

Teaching induction bibliography

Adjunct Professor Yoni Ryan, Queensland University of Technology
Associate Professor Kym Fraser, Swinburne University of Technology

May, 2018

This annotated bibliography was developed in the program of activities for Associate Professor Fraser's National Teaching Fellowship. The bibliography reviews twenty seven publications which relate specifically to university teaching induction or foundation programs for new teaching staff and two publications which discuss Graduate Certificates in learning and teaching which have implications for teaching induction programs. The literature is primarily drawn from Australia and the United Kingdom.

Adcroft, A. & Taylor, D. (2013). Support for new career academics: an integrated model for research intensive university business and management schools, *Studies in Higher Education*, 38 (6), 827-840. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.599378

P 827: Abstract: "The research suggests that there are four crucial dimensions to successful career support for new academics: managing expectations, career management, mentoring and professional development. Whilst it is important to offer good practice in each of these dimensions, the article argues that it is the relationship between them which determines the quality of career support offered".

The study is about 'career support' for new staff, not on L&T per se. Both unis involved had a mandated Certificate program required for probation; staff who had taught before were unhappy that it detracted from the time they had for research.

Bamber, V., Walsh, L., Juwah, C., & Ross, D. (2006). New lecturer development programmes: A case study of Scottish higher education institutions. *Teacher Development*, 10 (2), 207-231. doi:10.1080/13664530600773069

P 207: "The article presents four different programme models that emerged within the sector in terms of programme structure and delivery, participant support and institutional factors, and explains the wide variety of provision in terms of cultural factors and the nature of the national framework for HE teacher development." The research is set against the new framework for teaching standards promulgated by the HEA for UK universities. Key questions posed are:

1. What are the patterns of lecturer development programme (LDP) provision in Scottish higher education (HE)?
 2. Why are there differences in provision?
 3. What is the significance of this for those who are involved with lecturer development?
- There is a useful historical overview of UK initiatives in PD for quality teaching. A survey question of interest to the present Fellowship was 'how is completion related to probation'? As a result, the authors were able to develop the notion of 'loose/tight' institutional arrangements, where 'loose' suggested no consequences for non-completion.

P 211: *Programme structure and delivery.* Whilst most of the LDPs surveyed used a variety of delivery methods, three main modes of delivery were identified—face to face (seven programmes), distance learning (five programmes) and a blended approach (one programme).

Assessment methods. The survey established that a diversified and multi-modal approach was used in assessing participants' learning, from activity-based tasks, narratives and individualised

reflective reports, work summaries and projects, through to portfolios of evidence. Even courses which were not explicitly work based used assessment which was generally designed to support some degree of authentic, work-based learning and peer observation of teaching, therefore, was universally used. Online critique by peers was used as formative assessment in two of the programmes. The majority of the programmes surveyed employed a pass/fail system, rather than marks or grades, since it was not considered politic to grade colleagues. Portfolio-based assessment, of two different types, was used by 92% of the programmes; some required behaviourist portfolios, with a focus on the systematic assessment of skill development, with feedback given until the skill was mastered. The second type of portfolio (more widely used) was cognitivist/constructivist portfolios, focusing on the learning of concepts and thinking processes aiming to give participants opportunities to engage in in-depth reflection that addressed fundamental issues of teaching and learning, and to analyse their thoughts and practices within the support of a systematic framework (Entwistle & Walker, 2000).

P212: *Participant support.* The major mode of support was again face to face, mainly from within the programme team. The trend in support was towards increasing use of online support and independent study resources.

Institutional factors. The most significant institutional factor which emerged was linkage between the LDP and probationary requirements.

P218: Support is key to successful learning for participants studying 'at a distance' and this support was provided through a subject-specialist local mentor, individual tutorials, workbooks, online activities and discussion, and a course tutor. As Nicholls (2002) argues, 'professional learning requires systematic conversation and dialogue about the actions of teaching and learning' (p. 140).

There is an interesting commentary on the effect of different institutional types on the adoption of PD programs, with post-82 unis more susceptible to management 'imposition' of compulsory PD, analogous to the Go8/other university types in Australia.

Take-away messages:

1. This research was conducted before explicit implementation of the new HEA Professional Standards Framework for the UK, which is now being implemented at a number of Australian universities. The Framework requires ongoing PD, as well as encompassing Induction into teaching.
2. Support for professional L&T discussions during an Induction program is essential, whether at local/departmental or central level.
3. Links to probation requirements mean liaison with HR departments are central to success.

Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 62 (2), 150-173. doi:10.2307/1982143

P150: "This article depicts the experience of new faculty as teachers over periods of one and two years and across two large campuses. It shows a surprisingly slow pattern of establishing comfort and student approval, of moving beyond defensive strategies including overpreparation of lecture content, and of looking for supports in improving teaching.

The aim of this study, though, is not simply to document the teaching experiences of new faculty but to answer four related questions. First, do initial teaching patterns, adaptive and maladaptive, tend to persist? Second, what can we learn from the experiences of new faculty who master teaching quickly and enjoyably? Third, how does success in teaching correspond to prowess in areas including the establishment of collegial supports and of outputs in scholarly writing? And, fourth, how do initial teaching experiences compare at a "teaching" (comprehensive) and at a "research" (doctoral) campus. One key element of the cohorts studied was that at US universities, inexperienced staff have very light teaching loads for their first 1-2 years of employment".

P155: "Another way of documenting inattention to teaching can be seen in a single datum: Less than 5 percent of new faculty in their first semesters at either campus could identify any sort of social network for discussing teaching".

P173: "Involving new faculty in programs that helped them refrain from overpreparing facts and that assisted them in finding comfort with increased student participation produced two measurable improvements here. One was improved comfort and ratings as teachers; the other was improved comfort and productivity as productive scholars".

Take away message: No unequivocal support for Induction programs, but induction did make participants less focused on content and more on involving students in discussion. Although very dated now, the study indicates the lack of institutional and collegial support for induction programs.

Bowie, C., Chappell, A., Cottman, C., Hinton, L., & Partridge, L. (2009). *Evaluating the impact of foundations of university teaching programs: A framework and design principles*. An Australian Learning and Teaching Council report. Retrieved from https://www.flinders.edu.au/pathe/Evaluating_Impact.pdf

This paper is a component of the much larger PATHE project *Preparing Academics for Teaching in Higher Education* (PATHE) project (Gannaway, D., Goody, A., Hicks, M., O'Brien, M., Smiegl, H., & Wilson, G., 2007), which had a specific focus on measuring the impact of 'Foundations' or Induction programs. The authors posit that impact depends on the particular context for developers, participants, and institution; they develop an audit tool for evaluation of programs.

P15: "There are at least three intersecting contexts of operation here:

1. *FUT teachers* and participants in the FUT program;
2. FUT program *participants* and their *students*, in their practice, in their particular context; and
3. Impact upon T&L across the *institution* and *sector*".

There are useful tables on sources of evidence for evaluating programs. There is also a very useful Planning Grid for evaluation on P 25. One difficulty the authors found was in determining whether the Induction program was integrated with the GCHE offered at institutional level.

