Basics and Beyond:
Faculty Development as a Professional Learning Journey

Diane J. Salter

Shannon E. Rushe

Glen Jacobs

This paper describes the implementation of the Basics and Beyond certificate program for faculty that models a learning-centered, task-based approach to active learning. Unique aspects of the program include: flexible entry; a student focused/conceptual change model; a task-based, learning-centered approach (tasks and feedback drive the learning process); and authentic assessment. Throughout this program, tasks and feedback drive the learning process so as to engage faculty in active rather than passive learning. Faculty have immediate opportunities to apply new strategies to their own teaching context and receive feedback. In this way, the journey itself is as important as the destination. A two-year research project assessed the uptake and impact of the program. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of data shows changes in participants' attitudes and approaches to their teaching. The data suggests that our model promotes deep learning that resulted in attitudinal and behavioral changes in the faculty participating in the Basics and Beyond program. In the paper we describe unique features of our program, the design of the research project, and our findings.

Introduction: The Importance of Approaches to Teaching

Research shows that the biggest influence on how students approach their learning is how teachers approach their teaching (Kember, 1997; Martin & Balla, 1991; Prosser & Trigwell, 1997; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999a; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999b; Samuelowicz & Bain, 1992, 2001). Knowledge of the variations between the Conceptual Change/Student Focused (CCSF) and the Teacher Focused/Information Transmission (ITTF) approach to teaching is central to understanding the model for faculty development we describe here. The use of this terminology, as a way to describe approaches to teach-

ing, is well known in Canada, Europe, and Australasia; however, these descriptors (although not the concepts) may be less familiar to American institutions. A fundamental distinction between the CCSF and ITTF approach is instructors with a CCSF approach see their role as helping students to develop an understanding of the discipline; instructors with an ITTF approach see their goal as delivering information/content. The CCSF approach has been shown to be more likely to foster deep learning than the ITTF approach (Biggs & Tang, 2005; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999a; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999b; Salter, 2013). We, members of our Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC) team, designed our program, Basics and Beyond to provide instruction within a CCSF framework: Faculty participate in the model that they will subsequently apply in their own course design and delivery.

We argue that the course design and delivery of a faculty development program adopt a CCSF design model in order to promote deep learning and application of strategies in a directly relevant way. In this approach, the facilitator does not give a didactic lecture about the teaching methodologies; instead of a lecture-based class, the facilitator incorporates activities and self-directed learning tasks in every session. These activities require faculty to engage in discussion, generate ideas based on their prior knowledge, and learn while they engage with the content. In this way, participants apply concepts to their own teaching situations and receive immediate feedback. The tasks and feedback drive the deep learning process as the students (in our case the faculty) engage in active rather than passive learning (Laurillard, 2002; Salter, Richards, & Carey, 2004; Vella, 2000**).** Meaningful tasks, which allow faculty to directly apply concepts to their courses, are incorporated during workshops and as homework (in the form of post-session tasks).

The Basics and Beyond Program functions as a learning journey exploring teaching, research, and leadership in higher education. A key difference between our program and many other faculty development programs is the flexible entry model. Sessions are not sequential. Faculty may take any session that suits their schedule and work on multiple certificates simultaneously if they choose. Participation in the journey through learning tasks, feedback, and authentic assessment is as, or perhaps even more, important than the final destination of achievement of a certificate. As faculty progress through each certificate, completion of experiential, discipline-specific, post-session tasks allows them to demonstrate that they have met the learning outcomes of the program (Salter, 2013; Salter & Knaack 2014). Faculty build

on their prior knowledge and experience and self-monitor the impact of their continuing involvement and professional learning.

New Directions at Our University

Our CLT launched the Basics and Beyond certificate program at our institution in August 2017. Aligning with the framework shown in Table 1, which highlights activities representative of this learning-centered approach to faculty development, the primary goal of the new program is to enhance student learning by preparing faculty through professional development around teaching and learning. Teaching is a central role for all of our faculty within the schools of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Arts and Sciences, and Graduate Studies. Student learning is a primary goal of the university.

