INFLUENCE OF “PROFESSOR CAMP”: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY ON THE
WAKONSE CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE TEACHING

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
CRYSTAL AILEEN GATELEY
Dr. Jeni Hart, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2015

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the
[thesis or dissertation] entitled

INFLUENCE OF “PROFESSOR CAMP”: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY ON THE
WAKONSE CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE TEACHING

presented by Crystal Aileen Gateley,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Jeni Hart

Professor Joe Donaldson

Professor Sarah Diem

Professor Diane Smith

DEDICATION

I am eternally grateful for the love and support of my family throughout my educational journey. My husband Curt has endured my being in graduate school for over one-third of our 20-year marriage as I pursued both master's and doctoral degrees. As I tried to balance work, school, and family obligations, he was always the one who got the proverbial short end of the stick when it came to my time. Thank you for bringing me Dr. Pepper when I needed caffeine to stay up until 2:00 AM doing homework and for always knowing when to bring me chocolate to make my day better. Thank you for functioning as a single parent on the countless days when I was gone to class or busy doing homework. Most of all, thank you for making me laugh every day in spite of all life's challenges. And I promise, no more degrees after this!

My two daughters, Katrina and Lauren, have difficulty remembering a time when Mom wasn't in school. I hope you both can forgive me for all the events I missed over the past 5 years and all the times you heard, "I'm sorry, I can't. I have homework to do." I don't say it often enough, but I am so proud of the young ladies you have become. Beyond your academic and athletic accomplishments, I am most impressed with the compassion that you both show to others and your willingness to stand up for what is right.

Finally, my parents and grandmother have provided support throughout my life to pursue educational endeavors and professional advancement. There are many people in this world who think that kids like me, a girl from humble beginnings in rural Missouri, probably won't achieve much in life. Thank you for never letting me think like that, and I hope I continue to make you proud.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the four members of my committee for their support, encouragement, and mentorship throughout my doctoral career. My current advisor and committee chair, Dr. Jeni Hart, provided invaluable guidance with conceptual and methodological challenges and scholarly writing. Thank you for tolerating my OCD tendencies in coursework and throughout the dissertation process. Perhaps next time we run into each other at Panera we can talk about something other than my dissertation.

Dr. Joe Donaldson, after being the most influential faculty member of my master's program in ELPA, helped affirm my decision to pursue a doctoral degree in the same program, served as my advisor for the first three years, and allowed me flexibility in coursework to tailor a program that addressed my educational needs and interests. Thank you for continuing to serve on my committee after your retirement.

Dr. Sarah Diem taught two of the first few courses I took during my doctoral program. Although early in her academic career, she demonstrated an incredible knack for challenging students' views and demanding excellence in writing, both of which were beneficial in subsequent coursework and throughout the dissertation process.

Beyond serving on my dissertation committee, Dr. Diane Smith also provided support and encouragement through numerous other professional endeavors over the past 6 years. Thank you for pushing me to advance my career as an occupational therapy educator, and also for the encouraging words and never ending supply of chocolate as I struggled to balance my work and academic challenges.

I would also like to thank Dr. Joe Johnston for his support of my research. He and Linda Coats, business support specialist at the MU Career Center, were extremely helpful in providing access to archived documents relevant to my research and helping in recruitment efforts at the onset of the project. In addition, it was Joe's vision and

continued passion for Wakonse, and more importantly for quality teaching in higher education, that initially sparked my interest in this project.

I am very thankful to the 10 individuals who participated in this study. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules on multiple occasions to share your experiences and insights about faculty development with me. I appreciated the opportunity to get to know each of you and your academic interests, and I look forward to future interactions with you beyond this research.

The faculty, staff, and students of the MU Department of Occupational Therapy have shown endless support and encouragement over the past 5 years. When one member of a department is pursuing an advanced degree, the additional commitments on time and energy put a strain on everyone in the department. In our case, we had multiple individuals enrolled in educational advancement at the same time, and we managed to continue providing an excellent educational experience for our students.

Finally, I would like to thank Molly Tugushi and Ericka Hutchens for your assistance in proofreading, editing, and formatting this dissertation and all the other papers you have reviewed for me over the past several years. Thank you for finding every little error to help improve my writing, even when you had no idea what I was talking about. Thank you both for also lending a supportive, nonjudgmental ear when I complained about work, school, and life in general.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
History and Overview of the Wakonse Conference	2
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions	9
Significance of the Study	10
Overview of Conceptual Framework	11
Definition of Terms	13
Faculty Development	13
Faculty Attendees	14
Communities of Practice	15
Quintain	16
Organization of the Dissertation.....	16
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	19
Higher Education Context	19
Institutional Differences	20
Institutional Type	20
Institutional Culture.....	21
Institutional Values.....	23
Changing Student Population	24
Undergraduate Students	24

Graduate Students	25
Changing Professoriate	27
Type of Appointment	28
Job Satisfaction	29
Socialization into the Faculty Role	30
Career Stage	32
New Concepts of Teaching and Learning.....	32
Teaching versus Research	33
Teacher Identity.....	33
Active Learning Strategies	35
Scholarly Teaching.....	36
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL).....	37
Faculty Development	38
K-12 Professional Development.....	39
Medical Education Faculty Development.....	41
General Higher Education Faculty Development	43
Continuing Professional Education.....	44
Adult Learning	45
Forms of Faculty Development	46
Workshops and Conferences	47
Teaching Renewal	47
Reflective Practice.....	48
Peer Mentoring	49
Group Process.....	50
Conceptual Framework	51

Summary	57
Research Gap	58
3. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN	60
Researcher Positionality	61
Research Context	66
Participants and Sampling Procedure	66
Data Collection	69
Demographic and Academic Background Information	69
Interviews	69
Observations	70
Archived Documents	72
Journals	72
Photographs	73
Data Analysis	74
Interviews and Observations.....	74
Archived Documents	75
Use of Conceptual Framework in the Research Process	77
Trustworthiness	79
Credibility	79
Transferability	80
Dependability	81
Confirmability.....	81
Research Ethics	82
Limitations	82
4. FINDINGS – DOCUMENT ANALYSIS AND OBSERVATIONS	84

Archived Document Analysis	84
Conference Agendas	85
Camp Miniwanca	85
Wakonse Conference Mission	91
Introduction to Conference Participants	91
Materials about Teaching	93
Future Resources	94
Daily Itineraries and Conference Structure	95
Conference Topics	100
Conference Attendee Feedback	102
Positive Aspects of Conference	103
Structure	103
Context	104
Dialogue Groups	105
Social Interaction	106
Interaction with Students	107
Holistic Approach	108
Suggestions for Improvement	111
General Suggestions	111
Structure	112
Topics	116
Attendees	117
Outcomes of Attending	117
Classroom Changes	118
Impact on Campus Community	120

Insights	121
Personal and Professional Renewal	123
Lack of Outcomes	124
General Concerns Regarding Higher Education	125
Communication with Campus Administrators	126
Article by Wakonse Attendee	129
1995 Qualitative Report of Wakonse Conference	130
Participant Observations	132
Pre-Conference Observations	135
Travel to Wakonse	137
Meals	138
Community Forums	140
Dialogue Groups	145
Concurrent Sessions	146
Optional Activities	147
Free Time	149
Other Scheduled Activities	150
Interaction with Undergraduates	150
Questing	152
Dunes Tunes	153
Ecumenical Service	154
Polar Plunge	155
Chautauqua	157
Breakfast by Institution	157
Solo Time for Goal Writing	158

Virtual Wakonse	159
Return Bus Trip	160
5. FINDINGS – CASES AND CROSS-CASE ASSERTIONS	161
Rocco	162
Dylan	163
John	164
Delores	165
Sumita	166
Wayne	167
Emma	168
Richard	169
Lewis	170
Anne	172
Cross-Case Assertions.....	173
Participants’ Backgrounds	174
Remote Context	176
Holistic Approach	177
Sense of Community.....	179
Participant Changes	181
Departmental and School Support for Faculty Development	186
Future of Wakonse Conference	190
Leadership Transition Plan	190
Mentoring New Wakonse Staff	191

Collaboration with Center for Excellence in Teaching.....	191
Collecting and Reporting Participant Outcomes.....	192
Conference Participants	193
Sessions for Specific Groups of Attendees	194
Interaction with Undergraduate Students.....	195
Advance Notice of Session Responsibilities.....	196
Orientation Information	197
Limiting Schedule Options	198
Notable Differences in Cases	198
Summary of Findings	201
6. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	204
Significance of the Study	204
Research Questions	205
Influence on Teaching.....	206
Core Features of Faculty Development Event.	206
Change in Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Beliefs	207
Change in Instruction.....	208
Change in Student Learning.....	209
Communities of Practice	210
Faculty Development Event.....	210
Academic Workplaces	213
Implications	215
Research.....	216

Policy	217
Practice.....	218
Conclusion.....	221
APPENDIX	
A. FIRST EMAIL INVITATION PROTOCOL	223
B. SECOND EMAIL INVITATION PROTOCOL	225
C. DEMOGRAPHIC AND ACADEMIC BACKGROUND FORM	226
D. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL # 1.....	228
E. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL # 2.....	229
F. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL # 3.....	230
G. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL # 4.....	232
H. IRB Consent Form	234
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	236
VITA.....	252

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Upper Tipi	88
2. Lake Michigan and Grey's Deck.....	88
3. Sunset over Lake Michigan.....	89
4. Entrance of Camp Miniwanca.....	89
5. West Camp of Miniwanca.....	90
6. View of West Camp from Beach	90
7. MPSR Symbol at West Camp Entrance	109
8. MPSR Symbol near Upper Tipi	109
9. Camp Miniwanca Dining Lodge	140
10. Commemorative Pottery from Wakonse Conference	140
11. Camp Miniwanca Motto.....	143
12. High Ropes Course.....	148
13. High Ropes Course.....	148
14. Church of the Dunes.....	154
15. Wakonse Polar Plunge	155
16. Wakonse Polar Plunge	156
17. Wakonse Polar Plunge Commemorative T-Shirt	156
18. Council Circle	160

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Daily Itinerary from 1991 Wakonse Conference	97
2. Daily Itinerary from 2014 Wakonse Conference	98
3. Topics across 25 Years of the Wakonse Conference	101
4. Participant Characteristics	162

Chapter 1: Introduction

Why do adults send children to a particular camp? Perhaps for relaxation and recreation, or to learn new concepts and skills, or to be surrounded by people they should emulate. With those possibilities in mind, why would more than 100 college professors send themselves to camp each year along the shores of Lake Michigan? This phenomenon has been occurring for 25 years at the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching, yet little research exists on the conference that is jokingly referred to by founders and attendees as “Professor Camp” (B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013).

As a three-time Wakonse attendee, I have had a combination of mostly positive experiences interspersed with a few negative experiences at the conference. In large and small group discussions, I have interacted with others who have the same passion for teaching as me. Through observations of experienced faculty, I have gained a number of new ideas about how to improve my own teaching. I have developed long-lasting friendships with colleagues from my own campus and several other institutions. And, as with many conferences, occasionally I have found myself near individuals who are so cynical and pessimistic about their personal and professional lives that I simply do not want to be around them.

Overall, my experiences at Wakonse changed the way I think about teaching, and I came away with several specific strategies that I have incorporated in my approach to teaching. However, I am aware of other past Wakonse attendees who have a less positive overall view of the conference and did not find it very beneficial to their faculty

development. Wakonse celebrated its 25th year of existence in 2014, and conference organizers and campus administrators would benefit from a thorough exploration of the influence that Wakonse has on faculty attendees, particularly when they return to their campus workplaces where teaching actually occurs.

Each year at the opening session of Wakonse, one of the conference founders gives an eloquent account of the history and purpose of Wakonse, and he ends with a simple question intended to serve as a challenge for Wakonse attendees: “So what? You came to Lake Michigan, you had a great time, and you learned a lot at ‘Professor Camp.’ So what?” (B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013). Exploring the answer to that question was the impetus for my study.

History and Overview of the Wakonse Conference

The University of Missouri is a large, public university with a very high level of research activity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013). Although teaching is touted as an important function by the University of Missouri (2014), a group of faculty members in the late 1980s perceived a dwindling focus on good teaching (Johnston, Kerr, Bondeson, Hansen, & Claiborn, 1994). Three of the Wakonse founders were assisting with a college leadership conference that had taken place for several years at Camp Miniwanca, a youth summer camp on the shores of Lake Michigan (B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013). Recognizing that the setting seemed perfect for collaborative interactions among faculty as well as students, the idea for Wakonse was initiated during an informal conversation.

After a few years of planning and efforts to obtain both grant funding and institutional support, the first Wakonse Conference on College Teaching was held in

1990 at Camp Miniwanca near Shelby, Michigan (Boettcher, 2013). Seven institutions sent teams of six to eight faculty members to the first Wakonse. Deemed an initial success, Wakonse continued annually, with a gradual increase in support from the University of Missouri, the founding institution, as well as other institutions that sent attendees.

The conference's name was derived from a Lakota Indian word meaning "to teach, to inspire" (Wakonse Foundation, 2014b). Unique features of the conference include recruitment of participants to lead roundtable discussions and demonstrate effective teaching strategies, small "Dialogue Groups" that meet periodically throughout the conference to reflect on what participants have learned, an emergent structure that allows for flexibility in the conference schedule, and a remote location that allows for complete immersion in the conference experience without the distraction of other life commitments (Kramer, Benoit, Dixon, Benoit-Bryan, 2007; Wakonse Foundation, 2013).

Wakonse attendees are informed that it is acceptable and even encouraged to skip a session or two and instead spend time walking on the beach or through the woods, perhaps engaged in personal reflection or simply as a break from the hectic life of academia (Wakonse Foundation, 2013). With this design, each attendee is in control of his or her own Wakonse experience (Kramer et al., 2007).

One of the few scholarly articles about Wakonse, authored by the conference founders just a few years after the conference originated, described Wakonse as "a week-long retreat that provides renewal and support for college teaching. Offered in a secluded environment away from campus, it engages faculty from various colleges in demonstration and discussion of what makes teaching effective and rewarding" (Johnston

et al., 1994, p. 480). Johnston et al. described five observable outcomes of Wakonse.

Conference attendees:

- returned to their campuses inspired about teaching;
- acquired new ideas and pedagogical skills that could be incorporated into their classrooms;
- witnessed the importance of the practice and refinement of teaching;
- experienced the power of a large, interdisciplinary group concerned with teaching; and
- left Wakonse with a vision of what could make for a better campus overall.

Although more than 2,500 faculty and graduate students had attended Wakonse by 2014, there has been no in depth exploration of participants' experiences at the conference and the influence that the conference has on attendees once they return to their home campuses where teaching and other faculty work actually occur. How do the inspiration and vision gained at Wakonse translate into change in teaching and other faculty duties?

Although Wakonse is a unique faculty development opportunity for faculty from the University of Missouri and several other institutions, the conference addresses a need for faculty development that exists across higher education (Boettcher, 2013). In order to situate this study on Wakonse within a broader research context, it is imperative to provide the reader with a brief overview of the higher education context that led to the establishment and continuity of the conference.

In 1990, Ernest Boyer published *Scholarship Reconsidered*, in which he called for higher education to move away from the teaching versus research dichotomy and instead to consider four different forms of scholarship: the discovery of new knowledge, the

integration and synthesis of knowledge, the application of knowledge, and the scholarship of teaching. The founders of Wakonse, tenured professors who could take the academic risk of focusing on teaching although they were employed at a large research university, believed in Boyer's new model and felt that Wakonse provided an effective way to promote the scholarship of teaching (Boettcher, 2013; Bondeson, 1992; B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013). "A re-emphasis on teaching in all of its diversity and a new understanding of scholarship in all of its complexity can help us recognize what our mission is all about and help us find better ways to support one another in teaching" (Bondeson, 1992, p. 3).

In the late 1990s, higher education also saw a demand for a renewed focus on undergraduate education by changing the faculty reward system and cultivating a sense of community among faculty, staff, and students (Boyer Commission, 1998). In a follow up study to the original *Boyer Report*, researchers found an increased emphasis on teaching but an ongoing need for funding and other faculty incentives to support undergraduate teaching (Boyer Commission, 2001). Teichler (2003) described continued and increasing tensions between the teaching and research functions of higher education and a "growing pressure for the relevance of teaching" (p. 175). In addition to the demand for relevant teaching, faculty are also faced with pressures to keep up with rapid increases of information and knowledge, and to incorporate technology into their teaching in order to maximize efficiency, effectiveness, and authenticity of the educational experience (Brennan, 2008; Handzic & Lagumdzija, 2010; Henry, Kitchel, & Hart, 2012; Hilton, 2006). Rosser (2004) explained that "faculty members are expected to engage in a constant quest to build their technological expertise, both in depth and breadth" (p. 301).

A number of institutional factors have been identified that influence the academic roles of faculty and their need for faculty development including institutional classification (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013), institutional culture (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008), and institutional values (Mauksch, 1986; Trower, 2012). Another issue in higher education that impacts the need for faculty development is the changing professoriate (Gappa & Austin, 2010; Sorcinelli, 2007). In an effort to reduce costs and increase efficiency, many institutions have increased the number of non-tenure-track (NTT) and adjunct faculty who may have limited knowledge of an institution's mission and how a particular course fits into the overall curriculum of a given department (Kezar & Sam, 2010). In addition to the changing professoriate, higher education has also seen a change in the student population, with institutions experiencing growing numbers of students and a greater diversity in their background, academic experience, needs, and expectations (Light, Cox, & Calkins, 2009).

Wakonse has addressed, at least to some degree, many of the concerns discussed above. The topical agenda for Wakonse varies from year to year based on the expertise of the attendees and the current issues that are facing higher education (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013). Although the overall focus of Wakonse is always on the importance of quality teaching, specific sessions in recent years have focused on teaching with technology, interdisciplinary collaboration, NTT faculty challenges, and making teaching relevant for a new generation of college students (Wakonse Foundation, 2010, 2013, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

Higher education faculty typically enter their academic roles with considerable disciplinary expertise but little or no knowledge of effective teaching practices (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Gardiner, 2000). “A major fallacious assumption of higher education hiring practices within the United States and globally is that if one has a graduate degree from an accredited institution, the individual is qualified to teach” (Minter, 2009). Although significant learning occurs as faculty members gain experience in the classroom setting (Palmer, 2007), institutions have long recognized the need for formal faculty development related to teaching (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Brancato, 2003; Camblin & Steger, 2000; Guglielmo et al., 2011). Once considered the responsibility of the individual faculty member, faculty development emerged as an institutional entity during the 1990s in response to Boyer’s (1990) foundational work *Scholarship Reconsidered*, which recognized teaching as a form of scholarship (Bondeson, 1992; Chesebro, 1991; Light et al., 2009).

