e., teaching, service, research), and the growing prominence of the scholarship of teaching and learning movement (see Kreber, 2007; Shulman, 2004) in higher education in general and within the scope of developer practice and teaching and learning centres specifically

(see Eggins & Macdonald, 2003; Felton, Kalish, Pingree, & Plank, 2007; Woodhouse & Force, 2010). Tara clearly conceived educational development as an academic position.

> I see it exactly parallel to an academic position even though it's an administrative position. It allows me a service role. There's also a teaching component whether I'm teaching in my discipline or teaching in terms of workshops or whatever….There's also a research component.…I see it as an administrative position. I see it as an academic position.

Miranda, too, saw parallels between educational development and academic work.

> This is an academic career too. You have the research aspect of it that's important. You have the teaching aspect of it that's important – that's your workshops and all that stuff. And, you have your administrative aspect where you're advocating and being proactive.

Edward also described educational development as moving along academic and helping lines, reflecting his vocational, disciplinary, and philosophical leanings.

> I see it maybe as a three-pronged fork. One is the sort of the research aspect of it, and then the second would be the sort of the pastoral aspect of it [personal development], and then the big one would sort of be the philosophical, you know, what I think and how I feel about it.

While others did not articulate educational development along academic lines as clearly as Edward, Tara, and Miranda, more than half of the study's participants acknowledged that their work involved all three aspects of the traditional academic role: teaching, scholarship/research, and service/administration. In so doing, their conceptualizations moves closer to what Taylor (2005) calls an academic disposition, that is, having "academic expertise (possessing a body of knowledge and being engaged in scholarly work) and social (understanding academic culture, able to interact with a colleague) dimensions" (p. 36).

Changing Conceptions of Educational Development

A subset of the participants, mostly those at the mid-career point and beyond, were able to differentiate between their current and past conceptions of educational development. Below I have contrasted the experience of four developers, offering insights to explain and build on those offered by the developers themselves as to why and how their conceptions changed.

Early conceptions. Contemplating her early educational development journey, Lila related: "I don't think I would have been as big or broad [in my scope or philosophy of practice]. I think I would have been more focused on the details of the day-to-day of what we do – workshops, seminar series, [and] supporting teaching." By the same token, Beverly supposed: "I guess I might have said, it's offering workshops and resources for people to help improve their teaching so they can help their students learn." On a similar note, Miranda indicated: "When I first started, I saw educational development as training for teaching in the classroom." Likewise, Edward initially stated: "when I first started it, I just looked at it from a personal perspective: 'How can I help that individual?' It was superficial."

Celine, a new educational developer (five years or less in the field), indicated that when she first started in the profession, she could not have articulated what educational development was at all or what her developer role constituted. Not only was she new to the field (with no prior engagement), but also to the idea of educational development as a whole (i.e., she had no awareness of its existence as an institutional service or as a career option). This would suggest that the context of one's entry to the field and one's individual career history (or inexperience in this case) is relevant to a developer's ability

to characterize the field and the activities associated with educational development. As Celine herself noted, her learning curve and orientation to the field upon entry was steep – perhaps the steepest of all the participants.

These autobiographical reflections suggest that the simplified more task-oriented descriptions or "event management" as Karen described it, may reflect newness to, but not unfamiliarity with the field (e.g., engaging with educational development as a graduate student or having had a general awareness of its existence within the university). The developers' early conceptions may further suggest a limited awareness of the scope of practices and the range of contexts in which developers work. It could be, too, that the structure of the participants' positions at the time of entry to the field (e.g., entry, part-time, contract, and/or project-based work) was narrow in focus, thereby limiting their exposure to the full range of educational development activities and roles. More likely, their early conceptions speak to the absence of a formalized career path to profile, induct, and shape entry to and advancement within the field.

Current conceptions. Coming back to the same set of developers profiled above, it can be seen from the examples below that their understanding of educational development, at the time of their interview, was more sophisticated from when they first started in the profession. Lila, for example, indicated the following:

> The scope of what we do is huge….We network people. [We do] research as it relates to learning, [even] leading subversively…anything truthfully. I work through the teachers to help the students learn better.

Not only that, but as she further explained, you have to be "pretty confident….If you don't believe in it [i.e., educational development] wholeheartedly, it's very hard to move people." Beverly, too, broadened her definition from a programming focus alone to one

that involved "finding ways to help people the most with their teaching and learning related work….It's about being responsive, but also very proactive, and that's even harder." Edward reflected that "as you get older, you begin to notice there's many more dimensions to the person and so meeting them at all their levels and defining their needs becomes much more multi-layered." Similarly, Miranda indicated: "the more I understand from the last three years of being entrenched in the administrative side of the University, the more I think of career development for faculty members [too]."

Overall, the participants' responses hint at the complexity of development work, suggesting that time and varied experience in one's position, not to mention conversations and connections with other educational developers, both locally and nationally, together provide a backdrop to expand their understanding of educational development as a whole. Their more sophisticated understandings may also be a reflection of how the field has evolved in response to centre, institutional, and sector trends and changes within higher education (e.g., accountability, quality assurance, retention); growth, advancement, and mobility within their individual developer roles and positions; and the relatedness (or not) of their previous work histories to educational development work. Whatever the exact combination of variables, there is a sense that each of their conceptions had changed.

Answering the Question

Of all the questions asked of the participants during the interview process, the two associated with their conceptions of the field and their developer role were most likely to temporarily halt conversation or provoke a comment. In four instances, participants (from all levels of experience and varied age groups) remarked on the challenging nature of

differentiating between the two questions associated with conceiving educational development and articulating one's understanding of their developer role. Ellen commented on this directly. "I'm not sure how different this question is from the previous question….That's a hard question. It's really abstract in some ways." Victor more specifically stated: "that's a big question," while Paul (the most experienced of the four) said, "this is a frightening question." Karen, on the other hand, commented that it was "actually a bit of an issue" for her, as her understanding of the field and her developer role was constantly evolving.

Those participants who did not comment on either question directly, tended to pause in conversation, taking a moment or two to reflect on their response before answering. In some cases, a gentle probe or rephrasing of the question was necessary to help them articulate a response. Even then, a few participants were unsure if their answer was what I wanted to hear, requiring me to reassure them that I was not looking for a particular reply, but rather insight into their conceptions of their role and the field, whatever they may be.

Most likely, the level of effort it took to respond to the questions and in some cases the tentativeness of their responses spoke to how I worded them (there was a very fine distinction between the two). It may also reflect the interrelatedness of how they conceive their day-to-day work as a practitioner and educational development overall. Perhaps, too, they never before had been asked to articulate out loud and in a meaningful way what educational development meant to them. Certainly the currency of the labels *educational development* or *educational developer* within and beyond the academy is tenuous, if not contested. Even within the participant group, some preferred one label

over another (e.g., educational consultant, instructional development, educational developer, faculty developer, facilitator), while for others it did not matter.

To the latter point, Miranda spoke very plainly: "It doesn't matter what we're called….What really matters is how we're valued." Others came to associate with a given term as they connected more with the development community. This was the case for Sarah and Sean. Coming from the private sector, Sarah pointed to the contrast of sites. In her words:

> I guess the term educational developer came on to the radar when I left [industry and entered the field]….I never really thought of the term educational developer to be quite honest until I actually saw the need [and], checked the box to join the satellite group of STLHE….It's not the title I would have used for myself, but once I saw it, I thought "it does kind of describe my interests."

Sean likewise acknowledged how he came to associate with a specific label upon learning about the field as a whole.

> I guess the phrase educational development – I didn't hear about it until maybe five or six years ago. [It] was more the case of another example of me stumbling along in the educational field, that is, doing stuff and then finding out afterwards that it was actually a recognized activity [that had a name].

Others still had a specific preference for one label over another, reflecting their personal, positional, or institutional context. Paul, for example, indicated that he preferred the term *instructional development* "because it [didn't] put the onus on how the faculty member [can] improve, [but rather on] how we organize and deliver a curriculum and set up conditions so that we're improving the quality of education." Karen and Charlotte each preferred the label of *facilitator* because it more closely aligned with how they saw their

roles, while Celine, because of her specific university culture, preferred the descriptor of *faculty developer*. In this, she said: we "don't work with students. The history and the culture won't allow it. That's why I've continued to think of my role as faculty developer as opposed to an educational developer. We're not a teaching and learning centre."

Participant acknowledgement of the lack of currency of educational development beyond academia was evident in their responses as well. When asked to comment on what they tell their family and friends about what they do, academic colleagues included, their explanations belied the range and sophistication of roles, practices, and modes in which they operated. Dan, for example, indicated: "I tell people generally that 'I do what I can to enhance teaching and learning at the campus and I work through faculty.'" Similarly, Sarah communicated: "I just say that 'I teach at the university' and I wouldn't get into the details about educational development or anything." Kendra, too, said that she kept her responses simple to avoid "blank stares." Others (8 of 18 in total) who commented on what they told their social and academic peers about what they do offered similar explanations to those indicated above, sometimes also mentioning their position title or identifying the specific client group they supported (e.g., professors, teaching assistants, graduate students, other).

Not surprisingly, terminology within development circles is contested also. In some cases, the adoption of certain labels as discussed in Chapter two reflects regional nuances and cultural and institutional contexts. As Rowland (2003) reminds us, as more and different voices contribute to the discourse on educational development, achieving a common language may be challenging. Even so, if we look to the development literature, the term *educational development* increasingly seems to be the label of choice,

recognizing its inclusive potential to capture the diversity of the field and its breadth of practice (Felton et al., 2007; Fraser et al., 2010).

The Impact of Context

As alluded to in previous sections, context up until this point has been situated as a mediating factor, not only in how educational developers approach what they do, but also in how they define and conceive of educational development as a whole. Karen pointed to this meaning specifically. She said: "people define what constitutes educational development work in different ways and in context." She related this opinion in reference to a recent international experience, one in which she saw firsthand how the mandate of an institution and its instructional centre can shape what is considered development work. The other participants in this study similarly identified various contextual factors, each operating at different levels (centre, institutional, individual), to influence their conceptions of the field and their overall practice and unit foci. Examples are provided below at different levels.

Beyond university borders, Miranda spoke to the influence of external dictates (e.g., auditing practices and teaching quality initiatives) on the institution and, hence the involvement of her teaching and learning centre on such matters. In reference to the undergraduate degree level expectations, which all Ontario universities are required to integrate into their quality assurance frameworks for program approval and academic review, she commented: "Well! Didn't that get our centre just sucked into the curriculum review process where we've never touched it before!" Such developments have and continue to facilitate access to academic colleagues/administrators and a more central

positioning within universities – the likes of which have never previously been experienced (Clegg, 2009).

From an institutional standpoint, Ellen spoke to various university structures impacting their office operationally and politically. “We’re really central in the strategic plan, so that makes us more in the centre.” Miranda and Paul further noted the impact of institutional culture on their centre and individual practice. In this, Miranda noted the importance of being realistic, mindful of, and sensitive to one’s workplace context both in terms of what you do and how you do it. On a more tenuous level, Paul cautioned, “we are only as strong in the centre as the will of the Vice President Academic in charge at any given moment,” suggesting that teaching and learning centres are still subject to the whims of senior administration, the outcome of which can be positive (e.g., increased funding and positioning) or negative (e.g., reduced resources, centre amalgamation).

At the level of teaching unit, how one’s job is defined and the staffing complement of the centre can be another shaping factor of developer roles, responsibilities, and opportunities and, hence, individual conceptions of educational development. Some centres, for example, hire developers to fulfill specific roles and functions. While there may be shared knowledge and skills across centre staff, positional expectations may require specialization, shaping what the developer does, who they work with, and in what contexts. This was clearly the case for Ellen, who came to her job with specific knowledge and skill sets gained from previous work experiences and her discipline training. Even where there is less variation across positions, it is not uncommon to be selective of individual developer abilities, backgrounds, and experiences to best meet centre needs. Paul, a senior level educational developer, alluded to this

expectation in his example. “Sometimes it becomes a matter of the combination. So, you look for different strengths in different people.” Kendra, too, reiterated this point, noting that the direction and chief philosophy of her director saw more part-time and contract level positions in her office, each working together to meet centre and institutional mandates. In this regard, more people with varied qualifications, performing specific roles, were perceived by the centre director to be a better fit for the unit, its work activities, and its overall structure.

More at the micro level, individual clients were thought to play some part in shaping developer roles and responsibilities, and hence their understanding of what constitutes educational development. As the participants themselves noted educational development work is ever changing, reflecting its responsive and proactive nature. Hence, describing and conceiving what it is can be a moving target. Kendra captured this sentiment in her musings about educational development and her developer role. “Part of what makes it hard for me to define is that I do what people need me to do.”

Summary

This chapter revealed how a subset of Canadian educational developers conceive of what they do (their role) and understand the field of educational development as a whole. The descriptors referenced and the categories into which they were clustered reflect the varied orientations (Land, 2001; 2004) developers embrace in their practices and the breadth of scope and location within their work. Their conceptions of educational development in general reflect how the field has evolved over the last 50 years and how it continues to evolve and situate itself within individual institutions and the landscape of higher education. Central also to their work and conceptions of educational development

is the relational element: the relationships, the networks, and the sense of community they enjoyed. Chapter seven explores further the relational element, identifying it as one of several factors developers found attractive about educational development as a whole.