Table 1
**A Learning-Centred Framework
for Programs Offered by Academic Development Centres:
CCSF Apporach to Program Delivery**

Before Session (guiding tenets during preparation)	**During Session (activities facilitator and faculty participants engage with)**	**Incorporate into Curriculum (course design guidelines)**
Facilitator designs programs for faculty that are assignment and task-based.	Facilitator considers how the students (who are faculty) will be actively engaged during the session.	Model outcomes-based, task-based approaches to learning with align-ed curriculum.
The facilitator prepares learning activities for use during the class and post class assignments. The facilitator prepares by thinking about 'What tasks will I create for the faculty to engage with? vs what power points will I prepare to cover during	In sessions and post-session tasks, the faculty members' focus is on adapting and adjusting their teaching to enhance the student learning experience with consideration to their own context and unique signature peda-	Alignment of learning outcomes with institutional strategic initiatives with a discipline specific focus.

the class?	gogies of their respective disciplines.	
In planning for sessions, facilitator considers the questions: "What do I want the faculty to learn?" and "How will they learn?" vs "What material do I want to cover?" and "What theories do I want to teach?"	Opportunities for active learning and engagement with material to engage with empirical evidence and theory.	Offers holistic, ongoing experiences (such as year-long programs or intensive three-day summer institutes) rather than one-off sessions. Creates a culture of learning whereby faculty want to engage in challenges and choices. Provides opportunities for faculty to reflect on their approach and learn how to collect their own data to self-monitor impact of their teaching on student learning.
Sessions are planned to build on existing faculty expertise. Facilitator recognizes there will be varying degrees of past experiences and expertise faculty bring to the sessions. Sessions are planned to include dialogue and sharing of ideas to promote new learning at	Faculty and facilitators engage in conversation about approaches Faculty brings existing resources they use (syllabus, assessments,	Reviewing and revising syllabus elements such as constructing revised learning outcomes, incorporating formative and summative assessment in curriculum, frameworks, considering and practicing alterna-

various levels of faculty expertise and continuing professional learning opportunities.	other) to sessions. Revision and feedback begins during the sessions and is completed as post-session tasks.	tive learning activities and assessments.
Sessions planned for Dialogue vs Monologue to engage faculty in conversations about things that matter relative to teaching and learning. Participation in the ongoing program affords an opportunity to participate in community of learners within a learning institution.	Participatory activities Communication skills Content as 'dialogue' for deep learning	Design pedagogy, questioning skills, inclusive learning design. Re-thinking curriculum design to plan from a learner's point of view with multiple ways to of learning a discipline. Professional Development as an ongoing Learning Journey.

To ensure appropriateness of the new program for our context, we conducted a needs analysis over three months. We collected data through surveys and focus groups with input from new and experienced cross-disciplinary faculty, deans, and other senior administrators. The needs analysis identified reasons for non-attendance at faculty development sessions that echoed research findings from other institutions. Representative reasons cited for non-participation included: "lack of time in my schedule," "sessions are not at a convenient time," "I don't need more training," "sessions do not align with my needs," and "sessions are too theoretical rather than practical." The needs analysis made clear to us that faculty were interested in continuing professional development, flexible delivery, a certificate of recognition, practical ideas that could be applied in their context, and collegial sharing and learning with colleagues. Our approach to meeting each of these needs is described below.

Continuing Professional Development

The program combines core sessions and electives. Core sessions encompass topics (e.g., "Leading Through Coaching and Mentoring"; "Research Ethics for Classroom Research"; "Planning Your Class for Active Learning"; etc.) important for all faculty to have as a basic foundation in teaching. Electives are offered on multiple topics (e.g., "Writing Measureable Learning Outcomes"; "Inclusive Teaching: Universal Design"; "Intersectionality and the Learning Experience"; etc.) related to teaching and learning. The list of electives (see below) continues to grow and change as these elective sessions may be taught by faculty from across the institution as well as by visiting scholars in addition to the faculty development team. With new electives added each semester, the professional learning journey for participating faculty can be ongoing. Completing a certificate level is a milestone but does not mean the learning journey is complete. Faculty may finish all certificate levels but continue to take electives that interest them as faculty continually build on their knowledge and expand their professional learning portfolio.

Flexible Delivery

A commonly cited challenge by faculty is that faculty development programs offer start and end dates that do not fit diverse schedules. Our program allows faculty to register for the program at any time during the semester and begin with any session that interests them and fits with their schedule. Faculty choose sessions throughout the term and register for offerings at a time that suits them. Our program offers core sessions on multiple occasions throughout the year so faculty have multiple opportunities to complete the core sessions needed for each certificate.

Certificate of Recognition

Recognition of achievement is important for faculty promotion portfolios as a way to document their professional learning. Our program offers three certificates: Scholarly Foundations in Teaching and Learning; Research in Teaching and Learning; and Leadership in Teaching and Learning. Each requires a minimum of thirty hours of professional development activity.