P36: Several trends were evident:

- Trend towards community of practice – based model by highlighting the potential for collegial support of each cohort participating in each offer of FUT. This is evident in the focus given to peer support and review, and group reflective practice.
- Inclusion of action learning based project activity – many FUT programs include an action learning project, either as an integral component of the FUT program or as an optional element. These recommend the plan/ act/ observe/ reflect cycle that is indicated in action learning literature (reference: Bourner, Cooper & France, 2000)
- Modelling of active teaching behavior – FUT facilitators and convenors generally recommend that the desired 'reflective practitioner' behavior be evident from all presenters as well as the approach recommended for participants. (reference : Kahn et.al. 2006).

There are 4 useful case studies of programs evaluated using the Framework proposed.

Take-away message: This paper will help colleagues to persuade their managers of the value of teaching induction programs.

Boyle, P. & Boice, B. (1998). *Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants*. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22, 157-179. doi:10.1023/A:1025183225886

Abstract: "This study reports on the development and assessment of two mentoring programs, one for new faculty and one for new graduate teaching assistants. We developed a replicable model of systematic mentoring; and we obtained a clear picture of the styles and skills of exemplary mentors".

Take-away message: This article is very dated, but argues strongly for the efficacy of institutionally-based mentoring as a preferred method of induction.

Butcher, J. & Stoncel, D. (2012). The impact of a Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching In HE on university lecturers appointed for their professional expertise at a teaching-led university: 'It's made me braver' *IJAD 17 (2) 149-162.*

Reports on self-perception of acculturation into the discourses of L&T. Lit review 'reveals (at best) ambivalent evidence of impact'. Traces change from self-perception as 'trainers' to 'academics'. Program is part time over 2 years usually. Assessment is a portfolio + pedagogic research project. Has discipline specific mentors. Annual cohorts @ 20. 'What would a student-centred approach look like?' at the end of the program. They stress that the program is probably more effective in a teaching-oriented university than a research university.

Chalmers D. & Gardiner D. (2015). An evaluation framework for identifying the effectiveness and impact of academic teacher development programmes. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 46, 81-91.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.02.002>

Abstract: P 81: "It is argued that teacher development programmes should be designed to build an evidence base from the initial planning stage and be continued over an extended period in order to enable practitioners, researchers and institutions to ask more complex questions on whom the programmes have an impact, and where and why they have impact".

P 84. "An audit of Australian universities focused on 10 key features: location of programme, number/frequency, duration, status, participants, format, intended outcomes/impact, generic/discipline specific, evaluation, institutional climate. The present paper focused on Formal programs".

P 85. :Outcomes focus The categories of outcomes focus reflect the intended outcomes of the teacher development programmes in Australian universities. These are:

- Teacher knowledge, skills and practice: includes intended outcomes, for example, pedagogy, curriculum design, assessment and feedback, teaching approaches, strategies, and skills, deep and surface learning, large and small group teaching, use of technology, etc.
- Teacher reflective practice and scholarship of teaching: includes intended outcomes, for example, use of student feedback, techniques for reflecting on and evaluating teaching, peer review, innovations in teaching, communities of practice, researching teaching, etc.
- Student engagement, learning experience: includes intended outcomes, for example, effective group teaching, active learning, questioning and communication techniques, use of information and communication technology (ICT) and learning management systems (LMS) to engage students, dealing with diversity, inclusive teaching, dealing with difficult students, enhancing learning experiences etc.
- Student approaches to learning: includes intended outcomes, for example, student focused approaches to teaching and learning, authentic assessment, problem-based learning (PBL), work integrated learning, group tasks, critical and creative questioning etc.
- Policy: includes the extent to which institutional organisation, policies and strategic priorities recognise, support and value quality teaching and learning and participation in teacher development programmes through, for example, promotion criteria, financial and workload support for participation in teacher development programmes, embedded review processes, recognition and reward for excellence in teaching through promotion criteria etc.
- Resourcing: includes the extent to which institutions commit resources to teacher development programmes both centrally and at faculty/department level, to the recognition and reward of quality teaching and to activities which promote quality teaching, etc.
- Culture: includes the extent to which institutional culture encourages participation in teacher development programmes, promotes the sharing of teaching and learning ideas and issues,

celebrates excellence in teaching, encourages and rewards the scholarship of teaching, supports communities of practice, values teaching and learning related events, etc”.

There are very useful tables of Input, Process, Output, & Indicator measures of impact, but it should be noted that the Framework is best applied to longer duration programs.

Take-away message: P89: “The importance of deciding what is achievable in an Induction program: A curriculum design checklist. Sometimes called ‘backward design’, the process of looking at the intended outcomes and indicators of effectiveness at the beginning of the curriculum design process allows for stronger alignment, not only of the curriculum, instructional strategies and evaluation processes, but also with institutional values and priorities relating to teaching and learning”.

Chalmers, D., Stoney, S., Goody, A., Goerke, V., & Gardiner, D. (2012). *Identification and implementation of indicators and measures of effectiveness of teaching preparation programs for academics in higher education. An Office for Learning and Teaching final report.*

<http://www.olt.gov.au/resource-indicators-of-effectiveness-teaching-preparation>

P 3: “In the first stage the project team undertook an extensive review of the literature in relevant fields, conducted an audit of academic teaching preparation programs (TPPs) in every Australian university. The project team then developed a draft Academic Professional Development (APD) Effectiveness Framework which was disseminated and reviewed through various fora and subsequently revised prior to the second stage of the project. During this process it became clear that it was essential to develop the Framework in two complementary parts; one for formal programs and another for informal programs. The project was conducted 2010-2011”.

P 8: “Professional development programs and activities to enhance teaching and learning have been undertaken for more than 50 years in some higher education institutions. However, whether these programs, and less formal development activities, have had an impact on enhancing teaching understanding or practice, student satisfaction or learning, and/or the institutional climate that rewards and recognises teaching, remains difficult to ascertain. The linking of teaching preparation activities and experiences to tangible outcomes is highly contentious, complex and contingent”.

P 9: “The Framework incorporates indicators and evidence of change which require looking beyond the immediate results of participant satisfaction and the quality of program delivery, to the intermediate and longer term effects of programs on teacher and student behaviours, to institutional teaching and learning policies and culture, and to data which demonstrates sustained and sustainable improvement.

P 17: The formal programs are those which are accredited, mandated or required, and offered in either intensive (one to three days) or extended (usually from one semester to two years) mode. In a number of cases the extended programs have both an intensive introductory module which is followed by an extended module (six months to two years)”.

In 2010:

“Formal programs, Foundations of University Learning and Teaching (FUL): Approximately 80 per cent of universities offer a FULT program and in half of those participation is mandatory for new staff, although this most often applies to staff on level B or above on ongoing contracts. Several institutions express the expectation that new staff attend a foundations program although again, it is not clear whether there are mechanisms to follow this up. Of the remaining 20 per cent most provide on-line materials, a handbook or facilitate one-on-one faculty-based orientation to teaching. In the majority of cases where a FULT is offered it forms one unit of the GCHE.

Orientation/Induction: Twenty per cent of universities have compulsory orientation/induction programs for new staff, particularly sessional staff or clinical tutors, while a further 10 per cent highly recommend attendance at such a session”.

P 18: Informal programs:

“While the majority of the informal orientation or induction programs are delivered centrally, some (approx. 38 per cent) do provide orientation at the faculty or discipline level. The centrally delivered programs tend to be generic, rather than discipline-specific, although some are designed to meet the needs of particular groups, for example, new course coordinators, supervisors, tutors, clinical or laboratory demonstrators and international staff. In fact, 35 per cent of institutions offer specific preparation for sessional staff, acknowledging the significant contribution of this group to teaching in higher education”.

