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Abstract

This paper describes three models for creating SoTL/classroom research inquiry communities with K-12 teachers and college faculty. Mixed-level inquiry groups hold significant potential for providing a middle ground for the exploration and sharing of carefully designed educational activities and classroom research, furthering the goals of multiple educational institutions in the same community. We describe exemplary projects, the essential support needed for creating and sustaining inquiry communities, and the many benefits of mixed level inquiry communities, including exposure to new ideas about teaching and learning, more intentional teaching, and contributions to the broader knowledge base about teaching and learning.
Creating and Supporting Mixed-Level Inquiry Communities

Educators at all levels face ‘problems of practice’ every day. Further, educators at all levels often find themselves isolated in their own classrooms and embedded in disciplinary research that does little to help them connect abstract theory to issues of student learning they encounter on a daily basis. Therefore, we argue that educators of all levels need opportunities to develop their own theories in the context of their practice and to conceptualize the relationship between educational challenges and potential solutions that will improve student learning. This conceptualization allows educators to connect theory to their practice. As Hatch explains (2005), “[Educators] make local theories that they can apply in a number of related contexts and that other teachers can learn from and build upon” (p. 2). Providing educators with the time, space, and a group of similarly motivated colleagues substantially enhances these enriching and empowering connections between theory and practice.

Many K-12 educators have opportunities for these explorations in department meetings, teaching teams, and other professional development communities. However, a culture of sharing information about teaching a teaching commons, is only gradually taking shape in higher education. The implementation of programs that foster a teaching commons can provide educators with the resources and collegial support necessary to do the sustained intellectual work of exploring problems of practice (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). Such a collaborative inquiry community can provide a powerful and immediate venue for sharing pedagogical insights, a middle ground where educators can share their work so that both carefully designed educational activities and the results of classroom research can be more easily accessed and extended by other educators. Between the relatively private work of teaching and the public dissemination of polished scholarship on teaching and learning, inquiry communities that are rooted in a teaching commons provide a middle ground to help educators cultivate “work that falls between individual practice and the world of generalized knowledge about teaching and learning” (Bass & Bernstein, 2008, p.304).
In this paper we share three models of K-12 teacher and college faculty collaborating in inquiry communities. These communities are evidence of the significant potential for providing a place for the development and sharing of carefully developed knowledge about teaching and learning that advances the goals of multiple educational institutions within the same community. The following case studies, which present three models of collaborative inquiry groups, begin with an outline of each institution’s initiative and therefore will provide a contextual base. The descriptions of the cases are organized in three sections: rationale, recruitment, and structure and analysis. The subsequent sections of the paper include descriptions of exemplary research projects, discussion of the challenges associated with supporting inquiry communities, and a brief set of commonalities for using the framework of collaboration.

**Model One: Collaborative Inquiry at Wabash College**

*Rationale*

In the spring of 2004, the Teacher Education Program faculty at Wabash College invited college faculty and K-12 teachers to join a collaborative research group. The initiative has two major purposes. The first purpose is to provide meaningful, on-going professional development to teachers who work with Wabash education students in their field placements. The second purpose is to support and encourage K-12 teachers and college faculty to improve their practice and student learning through classroom-based research (CBR/SoTL).

*Recruitment*

The Teacher Education Program at Wabash College sent announcements to three local school districts’ central offices and school principals inviting teachers to participate in the CBR collaboration. We framed this collaboration as a professional development opportunity. We thought it was important to let school superintendents know that we were making an effort to give back to the schools who graciously host our students’ field experiences. Those also invited to the collaboration included local alumni teaching in the
area, other teachers active with the Wabash College, faculty serving on the Teacher Education Committee, and faculty members already engaged in SoTL.