Practical Ideals

The task-based approach to learning requires faculty to complete post-session tasks and apply strategies introduced in the sessions to their own course design and delivery. Examples of post-session tasks include: designing a lesson plan for active learning, creating a rubric for a specific assignment, storyboarding a class for online delivery, revising learning outcomes, revising a syllabus to show constructive alignment, defining a research question, and so on. Some post-session tasks require technology implementation. For example, academic departments require many of our faculty to create short lecture videos as resources to be used in their courses. Therefore, in specific sessions, participants in Basics and Beyond learn how to create and implement these videos in keeping with best pedagogical practice. The focus is on the learning design and the technological skill.

Collegial Sharing and Learning

In our face-to-face sessions we create an opportunity to build a community of practice around teaching and learning. Colleagues from across the university attend sessions and discuss approaches to teaching and learning.

Program Overview:
Basics and Beyond Faculty Development Program

As we mention above, the program consists of three certificates: Scholarly Foundations in Teaching and Learning, Research in Teaching and Learning, and Leadership in Teaching and Learning. Each certificate requires completion of thirty-plus hours of professional learning comprised of eight sessions (four core sessions plus four elective sessions) with associated pre- and post-session tasks, a reflective paper, and a consultation. Sessions and certificates may be completed in any order; each is a stand-alone certificate. The four core sessions required for each certificate are shown in Table 2.

Below is a list of some of the elective topics that have been offered as workshops over four semesters. Not every elective is offered each semester (especially those facilitated by visiting professors); rather, new electives are added and some are repeated. In this way, new electives maintain interest in ongoing faculty development after completion of certificates.

Elective Topics

- Small Group Facilitation Skills
- Writing Measurable Learning Outcomes
- Engaging Students in Large Classes
- Inclusive Teaching: Universal Design
- Why and How to use Images to Enhance Professional Publications
- Designing Rubrics to Enhance Learning and Feedback
- Curriculum Design for Effective Student Learning
- Intentional and Integrative Learner Pathways and E-Portfolios for Student Success
- Learning as Storytelling: Illuminating Your Teaching Philosophy for Integrative Learning
- Meaning and Medicine: Constructions of Health in Memory and Medicine
- Identity Development in the Curriculum: Mindful Engagement of Learner Pathways
- Integrative Learning: Outcomes to Illuminate Learner Pathways
- Effective Use of Panopto: Strategies for Saving Faculty Time while Enhancing the Student Learning Experience
- Tools to Enhance the Way We Communicate and Manage Relationships with Colleagues and Student/Advisees
- Topic: Teaching Philosophies and Strategies: Start at the End—End at the Start
- Creating Your Power Point Slides with Your Students in Mind
- Mindfulness in Teaching Learning and Everyday Life
- The T5 Curriculum Design Model
- Block Party: An Instructional Strategy for Increasing Engagement with Course Texts
- Fishbowl: A Technique for Building Discussion Skills and Enhancing Students' Metacognition
- Intersectionality and the Learning Experience
- Professional Growth and Self-Assessment
- Speech Skills for Professionals
- Using the PERMA Framework to Foster Educational and Student Well-Being in the Classroom
- Four Evidence-Based Practices for Teaching in Higher Education
- Providing Evidence of Teaching Through Teaching Portfolios
- Preparing a Teaching Philosophy Statement

Table 2 Core Sessions		
Scholarly Foundations in Teaching and Learning (4 core + 4 electives)	**Research in Teaching and Learning (4 core + 4 electives)**	**Leadership in Teaching and Learning (4 core + 4 electives)**
Core Sessions	Core Sessions	Core Sessions
Planning Your Class for Active Learning	Being a Mindful Practitioner: The Heart of Scholarly Teaching	Leading Curriculum Change Initiatives
Aligning Learning Outcomes/Learning Activities/Assessments	Research Methods for Teaching and Learning Projects	Leading Through Coaching and Mentoring
Approaches to Teaching that Enhance Students' Approaches to Learning	Research Ethics for Classroom Research	Distributed Leadership in Teaching and Learning
Assessment for Learning	Publishing Your Research on Teaching and Learning	Communities of Practice

Each session (core or elective) is conducted as a one-hour, active workshop with post-session tasks submitted online within a two-week window following the session. Most post-session tasks (completed outside of class time) require two to four hours of independent work. The facilitator provides feedback to tasks online and in scheduled sessions throughout the semester that include office hours and drop-in consultations. Program facilitators consider tasks to be "learning in progress" and assess them for completeness, not perfection. The tasks demonstrate how the participants have applied the ideas learned during a session; feedback enables them to continue to reflect, modify, and apply the ideas to their teaching context.