In response to the proliferation of faculty development programs, many scholars have focused their research efforts on exploring various aspects of faculty development (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Steinert et al., 2006; Stes, Clement, & Van Petegem, 2007). Much of the faculty development research has focused on program format (Hahn & Lester, 2012; Knight, Tait, & Yorke, 2006), participant satisfaction (Ryan, Healy, & Sullivan, 2012), and learning outcomes (Nasmith & Steinert, 2001; Preston-Whyte, Fraser, & McKinley, 1998). Over the past several years, scholars have also investigated the role of communities of practice, or groups of individuals with a shared interest who interact over a period of time, in faculty development (Eib & Miller, 2006; Steinert,

2010; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) proposed that two communities of practice should be explored in regard to the faculty development process. First, there is the transitory faculty development community that consists of a particular program, participants, facilitator, and context. Then, there is the larger academic community that includes teaching tasks and activities, mentoring and coaching among colleagues, professional relationships and networks, and organizational systems and culture.

Furthermore, institutional type has been identified as having a significant role in the amount of faculty development geared specifically toward teaching. At large research universities, it is not uncommon for teaching to be overshadowed by the institution's research function (Gaff, 2007). The Wakonse Conference on College Teaching developed as a result of this trend, but an extensive literature search revealed no studies on the influence of the conference once faculty attendees return to campus.

My review of existing faculty development literature has identified multiple research gaps. First, higher education scholars repeatedly have called for rigorous qualitative studies that provide an in depth understanding of the learning that takes place throughout the faculty development process rather than focusing solely on outcomes and participant satisfaction at the immediate conclusion of a conference or other faculty development event (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012). In this view, faculty development is seen as a longitudinal process that occurs during a particular faculty development event as well as in the months that follow as participants experiment with what they have learned. Second, multiple reviewers have critiqued previous research for a lack of strong theoretical grounding (Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Steinert et al., 2006; Stes et al.,

2010). Third, faculty development research has taken place in three distinct silos: medical and health professions education, K-12 education, and general academic contexts, “with very little sharing of experience. This discourages the cross-pollination required to build on relevant research” (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012, p. 113). My study seeks to address these research gaps by synthesizing conceptual frameworks from K-12 education and medical education to examine the experiences of higher education faculty across disciplines during the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching and throughout the following academic year.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

Successful faculty development programs often have a broader impact on campus than initially anticipated by program planners (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975). When Wakonse began over 2 decades ago, the founders had no idea the level of success and longevity that the conference would experience (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013). Established in 1990, the 25th annual Wakonse occurred in May 2014, and more than 2,500 faculty and graduate students from dozens of institutions have attended the conference (J. Johnston, personal communication, January 30, 2014). However, beyond anecdotal accounts of teaching improvement and a few descriptive articles about the conference (Bondeson, 1992; Johnston et al., 1994; Kramer et al., 2007), there is limited information about the lasting influence that Wakonse has on attendees.

The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the influence on teaching of the Wakonse Conference for faculty attendees from the University of Missouri during the academic year following their attendance at the conference. Furthermore, guided by the new model for faculty development research proposed by O’Sullivan and Irby (2011),

this study explored how communities of practice at the conference and in attendees' workplaces influenced their overall faculty development experiences. The following overarching research questions were used to guide this study:

1. What influence on teaching does the Wakonse Conference have for faculty attendees from the University of Missouri?
2. How do the communities of practice at the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching and in the participants' work contexts influence their overall Wakonse faculty development experiences?

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the knowledge base about faculty development in higher education. This study helps campus administrators understand how to support faculty in improving their teaching to provide a quality educational experience for the institution's students. Findings from this study help to inform campus and system administrators about the influence of current faculty development programs and highlight areas for improvement in addressing campus and system-wide strategic plans related to teaching and learning. In addition, this study advances the scholarship around faculty development at both the campus level and beyond. By synthesizing conceptual underpinnings from related fields, this study helps to bridge gaps in research that exist between faculty development in K-12 education, general higher education, and medical education (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012). Although contextual differences may exist, the knowledge gained from this study about faculty development is beneficial to other scholars and practitioners in related fields who are interested in improving faculty development in all arenas of education.

At a more local level, this study provides beneficial information to conference organizers and campus administrators as they make decisions about the future of the Wakonse Conference, particularly as the conference founders are nearing retirement (J. Johnston, personal communication, January 30, 2014). Three of the primary founders of the conference have remained in charge of Wakonse since its inception, and there is not a clear plan as to when, or even if, the leadership of Wakonse will transition to someone else (Boettcher, 2013). Findings from this study provide insights about the conference's influence on faculty from the founding institution and will help conference organizers make decisions about the format and content of future conferences.

Furthermore, the issue of continued financial support for Wakonse remains a concern. The University of Missouri Provost's Office has been a strong supporter of Wakonse, but budget cuts across higher education have resulted in questions about the future of Wakonse (B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013). As higher education faces more scrutiny regarding financial operations, it is imperative for conference organizers and campus administrators to have evidence of the effectiveness of existing faculty development programs (Hilton, 2006). Recent changes in campus administration add even more uncertainty regarding the future of Wakonse (University of Missouri, 2013), thus providing further justification for this study.

Overview of Conceptual Framework

Given previous critiques about the lack of conceptual grounding in studies on faculty development (Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Steinert et al., 2006; Stes et al., 2010), I explored the existing literature on higher education faculty development to identify frameworks that potentially would be useful in guiding this study. I considered a

number of frameworks, and although not selected as part of the overarching framework for this study, several of them provided guiding concepts to inform the research process. For example, Caffarella and Zinn (1999) identified barriers and supports that impact the faculty development experience. Another study synthesized concepts of collaborative learning and reflective practice to analyze faculty development experiences (Wildman, Hable, Preston, & Magliaro, 2000). In an alternative approach, Robertson's (1999) model viewed faculty development as a progression from teacher-centeredness to learner-centeredness to teacher/learner-centeredness. Additionally, Fink (2010) emphasized the need for faculty to explore questions such as "Who are we?" and "How do we teach?" as part of the responsibility of learning to teach well.

I addressed concepts from each of the frameworks mentioned above to some extent, but none of those frameworks provided a clear explanation of the faculty development process that was needed to guide this study. The two frameworks ultimately selected to guide this study came from literature on K-12 faculty development and faculty development in the medical education. Desimone (2009) proposed a conceptual framework for use in professional development impact studies in the K-12 arena that is also relevant to higher education faculty development. Desimone's model identified core features of effective professional development, which in turn affect the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs of participants, thus leading to changes in instructional practices, and ultimately improved student learning.

Desimone's (2009) model is somewhat positivist in nature and did not sufficiently address the concept of sociocultural context during the faculty development process. Therefore, I also utilized concepts from a model developed by O'Sullivan and Irby

(2011) for faculty development in medical education that considers the communities of practice that exist during the faculty development event as well as in participants' workplace contexts. According to this model, "the educational workplace is as important to the success of the faculty development participants as are the program components" (O'Sullivan & Irby, 2011, p. 425).

O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) expanded traditional definitions of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002), and proposed that the academic workplace is indeed a community of teaching practice, regardless of how close-knit or well-defined that community may be. In order to address the issue of long-standing silos in faculty development research (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012), this study on faculty development in general higher education was guided by a synthesis of concepts found in these two frameworks from K-12 and medical education. Chapter 3 will include a more comprehensive overview of these two frameworks as well as explanations about how the concepts from these frameworks guided the research process.

Definition of Terms

Faculty Development

A review of extant literature revealed several terms that are used somewhat interchangeably to describe the process of improving one's performance as a faculty member. These terms include *instructional development* (Stes, Coertjens, & Van Petegen, 2013; Stes, Min-Leliveld, Gijbels, & Van Petegem, 2010), *professional development* (Caffarella & Zinn, 1999; Huston & Weaver, 2008), *faculty development* (Gardiner, 2000; McKeachie, 1991; Steinert et al., 2006), and *educational development* (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Taylor & Rege Colet, 2010). While instructional development relates

specifically to a faculty member's role as a teacher, the other terms in the list above encompass more broadly the various duties of a faculty member including teaching, advising, research, and service (Stes et al., 2013).

Although the title Wakonse Conference on College Teaching suggests an explicit focus on *instructional development*, as a three-time attendee of the conference, I am aware that the conference addresses other aspects of the faculty role beyond teaching. Therefore, throughout this document, I will use the term *faculty development* to describe the process through which faculty members work toward improvement in any of their academic roles. This term is commonly used in North America (Stes et al., 2013), and therefore may be familiar to most study participants.

Faculty Attendees

Originally designed for faculty from the University of Missouri and a few other institutions, Wakonse has expanded to include faculty from dozens of institutions (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013). In addition, conference attendees include other academic professionals from student services as well as graduate students referred to at Wakonse as *Future Faculty*. For purposes of this study, which focuses on the conference's influence on faculty from a single institution, the term *faculty attendees* will refer to those attendees from the University of Missouri who hold a current faculty position that includes some degree of teaching responsibility. Future Faculty were not included as participants in this study, as professional development for graduate students is a topic that is beyond the scope of this study. However, I will at times refer to Future Faculty in upcoming chapters because they were an integral piece of the Wakonse

Conference and influenced the overall experiences of the faculty attendees who were participants in this study.

Communities of Practice

Faculty development is a learning process that occurs within a social environment (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this view, “learning is a process of enculturating that is supported in part through social interaction and the circulation of narrative, groups of practitioners are particularly important, for it is only within groups that social interaction and conversation can take place” (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989, p. 40). From this perspective came the concept of *communities of practice*, which are defined as groups of people who share a particular concern and who interact with one another on an ongoing basis to deepen their expertise in that area (Wenger et al., 2002).

Communities of practice are a natural part of organizational life. They will develop on their own and many will flourish, whether or not the organization recognizes them. Their health depends primarily on the voluntary engagement of their members and on the emergence of internal leadership. (Wenger et al., 2002, p. 12)

O’Sullivan and Irby (2011) expanded the view that communities of practice are not always well-defined and recognized. In their perspective, there are multiple communities of practice in regard to faculty development. During a particular faculty development event, a transitory community of practice develops and consists of the program, participants, facilitator, and context. After the faculty development event, participants return to their academic workplaces where a community of teaching practice exists. This community of practice is comprised of teaching tasks and activities, mentoring and coaching among faculty colleagues, professional relationships and networks, and the organizational systems and culture. In this study, I utilized the broader

view of communities of practice proposed by O’Sullivan and Irby (2011) rather than the more traditional views that suggest interaction among well-defined groups of individuals (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002).

Quintain

Stake (2006) explained that, in order to answer some research questions, it is necessary to study more than just a single case. Instead, researchers can explore a collection of cases that share a common condition or characteristic. In his detailed description of multiple case analysis, he defined the *quintain* as:

an object or phenomenon or condition to be studied....to understand [the quintain] better, we study some of its single cases...or manifestations. But it is the quintain we seek to understand. We study what is similar and different about the cases in order to understand the quintain better” (Stake, 2006, p. 6).

The quintain, or phenomenon of interest, for this study was the influence on teaching that the Wakonse Conference has on faculty participants from the University of Missouri. I explored the quintain by studying a group of faculty members from the University of Missouri who attended the 2014 Wakonse Conference on College Teaching. Ten individual cases (faculty attendees) were invited to participate in order to better understand the overall influence on teaching that the Wakonse Conference had on those attendees.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

I begin the literature review with an overview of the higher education context that lays the foundation for understanding faculty development in general, and the Wakonse Conference in particular. Within this section, I review issues related to institutional

differences such as institutional type, institutional culture, and institutional values. Next, I review literature pertaining to the changing student population in higher education as well as the changing professoriate. Finally, I focus on literature that explores new concepts of teaching and learning in higher education, including the ongoing teaching versus research dichotomy, scholarly teaching, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and an increased focus on undergraduate education.

In the second section of the literature review, I will provide a brief overview of several strands of faculty development literature: (a) K-12 education, (b) medical and health professions education, and (c) general higher education, (d) continuing professional education, and (e) adult learning. Next, I will synthesize previous studies on various forms of faculty development including workshops and conferences, peer mentoring, teaching renewal, reflective practice, and group process. I will end the literature review with a more in depth overview of previous conceptual frameworks on faculty development, with specific emphasis on the two frameworks (Desimone, 2009; O'Sullivan & Irby, 2011) that guided this study.

Chapter 3 – Methodology and Research Design

In Chapter 3, I begin with an explanation of the methodology and research design selected for the study, followed by a statement of my researcher positionality. Next, I will describe the research context. Then, I describe the sampling procedures and the participants of the study. I also provide a detailed description of data collection and data analysis methods, with specific emphasis on the strategy recommended by Stake (2006) for merging case findings to generate cross-case assertions. Furthermore, I provide a discussion of how the conceptual frameworks were utilized to guide the research process.

Finally, I end with an overview of the strategies employed to ensure trustworthiness and research ethics, as well as a brief discussion of the limitations of this study.

Chapters 4 and 5 – Findings

In Chapter 4, I introduce findings from archived documents that provide an understanding of the history of the Wakonse Conference leading up to 2014 when this multiple case study was conducted. I also synthesize my participant observations from the 2014 Wakonse Conference, with pertinent reflections from the 2010 and 2013 conferences that I attended. In Chapter 5, I introduce the 10 cases and present the cross-case assertions that arose through merging individual case findings.

Chapter 6 – Discussion and Implications

In Chapter 6, I provide a discussion of the significance of the study in contributing to the existing literature on faculty development. I also address how the findings of this study help to answer the research questions through the lens of the guiding conceptual frameworks. Finally, I conclude with implications for educational research, policy, and practice.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to explore the influence of a particular faculty development event, the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching, on faculty attendees from a particular institution. In order to situate this study within the larger research arena, I will review literature related to the general higher education context including institutional differences, changes in the student population and professoriate, and pertinent concepts related to teaching and learning. Next, I will synthesize previous literature on faculty development. This section of the literature review will be organized by the existing research silos of K-12 professional development, faculty development in medical and health professions education, faculty development in general higher education, and continuing professional development. Then I will provide an overview of research on the various forms of faculty development including workshops and conferences, peer mentoring, teaching renewal, and reflective practice. I will end this literature review with an overview of existing conceptual frameworks on faculty development, with particular emphasis on the two frameworks that have been selected to guide this study.

Higher Education Context

American higher education has undergone significant transformation over the past century. Originally intended to train theologians and to transmit knowledge in the liberal arts to the elite classes, higher education institutions evolved to provide training for a growing number of professions as the world saw advances in scientific discovery and innovation (Harper & Jackson, 2011). With changes in educational mission came changes

in what was taught, how it was taught, and who was teaching (Light et al., 2009). In the subsections below, I will review some of the primary factors within the higher education context that influence faculty development needs and experiences.

Institutional Differences

Within the higher education context, a variety of institutional issues influence teaching and faculty development (Drew & Klopper, 2014; Gaff, 2007). These issues have had an impact on the Wakonse Conference as an organization and on the participants (Boettcher, 2013). Although not an exhaustive list, some of the primary issues relevant to the importance of teaching and faculty development are institutional type, institutional culture, and institutional values. Each of these issues will be explored in more depth in the subsections that follow, particularly as they relate to the University of Missouri as the founding institution of Wakonse.

Institutional type. American institutions of higher education are classified by a variety of characteristics including size, setting, funding, types of degrees granted, enrollment profile, instructional programs offered, and level of research activity (Carnegie Foundation, 2013a). The University of Missouri is a large, public university with a very high level of research activity and a diverse offering of both undergraduate and graduate degrees (Carnegie Foundation, 2013b). It is not uncommon for teaching to be overshadowed by research at this type of institution (Gaff, 2007). Although teaching is touted as an important function by the University of Missouri (2013), the Wakonse founders have suggested that teaching has typically fallen far behind research as a focus of the institution, particularly in the early 1990s when Wakonse first began (Boettcher, 2013).

Institutional culture. Beyond institutional classification, the culture of an institution also shapes how teaching and faculty development are perceived by members of the institution. “The main impediment to staff engagement with development of excellence in teaching and learning is organizational culture,” particularly in research universities (Drew & Kloppe, 2014, p. 352). Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) identified six cultures that may be found in higher education institutions. Each culture is characterized by emphasis on a particular aspect of the academy. A collegial culture values research and traditional scholarship. A managerial culture is based on a hierarchical formality and efficiency in operations. Developmental cultures are learner-centered and promote instructional improvement through faculty development. Service learning and a focus on social justice are cornerstones of an advocacy culture. Virtual cultures are characterized by loose organizational boundaries and online instruction. In contrast, tangible cultures place value on face-to-face education and active engagement of students.

According to Bergquist and Pawlak (2008), most institutions have one dominant culture, but the other five typically are present. Based on their typology and the University of Missouri’s designation as a research institution (Carnegie Foundation, 2013a), it is likely that the collegial culture that values faculty research and traditional forms of scholarship was the dominant culture of the institution in the early 1990s when Wakonse first began. The Wakonse Conference embraces more of a developmental culture, which is based on Boyer’s (1990) diverse concepts of scholarship. According to the conference website, “The aim of the teacher conference is to bring good teachers together to learn from one another in a supportive environment where they can rekindle the spirit for teaching” (Wakonse Foundation, 2014c, para. 2). One of the annual events

at Wakonse is a meeting of attendees from each institution to discuss how to take the message of Wakonse back to each campus (Wakonse Foundation, 2013). Conference attendees are challenged to ensure that teaching becomes or remains an important part of their institutional cultures. Although many Wakonse attendees leave the conference renewed and excited about teaching, they often return to institutions where teaching may not be highly valued in the institutional culture (J. Johnston, personal communication, January 30, 2014). Changing an established culture is not an easy task (Trowler, 2008). “Cultures do not change readily. Cultures in academic institutions are even more resistant to change than in other sectors of society” (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008, p. 226).

An exploration of University of Missouri faculty needs, expectations, and goals related to teaching provided useful information about the culture of teaching at the institution (Henry et al., 2012). Participants in this study perceived a decrease in the quality of their teaching resulting from increased enrollments and limited time to address teaching tasks such as syllabus development, instructional planning, grading, and keeping up with disciplinary knowledge and educational technology. They also noted that time spent advising and mentoring students outside of the classroom was not quantifiable. Furthermore, some faculty members with high teaching evaluations were cautioned that they should be spending more time on research and less time on their teaching efforts. Although faculty perceived the primacy of research, they recognized the link between research and teaching and “wanted teaching to be valued and rewarded more, not for research to be valued and rewarded less” (Henry et al., 2012, p. 10). The following statement summarizes recommendations for addressing faculty development concerns related to teaching:

The researchers recommend that faculty development efforts focus less on specific ‘teaching tips’ and more on finding ways to transform the culture of teaching at [the University of Missouri]. Faculty development should help support and recognize faculty for their efforts in teaching, create a community of individuals devoted to thinking about and talking about teaching, clarifying teaching roles and practices particularly for non-regular faculty members, and empower faculty members to become future leaders, agents of change for, and developers in the community of teaching at [the University of Missouri]. (Henry et al., 2012, p. 10)

Institutional values. Closely related to an institution’s culture is its set of values, both explicit and implicit. Mauksch (1986) reported prevalent devaluation of teaching across institutions, particularly large research universities, although “there is general agreement that we must accord more importance to the teaching component of the professor’s role” (p. 40). Scholars have suggested a number of ways for institutions to demonstrate more explicit commitment to teaching. Many institutions report an emphasis on learner-centered teaching (Sorcinelli, 2007), but funding for faculty development activities related to teaching and recognition of faculty committed to excellence in teaching must increase if institutions truly value teaching (Darwin & Palmer, 2009; Huston & Weaver, 2008).