CHAPTER SEVEN: IDENTIFICATION WITH AND COMMITMENT TO EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This chapter speaks to the final research question outlined in previous Chapters one and three, specifically: *At what point in their journey do individual practitioners begin to think of themselves as educational developers?* What emerged from an analysis of their individual and collective journeys were three phases of becoming, each contributing to their connection and association with the field of educational development as educational developers. As hinted at earlier, the first phase speaks to the "lead-up" and "tipping point" in their academic and professional lives where educational development comes to be seen as a viable career option, one they can potentially commit to for the long-term. The tipping point represents the participants' initial level of commitment to the field. The second phase speaks to what I call the attractiveness of the field, the realization that educational development and/or their developer role offers something that they do not already have or would like to experience more of in their professional lives. The final phase is one of solidification where various conditions associated with identification and commitment to educational development and their developer role are identified. Each phase of commitment to the field and identification with their practitioner role is discussed in turn with reference to the communities of practice and career satisfaction literature.

The Tipping Point: Initial Commitment

Malcolm Gladwell's (2002) book *The Tipping Point* speaks to the conditions under which a wave or movement gains momentum to a point where it either stagnates or

catches on. I have borrowed from his concept of the tipping point to capture that moment or context when the participants in this study developed an awareness of or came to realize that educational development was a viable career path they could legitimately explore on a professional level. For some, this awareness was more immediate, for others it was more gradual.

In the sociological literature, what I call the tipping point is referred to by a number of terms that interchange *career* with *work, professional, occupational,* or *organizational*, that is, career commitment, career identification, career orientation, career motivation, and career-centredness (Blau, 1988). These terms and concepts have been studied over the years by sociologists and social psychologists, examining different aspects and using different measures to distinguish between and among dimensions of career, occupational, professional, or work commitment. For example, Morrow (1983 as cited in Morrow & Goetz, 1988) proposed that work commitment comprises five potential areas of focus: (1) value focus, (2) career focus, (3) job focus, (4) organization focus, and (5) union focus. Others (Jauch et al., 1978; Tuma & Grimes, 1981 as cited by Blau, 1988) have attempted to measure "professional commitment by developing multi-item scales to assess…professional values" (Blau, 1988, p.285). Each area of focus and study has contributed to the literature base and provided insight as to what constitutes career commitment (whatever the area of emphasis).

The concept of commitment has been used in the literature, for example, to explore individual and organizational behaviour (Becker, 1960) and to contrast occupational and organizational commitment (Hebden, 1975). In this study, and specifically this chapter, the focus is on the individual and the evolving and sustaining

factors (personal and otherwise) identified in the data that were found to be facilitative of participant identification with and commitment to educational development. As Becker and Carper (1956) suggest, commitment is an important element in the development of occupational identification, a state educational developers in this study had to realize before they could fully embrace educational development professionally and in a lasting and sustaining manner.

The examples in the remaining part of this section underscore the various conditions and trigger points leading to the participants' initial commitment to the field that were implied in Chapter four. The first four examples reflect the experience of those participants who entered educational development directly from graduate school (Ellen, Dan, Lila, and Miranda), whether completed or not. The next example speaks to a developer (Victor) who transitioned to educational development from within a university context. The last example comes from a developer (Charlotte) who entered the field from outside higher education. Other examples from participants who were former faculty members or who came from outside higher education initially are omitted to avoid duplication, but are noted here to acknowledge their place.

For Ellen, a cross-country move at the end of her graduate program saw her look to the same institution for work as her spouse. Having always had an interest in training and development alongside her discipline focus, she was poised for an academic life as a faculty member, but open to other options also. The tipping point in favour of educational development came when she saw a posting that combined both her disciplinary and training interests. "It was a great fit, so I was really excited." Having previously met someone from her discipline who had worked in a teaching centre, she was not unfamiliar

with what the position might entail. As such, when she saw and read through the posting, she thought to herself, "I've got the teaching and training experience….It sounds pretty good. I could do that." Still, it was close to four years after entry before she fully committed to the field and let go of any notions of a faculty track as her primary career path. Now, when asked about her career plans, she cannot envisage doing anything else. "I see myself doing this for the next long while because I'm really enjoying it and I really feel part of the educational development community."

Having engaged in educational development activities both as a client and a service provider during her graduate and post-doctoral years, Lila made the connection that educational development could be a viable and secure career option for her, during her attendance at a professional development event at an STLHE conference. It was at this preconference workshop for new educational developers that she realized educational development was "not just a contract or a teaching job, [but] a career with a series of models and many other people doing it." For someone who was on an academic track, but who also loved doing educational development work, this workshop was the tipping point that legitimized the field and made it possible for her to commit to it as a career. Coupled at the time with an invitation from her centre director to apply for a position opening and the realization that she was not enjoying her discipline research all that much, it dawned on her that she "could do this [be an educational developer] full-time and get paid for it!" As suggested in Chapter four, timing and self-awareness were key to acting on a new career path that saw her deepen her knowledge of the field, connect with others who like her were new to the community, and respond in a meaningful way to a

latent concern that "education at a university [took place]…often in spite of rather than because of teaching."

Dan, too, was involved in educational development initiatives during his doctoral studies, taking on a part-time consultancy job at his institution's teaching centre, while finishing his dissertation. Like Lila, his attendance at a workshop and the timing of a job offer made him revisit his career goals. He commented:

> I took some workshops early on that were very good. I took one on consulting by Jack Newman. It was brilliant. I ended up with a bundle of tools and strategies [that got me] thinking about the job, which I think has stuck with me for a long time. Up until then, I still kind of imagined myself as just a teacher that was interested in this stuff.…I never thought of myself as professionally helping people.

This awakening primed Dan to rethink his doctoral goals and commit to the field when a full-time position came up at his centre shortly thereafter. "I was getting bored with my academic research. The intention was to finish my thesis, [but] within six months the [consultancy] job went from part-time to full-time....It was a conscious decision to do that [which] meant not finishing my thesis." Again, timing, self-awareness, and opportunity came together at a pivotal time, resulting in a new career trajectory.

For Miranda, it was less an individual event or workshop that was pivotal to committing to the field, but rather a change in status and identity from graduate student to professional that came with completing her doctoral program and changing institutions. As she put it, "it wasn't until I broke away from graduate school and was doing work on my own that I realized how many years of experience I had in this area and identified as someone with a really keen interest in educational development." No longer did Miranda have to hide her "secret passion" for educational development. Upon starting work as an

educational developer in a full-time professional capacity at another institution, she began to say, “I’m an educational developer and that’s what I do.” In this case, her commitment to educational development was facilitated by a change in location, personal reflection, and attention to one versus multiple and competing areas of professional and academic focus.

Victor’s tipping point came when he undertook his first educational developer position outside of graduate school. One of several part-time jobs he had on the go, it was through this position that he became aware of and involved with the larger educational development community – people with whom he could identify. Through contact with the sector community, he gained a sense that he could do development work for the long term. He said:

> I think it was the job [at my second institution],…not just the job, but meeting the network of other developers, so relying on them to learn the job that seemed like a temporary job, [and who collectively] made it clear that this could be a career. [Not only that but] finding out that so many people had various pathways into it…from almost every discipline under the sun, and people who were like me.

Realizing that educational developers came from all walks of life and with different experiences, backgrounds, and credentials further primed Victor to commit to the field when a full-time educational developer job closer to home became available at yet another institution (his third).

> It felt like something I could commit to for a lot longer than just a stop gap temporary thank goodness I have a paycheck kind of thing. I’m doing what I love and it seems to be more rewarding than the cut-throat publish or perish world that I thought I would enter.

These factors combined allowed Victor to envision himself as an educational developer, which up until that time, had been peripheral to him in his pursuit of being and working with other academics.

For Tara (who came from the faculty ranks prior to committing to educational development), the tipping point came when she applied for a tenure track position at a new institution, but did not get it. She recalled: "I remember feeling shocked that I didn't get the job, but at the same time I had this huge sense of relief. I remember thinking at the time, 'what was that all about?'" Not getting the job forced Tara to think more intentionally about her career goals. "It gave me time to think. Even though I was following the academic path, because that's what I'd always done, I didn't know what else to do….I needed a break." Taking a break gave Tara time and permission to step back and re-examine what she really wanted to do – a traditional academic role or an educational developer pathway? Having done so, when an educational developer position became available at the same institution where she had applied previously for a faculty position, it was a sign to her that this was the direction she should be heading. At the time, she recalled saying to herself, "Oh my God! I'm getting a second chance….I'm going to do this for this limited term and see how it goes." The temporary nature of the position allowed Tara to re-orient herself to educational development activities and explore if the work still resonated with her. Obviously, it and the people she worked with agreed with her, for when the new centre director consulted with her about the position, and eventually offered it to her in its permanent full-time form, Tara made an important decision. "For once in my life I'm going to do one job and do it really well."

For those who came from outside higher education with a wealth of experience in teaching, professional development, educational administration, adult education, and so on, educational development proved to be a good fit as a second, third, or even fourth career move. We saw this in Chapter four, for example, with Karen, Paul, and Fida. Of all the study participants, only Charlotte was the most intentional about entering the field of educational development, actively attending to the availability of job postings in teaching and learning units. “I decided to get into a learning centre in an educational institution because they were buying into technology.” Here, Charlotte felt she could develop the expertise she needed in order to continue her work in training and course design, an area she had previously worked in as an independent consultant and continued to do work in as an educational developer.

From the examples cited in this section, it becomes clear that a number of factors were at play in situating the participants’ initial commitment to and identification with educational development. Often their commitment was cemented by timely, facilitative, and opportunistic conditions. In many cases, for example, the participants experienced an event or outcome (e.g., attending a workshop, not getting a job, identifying with others in the field, graduating from school, professional growth) that led them to pause, take stock, and reflect on (e.g., what is important to them, their level of happiness or dissatisfaction with the status quo) what was best for them personally and professionally. The act of pausing to take stock more often than not predicated the making of a decision (e.g., to leave school, exit their former career path, focus on permanent full-time job versus multiple part-time jobs) that timed with the offering of a permanent developer position, led them to commit to the field and turn away from other career options. Variations on

the pattern described above were consistent across participant trajectories and pathways into the field of educational development.

Attractiveness of the Field: Facilitating and Sustaining Commitment

In mapping their journeys toward becoming educational developers, several subthemes emerged related to what I call attractiveness of the field. It is this attractiveness that seems to facilitate and sustain developer careers, their sense of professional happiness, and their commitment to educational development and their developer role overall. I clustered these subthemes into two broad categories: community and satisfaction. The first category speaks to the importance and level of community enjoyed by developers in their daily practice, the relational element (discussed in previous chapters); the second addresses the satisfaction they derived from their work such as making a difference in the lives of others. Collectively, these categories underscore the meaning, fulfillment, and well-being experienced by the participants in their developer roles.

The career development literature references a variety of terms and concepts (e.g., flow, bliss, spirit at work) used to capture and study the notion of career satisfaction and happiness, examining in the process: (1) the influence of workplace factors, (2) the individual's ability to recognize and follow their own interests, and (3) the alignment "among one's personality, values and interests, and the characteristics of one's circumstances" (Henderson, 2000, p. 306). One direction in the literature that resonates with the experience of the study participants is the concept of "spirit at work" (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004, 2006, 2008). Kinjerski and Skrypnek define spirit at work "as a distinct state characterized by profound feelings of well-being, a belief that one is

engaged in meaningful work, a connection to others and a common purpose, a connection to something larger than self, and it has a transcendent nature" (2006, p.232). They further characterized this state of being by four unique dimensions – cognitive, interpersonal, spiritual, and mystical.

> Spirit at work involves: engaging work characterized by a profound feeling of well-being, a belief that one is engaged in meaningful work that has a higher purpose, an awareness of alignment between one's values and beliefs and one's work, and a sense of being authentic; a spiritual connection characterized by a sense of connection to something larger than self; a sense of community characterized by a feeling of connectedness to others and common purpose; and a mystical or unitive experience characterized by a positive state of energy or vitality, a sense of perfection, transcendence, and experiences of joy and bliss. (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2008, p. 320)

The sections on community and satisfaction below provide several illustrative examples of spirit at work in play.

Community. The various communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) to which educational developers belong (i.e., local, regional, national, and international) provide a foundation to situate and appreciate the notion of spirit at work and the qualities educational developers find attractive about the field (itself defined as a community of practice by Canada's national association, the Educational Developers Caucus) and their developer role. These communities of practice offer intangible value to members through their ability to facilitate relationships with professional colleagues (often geographically dispersed), engender a sense of belonging, forge a spirit of inquiry, and impart a sense of professional competence and identity (Wenger et al., 2002). Formally, they also serve to improve the work experience of its members (e.g., help with challenges, confidence in

one's approach, discussion of issues and developments) and provide a means for professional development such as networking, developing skills and expertise, and staying abreast in their field (Wenger et al., 2002). A common theme in this research study is the relational element and the sense of community that the participants derive from their participation in educational development both individually and collectively. It permeates their experience as educational developers and how they conceptualize and articulate their understanding of educational development as a whole.

Above all else, the participants highlighted the foundational and sustaining role of collegiality and community within and amongst developers both at the local level of their centre and institution and more broadly with their sector peers. They characterized this sense of community in terms of shared values and ideas, learning from one another, caring and support, and a sense of place and belonging. Ellen, for example, who kept her career options open during graduate school, believed she made the right career choice in becoming an educational developer versus becoming a faculty member. She attributed her choice of pathways both to the people she worked with and the development community as a whole. As she expressed it,

> [My centre is] the most collaborative place I've worked, and that's something that I really appreciate about the educational developer community. We share our ideas and resources with each other….It's not as competitive as academia. For me it's really about being a part of a professional community that I think is really innovative, that's very creative, that I really enjoy being a part of.