The most common mode of delivery is face to face with online resources.

P 19: “The outcomes of formal programs have a strong focus on pedagogy in higher education. Participants are introduced to theoretical frameworks which inform teaching in higher education, principles and processes of curriculum development, principles and practices of assessment, reflective practice techniques and the evaluation of teaching. Within the pedagogical framework common areas of focus are constructivist approaches to teaching, how tertiary students learn, learner-focused approaches and challenges in tertiary teaching. The curriculum development component includes attention to the principles of curriculum design and the importance of curriculum alignment. Other common emphases are the role of assessment as an integral part of the learning process and the importance of reflective practice, evaluating teaching and the scholarship of teaching for ongoing PD”.

P 20: “The underlying intentions of the outcomes of formal programs appear to be to change teachers’ conceptions of teaching, improve teacher knowledge and understanding about teaching, and develop teaching behaviours and skills with the implicit goal of improving student learning experiences.

Table 1 Outcomes focus of formal and informal programs Type of Program	Teacher Focused Outcomes	Learner Focused Outcomes	Institutional Focused Outcomes
Formal Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedagogy • Key learning theories • How tertiary/adult students learn • Constructivism • Curriculum design • Assessment • Reflective practice • Peer review • Principles of good teaching • Issues and debates in higher ed. teaching • Using student feedback • Challenges of tertiary teaching • Evaluating teaching • Critical incident analysis • Applied research in higher ed. Teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging Learners • Challenging learners • Promoting deep learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to academic life • Scholarship of teaching • Leadership development • Applied research in higher ed. teaching • Organisational transformation through learning

Fewer than 25 per cent of institutions reported that they follow up participants of TPPs during and after completion of the program and where it does occur, it tends to be for participants of formal programs”.

P 25: “Short training courses which present discrete, skills-based topics have little impact on teaching as there is limited opportunity to change teachers’ conceptions of teaching and little or no opportunity for teachers to apply the new techniques within their discipline-specific context. This is not to suggest that short programs do not stimulate a deeper interest in teaching and learning. On the other hand, intensive, more comprehensive programs can influence teacher beliefs and behaviour and may lead to

a more student-focused approach in teaching. In general these studies suggest discipline based programs or in-situ training is a more effective setting for TPPs.

There have been few studies that have addressed the long-term impact of TPPs (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Prebble, et. al., 2004; Trowler & Bamber, 2005) and these conclude that on the whole there appears to be little systematic investigation of impact across programs or of programs over time. This is of concern given the number of studies which report that changes in teaching practices following participation in professional development unfold over time (Giertz, 1996; Entwistle & Walker, 2000; Knight, 2006; Akerlind, 2007)”.

P 26: “In particular, the work of Gibbs and Coffey makes a convincing case for the importance of TPPs in higher education concluding that participation in TPPs leads to the increased adoption of student focused approaches in teaching and improvement in aspects of teaching such as enthusiasm, organisation of learning experiences, use of group techniques, rapport with students and the adoption of deep learning approaches by the students. These findings were confirmed some years later by Hanbury et al. (2008).

Findings suggest that such evidence should be collected longitudinally and encompass more rigorous methods than self-reporting including peer observation, analysis of teaching and learning materials (including teaching strategies and assessment tasks), teaching portfolios and student interviews”.

P27: “Burke, Minassians and Yang (2002) and Chalmers (2008) comment on the limitations of Input and Output indicators which tend to generate statistics which reveal how much or how many, but say little about quality and may actually inhibit the investigation of teaching and learning processes, experiences and interactions which could be more enlightening. Outcome and Process indicators do provide information about quality, but because they are more difficult to measure and often produce tentative results they tend to be used less frequently (Romainville, 1999). More recently, however, a convincing case has been made for the inclusion of process and outcome indicators which deliver rich, qualitative data to provide answers to the questions of how and why, rather than how many, in assessing the effectiveness of TPPs (Pawson & Tilley, 2004; Trigwell, 2010; Kreber, 2011)”.

Take-away messages:

1. No definitive conclusions were reached regarding the efficacy of different types of program, although it is suggested longer programs have more institutional impact, and also have more longer term behavioural and attitudinal changes for participants, towards more student-centred approaches, and reflective practice, as well as assessment planning.

Clarke, M. (2006). *Evaluating the Impact of Foundations and Graduate Certificate Programmes: Methodologies and Measures*. University of South Australia.

This unpublished university report sampled an unstated number of ongoing and completed research studies from the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia.

P1. Most evaluations “tend to employ a mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The most popular data-collection methods are interviews, questionnaires and teaching/course evaluation instruments (Table 4). Most of the data collected pertain to participants’ satisfaction with the programme, their intentions to alter their practice and their perceptions of whether those changes to practice (if implemented) made a difference to student learning. Far rarer are evaluations that seek to document actual changes in practice or that try to causally link those changes to student learning outcomes. While such evidence is difficult to collect, it is vital for demonstrating the effectiveness of these programmes.”

Findings appear to be used primarily for internal accountability and for programme improvement. Some recommendations, e.g. that there be an external evaluator or that there be several years data collected, are probably impractical.

Take-away message: Teaching induction is undertaken for improving teaching, not monitoring performance.

Dearn, J., Fraser, K., & Ryan, Y. (2002). *Investigation into the Provision of Professional Development for University Teaching in Australia: A Discussion Paper*. A DEST commissioned project funded through the HEIP program. www.trove.nla.gov.au/work/153104139

This published report took a snapshot of teaching professional development in the Australian higher education sector.

P iv: "A survey of 32 universities shows that the provision of both preparation programs and ongoing support for academic's for their teaching role is uneven and unsystematic".

The report refers to a 'reluctance among the majority of university staff, especially sessional staff, to engage in the many programs available in the practice and theory of higher education'.

The executive summary indicates that peak body representatives perceived that teaching professional development programs were at best variable in effectiveness while interviews with staff revealed that the programs (not just teaching induction) were ineffective.

The report has a very useful section on why the sector needs to professionalise higher education teaching

Four of the fourteen recommendations (pages 58 – 59) relate specifically to teaching induction.

"All staff new to university teaching should be required to complete either a formal preparation program in university teaching or a portfolio demonstrating their teaching competence as part of their probation requirements.

Given the requirements for (a) quality assurance, (b) the need for a form of recognition that is portable, and (c) the need to embed university teaching in a scholarly framework subject to peer review, preparation programs should form part of formal award courses, which might include a comprehensive peer review of a portfolio.

Institutions should be specifically funded as part of their operating grant to provide the necessary resources (mainly in the form of time release) to support new staff while they obtain appropriate qualifications in teaching as part of the overall quality assurance system for Australian higher education. This would entail the establishment of a national Teaching Quality Fund. Funding to institutions would be based on actual numbers of teaching staff at each institution, individual missions, discipline specialties and staffing profiles. Individual institutions would be responsible and accountable for the dispersal of funds for either formal

There should be an expectation that sessional staff undertake a minimal level of teaching preparation before being offered a contract for teaching. Institutions should be specifically funded from the Teaching Quality Fund as part of their operating grant to provide the necessary resources for this development, including payment of sessional staff for teaching development time.