Although individual faculty members and even entire departments may value teaching, the most effective opportunities for training and development occur at the institutional level (Hahn & Lester, 2012). Trower (2012), however, cautioned that “offering teaching development workshops and seminars may symbolically represent an institution’s values, but faculty will only participate if such values are embedded in institutional culture” (p. 102). Although the collegial culture may still dominate at the University of Missouri, the institution has placed enough value on teaching that the

Wakonse Conference has been financially supported and well-attended for 25 years (Boettcher, 2013).

Changing Student Population

In addition to institutional factors, the changing student population also influences teaching and faculty development. Across higher education, institutions are experiencing growing numbers of students and a greater diversity in their background, academic experience, needs, and expectations (Eagan, Lozano, Hurtado, & Case, 2013; Light et al., 2009; Pryor et al., 2012; Rhoades, 2012). Although many institutions have moved toward a learner-centered approach (Sorcinelli, 2007), faculty are faced with some students who simply want to obtain the credential deemed necessary for their chosen career path with the least amount of time and effort possible (Scanzoni, 2005). Faculty must therefore “seek to wean students from the milk of the teaching paradigm and get them comfortable chewing the solid food of the learning paradigm” (Scanzoni, 2005, p. 230). In the subsections below, I will describe some pertinent issues related to the education of both undergraduate and graduate students and how those issues may be addressed through faculty development.

Undergraduate students. There has been a renewed focus on undergraduate education at research universities since the publication of the *Boyer Report* (Boyer Commission, 1998). The *Boyer Report* provided a number of recommendations to improve undergraduate education including advancing interdisciplinary education, creatively using technology, cultivating a sense of community in the academy, and promoting synergy of teaching and research. According to Boettcher (2013), the Wakonse Conference continues to embrace and address this commitment to improving

undergraduate teaching. For example, during the same weekend as the Wakonse Conference, an undergraduate leadership conference is held concurrently at Camp Miniwanca in a different section of the camp. Wakonse organizers incorporate several opportunities for faculty and the undergraduate students to collaborate with each other throughout the conference (Boettcher, 2013).

Bryn Mawr College has taken this concept of collaboration between faculty and students one step further. The Teaching and Learning Institute at Bryn Mawr hires undergraduate students as pedagogical consultants for faculty who are interested in improving teaching and learning in their classrooms (Cook-Sather & Alter, 2011). Student consultants, who are not enrolled in the course to which they are assigned, spend approximately 7 hours per week in the class, attending pedagogical workshops, and consulting with students enrolled in the course as well as the instructor. Although not affiliated with Wakonse, this program embraces a similar vision of collaboration between faculty and students:

The importance of recognizing the power and potential of bringing different perspectives into more democratic dialogue; of making spaces for such dialogue within which faculty and students contemplate together what learning is or what could be happening in college classrooms; and of building on these insights and experiences to inform teaching and learning beyond these spaces. (Cook-Sather & Alter, 2011, p. 5)

Graduate students. Although undergraduate education has received considerable attention (Boyer Commission, 1998, 2001), we must also consider the issue of graduate student education. Graduate students enter higher education with a different set of needs and expectations that faculty must address (Austin 2002; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Barnes & Austin, 2009). Weisblat and Sell (2012) explained that, beyond disciplinary expertise, graduate students need to develop writing skills, research skills, and the capacity to serve

as a future faculty member. Teaching and advising graduate students is not an easy task for faculty members, particularly for early career faculty who often rely heavily on their own graduate student experiences to guide them (Barnes & Austin, 2009; Dodson, Fernyhough, & Holman, 2006; Finch & Fernandez; Reybold, Brazer, Schrum, & Corda, 2012; Walstad & Becker, 2010). Faculty have been described as both mentors and tormentors of graduate students, while graduate students have reported simultaneously being inspired and frustrated by their faculty advisors (Dodson et al., 2006).

At many research universities graduate students serve in a dual capacity as students themselves and instructors for undergraduate courses (Bieber & Worley, 2006). Furthermore, many graduate students aspire to become faculty members and therefore have their own unique needs for professional development (Austin, 2002; Nyquist et al., 1999). In many instances, graduate students learn to teach by serving in a teaching assistant role, but Finch and Fernandez (2014) recommended moving beyond the traditional hierarchical structure of a graduate student reporting to a faculty member and instead moving toward a system of collaboration and co-instruction between faculty and graduate students. Other scholars have called for graduate students to be required to complete for-credit pedagogical coursework before being allowed to teach undergraduate courses (Walstad & Becker, 2010).

Rhoades (2012) explained that even when there is support for teaching and instructional design, graduate students experience little encouragement to explore faculty positions outside of research universities. Graduate students may be unaware of the range of faculty positions available to them and unfamiliar with the contextual considerations of various institutional types such as private liberal arts institutions and community colleges

(Gappa & Austin, 2010; Rhoades, 2012). “Preparing graduate students to teach is often done in isolation from considering the types of students and working conditions found in different types of colleges and universities” (Rhoades, 2012, p. 13).

Although Wakonse began as a conference for current faculty members, it has expanded to include graduate students, who are referred to at Wakonse as Future Faculty (Boettcher, 2013). Although they are housed in a different section of Camp Miniwanca and have some conference programming specific to their own group, the graduate students attend many of the same professional development sessions along with faculty (Boettcher, 2013; Wakonse Foundation, 2010, 2013, 2014). They also participate alongside faculty in the Dialogue Groups, groups of 7 to 10 individuals who meet multiple times throughout the conference to discuss relevant issues (Boettcher, 2013).

The intent of combining faculty members and graduate students in these Dialogue Groups is that they will learn from each other’s experiences and perspectives (Boettcher, 2013). Coppola (2002) reported, however, that this mix sometimes leads to stressful interactions between individuals who are at very different points in their academic careers. He described a particularly negative exchange that occurred between a faculty member and a graduate student during a Wakonse Dialogue Group. Coppola called for a renewed focus on treating graduate students with dignity and providing meaningful opportunities for the professional development of the next generation of faculty.

Changing Professoriate

The changing professoriate in higher education is another challenge to providing excellent teaching and appropriate faculty development (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Jackson-Weaver, Baker, Gillespie, Bellido, & Watts, 2010; Plater, 2008; Sorcinelli,

2007). In an effort to reduce costs and increase efficiency, many institutions have increased the number of NTT and adjunct faculty who may have limited knowledge of an institution's mission and how a particular course fits into the overall curriculum of a given department (Baldwin & Chronister, 2011; Kezar & Sam, 2010). Furthermore, faculty members are challenged with finding a balance between personal life and the diverse work commitments of teaching, research, and service (Sallee, 2008; Seritan et al., 2010; Vijayalakshmi & Navaneetha, 2013; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007). Faculty who are also parents face additional challenges in balancing work and personal commitments (Mason & Goulden, 2004; Sallee, 2008, 2013; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2013).

In addition to the challenges of achieving work-life balance, expanding academic roles may require new faculty to become experts in grant writing, online education, interdisciplinary collaboration, and course development while simultaneously trying to orient themselves to the institution and develop professional networks (Gappa & Austin, 2010; Sorcinelli, 2007). Novice faculty are particularly susceptible to burnout if not provided support and guidance early in their academic careers (Dunham-Taylor, Lynn, Moore, McDaniel, & Walker, 2008). Additional factors related to the changing professoriate that may impact overall faculty development experiences include type of academic appointment, level of job satisfaction, socialization into faculty role, and career stage. Each of these issues will be explored in the subsections below.

Type of appointment. Faculty members' academic appointments may significantly influence the emphasis and value placed on teaching and the faculty development opportunities related to teaching that are available to them (Gaff, 2007).

Although numerous professional development opportunities exist for tenure-track faculty, most of them are related to improving faculty research and publication, not teaching (Guglielmo et al., 2011). In addition, early career tenure-track faculty often get release time from teaching in their first few years in order to focus on other scholarly pursuits, thus giving them even less time dedicated to teaching (Trower, 2012).

NTT faculty, who typically have higher teaching loads and less expectation for research and publication, often experience the highest levels of stress but few opportunities for faculty development related to teaching (Ryan et al., 2012). Among NTT faculty, those individuals in part-time and adjunct faculty positions report the most need for more support and encouragement and an overwhelming desire for faculty development related to teaching (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Forbes, Hickey, & White, 2010; Guglielmo et al., 2011; Handzic & Lagumdzija, 2010).

Wakonse attendees include a mix of tenured, tenure-track, and NTT faculty in both full- and part-time positions, and sessions at the conference address issues for all appointment types (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013; Wakonse Foundation, 2013). In addition, Wakonse offers professional development for faculty at all stages of an academic career. A Wakonse founder and long-time attendee stated, “I’ve been coming to Wakonse for 24 years and I learn something new every year” (B. Kerr, personal communication, May 23, 2013).

Job satisfaction. Another issue related to teaching and faculty development is overall job satisfaction. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) found differences in job satisfaction between men and women, with men reporting higher overall satisfaction than women. However, when controlling for demographic factors, institutional differences,

and other career factors, the difference was significantly reduced. Faculty members in the health professions reported higher job satisfaction than faculty in the sciences, social sciences, and engineering. In the same study, faculty who reported higher proportions of time spent teaching reported lower overall job satisfaction (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009).

Another factor in academic job satisfaction is faculty members' perceptions of their worklife (Rosser, 2004). Rosser found that faculty who perceived themselves to be well supported in terms of teaching, research, and professional development activities reported high levels of satisfaction. Faculty job satisfaction is also influenced by the degree of respect that they perceive from their peers (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). Additionally, faculty who experience a good fit between their professional goals and the priorities of the institution report higher levels of morale and lower intent to leave their institutions (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004; Ryan et al., 2012). Furthermore, faculty who are rewarded for their professional accomplishments are happier in their academic roles (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). Therefore, institutions should not only provide opportunities for faculty development related to teaching but should also recognize and reward faculty who participate in those opportunities (Darwin & Palmer, 2009; Huston & Weaver, 2008). Some participants of the Wakonse Conference experience this disconnect between recognition and reward. Wakonse attendees are recognized as "Wakonse Fellows" among the Wakonse community, but that designation carries little meaning within the larger context of the University of Missouri (B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013).

Socialization into faculty role. Tierney and Rhoads (1994) explained that there are two stages of faculty socialization. The anticipatory stage is comprised of the

undergraduate and graduate learning experiences where students observe how faculty members perform their jobs. The organizational stage occurs when a faculty member begins his or her first academic appointment. The initial entry and first few years “are characterized by loneliness and intellectual isolation, lack of collegial support, heavy workloads, and time constraints” (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994, p. *iii*). During this stage, individuals learn through trial and error, and socialization to the organization occurs somewhat haphazardly through interactions with senior faculty. Boice (2000) emphasized the importance of early career faculty actively trying to learn the culture of their institutions and departments.

Senior faculty have the responsibility of serving as mentors and leaders for newcomers as they learn institutional culture, particularly information that does not appear in faculty handbooks, mission statements, and guides of policies and procedures (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Mendoza (2008) also recognized the role that academic culture plays in the socialization process of new faculty. Newcomers attempt to make sense of events and behaviors as they learn the culture of the institution. Sensemaking is viewed as an ongoing process that occurs in a social context “where individuals’ identities are formed and modified according to how they believe others view the organization to which they belong” (Mendoza, 2008, p. 2008).

In order to assist faculty newcomers with the socialization into their academic roles, Tierney and Rhoads (1994) recommended that institutions create networks that allow novice faculty to interact with senior faculty across disciplines. When new faculty experience collegiality and mentorship, they develop ownership of their roles as faculty members and feel a sense of connectedness to the institution (Schrodt, Cawyer, &

Sanders, 2003). The Wakonse Conference provides an opportunity for new faculty members to interact with senior faculty from many disciplines, thus contributing to the socialization process of new faculty into academic roles. Furthermore, because faculty socialization is viewed as a continuous process that occurs throughout all stages of the faculty career (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994), the Wakonse Conference also allows mid-career and senior faculty, particularly those who have attended the conference multiple times, to develop in their roles as socializers for the new generation of faculty.

Career stage. In addition to type of faculty appointment, job satisfaction, and socialization into the faculty role, faculty members' stage of career can also impact their faculty development needs. Many faculty development initiatives target faculty members early in their academic careers and overlook the professional development needs of mid-career and senior faculty (Huston & Weaver, 2008; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011). The needs of more experienced faculty are likely to differ significantly from early career faculty. "Mid-career and senior faculty members may be disappointed in professional development activities that do not offer sufficient time and opportunity to explore the questions of greatest importance to them at this point in their careers" (Huston & Weaver, 2008, p. 7). One of the unique features of the Wakonse Conference is the integration of participants from various career stages, from graduate students anticipating their first faculty positions, to tenured faculty with decades of teaching experience (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2014).

New Concepts of Teaching and Learning

Beyond institutional factors and issues related to the changing student population and professoriate, new concepts of teaching and learning have also influenced faculty

development and related research. Teaching is the central interaction that occurs between individual faculty members and their students, and there is a vast literature on various aspects of teaching such as pedagogical practices (Clark, 2008; Smith, Sheppard, Johnson, & Johnson, 2005), teaching and learning (Cook-Sather, 2014; Myers, 2008; Winkelmes, 2013), student evaluation of teaching (Algozzine, Beattie, & Bray, 2004; Aultman, 2006), and teaching and technology (Baepler, 2010; Norbury, 2014). For purposes of this study, I have elected to focus on the ongoing dichotomy between teaching and research, teacher identity, the growing focus on use of active learning strategies, and the distinction between scholarly teaching and SoTL.

Teaching versus research. Despite recommendations to promote a synergy between teaching and research in higher education (Boyer Commission, 1998), in most disciplines “academics tend to perceive the teaching and research roles to be competing for their time rather than complementary,” particularly for tenured and tenure-track faculty at research institutions (MacFarlane & Hughes, 2009, p. 10). Furthermore, a record of scholarly publication is typically the most important consideration for tenure and promotion among tenure-track faculty, a standard that provides little incentive for them to spend time on or even do a good job of teaching (Beckerman, 2010). The low status of teaching is a major barrier to faculty development across disciplines (Stenfors-Hayes, Weurlander, Dahlgren, & Hult, 2010). In a qualitative study exploring faculty development for teaching in higher education, the difficulty of balancing research and teaching time was a common theme in participant interviews (Wood et al., 2011).

Teacher identity. Closely related to the dichotomy between teaching and research is the concept of teacher identity. Palmer (2007) emphasized the importance of

faculty members understanding themselves as teachers in order to best serve their students. “When I do not know myself, I cannot know who my students are” (Palmer, 2007, p. 3). Most faculty members identify their primary role as either research or teaching (MacFarlane & Hughes, 2009). Skelton (2012) explored the self-perceptions of faculty members at research institutions and found that many of them “experience significant ‘identity struggles’ as they attempt to juggle personal commitments to teaching with the realities of the research culture” (p. 36). In his research, Skelton identified three levels of teacher identity: (a) teaching specialists, (b) blended professionals, and (c) researchers who teach.

Individuals who viewed themselves as teaching specialists tended to hold NTT positions and believed that faculty development in pedagogical knowledge and skills was important (Skelton, 2012). Teaching specialists were found primarily in vocational disciplines such as business and health professions. Blended professionals considered learning the primary purpose of higher education and argued that learning can occur through both teaching and research activities. Although they recognized the importance of faculty development related to teaching, blended professionals were more interested in faculty development related to research because they saw research scholarship as the primary means for advancement in their academic careers. A third group of faculty saw themselves as researchers who teach. These individuals tended to hold tenure-track positions in non-vocational disciplines, and they viewed teaching as a secondary responsibility. Furthermore, they saw little value in seeking out faculty development related to teaching because teaching was only a minor consideration, if at all, in the tenure process.

Active learning strategies. Once based on the traditional format of an expert lecturer standing in front of a class imparting knowledge to learners (Harper & Jackson, 2011), higher education has experienced an increased demand for the use active learning strategies in the classroom (Chism, Lees, & Evenbeck, 2002; Davis & Desselle, 2013; Michael, 2007;). “Active learning is an instructional method that engages students in meaningful activities in the classroom and allows for student reflection of the learning” (Davis & Desselle, 2013, p. 395). The main objectives of active learning are the application of knowledge to real-life situations and the sharing of learning with peers. Examples of active learning strategies include simulations, case studies, large group discussions, small group activities, in-class writing, and games (Boctor, 2013; Bromley 2013). Use of active learning strategies has been associated with increased student learning (Gardner & Belland, 2012), improved critical thinking skills (Burbach, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004; Kim, Sharma, Land, & Furlong, 2013), and enhanced ability to write, interpret literature, and apply course concepts (Remler, 2002).

Scholars have identified a number of barriers associated with faculty attempts to incorporate active learning strategies into their teaching. Students may have different expectations about learning and therefore may be unwilling to engage in what they view as a more challenging form of learning (Michael, 2007). Michael also identified class size, lack of time, and difficulty in assessment of learning as barriers. If faculty are expected to overcome these barriers and utilize active learning strategies, they must have adequate faculty development on these pedagogical techniques (Michael, 2007; Chism et al., 2002).

Scholarly teaching. In addition to incorporating particular pedagogical strategies into their teaching, some faculty members place an emphasis on scholarly teaching.

“Scholarly teaching is achieved when faculty use a documented evidence-based approach to deliver their discipline-specific content knowledge as well as their pedagogical knowledge of teaching and motivation” (Medina et al., 2012, p. 2). Scholarly teaching involves the following criteria:

- Clear goals – Scholarly teachers must clearly articulate goals and learning objectives to their learners. Faculty should also develop a teaching philosophy to be shared with students and administrators.
- Adequate preparation – Scholarly teachers must have a clear understanding of their students, how a particular course fits into departmental curriculum, and how to use technology effectively to facilitate learning.
- Appropriate methods – Scholarly teachers should demonstrate disciplinary expertise and implement evidence-based pedagogical methods that are in alignment with established course goals and objectives.
- Significant results – Scholarly teachers must determine if their pedagogical methods have had an impact on student learning by assessing learner outcomes and considering statistical analysis of learner assessments.
- Effective presentation – Scholarly teachers must effectively present their teaching materials to students, and they also need to communicate their

results to their departmental chairs and other faculty within their department.

- Reflective critique – Finally, scholarly teachers must engage in both self and peer evaluation to determine what worked, what did not work, and what should be improved in future teaching.

Medina et al. (2012) also suggested that teaching should be emphasized in pre-employment interviews and that faculty should have access to teaching seminars at the departmental and institutional levels.

The need for improved pedagogical instruction for faculty has also been recognized by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (Beckerman, 2010). The AAUP described scholarly teaching as a complex endeavor that involves both content knowledge as well as the knowledge of how to present it in a manner that leads to effective learning. Beckerman proposed a curriculum for new faculty that includes a review of educational theory, examination of diverse teaching practices, and collegial networking with other faculty.

Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Scholarly teaching has been distinguished from SoTL, which involves a research agenda and public dissemination of teaching strategies and learning outcomes rather than sharing results only within one's own department (Medina et al., 2012). Originating from Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, SoTL has received considerable attention in the higher education literature (Elton, 2009; Kreber, 2002; McKinney, 2007; Medina et al., 2012). Many Wakonse attendees are seeking to improve their scholarly teaching, while others are interested in pursuing SoTL. SoTL is a topic that has been addressed through various presentations

and discussions at recent Wakonse conferences (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013).

Faculty Development

Gappa and Austin (2010) recognized faculty development as one of the essential elements of faculty work across all appointment types. “Attention to professional development both enriches the individual faculty member and, by expanding or deepening the abilities of the faculty, contributes to the quality of the institution” (Gappa & Austin, 2010, p. 17). Scholars have made various recommendations for effective faculty development. Bergquist and Phillips (1975) suggested that faculty development can only be successful if change occurs in attitude (personal level), process (instructional level), and structure (organizational level). Although there is a general consensus among scholars that faculty development is essential to improve teaching and foster student learning (Brancato, 2003; Boucher et al., 2006; Chesebro, 1991; Gandolfo, 1997; Mundy, Kupczynski, Ellis, & Salgado, 2012), Huston and Weaver (2008) stressed the importance of voluntary participation in faculty development opportunities for them to be effective. One of the founders and current organizers of Wakonse echoed this sentiment. “Wakonse is not intended to be a remedial solution or punishment for poor teaching. It only works if you *want* to be here” (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013).

Amundsen and Wilson (2012), in their review of faculty development literature, revealed three distinct silos of research: (a) professional development in K-12 education, (b) faculty development in medical and health professions education, and (c) faculty development in the general higher education arena. Each area of research provides important concepts that help situate my study in the larger research context. Additionally,

although not identified as silos by Amundsen and Wilson, I believe that the fields of continuing professional education and adult learning also offer important concepts for understanding faculty development. The subsections below will synthesize existing literature in each of those areas. Then I will move on to an overview of the various forms of faculty development that have been addressed in previous research across those strands of literature.

K-12 Professional Development

Although my research interest was exploring faculty development in the higher education context, I believe it is also important to consider related research in K-12 education. In the 2004 Presidential Address at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Borko (2004) provided an overview of professional development in the K-12 educational arena and suggested directions for extending the knowledge base related to professional development. Borko categorized previous research based on the extent to which each study addressed the following elements: (a) the professional development program, (b) the participants, (c) the facilitators, and (d) the context. In her categorization, Phase 1 research focused only on individual professional development programs and participants with little emphasis on facilitators and context. Phase 2 research addressed programs, participants, and facilitators. Phase 3 research explored the relationships between all four elements, particularly when comparing multiple programs in multiple contexts. Borko recommended longitudinal studies that address all four elements of professional development.

The concept of teacher identity, already discussed in a previous subsection, has also appeared in the K-12 professional development literature. Similar to Skelton (2012),

Battey and Franke (2008) also recognized the impact that teacher identity has on how teachers experience faculty development, particularly when they collaborate with other teachers from different contexts and with different teaching experiences. Battey and Franke suggested that communities of practice provide educators with the opportunity to become different kinds of teachers:

It is the differences and diversity of the teachers in the workgroup that pushes the possibilities of transformation, and the development of common goals allows for a community to emerge. Developing a new identity is not just about gathering new ideas; it is also about developing new frameworks for understanding those ideas and reinterpreting their past experiences. (Battey & Franke, 2008, p. 127)

Another study also highlighted the relationship between professional development opportunities and professional identity (Hardre et al., 2013). In an analysis of a year-long collaboration between K-12 educators and university mentors, participants formed a community of learning and practice characterized by sharing of resources and strategies as well as a critical reflection on their identities as teachers. “Real and lasting change requires experience that affects thinking and feeling and reaches out to influence personal and professional identity” (Hardre et al., 2013, p. 409). Participants found the professional development opportunity beneficial because it allowed them to take on the identity of learners, thus helping them to better understand their own students.

In addition to the concept of teacher identity, the idea of professional learning communities in K-12 education is also relevant to my study on higher education faculty development. Professional learning communities involve groups of teachers actively engaged in an ongoing, collaborative professional development process to improve student learning (Carmichael & Mertens, 2012; DuFour, 2004, 2012; Linder, Post, & Calabrese, 2012). DuFour (2004) expressed concern that the term had been overused to

describe “every imaginable combination of individuals with an interest in education” (p. 6), and recommended that educators remember the guiding principles of professional learning communities: (a) ensuring that students learn, (b) promoting a culture of collaboration, and (c) focusing on results.

Medical Education Faculty Development

Along with the K-12 professional development literature, the medical education and health professions education arenas also offer a vast literature on faculty development that helped to situate my study within the larger research context. In an exploration of best practices in medical education, Steinert et al. (2006) reviewed more than 2 decades of literature on faculty development related to teaching in medical education. Their review identified key features of effective faculty development programs including experiential learning, inclusion of teaching and learning principles, diverse educational methods within a single program, and the facilitation of peer and collegial relationship to foster the exchange of ideas and mutual support. Furthermore, their review highlighted the importance of context on faculty development. Although the context of a particular conference may lend itself to faculty learning, a supportive work environment is necessary for a change in teaching to occur (Caffarella & Zinn, 1999; O’Sullivan & Irby, 2011; Steinert et al., 2006).

At some institutions, medical faculty have borrowed concepts from business and management as they implemented faculty development initiatives (Steinert, Cruess, Cruess, Boudreau, & Fuks, 2007). For example, at McGill University, administrators used the following 8-stage model of implementing change:

1. Establish a sense of urgency for improvement of teaching

2. Form a powerful guiding coalition to lead faculty development initiatives
3. Create a vision for improved teaching
4. Communicate the vision to all departmental faculty
5. Empower faculty to act upon that vision
6. Generate short-term wins through improvements in the classroom
7. Consolidate those gains and produce more change
8. Anchor new approaches in the culture of the department and institution

While the above steps provide guidance for implementing a specific faculty development initiative, other scholars have proposed more general goals for the field of faculty development. At the First International Conference on Faculty Development in the Health Professions, Steinert (2012) proposed six goals as part of an overall vision for faculty development in medical and health professions education over the next decade:

1. Grounding faculty development in a theoretical framework;
2. Broadening the focus on faculty development to address the various roles that practitioners and basic scientists play;
3. Recognizing the role that faculty development can play in promoting curricular and organizational change;
4. Expanding the notion of how faculty members develop and moving beyond formal, structured activities to incorporate notions of work-based learning and communities of practice;
5. Making faculty development an expectation for all faculty members; and
6. Promoting scholarship in faculty development to ensure that research informs practice.

Steinert also critiqued previous research for an overwhelming emphasis on participant satisfaction, suggesting that future research should address the impact of faculty development on practice.

General Higher Education Faculty Development

In addition to the K-12 and medical faculty development literature, the literature on faculty development in the general higher education arena also contained important information that helped situate my research study. Researchers have identified a number of trends in faculty development research and practice. For example, faculty development events tend to be discipline-focused, skills-focused, methods-focused, or process-focused (Amundsen et al., 2005). Discipline-focused events focus on content knowledge within a given discipline. Skills-focused faculty development addresses particular teaching tasks such as presentation skills or assignment development, while methods-focused events focus more on pedagogical approaches such as problem-based learning. Finally, process-focused faculty development focuses on

the process of learning to teach....while these activities and programs are often designed around work in collegial groups, the central process centers on examining one's own thinking about teaching and teaching practice, and through this reflective process, achieving pedagogical growth.
(Amundsen et al., 2005, p. 9)

Another literature review of faculty development in the general higher education realm identified four various outcomes of faculty development programs (Stes et al., 2010). When faculty members participate in a faculty development program, they may come away with change in attitudes, change in conceptions, change in knowledge, and/or change in skills. Additionally, the impact of institutional context was identified as an important factor in the influence that faculty development actually has on teaching.

There has also been an increasing amount of literature on the relationship between technology and faculty development (Stein, Shephard, & Harris, 2011; Wilson, 2012). As technological advances have changed the way that teaching occurs, faculty are in need of professional development activities that introduce them to the utility of those technological advances. Stein et al. (2011) proposed that faculty development could be approached from four possible conceptions: (a) as training, (b) as opening up possibilities, (c) as collaboration, and (d) as relevant and purposeful. Like many other researchers, they also recognized that context influences faculty development activities. “The very existence of professional development and its worth, place and type exists as one small element among many competing organizational and educational tensions” (Stein et al., 2011, p. 161).

In summary, previous literature reviews of faculty development in higher education have categorized research in a number of different ways. Some researchers are most concerned with the characteristics of a given faculty development program (Amundsen et al., 2005), while other scholars focus on the rationale and purpose of the program (Amundsen et al., 2005; Stein et al., 2011). In contrast, Stes et al. (2011) viewed participant outcomes as the most salient issue when conducting faculty development research.

Continuing Professional Education

Beyond PK-12 education and higher education, another arena that offered important concepts in situating this study on faculty development was the arena of continuing professional education. Based on the assumption that individuals working in fields that require some form of professional education and certification (e.g., law,

medicine, health professions, engineering, management) should engage in lifelong learning to remain effective in their professions, continuing professional education has emerged as a distinct sector of education (Cervero, 1988, 2000; Cervero & Rottett, 1984; Silver & Leslie, 2009). Cervero (2000) emphasized the need to move beyond a model of simply updating individuals with information and instead to ensure that the learning that takes place during continuing educational events translates into changes in professional practice.

Continuing professional education is most effective when participants perceive a given educational program to be relevant to their professional practice needs (Cervero & Rottett, 1984). Furthermore, the social context in which the individual works can have a significant effect on whether or not a behavioral change occurs. Cervero (1988) emphasized the importance of moving beyond participant satisfaction after an educational event and exploring the application of that learning as well as any related impacts to application of learning.

Adult Learning

Much of the continuing education practice and research described in the preceding section is based upon concepts from adult learning theory, which assumes that adults learn differently than children and therefore should be educated in a different manner (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Knox, 1980; Merriam, 2008; Mezirow, 1997). It is essential to consider adult learner characteristics when planning faculty development programs (Lawler & King, 2002). Knowles et al. (2005) proposed that adult learners bring the following characteristics to the educational process:

- A need to know why it is important to learn something before they are willing to expend the effort in learning it
- A sense of responsibility for themselves as learners and a desire to be seen as capable in self-directed learning
- An array of life experiences that serve as a resource in peer learning
- A readiness to learn concepts that relate to their real-life situations and future career goals
- A problem-centered or life-centered orientation to learning

Merriam (2008) explained that adult learning theory has evolved to include an emphasis on the sociocultural context of learners and the recognition that adult learning is more than a cognitive process. Rather, there is a mind-body connection that contributes to the multidimensional nature of learning. Additionally, narrative learning, or learning through the stories of ourselves and others, has emerged as a component of adult learning theory (Clark & Rossiter, 2006). Effective teaching strategies for adult learners include self-directed learning activities, small and large group discussion, case studies, use of visual resources, experiential activities, and guest presenters that can help learners connect theory to practice (Bash, 2005; Knowles et al., 2005; Merriam, 2008; Robert, Pomarico, & Nolan, 2011).

Forms of Faculty Development

The preceding sections on faculty development across a number of educational contexts have provided a foundation for situating this study on a particular faculty development program. Now, I turn to a discussion of several common forms of faculty development described in the various strands of faculty development research. In the

subsections below, I will provide an overview of literature on workshops and conferences, teaching renewal, reflective practice, peer mentoring, and group process.

Workshops and conferences. Although professional development may take many forms, researchers have found a strong preference for in-person workshops and conferences (Hahn & Lester, 2012; Knight et al., 2006). If well-designed, a single professional development conference can be one of the most beneficial and influential experiences of a faculty member's career (Camblin & Steger, 2000). However, Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981) explained that "workshops and seminars are probably the most frequent but least evaluated instructional improvement activities" (p. 406).

Beyond the formal instruction that occurs at professional development events, faculty members have also reported significant learning from spontaneous, unstructured interactions with colleagues that occur during workshops and conferences (Knight et al., 2006; Van Eekelen, Boshuizen, & Vermunt, 2005). Through informal learning, "we can gain new understandings and become able to do new things, or to do old things better, without being aware of it. Powerful learning environments encourage these subliminal achievements" (Knight et al., 2006, p. 321).

Teaching renewal. Many professional development programs for faculty are based upon a concept of teaching renewal. For example, the University of Georgia offers a year-long program for a small group of full and associate professors to share ideas about teaching and learning through monthly roundtable discussions, guest speakers, an annual retreat, and small grants for instructional enhancement (Morris, 2012).

Participants of the program reported that the Senior Teaching Fellows program was a

very positive experience and that they came away with ideas to improve teaching and learning in their classrooms and ultimately improving the lives of their students.

Intrator and Kunzman (2006) described similar positive results from a teaching renewal program of quarterly 3-day retreats spread out over a 1-year period. Originating from Palmer's (2007) book *The Courage to Teach*, the renewal program was based on the premise that an educator's "vocational vitality, or capacity to be vital, present, and deeply connected to his or her students, is not a fixed, indelible condition, but a state that ebbs and flows with the context and challenges of the teaching life" (Intrator & Kunzman, 2006, p. 16). Teachers who exhibit a strong vocational vitality are engrossed in their roles as educators, tuned in to context and the needs of students, and purposeful in trying to improve student learning. Participants in the teaching renewal retreat experienced a generative process in which they generated new insights and perspectives about the connections between their personal lives and their professional careers.

Reflective practice. The importance of critical reflection about teaching practices has also been a common topic in the higher education literature. Faculty members who are committed to improving their teaching should reflect on the effectiveness of their pedagogical choices (Clayton & Ash, 2005; Huston & Weaver, 2008; Light et al., 2006; McAlpine, Weston, Berthiaume, & Fairbank-Roch, 2006). However, Brookfield (2009) explained that critical reflection goes beyond simply reviewing the logistics and effectiveness of teaching and learning:

Critical reflection calls into question the power relationships that allow, or promote, one set of practices considered to be technically effective. It assumes that the minutiae of practice have embedded within them the struggles between unequal interests and groups that exist in the wider world. (Brookfield, 2009, p. 293)

Brookfield (1998) offered four lenses through which educators can critically reflect on their practice: (a) their autobiographies as learners and teachers, (b) their students' eyes, (c) their colleagues' experiences, and (d) the theoretical literature. "Viewing what we do through these different lenses alerts us to distorted or incomplete aspects of our assumptions that need further investigation" (Brookfield, 1998, p. 197). Several scholars have identified critically reflective practice as a key component to effective professional development (Clayton & Ash, 2005; Felton, 2000; Hill, Kim, & Lagueux, 2007; Knight et al., 2006).

Peer mentoring. Another form of faculty development that has received growing attention is peer mentoring. In some settings, mentoring is used as a developmental process over an extended period of time to aide in the training and retention of new faculty (Dunham-Taylor et al., 2008). Huston and Weaver (2008) explained that peer mentoring or peer coaching can provide professional development for more experienced faculty as well. "If teaching is to be considered scholarship, there is no debate about the fact that it must be reviewed by peers, just as any other form of scholarship is scrutinized by other community members" (Huston & Weaver, 2008, p. 13). Peer mentoring occurs when two or more faculty members agree to collaborate regarding teaching or other faculty responsibilities over a defined period of time. Huston and Weaver recommended six keys to success when implementing peer mentoring initiatives:

1. Personal goal setting by the faculty member, not the mentor or coach;
2. Voluntary participation for both individuals;
3. Confidentiality in regard to questions, suggestions, and changes;
4. Assessment of the mentoring program, performed confidentially;

5. Formative evaluation that is focused exclusively on improving teaching, as opposed to summative evaluation used for decisions about promotion, tenure, or merit raises; and
6. Institutional support from upper level administration in the form of funding, marketing, and sponsorship of events.

Wygall (2011) also explained that mentoring can be a beneficial form of professional development at any stage of an academic career and that early career faculty members have the capacity to serve as a valuable resource to their senior colleagues.

Group process. Moving beyond the dyad model of peer mentoring, other scholars have advocated for innovative group processes among faculty members called mentoring circles (Darwin & Palmer, 2009) and communities of practice (Blanton & Stylianou, 2009; Herbers, Antelo, Ettling, & Buck, 2011).

Being really present there, within the group, can contribute to deeper levels of awareness and achieve new learning that might, in turn, lead to significant change. In addition, a social process is developed within the group as a product of the exchanges, encounters, and innumerable interactions taking place. (Herbers et al., 2011, p. 92)

New faculty members are often encouraged to collaborate with colleagues about teaching and research, but they may be uncertain about how to follow those recommendations (Boice, 2000). However, collaboration with a small group of peers can provide substantial benefits for new and aspiring faculty to learn how to balance competing work demands in the academic culture (Boice, 2000; Hunt, Mair, & Atkinson, 2012). Chism et al. (2002) endorsed group process in faculty development and recommended utilizing a community of practice approach to help faculty learn about pedagogical innovations such as the use of active learning strategies. Group process has

been utilized successfully with small groups of early career faculty as they supported one another through collegiality and collaboration on teaching, research, and other academic worklife issues (Ortleib, Biddix, & Doecker, 2010). Similar positive results of group process were noted in a study exploring collaborative approaches among faculty and graduate students to learn about particular methodological approaches for research (Wilhelm, Craig, Glover, Allen, & Huffman, 2000).

Despite the push to utilize group process in faculty development (Blanton & Stylianou, 2009; Chism et al., 2002; Herbers et al., 2011), not everyone likes to learn through group interactions. Dominating personalities can present a problem for interpersonal dynamics in any group setting (Darwin & Palmer, 2009). Kramer et al. (2007) found this to be true in their exploration of Wakonse Dialogue Group interactions. Participants reported both positive and negative perceptions about participation in the Dialogue Group discussions. Boettcher (2013) explained that “the Dialogue Group makes or breaks the Wakonse experience” (p. 153).

Conceptual Framework

In my exploration of previous conceptual frameworks on faculty development, I discovered a brief passage that synthesized what I have learned about theory and research throughout my doctoral coursework and reminded me of the benefits and limitations of theory:

Any concept or theory helps us focus on things to the exclusion of others; there is always a danger that we’ll become over-committed to a particular theory and distort the data to fit the theory we have. We need to use theories with flexibility and openmindedness. Let us be masters of the theory, not slaves to it. (McKeachie, 1990, p. 5)

Interestingly, McKeachie suggested that a theory of faculty development is not needed because the first step in helping new faculty members is simply providing them with tips and techniques rather than attempting to ground those strategies in theory. McKeachie believed that if faculty experienced some initial success in the classroom setting and received positive feedback from students, they would find teaching intrinsically rewarding and thus be motivated to pursue additional faculty development.