Norah, too, picked up on the sharing capacity of developers, commenting on this directly. What's "really nice about this whole thing is the generosity of sharing. There's no limit to what people are willing to share." Along these same lines, Beverly prized the open give-

and-take and receptiveness between “newcomers” and “old-timers” (Lave & Wenger, 1991) within the larger educational development community.

> I wanted to hear from them so I could learn from them. They are very good at bringing in all voices, and they’re also good at saying, “well, you know, just because I’ve being doing it for 20 years, doesn’t mean there’s not a fresh way to do things.”

The importance of having a sense of place, belonging, and shared values was reiterated by the participants with respect to working in community. In relation to her professional learning, Tara commented:

> Any time I have gone to [development] conferences or have had connections with other people,…I have found the same sense of community. Even at the Professional and Organizational Development Network conference, which is huge, I’ve met people there that I’ve subsequently met again and they always remember who you are and what you do.

In reference to her regional educational development network, Fida acknowledged a similar kind of experience.

> [They’re] a wonderful resource. We meet three times a year, we have our own listserv, and we have a regional conference. We find a sense of belonging, and a sense of community, and a sense of validation there. And, they often become, you know, the place where we test ideas and we do reality checks.

Kendra, too, noted how much she valued having access to and association with a professional group to situate her work and validate her worth. “I think the Educational Developers Caucus has been really useful for me for exchanging ideas and maybe, validating what it is that I do.” Lila’s observations of her own work context perhaps

captured best the sense of caring and shared values among individual developers, centre colleagues, and the sector at large.

> Our office is really supportive of each other. We gain a lot of support and sometimes challenge, [but]…all of us care deeply about what we're doing, so even if we don't agree on everything, we all know that we're heading towards the same point, helping people how to learn how to teach better and helping the student have a better learning experience. And, we get reinforced when we go back to the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education and the Educational Developers [Caucus].

Most striking of all, in appreciating what the developers found to be attractive about educational development, came from those participants who transitioned to the field from within a university setting. In contrasting their academic or discipline worlds with that of educational development, they were able to articulate what they lacked or disliked about their former role and/or work setting. In fact, many of the participant comments outlined below reinforce what has already been mentioned above, but perhaps with a greater level of conviction and force of emotion. We see this beginning with Lila, who said:

> If the people at the university are interesting and nice, the people at the EDC are [in] even a higher concentration…really supportive, really collaborative, pretty much a family....I noticed a big difference between the science community and the EDC community, just [a] complete[ly] different tone at the conferences.

Miranda similarly spoke to the critical, defensive, and individualistic qualities of her discipline versus the spirit of openness and the willingness of developers to share their knowledge, expertise, resources, and scholarship with others. In her comment below, one

gets a sense of her rejection of a discipline-based academic role, where isolation figures more prominently into academic life.

> You've got to find your own rewards. There isn't anybody to pat you on the back.…Coming from that [academic culture] as somebody who's a little more people oriented, I need[ed] a little bit more community and a place where I could go and say, "hey, I'm trying this idea" and rather than everybody attacking it, everybody [is] saying "hmmm, that's got some value. What about this?"….My first experience at STLHE gave me that. It was like this warm sense of community that…drew me towards it more and more.

Kendra likewise commented on the degree of support she experienced within the educational development community and the value placed on teaching at her centre and by her developer colleagues, both of which she found absent in her disciplinary home.

> [My centre] was such a lovely place to be.…People had similar ideas around teaching that I did, as opposed to within my department. [There] I found it really discouraging….Teaching, being a good teaching assistant, and really working on those skills was not something they valued.

In terms of research, Edward, a former teacher and professional, remarked on how the field of educational development was, from his perspective, more accepting of a greater variety of research avenues. For him, it represented "a wonderful venue" to continue doing scholarly work where increasingly it was "rewarded and talked about." Tara, too, acknowledged this point.

> I like to follow different research paths that interest me….One of the things that was problematic about my academic career was [that] once I got locked into a particular field everybody pretty much told me you're stuck in that until you retired, and I don't want to go there.

Beyond not wanting to get locked into a narrow focus of research, Ellen, like Tara, reinforced the importance of working in community versus isolation, and being valued for who you were versus what you could or could not bring to the community. In reference to the isolating nature of the academy, she commented: "I see colleagues and friends who are…academics and they feel very lonely doing research and teaching on their own.…They don't feel like they have a teaching community in their department." Tara perhaps captured best the idea and degree of "fit" that comes with community and collegiality. As she explained:

> I'm so much more comfortable…[with] who I am…in an educational developer role than I ever was as an academic, you know the whole sort of imposter thing. I definitely suffered with that as an academic even though I was a good teacher and published and everything….I never feel that way in the educational developer role.

The examples of community provided here amplify and portray how Wenger (1998; 2006) characterized the element (one of three) of "community" within his construct of communities of practice. The examples also parallel nicely with the dimensions of the "interpersonal" and "mystical" (two of four dimensions) that Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2008) incorporated into their concept of spirit at work. As Wenger argues, it is the very element of community that provides the "social fabric" for learning about the "domain" (second element) – the "raison d'étre" that creates the common ground for and a common sense of identity for all developers – and the means for building and sustaining "social capital" (Wenger et al., 2002). The community element also serves as the backdrop to learn the "practice" (third element) of educational development such as its frameworks, ideas, tools, language, and approaches (Wenger, 1998). In essence, the

community functions as a "learning curriculum" and a "participation framework" for developers to engage in educational development practice moving through an iterative process as they evolve in status from a newcomer, to becoming an old-timer, to being an old-timer (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Satisfaction. Not only did the participants appreciate a sense of community in their work, but they derived a great deal of satisfaction from their daily practice, particularly the variety and challenge associated with their jobs, the ongoing learning opportunities afforded to them, the relational aspects of their work, the flexibility their positions and work settings afforded them, and, most importantly, being able to make a difference and have impact. Lila and Celine each addressed several of these qualities.

> I like the variety. I like learning things all the time, and I like meeting interesting people and talking to them.…The fact that I can sit down and ask them [the client] about Physics and then about Aristotle.…It's very fulfilling. It was interesting to me, too, to continually try to challenge and change what I was doing, and [see] how that changed and improved things. (Lila)

> It's never the same. It's not routine, and I get to work with different people every day…with faculty from a range of disciplines, hearing about what they're doing in the classrooms…and the types of teaching they're doing. It's the variety that I think is most interesting. I get to work on really little things, but also big policy issues. (Celine)

Others cited professional and personal examples of work satisfaction. Fida said she felt sustained by "finding intersections" in her work, such as: identifying places where ideas are relevant and meaningful for people, finding seats at difficult to access tables (e.g., pushing the teaching agenda at dean's council), and establishing a positive

relationship with senior administration for strategic purposes (e.g., institutional positioning). On a more personal level, Paul said he gained satisfaction through "rediscover[ing] a passion for teaching and teaching improvement [through the] daily privilege of sharing very closely with faculty members the intimate part of their lives." These conditions together reinforced for Paul that his transition to higher education to continue his educational career was the right move for him, such that when asked about his take on his developer role, he replied: "I love to be here." Edward, too, identified with the relational aspects of his developer role. "I love working with people.…It's more than just giving them help, it's also listening to what their needs are [so] I can help them out with what background I have."

Contributing to work satisfaction was the degree to which the participants enjoyed a measure of flexibility and choice in their daily practice. Victor, a mid-career developer, spoke to this flexibility at the sector level:

> It [educational development] seems flexible as a field and I think I never want that to change. It seems to me that the richness of the field…[is] that people can speak in a certain disciplinary tongue, you know, and learn how to adapt to the many different settings.

More generally, Karen and Sarah, both mid-career developers who transitioned to educational development from outside higher education, appreciated the flexibility associated with how their jobs were structured and the autonomy they could exercise in their positions. As Karen noted, "what I love about this job is the flexibility. I identify areas of need and respond to it or not" as time, resources, and centre priorities permit. Similarly, Sarah, a discipline-based educational developer, shared: "It's lovely. It [my position] allows you to pick the parts and not have to try all things at the same time."

Along the same lines, Sean commented on how much he valued being able to move back and forth between his developer role and his discipline-based work, attributing it to the level of autonomy each position afforded him and the complementary timing of when things had to be accomplished for each area of responsibility.

> I swing back and forth. During the academic year I have times when I concentrate on centre work and then I step back from that and concentrate on [my discipline work]. I enjoy that ability to be able to oscillate because it gives me a lot of freedom in both camps, and it's also a change….I work longer hours, [but] I don't find that stressful because I'm not doing the same thing all the time.

Underscoring his personal values, Edward appreciated that development work in general and his position specifically allowed him the flexibility to do what he loves best, that is, "helping people." That his director expected and positioned him to engage multiple client groups made development work all the more attractive. "I had a lot more openness because I could go to a different department and just try different things and get to know the people."

Most important, satisfaction for many of the participants was expressed by way of having impact and making a difference in the lives of others. In contrasting his former faculty role with that of being an educational developer, Tony identified what it meant to him to be able to make a difference both for himself and his client(s). He said:

> The broad brush thing is that there's much more immediate feedback [in educational development], much more a feeling of contributing [to something bigger]. I mean, I can do research, I just don't get the same value out of it, the same giddy feeling. It just takes too long.…[F]or me, I can sit down with someone for an hour and together we can do

> something…that has immediate effect.…With some thinking about it and the right attitude, you can actually make a difference.

Ellen likewise picked up on the relevance and immediacy of what she and other developers do. "Our work has immediate impact, and I find it rewarding to work with [graduate] students and see them grow over time, blossoming, becoming confident, and enjoying what they do." Similarly, Fida and Celine each expressed appreciation of the "can do" attitude of developers and the shared desire to contribute to something bigger than themselves in their respective institutional and centre contexts. In reflecting on her foray into educational development, Fida, a seasoned developer, shared:

> I was in on the ground level. It was thrilling, you know, to be a new participant in this profession. There was the sense that I was in on something that was growing…[and] that even though I was a novice and I was learning, I was making a very valuable contribution, not just in my own university, but more broadly through to colleagues around Canada.

At an institutional level, Celine, a new developer, pointed to the satisfaction she derived from seeing what a difference her centre had and could make with respect to teaching and learning. "Being part of a shift in the culture of our institution [and]...seeing the impact that our office has had even on a small scale has been very rewarding."

What the participants in this study deemed to be attractive about their involvement in or association with educational development provides insight to how and when they began to identify with and commit to the field as educational developers. A sense of community and collegiality factored prominently in their commitment to the profession, a commitment that Eraut (2004) believes comes about "through social inclusion in teams [and communities of practice], and by appreciating the value of the work for clients and the workers [educational developers] themselves" (p. 270). As Eraut

suggested could happen, the personal and professional satisfaction the participants gained from their work and the flexibility by which they could operate reinforced a spirit at work, particularly the spiritual dimension, which Kinjerski and Skrypnek conceptualize as "a belief that one is engaged in meaningful work that has a higher purpose, an awareness of alignment between one's values and beliefs and one's work, and a sense of being authentic" (2008, p. 320). These factors combined helped to situate the developers' professional commitment and association.

Being an Educational Developer: Identification and Consolidation

Many elements contributed to the participants identifying with the field of educational development and their developer role. This section outlines four that specifically resonated with the participants and evolved both from an examination of their conceptions of the field and their developer role as well as the participants' individual and collective journeys. Most notable of the four was a change in emphasis from the coordinating aspects of their jobs to building or creating something bigger. Validation by others also factored prominently as did a period of socialization and discovery to orient themselves to the world of educational development, that is, its domain, community, and practice (Wenger, 1998; 2006). Others still (seasoned developers) spoke of a deepening of their identity that came with a more sophisticated understanding of what they did, greater complexity and responsibility in their work, and engaging in activities that connected them with the sector and the international arena in new and profound ways.

From coordinating to building. For many developers, irrespective of their trajectory into the field, their commitment to educational development and identification with their developer role was solidified in part by a change of focus in their work: from

what they saw as coordinating to what they termed as building. We saw early evidence of this in Chapter six in contrasting select participants' (mid to late career) conceptions of educational development. Tony spoke of his change directly when he said, "what's important to me is the switch from coordinating something to actually building something,…recognizing where the issues are and then doing something about it." Kendra, too, spoke of the significance of being part of something bigger as her job shifted in its second year from one of program coordination to one of "working within different departments and with different faculty members and teaching assistants to develop...training programs, or to come in and give one-off sessions or work with people one-on-one." With this shift, she came to be more involved with clients, expanding her scope of practice and her understanding of what it means to be a developer. She also gained an awareness of and connection to the development community outside of her institution, and in so doing, a realization that others did this "actual thing out there" as well. Likewise, Celine, one of the newest developers of all the study participants, said she started thinking of herself as an educational developer only after she realized that she had "developed all this programming for faculty" and had "gone through that cycle of programming [and] had something tangible at the end" to show for her efforts. Given the steep learning curve she had coming into the field, this was a profound realization for her, one that helped to dispel early and episodic moments of her feeling like an "imposter."

These examples combined signal the importance of having tangible evidence of developer efforts, ongoing participation in educational development to advance their practice, and means to develop professional competence in their position. The distinction between and the progression from coordinating to building also suggests a change in

status or a movement from the periphery to the heart of educational development – one that is concrete and visible to others to be judged and/or valued.