Take-away messages: "The research role of academic work is professionalised through doctoral study and active engagement in a scholarly community, there is no commensurate rigour in the preparation and ongoing support for the teaching role." (P. Iv)

Duck, J. (2015). *Evidence for good practice principles of teaching and learning foundations programs in higher education*. ITALI: UQ. www.itali.uq.edu.au

P 3:

1. **Develop an evidence based curriculum that has clear objectives. Effective programmes have had as their objectives:**

- 1.1. **Development of academic professional activity, knowledge, and values** that have been shown to enhance student engagement, encourage learning and improve student outcomes
- 1.2. **Raising academic's awareness of their conceptions of student learning, teaching and assessment practices**

- 1.3. **Employing effective evidence-based approaches to learning, teaching and assessment**, for example those that encourage a 'student centred (SC)' and 'learning focussed' approach
- 1.4. **Engaging participants in experiential activities** that model student-centred teaching practices and provide 'real' contexts in which participants implement new teaching and learning knowledge and practise and review new skills
- 1.5. **Employing cycles of training, observation and review** over the course of a year
2. **Accommodate the diverse and discipline specific learning needs and work demands** of participants
3. **Identify and align generic and discipline specific program components to school and discipline-based knowledge and practices** by integrating faculty in the development and implementation of program components
4. **Deliberately build and use networks of contacts within and across schools and faculties to share best practice approaches and support peer review processes**
5. **Embed and resource the program within institutional culture, administrative and HR policies and institutional budgets**, and ensure it is suitably **recognised through promotional pathways and appointments**
6. **Utilise an effective evaluative framework"**

PP 12-13:

"A further suggestion which emerges from the literature on **impact indicators** is that perhaps they should be put at the front end of decision making rather than at the back end (Chalmers, Goody, Goerke, Gardiner, and Stoney (2011) citing Nikols, 2010). If we apply this thinking to Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation the four stages would be used to prompt design-related questions as indicated in Table 1 below".

Table 1 Impact evaluation questions to guide programme design

Results

What are the institutional goals in teaching and learning? How can these be valued/ recognised?

How can these goals be achieved?

How are these communicated to teaching staff?

Behaviour change

What teacher behaviours are desirable for teaching staff? What are the current behaviours?

What would be required to support new behaviours?

Learning

What knowledge/skills are evident in current teaching practices?

What conceptions of teaching might have to be unlearned/ challenged?

What is the most effective way to do this?

What is likely to create a positive learning environment?

Reaction

How will academic staff respond to this?

What can be done to encourage this response?

What collegial interactions are desirable?

What do we want them to do as a result of what they have learned?

Take-away messages: The whole document is useful, but especially:

P 10:

1. **"Use effective policy implementation practices (P. Trowler & Bamber, 2005) 5.3.1.** Keep institutional leaders really engaged with the policy, and willing to devote resources: support needs to be more than rhetorical, although genuine moral support is important
2. **Find and work with good practice on the ground. Avoid any hint of a deficit model, including discursively. For example, use the word "enhancement" rather than "development", and avoid the word "competence" altogether. (See below NB)**
3. **A good perceptual change program takes a year at least".**

Garrison, C. P. (2005). Exploring new faculty orientation: The good, the bad, and making it better. *Essays in Education*, 13, 1-9.

P1 Abstract: "This article reports survey results of a special segment of academics, those who worked in industry prior to becoming full-time faculty. The survey solicited their opinions on the strengths and weaknesses of university and department orientation programs. Interaction with other faculty and interaction senior faculty were the most frequently selected strengths. Lack of a feedback mechanism was the most frequently selected weakness. Analyses of suggestions reveal eight areas where institutions can assist the general new faculty member, mentoring being the most recommended".

This US study canvassed 33 institutions, and 87 responders, including some multiple respondents from the same institution, so the survey methodology is questionable, as is the multiple choice survey instrument.

The most often selected weakness was the absence of a feedback mechanism. The second most selected weakness was that the program was too shallow (focusing on pay rates and university policies).

Take-away message: For professionals moving into academia, mentoring was the most preferred Induction, especially for Business staff.

Gibbs, G. & Coffey, M. (2004) The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students, *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5 (1), 87-100. doi:10.1177/1469787404040463

The research involving 22 universities in 8 countries, studied changes over a year of the effect of L&T programs on new academics, using control groups (no 'training'). The authors have used their conviction of the value of **accredited** programs in HE (usually of longer duration), of the conception of Deep and Surface learning as indicators of student learning outcomes, and standardised evaluation of teaching to construct the argument. Their results indicated that staff who received training became more student focused, and remained so even after a year; their students adopted Deep learning approaches, while the control groups became even more teacher focused, and student learning seemed shallower.

Some of the programs examined were of only 60 hours' duration, many were 300 hours' equivalent.

Take-away message:

1. It was not clear whether a short-duration program would deliver the same effects/impact.
2. The authors noted that the **goals** of a program (e.g. teaching **skills** vs teacher attitudes/conceptions of L&T) would affect the outcomes.

Grasgreen, A. (2010, October 15). Preparing professors to teach. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/10/15/mit#ixzz1fbk93Xmh>

This is a blog reports on various universities' certificate programs, and their popularity among postgraduates preparing for an academic position.

Some data: At MIT, participants participate in eight workshops that include readings and assignments. They formulate teaching philosophy statements (a staple among such programs), learn how to design courses, plan lectures and create syllabuses, among other things. Students have two years to complete the program. At Brown, students can earn four certificates. Each program takes a year to complete, and comprises four to seven workshops. The programs are modelled around different themes that build the components of a "reflective teaching practice": an understanding that effective teaching requires careful planning; knowledge of one's audience and the ability to engage different learning styles; a recognition of the importance of establishing learning goals (and means to determine if such goals have been achieved); and a willingness to be innovative. Brown requires some of the same tasks as MIT, such as the philosophy statement and syllabus construction, but it also stresses heavily the importance of student-faculty collaboration, and creating a community that emphasizes reflection on and scholarship of teaching.

Take-away message: The author concedes that the competitive market for academics has spurred much of the popularity of certificate programs.

Heinrich, E. (2017) Teaching groups as midlevel sociocultural contexts for developing teaching and learning: a case study and comparison to microcultures. *HERD* 36 (4) 702-715.

This study was conducted with 4 groups, including professional staff working in collaboration, and same subject group, as well as cross-disciplinary group.

P 702 Mentoring circles, CoPs, now 'microculture' or 'teaching group' lens. Actually meso level.

P 703: Builds on 3 observations: teaching is not individual but requires close collaboration with others; academics who teach together are not necessarily in same organisational unit. Academic development is voluntary and therefore reaches only a few. Teaching groups need a strong supportive context yet the individual is unable to 'choose' their colleagues.

Take-away message: teaching groups formed and deliberately nurtured by academics & professionals can be a powerful force for quality improvement.

Holyfield, L. J., & Berry, C. W. (2008). Designing an orientation program for new faculty. *Journal of Dental Education*, 72 (12), 1531-1543.

The article describes the process of designing a new more effective Induction program for new staff, mostly practising professionals, in a dental department, and implementation. The resulting program is more institutionally biased than teaching quality focused, as can be seen in its objectives:

P 1532: "Objectives of the program are to 1) explain general governance and policies of the institution at all levels including the Texas A&M University System, the Texas A&M Health Science Center, and BCD, particularly those aspects that directly impact faculty life; 2) summarize details and actions that apply to promotion and tenure; 3) identify internal and external resources available to faculty; 4) provide an overview of the departments of clinical and basic sciences; and 5) define the principles of effective teaching".