Many of our faculty teach large lecture classes and during our sessions we model and encourage the use of strategies that can be incorporated in their classes to engage students in large-group settings. The program's post-session tasks relate to the content of each workshop and require faculty to demonstrate how they will apply the concepts to the course they teach. The following is an example of a post-session task required after an

elective session about the importance of active learning and lesson planning for active learning. This planning template can be used for large- or small-group settings.

Example of a Post-session Task:
Redesigning a Lecture Class

Consider a lecture topic that you will give in the future. Write down ideas for planning the activities that you *and your students* may engage in.

1. How will you set the stage for the introduction to "grab the attention" of the students? Consider the notion of "active review" from the last class and/or a thought provoking visual image or quote that you might use to focus attention on the current class.

2. If you are teaching a one-hour class, plan for three "pauses," one after each 10-15 minutes of your lecture. Describe three activities you require the students do during each pause. In preparing these activities, consider: What is the desired learning outcome (DLO)? What do the students need to do/know/think about to achieve the DLO?

3. Consolidate the lecture with an "active review"' in the last five minutes by getting the students to "do" something. What will they do? What will you do?

Each semester, our CLT offers the twelve core sessions at least once along with multiple elective sessions. Faculty may start with any workshop at any time during the semester. We facilitate 25-30 sessions each semester, all are face to face and one-hour long and a good number of them occur at lunch time, which is a time span and slot most faculty can squeeze into their schedules. Attendance in consistently high. Attendance ranges between ten to thirty participants each session. Pre-registration is encouraged but not mandatory in case someone chooses to come at the last minute. Sometimes people register and do not attend (we think they have good intentions and last minute conflicts). We have never scheduled a session where no one shows up.

A commonly cited challenge by faculty is that faculty development programs offer start and end dates that do not fit diverse schedules. Our flexible program overcomes this challenge and allows faculty to register for the program at any time during the semester and begin with any session that interests them and fits with their schedule. Faculty choose sessions throughout the term and register for offerings at a time that suits them. Our program offers core sessions on multiple occasions throughout the year so faculty have multiple opportunities to complete the core sessions needed for each certificate. Our institution has a staggered, protected lunch hour, the majority of faculty are free from 12:00-1:00 pm or from 12:30-1:30 pm; therefore, we host our sessions over lunch. We do not provide lunch but faculty can bring lunch if they wish. Core sessions are offered every other week from 12:00-1:00 pm, and then repeated on a different day from 12:30-1:30pm. For example, if the Foundations in Teaching and Learning core sessions are run on Tuesdays from 12:00-1:00 from September to mid-October, this would be followed by running a repeat on Wednesdays from 12:30-1:30 pm from mid-October to early December. Elective sessions are scheduled around the core sessions. In this way three to four sessions a week can be offered.

Participants may, or may not, choose to do the post-session tasks and get feedback on their ideas. Although, it's important to note that they do not receive a certificate unless all post-session tasks are completed. We believe this application is essential to learning. There is no minimum or maximum timeline to complete a certificate; however, most faculty complete a certificate within one semester. Some dedicated faculty have completed multiple certificates within one semester. We provide updates to faculty on their progress at the end of each semester but allow them to choose when to participate and how long it will take them to complete each certificate. Our self-directed faculty find the autonomy and flexible timeline very appealing.

Culminating Activity

Upon completion of the required core and elective sessions and all post-session tasks, faculty participate in a culminating activity to achieve the certificate. The reflective essay and consultation are important elements of the program that incorporate folio thinking and oral assessment. Folio thinking involves an activity that requires learners to compile and reflect upon the multiple activities completed over a period of study and demonstrate their ability to connect the dots between elements of a course or program.

Instructions on how to complete the reflective essay are:

The reflective essay is an opportunity to consolidate *your* thinking about *your* experiences during the program. The reflective essay is about "you." It is not a repetition of the content you have learned during the sessions. It will not be like anyone else's reflective essay. Rather, the reflective essay is a chance for you to think about what you have learned, how you have connected ideas across your experience during the sessions, and reflect on how you might apply the concepts in your own teaching situation. Each essay is an individual and personal reflection. The list below is intended to be a catalyst to help you think about how you will approach your reflective essay. You may want to write about some of the following aspects:

What surprised you about the sessions or throughout the program?