Validation by others. Being valued and recognized by others was another key theme with respect to associating with educational development and their developer role – one that was hinted at in Chapter four with respect to the types of influential people (mentors and enablers). Several study participants spoke to the issue of validation by others directly. Fida, for example, mentioned how being asked to serve as a keynote speaker, based on her educational development work and scholarship, was a boost for her sense of self and her accomplishments as a developer. Norah, too, felt like she had arrived when a colleague said to her at professional development event for new faculty developers: "What are you doing here? You should be on the team!" Hearing this, Norah said to herself, "maybe I've got more credibility than I thought I had because I still feel new, in the embryonic stages of things" even three to four years into the position.

Many other participants identified the point at which their colleagues – faculty members, teaching assistants, adminstrators, educational developers, and others – sought them out for their knowledge, skills, and expertise as being central to their sense of connection and commitment to the field. Indeed, recognition by others represented progression toward more advanced participation within the developer community of practice, movement along the continuum of newcomer through to old-timer, and solidification of their identity overall (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Karen, for instance, felt valued when people proactively sought out the services and supports of her centre. This valuing was bolstered by former students of hers, who upon hearing about what she now did, reinforced the need for and importance of the work she was doing. "They validated

the need for…[educational development] through their own learning experience at university." Tony, too, felt more legitimate when he was "asked externally to sit on certain things…a committee, or [to give a] talk, or whatever it might be." For Victor, it was being called upon by his developer colleagues that meant the most to him. In so doing, they made him feel "central to the movement" of educational development. Celine perhaps captured best the point at which she felt "legitimate" in her role and not an imposter.

> The part where I felt legitimate and I felt like I knew what I was doing, [occurred when] someone asked and turned to us, asked my opinion or my assistance in developing workshops outside my normal routine,...then you sort of become aware that others are aware of what you're doing.

Being valued, as evidenced in this chapter, helped the participants explore their career options and ultimately commit to educational development. As Zikic and Hall (2009) acknowledge, a "lack of affirmation and validation of explorers' [that is, educational developers'] interests and competence from significant others limits the expression of the self and may negatively influence career development" (p. 185) and ultimately role identification.

Socialization into the field and developer role. Alongside being validated by others and a change in emphasis in their position from one of coordinating to one of building, a period of socialization, "enculturation into a group" (Boshuizen, Bromme, & Gruber, 2004, p. 6), or "coming to know" (Trowler & Knight, 2000) was necessary to identifying as a developer. Even those with previous educational development or training experience acquired during graduate school or previous jobs noted that it took time –

anywhere between two and four years before they fully felt grounded in their role, situated within the community, and committed to the label of educational developer.

For Ellen, it was close to four years before she could finally call herself an educational developer. Before she could commit to the label and identify as a developer, she had to find a way to weave her multiple identities into an integrated whole. As she put it:

> I think over the last three years I had to learn a lot about educational development because I wasn't specifically trained for this, but now I feel like I'm familiar with what we do and why we do it, and I feel like I know people in the field [and am] part of the community as well.

At the outset of her foray into educational development, she felt "very conflicted" about not knowing if she "wanted to do it for a while, and then maybe go back and become an academic" or not. With the support and encouragement of her director, or what Becker and Strauss (1956) call "sponsorship" (p. 261), to shape and define her role more inclusively and reflective of her discipline and training interests (and identities), Ellen realized she felt more "comfortable in her role" as an educational developer. Now, when asked about her ultimate choice of careers there is not contest.

Kendra aptly described her period of discovery and orientation to her role and the field of educational development as a "settling into" phase. It was during this time that she established her scope of practice and pieced together an understanding of what it meant to be an educational developer. "I think most of my understanding of what an educational developer does or is comes from the people around me, and having a full conversation about what we do and what we don't do." For Kendra, meeting and engaging with her centre peers and connecting with

developers outside her institution was part of her journey toward identifying with educational development. This state only came about as her job evolved, thereby, providing means and opportunity to attend educational developer meetings and teaching and learning type conferences where the development community comes together.

On a similar note, Tony, even with his previous faculty associate experience, noted that it took time to find his way and situate himself within his educational developer role. In his words:

> It probably didn't come right away. It certainly didn't come…even in that first year. I was just doing the job, right! I would say even two years, maybe the third. It was a fact-finding and learning mission for me in the position. And knowing one that you could do it right, that you have something to offer, which takes time, and then secondly having the opportunity to offer it.

While no specific timeframe was articulated, Paul likewise alluded to a point in his career, even with his professional development and curriculum design background, where he finally connected with his new role. "At a certain point in my career, I said 'I am an educational developer, and I want to think of myself as an educational developer for the rest of my life.'" Even after he left the field for a short time due to family reasons, he did so only to come back to it at another institution, and in a more senior level position at which he continues in today.

As the examples above suggest, the participants engaged in a process of sense-making (Trowler & Knight, 1999) as they engaged in various activities associated with professional learning. More often than not, this learning was informal, implicit, and unplanned recognizing that "professionals learn from and in context of their daily work"

(Simons & Ruijters, 2004, p. 210) and that the "cultural knowledge" of what developers do is embedded in their work-based practices and activities (Eraut, 2004, p. 263). Eraut (2004) summarizes four main types of activities that give rise to professional learning and which have been described throughout this chapter and others: (1) participating in communities of practice (or workplace groups), (2) working with and alongside others (including but not just educational developers), (3) engaging with clients (students, faculty, administrators, committees, departments, the university), and (4) tackling challenging and day-to-day tasks.

Deepening developer identity. Those who were mid- or end-of-career at the time of their interview mentioned various factors or experiences that deepened their sense of identification and commitment to the field and enhanced their understanding of what and how they do their work. Karen, for example, after going back to graduate school and feeling more situated in her developer role, reflected on how the experience of her doctoral studies grounded her in her work. She further noted that the "time, structure, and requirement to engage in reflective practice at a much deeper level" enabled her to approach educational development with "much more conviction." Outside of her doctoral studies, Karen talked about the significance of a recent international experience. Through a partnership with her institution's international office, she was able to travel to another country and support the establishment of a new teaching and learning centre. The experience, she felt, was not only rewarding personally and professionally, but also extended her global network of peers and made her realize that people define educational development in various and contextually specific ways. Had Karen not partnered with her

institution's international office and gone overseas, she might not have gained these insights, nor a refreshed interest in her work and the profession overall.

Like Karen, Victor pointed to the growing importance of his sector contacts at the international level. "I just feel there's more to be done at an international level that I'd like to be a part of." As such, he started to attend educational development conferences outside North America, work with educational development scholars on international projects, and both publish and co-edit publications in the field of educational development. The latter in particular "crystallized" for him that he could "stay in the field and make a contribution" and get "paid to do that too!"

Lila, too, noted how her attendance at international development conferences and her role as editor for sector and association publications brought her into contact with other developers who, while dealing with similar issues and challenges, brought "different perspectives" to the conversation. These conversations made her reflect on her own centre and professional practices with new eyes. Combined, these experiences, she said, "sustained" her commitment to the field not to mention provided unexpected "growth opportunities."

These above forms of participation signal their (the more seasoned participants) becoming "full participants" (old-timers) within their communities of practice as they moved along the continuum of participation, negotiating and renegotiating what it means to be and identify as an educational developer (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As Wenger (1998) reminds us, identity in practice is lived (not just a label or category), negotiated (a becoming, ongoing, pervasive), social (community formation of identity), a learning

process (a trajectory in time), a nexus (combines multiple forms of membership), and a local-global interplay.

Summary

This chapter sought to identify conditions and contexts under which the developers made their initial and sustained commitment to the field, and at what point in their journeys they began to identify with their developer role. Initial commitment was captured by the notion of the tipping point – the point at which educational development was favourably perceived as a viable career option. Sustained commitment was marked by what the developers found attractive about participating in the field, mainly, a sense of community and career satisfaction, while identification with their developer role was underscored by their professional commitment and learning that came with contributing (building) to the faculty development process, being validated by others and socialized in the profession, and experiencing new and meaningful forms of participation by which to perceive the field, their role, and their professional identity. Perhaps Simons and Ruijters (2004) capture best what it means to be professional and to identify with one's field or profession, characterizing it as:

> hav[ing] an explicit vision about the profession and its contribution to society; develop[ing] a unique methodology (way of working); be[ing] able to work with a set of tools and techniques that fulfill quality criteria of the professional association [community of practice]; and…[demonstrating] alignment between the vision, methodology and tools and techniques. (p. 208)

In the closing chapter, Chapter eight, major themes and key findings are summarized, study limitations are noted, directions for continued growth and solidification of the field are offered, and recommendations for future research are made.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE RESEARCH JOURNEY – LOOKING BACK, MOVING FORWARD

Introduction

The impetus for this study began with a conversation, several conversations in fact, over time, at various conferences and association meetings, with other educational developers, about how they came to be engaged in the field of educational development – one they eventually selected as their career home. These conversations came from a place of wanting to know: (1) more about the field and what others do in their professional role at their respective teaching and learning centres, (2) if my haphazard experience of entering the profession was any different than that of my peers, and (3) if there was more to learn or know about the sector of educational development than my experiences to date had provided. What I gleaned from these conversations helped me better understand, appreciate, and situate my own pathway to educational development summarized briefly in Chapter one. These conversations also seeded an interest in exploring educational development more formally and in a scholarly way at a time when the field was and is still coming of age, both here in Canada and internationally. Hence, I entered into this study, an extension of my personal and professional journey, to learn more about educational developers, to give back to the members who comprise the larger community (many of whom mentored and openly welcomed me), and to advance the sector as a whole as it continues to solidify its place within academic institutions and the higher education landscape. More important, this study contributes to the scholarship of educational development, bridges a gap in the educational development literature, and provides a base upon which the Canadian educational development sector can examine

how best to attract, sustain, and advance it members throughout their developer careers. In the following sections, I briefly outline my research journey including study limitations, summarize major findings and key themes, discuss sector implications and considerations, and suggest future areas of study.

The Research Journey

My journey began, as noted in Chapters one and three, with a simple question: *How do individuals come to be educational developers?* In order to answer this question, I explored four supporting sub-questions: (1) What processes and practices do educational developers undertake to navigate entry into the field of educational development? (2) What external incidents or situational factors shape the pathways of developers into the field of educational development? (3) How do educational developers conceive of educational development? (4) At what point in their journey do they begin to think of themselves as educational developers?

I conceptualized the process of becoming an educational developer as a journey, based upon my own pathway to and within the profession, and how I approached the study itself – as an "interviewer traveller." As noted in Chapter one, an interviewer traveller refers to someone who roams their environment, connecting with subjects of study to ask questions and converse with them about their experience of the world (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). For this study, I wandered the Canadian university educational development landscape as an "indigenous insider" (Banks, 1998), dialoguing my fellow developer colleagues.

Taking an exploratory qualitative approach, I sought to capture and describe the individual and collective stories of my peers, providing a rich account of their pathways

to the profession, while drawing upon the career development and communities of practice literatures. In total, I interviewed 18 Canadian university educational developers from 16 institutions, working in either a discipline-based teaching and learning centre or a campus-wide teaching and learning unit. My sample was not representative, but purposive (Patton, 2002). This choice of sampling approach was intentional, aiming as I was to connect with a heterogeneous group of participants of varied age, years of experience, sex, geographic location, and professional status, who could provide rich accounts of their pathways during the interview process. These semi-structured interviews as well as my own field notes formed the backdrop for my study findings which are outlined below.

In narrowing the focus of my study, my sample was limited to the Canadian university scene and to those working directly with teaching and learning centres – either campus-wide or discipline-specific (i.e., insiders – situated within the profession). As such, three groups were excluded: (1) college sector educational developers, (2) international development practitioners, and (3) educators engaged in workplace learning, who because of their external location to teaching and learning units (i.e., outsiders – situated external to the profession), are typically not recognized as or attributed developer status within the educational development sector (and possibly their own profession). These individuals may include those who are embedded in academic departments (e.g., faculty associates, mentors, or consultants), in service units (e.g., educational technologists, learning strategists), in university libraries (e.g., liaison librarians), and so on.

In aiming for a heterogeneous sample, I was limited also by what I could or could not discern about potential participants through my personal or collective knowledge about them, from what was publically communicated via centre websites (e.g., staff pages) and the Internet in general, and from what was made available from the password protected online membership directory of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Finally, as I am proficient in speaking and reading in English only, I was not able to conduct interviews with educational developers whose mother tongue was French. These limitations are addressed in my recommendations for future research section found at the end of this chapter.

Study Findings: A Brief Summary

As outlined in Chapters three and four, two distinct trajectories into the field of educational development were identified: (1) those coming initially from outside higher education (six in total), having established careers (often multiple careers) within an educational and/or training sphere and (2) those transitioning into the field from a university context (12 in total), having already started their careers within academia either as a graduate student, a post-doctoral fellow, a faculty member, or as a professional staff member. More often than not, contact with their institution's centre for teaching and learning (often through peer association) represented the participants' point of introduction to educational development, but not awareness of it as a career option or field of study and practice with models, theories, approaches, and a literature base underpinning its existence – that, as previously noted, came later. In fact, only one participant was actively aware of what teaching and learning centres were all about and potentially had to offer, and was actively looking for an opportunity to formally connect

with and work for such a unit. Even at that, it was not for the purpose of building a career in educational development per se, but gaining specific knowledge and skills not easily accessible elsewhere. Otherwise, various conditions, situational factors, or drivers, often serendipitous or coincidental in form, facilitated initial and future contact, resulting in some participants experiencing more direct paths to educational development and others encountering more twists and turns.