We had one year of funding from an outside grant that we used to pay teachers a small stipend, send participants to conferences, bring in an outside speaker, and offer small technology grants. Subsequently, the collaboration has been supported by the Education Program at Wabash College, which reimburses schools for substitute teachers, provides lunch, grants access to library and media center resources, and supply a copy of *The Art of Classroom Inquiry* (Hubbard & Power, 2003). The lack of long-term funding creates a challenge of sustainability. Therefore, we have welcomed anyone committed to the process of CBR and/or SoTL. Over the past four years, the group has included Wabash College faculty and teachers from five schools with varying levels of experience. Two of the authors, Gillan, a teacher educator and former junior high science teacher, and Pittard, a teacher educator, have been part of a core group of participants. The group currently also includes a first year elementary teacher, high school science and biology teachers, an elementary art teacher, a math education doctoral student, a history professor, and an English professor.¹

**Structure and Activities**

The collaborative group meets for at least two full-day work sessions each semester. At the start of each academic year, teacher-researchers begin by identifying an area of curiosity or concern related to their teaching practice and/or student learning. Sessions during the year focus on the research process such as: refining questions, data collection and analysis, sharing results, and implementing changes to classroom practice as a result of findings.

The research process is ongoing, recursive and both structured and flexible enough for continued support for group members. Participants are paired with a *critical friend* from the group who provides feedback as
well as an additional vantage point into their work. Through these meetings, participants seek advice from other group members by posting project updates on the College’s Moodle website or corresponding via e-mail with their critical friend. We also hold an end-of-year celebration which provides an opportunity to report the progress of members’ projects and to present findings. We invite the College’s academic dean, local superintendents, and school principals all to attend the celebration as a way to show the administrators the power and promise of the work to positively impact both educator practice and student learning.

Model Two: Course-Based Intercultural Curriculum Innovation at Goshen College

Rationale

In the fall of 2006, Goshen College was awarded a major grant from the Lilly Endowment to found the Center for Intercultural Teaching and Learning (CITL). The focus of the Center is to understand the nature and process of intercultural teaching and learning as it relates to Latinos in the Midwest. The work of the Center encompasses three main areas. First the Center creates access to small liberal arts colleges for local Latino students. Second the Center works to transform curriculum and provide faculty development that supports an intercultural campus community. Third the Center publicizes through documenting work in the other two areas, funding research on Latinos in the Midwest, and disseminating findings.

Research on the retention of Latino college students makes it clear that attention to students’ needs must be paid early in the academic process to college (Rendon, Novak, & Dowell, 2005). CITL began meeting with the Goshen Community Schools central district office staff in the summer of 2007 to discuss ideas for collaboration. After some initial discussions, we came to the mutual decision to form a learning community for faculty and teachers. The Goshen High School had been using a Professional Learning Community (PLC) model as their primary method for teacher professional development for about six years, and they were poised to try a new iteration of PLCs. The Faculty Learning Community (FLC) was formed under the
of CITL in 2008 as a joint learning community designed to foster conversations about curriculum and pedagogy across the K-16 continuum as well as provide faculty development to Goshen professors. The focus of our mixed level faculty learning community is on three pedagogies shown to support students of color in high school and college classes: equity pedagogies, critical pedagogies, and service-learning pedagogies.

Recruitment

In March of 2008, the Goshen High School administrators asked their PLC team leaders to promote a summer professional development seminar in June at Goshen College. Seven educators participated: five high school teachers, one middle school administrator, and one member of the district office leadership team. Goshen faculty members were recruited as a part of our annual round of faculty development grant awards. Goshen has a modest endowment for faculty development that allows us to support research, faculty publication, and work towards terminal degree completion for some faculty every year. Additional funds are also available to provide incentives for curriculum development to faculty and staff. Ten faculty members were awarded FLC grants for the 2008-2009 year.

Structure and Activities

The FLC uses two well established tools for promoting collaborative inquiry into teaching and learning. Critical friendship is a conceptual framework for establishing learning communities in which teachers examine student work as the basis for a change in their own classroom practice (for more information on critical friendship, see the School Reform Initiative, Inc. website: http://schoolreforminitiative.org). In the Goshen FLC, participants choose an area of student learning that they focus on for a year or more, read about that area, and look at student work with others to determine how that area of learning is advanced (or not advanced) in their classes. Course Portfolios involve the use of student work as evidence of learning and provide a format for going public with the results of a classroom research project. For more
information on course portfolios see the Peer Review of Teaching Project website
www.courseportfolio.org.