What did you learn during the sessions?

How did the post-session tasks contribute to your learning?

What connections have you made between the sessions?

Has what you learned influenced your professional goals related to teaching and learning? If yes, how?

What are your plans to continue your journey as a teacher?

Are there new strategies that were discussed that you have incorporated or hope to incorporate into your teaching?

Consultation and Oral Assessment

The faculty member submits their reflective essay prior to the consultation. In preparation for the consultation, the director of our Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC), who is the program director, reads the faculty member's essay and also reviews the folder of completed post-session tasks. As mentioned above, the post-session tasks are not graded but are assessed for completeness and application of strategies. The director views tasks as works in

progress. Questions are raised and concepts clarified during the consultation; as with any learning, we expect that the faculty member's ideas will continue to evolve over their career. The consultation provides an opportunity for professional learning through reflection, discussion, and feedback.

During the consultation, the TLC's director invites the faculty member to read their reflective essay aloud. The oral activity frequently surprises faculty members (pleasantly) as there are not often opportunities to read reflections aloud and receive feedback; this activity provides a different dynamic to the meeting. Reading the reflection aloud enables a conversation to take place that would not be possible if the director had merely read the essay prior to the meeting and made comments on the text. During an oral reading of their reflection, faculty tend to stop at various points to spontaneously expand upon ideas that they had noted in their paper; throughout the reading, the director probes ideas when clarification is needed. Through this process, the reading manifests as a dialogue about the new directions in approaches to teaching that the faculty member has reflected upon. The reading of the reflective essay enables both the faculty member and the director to deepen their knowledge and demonstrates, to both parties, how well the learning outcomes of the program have been met. After the reading and discussion of the reflective essay, the director provides feedback on the folder of completed tasks, which leads into a discussion of the next steps the faculty member hopes to take on their professional learning journey. Feedback from the participants indicates that they found this culminating activity an energizing and exciting way to finish the certificate level.

Who Are the Workshop Facilitators?

The workshop facilitators in our program include members of our TLC team: the Director of Faculty Development, the Associate Director of Faculty Development, one Educational Developer, and one Instructional Designer. In addition, we invite other faculty, including visiting professors, from across the institution to facilitate elective sessions based on the instructor's specific expertise. In order to give our faculty participants maximum choice of topics and timing of sessions, we offer three to five sessions almost every week during the semester.

With a multiple-facilitator program, such as ours, it is important to ensure consistency in the design of each workshop. To ensure our task-based model is used across sessions, our team developed a set of materials for each of the core sessions that are reused for each repeat session; this ensures consistency

in content and delivery. Also, when external facilitators lead elective sessions we work closely with them prior to their visit to plan their session and to share our format. In the planning meetings, we guide them in the design of their session to ensure that all sessions follow our standard format. This process includes providing an online form for the external facilitator to complete followed by two meetings (face-to-face or virtual) with a member of our team. In the meeting, our team members work with the facilitator to review the plan for the session and draft the post-session tasks. To ensure consistency of the post-session tasks, we developed a template that facilitators follow so that all sessions have a similar format for the post-session tasks. This template can be customized for the specific topic of the session. The template includes reflection questions and an application section. For example, if the session is about designing rubrics, the post-session task requires the participant to create a rubric for a specific assignment. The reflection questions will then ask participants to describe their prior experiences with rubrics, identify one new thing they learned in the session, and discuss how they applied this new idea to develop their new rubric.

Assessment, Evaluation, and Findings

In this section, we describe three aspects of our assessment process: how we have assessed the faculty participants in the program, how we have evaluated the program, and what our research findings indicate about the program's impact.

Faculty Assessment:
How Do We Know Faculty Have Met the Learning Outcomes?

Faculty in the program receive formative feedback and summative assessment. Formative feedback is provided after each workshop during the completion of post-session tasks. There is ample opportunity for feedback to tasks and reflection on work completed throughout the term. The TLC Director and session facilitators asses task folders as either complete or incomplete. A summative assessment is done in the culminating interview using oral assessment. During this conversation, we stress that the learning journey is ongoing both during faculty participants' teaching at this university and throughout their career. We consider all of the tasks and activities as works in progress that the faculty members can apply, review, and continu-

ally adapt to new teaching situations. The participants' self-assessment is on-going throughout the program with a goal of developing self-directed faculty who can assess their learning needs independently and create exceptional learning experiences for their students long after their participation in the workshop. To provide opportunities for peer assessment, we pair or team faculty during workshops so that they can benefit from informal peer feedback to their strategies and tasks in progress (such as when they revise their course learning outcomes, when they design rubrics, etc.).

