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The challenge

Maintaining collegial, collaborative learning spaces within proposed Academic Model

Context

- Division review and restructure
- Mandated centrally coordinated academic development model
  - Top-down orientation
  - Based on multi-disciplinary teams
  - Program, rather than a unit focus
  - Project management framework.
How LITE teams work

Scope
Stakeholders meet to clarify project aims & outcomes

Begin
Information session for faculty & support team. Allocate tasks

Act
Reviews, Group planning & design, Tailored PD, consults

Implement
Outcomes of activities, identify and provide additional support.

Wrap-up
Ensure outcomes are met & take note of further actions required.

Review
School evaluates enhancements & LITE team evaluates project.

Tailored activities

Generate
Buy-in & determine support required
LITE teams - existing practice

**Hybrid model**

**Collegial, ‘learning community’**
(Carew et al., 2008)

**Situated, ‘action learning’**
(Boud & Brew, 2012)

**Consultancy**
(Boud & Brew, 2012)

**Online, inter-disciplinary teams**
(Hixon, 2008)

**Professional competence**
(Land, 2012)

**Managerial dimension**
(Land, 2001)
Do LITE teams activities align with good practice?

Good practice = conditions for effectiveness in changing teacher practice and attitudes

1. Do they incorporate longer academic development activities > 60 hrs (Prebble et al., 2004)?

2. Are activities situated and discipline-specific in focus (Boud & Brew, 2012; Parsons et al., 2012; Prebble et al., 2004)?

3. Do they harness the benefit of peer-to-peer learning, and learning communities (Bell & Mladenovic, 2007; Cox, 2004)?
Evaluation of LITE teams model

- Strong faculty uptake, 12 projects (9 months)
- 71% of deliverables by CoB 2012
- Positive evaluations of Tailored PD
- Evaluation survey for LITE teams program:
  - Overall ratings 6/12 good-excellent; 3/12 average-good; 1 poor-average, 1 no response
  - Perceived impact on practice (change or intended change to practice) as a result of LITE team participation was strong for all faculty respondents who rated their team as good-excellent.
Qualities of successful projects

- Strong faculty participant ownership of project aims
- Committed faculty leadership within the project team
- Significant horizontal interactions (faculty-faculty, faculty-support) over project life
- Academic developer experience and prior relationships with faculty.
Conclusion

- LITE teams model has broadened our impact
- Challenge is to steer more projects towards collaboration as well as service
- This year, more planning and internal PD to facilitate this
- Future challenge – measure impact on student performance
- THANKS!

- NB* References are on final notes page