We began the FLC with a three-day seminar in June 2008 during which participants learned to examine student work together using three protocols from the framework of critical friendship: the Collaborative Assessment Conference, the Tuning Protocol, and the Consultancy (for descriptions see SRI, http://schoolreforminitiative.org). All three of these protocols are turn-taking activities in which participants focus on a piece of student work in the context of helping a teacher to answer a question about student learning or teacher practice. In August, we continued to build a collaborative foundation and set up peer classroom observations. In September, we debriefed our classroom observations by having participants respond to the question What did I learn about my own teaching from watching you?

We have continued to meet each month to work on course portfolios and discuss readings on equity pedagogy, critical pedagogy, or service learning. Participants obtained permission from Goshen’s IRB to use student work in their portfolios, which we anticipate will be completed by the end of May 2009. Each portfolio addresses four questions about teaching outcomes and pedagogical effectiveness. The questions are listed below.

a) What is the most important outcome of your course in terms of student learning?
b) What assignments drive toward that outcome?
c) What evidence do you find of student learning in the results of that assignment?
d) What is your conclusion as to the effectiveness of that assignment in helping students achieve the important outcome?
Model Three: Outreach to the Public Schools at Elon University

Rationale

Elon Teaching and Learning Partnership (ETLP) is a co-inquiry group composed of faculty at Elon University and teachers from nearby high schools. It is part of a public schools outreach initiative on the part of Elon University. In addition to providing high quality individualized faculty development for local high school teachers, the inquiry community was designed to bridge the divide that typically separates high school teachers and college faculty. The goal of the community inquiry was the development of viable solutions to common problems of educational practice. Funding was obtained from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations for the improvement of secondary education.

As at Wabash, recruitment involved letters of invitation sent to local public school staff and a general call for applications from the faculty at Elon University. Unlike Wabash College, Elon’s grant funding allows us to provide our participants with a stipend that acts as a significant incentive. We selected applicants who demonstrated dedication to their teaching and a desire to learn to apply classroom research techniques to better understand and improve the teaching and learning process. Although we have had interest from educators who work in varied settings, to date we have selected only those who work primarily in classrooms teaching core educational courses.

Structure and Activities

The first cohort, comprised of seven high school teachers and eight university professors from across the disciplines, has been meeting to plan projects and share progress since the spring of 2008. We obtained IRB approval to conduct assessment research on the ETLP program so each participant signed an informed consent form to allow us to use any pictures, written work, and audio and video-recordings for research purposes. Following orientation meetings in the spring and independent reading and thinking during the summer, the projects were developed during a three-day institute in August. The institute
began with participants meeting in small mixed group sessions to share problems of practice and develop potentially researchable questions about teaching and learning. The participants received training in accessing relevant literature and an introduction to the basic elements of research design and data collection methods, including audio and video tapes of interviews, focus groups, teacher journals, student work, and questionnaires. The participants were also provided with guidance through the University’s IRB process since each member of the cohort designed a research project that required IRB approval. The group was facilitated by staff at Elon’s Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, two education professors from Elon University, and two education professors from the University of South Carolina.

The research projects were launched in the fall, and the group continued to meet on a monthly basis throughout the academic year. In the spring, meetings focused on data organization and analysis. Dissemination efforts are focused on three audiences: colleagues in the participants’ own departments, schools and districts, a Web-based gallery (http://org.elon.edu/etlp/aa_etlpgallery.html), and publications and conferences for a wider audience.

Supporting Inquiry Communities

Framing questions

We have found that new teacher-researchers’ initial questions are generally broad and may imply experiments that would typically be beyond the control of classroom teachers. For example, Megan, an Elon English professor with 11 years of teaching experience and no SoTL experience first posed her research question in this way “I’d like to measure whether my students learn more from those on-your-feet, interactive, engaged kinds of teaching than they do from the more traditional me-at-the-front-of-the-classroom, answering questions, or bringing in some kind of written piece about what they’ve read” (interview, 4/2008). As the participants talk among themselves, access scholarly literature, and consult
with the ETLP facilitators, they begin to ask questions that are oriented differently. These questions move towards a detailed examination of student learning in context, although some are focused on examining the impact of new methods, activities, and materials. Following the three day institute, Megan’s research question was posed in a different way on her IRB application. Her question was, “The purpose of this research is to explore what and how students learn about Early English Drama when participating in interpretation groups during the course of regular classroom assignments” (8/2008).