The final summative assessment and sign off for achievement of a certificate comes from the program director who, during the final consultation, reviews the folder of completed tasks with the faculty member, listens to the reading of the reflective paper, ensures completeness of attendance at all sessions and completion of all tasks, and discusses next steps.

Program Evaluation: How Do We Know Our Program Is Effective?

Our program evaluation consists of end-of-semester feedback from participants and ongoing review of the post-session tasks. At the end of each semester, participants complete an anonymous, online feedback survey. Analysis of the feedback showed that 94% of participants reported that completing the certificate was "useful in their work as an educator," 94% indicated that the participation in the certificate program contributed to their ability to engage students in learning, and 100% reported that the post-session tasks helped them to develop the ability to use the strategies and implement new approaches to teaching. Throughout the semester, as we reviewed the completed post-session tasks and provided feedback, we were able to assess faculty understanding and application of principles. In the future we plan to request independent external reviewers to conduct a formal program review.

Research Findings on Impact: How Do We Know
Participation Has Impacted the Student Learning Environment?

Our two-year research project assessed the following question: What is the impact on teaching as the result of participation in a certificate program in university-level teaching at a special-purpose, professional institution in the Caribbean? We investigated attitudinal and behavioral change of faculty after completion of each certificate. We measured attitudinal change by scores on the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) developed by Prosser

and Trigwell (1999), administering this pre- and post-participation in the program. To measure behavioral change, we reviewed the post-session tasks and the reflection papers to assess evidence of application of tasks and transformation in approaches to the design and delivery of courses. Our definition of transformation derives from descriptors used in business settings that describe transformative change as a profound change in approach that results in enhanced effectiveness.

In the first two years of the program (four semesters), 163 cross-disciplinary faculty enrolled in the program. Since there is no fixed start date, the rolling enrollment process allows faculty to begin the program throughout the semester and for new hires to join the program throughout the term. The total attendance at all sessions was 1790, with 112 workshops offered and 82 certificates completed. Participation in the first three certificates generated over 640 post-session tasks submitted by faculty.

Methodology and Results

We used quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze the data. Participants completed the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) prior to beginning the certificate program and again at the end of their first completed certificate level. ATI scores were calculated according to the procedure developed by Prosser and Trigwell (1999) and categorized into Conceptual Change Student Focused (CCSF), Information Transfer/Teaching Focused (ITTF) or Balanced (B). In the pre-participation ATI inventory, 38% of participants were categorized as Balanced, 38% Information Transfer/Teaching Focused, and 24% as Conceptual Change Student Focused. In the post-test inventory scores, 44% showed a Balanced approach (B), 6% showed an information transmission approach (ITTF), and 50% showed scores in the conceptual change category (CCSF). The overall group change marked a shift towards a Balanced or Conceptual Change/Student Focused approach with a 6% increase in Balanced, a 26% increase in Conceptual Change/Student Focused, and a decrease of 32% in Information Transfer/Teaching Focused approach (see Table 3).

We used a phenomenological approach to analyze the reflective papers and explore the nature of the experience of participants in the program. Three independent researchers coded comments to identify themes in the reflective essays. Differences in coding were resolved by discussion until 100% agreement was obtained in the coding of the comments. Identified themes were consistent with attitudinal and behavioral change.

	Table 3	
Approaches to Teaching Inventory Scores		
Category	**Pre-test** **(Pre Certificate 1)**	**Post-test** **(Post Certificate 1)**
CCSF	24%	50%
Balanced	38%	44%
ITTF	38%	6%

Note. Balanced = less than 8 points difference between CCSF and ITTF scores.

Analysis of the post-session tasks and the reflective essays shows program participants re-thinking the design and delivery of their teaching. The qualitative analysis of the reflective essays indicates the following themes: Growth Mindset; Professional Identity Formation; Transformation of Approaches to Teaching; Thinking About the Learner; Intention to Apply Strategies; Application of Strategies; Benefit of the Professional Learning. Representative examples of comments by theme include:

Growth Mindset: "For me, in every session there was something new. I had heard about some of the ideas before, but not in a way that I could apply them. Working towards this teaching certificate has opened my eyes to many new and exciting concepts I had never really thought of or even considered."