In all cases, the participants experienced various obstacles and chance opportunities during their journey in the form of influential people, program structures, teaching centre conditions, and departmental or institutional contexts to name few, not to mention their own personal motivations and interests and their individual responses to external happenings. What helped them forge onwards and navigate their path toward entry and advancement in the field was, as mentioned in Chapter four, the participants' own curiosity, persistence, flexibility, optimism, and willingness to take risks (Mitchell et al., 1999). These skill sets are recognized in the career development literature as being helpful toward individuals recognizing and responding to various barriers and chance encounters that ultimately determine "the circles in which they move and hence the kinds of social encounters they are most likely to experience" (Bandura, 1982, p. 750).

Various individuals within the lives of each participant shaped these social encounters (and likewise these social encounters influenced the various individuals they connected with), and hence their trek toward educational development. Indeed, the participants' collective stories pointed to the impactful nature of various individuals (e.g., colleagues, peers, family members) and the identification of four specific types of players central to their journeys: (1) gatekeepers, (2) distractors, (3) mentors and (4) enablers.

The individuals associated with these categories created, influenced, and/or situated contextual factors or serendipitous happenings that enabled or diverted entry and advancement within the profession either directly or indirectly.

Once the participants became involved in educational development activities as a participant or client and/or as a provider of such services themselves, there seemed to be a tipping point at which they committed to the field as their career home. As noted in Chapter seven, commitment is an important element in the development of occupational identification (Becker & Carper, 1956). In this study, their commitment was solidified by timely, facilitative, and opportunistic conditions, coinciding, for the most part, with the experience of an event or outcome (e.g., attending a workshop, completing one's doctorate, identifying with others in the field) that led them to rethink what was best for them (personally and professionally), and ultimately make a decision to consign themselves to the field. Most often this commitment was solidified with the offering of a full-time position in a teaching and learning centre, one in which a pre-existing relationship existed. What facilitated and sustained their commitment to educational development and their developer role over time, even when various circumstances along the way resulted in a few participants exiting and re-entering the profession, entailed, what I call, the attractiveness factor. By this phrase I mean the perceived fit of educational development with their career aspirations; the satisfaction, flexibility, and sense of accomplishment they experienced in their work (what Kinjerski and Skrypnek [2004, 2006, 2008] refer to as spirit at work); and the community they enjoyed with their professional peers and their centre clients. For the educational developers in this study,

particularly those coming from academic disciplines, the relational element was central to their work and what educational development practice is all about.

In the process of recollecting their individual journeys, the participants identified a number of activities and experiences they found to be helpful in preparing them for and in carrying out their developer role. Outlined in Chapter five, and in order of most to least referenced, they include: (1) conference and meeting attendance, (2) teaching experience, (3) reading, (4) graduate school involvement, (5) former work experience, (6) personal and professional development, (7) interaction with developer colleagues, and (8) other unique experiences. Collectively these types of activities and experiences capture the implicit, reactive, and deliberative forms of learning (Eraut, 2004) that characterize the socialization and induction process of all professionals as they enter into their profession of choice. Given that the field of educational development lacks a professional credential that necessitates specific formal schooling where this socialization and induction process so often takes place, the developers in this study noted that it took between two and four years following entry to the field before they could confidently call themselves educational developers. This block of time was needed to become oriented to and to learn about the intricacies of educational development (i.e., its culture, practices, and values) and was achieved by participating in local, regional, national, and sector communities of practice. Through their participation in these communities at these various levels, they came to know (Trowler & Knight, 2000) what it meant to be a developer. Two other factors that carried across the participant group with respect to their identification with and commitment to the profession was (1) the transition in their role from coordinating alone (e.g., program coordination) to building or contributing to something greater than

themselves or their centre (program/policy development, cultural change) and (2) being recognized and valued by others (i.e., their peers, their client group, their institution, and/or the sector). Both factors suggest movement toward more advanced participation within the educational development community of practice – from that of newcomer, to becoming an old-timer (where you are neither a newcomer anymore, but not yet an old-timer), to achieving old-timer status (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Along this continuum, seasoned developers noted a deepening of their commitment and identification with their role and the field through their involvement in various initiatives and opportune experiences (e.g., scholarship activities, international development work). As Wenger (1998) reminds us, and as previously noted in Chapter seven, identity in practice is lived, negotiated, social, a learning process, a nexus, not to mention an interplay of the local and the global.

In addition to mapping the individual and collective journeys of the participants, I was interested in understanding how they conceive their developer role and the field of educational development overall. In characterizing what they do, the participants used more than 30 descriptors. These I distilled down to five broad categories: (1) facilitator, (2) connector, (3) consultant, (4) champion, and (5) change agent. As noted in Chapter six, many of these categories mapped nicely on to Land's (2004) 12 orientations to development practice, reinforcing, what I cited previously, that "the complexity of the field inevitably implies variety of practice" (p. 127). More broadly, the participants variously described educational development as being service oriented, progressive, a profession, and a community of practice. Further still, more than half the participants perceived educational development along academic lines (i.e., inclusive of teaching,

research, and service) or closer to what Taylor (2005) refers to as an academic disposition. Interestingly, a subset of mid to late career developers were able to articulate how their conceptions over time had changed from one of event management and task completion at the start of their career to a more sophisticated understanding reflective of the evolution of the field, various sector trends, drivers external to the institution, changes in higher education, and individual development careers. Surprisingly, too, a number of participants struggled with differentiating between characterizing their developer role and articulating their understanding of educational development overall. Four participants spoke to this challenge directly, while most others required gentle probing or time to reflect upon their answers before responding to the question. It could be that the participants had never previously been asked to articulate their conceptualizations in such a way. It could be, too, that the various terms used to describe what we do and the currency of these labels within and outside our professional circle is contextually and institutionally specific or centre bound. As more voices enter into the discourse of educational development, we may never have complete agreement on all matters. At the very least, however, we should have some underlying principles or values to which we collectively ascribe.

Sector Implications and Considerations

The following section highlights areas in need of attention by the educational development sector in order for the profession to continue to grow and position itself within higher education and individual academic institutions. The list is not exhaustive, but reflects the experiences of the participants and the key themes that evolved from the data.

Training and development needs of educational developers. With developers entering the field from multiple trajectories, at different points in their careers, and with various educational backgrounds, knowledge and skills sets, and work/life experiences, there is growing demand to provide training and development opportunities that reflect their individual needs as they enter and advance within the field. While we see evidence of the provision of these opportunities underway, as previously noted in earlier chapters (e.g., workshops and institutes offered by national educational development associations), sector attention to articulating a professional development scheme as well as identifying regional and international source providers is needed. With the articulation of a professional development scheme, there is also need to pinpoint and classify the requisite knowledge, skills, abilities, and experiences of developers (see Chism, 2008). At the same time, these competencies and capacities need to be differentiated across the ranks to facilitate advancement of developers through the various career stages of educational development. The latter has only recently been examined (see Dawson, Britnell, & Hitchcock, 2010) as different career paths within the field have become apparent. Now that there is greater mobility to move between institutions and avenues by which to engage in educational development activities, mapping these career paths is vital to attracting new and retaining existing members as well as consolidating our presence within the higher education landscape.

Situating educational development. As my study and others suggest, educational development is moving from the periphery to the centre of postsecondary institutions and higher education overall. Many factors have contributed to this change in status as outlined in Chapter two and as conveyed by the participants themselves.

Accountability and quality assurance measures, for example, have resulted in institutions turning to various academic and service departments within the academy, especially teaching and learning units, to respond to these external drivers. While these occurrences represent leverage opportunities for the sector and for individual teaching and learning centres and practitioners overall, they also represent sources of tension with respect to who, for example, sets the agenda of educational developers, where and to whom efforts and resources are directed, and, finally, what initiatives and directions are prioritized within centres, institutions, and the sector as a whole. As educational development continues to evolve, attention toward addressing these concerns across the sector is needed.

Credentialing and credibility. As an emergent profession, one that is growing and welcoming new centres, new areas of practice, and new members to its ranks, the educational development sector is faced with not only identifying the knowledge and skill sets of its members, but also what, if any, credentials are needed or desired to perform and be acknowledged as educational developers. In this regard, the participants identified two areas of tension: (1) whether educational developers needed teaching experience and (2) whether they needed a doctorate to do their job and be successful. On the teaching side, the participants spanned the continuum on where they sat on the matter possibly reflecting the influence of centre/institutional mandates, their years of experience in the field, and the expectations of their specific developer roles. They did agree, however, that teaching experience provided context to their work and an entry point for building trust and equal footing with faculty and administrators.

With respect to one's educational status, the participants also agreed that having a doctorate did not guarantee individual effectiveness or sound performance. More to the point, having a doctorate provided academic currency, levelled the playing field with other academics, and opened doors previously closed to them. On a less contentious note, the participants acknowledged that their graduate student experiences facilitated application of knowledge to practice, access to opportunities and networks inaccessible to others, personal and professional fulfilment (e.g., confidence, grounding), and, of course, credibility. As the sector formalizes and a professional development scheme is developed, consideration of the need for and effect of requiring certain kinds of knowledge, skills, abilities, and credentials to enter and advance within the field is merited. For example, how will such changes impact who can access and potentially be admitted to the profession?

The relational element. Throughout each of the data chapters, the participants continuously came back to what they found to be attractive about the field of educational development. In this respect, the relational element captures best what they meant. Unlike the isolation that is characteristic of academic disciplines and traditional academic roles (at least most academic roles), educational development has a recent and past history that is built on supporting clients and peers, openly sharing knowledge and expertise, valuing what developers bring to the table irrespective of their level of experience and time in the field, exploring a range of scholarly interests (i.e., not being confined to one area of study), and valuing a breadth of scholarly products and outputs. These examples are characteristic of the educational development experience and are selling points that the sector can maximize to market itself and bring new developers into the fold, while at the

same time sustaining those already engaged in its practice. As the participants themselves acknowledged, this can be done through networking and collaborating at various venues (i.e., conferences, association meetings) and through joint projects and initiatives. National and regional associations can also play an advocacy and partnering role within and between major higher education stakeholders**.**

Future Areas of Research: Some Recommendations

The above sections point to many areas of study where further exploration has the potential to extend the outcomes of this investigation and benefit the sector as a whole. I have outlined them below in brief further adding other considerations based upon my own personal discoveries, interests, and questions that have surfaced as a result of undertaking this research project.

1. As this study was limited to the Canadian university educational development scene, it would be interesting to examine the college sector in a similar manner, recognizing the shared histories of colleges and universities, while at the same time acknowledging their unique differences.
2. In limiting my definition of educational developers to those individuals who were in/formally attached to teaching and learning centres (disciplines-specific or campus-wide), faculty and academic staff members who contribute to the learning of others (i.e., workplace learning) were rendered invisible and excluded from the participant pool. A study that aims both to identify and capture the contributions of these "hidden" individuals as well as examine the contexts in which they are embedded has merit (e.g., as potential sources of membership and entry points to

the profession, and to broaden the boundaries of who and what is considered educational development).

3. As this study was Canadian in focus, it would be interesting to conduct a like study that is cross-cultural in form such that similarities and differences could be traced in support of developer recruitment and cross-border mobility. A regional analysis within Canada may also be of interest. While my sample included developers from across the country, the number of participants interviewed in total was not sufficient to make substantive conclusions about regional variations.
4. With 50 plus years of educational development history behind us, there is opportunity and merit in conducting a study with specific developer cohorts. By doing so, certain discourses, historical cycles, and external drivers may become more apparent, adding to our understanding of educational development.
5. Acknowledging the different trajectories of developers and their varied training and educational needs from entry to exit, an examination of educational developer job descriptions or position profiles may provide insight to the knowledge, skills, abilities and educational requirements of developers of different ranks and positions, not to mention a sense of who is well positioned for such jobs and what kinds of credentials and experiences, for example, open or limit entry to the profession.
6. This study positioned educational development as an emergent profession, but did not directly address its progression and evolution beyond the historical account provided in Chapter two. A professions lens that draws upon the sociological literature in this regard would provide further insight and a foundation and

perspective on which to guide future development of the field in a manner that is consistent with its sector values.

7. This study also examined how individuals began to associate and identify with the profession and their role, but did not speak directly to the identity literature, having conceptualized the process of becoming a developer from a career development and communities of practice perspective. Examining how developers establish occupational/professional identity from a sociological perspective may further enable the sector to attract, develop, and socialize current and future developers.
8. One of the defining elements of educational development is our championing role of teaching and learning in all its various forms. Oftentimes though, teaching and learning units are engaged more directly in the instructional side of supporting faculty and graduate students versus the learning of undergraduate students. With a growing focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning and student engagement, how might educational developers reconceive their role to more directly impact student learning and is this the appropriate thing to do given the supports that already exist within academic and student affairs?

Concluding Thoughts

My closing words to this chapter bring closure to the journey I began so many years ago, informally through conversations with my peers and formally through the initiation of this study. I have delved deeper into understanding what brings like-minded people to the field of educational development; come away with a better sense of how individual developers at various stages in their careers conceive what they do and how it

is changing in response to various drivers, people, and influences; and developed an appreciation of the richness and community spirit that underlies what we do in our professional practice. Now comes a time of reflection as I begin to explore a new path of discovery in relations to the proposed areas of research noted above.

REFERENCES

Acker, S. (2000). In/out/side: Positioning the researcher in feminist qualitative research. *Resources for Feminist Research, 28*(1-2), 189-210.

Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (2003). Hearing others and seeking ourselves: Empathy and emotions in a study of Canadian academics. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 19*(4), 49-64.

Åkerlind, G. S. (2005). Academic growth and development - How do university academics experience it? *Higher Education, 50*(1), 1-32. doi: 10.1007/s10734-004-6345-1

Andresen, L. (1996). The work of academic development – occupational identity, standards of practice, and the virtues of association. *International Journal for Academic Development, 1*(1), 38-49. doi: 10.1080/1360144960010105

Association of the Atlantic Universities. (2011). *Faculty development committee* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.atlanticuniversities.ca/faculty-development-committee

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2011). *About AUCC* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/about_us/index_e.html

Ball, S. J. (1990). Self-doubt and soft data: Social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 3*(2), 157-171. doi**:** 10.1080/0951839900030204

Bandura, A. (1982). The psychology of chance encounters and life paths. *American Psychologist, 37*(7), 747-755.

Banks, J. A. (1998). The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher, 27*(7), 4-17. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1176055

Barr, H., & Tagg, J. (1995, November-December). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 27*(6), 12-25.

Baume, D. (2006). Towards the end of the last non-professions? *International Journal for Academic Development, 11*(1), 57-60. doi: 10.1080/13601440600579050

Baume, D., & Baume, D. (1994, March). Staff development and educational development. *SEDA Newsletter, 2*, 6-9.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines.* Milton Keynes, England: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*(1), 32-40. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2773219

Becker, H. S., & Carper, J. W. (1956). The development of identification with an occupation. *American Journal of Sociology, 61*(4), 289-298. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2773529

Becker, H. S., & Strauss, A. L. (1956). Careers, personality, and adult socialization. *American Journal of Sociology, 62*(3), 253-263. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2772919

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1975a). *A handbook for faculty development.* Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges in association with the College Center of the Finger Lakes.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1975b). Components of an effective faculty development program. *Journal of Higher Education, 46*(2), 177-211. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1980880

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1977). A handbook for faculty development: Volume 2. Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges in association with the College Center of the Finger Lakes.

Betsworth, D. G., & Hansen, J. C. (1996). The categorization of serendipitous career development events. *Journal of Career Assessment, 4*(1), 91-98. doi: doi:10.1177/106907279600400106

Blau, G. J. (1988). Further exploring the meaning and measurement of career commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*(3), 284-297. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(88)90020-6

Blustein, D. L., Prezioso, M. S., & Schultheiss, D. P. (1995). Attachment theory and career development: Current status and future directions. *Counseling Psychologist, 23*(3), 416-432. doi:10.1177/0011000095233002

Boshuizen, H. P. A., Bromme, R., & Gruber, H. (2004). On the long way from novice to expert and how travelling changes the traveller. In H. P. A. Boshuizen, R. Bromme, & H. Gruber (Eds.), *Innovation and Change in Professional Education: Vol. 2. Professional learning: Gaps and transitions on the way from novice to expert* (pp. 3-8). doi: 10.1007/1-4020-2094-5_1

Boud, D., & McDonald, R. (1981). *Educational development through consultancy*. Research into Higher Education Monographs, Vol. 42. Guildford, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brew, A. (1995). *Directions in staff development*. Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press.

Brew, A. (2002). The changing face of academic development [Editorial]. *International Journal for Academic Development, 7*(1), 5-6. doi: 10.1080/13601440210156420

Bright, J. E. H., & Pryor, R. G. L. (2005). The chaos theory of careers: A user's guide. *Career Development Quarterly, 53*(4), 291-305.

Cabral, A. C., & Salomone, P. R. (1990). Chance and careers: Normative versus contextual development. *Career Development Quarterly, 39*(1), 5-17.

Canadian Association of Graduate Studies. (2008). *Professional skills development for graduate students*. Retrieved from http://www.cags.ca/media/docs/cags-publication/Prof%20Skills%20Dev%20for%20Grad%20Stud%20%20Final%2008%2011%2005.pdf

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2011). *About CAUT* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=6

Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education. (2011). *About us: History and mission* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.csshe-scees.ca/02_01_history.htm

Centra, J. (1976). *Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.

Chism, N. (2008, March). A professional priority: Preparing educational developers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Christensen Hughes, J., & Mighty, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Taking stock: Research on teaching and learning in higher education.* Queen's Policy Study Series. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Clegg, S. (2009). Forms of knowing and academic development practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(4), 403-416. doi: 10.1080/03075070902771937

Council of Ontario Universities. (2011). *About* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.cou.on.ca/about.aspx

Crow, M., Milton, O., Moomaw, W. E., & O'Connell, W. R. (Eds.). (1976). *Faculty development centers in southern universities* [Research report]. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Board. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED129132.pdf

Cunsolo, J., Elrick, M., Middleton, A., & Roy, D. (1996). The scholarship of teaching: A Canadian perspective with examples. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 26*(1), 35-56.

D'Andrea, V. D., & Gosling, D. (2001). Joining the dots: Reconceptualizing educational development. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 2*(1), 64-80. doi: 10.1177/1469787401002001006

Dawson, D., Mighty, J., & Britnell, J. (2010). Moving from the periphery to the centre of the academy: Faculty developers as leaders of change. In J. McDonald & D. Stockley (Issue Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol. 122. Pathways to the profession of educational development* (pp. 69-78). doi: 10.1002/tl.399

Dawson, D., Britnell, J., & Hitchcock, A. (2010). Developing competency models of faculty developers. In L. Nilson & J. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (Vol. 28, pp. 3-24). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Dayman, J. L. (1999). *Implementing collaborative learning at the University of Guelph: Faculty perceptions of issues and challenges* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Guelph, Canada.

Diamond, R. M. (2002). Faculty, instructional, and organizational development: Options and choices. In K. Herr Gillespie, L. R. Hilsen, & E. Wadsworth (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples and resources* (2nd Ed., pp. 2-8). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Donald, J. (1986). Teaching and learning in higher education in Canada: Changes over the last decade. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 16*(3), 77-84.

Donald, J. G., & Saroyan, A. (1991). *Assessing the quality of teaching in Canadian universities.*. Ottawa, Canada: Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education.

Donald, J., & Shore, B. (1976). *Annotated index to pedagogical services in Canadian colleges and universities*. Montreal, QC: McGill University.

Duffy, R. D., & Dik, B. J. (2009). Beyond the self: External influences in the career development process. *Career Development Quarterly*, *58*(1), 29-43.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Educational Developers Caucus. (2006). *By-laws of the Educational Developers Caucus of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.stlhe.ca/wp-content/uploads/documents/Bylaws%20English%20Amended%20Feb%2025%202011%20final.pdf

Educational Developers Caucus. (2011a). *Canadian regional educational development organizations*. Retrieved from http://www.stlhe.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/Canadian-Regional-Educational-Development-Organizations-updated-May-2011.pdf

Educational Developers Caucus. (2011b). *Educational Developers Caucus annual conference: Preconference workshops* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://edc.algomau.ca/?q=node/17

Eggins, H., & Macdonald, R. (Eds.). (2003). *The scholarship of academic development.* Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Elrick, M.-F. (1990). Improving instruction in universities: A case study of the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development (OUPID). *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 20*(2), 61-79.

Elvidge, L., Fraser, K., Land, R., Mason, C., & Matthew, B. (Eds.). (2003). *Exploring academic development in higher education: Issues of engagement*. Cambridge, UK: Jill Rogers Associates.

Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*(2) 247-273. doi: 10.1080/158037042000225245

Erickson, G. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. In M. Svinicki, J. Kurfiss, & J. Stone (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional and organizational development* (Vol. 5, pp. 182-196). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Evered, R., & Louis, M. R. (1981). Alternative perspectives in the organizational sciences: "Inquiry from the inside" and "Inquiry from the outside". *The Academy of Management Review, 6*(3), 385-395. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/257374

Felton, P., Kalish, A., Pingree, A., & Plank, K. M. (2007). Toward a scholarship of teaching and learning in educational development. In L. Nilson & J. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (Vol. 25, pp. 93-108). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Finnie, R., & Usher, A. (2005). *Measuring the quality of post-secondary education: Concepts, current practices, and a strategic plan* (Report No. W|28). Retrieved from Canadian Policy Research Network website: http://www.vpit.ualberta.ca/elearning/resources/pdf/finnie_usher.pdf

Fletcher, J. J., & Patrick, S. K. (1998). Not just workshops anymore: The role of faculty development in reframing academic priorities. *International Journal for Academic Development, 3*(1), 39-46. doi: 10.1080/1360144980030106

Fraser, K. (1999). Australasian academic developers: Entry into the profession and our own professional development. *International Journal for Academic Development, 4*(2), 89-101. doi: 10.1080/1360144990040203

Fraser, K. (2001). Australasian academic developers' conceptions of the profession. I*nternational Journal for Academic Development*, *6*(1), 54-64. doi: 10.1080/13601440110033706

Fraser, K., Gosling, D., & Sorcinelli, M.D. (2010). Conceptualizing evolving models of educational development. In J. McDonald & D. Stockley (Issue Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol.122. Pathways to the profession of educational development* (pp. 49-58). doi: 10.1002/tl.397

Gaff, J. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional and organizational development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Gillespie, K. H., Hilsen, L. R., & Wadsworth, E. C., (Eds.). (2002). *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Gillespie, K. J., Robertson, D. L., & Associates. (2010). *A guide to faculty development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Gladwell, M. (2002). The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference. Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Gosling, D. (1996). What do UK educational development units do? *International Journal for Academic Development, 1*(1), 75-83. doi: 10.1080/1360144960010109

Gosling, D. (2010). Value commitments and ambivalence in educational development. In J. McDonald & D. Stockley (Issue Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol.122. Pathways to the profession of educational development* (pp. 91-102). doi: 10.1002/tl.401

Gosling, D., McDonald, J., & Stockley, D. (2007, November). We did it our way! Narratives of pathways to the profession of educational development. *Educational Developments: The Magazine of the Staff and Educational Development Association, 8*(4), 1-6.

Graf, D. L., Albright, M. J., & Wheeler, D. W. (1992). Faculty development's role in improving undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol. 51. Teaching in the information age: The role of educational technology* (pp. 101-109). doi: 10.1002/tl.37219925112

Grant, B. M., Healey, M., & Taylor, L. (Eds.). (2011). Inside cover. *International Journal for Academic Development, 16*(2).

Griffith, A. I. (1998). Insider/outsider: Epistemological privilege and mothering work. *Human Studies, 21*(4), 361-376.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries [ERIC/ECTJ Annual Review Paper]. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 29*(2), 75-91.

Guindon, M. H., & Hanna, F. J. (2002). Coincidence, happenstance, serendipity, fate or the hand of God: Case studies in synchronicity. *Career Development Quarterly, 50*(3), 159-209.

Hansen, E., & Stephens, J. (2000, September-October). The ethics of learner-centered education: Dynamics that impede the process. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 33*(5), 40-47.

Hebden, J. E. (1975). Patterns of work identification. *Work and Occupations, 2*(2), 107-132. doi: 10.1177/073088847500200201

Henderson, S. J. (2000). "Follow your bliss": A process of career happiness. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*(3), 305-315.

Hicks, O. (1997). Career paths of directors of academic staff development units in Australian universities: The emergence of a species? *International Journal for Academic Development, 2*(2), 56-63. doi: 10.1080/1360144970020209

Hicks, O. (1999). Integration of central and departmental development – reflections from Australian universities. *International Journal for Academic Development, 4*(1), 43-51. doi: 10.1080/1360144990040107

Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario. (2009). *2008/2009 Annual Report.* Retrieved from http://www.heqco.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/HEQCO%20Annual%20Report%202008-09%20Online%20Version.pdf

Higher Educational Quality Council of Ontario. (2011). *About us* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.heqco.ca/en-CA/About%20Us/Pages/default.aspx

International Consortium for Educational Development. (2011). *History* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.osds.uwa.edu.au/iced/history

Isaacs, G. (1997). Developing the developers: Some ethical dilemmas in changing times. *International Journal for Academic Development, 2*(2), 6-12. doi: 10.1080/1360144970020202

Jauch, L. R., Glueck, W. F., & Osborn, R. N. (1978). Organizational loyalty, professional commitment, and academic research productivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 21*(1), 84-92. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/255664

Jones, G. A. (1997). Research on higher education in a decentralized academic system: The case of Canada. In J. Sadlak & P. Altbach (Eds.), *Higher education at the turn of the new century* (pp. 189-208). New York, NY: Garland.

Kahn, P. (2004). Careers within staff and educational development. In D. Baume & P. Kahn (Eds.), *Enhancing staff and educational development* (pp. 154-169). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kahn, P., & Baume, D. (Eds.). (2003). *A guide to staff and educational development.* Sterling, VA: Kogan Page.

Kahn, R. L., & Cannell, C. F. (1957). *The dynamics of interviewing: Theory, techniques and cases*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Kezar, A. J. (1999). *Higher education trends (1997-1999): Instruction.* ERIC-HE Trends. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED435348.pdf

Kinjerski, V. M., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2004). Defining spirit at work: Finding common ground. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17*(1), 26-42. Retrieved from http://www.kaizensolutions.org/definingsaw.pdf

Kinjerski, V., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2006). A human ecological model of spirit at work. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 3*(3), 231-241. doi: 10.1080/14766080609518627

Kinjerski, V., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2008). Four paths to spirit at work: Journeys of personal meaning, fulfillment, well-being, and transcendence through work. *Career Development Quarterly, 56*(4), 319-329. Retrieved from http://www.kaizensolutions.org/paths.pdf

Knapper, C. (1985, April). From the editor: Our first newsletter. *Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 1*, 1-6. Retrieved from http://www.stlhe.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/STLHE-Newsletter-01-1985-Summer.pdf

Knapper, C. (1998). Is academic development a profession [Editorial]? *International Journal for Academic Development, 3*(2), 93-96. doi: 10.1080/1360144980030201

Knight, P., & Wilcox, S. (1998). Effectiveness and ethics in educational development: Changing contexts, changing notions. *International Journal for Academic Development, 3*(2), 97-106. doi: 0.1080/1360144980030202

Konrad, A. (1983). Faculty development practices in Canadian universities. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 13*(2), 13-25.