Many researchers disagree with McKeachie (1990) and instead believe that faculty development and related research should be guided by conceptual underpinnings. For example, Caffarella and Zinn (1999) proposed a conceptual framework of barriers and supports that impact the ability of individuals to pursue faculty development including self-directed learning experiences, formal professional development programs, and organizational development strategies. In this framework, barriers and supports are clustered around the following domains:

- People and personal relationships both within and outside the work environment, including friends, faculty colleagues, and administrators;
- Institutional structures such as the availability of faculty development opportunities, time, and access to resources;
- Personal considerations and commitments such as family obligations and community involvement; and
- Intellectual and psychosocial characteristics such as the faculty member's belief in the importance of teaching and symptoms of frustration and burnout

While Caffarella and Zinn (1999) focused on barriers and supports related to faculty development, Robertson (1999) was more concerned with faculty development as

a sequential developmental process. Robertson proposed a three-step conceptual model of faculty development related to teaching. During the first phase of egocentrism, faculty concentrate on their own needs as designated content experts in their given field, and their focus in terms of teaching is primarily on content mastery. Little attention is paid to pedagogy, and faculty tend to replicate teaching methods they experienced as former students. At the next development stage, aliocentrism, faculty experience a transition of their attention to the students and recognize that the purpose of teaching is to facilitate student learning rather than simple transmission of information. At the most mature stage of teaching, faculty achieve systemocentrism, which focuses on the dynamic relationships between students and teachers. Faculty members demonstrate concern with their inner life as learning facilitators and how that inner life interacts with the inner lives of the learners.

Similar to Robertson's (1999) model, another conceptual framework explained how faculty development takes place (Wildman et al., 2000). In their exploration of faculty study groups, they proposed a framework that recognized the relationship between experience and reflection, the importance of narratives of practice, and the power of collaborative learning. Their findings suggested that administrative support was required in order "for faculty to pursue the study of their own teaching as a legitimate scholarly activity" (Wildman et al., 2000, p. 262). Furthermore, like Caffarella and Zinn (1999), results of their study identified time as a significant barrier to the pursuit of faculty development activities.

In a different approach to understanding faculty development, Fink (2010) suggested re-examining questions about how faculty members approach their work.

Traditionally, faculty members ask the following questions when thinking about teaching:

1. What do we teach?
2. How do we teach?
3. How do we gear up to teach?
4. Who are we?

Fink suggested reversing the order of these questions in order for faculty to improve their teaching, with an emphasis on “Who am I?” as a teacher. “If professors took their identities as educators more seriously, faculty would spend substantial amounts of time learning about teaching and learning and would work hard to be on a continuous growth curve as a teacher” (Fink, 2010, p. 13).

Concepts from each of the frameworks described above were addressed in this study to some extent, but none of those frameworks provided a clear explanation of the faculty development process that was needed to guide this study. The frameworks ultimately selected to guide this study came from the literature on K-12 professional development and faculty development in medical education. Desimone (2009) proposed a conceptual framework for use in professional development impact studies in the K-12 arena that is also relevant to higher education faculty development. Desimone’s model identifies core features of effective professional development, which in turn affect the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs of participants, thus leading to changes in instructional practices, and ultimately improved student learning. Although somewhat positivist in structure, Desimone also recommends taking into account the sociocultural context of participants when using the framework to analyze faculty development.

However, the framework provides little explanation as to how context influences the faculty development process.

Another conceptual framework proposed for faculty development research in the medical profession addresses the issue of context that is limited in the Desimone (2009) framework. O’Sullivan and Irby (2011) suggested that faculty development research consider “two communities of practice: the community created among participants in faculty development programs and the communities of teaching practices in the workplace...where teaching actually occurs” (p. 421). During the faculty development event, a transitory community of practice develops and is comprised of the program, participants, facilitator, and context. When participants return to their campus workplaces, they return to an academic community of practice that consists of teaching tasks and activities, peer mentoring and coaching, professional relationships and networks, and the organization, systems, and culture of the institution. O’Sullivan and Irby recommended that future research on faculty development consider these broad interpretations of communities of practice.

In order to address the issue of long-standing silos in faculty development research (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012), this study on faculty development in general higher education was guided by a synthesis of concepts found in these two frameworks from K-12 and medical education. I focused primarily on the first three components of Desimone’s (2009) framework to explore the faculty development process experienced by Wakonse attendees during and after the conference. In addition to providing a rich, thick description of the case (Creswell, 2013), I compared features of the Wakonse Conference with the core features of effective professional development identified in

Desimone's model. Furthermore, through interviews conducted throughout the following academic year, I explored how the Wakonse Conference influenced the self-reported knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs of faculty attendees, as well as any influence that the conference had on their actual teaching. Desimone's final framework component, improved student learning, was beyond the scope of this research study and was addressed only to the extent that participants were asked during the final interview to self-report on their perceptions of improved student learning that may have occurred during the Fall 2014 semester as a result of instructional changes.

A strength of Desimone's (2009) framework is the recognition that not every participant of a particular faculty development event will experience the same progression through the faculty development process. For example, some attendees may experience only a change in attitudes or beliefs, while other attendees apply newly acquired knowledge to specific changes in their instructional strategies. Desimone's framework has also been used to explore professional development related to e-learning (Wilson, 2012).

Although Desimone's framework provided a good foundation for understanding the faculty development process, it did not adequately address the sociocultural context that influences that process. Therefore, I also pulled in concepts from the model proposed by O'Sullivan and Irby (2011). This framework has been recommended as a guide for future research because of its emphasis on context and multiple communities of practice (Steinert, 2012).

Summary

This literature review began with an overview of the higher education context, which is important in understanding faculty development experiences. I reviewed institutional differences such as institutional type, institutional culture, and institutional values. I also described changes in both the student population and the professoriate. Then I provided an overview of concepts in teaching and learning that relate to faculty development including the ongoing dichotomy between teaching and research, teacher identity, scholarly teaching, and SoTL.

The second part of the literature review provided a synthesis of the literature on faculty development. Recognizing that literature in related fields is important in situating my study, I reviewed the existing research silos of professional development in K-12 education, faculty development in medical and health professions education, and faculty development in the general higher education arena as well as the related fields of continuing professional education and adult learning. I also provided a discussion of previous research on various forms of faculty development including workshops and conferences, teaching renewal, reflective practice, peer mentoring, and group process.

The final section of the literature review explored existing conceptual frameworks that have guided previous research on faculty development. Each framework provides useful concepts that should be considered in this project. However, I was seeking frameworks that provided an explanation of the research process and considered the sociocultural contexts during that process. Therefore, I ultimately selected two previously proposed frameworks (i.e., Desimone, 2009; O'Sullivan & Irby, 2011) to guide this study.

With so much existing literature on faculty development, is there a need for yet another study on this topic? I believe that there is. Reviews of existing literature have identified a number of research gaps that have yet to be addressed. In addition, previous researchers have offered a number of suggestions for future research that to date remain unexplored. In the subsection below, I will provide an overview of the existing research gaps and how my study will address those gaps.

Research Gap

There is an extensive literature base on faculty development in higher education. However, several research gaps have been identified over the past few decades. Levinson-Rose and Menges (1981) claimed that research on faculty development to improve college teaching was not a well-defined field at that time. They suggested that more attention should be given to individual differences rather than treating “participating faculty members as an undifferentiated mass” (Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981, p. 418). They also suggested that the quantitative studies that previously dominated this field of research were not sufficient to reveal the experiences of participants engaged in faculty development.

In the years that followed, McKeachie (1990) proposed that future research in the field focus on how teaching and learning are influenced by institutional culture. Furthermore, Gardiner (2000) recommended that future research on faculty development explore the effectiveness of specific faculty development programs, particularly in regard to whether participants are actually using new knowledge and skills in their teaching and advising responsibilities. In addition, scholars have been encouraged to include a guiding conceptual framework for research related to faculty development (Steinert et al., 2006).

In their systematic review of faculty development initiatives related to teaching in medical education, only 57% of the works reviewed used a conceptual framework to guide the study. They recommended that future research on faculty development be grounded in theory and that qualitative methods be utilized “to capture the complexity of what occurs *during*, and *following*, faculty development interventions” (Steinert et al., 2006, p. 520).

Amundsen and Wilson (2012), in their review of faculty development literature in higher education, critiqued past research for ignoring the influence of context, noting “how infrequently these researchers explicitly recognize the broader context in which faculty teach and, therefore, in which educational development happens” (p. 110). Furthermore, they lamented the lack of sharing of information and experience across the long-established silos of research on faculty development in K-12 education, medical and health professions education, and the general higher education context.

My study sought to address the research gaps identified above. First, my study explored the experiences of individual participants through qualitative methods to gain an in depth understanding of their faculty development experiences. Additionally, as recommended by Gardiner (2000), my study moved beyond simple analysis of participant satisfaction and instead explored the influence of a faculty development event after participants returned to their workplace contexts, taking into account both institutional and departmental culture. Finally, my study was grounded in a synthesis of conceptual models from the K-12 and medical education communities, thus addressing the long-standing research silos that have dominated previous faculty development literature.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Research Design

The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the influence of the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching on faculty attendees from the University of Missouri during the academic year following their attendance at the conference. This study also explored how communities of practice during and after the conference influence the overall faculty development experiences of Wakonse attendees. This chapter will provide information about how I conducted the research for this study.

Because the intent of this project was to gain an in depth understanding of a complex issue, I used a qualitative research design in order to gather data from multiple sources over an extended period of time (Creswell, 2013). Merriam (2009) described four key characteristics of qualitative research: “the focus is on process, understanding, and meaning; the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis; the process is inductive; and the product is richly descriptive” (p. 14). Qualitative research methods fit well with my research questions of understanding how a particular faculty development experience influences conference attendees and how their communities of practice shape their faculty development experiences. Interviews, participant observation, and document analysis were essential to gathering data to answer my research questions. Although my study was guided by previous conceptual frameworks (i.e., Desimone, 2009; O’Sullivan & Irby, 2011), I approached this study inductively. I then compared my findings with the guiding frameworks, rather than limiting my data collection and analysis only to the concepts identified within those frameworks. Finally, descriptions of

the context and participants, as well as direct quotations from the participants and archived documents, allowed for a rich, thick description of the case.

Crotty (1998) explained the importance of approaching qualitative research with a clear link between epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology, and methods. I approached this study from a constructivist worldview, which assumes that knowledge is constructed by individuals as they engage with their life contexts and make meaning from their experiences. An interpretivist theoretical perspective allowed me to explore “culturally derived and historically situated interpretations” of participants’ faculty development experiences (Crotty, 1998, p. 67).

The case study methodology allowed for in depth exploration of a bounded system within its context (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2009). More specifically, I used a holistic multiple case study design that focused on the overall influence of the Wakonse Conference for a single institution by exploring the experiences of several faculty attendees from that institution (Yin, 2009). Finally, the specific methods of participant observation, interviews, and document analysis allowed for collection of data that addressed the research questions and highlighted the meaning that participants constructed from their faculty development experiences (Creswell, 2013; Crotty, 1998). In this study, each participant was viewed as an individual case, and the collection of cases was analyzed holistically to understand the quintain (Stake, 2006).

Researcher Positionality

In addition to linking the elements of the research process, good qualitative research also involves researcher reflexivity, or the recognition that personal identity and prior experience influence the research process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). My personal

experiences as an occupational therapist, graduate student, and faculty member influenced my decision to conduct this research study. Furthermore, my roles as a faculty member and former Wakonse Conference participant have allowed me access to conference founders and participants that would have been more challenging for someone not affiliated with the conference.

I had nearly 15 years of experience as an occupational therapist before transitioning into an academic role. During my years as a clinician, I was always seeking out opportunities to advance my clinical skills and ultimately to do a better job serving my clients. As a clinician, I had considerable experience as a fieldwork educator of occupational therapy students at various stages of their professional preparation. I frequently received positive feedback from my students and the academic programs for which I supervised students about what a “good teacher” I was. Therefore, I thought the transition to a full-time academic role would be relatively easy, particularly since I already had some experience in the classroom as a guest lecturer and adjunct faculty member. Reality quickly set in.

I recognized that I was not nearly as good at educating students in the classroom setting as I had been in the clinical setting. I also realized that my department chair and colleagues were either too busy to notice my shortcomings or simply did not care. Wanting to do a better job for my students, I began seeking out opportunities for professional development related to teaching. I attended every campus event that I could find during my first year as a full-time NTT faculty member. Early in the spring semester of 2010, I received a forwarded email about the Wakonse Conference on College

Teaching. I knew immediately that I wanted to go, but I had no idea the degree of impact Wakonse would have on my teaching.

At Wakonse 2010, I met colleagues from across the University of Missouri campus and from numerous other institutions. Most importantly, however, I met colleagues from my own School of Health Professions with whom I have maintained contact and collaborated on various endeavors to improve teaching. Each year at the opening ceremony of Wakonse, Bill Bondeson, one of the founders, jokes about having to go all the way to Michigan to meet people who work down the hallway (B. Bondeson, personal communication, May 23, 2013), and I understand exactly what he means.

When I attended Wakonse in 2010, I was surprised that several attendees had been there multiple times. At the time, I thought Wakonse was for new faculty who needed some ideas to get off to a good start in academia. Although I truly enjoyed my first Wakonse experience and learned a lot from the conference, I did not understand why faculty would attend more than once. A few years of teaching experience and several hours of doctoral coursework later, I found myself wanting to return to Wakonse, but for different reasons than I had in 2010. I was still looking for new ideas, of course, but mostly I found myself wanting to be surrounded by other faculty who love teaching as much as I do. For me, much of the learning that took place at Wakonse 2010 and 2013 happened during informal interactions with other attendees.

Although I certainly was seeking continued professional development related to my role as a faculty member, I would be remiss if I did not explain the impact of my role as a graduate student on my desire to attend Wakonse again. Having completed 3 years of part-time coursework toward a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy

Analysis (ELPA), I had encountered a considerable amount of information about teaching, learning, and various issues related to faculty and student development. With the dissertation process approaching, I found myself with numerous ideas for a research topic, one of which was the influence of the Wakonse Conference. Do other attendees have a positive experience like I did? What do they do with the ideas they encounter at Wakonse? Surely someone had addressed these questions previously. After all, Wakonse has been an annual event for more than 2 decades (Boettcher, 2013). However, preliminary searches and conversations with the founders revealed only a few brief articles about Wakonse (B. Bondeson, personal communication, April 4, 2013; J. Johnston, personal communication, April 4, 2013). I did learn that one previous attendee had just completed her doctoral dissertation about Wakonse, but her focus had been on the development of Wakonse from an organizational framework (Boettcher, 2013).

I was fortunate enough to be selected to attend Wakonse again in 2013. This time, however, I had a dual purpose for attending. I was seeking professional development related to teaching, but I was simultaneously exploring a potential focus for my dissertation, and I was very clear about my intentions in my application to attend Wakonse 2013. While attending, I had the opportunity to speak to the founders of Wakonse and to meet with the author of the one and only dissertation on Wakonse (Boettcher, 2013). I once again had a mostly positive experience at Wakonse and returned to my campus feeling renewed and full of ideas to implement in my teaching. I also affirmed my decision to pursue a dissertation exploring the impact that Wakonse has on attendees.

I maintained contact with Joe Johnston, founder and current director of the Wakonse Conference, throughout the 2013 – 2014 academic year. He was fully supportive of my research interests and allowed me full access to archived Wakonse documents including old conference agendas, a collection of participant comments about Wakonse from the last 24 years, and a copy of a brief 1995 qualitative report about the conference. Although these documents had been archived, they had never been formally analyzed in their entirety to determine the overall influence of Wakonse on attendees. Joe also played an important role in recruitment of participants for the study. For example, he forwarded my initial recruitment email to the distribution list of 2014 Wakonse attendees. He also allowed me to introduce myself and discuss the study at multiple Wakonse orientation meetings that were held in Spring 2014.

In May 2014, I attended the 25th annual Wakonse Conference. As a participant observer, I recognized that I needed to take caution to minimize the impact of my research on the experience of other participants (Merriam, 2009). I was also aware that I needed to bracket my own experiences as I gathered and interpreted the data from participants throughout the study (Creswell, 2013). Although I had mostly positive experiences during the three Wakonse Conferences that I attended, I know that not everyone feels the same about their experiences at Wakonse or the influence the conference had on their faculty development. Although qualitative research is undertaken with the assumption that the researcher cannot remain completely objective (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009), I recognized the need to limit the influence that my own experiences and assumptions about the Wakonse Conference had on my interpretation of

study participants' descriptions of their experiences. Descriptions of my strategies for trustworthiness will be provided in an upcoming subsection.

Research Context

There are two distinct research contexts that must be considered in the study. Because data from my participant observations will be utilized in developing the description of the Wakonse Conference and the individual cases, it is important to recognize the site of the conference as part of the research context. In addition, one of the guiding conceptual frameworks for the study recognizes the influence of the context of the specific event on the overall faculty development process (O'Sullivan & Irby, 2011). The Wakonse Conference is held each year at Camp Miniwanca near Shelby, Michigan. Camp Miniwanca is situated on 360 acres including forests, beaches, and numerous buildings typically found at a youth summer camp such as a dining hall, meeting lodges, and rustic dormitories (Wakonse Foundation, 2014a).

The second context for this study was the University of Missouri campus where faculty attendees from Wakonse conduct their work as faculty members. The University of Missouri is a large, public university with a very high level of research activity (Carnegie Foundation, 2013). The institution currently is recognized as a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU), a distinction offered on an invitation-only basis to those institutions with outstanding reputations in research and education (AAU, 2014).

Participants and Sampling Procedure

In his detailed description of multiple case study analysis, Stake (2006) defined the "quintain" as the object, condition, or phenomenon of which the researcher seeks

understanding. The quintain, or phenomenon of interest, for the study was the influence of the Wakonse Conference on the teaching of faculty attendees from the University of Missouri, which is the founding institution for the conference and the source of the largest contingent of attendees at the conference each year (J. Johnston, personal communication, May 23, 2013).

If the Wakonse Conference is going to continue, at least in its present format with its current institutional funding, I believed that campus administrators would be most interested in evidence related to the influence of the conference on attendees from the University of Missouri rather than the impact that the conference has for other participating institutions. Furthermore, previous research suggested that institutional type and organizational culture play a significant role in the impact of faculty development related to teaching (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Gaff, 2007), and I wanted to explore those factors as they relate to a single public research university. Therefore, when recruiting participants for this study, I was specifically interested in faculty attendees from the University of Missouri.

In March 2014, I received IRB approval to recruit participants for the study. Participants were solicited through multiple methods. The administrative assistant of the Wakonse Conference director forwarded two recruitment emails (see Appendix A), 2 weeks apart, to all University of Missouri faculty registered for the 2014 conference. In addition, during two pre-conference orientation meetings in April and May 2014, the director allowed me to explain my research project and invite attendees to participate in the study. Initially, nine individuals volunteered for participation in the study. Those individuals provided the sample variation I was hoping for, and all were accepted as

study participants. At the second pre-conference gathering and at the 2014 conference, I mentioned that I was still recruiting additional participants, particularly female faculty in the humanities because that was a characteristic not yet represented in my sample. Within the week, one additional participant, a female humanities professor, volunteered to participate in the study. In July 2014, I received approval of an IRB amendment to invite the existing participants to complete additional interviews (see Appendix B).

To the extent possible, I purposively selected participants for the study through maximum variation sampling (Creswell, 2013) based on participant demographics, academic discipline, length of time in faculty role, designation of faculty role (e.g., tenured, pre-tenure, NTT), and the number of times the faculty member had attended Wakonse. Although I hoped to recruit a few participants who had attended Wakonse multiple times in order to gain perspectives about the conference's history and changes over time, my recruitment emphasis was on first-time Wakonse attendees.