In some cases, participants in small groups find commonalities in their problems of practice which lead to the development of common questions. One group at Elon decided they would all focus on aspects of critical thinking, contextualized in each classroom in each discipline. A high school chemistry teacher is studying students’ use of critical thinking in solving chemistry problems, while a philosophy professor is focusing in the development of his students’ evidence-mindedness, a discipline-specific form of critical thinking.

As described above, Goshen’s Faculty Learning Community participants look collaboratively at students’ work to help researchers clarify their research questions. In the Goshen program, a number of ground rules are established at the outset in order to maximize the usefulness of the group consultation and maintain an equitable, collegial work environment. The Consultancy Protocol process, for example, begins as one participant, the presenter, distributes copies of an assignment and samples of student work to the rest of the group and describes his or her problem of practice. The whole group examines the samples of student work and asks questions in order to clarify, explore, and extend the presenter’s thinking about the nature of the perceived problem. After this, the whole group converses about the problem and reflects back to the presenter their ideas about what is going on. The presenter then describes his or her new understanding of the teaching and learning problem. One participant remarked that using this protocol “resulted in a total shift in my thinking about the focus of my teaching – I think now about ‘what are my students really learning?’” (Goshen professor, interview 2/2009)
Learning about Methods: Collecting, Organizing and Analyzing Evidence

We have found it important to spend a lot of time exploring methods of gathering evidence of teaching effectiveness and student learning. Participants tend to have preconceived notions of research and data collection based on their own disciplinary training (especially in the case of our science-trained educators) or other experience with quantitative research methodology. Surveys, pre- and post-tests, and large scale videotaping are generally time intensive and may not yield much useful data in the long run. We advise teacher-researchers to list potential data sources they already have (e.g., student grades, homework assignments) and to consider how their class assignments can serve as rich data sources. For example, an English teacher in the Wabash group wanted to look at the development of study skills in her first year students. She eventually decided to use drawings her freshmen had done on the first day of school that depicted the various ways they spend their time each day. After analyzing the drawings as a baseline data source, she used the same drawing activity as follow-up post assessment at the end of the term. Educators are often surprised to learn that their own reflections on their classroom activities are legitimate data sources. At ETLP we recommended the use of small digital audio recorders so that instructors can verbally record a few impressions even when they have only two or three minutes between classes or commitments.

As an initial step in organizing their data, participants in ETLP are taught to create a crosswalk (O’Sullivan, 2004), in which sources of data are listed horizontally across the top of a matrix and research questions are listed vertically down the side. Initially checks are made in the intersecting boxes to indicate which sources of data should be used to answer specific research questions. As the analysis of questions progresses, these check marks can be replaced by short summaries of findings or even samples of data in digital format. Participants are taught to use basic inductive analysis techniques for their qualitative data such as student work and interviews, and to use Excel to conduct basic statistical analyses for their numeric data, such as attendance rates and test scores.
Developing a New Teacher-Researcher Identity

The development of a teacher-researcher identity appears to take different paths for K-12 teachers and college faculty members. All of our participants are dedicated, excellent teachers with “problem solving minds” (Hubbard & Power, 2003, p. xvi). As the teachers become more comfortable with taking a scholarly approach to their teaching, some express difficulty with integrating their teacher and researcher roles in the classroom. It may be that some teachers and some college faculty members as well, will have to take turns acting as educator and acting as researcher until they are able to integrate these two activities. Experienced college faculty members are typically comfortable with their dual roles of teacher and researcher. Experienced faculty members struggle focuses on coming to see their teaching practice as an object of research and the integration of scholarship of teaching and learning with their research based within their discipline. Some college professors worry about spending too much time on research that has not traditionally been valued highly as disciplinary research. These teacher-researchers may need guidance in exploring their departmental perspective on ‘what counts’ as scholarship or finding a place for their work in the pedagogical research of their discipline.