Kreber, C. (2007, Summer). The scholarship of teaching and learning – No one way. *TLA Interchange, 1, 1-6.* Retrieved from http://www.docs.hss.ed.ac.uk/iad/Learning_teaching/Academic_teaching/News/summer2007.pdf

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Land, R. (2001). Agency, context and change in academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development, 6*(1), 4-20. doi: 10.1080/13601440110033715

Land, R. (2003). Orientations to academic development. In H. Eggins & R. Macdonald (Eds.), *The scholarship of academic development* (pp. 34-46). Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Land, R. (2004). *Educational development: Discourse, identity and practice*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, A., Manathunga, C., & Kandlbinder, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Making a place: An oral history of academic development in Australia*. Milperra, NSW: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.

Lerch, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Making a difference: A celebration of the 3M teaching fellowship*. Hamilton, ON: Council of 3M Teaching Fellows, the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.

Lewis, K. (1996). Faculty development in the United States: A brief history. *International Journal for Academic Development, 1*(2), 26-33. doi: 10.1080/1360144960010204

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lindquist, J. (Ed.). (1978). *Designing teaching improvement programs*. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Sound Press.

Macdonald, R. (2003). Developing a scholarship of academic development: Setting the context. In H. Eggins & R. Macdonald (Eds.), *The scholarship of academic development* (pp. 1-10). Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Main, A.N., Berland, A., & Morand, P. (1975). *Teaching and learning. An evaluation of the Ontario Universities Programme for instructional development* (Report – ED119541). Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED119541.pdf

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McAlpine, L. (2006). Coming of age in a time of super-complexity (with apologies to both Mead and Barnett). *International Journal for Academic Development, 11*(2), 123-127. doi: 10.1080/13601440600924488

McDonald, J., & Stockley, D. (2008). Pathways to the profession of educational development: An international perspective. *International Journal for Academic Development, 13*(3), 213-218. doi: 10.1080/13601440802242622

McDonald, J., & Stockley, D. (Eds.). (2010). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol. 122. Pathways to the profession of educational development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the Sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(1), 9-47.

Mighty, J. (2006). *Report on the Educational Developers Caucus (EDC).* Retrieved from http://www.stlhe.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/REPORT_ON_THE_EDC_for_STLHE_Steering_Committee_June_13_06_JM.pdf

Millis, B. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*(5), 454-464.

Miller, M. J. (1983). The role of happenstance in career choice, *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, *32*(1), 16-20.

Mitchell, K. E., Levin, A. S., & Krumboltz, J. D. (1999). Planned happenstance: Constructing unexpected career opportunities. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*(2), 115-124.

Morrow, P. C., & Goetz, J. F. (1988). Professionalism as a form of work commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*(1), 92-111. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(88)90008-5

Moses, I. (1987). Educational development units: A cross-cultural perspective. *Higher Education, 16*(4), 449-479.

Network of European Tertiary Level Educators. (2005). *NETTLE summary*. Retrieved from http://www.nettle.soton.ac.uk:8082?GenInfo?

Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents. (2005). *Guidelines for undergraduate degree level expectations*. Retrieved from http://www.cou.on.ca/issues-resources/student-resources/publications/reports/pdfs/university-undergraduate-degree-level-expectations.aspx

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riegel, R. (1987). Conceptions of faculty development. *Educational Theory, 37*(1), 53-59. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.1987.00053.x

Rojewski, J. W. (1999). The role of chance in the career development of individuals with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 22*(4), 267-278.

Rothstein, W. G. (1980). The significance of occupations in work careers: An empirical and theoretical review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17*(3), 328-343. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(80)90026-3

Rowland, S. (2003). Academic development: A practical or theoretical business? In H. Eggins & R. Macdonald (Eds.), *The scholarship of academic development* (pp. 13-22). Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schroeder, C. M. (2011). Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Seldin, P. (1995). *Improving college teaching*. Boston, MA: Anker.

Seldin, P. (2002). *Administrative portfolio: A practical guide to improved administrative performance and personnel decisions.* Boston, MA: Anker.

Seldin, P. (2004). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Anker.

Seldin, P., & Miller, J. E. (2009). *The academic portfolio: A practical guide to documenting teaching, research, and service.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Sell, G. R., & Chism, N. V. (1991). Finding the right match: Staffing faculty development centers. In E. Zahorski and Associates (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional and organizational development* (Vol. 10, pp. 19-29). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Shore, B. (1974). Instructional development in Canadian higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 4*, 45-53.

Shore, B. & Donald, J. (1974). *Index to pedagogical services in Canadian universities and colleges*. Montreal, Canada: Centre for Learning and Development, McGill University.

Shore, B., Foster, S., Knapper, C., Nadeau, G., Neill, N., & Sim, V. (1986). *The CAUT guide to the teaching dossier: Its preparation and use* (Rev. ed.). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Shulman, L. S. (2004). *Teaching as community property: Essays on higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Simmons, N., Kustra, E., Potter, M. K., Rodgers, R., Scriminger, A., & Wolstenholme, J. (2008). *Mapping the Canadian educational development landscape: Demographics and practices of post-secondary educational development centres* [2008 EDC Grant Program Proposal]. Retrieved from: http://www.stlhe.ca/en/stlhe/constituencies/edc/pdf/Simmons_08grant.pdf

Simons, P. R., & Ruijters, M. C. P. (2004). Learning professionals: Towards an integrated model. In H. P. A. Boshuizen, R. Bromme, & H. Gruber. (Eds.), *Innovation and Change in Professional Education: Vol. 2. Professional learning: Gaps and transitions on the way from novice to expert* (pp. 207-229). doi: 10.1007/1-4020-2094-5_11

Smith, S. (1991). *Report of the commission of inquiry on Canadian university education*. Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. (2007). *Networking guide 2006/2007*. Hamilton, ON: Author.

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. (2011a), *About STLHE: Vision and goals* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.stlhe.ca/about/vision-goals/

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. (2011b). M*emberships: Online directory* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.uoguelph.ca/ltci/stlhe/directory/login.cfm?destination=index%2Ecfm&CFID=3759161&CFTOKEN=ef09a1e69306f663-696E657B-0AE8-7315-910C3188D386FFD9&jsessionid=123059a78ca029393085

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. (2011c). *3M national teaching fellowships* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.stlhe.ca/awards/3m-national-teaching-fellowships/

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Stefani, L. (1999). On becoming an academic developer: A personal journey. *International Journal for Academic Development, 4*(2), 102-110. doi: 10.1080/1360144990040204

Stefani, L. (2003). What is staff and educational development? In P. Kahn & D. Baume (Eds.), *A guide to staff and educational development* (pp. 9-23). Sterling, VA: Kogan Page.

Survey of provision for academic staff development (United Kingdom and Canada) Survey III. (1980, February). Winnipeg, Canada: Department of Education, University of Manitoba. (ED185942)

Taylor, K. L. (2005). Academic development as institutional leadership: An interplay of person, role, strategy, and institution. *International Journal for Academic Development, 10*(1), 31-46. doi: 10.1080/13601440500099985

Taylor, K. L. (2010). Understanding the disciplines within the context of educational development. In J. McDonald & D. Stockley (Issue Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Vol.122. Pathways to the profession of educational development* (pp. 59-68). doi: 10.1002/tl.398

Thielens, W. L. (1957). Some comparison of entrants to medical and law school. In R. Merton, G. Reader, & P. Kendall (Eds.). *The student-physician: Introductory studies in the sociology of medical education* (pp. 131-152). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tiberius, R. (1995). From shaping performances to dynamic interaction: The quiet revolution of teaching improvement programs. In W. A. Wright and Associates (Eds.), *Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies in higher education* (pp. 180-205). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Toombs, W. (1975). A three-dimensional view of faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education, 46*(6), 701-717.

Trotter, B. (1970). *Television and technology in university teaching* [Report]. Toronto, Canada: Committee on University Affairs and Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

Trowler, P., & Knight, P. T. (2000). Coming to know in higher education: Theorising faculty entry to new work contexts. *Higher Education Research and Development, 19*(1), 27-42. doi: 10.1080/07294360050020453

Trowler, P., & Knight, P. T. (1999). Organizational socialization and induction in universities: Reconceptualizing theory and practice. *Higher Education, 37*(2), 177-195.

Webb, G. (1996a). *Understanding staff development*. Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Webb, G. (1996b). Theories of staff development: Development and understanding. *International Journal for Academic Development, 1*(1), 63-69. doi: 10.1080/1360144960010107

Weimer, M. (1990). *Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing instructional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (2006). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction* [Web page]. Retrieved from http://www.ewenger.com/theory/

Wenger. E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Wilcox, S. (1997a). *Learning from our Past: The history of educational development in Canadian universities*. Occasional Papers in Higher Education, No. 8. Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, University of Manitoba. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED443309

Wilcox, S. (1997b). Becoming a faculty developer. In P. Cranton (Issue Ed.), *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* (Vol. 74, pp. 23-31). doi: 10.1002/ace.7403

Wilcox, S. (1998). The role of the educational developer in the improvement of university teaching. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 28*(1), 77-104.

Williams, E. N., Soeprapto, E., Like, K., Touradji, P., Hess, S., & Hill, C.E. (1998). Perceptions of serendipity: Career paths of prominent academic women in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*(4), 379-389.

Woodhouse, R. A, & Force, K. A. (2010). Educational development websites: What do they tell us about how Canadian centres support the scholarship of teaching and learning [Research Note]? *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*(1), 1-6, article 4. Retrieved from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cjsotl_rcacea/vol1/iss1/4

Wright, D. L. (2002). Program types and prototypes. In K. Herr Gillespie, L. Hilsen, & E. Wadsworth (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples and resources* (pp. 24-34). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Wright, W. A., & O'Neil, M. C. (1995). Teaching improvement practices: International perspectives. In W. A. Wright & Associates (Eds.), *Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies for higher education* (pp. 1-57). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Wright, W. A., & Miller, J. E. (2000). The educational developer's portfolio. *International Journal for Academic Development, 5*(1), 20-29. doi: 10.1080/136014400410079

Young, J. B., & Rodgers, R. F. (1997). A model of radical career change in the context of psychosocial development. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *5*(2), 167-182. doi:10.1177/106907279700500204

Zikic, J., & Hall, D. T. (2009). Toward a more complex view of career exploration. *Career Development Quarterly*, *58*(2), 181-191.

APPENDIX A: REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE LETTER

"to be put on OISE/UT Letterhead"

REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE

Date

Name of Potential Participant
Institutional Address

Dear [Name of Potential Participant],

My name is Jeanette McDonald. I am a doctoral (Ed.D) student in the department of Theory and Policy Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). Professionally, I work at Wilfrid Laurier University as Manager of Educational Development (ED) in the department of Teaching Support Services. I am also a member of the Canadian educational development community and the Educational Developers Caucus (EDC).

As part of my doctoral studies I am interested in learning how Canadian university educational developers navigate their way into the field and, at what point in their journey, they begin to self-identify as educational developers. Given there is no common educational requirement (entry or continuing professional development) or formal career structure or training to guide one's pathway into the field, I am most interested in collecting and analyzing stories of educational developers who are at various points in their educational development career (e.g., early, middle, later) to determine what factors, if any, are common and/or critical to their experience of becoming a developer. The working title of my dissertation is "Becoming an Educational Developer: A Canadian University Perspective."

As the field continues to grow and organize, as evidenced most recently by the establishment of the Educational Developers Caucus in 2003, greater understanding of it members, their pathways into the profession, their development needs, and their working contexts is increasingly important. The outcomes of my research have the potential to provide insight into several of these areas and also to inform organizations, like the EDC, what steps they may take to support its members and advance the field. Indeed, the nine aims of the EDC broadly speak to these matters.

In pursuit of my research study, which has been approved by the ethics board at OISE/UT and Wilfrid Laurier University, I am contacting Canadian university educational developers who have a range of working experience in the field to participate in semi-structured interviews. All potential participants have been identified through my cull of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) Networking Guide, the Educational Development Office Profiler website (www.tss.uoguelph.ca/edop) and the publicly available websites of Canadian university teaching and learning websites (however named). Participation in the study is voluntary.

I hope to interview between 18 and 22 individuals from across Canada by telephone, videoconference or face-to-face means, whichever proximity, timing and/or participant preference permits. Interviews may take between 60 and 90 minutes and require participants to reflect and respond to questions about their experiences of becoming an educational developer (e.g., career motivations/decisions, institutional context, personal pathway). Participants will also be asked to share a copy of their curriculum vitae with complete educational background and career history sections. This information will further aid in understanding, individually and comparatively, the career pathways of educational developers.

For clarification and follow-up purposes, participants may be contacted by phone for more information following their interview. With permission, interviews will be recorded and transcribed for later analysis. Participants may decline to answer any question(s) they are not comfortable with and may terminate the interview or follow-up call at any time. Likewise, participants are free to withdraw at any time by notifying me, the principal investigator.