In 2014, 39 individuals from the University of Missouri attended the Wakonse Conference. Of those 39 people, I excluded 6 people from sampling because of their designation as Future Faculty or non-teaching academic professionals, such as academic advisors. There were 12 other first-time attendees, including 9 NTT and 3 pre-tenure faculty members. My recruitment efforts resulted in 6 NTT participants and 1 pre-tenure participant. In addition, I recruited three of the 21 attendees who had attended Wakonse multiple times. All three of those individuals served as Wakonse staff at the 2014 conference. Additional information regarding participant characteristics will be provided in Chapter 5 when I introduce the cases.

Data Collection

Demographic and Academic Background Information

I gathered demographic information and academic background information via a brief written form (see Appendix C) that was administered to participants at the beginning of their involvement in the study. These data were used for purposes of describing sample participants in terms of sex, race, ethnicity, faculty role, academic discipline, years of experience, and frequency of Wakonse attendance.

Interviews

Guided by the conceptual frameworks proposed by O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) and Desimone (2009), data were collected through four semi-structured interviews completed at the following times:

- Prior to attending Wakonse
- Within 4 weeks of attending Wakonse
- Beginning of the Fall 2014 semester
- After the conclusion of the Fall 2014 semester

The first round of interviews explored each participant's current academic responsibilities, previous faculty development experiences, and reasons for attending the 2014 Wakonse Conference (see Appendix D). The second round of interviews addressed participants' experiences during the conference and their initial predictions about the conference's influence on their approach to teaching and other faculty responsibilities (see Appendix E). The third and fourth interviews (see Appendices F and G) asked participants to reflect on the Wakonse Conference and any influence that the conference had on their approach to teaching in the fall semester. In addition, participants were asked

to reflect on the influence of their specific workplace communities on their overall faculty development.

Interviews were audiorecorded and transcribed verbatim, with the exception of pseudonyms used for participants. In addition, I also took notes during the interviews that were reviewed later during data analysis. Interviews lasted between 15 and 48 minutes each. Seven of the 10 participants completed all four interviews. For the last participant recruited, I combined the questions from the first and second interview protocols because the first interview was conducted after the conclusion of the conference. Another participant was very busy during the summer immediately after returning from Wakonse, and I combined the second and third interview protocols when we finally conducted the interview in August. Another participant did not participate in the final interview, despite multiple attempts to schedule.

Most of the interviews were conducted in the participants' offices or other campus locations they identified as convenient. One participant preferred to conduct all interviews at a local coffee shop near campus. Five of the second-round interviews were conducted on the bus ride home from Wakonse because participants were going to be gone or busy during the upcoming summer.

Observations

Stake (2006) explained that “qualitative understanding of cases requires experiencing the activity of the case as it occurs in its contexts and particular situation” (p. 2). Furthermore, Desimone's (2009) framework explained that faculty development is a process that occurs both during and after a specific faculty development event. As a 2014 Wakonse attendee, I undertook the role of participant observer throughout the

conference in order to gain a better understanding of the conference, the participants, and the quintain, or phenomenon of interest for this study. Furthermore, my role as a participant observer allowed me to establish relationships with Wakonse attendees and develop rapport with them prior to asking for their participation during the following academic year in the follow-up interviews.

Upon arrival to the Wakonse Conference, each attendee was given a canvas bag and a small notebook for taking notes throughout the conference. I did not use an observation protocol. Instead, I utilized that notebook to take extensive field notes on the general atmosphere and flow of conference, participant behaviors, and comments that were made in large and small group forums. I was particularly interested in the interactions among attendees, and I recorded what I perceived to be particularly positive, negative, or insightful comments. Observational data were analyzed to develop the overall case study and to explore the influence of the community of practice at the conference on the overall faculty development experience of each participant.

There is one aspect of the Wakonse Conference that I intentionally excluded from my data collection. Dialogue Groups are assigned groups of up to 10 individuals who meet periodically throughout the conference to discuss relevant issues (Wakonse Foundation, 2013). One of the explicit expectations at Wakonse is that the Dialogue Groups are safe places for conference attendees to share their experiences and feelings about a variety of faculty issues. I wanted to honor that commitment to confidentiality, and beyond general descriptions of what takes place in a Dialogue Group, I did not collect specific data that would be attributable to any particular conference attendee.

Archived Documents

According to Merriam (2009), document analysis is an excellent way to augment data gained from interviews and observations, particularly when the documents were produced for purposes other than the specific research project at hand. The purpose of the document analysis in this study was to help contextualize the overall conference and understand any changes that had taken place over time.

Wakonse director Joe Johnston provided me with a large 3-ring binder of comments and reflections from past Wakonse participants. The binder also contained news clippings and other written documents mentioning Wakonse throughout the conference's history. Joe also provided me with an unpublished nine-page qualitative review of Wakonse from 1995, 5 years after the conference's establishment. Additionally, one of my interview participants provided me with a printed copy of an online article about Wakonse written by a former conference attendee. Finally, I reviewed 17 of the 25 agendas from the Wakonse Conference, including agendas from 1991, 1994, 1995, and 2002 through 2014. The other eight agendas were not available for review.

Journals

Ortlipp (2008) explained that keeping a reflective journal throughout the qualitative research process can facilitate reflexivity and help researchers understand "the messiness of the research process" (p. 704). In anticipation of this research project, I kept an electronic reflective journal during the 2013 Wakonse Conference. I also kept an electronic journal from March 2014, when data collection began, through February 2015, when data collection ended. As previously mentioned, I kept a handwritten journal throughout the 2014 Wakonse Conference. Each day at Wakonse was very busy with

numerous scheduled meetings and activities, and the handwritten journal, kept in conjunction with my observational data collection, allowed me to reflect on activities as they occurred rather than trying to recall everything at the end of the day.

I reviewed my reflective journals before each round of interviews and throughout the data analysis process. Reviewing the journals helped me formulate potential follow-up questions for participants that went beyond the semi-structured interview protocols and further explored topics that had arisen as relevant to each participant based on previous interviews, conversations, and observations at the conference. Furthermore, reviewing the journals facilitated the member check process I incorporated during subsequent interviews. During several interviews, participants inquired about my findings from the document analysis and other interviews. I shared my reflections, perceptions, and interpretations of the data throughout the research process, both specific to the individual participant and collectively regarding the quintain, and invited participant discussion regarding those interpretations.

Photographs

To minimize any changes in behavior of attendees as a result of my role as a participant observer, I intentionally did not take any photographs during the 2014 conference. However, as I began the data analysis process, I discovered that I had photographs that I had taken during the 2010 and 2013 conferences that related to many of the details found in the archived documents, my observations, and the interviews. Although I did not analyze the photographs, I did include them in the presentation of the findings in Chapter 4 with the intent of adding to the rich, thick description of the research context.

Data Analysis

Interviews and Observations

For the interview and observation data, I used a combination of the multiple case study analysis procedures described by Stake (2006) and the data analysis procedures for developing codes, categories, and concepts described by Lichtman (2013). Stake described that a multiple case study is “undertaken to understand the quintain...both its commonality and its differences across manifestations. Each case is studied to gain understanding of that particular entity as it is situated. The quintain is studied in some of its situations” (Stake, 2006, p. 40). With this strategy, the experiences and contexts of each case provide a better understanding of the complex meanings of the quintain.

I compiled the multiple interviews for each participant into a collective document so that I could review each case to develop individual case findings. I followed the six-step strategy described by Lichtman (2013) for this stage of data analysis:

1. Initial coding of responses to summary ideas
2. Revisiting initial coding
3. Developing an initial list of categories
4. Modifying the initial list based on additional rereading
5. Revisiting categories and subcategories
6. Moving from categories to concepts

I used the track changes feature in Microsoft Word for each of the transcribed interviews to facilitate coding. I coded the interviews as they were transcribed, and then revisited and revised codes within each case and between cases for consistency as data collection progressed. I then proceeded with developing categories, modifying those categories, and

identifying major concepts in each case. A brief description of each case and findings will be presented in Chapter 5. I used the same strategy to analyze the data from my participant observation notes. However, these data were used primarily to describe and contextualize the conference and will therefore be presented in Chapter 4 along with the findings from the archived document analysis.

Stake (2006) warned against getting bogged down in individual case analysis and losing sight of the quintain, particularly when there are more than just a few cases involved in the study. Therefore, I used his cross-case analysis strategy that calls for merging case findings to work toward cross-case assertions based on evidence from the individual case reports. I reviewed the major concepts from the findings of each case and identified relationships between those concepts to develop the cross-case assertions. The assertions represent my findings about the quintain, which was the influence on teaching that the Wakonse Conference has on faculty participants from the University of Missouri.

Archived Documents

For the unpublished qualitative report and article by the former attendee, I recorded several pertinent quotations and general descriptive information about topics addressed. Because these two documents were unique in nature, I did not include them in the collective analysis of the archived participant feedback and the previous conference agendas. Instead, I analyzed each document individually, and in Chapter 4 I will present descriptive information about each document.

As I reviewed the archived documents in the Joe Johnston's binder, which primarily consisted of feedback from past Wakonse attendees, I quickly discovered that they were not in chronological order, nor were documents present from each of

Wakonse's 25 years. I obtained verbal permission from Joe to reorganize the documents chronologically, as I felt this would provide a better understanding of the conference over time. I reviewed and catalogued a total of 129 documents ranging from 1990 to 2005, recording a description of the type of document, the author of each document, to whom it had been sent, and the nature of the content. Many of the documents from the early 1990s were handwritten forms that specifically asked for participant feedback. By the late 1990s, most of the documents were printed emails from participants either directly to Joe Johnston or to campus administrators with Joe Johnston copied on the email. The majority of the documents were from the years of 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1997, and 2005.

Joe Johnston's administrative assistant had hard copies of the 1991, 1994, and 1995 agendas, each of which was contained in binders and contained numerous stapled pages. I took digital photographs of each page and inserted them in Word documents for ease of printing and review. All agendas from 2002 through 2014 were available in electronic format for review. Agendas from the other years of the conference were not available in either hard copy or electronic version compatible with current technology. I reviewed all available agendas and recorded information about conference schedule, structure, topics addressed, and supplemental materials.

For the document analysis of the past attendee feedback and old conference agendas, I used the analysis strategy described by Lincoln and Guba (1985), which was modified from the constant comparative method originated by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed the following modified steps in processing data:

1. Identifying units of information that will help to define categories

2. Using constant comparison to develop categories
3. Identifying patterns and relationships between categories

Lincoln and Guba also recommended member checks after the above steps have been completed. Because the archived documents contained information from past Wakonse Conference participants, I did not perform member checks with the original authors of the documents. However, throughout the third and fourth round of interviews, I did briefly discuss the results of my document analysis with current study participants to obtain their reactions to the perspectives of past Wakonse attendees, particularly when there was a common theme between past attendees and current participants, such as the importance of context and the holistic approach of the conference.

Initially, I identified over 500 units of information from the past attendee feedback. Using constant comparison, I developed 13 categories. I then looked for patterns and relationships between the categories and identified five major categories. I used a similar strategy for analyzing the old conference agendas. I began by identifying over 200 units of information, then reduced those units to 17 categories, and eventually developed six major categories of information contained in agenda materials. For the past attendee feedback and old conference agendas, the major categories will be presented in Chapter 4 with descriptions and supporting data.

Use of Conceptual Framework in the Research Process

Ravitch and Riggan (2012) explained that conceptual frameworks can guide data collection, data analysis, and contextualization of the findings. Although many of the questions on the semi-structured interview protocols were very general, such as “Tell me about your experiences at Wakonse,” other questions were developed to address specific

concepts from the guiding frameworks by Desimone (2009) and O'Sullivan and Irby (2011). For example, in the third interview, I asked participants to "Describe specific changes in either the way you think about teaching or in how you plan to teach this semester that you would attribute to your experience at Wakonse" in order to explore concepts presented by Desimone (2009) about faculty development. In the third and fourth interviews, I asked questions that addressed issues of workplace context and workplace relationships to explore the concepts of community and context from the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model. In multiple interviews, I addressed issues related to teaching tasks and other faculty duties, concepts relevant to both models. Additionally, as I was collecting observational data during the conference, I was mindful of concepts from both models and documented observations regarding participants, facilitators, content, context, and conference activities.

After inductive analysis of the interviews for each case and identification of the cross-case assertions, I returned to the conceptual frameworks that guided the study and used them as lenses to help answer the original research questions. I compared case findings and cross-case assertions with the guiding conceptual frameworks. For example, regarding influence on teaching, I compared the findings to the stages of Desimone's (2009) model: core features of event; change in knowledge, skills, attitude, and beliefs; change in instruction; and improved student learning. Furthermore, regarding communities of practice, I compared the findings to components of the faculty development community and workplace community described by O'Sullivan and Irby (2011).

Trustworthiness

In contrast to validity, reliability, and objectivity that are indicative of good quantitative research, the worth of qualitative research can be judged by its overall trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described four elements of establishing trustworthiness:

- Credibility – Confidence in the truth and accuracy of the findings
- Transferability – Applicability of the findings to other contexts
- Dependability – Consistency and repeatability of the research process
- Confirmability – Extent to which findings are shaped by the participants rather than researcher bias, while recognizing that research is never completely objective

Although 3 decades old, Lincoln and Guba's evaluative criteria remain among the most robust ways to establish trustworthiness in qualitative research, particularly in case study research (McGloin, 2008; Morrow, 2005; Shenton, 2004).

Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1985) offered a number of techniques for establishing credibility, and contemporary proponents of their trustworthiness criteria have expanded on those techniques (Morrow, 2005; Shenton, 2004). First, I demonstrated prolonged engagement with my participants over a period of 9 to 10 months. I also established rapport and trust with the conference organizers, who served as gatekeepers and allowed me access to conference participants and archived documents. In addition, I used triangulation by analyzing data from diverse participants and different methods including interview, observations, and document analysis. Finally, I employed member checks

throughout the research process. Because I transcribed and coded interviews as they were completed, I was able to discuss emerging interpretations with interviewees during follow-up interviews and ask for clarification regarding perceptions of their faculty development experiences.

In addition, after the conclusion of the interviews, I emailed participants their respective case descriptions and findings that included information from their interviews to ensure accuracy of my interpretations. Six of the 10 participants responded. All six agreed with my general interpretations of the data. One participant pointed out an error in transcription, and I reviewed the audiorecording to determine a missing word. Two other participants requested minor corrections regarding descriptive information about their faculty roles, and I made those corrections.

Transferability

A rich, thick description is the primary means of establishing transferability, or the ability of readers to relate the findings to their own situations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morrow, 2005; Shenton, 2004). The researcher must provide “sufficient contextual information about the fieldwork sites...to enable the reader to make such a transfer” (Shenton, 2004, p. 69). This concept of transferability was one of the primary reasons for reviewing the archived documents and conducting the participant observation during the 2014 Wakonse Conference. The data gathered through interviews, observations, and archived document analysis allowed me to provide a thorough description of contextual factors for better understanding of the quintain and the individual cases.

Dependability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasized the relationship between credibility and dependability, suggesting that techniques that establish credibility also help to establish dependability. Therefore, the triangulation of multiple data sources contributed to the dependability of my findings. In addition, the details of the methodological processes should be recorded. I kept an audit trail in a methodological journal that included information about the research design and implementation, the operational details of data collection, and reflections on the inquiry process (Shenton, 2004). I communicated with a faculty mentor periodically throughout the research process through both email and face-to-face meetings to review steps of the research process and ensure that I was employing sound methodology.

Confirmability

Lincoln and Guba's (1985) final criteria of trustworthiness addressed the confirmability of the research. "Here steps must be taken to help ensure as far as possible that the work's findings are the result of the experiences and ideas of the informants, rather than the characteristics and preferences of the researcher" (Shenton, 2004, p. 72). Morrow (2005) suggested that many of the same procedures for establishing other elements of trustworthiness are applicable in establishing confirmability. For example, triangulation of sources helps to confirm the integrity of the findings. Furthermore, I reviewed methodological decisions throughout the research process with a faculty mentor. Finally, I clarified my researcher bias at the outset of the study and maintained a reflective journal throughout the study in order to identify personal experiences that shaped my interpretation of the study data.

Research Ethics

This study had little to no risk for participants. Other than the chance of minor emotional upset as a result of discussing unpleasant experiences at the conference or in their workplaces, there were no foreseeable risks. Participants were each provided with a written consent form (see Appendix H) that explained the purposes and procedures of the study. However, per IRB protocol, no signature was requested on the form. Data were de-identified and pseudonyms were used in the transcriptions of interviews. Data were maintained in a locked file cabinet in a locked office in a locked suite. Electronic data including interview transcripts and track-changed documents were stored on a password-protected computer in a locked office in a locked suite. Only my doctoral advisor and I had access to the electronic and printed documents containing raw data from the interviews. Audiorecordings were maintained on a separate electronic data storage device, which was also maintained in a locked file cabinet in a locked office in a locked suite.

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the study focused on faculty members from a single institution, so readers may not find the results of this study to be transferable to institutions with considerable contextual differences. Second, faculty must apply to attend Wakonse, suggesting a personal motivation for improving their teaching skills and other aspects of their faculty roles. Furthermore, the extent to which the conference was advertised may have limited who applied to attend the conference.

Third, the individuals who agreed to participate in the study may not be representative of the larger population of conference attendees from the target institution.

For example, I personally am aware of past participants who had negative overall experiences at Wakonse, but individuals who have positive experiences may be more likely to participate in the study, thus leaving some important voices unheard. Fourth, this study focused only on the self-report of participants regarding influence that the conference has had for them and does not explore the actual changes that faculty may make in the classroom and the impact on student learning. These may be areas for future research but are beyond the scope of this study.

Finally, in any case study research involving interviews, there is concern regarding the researcher being the primary instrument of data collection and the potential for researcher bias to influence the study's findings (McGloin, 2008). However, I entered into this study with nearly 2 decades of experience interviewing clients in a clinical setting, as well as experience on seven different research projects involving interviews in the academic setting. Therefore, I was confident in my ability to demonstrate an appropriate level of researcher reflexivity throughout the research process to minimize researcher bias and instead co-construct meaning with the participants from their faculty development experiences (Creswell, 2013).

Chapter 4: Findings – Document Analysis and Observations

As a reminder, the quintain, or phenomenon of interest, in this multiple case study was the influence on teaching that the Wakonse Conference has on faculty participants from the University of Missouri. Ten faculty attendees of the 2014 Wakonse Conference were selected as the multiple cases to help understand the quintain. Furthermore, this study explored how communities of practice at the conference and in participants' workplaces influenced their overall faculty development experiences. Stake (2006) explained:

Qualitative understanding of cases requires experiencing the activity of a case as it occurs in its contexts and in its particular situation. The situation is expected to shape the activity, as well as the experiencing and the interpretation of the activity. (p. 2)

Following Stake's (2006) emphasis on situation and experience, in this chapter I introduce findings from archived documents that provide an understanding of the history of the Wakonse Conference leading up to 2014 when this multiple case study was conducted. I also synthesize my participant observations from the 2014 Wakonse Conference, with pertinent reflections from the 2010 and 2013 conferences that I attended. I present the 10 cases and cross-case assertions in Chapter 5.

Archived Document Analysis

In order to inform the interpretation of my participants' experiences, I analyzed multiple types of documents related to the history of the Wakonse Conference. In the subsections below, I will provide descriptive findings from the review of old Wakonse Conference agendas, miscellaneous attendee feedback collected by conference director Joe Johnston, a reflective online article from a 2002 Wakonse Conference attendee, and a

1995 unpublished qualitative report of the conference. In addition, I will intersperse photographs that add to the narrative descriptions in order to help readers develop a better understanding of the Wakonse Conference context.

Conference Agendas

I reviewed 17 agendas across the history of the Wakonse Conference. I reviewed each document to determine conference schedule, structure, and topics addressed. I discovered that, even in the early years of the conference, the conference agendas included much more than just a daily itinerary. Conference participants also received several documents that served the following purposes:

- To introduce them to Camp Miniwanca;
- To describe the mission of the Wakonse Conference;
- To introduce them to fellow conference participants;
- To stimulate thought and conversation about teaching;
- To provide resources for future reference; and
- To provide a detailed schedule of events and topics to be addressed.

Camp Miniwanca. Most agendas included a camp map and *Welcome to Miniwanca* page that provided a brief history and an explanation of the camp's values and philosophy. This page also gave Wakonse attendees a glimpse of what they would experience while on the Miniwanca property:

Miniwanca is a place of beauty set apart from the mainstream of life. It is a special place that enables people to grow, learn, and discover who they are and the best that is in them.... For many people, being at Miniwanca is like living in another culture or country. There are words, names, people, abbreviations, customs, songs, procedures, policies, and rules which are unique only to this place. It is the responsibility of those who are veterans to share this information.

By 1995, participants received a one-page *Wakonse Glossary* that defined several terms related to conference facilities, structure, and activities. In order to familiarize readers with the context of the conference and to facilitate understanding of upcoming discussion of archived documents and participant interviews, below I will provide definitions of a few of the *Wakonse Glossary* terms described:

- Chautauqua – Talent show held on Saturday night of the conference that includes musical and dance performances, sharing of poetry, and several humorous skits by conference attendees, including the attendees of the undergraduate leadership conference.
- Community Forum – “Gathering of the entire Wakonse community to present and share knowledge, ideas, and experiences of topics of universal interest.”
Community Forums are held in Upper Tipi, described below. In upcoming sections, participants sometimes refer to these Community Forums as plenary sessions.
- Dialogue Groups – Groups of 8 to 10 conference participants who meet seven times throughout the conference to discuss conference topics as well as other personal and professional issues. Dialogue Groups include one or two discussion leaders and a mix of faculty, professional academic staff, and graduate students.
- Future Faculty – Graduate student attendees of the Wakonse Conference. First included in the conference in the early 2000s, Future Faculty have separate lodging and a few separate meetings throughout the conference, but they also attend most Community Forums, Dialogue Groups, Workshops, and other conference activities.

- Questing – Mysteriously described in the *Wakonse Glossary* as “a ritual practiced by some Wakonse Fellows that lengthens the hours of a night,” this term refers to conference attendees walking into Stony Lake Village to the local restaurant and bar for food, conversation, and beverages late at night after other scheduled activities have concluded.
- Stony Lake Yacht Club – Wakonse nickname for Stony Lake Inn, the local restaurant and bar located in a small village just a 10-minute walk from the camp. The only definition provided in the *Wakonse Glossary* is “where the night is lengthened.”
- Upper Tipi – “Large meeting room with scenic murals, fireplace, and overlook of Grey’s Deck and Lake Michigan.” This building is the site of all Community Forums and several other conference activities. In addition, the adjacent Grey’s Deck “serves as the gathering spot for afternoon sun or for the sunsets over Lake Michigan.” (See Figures 1, 2, 3)
- West Camp – Site of the Wakonse Conference at Camp Miniwanca. Includes two rustic dormitories, the Dining Lodge, Upper Tipi, and several other buildings used for meetings and conference activities. (See Figures 4, 5, 6)
- Workshops – “Presentations that emphasize skill building or provide teaching demonstrations.” Sometimes referred to as Concurrent Sessions, as three or more topics may be scheduled at the same time.

Figure 1. Main room of Upper Tipi building where Community Forums are held.

Figure 2. View of Lake Michigan from Grey's Deck, adjacent to Upper Tipi.

Figure 3. Sunset over Lake Michigan as viewed from Grey's Deck.

Figure 4. Sign at entrance of Camp Miniwanca directing Wakonse attendees to West Camp.

Figure 5. Camp Miniwanca West Camp. Dining hall is on the right; dormitories are in center behind trees; Upper Tipi is on the left.

Figure 6. View of West Camp from the beach. Dormitory is on the left. Upper Tipi located behind sand dune on right.

Wakonse Conference mission. According to introductory conference materials, “Wakonse” is a word from the Lakota Indian language that means to influence, to teach, and to inspire. The *Introduction to the Wakonse Conference* page explains that, “Those who come to the conference are ones who are doing that and want to learn ways to do it better.” Below I provide additional excerpts from the introductory essay that reflect the mission of the conference:

Wakonse brings together those who identify with teaching as a profession. Wakonse creates a climate where it is important and appropriate to display and discuss our teaching talents. Where we learn from one another while coming to learn about ourselves as teachers. Where we can see and consider the tasks and issues of creative teaching in a manner we would characterize as enjoyable. Where providing feedback to one another is a norm and where that feedback is outside of any institutional mandate to improve or to evaluate teaching....To be a Wakonse Fellow, means in the simplest of terms, to be one interested and motivated to promote and share the excitement and satisfaction of teaching with colleagues. To inspire others and ourselves about something we share in common and we have committed ourselves to as a profession regardless of our particular discipline.

The *Introduction* goes on to describe the participatory nature of the conference, explaining that many attendees will serve as presenters, discussion panel members, and in other conference capacities. Furthermore, participants are introduced to the expectation of goal setting, a scheduled activity near the conclusion of the conference during which each participant develops an action plan that may include individual, departmental, and campus goals. Participants share these goals with their respective Dialogue Groups and receive a copy of them in the mail 6 months later as a reminder of their Wakonse experiences.

Introduction to conference participants. Prior to the conference, attendees were asked to submit a brief biography including personal and professional information. These

biographies were compiled into a packet that is included in a folder with other conference materials. The biographies ranged from a few sentences to a few paragraphs, and many of them included information about how many times the individual attended Wakonse and general thoughts about the conference. A returning attendee and 2014 Wakonse staff member explained:

This will be my 4th Wakonse experience and I am looking forward to seeing what this one brings. Each of my previous Wakonses have brought new insights into my teaching and have renewed my excitement for teaching in different ways.

Several first time attendees mentioned what they hoped to gain from the conference. For example, another 2014 attendee stated, “I feel that it is critical to maintain a high degree of student engagement in order for learning to occur, and I am interested in finding new ways to foster student engagement.” Another first-time attendee shared, “I am looking forward to learning more about new approaches to teaching and learning as well as networking to help me develop my teaching career.” A 2014 Future Faculty attendee explained, “I am excited to meet with faculty who have much more experience and wisdom who can help mentor me in becoming a much better teacher.”

At the 2014 conference, I used my biography to help ensure that attendees were informed about my role as a participant observer:

Hello! My name is Crystal Gateley, and I am assistant teaching professor in the MU School of Health Professions – Department of Occupational Therapy, just completing my 5th year as faculty member. This is my 3rd time to attend Wakonse, and this year I will be in the unique role of participant observer. I am pursuing a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis, and my dissertation topic is the influence that the Wakonse Conference has on attendees once they return to their home campuses. I will be taking notes of general observations about the conference, while making every effort not to alter the Wakonse experience for other attendees. One part of the conference during which I will NOT be collecting data is during Dialogue Group, which I consider to be a safe

space for attendees to share thoughts and experiences in confidence. Outside of my professional life, I am married and have two teenage daughters who keep us very busy with their various sports and extracurricular activities. I love the outdoors, and my family spends a lot of time camping, boating, fishing, floating, etc. I LOVE to explore the Camp Miniwanca property, so if anyone is interested in early morning treks through the woods and dunes, come find me! The sunrise over Stony Lake is just as beautiful as the sunset over Lake Michigan!

Materials about teaching. Each set of conference materials reviewed contained multiple written works related to the importance of teaching. Although many of the materials appeared to be for participants to peruse on their own, some items appeared to be related to specific Community Forum discussions. For example, the 1991 Wakonse Conference agenda included copies of a lecture on teaching by Bill Bondeson, one of the conference founders, and a response to the lecture by another member of the Wakonse staff. Bondeson referred to Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Rediscovered* and proposed, "If teaching is to be rediscovered and re-emphasized, it requires an environment of support and recognition. It also needs to be removed from the old dichotomy of teaching versus research." The respondent agreed with Bondeson's statement and provided additional comments in support of teaching:

I believe that teaching is the major function of the University. To average citizens, we are valued less for our books and scholarship than for the ways in which we pass on what we know to their children and grandchildren....We tend to tenure and promote professors solely on the basis of their research and writing. We can count books and articles, but we know that one's worth as a teacher defies simple quantification.

Across Wakonse's 25-year history, each year's conference materials included similar essays and articles about teaching. The 2014 conference materials included excerpts from Parker Palmer's (2007) *The Courage to Teach*, a book that in some years had been distributed to participants before the conference or included on a list of

suggested readings. In addition, 2014 participants received copies of articles discussing large lecture classes, writing statements of teaching philosophy, and the use of strengths in teaching and learning. Participants also received a copy of an essay entitled *We Teach What We Believe* by Dr. Thomas Krieshok, a 2000 winner of the University of Missouri's Kemper Fellowship for Teaching Excellence, which is awarded to five outstanding educators each year (University of Missouri, 2015). In the essay, Krieshok explained, "We teach what we believe. More than that, students learn what we believe." After providing several examples of the positive and negative messages that students can take away from a professor's teaching, Krieshok concluded with the following insight:

When things are not going well in my teaching, I need to look inside at what I am believing, about my subject matter and about my students. I may need to spend more time with either – reading in my area, carving out an investigation of something I really care about, or getting to know my students again, finding out what they are so passionate about that they would make so many sacrifices to come to graduate school. I am convinced that when my beliefs are great, my teaching is great. And when my beliefs are timid, or fearful, or contemptuous, my teaching is discreditable.

Future resources. In addition to materials intended to stimulate conversation about teaching during the Wakonse Conference, the conference materials also included information about various resources that conference attendees could utilize in the future. For example, conference agendas in the early 1990s advertised a Wakonse Fall Renewal Retreat held in Monticello, Illinois. The 1997 conference materials included a flyer about the University of Missouri's Program for Excellence in Teaching (PET). Established in 1986, PET:

offers instructional and career development to MU faculty, graduate instructors, and teaching assistants. Our mission is to provide opportunities for instructors to enhance their growth professionally as teachers. Our program activities reflect MU's commitment to

strengthening the understanding and improvement of the teaching environment and to meeting the learning needs of all students.

The flyer explained that one way that PET supported teaching was by providing funding for individuals to attend the Wakonse Conference. A participant in this study later explained that PET ceased to exist as an institutional entity in the early 2000s because the director of the program left the University of Missouri to take over a similar program at another institution.

The 2014 Wakonse Conference materials included a list of webinars and other online resources provided by the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL), a network of nearly two dozen research institutions across the United States. According to the CIRTL website, the organization's mission "is to enhance excellence in undergraduate education through the development of a national faculty committed to implementing and advancing effective teaching practices for diverse learners as part of successful and varied professional careers" (CIRTL, 2015, para. 1). As in previous years, organizers provided a list of suggested books and articles related to teaching. In addition, conference attendees received a two-page handout from Academic Impressions, an online faculty resource, that addressed topics such as supporting and developing adjunct faculty, communication and conflict management for department chairs, and revising faculty handbooks. Another handout was provided to accompany a conference presentation on using PowerPoint and other technology for teaching.

Daily itineraries and conference structure. Each year, conference attendees were provided with a detailed itinerary listing each day's scheduled activities. For comparison, Tables 1 and 2 provide a sample of the activities scheduled during the 1991 and the 2014 conferences. Please note that the times provided in the tables are not exact,

as many of the activities were actually scheduled for 45 minutes with a specified 15-minute break. For ease of presentation here, these activities are listed in the tables in 60-minute timeslots.

Throughout its first 25 years, the Wakonse Conference included a mix of large group presentations, smaller concurrent breakout sessions from which to choose, small discussion groups, goal setting, free time, social activities, and leisure activities.

Although many of the core features from the first Wakonse Conferences were still present in the conference's 25th year, I noted several changes over time. For example, sometime between 1997 and 2002, Discussion Groups were renamed Dialogue Groups, and Special Interest Groups became Concurrent Sessions. The exact dates of these changes are unknown as there was a gap in availability of conference agendas during this period of time. By 2002, attendees were encouraged to leave their phones and email at home in order to be fully engaged in the conference. Also beginning in 2002, following the establishment of the Undergraduate Leadership Conference that runs concurrently with the Wakonse Conference at Camp Miniwanca, the agendas included a time for team challenges led by the undergraduate students.

Table 1. Daily Itinerary from 1991 Wakonse Conference

	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday				
7:30 AM	Travel to Camp Miniwanca via plane, bus, van, or car	Exercise		Exercise	Exercise				
8:00 AM		Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast				
8:30 AM		Conference Overview	R&R until afternoon. Walk the beach, trails, discover new colleagues, read, church options available.	Community Forum	Break				
9:00 AM		Community Forum			Special Interest Groups (4 options)				
9:30 AM		Reaction to Presentation		Reactions to Presentation	Special Interest Groups (4 options)				
10:00 AM				Discussion Group	Special Interest Groups (TBA)				
10:30 AM		Lunch		Lunch	Lunch	Lunch			
11:00 AM			Solo Time: Goal Setting						
11:30 AM			Special Interest Groups (4 options)			Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Community Forum & Reactions	Discussion Group: Goal Sharing	
12:00 PM								Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Discussion Group
12:30 PM		Arrival & Registration – Meet Wakonse staff & other attendees, find room, relax, walk on beach, enjoy Lake Michigan.	Free Time	Community Forum	Reading, R&R, or time for forming Special Interest Groups	Free Time			
1:00 PM	Special Interest Groups (4 options)						Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour	Social Hour
1:30 PM									
2:00 PM	Free Time						Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour	
2:30 PM			Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour				
3:00 PM	Free Time						Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour	
3:30 PM			Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour				
4:00 PM	Free Time						Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour	
4:30 PM		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
5:00 PM	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
5:30 PM		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
6:00 PM	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
6:30 PM		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
7:00 PM	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
7:30 PM		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
8:00 PM	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
8:30 PM		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
9:00 PM	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
9:30 PM		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	Free Time				Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour			
		Free Time	Special Interest Groups (4 options)	Social Hour					
	 			

Table 2. Daily Itinerary from 2014 Wakonse Conference

	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday
7:30 AM	Travel to Camp Miniwanca via plane, bus, van, or car			Golf or Meditation	
8:00 AM		Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast by Institution – Discuss institutional goals
8:30 AM		Conference Overview	Community Forum		
9:00 AM		Community Forum		Concurrent Sessions	
9:30 AM					
10:00 AM		Community Forum	Dialogue Group #4		Discuss goal setting
10:30 AM				Optional Ecumenical Service	Solo Time: Find a place alone to reflect and write personal / professional goals
11:00 AM		Dialogue Group #2	Community Forum	Polar Plunge	
11:30 AM					
12:00 PM		Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	
12:30 PM					Lunch
1:00 PM	Arrival & Registration – Meet Wakonse staff & other attendees, find room, relax, walk on beach, enjoy Lake Michigan. Turn off your phone and email!	Dialogue Group #3: Teams Challenge led by undergraduate students	Concurrent Sessions: Four topics to choose from for each 45- minute session. Also, Dialogue Group #5 between first and second session.	Community Forum	Dialogue Group #7: Share goals set earlier in day
1:30 PM				Dialogue Group #6	
2:00 PM					
2:30 PM					
3:00 PM		Optional Activities: Golf, Stream Clean, hike, camp tour, run, choir, basketball, zentangle		Optional Activities: High ropes course and climbing wall, horseback riding, trip to local pottery studio and farmer's market, meditation	Concurrent Sessions
3:30 PM					
4:00 PM					
4:30 PM					
5:00 PM			Free Time		Free Time – Engage in any optional activities previously listed, clean room, and pack
5:30 PM					
6:00 PM		Dinner	Dinner		
6:30 PM	Dinner			Outdoor Dinner (BBQ)	Dinner – Served by Wakonse Staff
7:00 PM		Community Forum	Community Forum		
7:30 PM	Welcome and			Chautauqua – Talent show for all conference attendees, including undergraduates	Virtual Wakonse: Slideshow and video
8:00 PM	Conference Overview	Community Forum			
8:30 PM	Dialogue Group #1 & Watch Sunset		Dunes' Tunes – Music Performances		Conference Review
9:00 PM		Board Games			Sunset
9:30 PM	Questing or R&R		Board Games		

Watching the sunset first appeared as an agenda item in 1995. A few agendas over the years included presentations by upper level administrators from the University of Missouri, including a “Who Will Do Science?” presentation by Vice Provost Jeff Chinn in 1991 and a presentation in 2004 by system President Elson Floyd entitled “Expanding Expectations for a University: Research, Teaching, Service, and Economic Development.” President Emeritus Mel George appeared on Wakonse agendas multiple times throughout the conference’s 25-year history. The term “questing” first appeared in the Wakonse Glossary in 1995, and by 1997 the term was listed as an option on the daily itineraries. The 2006 agenda was the first to include separate meetings specifically for the Future Faculty attendees, and these meetings appeared on the agendas each year through 2014.

In the mid-2000s, each Wakonse Conference had one or two specific themes listed on the conference agendas:

- 2004 – “Inspiring Good Teachers to Be Better” and “Expanding the Role for Faculty in the Academy”
- 2005 - “Inspiring Good Teachers to Be Better” and “Rethinking the Role for Faculty in the Academy”
- 2006 - “Building a Community of Support for College Teaching” and “Finding Balance in Life in the Academy”
- 2007 - “Building on Your Personal Strengths” and “Finding Balance in the Life of the Academy”
- 2008 - “Building on Your Personal Strengths” and “Finding Balance in the Life of the Academy”

- 2009 - “Building a Campus Community Around Learning”

None of the agendas from 2009 to 2014 included a specific conference theme. Other conference features that appeared inconsistently across the 25 years were assigned readings and book discussions, assigned topics for Dialogue Group meetings, and suggested seating at meals to encourage engagement with different conference attendees.

Conference topics. For Community Forums, large group meetings in which all attendees participated, the daily itineraries listed specific topics such as “Building a Community of Support for College Teaching” or “Teaching Using Your Strengths.” The topics for concurrent smaller break-out sessions from which attendees had to choose were listed in a separate appendix in the conference materials. Table 3 provides a comparison of topics addressed in both the Community Forums and the Concurrent Sessions across the 25 years of the conference, in 5 to 6 year intervals. The list of topics for each year is intended to provide a general representation of the topics addressed in that year but is not all-inclusive.