The survey showed PD for teaching was in fact, only No 8 on their list of desiderata for professional development. After initial implementation, a separate program on teaching 'skills' was instituted.

Take-away message: Mentoring was a preferred Induction approach.

Houston, D. & Hood, C. (2017). University teacher preparation programmes as a quality enhancement mechanism: evaluating impact beyond individual teachers' practice, *Quality in Higher Education*", 23 (1), 65 -78. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13538322.2017.1294408>

P 65: ABSTRACT

"Conceptually, practically and rhetorically teaching is at the core of quality in higher education. University teaching preparation programmes (TPPs) are regularly advocated to foster enhancement of teaching but there remains limited evidence to demonstrate their effectiveness or impact as a quality improvement mechanism. Support for such programmes is largely a matter of faith amongst their advocates. This paper presents an analysis of the impact of one initial TPP to add to the body of evidence on the efficacy of such programmes. The results reinforce other research indicating that such programmes do have beneficial effects on individual academics. The benefits extend to work groups and have value to the institution. However, the transfer of learning by academics to practice takes time and is mediated by many factors. Nevertheless, where institutional and local departmental cultures value teaching, TPPs provide a useful strategy for quality enhancement in higher education".

The article argues that foundation programs should be explicitly linked to quality enhancement measures in a university, but that the evidence of their research in one Australian university indicates that the value of the program is more evident to participants two +

years **after** participation. Participants self-reported they and others who had participated had increased the interest in L&T amongst colleagues, thus contributing to departmental cultures that valued L&T, and had benefitted from having a 'common lived experience' for cohorts. Methodology was a survey and interviews with self-selected participants.

Take away messages:

1. Evaluation of a program may need to occur 2+ years after undertaking induction programs, as the experience of teaching within discipline departments and in the institution as a whole may affect the efficacy of training, because departmental cultures and institutional barriers may not produce desirable/effective teaching practices.
2. This small scale research provides an endorsement of Induction for quality improvement accountability measures.

Lueddeke, G. (1997). Training postgraduates for teaching: Considerations for programme planning and development. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 2(2), 141-151.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1356251970020204>

P141 Abstract: "This paper reviews several rationales for supporting postgraduates in their roles as graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) and considers content areas that might be included in the design of training programmes.

This UK paper deals with a specific cohort of new academics, those completing postgraduate studies while also tutoring. Bradford University determined the following topics/content for programs".

P 145: "For practical or programme planning purposes, these topics may be grouped into four interrelated categories consisting of:

- Tutoring in seminars, workshops, field trips and practicals.
- Traditional and interactive lecturing (including IT).
- Assessment and marking.
- Classroom management: special considerations (e.g. student diversity and special needs) and problems (e.g. plagiarism, discipline).

A number of universities have devised a two-level programme for GTAs: training that is institution-wide (centrally co-ordinated) and training or induction that is department-specific (locally co-ordinated)".

Take-away message: Should the central teaching induction programs be supplemented by departmental specific Induction for pedagogies relevant to particular disciplines? Or can lab work/clinical demonstration/lecture/online tutoring be canvassed in a single Induction program?

Martin, E. & Ramsden, P. (1994). *Effectiveness and Efficiency of courses in teaching methods for recently appointed academic staff*. Higher Education Division Evaluations and Investigations Program. Australian Government Publishing Service: Canberra.

The authors compared 'courses in teaching' for new academic staff from 10 Australian universities. Documented curriculum, delivery methods, support and resource requirements and then compared the effectiveness (impact on participants' teaching competence and their perceptions of their quality – it's not if this refers to quality of the program or quality of the participant's teaching), and efficiency (resources invested and evidence of participants' professional development) of the courses.

P v: "...the first year of university teaching was an exceptionally difficult and stressful time; new staff were usually left to their own devices and got little collegial support or other help; new staff wanted more guidance and assistance; systematic programs, extending beyond short courses in teaching techniques and including help from senior staff and institutional support such as reduced workloads, should be provided to address their needs".

The results of their study supported a move to longer programs. They concluded that provision of teaching courses for university academics remained inadequate, that institutional commitment particularly at the departmental level limited the positive effects of courses and that there wasn't a uniform definition of a university teaching methods course.

P 1: "Courses for recently appointed teaching staff in Australian universities vary greatly in their scope and in the demands they make on institutional resources. A preliminary survey of 1991 brochures advertising five courses showed that they extended between two days and one entire semester; that they included between five and forty hours of contact time and that their specified objectives varied from giving teachers 'a few survival skills' to 'understanding more about the ways in which students learn and what constitutes effective teaching'".

In the introduction the authors argue that orientation programs (i.e. teaching induction programs) aren't the complete answer and that staff need support from more experienced colleagues. They review studies from the USA and the UK from the late 80s and early 90s which showed that new staff needed support and that it wasn't there for them.

P 6: "Mitchell (1989) examined the experiences of first year university tutors and found that they needed guidance throughout the year after they had experienced teaching tasks rather than before teaching began".

Pp. 6-7 "... that successful programs will combine several characteristics. They will encourage staff to become immersed in learning about teaching; reward and support risk-taking; make no sharp divide between theory and practice; develop peer supports such as co-teaching and mentoring; require a high level of independent reflective activity; encourage staff to learn how to see the teaching process from the perspective of students. Such programs will inevitably be longer than a few days".

Methods – surveyed program convenors to find out about the courses, with a participant survey to find out what they thought about the course and another survey for 5 of the 11 universities to find out about the participants' experiences of their first year of teaching and if the course had helped them. 'Approaches to teaching' inventory was provided to participants before and after the course, and case studies were completed of three courses.

There is a very useful summary table on page 22 of the characteristics of the programs – aims, duration, hours, qualification, continuing social support and integration of theory/skills/experience.

Participant data showed that they valued the social support function of the programs, skill and professional expertise development, student learning literature, longer programs and problem based work.

P 29: "Participants' satisfaction with these courses is an important consideration, but it is not satisfactory to let our evaluation of their effectiveness rest there. Less experienced university teachers, like new undergraduate students, are not necessarily in a good position to judge what sort of a course will assist them in developing professional skills. A well-established finding of organisational research (Baron, 1983) is that immediate satisfaction measures are not useful in predicting long-term results in areas such as job adjustment and productivity".

P 37: Approaches to teaching inventory

"... most staff reported a lower commitment to teaching and a move away from a model of teaching as helping students learn. At the same time, most of them reported a shift to a model of teaching as the transmission of information. These results are broadly consistent with the evidence from the interviews reported in the previous section, together with that described in the literature on the experiences of new staff (see chapter 1). They suggest that the effects of the context of the first year of teaching on new academics' approaches are generally negative. The heavy and often conflicting demands of the first year of teaching may push many new staff towards strategies that are inimical to the development of professional expertise and commitment to teaching students".

Take-away messages:

Suggestions for program design are: longer programs; problem based program; integrate theory and skills; address immediate teaching needs; program not before teaching but after or during teaching; reduction in teaching load to engage in teaching professional development; develop peer interaction and support; require reflective activity; ask staff to see teaching from the student perspective; commit to own continuing growth as teachers. New teachers need to feel part of the broader community – social functions, interactions with others who are just as anxious.