At all times your anonymity and confidentiality will be protected and respected (e.g., use of pseudonyms, generic reference to institutions or geographic locations). All data collected will be used for the exclusive purpose of my doctoral dissertation and any subsequent publications or public presentations that may result. The data generated from the interviews will be kept in strict confidence and stored in a secure location. All raw data including recordings will be destroyed five years after completion of my study (i.e., completing of dissertation). Interview transcripts will be destroyed ten years following completion of my study. No personal information will be used or disclosed in my dissertation or in any future publication or public presentation.

Although there are no direct benefits or compensation for participating in this study, I am happy to provide an executive summary of the study findings and a copy of your interview transcript (if requested) for your personal records and for comment (if desired). Please note that quotes taken from transcripts will be used, for example, to illustrate themes across cases. At no time will you be judged or evaluated or a value-judgment placed on your interview responses. Please further note that there are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

At this time, I invite you to take part in this study. Please email or call me directly to indicate your interest. If I do not hear from you within 7 to 14 days, I will follow-up with

you by email or telephone to confirm your interest in participating in the study. At this time, arrangements for an interview will be coordinated, two copies of the study consent form will be forwarded to you for signature, and a list of topic areas shared in preparation for the forthcoming interview. In the mean time, if you have any questions or concerns, or if you would like more information about the study, please don't hesitate to contact me by telephone at 519 884-0710, ext. 3211 during regular business hours, at home in the evening at 519 837-8048, or by email at jmcdonald@wlu.ca. My supervisor, Dr. Sandra Acker, Professor, Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, is also available by telephone at 416 923-6641, ext. 2272 or by email at sacker@oise.utoronto.ca.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeanette McDonald
Ed. D. Candidate, Theory and Policy Studies in Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
Manager of Educational Development, Wilfrid Laurier University

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

"to be put on OISE/UT Letterhead"

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Date

[Name of Study Participant]:

Study Title: "Becoming an Educational Developer: A Canadian University Perspective"

This study will examine how educational developers navigate their way into the field of educational development and become educational developers. Given there is no common educational requirement, formal career pathway, or ongoing training requisite to guide entry and advancement, this study aims to identify what factors are common and/or critical to becoming an educational developer, and at what point in the process developers begin to self-identify as an educational developer. As a member of the Canadian educational development community and the Educational Developers Caucus (EDC) myself, this study has both personal and professional significance.

The research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Sandra Acker, Professor, Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree. The data collected will be used toward the completion of the investigator's doctoral dissertation and any future publications or presentations (e.g., journal article, conference presentation) that may result.

As part of the research, 18 to 22 Canadian university educational developers who are associated with campus-wide or discipline-specific teaching and learning centres (however named) will be interviewed. The sample will be drawn from a compiled list of educational developers amassed from the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Networking Guide, the Educational Development Office Profiler website (www.tss.uoguelph.ca/edop) and the staffing sections of publicly available university-based teaching and learning centre (however named) websites from across Canada. Participation in the study is voluntary; you may withdraw at any time by notifying the principal investigator (Jeanette McDonald) by telephone, email or during the interview itself.

Interviews are expected to last between 60 to 90 minutes, and will be arranged for a mutually convenient time, date, and location. To accommodate investigator/participant

proximity and preferences, the interview may be conducted face-to-face or via the telephone or videoconference. During the interview, you will be asked to reflect upon and respond to questions, for example, about you professional career, your conceptualizations of the field, your affiliated institution and some basic demographic information. You will also be asked to share a copy of your curriculum vitae with complete educational background and career history Sections. This information will further aid in understanding, both individually and comparatively, the career pathways of educational developers. For clarification and follow-up purposes, you may be contacted by telephone for more information. You may decline to answer any question(s) that you are not comfortable with, and may terminate the interview or any follow- at any time. Data collected from those individuals who terminate their participation will be immediately destroyed.

It is intended that each interview will be voice-recorded in digital format and transcribed to paper for later analysis. Quotes from interview transcripts may be used in the investigator's dissertation and other subsequent publications and public presentations (e.g., journal article, conference presentation), for example, to illustrate themes across cases. Quotes that may reveal your identity in any way will be omitted. Where there is any question or concern about a particular quote, you will be contacted for approval. Please note that at no time will you be judged or evaluated, or a value-judgment placed on your interview responses.

You may request a copy of your interview transcript, to be received within three weeks of your interview, for your own personal records by checking the appropriate statement at the end of this letter. If you choose to request a copy of your interview transcript, you may provide feedback on them (e.g., deletions/corrections), provided they are returned to the investigator by mail within 14 days of receipt. A stamped self-addressed envelope will be provided to participants to facilitate this option. If I, the principal investigator, do not hear back from you regarding your transcripts, it will be assumed that no changes are required. Please note that at no time will you be judged or evaluated personally or a value judgment placed on your question responses.

Data will be managed as follows. A reference list will be compiled with each participant's name, institution, interview/follow-up contact dates, geographic location and contact information, and their assigned pseudonym and institutional reference (e.g., institution A, institution B). This list will be kept separate from the participant's working file(s) and stored in the same secure manner as outlined below. Hardcopy and electronic files created for each participant will be identified by their assigned pseudonym and institutional reference only, thereby safeguarding and protecting their anonymity

At all times your anonymity and confidentiality will be protected. Access to data will be limited to the principal investigator, and if necessary, the supervising faculty member. No personal information will be used or disclosed in the dissertation or in any future written publication or public presentation. Identifying information (e.g., name, affiliated institution, home province) will be replaced with codes, pseudonyms and generic references, for example: "a middle-career developer from a doctoral institution in central

Canada reported that…" Hardcopy data generated from interviews and the investigator field notes will be kept in a locked box in a locked filing cabinet in the investigator's home or work office. Electronic data will be stored on the investigator's password protected laptop computer. Raw data (i.e., audio recording, field notes) in electronic and hardcopy form will be destroyed five years after completion of the study. Transcripts will be destroyed ten years following completion of study (i.e., completion of dissertation).

There are no direct benefits or compensation for participating in this study. An executive summary of the results will be provided to you upon completion of the study. There are no known or anticipated risks or costs to you as a result of participation in the study.

If you have questions regarding the study or require additional information, please contact me (Jeanette McDonald), principal investigator, by telephone at 519 884-0710, ext. 3211 during regular business hours, at home in the evening at 519 837-8048, or by email at jmcdonald@wlu.ca. You may also contact the investigator's supervisor, Dr. Sandra Acker, by telephone at 416 923-6641, ext. 2272 or by email at sacker@oise.utoronto.ca.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant or wish to talk to someone at arm's length from the study, please contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair of the University Research Ethics Board at Wilfrid Laurier University by telephone at 519 884-0710, ext. 2468 or Dean Sharpe, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto by telephone at 416 978-5855.

Thank you for in advance for your participation in this study.

Regards,

Jeanette McDonald (principal investigator)
Ed.D. Candidate, Theory and Policy Studies
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
Manager of Educational Development, Wilfrid Laurier University
519 884-0710, ext. 3211 / jmcdonald@wlu.ca

Please check and initial the following statements to confirm your consent:

☐ I agree to be voice-recorded for the interview. _____

☐ I agree to be available for future questions. _____

☐ I agree to provide a copy of my curriculum vitae. _____

Please check and initial the following statements to confirm your interest in receiving either of the following two documents:

□ I would like to receive a copy of my interview transcript. _____

□ I would like to receive a copy of the study's executive summary. ____

By signing below, you are indicating that you are willing to participate in the study, that you have received a copy of this letter, and that you are fully aware of your participant role and the study conditions outlined above.

Name: _____

Institution: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Study Title: Becoming an Educational Developer: A Canadian University Perspective

Objectives:

- To explore developer pathways into the field of educational development
- To identify situational factors and conditions that contribute to the developer's entry to the field
- To identify measures taken by the developer to navigate their entry to the field
- To identify the point in each developer's journey when they self-identify as an educational (i.e., their epiphanies)
- To identify factors leading to the developer's self-identification with their role
- To identify how educational developers conceive of the field.

Interviewer Preparations:

- if consent form not yet received back from participant two days prior to the interview, contact individual to inquire of its receipt
- two days prior to the interview send a reminder email to the participant with the details of the meeting and a reminder to send or bring their curriculum vitae and consent form if not yet received
- test recording device prior to the interview
- bring extra copies of the consent form to the interview

Introduction:

"I want to thank you again for agreeing to be interviewed for this study. I am eager to talk to you about your entry into the field of educational development and your journey toward becoming an educational developer.

Before officially beginning the interview I want to review the participant consent form with you one last time to ensure you are fully informed of your rights as a participant, your expected participant role, and the conditions of the research study. I am also happy to respond to any questions or points of clarification. I also want to reassure you that excerpts taken from interview transcripts will be used for illustrative purposes (e.g., themes across cases). Quotes that may reveal your identity will be omitted. Likewise, no value judgement will be placed on your responses or you personally.

[Review Form / Answer Questions / Complete sign-off if necessary / collect signed copy of form].

Finally, I would like to test the recording device and audio levels before beginning. Please say 'test 1, 2, 3' three times in your normal speaking voice. Thank you.
Are you ready to begin?"

Guiding Interview Topics/Questions

Topic 1: Pathway/Journey/Transitioning

Potential Questions to Probe Topic

Key question: How did you come to be in educational development?

What profession/occupation did you train for? Where?

What did you do before entering educational development/becoming an educational developer?

When did you first **learn about /hear** of educational development? What was the context?

- Student user? Faculty user?
- Position? Event? Reading? Colleague?

When did you first become **interested** in educational development? Can you pinpoint it to a specific event? Moment? Person? Position?

Why did you become **interested** in educational development?

- what about it appeals to you?
- what needs did it meet?

When did you first **start** in educational development?

What educational development positions have you held? Where?

Describe what steps you actively took to enter the field?

- what did that involve?

Describe what steps you intentionally took to become an educational developer?

- what did that involve?

Topic 2a: Conceptualizing / Participating in the Field

Potential Questions to Probe Topic

Key Question: What does educational development mean to you? Now? Ten years from now?

What has influenced your conceptions about educational development?

- Gender?
- Caring orientation?

- Local (institutional) vs. ED community (professional)?

How has your conception changed from when you first started?

What precipitated this change?

Topic 2b: Conceptualizing Role

Potential Questions to Probe Topic

Key Question: What does being an educational developer mean to you? Now? Ten years from now?

What term(s) do you use to refer to what you do?

If someone asked you to describe what you do for a living what would you say? How would you describe what you do? Would your reply differ according to the inquirer? How?

What has prepared you for your role? What do educational developers at large need?

How do you perceive your local versus your professional educational development context? Role?

Topic 3: Identifying with the Field/As an Educational Developer

Potential Questions to Probe Topic:

Key Question: At what point (aha/epiphany) did you begin to think of yourself as an educational developer? Identify with the educational development community?

Why was this the case?

What validated this belief?

Who validated this belief?

When and how did you get there?

Topic 4: Institutional Context

Potential Questions to Probe Topic

Key Question: Tell me about your centre? Where you work?

How is your unit organized?
- Reporting structure?
- Staffing?
- Mission, mandate?
- Scope of practice?
- Funding? Budget?

How is your unit/role perceived? (central/marginalized)
- Faculty?
- Administrators?
- Students?
- Peers?
- ED Community?

History / Development?
- Opening/closure
- Staffing?

NOTE: indicate to participant that you have asked the key topic areas and are about to move on to the background information. [may not need to ask all depending on availability of CV]

Topic 5: Background/Demographic Information

1. Sex (a) Male (b) Female (c) other

2. Age Bracket: (a) 20 – 25 (b) 26 – 30 (c) 31-35 (d) 36-40
(e) 41- 45 (f) 46 – 50 (g) 51-55 (h) 56-60
(i) over 60

3. Country of Birth

4. Educational qualification
(a) Doctorate (institution/country)
(b) Masters (institution/country)
(c) Undergraduate (institution/country)
(d) Diploma (institution/country)
(e) Other (institution/country), specify

5. Professional Status:
(a) Job position and title
(b) Full-time, part-time
(c) Limited term, seconded, temporary contract, permanent
(d) Graduate student, professional staff member, faculty member, other (specify)

6. Professional Setting
(a) Campus-wide teaching centre
(b) Discipline-specific teaching centre
(c) Other (specify)

7. Professional Mobility
(a) Name of different titles/roles held and length in each role
(b) Number of institutions previously worked at in educational development

8. Educational Developer Role status
(a) Primary role
(b) Secondary role (if secondary, specify primary role)

9. Number of years (full and part-time) working in educational development:
(a) Five or fewer years
(b) Six to ten years
(c) More than ten year

Conclusion of Interview

- ask them if they have anything else to add or have questions before the interview ends
- thank participant for their time
- remind them that you will be sending a copy of their transcript within three weeks; feedback optional
- invite them to follow-up with you at any time during the research study with questions or additional comments (refer them to informed consent for contact information)

After the Interview

- complete field notes form
- check recording
- prepare transcription of interview

- send copy of transcription, stamped self-addressed envelope and thank you note within three week of interview to participant
- perform some preliminary analysis

APPENDIX D: FIELD NOTE TEMPLATE

Field Note Form

Participant Pseudonym:

Institutional Identifier:

Date of Contact:

Mode of Contact: (face-to-face, telephone, videoconference):

Observations	**Reflections**	**Insights and Interpretations**

Questions/Concerns:

Other: