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OVERVIEW
AIMS – INSTRUCTORS REACT TO INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

» 2013 University shifts teaching emerging research institution

» CORE Committee charged with professional development
  ◇ Faculty integrating undergraduate research into courses
  ◇ CoP – members represent all 4 colleges
WHAT WAS DONE

» RSD was used in Community of Practice (CoP)
   ◦ 12 unique faculty over 2 years

» Stages of Concern Questionnaire – 2 year period
   ◦ George, Hall and Stiegelbauer (2006)
   ◦ Beginning, middle and end of each year
WHAT WAS FOUND

» Concerns changed over time
» External factors – administration/reorganization impact
» Self efficacy impacts concerns
» Data collection methods are critical
WHAT THIS MEANS

» Consider efficacy-based concern models
» Collect more individual and large group data
1. INTRODUCTION
RSD – Community of Practice

» Respond to Chancellor’s charge to CORE committee
  ◊ professional development for faculty
  ◊ implemented by fall 2014
  ◊ integrate with system-wide initiative
» Improve student research/critical thinking
» Incorporate undergraduate research into courses WiSCUR
  ◊ Part of state-wide/system-wide initiative
  ◊ Grant – funded across the UW - system
Concerns

» Confidence - leaders & participants
» Exposure to the RSD – limited
» Ability to integrate effectively into class/program
  ◦ course/program/department integration
  ◦ reasonable expectations
» Inexperienced leaders helping guide novice faculty
» Ability to get participants to collect needed data
» Feedback from students
Supports

» Directive from Chancellor
» Nakatani Teaching and Learning Center
  ◦ minimal stipend
  ◦ layout and structure expectations
  ◦ measurement component
» Motivated CoP participants
» Integrated personally identified academic setting
» Willison – workshop & email
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
RSD Framework for CoP

» Theoretical framework – research-based
» Faculty willingness to explore
» Scalable – lesson, course, program
» Research language (lingua franca)
  ◦ common terminology regardless of discipline
  ◦ student autonomy – helped describe research as process
  ◦ research “defined”
Stages of Concern Questionnaire

» Theoretical Framework – Research based
» Response to innovation focus of 1960s & 1970s
  ◦ Frances Fuller (1969) work
  ◦ Innovation developed externally
  ◦ Outcomes typically didn’t occur as intended

» 1970s – Development Center for Teacher Education
  ◦ University of Texas
  ◦ Focus on teacher/college faculty & educational innovation
Assumptions

» Change is a process
  ◆ Movement through the stages
    ◆ One type of concern intensely
    ◆ Subsites while another type emerges

» Change is personal
  ◆ Concerns vary depending on user experience
  ◆ Some aspects more important at any given time

» Organization doesn’t change until individuals in organization change
## Stages of Concern  
(George, Hall, Stiegelbauer, 2006, pg 8.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Refocusing – increase benefits, revise/replace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaboration – coordinate &amp; cooperate with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consequence – impact students &amp; changes for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management – focus on tasks &amp; processes to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal – uncertain about demands &amp; ability to meet requirements to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cheung, Hattie & Ng (2001):

» Questioned
   ◇ reliability of Hall’s (1976) – 35 questions SoC model
   ◇ content relevance, representativeness & criterion relatedness

» 3 alternative models ≠ good alternative
   ◇ Bailey & Palsha (1992) - 35 item model
   ◇ Bailey an Palsha – 15 item model
   ◇ Shotsberger & Crawford (1996) 27 – item model

» Conclude
   ◇ analyze data for reliability & construct validity
   ◇ developmental progression through 5 stages of concern
   ◇ propose 22 item – 5 stage model/stage 0 abnormal
Kwok - 2014

» Contextual information is critical
  ◊ experience, collaboration & resources

» Progression may not be linear
McKinney, Sexton & Meyerson (1999)

» Efficacy Based Change Model
  ◊ Efficacy (self beliefs) – can teach/can impact student learning
    ◊ internal & external causes/influencing factors
  ◊ Concerns – based change = self, task, impacts
  ◊ Innovation Stage = initiate, implement, refine
» Change = self efficacy + attribution (control & past success)
» Change is complex & individual
3. METHODOLOGY
RSD Community of Practice – 2 Years

» Led by 3 Faculty Members
» Attended 1 summer workshop
» 7 Participants meet bi-weekly first year (3 co-chair) & Library support
» 7 Participants second year 4 new to RSD (2 co-chair)
» Stages of Concern Questionnaire – beginning/middle/end semester

» Provide insight

畹Implementation effectiveness for institution
畹Data for NTLC – supports efforts
畹Data for CoP leaders
Participants Across Campus

» Academic Librarian
» Biology
» Education
» English & Philosophy
» Introductory Speech
» Journalism & Mass Communication
» Operations Management – Marya Wilson (not pictured)
» Political Science

Jessy Polzer
Academic Librarian

Kate Edenborg
Journalism/Mass Com

Kim Zagorski
Political Science

Anne Kerber
Speech

Kitrina Carlson
Biology

Sylvia Tiala
Education
4. RESULTS
Facilitator Stages of Concern - 2 Year Period

Awareness
Information
Personal
Management
Consequence
Collaborate
Refocus

Self                           Management                       Impact

Year 1 Begin
Year 2 Begin
Year 2 End
Influencing Factors

» Awareness: novice status 1st year to leader 2nd year
» Information: RSD nuances & Monash/Willison
» Personal: university dynamics (chancellor & reorganization)
» Management: role and support constant
» Consequence: confidence, multiple contexts, relevance
» Collaborate: constructivism, CoP novices, similar goals
» Refocus: good fit, scalable, flexible across contexts & disciplines
5. CONCLUSIONS
Conclusions

» SoC Questionnaire accurately captured changes in concern
» Results need to be contextualized (Kwok, 2014)
» Self efficacy model elements should be considered
  ◦ (McKinney, Sexton & Meyerson, 1999)
Recommendations

» Larger number of participants – institutional view
» Consistent responses over time
  ◦ individual identifiers – track changes
  ◦ qualitative data in addition
    ◦ internal & external locus of control
    ◦ institutional support
    ◦ changes in self efficacy
6. QUESTIONS & CONTACT INFORMATION
THANKS!
Any questions?

You can find me at
» tialas@uwstout.edu
» http://www.uwstout.edu/faculty/tialas/
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