Professional Identity Formation: "As a result of this course, my teaching philosophy and strategies have changed."

Transformation of Approaches to Teaching: "I realize now I can incorporate active learning into even my large classes. I'm thinking more about how my students learn and what helps with deep learning."

Thinking About the Learner: "The post-session tasks that we were given really helped me to understand what we learned. I am starting to do this in my classes to engage the students in learning after the lecture."

Intention to Apply Strategies: "I would like to implement a small change with the hopes of starting to develop more of a universal design in my courses. I hadn't thought about invisible disabilities before—I'm going to my changes to my power points [*sic*] and use close captioning in audio visuals."

Application of Strategies: "I was able to use the rubric I designed and put it into the online course management system."

Benefit of the Professional Learning: "For me, in every session there was something new. The in-class activities and interactive nature of the classes I thought were key to making it fun and rewarding."

Discussion

We designed Basics and Beyond as an ongoing professional learning journey for faculty using a conceptual change/student focused (CCSF) approach to the design and delivery of the program. Faculty engagement in the program has been substantial as shown by high participation and retention rates with a large number of faculty completing certificates. Faculty feedback shows that the flexible delivery of the program is particularly appealing.

Analysis of the data shows a shift toward a more conceptual change/student focused approach to course design and delivery and a substantive change in the way faculty are re-thinking their approaches to teaching. The time commitment for faculty, at least thirty hours for each certificate, is substantial. However, faculty tell us that they engage with the work required because they find the sessions well-facilitated, the time working with colleagues enjoyable, and the strategies learned applicable to their needs. One participant commented on the sessions' time slot: "Having these sessions at lunch I feel like I'm nourishing my mind as well as my body."

The discussions generated since the launch of the program have led to cross-institutional collaborations on new faculty development initiatives including:

> 1. Invited workshops on specific topics related to writing learning outcomes and curriculum mapping for the School of Veterinary Medicine.

> 2. A series of eight workshop sessions requested by our Nursing Faculty to address their teaching and curriculum needs. These sessions

are scheduled at a time convenient for the nursing faculty, who due to their schedule cannot attend the general sessions. The department chair has secured a time in their schedules that will be dedicated to professional learning activities.

3. At the invitation of the School of Medicine, our Educational Developer observed clinical preceptors (medical doctors who teach students in clinical placements) at the Grenada General Hospital and developed sessions to help the clinical preceptors teach in the hospital's small-group setting. (The preceptors are medical doctors who teach St. George's University medical students in small groups when they do their clinical placements at the hospital.) We facilitated these sessions in the evening since the clinicians work in clinics during the day and are rarely on campus.

4. On request from the Dean of Medicine, we created a modified version of the Scholarly Foundations Certificate for our medical faculty teaching at another campus. This program was offered as an intensive week-long session and will be offered each spring semester.

5. At the request of the Provost and the Dean of Medicine, we developed a Three- Day Summer Institute to deliver an intensive, customized program specifically for clinical tutors to help with small group facilitation and communication skills necessary for the small-group learning they facilitate.

6. The success of the program has encouraged and enabled the cofacilitation of elective topics in the certificate program with faculty from across the university and external visiting professors. We initiated these collaborations to raise awareness of our program, have a broader impact across the university, and provide diversity in the presentation of electives by inviting other faculty to develop sessions based on their discipline specific expertise. For example, our university's Institutional Review Board members collaborated with us and led a two-part elective session to help faculty prepare research ethics proposals.

One challenge we face is that the growing participation in and success of our program has placed additional challenges on our unit, which consists of

a Director, an Associate Director, one Educational Developer, one Instructional Designer, and an administrative assistant. Although a significant amount of our time is spent on the leadership and facilitation of the Basics and Beyond Certificate Program, this is only one aspect of our faculty development initiatives. Our team members also consult with cross-institutional departments on their specific teaching and learning initiatives, conduct research on teaching and learning, teach in the Masters of Education Program, facilitate a New Faculty Orientation twice each year, serve on curriculum committees, serve on our university ethical review board, and are involved with other internal and external commitments. We are all, however, full-time CTL staff members, and ensuring delivery of workshops in Basics and Beyond, consultations with its faculty participants, and time for administration of the program are high priorities. Because we have a very enthusiastic and well qualified team and an excellent administrative support for registration and maintaining records, everything has, thus far, worked smoothly. It has been very busy, but the rewards from seeing how well the faculty enjoy and benefit from the sessions make it all worthwhile.

At first, our CTL Director who had developed the concept for the program taught all of the core sessions and some of the electives. The resources she developed were then shared so that others from the team could use and modify resources already developed and maintain consistent learning outcomes. To develop their skills in this regard, other facilitators first participated in a session led by the CTL Director, then they led a session while the director observed and co-facilitated, and then team members led their own session (using the resources already developed). Enabling faculty outside the CTL (i.e., from other departments or from external universities who were visiting) to teach electives in topics of interest to them also helped the program to continue to grow and offer fresh new sessions. Our team worked with these faculty pre-session to ensure they followed the model. In the future, we hope to expand our team in order to ensure sustainability of the program at the current level and allow for the growth we anticipate. Right now, the structure of our program, the energy and competence of our small but dedicated team, and our invitations to external facilitators to lead sessions will contribute to the sustainability of our program.

It is too early to draw long-term conclusions or to generalize that our findings are replicable and/or relevant at other institutions. However, we hope that our results will be of interest to others and will facilitate conversations with faculty developers and institutional administrators who may wish to

explore this framework, share ideas for active, task-based learning for faculty development, and collaborate with us on future research projects.

References

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2005). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualization of the research in academic's conceptions of teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, *7*(3), 255–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(96)00028-X

Laurillard, D. (2002). *Rethinking university teaching*: *A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies.* New York: Routledge.

Martin, E., & Balla, M. (1991). Conceptions of teaching and implications for student learning. *Research and Development in Higher Education, 13,* 298–304.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1997). Relations between perceptions of the teaching environment and approaches to teaching. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*(1) 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1997.tb01224.x

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999a). *Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in higher education.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999b). Relations between teachers' approaches to teaching and students' approaches to learning. *Higher Education*, *37*(1). 57–70

Salter, D., Richards, L., & Carey, T. (2004). The 'T5' design model: An instructional design model to support the integration of online and campus based learning. *Educational Media International, 41*(3), 207–217. doi:10.1080/09523980410001680824

Salter, D. (Ed.). (2013). *Cases on quality teaching practices in higher education.* Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Salter, D., & Knaack, L. (June 2014) *Enhancing a culture of teaching and learning at a 'Teaching Focused' University.* Presented at the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Conference, Kingston, Canada.

Samuelowicz, K., & Bain, J. D. (1992). Conceptions of teaching held by teachers. *Higher Education, 24*(1), 93–112.

Samuelowicz, K., & Bain, J,.D. (2001). Revisiting academic beliefs about teaching and learning. *Higher Education, 41*(3), 299–325.

Vella, J (2000). *Taking learning to task*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Authors' Note

Diane J. Salter is former Director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning at St. George's University (SGU) in Grenada. She currently resides in British Columbia, Canada, and consults in higher education on strategic planning and faculty development. Diane has thirty years of experience in teaching and leadership at international research intensive universities and over 75 publications including books, book chapters, journal articles, short stories, and conference proceedings. Dr. Salter initiated the Basics and Beyond Program at SGU and was awarded the Society for Teaching and Learning's Desire to Learn Innovation Award (2019) for her work on this program. Other awards include co-recipient of the Ron Harden Innovation in Medical Education Award for her work at the University of Hong Kong. **Shannon E. Rushe** is a former Educational Developer in the Centre for Teaching and Learning at SGU in Grenada. Shannon has held various roles in higher education institutions, with a focus on designing and implementing training programs for faculty, peer educators, and students. Shannon is currently a Learning Specialist at the University of Guelph, Canada, and is the coordinator of an academic coaching program. Shannon received the Peer Helper Supervisor Award (2015) at the University of Guelph for redesigning a peer education training program. **Glen Jacobs** first joined SGU in 1997, serving as Chair of the Department of Educational Services from 1997-2002. He returned to SGU in 2010. In his current role as Provost, he is responsible for operational and academic initiatives of the four schools that constitute SGU. Throughout his thirty-year career in education, Dr. Jacobs has been involved in many aspects of academic support services, teaching and learning, and leadership in the United States, South Africa and Grenada. He has presented at numerous conferences around the world on topics such as distance learning, student retention, educational initiatives, small group learning, leadership and student academic success, and he was the founding Executive Director of the International Center for Supplemental Instruction at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, where he successfully established national supplemental instruction programs in South Africa, Canada, Australia, Sweden, Grenada, and the United Kingdom. He has received several international awards and recognition in the area of leadership and student support.