The new role of teacher-researcher is emotionally charged as teachers and professors begin to examine long-held assumptions about teaching and learning, as well as about themselves as educators. As they dig into their data to answer their research questions, they find more questions than answers. As Hubbard and Powers note in The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers (2003), it is important to build in time to allow for questions to shift as one becomes more intentional in observing how teaching and learning occur in one’s own classroom. It is exciting to work with dedicated teachers as they reach a point in their development as scholarly teachers, realizing that student work does not only reflect the level of motivation and mastery over the material achieved by their students, but also the effectiveness of their own teaching and pedagogical strategies. Therefore, it is tempting to suggest that
once over this threshold, these educators will take a more scholarly approach to all of their teaching activities.

**Using the Framework of Collaboration**

At Wabash College, Goshen College, and Elon University, we have found that mixed-level inquiry communities can provide a middle ground for critical conversations about teaching and learning, furthering the goals of multiple educational institutions in the same community. Although the three programs vary, we all have found that through a framework of collaboration, faculty and teachers learn a great deal from each other about the nature of teaching and become more intentional in their pedagogical practices. In addition, the work they do together has the potential to contribute to our collective understanding of teaching and learning.

Each of our three institutions developed an inquiry community to meet different goals, but in observing and analyzing our own programs with the same critical eye that we are asking our participants to turn on their own teaching, we have noted a number of commonalities that seem central to the success of an inquiry community. First, time is important. Our participants benefited from having several days to work together. This time enabled them to develop a common understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning, to develop projects rooted in their own questions about problems of practice, and to develop trust in each other as collegial partners. Regular meetings over a period of months (if not longer) also enabled our participants to offer feedback and receive help from each other as their projects progressed.

Second, breaking professional boundaries is essential. Institutions impose boundaries by arranging educators into departments and programs, but educators also impose boundaries on themselves by looking to those people and places whose practices are most similar to their own when they have questions. Enabling an unorthodox mix of specialties, fields, and kinds of expertise serves almost unavoidably to engender new insights and new ways of thinking. Through conversations, collaborative
examination of assignments and student work, visits to each others’ classrooms, teachers and professors within the same discipline gain a better understanding of what happens in each others’ contexts. Professors of writing are learning more about the writing experiences their students are likely to have had in high school. Teachers of biology know more about the biology labs their students are likely to do if they go to college. Working with teachers and professors outside of their own discipline invites new discoveries. A conversation shared by an art professor, a social studies teacher, and a professor of composition enables all of them to rethink how they design research assignments. They begin to see connections instead of differences among the varied kinds of work in which educators engage.

*We are less isolated in our professional community. I saw college profs doing very good work pedagogically, but not having a time to talk about it or to measure how their pedagogy really works. We have an immediate community to talk to about teaching methodology. Upon reflection, I realized that we talk much more about pedagogy than I even quite realized.* (Goshen High School Teacher, more than 26 years teaching, interview 2/2009)

*I appreciated being reminded that teaching is teaching, no matter at what level you’re doing it that there are the same kind of issues, and I thought that [high school teachers] had thought much more consistently through teaching issues than we usually do as college professors – and so they had insights that were kind of second nature to them, that we don’t usually think about.* (Goshen College professor, 6-10 years teaching, interview 2/2009)

Self-reflection, through a commitment of looking critically at student learning and how teaching practice directly impacts it, is also essential to this framework. By looking at student learning in their classrooms in a very focused and intentional way, teachers and faculty come to see their own planning and teaching methods as well as their students’ learning as data. All teaching can then be viewed as experimental. Therefore, when the data reflects low levels of engagement or learning, teacher-researchers are more committed to changing their practice in order to improve student learning. By using the pedagogical
literature and through conversations with their colleagues across disciplines and across teaching levels, teacher researchers learn they can draw on these resources to inform a wide range of problems of practice and to ultimately improve their practice and increase student learning.

Most importantly, however, is how these common elements are put in the service of directed and provocative discussion. Through critical conversations, participants have found that they are all focused on very similar problems of practice and therefore, they can contribute to the advancement of understanding of deep pedagogical questions. By bringing a variety of perspectives to bear on common or connected problems, K-12 teachers and college faculty are able to arrive at contextualized possibilities for solutions. These fruitful collaborations provide an additional resource to the growing scholarship of the teaching and learning commons.
## Appendix One

### Exemplary Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Amy Gillan</strong>, Visiting Assistant Professor of Teacher Education at Wabash College, former Science Teacher at Southmont Junior High School in Crawfordsville, Indiana, Participant in Wabash Inquiry Community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Questions:</strong> To what degree do my landlocked 7th grade students exhibit ocean literacy? How can I help my students to become ocean literate citizens in spite of their lack of proximity to the ocean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods:</strong> Student surveys based on the ‘seven essential principles of ocean literacy’ (National Geographic Society, 2006), were used to gauge students’ levels of ocean literacy. The students and the teacher kept reflective journals as they completed hands-on activities designed to arouse student interest in and allegiance to the ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results &amp; Implications:</strong> Initially, my students knew very little about the ocean. Even after our coursework was completed, they still had many gaps in their knowledge and clung to countless misconceptions. Although the oceans are scarcely mentioned in our Indiana State Science Standards, I came to realize that the best way to help my students become ocean literate would be to teach all the state standards through the ocean. This would instill in my students the idea that the ocean is indeed a crucial part of our lives, regardless how distant we are from the coast. Taking the time to reflect on this one aspect of my teaching has prompted a redesign of my entire curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Michele Pittard</strong>, Assistant Professor of Education at Wabash College in Crawfordsville, Indiana, Participant in Wabash Inquiry Community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question:</strong> How does specific writing prompts impact teacher candidates’ reflections of their teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods:</strong> A case study approach was used with three cohorts of education majors in a general methods course. Students were required to keep a daily teaching journal during the two-week field work for the course. A rubric with three different levels of critical reflection was used to code journal entries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results &amp; Implications:</strong> From my analysis of the journal entries, I identified patterns that are useful for thinking about how to teach and evaluate students’ journaling and reflective writing. When students were prompted to reflect on specific topics (e.g., theories of development) their answers tended to be characterized by a pervasive narrative style that was more descriptive than reflective. When students were prompted to pose their own questions at the beginning of their fieldwork, their subsequent journal entries were much more reflective. Another important finding was that I realized I should not be hesitant to comment on the content of the students’ journal entries as a way to mentor them toward becoming more critical thinkers. Now, as I teach the course, I am much more intentional about teaching students how to critical reflect and provide critical feedback to them in their journal writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Christi Fitch</strong>, Biology Teacher at Southern High School, Alamance County, NC Participant in Elon Inquiry Community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Questions:</strong> How do students use assessment feedback? Can their use of assessment feedback be increased with intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods:</strong> Students were guided in the use of feedback on their benchmark tests related to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study in biology. Teacher journaling, student self report data (journal responses to prompts), and test scores from 5 target students were analyzed, with a focus on student use of feedback, review strategies, and approach to testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Results & Implications:** This project has already taught me a lot about my teaching and my student needs. I now go into the classroom ironically asking for more feedback from my students. Students have been very honest in their answers and this has helped me change up how I present new material and how I review. I have more students staying after school for review and more students understanding and mastering the goals of biology. Doing research in the classroom has given me a greater insight into my own teaching and is the most useful professional development any teacher could ever participate in (Fitch, research memo, 12/4/08).

**Jan Bender Shetler, Prof. of History and Women's Studies, Goshen College, IN**

**Portfolio Title:** Incorporating Intercultural Pedagogies for Teaching “Gender in World History”

**Methods:** Learning outcomes related to alignment of course assignments with course goals are being examined along with student work resulting from those assignments.

**Results & Implications:** I think the process – since it’s not done – and maybe it is more about the process than about the final product. The whole process, not just the portfolio, but the whole process – all the things we’ve done – have helped me be more deliberate about what I’m doing. (Interview, 2/2009).
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