Martinez, K. (2008). Academic induction for teacher educators, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (1), 35-51.

Murray and Male (2005, p. 125) reveal two key tensions for career entry teacher educators: “developing a pedagogy for HE-based ITE work and becoming research active”. They also argue for closer articulation between institutional, departmental and self-induction, reporting that for most interviewees induction had failed to meet their needs. In fact, the graphic quotes from participants paint a picture of very stressful entry to the academy, with reports of feeling deskilled, anxious, vulnerable, powerless and insecure.

P 47: Murray (2005b, p. 9) reports that “the most common induction activity reported was the monitoring and reviewing of the NTE’s progress through target setting and review, against probationary requirements”, often as part of human resource procedures.

P 48: that the “one size fits all” approach was geared more to the university’s compliance and quality agendas rather than to professional development of the individual.

P 49: The challenge for academic developers is in designing induction curriculum to promote the generic professional knowledge base for effective teaching in higher education that supports student learning, and to recognise and respect particular discipline-specific contributions and tensions.

Miles, C. (2012). *The role of new faculty orientations in improving the effectiveness of university teaching - Part 1: University Sector*. Toronto. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.

The title of this paper doesn't reflect the work within as there is no data on teaching effectiveness.

P 6: "The professional development of new university instructors has received considerable investments of resources at Canadian Universities, but the impact of these efforts has only rarely been evaluated or studied."

The authors define 'new faculty orientation' (NFO) as "an induction program for newly hired faculty members at the beginning of their teaching career" (p. 6).

In this survey of 20 universities in Ontario two didn't have a NFO. On page 7 there is info on how many have graduate certificates and mentor programs. On page 23 there is more info on the range of teaching PD offered by the 20 institutions.

P 8: "...overall the effectiveness of new faculty programs is clearly under-researched".

P 17: "New faculty members reported high levels of stress by the end of their first year..." (Fink, 1990 - quoted in Miles, page 17, 2012). "However, stress was not due to time taken to engage in creative teaching: most new faculty were lecturing almost all of the time... They were not ... challenging students to engage in critical thinking; ... or using groups to encourage collaborative learning etc. They were not doing these things because no one had ever showed them how, or told them that they could and should do more than lecture (Fink, 1990, p2)".

Survey results

NFOs run by 66% (12) of the 20 institutions before 2000. 88% have voluntary programs, 5 have separate programs for contract instructors, program length from 1 day (8 institutions) to 5 or more

days (3 universities), they include NFO budgets on page 16, page 19 has a list of topics that are taught and frequency (on page 6 they say typically the content includes a greeting from VP academic provost, academic policies, classroom mgt techniques, teaching with technology, panel with experienced teachers), page 20 - they say that everyone evaluates their program and then there are a lot of quotes saying what was valued.

P 20: "Despite these positive comments, ... more needs to be done in assessing the longer term impact of the NFO...".

P 22: "In general, it appears that improvement is needed in offering more online modules on different teaching and learning topics that would provide flexible access to resources that faculty members can use to work on enhancing their teaching skills at a time and pace that is convenient to them".

P 24 discussion quotes Fink's 1992 criteria for exemplary NFOs

1. inform about institutional support services, and stuff about uni mission, values, goals
2. Networking opportunities
3. Reach a broad audience
4. Evidence based teaching ideas
5. Not provide too much information

Take-away messages: More research needs to be done on the longer term impact of these programs

Osmann, R. & Hornsby, D. (2016). Communities and scholarship in supporting early-career academics at the University of Witwatersrand. *Studies in Higher Education, 41 (10), 1835-1853.* doi:10.1080/03075079.2016.1221659

P1: "Almost all found support (for their roles) from within their discipline, although such support was incidental and spontaneous rather than planned. We offer the idea of communities of practice as an approach to institutionalize support for ECAs and draw on the scholarship of teaching and learning as the theoretical framing for this study and experience from a South African institution".

The authors argue that there is little study of Early Career Academics and their varied needs and adduce a number of studies to support that, although most of the literature surveyed in this annotated bibliography does focus on ECAs. The authors use a SoTL approach as a basis for examining the ECA 'dilemma', and argue that establishing CoPs is an 'elegant' way of providing professional develop for ECAs.

P 4: The argument for CoPs is:

"According to Wenger (1998, 93), the relationships within CoP are characterized by mutual engagement of the participants, binding them into a social entity, joint enterprise resulting from the collective process of negotiations, and a shared repertoire of communal resources, including 'routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence".

Those interviewed reported that although they valued a central unit dedicated to L&T, once they knew about it, they valued more local L&T support within the disciplinary context.

Take-away message: Use Sotl as a framework, and local CoPs as an organisational operational approach.

Radloff, A. (2004) Review of the UNSW GC of University Learning and Teaching.

Focus on graduate satisfaction, their learning, application to teaching, impact on students, colleagues and work units and on organisational support. Data from graduates as well as participants, and staff who finished the Foundations unit. Findings were high satisfaction with diversity of content and 'facilitation', more reflective and aware of importance of assessment, more st-centred and innovative, got positive feedback from students and produced publications on learning and teaching. Recommendations included better integration of Foundations unit and the graduate certificate. Also

recommended follow-up of graduates six and 12 months later to ascertain any changes to their teaching, and more formal group support for the 'self-directed' activities, and not a block of intensives, but rather face-to-face sessions spread over the semester, opportunities for peer observation, and all staff not just academics to be included. Small focus group method, surveys of participants. Sixty-six staff (2.3% of FTE academic staff) enrolled between 2002-2004, seven graduates. One hundred and fifty-three staff participated in Foundations program. Only 28.2 % of new academic staff appointed between 2002-2004 enrolled. Foundations program is face-to-face 5 days followed by rest of the Introductory unit. Staff found Brookfield's 4 lenses, Biggs' constructive alignment, & deep and surface learning (Trigwell & Prosser, Marton and Saljo) useful. Concedes that valid data on changes in teaching practice difficult.

Take-away message: survey methodology and small focus groups emphasise 'satisfaction' with program as relevant and demanding. Qualitative. 'Difficult' to get valid data on changed teaching practice and student learning.

Rowland, S. (2001). Surface learning about teaching in higher education: The need for more critical conversations. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(2), 162-166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13601440110033670>

The paper makes the case for a more integrated approach to PD for academics, that it can be 'theoretical, critical and interdisciplinary', requiring a reconceptualisation of organisational structure, to allow staff from different service units to work together. The author argues that there is no central text which a newcomer can use as a basis for L&T in HE.

Take-away message: The author stresses the importance of L&T central units to work with education faculties to do research in HE pedagogy.

Rust, C. (2000). Do initial training courses have an impact on university teaching? The evidence from two evaluative studies of one course. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37 (3), 254-262. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13558000050138498>

An evaluation of 2 Induction courses at Oxford Brookes.

Models of training:

P 255: "Gilbert and Gibbs (1998) go on to argue that different kinds of programmes may be based on different theoretical frameworks and may therefore achieve different kinds of outcomes against which they should be judged. They suggest six different theoretical models:

- Behavioural change models – which focus on changing/developing the teacher's behaviour in the classroom (Murray, 1983, 1997).
- Developmental models – the teacher's focus of attention changes (develops), with training and experience, from self to subject to process to student (passive) to student (active) to student (independent) (Kugel, 1993; Nyquist and Sprague, in press; Sprague and Nyquist, 1991).
- Conceptual change models – that teachers' conceptions of teaching are linked to their teaching intentions and the strategies they use and therefore their conceptions need to be developed/changed (Trigwell & Prosser, 1996; Ho 1998a, 1998b).
- Reflective practise models – the development of reflective practitioners (Schon, 1983).
- Student learning models – which focus on resulting student approaches (as measured by the ASI (Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983)) perceptions of their learning environments (as measured by the CEQ (Ramsden, 1991)) and learning outcomes (Angelo and Cross, 1993; Dahlgren, 1984).
- Hybrids – either implicitly or explicitly combining some of the above".

The Oxford Brookes course is face-to-face, over a year, weekly in 1st term, fortnightly in second term, and beginning and end of the third term.

"The course is focused on prescribed outcomes and values which have to be successfully demonstrated. This involves the production of a portfolio of evidence, is based around a learning contract, and also uses self-profiles. Teaching is observed at least three times (twice by tutors

once by a peer) and assessment of outcomes is carried out using a mixture of tutor, peer and self assessment.” It explicitly espouses the reflective practise model.

Evaluated using focus groups and questionnaire in first evaluation, through ‘guided conversations and questionnaire in second.

Highly positive reported self-efficacy among participants.

P 256: Of the skills participants most appreciated having learnt on the course, the skills of planning and course design were the most valued.

The second evaluation produced narrative responses, mostly positive, but could not be neatly summarised.

P 260: “The course has had an effect on a substantial number of the participants, even if we make the pessimistic assumption that non-respondents might be more negative in their views.

- In almost all cases behavioural change has been achieved.
- In many (possibly most) cases the changes are deep, going well beyond hints and tips in teaching practice and affecting beliefs and attitudes and resulting in theory applied in practice – in other words, conceptual change has been achieved.
- The course’s stated aim to develop reflective practitioners would seem to be largely successful.
- The impact of the course goes well beyond classroom practice to affect and influence and inform many of the other functions of a teacher in higher education”.

The impact of the course also goes beyond its primary developmental aims regarding teaching and learning through also providing things such as support, induction and networking. The changes may be more obvious to the course participant later, looking back, and this raises questions about when may the best time to evaluate such courses.

The author acknowledges that the data are subjective, and that student perceptions also need to be researched.

Take-away message: Most evaluations of programs are based on the perceptions of participants; since they are voluntary, they may not represent the views of all participants in a mandated program. They also do not provide any quantitative evidence of improved practice, nor of improved learning outcomes. However, they do focus staff on their teaching, and give them more confidence in teaching and planning learning. They also suggest that evaluation of a program should occur at the end of the program, and at least a year later, to gauge longer term influences.

Ryan, Y., Dearn, J. & Fraser, K. (2003, June). *Preparing academics for teaching in Australian Universities*. Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Conference, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Reports on Australian Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) funded research to determine what teaching professional development training central learning and teaching units in Australian institutions provided for their academics in 2002. Survey and interview methodology. Abstract: “...while the large majority of universities offered induction programmes to staff new to teaching, these are relatively poorly attended, and do not cater for part-time sessional staff in any systematic way.... The results form an important reference point for professional associations and staff development units concerned to promote teaching excellence and the professionalisation of the teaching role in universities”.

P1: “The last ten years have seen an increasing concern with the standard of teaching in Australian higher education, consequent on the need to provide quality assurance in an increasingly competitive and international environment”.

Moses (1988) reported that 9 universities had a central L&T unit in 1972 (page 3). Thirty four of the then 38 Australian universities were thought to have central L&T units.

Thirty two responses to the current survey received showed that 16 had central units, 12 had hub and spoke into faculties, one had L&T staff completely devolved and two had no L&T staff (one didn't respond to the question).

Induction programmes

P 3: "Induction to teaching programmes are primarily but not exclusively provided to staff who are new to teaching in the sector". Twenty eight of the 32 responding universities provided a program. "... it is likely that 10 of the 38 Australian Universities (26%) did not provide even an introduction to the elements of university teaching".

The rest of the paper is on workshop programs, graduate certificates and mentoring.

Take away message: Twenty six percent of Australian universities did not provide teaching induction for new teaching staff.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72 (5), 474-479.

Some models for Induction programs, but mostly about the identity of new staff in the US in the 90s. An example is the generalised finding that what attracts new staff to academia is the autonomy associated with the role: research from the CSHE at the University of Melbourne does not support this in the Australian context. Mentoring by senior staff was considered highly successful as an Induction activity for all aspects of academic work.

Stes, A., Clement, M., & Van Petegem, P. (2007). The effectiveness of a faculty training programme: Long-term and institutional impact, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 12 (2), 99-109.

Abstract: P 99: "In this exploratory study the long-term individual and institutional impact of a novice faculty training programme at the University of Antwerp (Belgium) was evaluated, using a written survey with open questions. The results revealed that 2 years after finishing the programme the respondents still referred to the programme as a means of explaining changes in their day-to-day teaching practice. No firm relationship could be established between the strength of individual impact and the extent to which respondents also felt inclined to change things at the institutional level. The data suggests that the long-term impact of the programme depends mainly on contextual elements. The article further discusses implications for the design of faculty training as well as perspectives for further research".

The program is a year long.

P 100: "Little is known about the real impact of staff development on day-to-day teaching practice and evaluations are generally limited to measures of participants' satisfaction (Wilson & Berne, 1999)." (Little has changed.)

"Guskey (2000) arrived at a similar categorisation as Kirkpatrick) and identified the following five levels of professional development evaluation: participants' reactions; participants' learning; organisation support and change; participants' use of new knowledge and skills; and student learning outcomes".

P 101: "Indeed, not only did the training programme—according to the participants—result in individual learning and behavioural changes, but it also seemed to exert some influence at the institutional level, as participants tried to make a contribution with regard to teaching culture and practices in their faculty. In this sense the programme seems to be in line with an observation by Biggs (2001) that, in order to promote student-centred teaching, educational development initiatives should lead both to individual and institutional changes".

P 102: The teaching approaches used were:

- "Discussions based on video fragments (modules 1 and 8).
- Problem-based learning (module 2).
- Guided autonomous learning (module 3).

- Online discussions (module 4).
- Group assignments (module 5 and 7).
- Case studies (module 6).

Contact moments were restricted (1 day a month). Some of these were practically oriented, while others explicitly promoted reflection on teaching and learning”.

P 102: The following home assignments were elaborated:

- “An outline of the participant’s vision of teaching and learning (modules 1 and 8).
- A draft design for a valid and reliable assessment (module 2).
- An analysis of a teaching and learning environment (module 3).
- An outline of the goals of the participant’s course in relation to the objectives of the curriculum
- (module 4).
- An analysis of an electronic site regarded as useful in stimulating students’ learning processes (module 5).
- A draft design for an alternative assessment (module 6).
- A draft plan for improving the quality of the curriculum and an outline of the methods used by the participant to obtain insight into his or her teaching effectiveness (module 7).

In order to receive a certificate at the end of the training programme those taking part were required to meet two criteria: participation in at least 80% of the contact moments; and a qualitative elaboration of the assignments for at least 6 modules”.

A survey was conducted 2 years after completion of the program.

P 103: “The research questions in this study are:

1. Does the 1-year training programme for beginning faculty members have a long-term impact?
2. What is the relationship between the individual impact (in terms of changes in teaching behaviour and instructional conceptions) and the institutional impact (in terms of involvement in teaching at the organisational level)?
3. Which factors—according to the participants—influence the long-term impact of the training programme?

P 105: “The first research question (“Does the 1-year training programme for beginning faculty members have a long term impact?”) can be answered affirmatively.”

P 106: “With regard to the second research question, our initial hypothesis about the relationship between institutional impact and the strength of the individual impact (suggesting that participants showing strong behavioural and conceptual changes would also feel more inclined to change things at the institutional level) is not unequivocally affirmed by the data. Participants reporting a strong individual change do indeed report institutional change, but five of the nine participants who were not so deeply influenced by the training at an individual level also report institutional impact.

The third research question concerned the factors experienced by the participants as promoting or constraining the impact of the programme. No clear connection can be observed between the nature and extent of the impact and the nature of the factors perceived as influencing this impact.

Factors perceived as constraining the impact mostly concern contextual aspects. A lack of consensus and collaboration with colleagues (n = 7) is the most frequently mentioned aspect. Students are another inhibiting factor (n = 5): there are too many of them in class and/or they have a passive attitude, which makes it difficult to apply the idea of student-centred teaching. Job responsibilities (time and publication pressure); striving for a balance between research and teaching duties; and a lack of support (in terms of practical guidance or support from the academic policy-makers) are also perceived as factors constraining the implementation of what has been learned.

At the same time the contextual aspects “colleagues” and “students” are perceived as the most important promoting factors. Enthusiastic reactions from colleagues or students to an innovation stimulate further implementation. Collaboration with colleagues who also participated in the training programme is also very motivating”.

P 107: “The data suggests that the long-term impact of educational development programmes mainly depends on contextual aspects. Colleagues and students are crucial in this regard. Thus the setting in which participating faculty members are working must be taken into account when designing educational development initiatives. In order to acknowledge the participant’s particular setting, small, domain-specific discussion groups could be used in addition to a general training programme”.

The authors suggest case studies may be another research approach to determining impact.

Take-away message: This is one of the few studies which evaluates program effects after a few years. It demonstrates that Induction programs do have longer term behavioural, and institutional change effects. It speaks to the need to conduct longitudinal evaluation of a program. It also suggests that participants in teaching induction programs should have local support, perhaps in the form of small discussion groups, at each institution.

Trowler, P. & Cooper, A. (2002) *Teaching and Learning Regimes: Implicit theories and recurrent practices in the enhancement of t & l through educational development programmes. HERD 21 (3) 221-240.*

Sociological investigation of attitudes and practices of those who react positively and negatively to educational development program.

Take-away message: Interesting question of term ‘participant’ rather than ‘student’ in our education development literature, and the loss of ‘power’ in being subjected to assessment and criteria; so more likely to ‘work’ with inexperienced staff.

The University of Western Sydney (2010). *Foundations of University Learning and Teaching Program: Report on the first three years. A report by the Teaching Development Unit.*
https://www.uws.edu.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/597229/foundations-report-final-iores.pdf

An evaluation of three years of the Foundations program, offered initially in 2007. Mandatory for full-time new staff with little experience.

P 4: “Graduates highlighted the following features of the program as instrumental in the success of the program:

- flexible structure of the program which accommodates the diverse learning needs and work demands of participants;
- exposure to research and literature in teaching and learning in higher education and to teaching practices used by colleagues at the University, which enables participants to broaden their expertise and try out a greater range of possibilities for improving their own teaching and assessing practice;
- valuable involvement in microteaching and cycles of observation and feedback on teaching which enhance teaching effectiveness;
- flexible assessment which enables participants to investigate areas of interest and value to them, and helps them recognise the value of researching their own practice; and
- valuable feedback on learning throughout the program and on assessment tasks, which promotes continuing learning.

Heads of School reported positive feedback from staff about the usefulness of the Foundations program. They said that staff had gained tools for reviewing and developing their teaching and assessing practice; that participants often formed ongoing working relationships focused on developing and refining their teaching practice; and that graduates encouraged new colleagues to view the program positively.

One vital recommendation was made by the evaluators:

Colleges and Schools reach agreement that all staff participating in the program will be allocated at least 100 hours workload for this purpose over the duration of their enrolment in the program”.

P 6: “A Certificate of Completion is issued to staff who satisfactorily complete the program. If they wish to, academic staff can seek advanced standing for one unit in Deakin University’s Graduate Certificate in Higher Education. Communication with graduates indicates that only four staff have taken up this pathway”.

P 7: “The key concepts taught in the program are student-focussed teaching, constructive alignment and reflective practice. These concepts are the three most common and strongly interrelated concepts taught in academic development programs in Australia and the UK. Two texts: 2 Biggs, J. & Tang, C. (2007) Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does (3rd ed) Berkshire: UK: Open University Press. Kember, D. & McNaught, C. (2007) Enhancing University Teaching: Lessons from research into award-winning teachers. London: Routledge.”

The program is offered in blended mode, incorporating face-to-face sessions, online learning and independent study. Face-to-face sessions at the beginning of the program enable staff to learn with and from peers and to gain exposure to different disciplinary examples. These couple of days spent together establish a strong group dynamic amongst participants and are a good preparation for the following modules which are conducted largely through online learning and independent study.

Microteaching of a concept, 10 minutes, videoed for self-review, and peer critiqued. Participants also observe 2 teaching sessions of mentors. Assessment is Satisfactory/Not satisfactory”.

It appears that the program is mostly online and self-directed, but some required attendance at workshops, over several weeks of approximately two and a half days.

P 9: “TDU notifies Heads of Schools when school staff commence the Foundations program and when they complete the program. A minimum of 100 hours workload allocation over the duration of the program is recommended. The actual workload allocation given to staff completing the program varies widely between Schools, and ranges from 0-144 hours for the duration of the program”.

Focus group evaluation.

P 12: “The following were found to be most valuable features of the program:

- flexible structure which accommodates the diverse learning needs and work demands of participants;
- exposure to research and literature in teaching and learning in higher education (Scholarship of Learning and Teaching – SOLT) and to teaching practices used by colleagues at the University.
- valuable involvement in microteaching and cycles of observation and feedback on teaching which enhance teaching effectiveness;
- flexible assessment which encourages reflective practice and enables participants to investigate areas of interest and value to them. It also enables participants to recognise the value of researching their own practice; and
- valuable and timely feedback on learning throughout the duration of the program and on assessment tasks, which promotes continuing learning.

Results: There were significant shifts moving from a content focus to a student focus. Graduates repeatedly commented on the notion of constructive alignment (aligning learning outcomes + teaching and learning activities + assessment) and how they were finding this a powerful tool. Graduates commented on the value of being exposed to research in learning and teaching (Scholarship of Learning and Teaching – SOLT) through the Foundations program”.

P 18: "Each of the Heads of School reported changes in the way graduates thought and talked about teaching; they had also seen graduates reworking teaching and assessment tasks during and after participating in the program".

Take-away messages:

1. Microteaching is a valuable learning activity.
2. It would be useful to interview Heads of School for the perceived effectiveness of any teaching induction program, but this may not be possible.
3. Some face-to-face element at the local level is advisable for a community of learners/colleagues to develop.