Several topics persisted throughout the conference’s history. The following topics appeared on nearly every agenda that I reviewed: student writing, problem based learning, teaching large classes, teaching and learning styles, pre-tenure issues, teaching high-risk and high-ability students, and balancing life in the academy. Other topics appeared only in a few years, perhaps reflecting contemporary issues in higher education respective to those years. For example, the 1997 agenda included topics such as service learning and learning outside of the classroom. The 2003 agenda included recruitment of students, and the 2008 agenda included changing student demographics and student engagement. Student mental health was a new topic in the 2014 conference agenda.

Table 3. Topics across 25 Years of the Wakonse Conference

Topics by Year				
1991	1997	2003	2008	2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Core curriculum • Experiential learning • Faculty & admin relations • Gender differences • High ability students • High risk students • Multiculturalism • Peer teaching evaluation • Problem Based Learning (PBL) • Sexual harassment • Small groups • Student cognitive development • Teaching and learning styles • Team teaching • Tenure concerns • Writing Intensive courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising • Balance in living • Distance education • Diversity • Email for communication • Experiential learning • High ability students • High risk students • Large lectures • Learning outside of the classroom • Learning styles • Mentoring faculty • PBL • Presentation software • Research in teaching • Service learning • Small groups • Teacher renewal • Team teaching • World Wide Web 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balancing life in the academy • Case studies • Computers • Gender and diversity • High risk students • Large lectures • Media applications • Models of teaching in natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities • Parker Palmer's <i>The Courage to Teach</i> • PBL • Pre-tenure concerns • Recruitment of students • Service projects • Student engagement • Teaching and learning styles • Teambuilding in the classroom • Writing across the curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising • Changing demographics • Difficult dialogues • Faculty professional development • Gender and diversity • High ability students • Internships • Large lectures • Mutual expectations • Personal/professional balance • Service learning • Social media • Student / Teacher Relationships • Student engagement • Student strengths • Teaching and learning styles • Women in academia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active learning strategies • Assuming administrative roles • Balancing life in academy • Gender and diversity • High ability students • Large lectures • Mentoring faculty • Mutual expectations • PBL • Peer teaching evaluation • Positive coaching • PowerPoint tips • Pre-tenure concerns • Student mental health issues • Student strengths • Student writing • Nontraditional students • Teaching online • Technology

Technology, in some form or another, was a topic of one or more sessions in every agenda. In the 1990s, the topics included general computer use, email communication, presentation software, and distance learning. In 2008, social media first appeared as an agenda topic, and the 2010 conference included a demonstration of using clickers in the classroom. The 2013 and 2014 conferences included sessions on online teaching and making PowerPoint presentations more effective.

Conference Attendee Feedback

Throughout this study, I had the support of Joe Johnston, the 25-year director of the Wakonse Conference. When I first presented my research idea to him, Joe provided me with a large 3-ring binder that contained numerous Wakonse-related documents from the past 25 years, the majority of which were handwritten and electronic participant feedback. He explained that the participant feedback was reviewed each year to plan for the next conference, but that no one had ever conducted a thorough review of the collective data.

The sections below are organized by nature of the content of the documents reviewed. I will review positive aspects of the Wakonse Conference, attendees' suggestions for improvements, self-reported outcomes of attending the conference, general concerns regarding higher education, and attendees' communications with campus administrators. Unless otherwise specified, the quotations included in the sections below come from University of Missouri faculty attendees, who were the primary focus of this study. However, one of the main features of the Wakonse Conference is that it brings together individuals from many institutions. Therefore, as I reviewed archived documents, I did keep note of quotations made by attendees from

other institutions, including Future Faculty, because I felt those comments provided information pertinent to understanding the history, purpose, and outcomes of the Wakonse Conference. I will provide the year and other pertinent information about the attendee's academic position, if available, in order to provide the reader with greater context for each quotation.

Positive aspects of conference. In general, attendees reported several positive aspects of the Wakonse Conference. They reported gaining valuable teaching strategies from the various Community Forums and Concurrent Sessions, and feedback related to the content of the conference will be addressed in an upcoming section about participant outcomes. However, conference attendees also provided considerable positive feedback about other aspects of the conference including conference structure, context, Dialogue Groups, social interaction with other faculty, interaction with undergraduate students and Future Faculty, and the holistic approach of the conference. A 1992 attendee summarized her experience by saying, "I found the conference to be thoroughly enjoyable and useful. I cannot think of a more positive professional experience I have had since beginning my academic career here at MU just four years ago."

Structure. Several conference attendees reported that the structure of the conference was influential in what they gained from their Wakonse experiences. In particular, they liked the mix of small and large group sessions and the participatory nature of the conference. A 1995 tenured faculty attendee from the University of Missouri explained:

The format of true participant participation seemed to bring out the best in people: compassion, mutual encouragement, receptiveness, camaraderie, and intelligent sharing. These were some of the best days, professionally

and personally, that I have spent since the first day at work as an assistant professor nearly 13 years ago. Wakonse was good, and true magic.

Other attendees appreciated that recreational and social events were interspersed with the Community Forums, Concurrent Sessions, and Dialogue Groups. A 1995 attendee explained:

Having some diversions, like Cherry Point [farmer's market] or queisting or ice cream was nice since it proved to be a good mental break. Concentrating...can still get old, no matter how great it is, so heading out for a break was totally refreshing.

A 2005 Wakonse attendee explained that he appreciated how the conference was structured to facilitate participant interactions:

I very much enjoyed the explicit structure of Wakonse for allowing participants to make connections with others, such as meal seating arrangements, Dialogue Groups, Special Interest Groups. The people I met were the source of much of what I learned at the conference.

Conference attendees were also impressed with the message they received at the beginning of the conference to take some time for themselves and to enjoy their beautiful surroundings. A 2005 faculty attendee from the University Missouri stated, "Here we were in the middle of a conference, in the middle of the schedule, and right away we're told 'it's okay to enjoy the time you're here.' That definitely sets the tone for the entire Wakonse experience." Another University of Missouri faculty attendee from 2005 echoed this sentiment:

I spent a lot of time on the beach during the conference and really enjoyed that and the fact that most nights the entire conference took time to pause and watch the sunset. It just emphasizes that no matter what is going on, we need to take the time and enjoy the journey.

Context. The remote context of the conference was another common theme in the feedback from past Wakonse attendees. In particular, attendees found value in being

away from their usual work environments and surrounded by individuals with similar interests in a context that was different from conferences typically held on campuses or in hotels and conventions centers where work-related demands still competed for their attention. “The Camp Miniwanca environment plus the inspiration from other Wakonse Fellows allowed me to renew old dreams and to discover new views about my roles in academia,” explained a 1992 pre-tenure attendee.

A tenured 1992 attendee described that the Camp Miniwanca environment was conducive to self-reflection, which he believed added value to his overall Wakonse experience:

The Wakonse highlight was the time for personal reflection and inner self rejuvenation. I really appreciated the free time structure in such a beautiful location as I spent a lot of time on the beach enjoying the water movement and stars.

Another 1992 attendee agreed that the context was an important aspect of Wakonse:

The conference offered us the time we rarely take to focus on ourselves – how we function as teacher, as learner, as human being...by placing us in a secluded and pristine environment filled with the beauty of nature, and by providing us with an intellectually stimulating environment that results from the convergence of a group of interested academics who like to talk about the craft of teaching.

Dialogue Groups. Many Wakonse attendees enjoyed their experiences with the Dialogue Groups, the assigned groups that met periodically throughout the conference for smaller group discussion. Attendees reported that the Dialogue Groups provided a way for them to connect with individuals from other disciplines and institutions, and they felt a sense of community and support from those interactions. A 2005 faculty attendee from Texas A&M University compared the Dialogue Group experience to a counseling group by stating, “The dialogue groups had the feel from the outset as a sort of therapy group

session for educators, which I think we all need from time to time.” A University of Maryland faculty attendee who first attended Wakonse in 2004 and then returned as a Dialogue Group leader in 2005 discussed her experiences:

I thought my Wakonse experience couldn’t get any better, but it did. Serving as a Dialogue Group leader significantly altered my experience from the first year. We had an exceptional Dialogue Group that worked hard at listening and sharing in appropriate ways. I can better understand the value of these groups. They provided a thread of continuity – and community – over the five-day experience.

Social interaction. Although the Dialogue Groups provided a scheduled and structured way for conference attendees to interact, many people appreciated the informal interactions that occurred during meals, extracurricular activities, and engagement during and after conference sessions. “The thing that helped me most during the past two Wakonse conferences was the informal environment for discussions. I wish all conferences were as informal as this so that information exchange happens at a very rapid and efficient pace,” stated a 2005 faculty attendee from Iowa State. Additionally, a 1991 University of Missouri faculty attendee explained:

Wakonse’s strength, it seems to me, is the opportunity for interdisciplinary interaction – not so much in the formal sessions, but in the numerous informal settings throughout the week – between experienced faculty and those new to academe. The real energy of the week was generated in collegial conversations in groups of two or three or four. These occasions are nearly impossible to replicate at one’s home campus where competing demands on time intervene.

Several Wakonse attendees also mentioned “questing” as an opportunity for social interaction with others. Attendees described talking and laughing with small groups with whom they walked down the dark path to town, with only a flashlight and the occasional light of the moon to guide their way. A 2005 Future Faculty attendee felt that questing provided him an opportunity to engage with faculty members in a way that he had not

previously experienced. “That night we became educational equals – the barriers between alumni and new Wakonse participants dissolved – and we continued to share our academic and teaching experiences throughout the rest of the week whenever we saw each other.”

Throughout the archived documents, I read several other comments from former Wakonse attendees who felt that social interaction was one of the most important aspects of the conference. The quotation below from a 2005 Kansas State University faculty attendee conveys the general sentiment expressed by many attendees:

The Wakonse Conference was truly one of the most wonderful academic experiences I have had in 20+ years of teaching. One of the most outstanding features of the conference was the opportunity to dialogue in a completely honest, open way with colleagues in an atmosphere charged with emotional connection, mutual concern and appreciation, and share non-competitive, meaningful conversation about our work as educators. I appreciated the chance to share ideas, successes, and methodologies with people of like mind who truly care about their teaching effectiveness, also to spar with those whose perspectives conflicted or raised concerns worthy of the group’s attention.

Interactions with undergraduate and graduate students. In addition to the Dialogue Groups and informal social interactions amongst faculty, attendees from Wakonse Conferences that occurred after the addition of the concurrent undergraduate leadership conference commented that the interactions with those students were very positive and helpful. Several attendees reported enjoying the team challenges led by the undergraduate students on the first full day of the conference. They also appreciated having the undergraduate students come to the Dialogue Groups and discuss their college experiences as well as their perceptions and expectations of faculty. “I loved being able to interact with the undergrads, who were delightful, and listening to their reflections on

effective classroom practices was another tremendously valuable experience,” explained a 2005 faculty attendee from Kansas State University.

Future Faculty attendees consistently provided positive feedback about their interactions with both undergraduate students and current faculty. They found interactions with the undergraduates helpful in regard to their current duties as teaching and research assistants, and they also valued the advice they received from current faculty about their upcoming transition into academic roles. A 2005 Future Faculty attendee from the University of Missouri explained:

Being given a chance to dialogue with faculty members as equals is something I have never done before in my life. The best part of the conference for me was the Dialogue Group, and feeling like I had something to contribute to the conversation. I also got a lot of great and practical ideas from the group and especially the undergraduates when they came to our group.

Holistic approach. Numerous attendees commented on the unique, holistic approach of the Wakonse Conference. During the first day of the conference attendees are introduced to the MPSR symbol that is seen in various locations throughout Camp Miniwanca (see Figures 7, 8). The acronym stands for Mental, Physical, Social, and Religious, although Wakonse organizers stress that the “R” is more broadly interpreted as spiritual rather than religious. According to conference organizers, the symbol was originally intended to remind youth campers at Camp Miniwanca that it is important to attend to all four aspects of one’s life to ensure health and happiness. The Wakonse Conference was structured around this same belief with an intentional mix of activities that address all four components.

Figure 7. MPSR symbol at entrance of West Camp.

Figure 8. MPSR symbol on retaining wall below Upper Tipi.

The holistic approach of the Wakonse Conference remained consistent since its inception, and attendees across the years responded positively to this unique aspect of the conference. An attendee from the third conference in 2002 stated, “The professional conferences I normally attend are not as concerned about the total person as was Wakonse.” Another 1992 attendee expanded on her perceived impact of the holistic approach:

As I sit here reflecting on Wakonse, I see the experience as a composite wholeness – a personal calm – that came from being placed in a setting of such natural beauty, with true strangers who became trusted friends. It was a time of learning and growth that will have a deep and lasting impact. It was an experience beyond monetary value. It was an experience that I only wish all of my colleagues will have the opportunity to experience.

A 1995 attendee was particularly struck by the spiritual aspect of the conference:

Although Wakonse is, of course, non-sectarian, I found it a great encouragement and boost to my specifically Christian spirituality. I expect sincere persons of other faiths, and perhaps agnostics too, would find benefit in such a time of reflection, interpersonal acceptance, and proximity to natural beauty.

A decade later, 2005 attendees had similar observations. A faculty member from the University of Maryland stated, “I feel that the Wakonse planners do well in replicating the Mental, Social, Spiritual, Physical AYP algorithm. By addressing these four themes throughout the conference, participants can find multiple ways to renew.” A University of Missouri Future Faculty attendee from the same year kept a detailed journal throughout the conference, and listed several events from Sunday that addressed the four aspects of the MPSR algorithm. He described attending great presentations, having great Dialogue Group discussions, participating in the Polar Plunge into Lake Michigan, visiting a local ice cream store with other attendees, enjoying the Chautauqua talent show, and taking time to pause at the end of the day to appreciate the beauty of the sunset.

Today's rare treat was my ability to really focus on being in the moment during each of these occasions. Usually I live such a harried, multitasking existence that I rarely taste my food! Today I basked in sensuous blessings. Overall I suspect Wakonse 2005 will be the highlight of my Ph.D. program. I have never slept so little and been so naturally energized.

Suggestions for improvement. In addition to the many positive aspects of the Wakonse Conference described in the previous sections, conference attendees also offered numerous suggestions to organizers to improve future conferences. Suggestions related to general conference features such as who should be involved in running the conference and how information was presented. Other suggestions related specifically to conference structure, topics addressed, and conference attendees. I will provide examples of the various suggestions in the subsections below, and I will also refer back to conference agendas that incorporated some of the recommended changes over the years.

General suggestions. In the early years of the conference, a few attendees expressed concern about the homogeneity of the conference organizers. One female attendee stated, "The 1992 conference was conspicuously orchestrated by an all-male cast. Today's egalitarian spirit calls for more balanced participation." She went on to offer herself up as a future Wakonse staff person to address this concern. Another attendee commented on the irony of having discussions about diversity led by White, male conference organizers and suggested that such discussions would have more meaning if led by minority faculty attendees.

A few attendees also expressed concern about the lack of evidence underlying the conference's content. For example, in 2005, a tenured professor from the University of Missouri challenged conference organizers to do a better job of backing up the conference's content with research, stating:

If there is one change I would make in Wakonse, it would be to push participants to go beyond their personal opinions and ask “How do we know that is true?” Discussion facilitators especially should try to go beyond their personal experience in leading discussions.

Other attendees, particularly in the early years of the conference when many of the attendees were tenured professors, cautioned conference organizers to avoid leading pre-tenure attendees into thinking that they could achieve tenure simply on the basis of good teaching.

Another concern brought forth was that certain events included only a small number of attendees, thus leading to the possibility that others might feel excluded, even if that was no one’s intention. For example, a 2005 first-time attendee described that she “appreciated the openness and welcoming of the staff members, and being invited up to the staff cabin one of the first nights was a welcome note of inclusion that I appreciated very much.” Another 2005 first-time attendee mentioned that he was aware of certain events, like an impromptu beach fire and roasting of hot dogs, but he did not feel comfortable joining in because he had not specifically been invited.

Structure. Wakonse attendees also offered several suggestions for improvement in conference structure, and when reviewing the conference agendas, I discovered that many of the suggestions were incorporated in subsequent years. For example, in the first few years of the Wakonse Conference, bus travel from the University of Missouri took 2 days with an overnight rest stop and campus tour at Notre Dame University. Several attendees recommended one long day of bus travel, and that change was made and continued through the 2014 conference. In 1992, a conference attendee suggested that organizers provide data sheets about each attendee including information such as institutional affiliation, educational background, discipline, academic appointment, length

of time in academia, tenure status, courses taught, research interests, and special teaching techniques:

The idea is not to make preparation for coming more cumbersome or attendance unduly structured, but to give people a faster start on conversations once they arrive, to get to greater depth in the ensuing dialogues quicker without having to establish the basics on each individual from the ground up.

That suggestion was implemented shortly thereafter and remained a feature of the conference through the 2014 Wakonse Conference.

Some early attendees cautioned against overscheduling and recommended that a few Concurrent Session time slots be left open so that impromptu sessions could occur, and I found that suggestion incorporated in subsequent conference agendas. Others recommended more free time for participants to take advantage of exploring the Camp Miniwanca property and engaging in informal interactions with other attendees. A 1992 attendee explained, “As valuable as the free time is perceived to be, I would recommend that ‘Free Time’ or ‘R&R’ be specifically indicated in the program. Then people know that they are expected to partake in the great Wakonse experiences.” Over the years, “Free Time” and “Optional Activities” appeared on subsequent agendas, and the number of optional activities increased from two or three activities in the first few years to five or six options by the 2000s. However, an attendee from 2005 perceived that there were “too many semi-official distractions that begin to overwhelm the conference.” Another 2005 attendee agreed, stating, “The one thing that I felt needed work was the scheduling of multiple events at the same time. You couldn’t do everything, which happens, but can be disappointing.”

One of the unique features of the Wakonse Conference is that attendees are asked to serve as presenters during various conference events such as Concurrent Sessions and Roundtable Discussions. Although attendees have some pre-conference input into topics with which they are comfortable presenting, they are not notified in advance of their assigned sessions. Rather, they find out this information when they get a copy of the conference agenda upon check-in. According to Joe Johnston, this strategy decreases the amount of time and stress that attendees put into preparing a detailed presentation. This strategy received mixed feedback from conference attendees over the years. A 1997 attendee stated, “Advance notice will only lead to better visual aids and demands for projector, etc., that are really not needed.” Another 1997 attendee agreed:

Advance notice may have been of some slight help, but it didn’t cause any major problems since the discussion took on a life of its own after the first 5 minutes. It’s somewhat like teaching without an objective. You just have no idea where you might end up!

However, another 1997 attendee had a different opinion. “Although I see the advantages in almost spontaneous presentation, it does strike me that the participants might derive particular advantage from substantial material (prepared, handed out) that might be useful to them in their disciplines.” In 2005, a Wakonse attendee suggested that conference organizers provide a clear explanation of what is expected during attendee-led

Concurrent Sessions:

The casual approach to asking people to share during Concurrent Sessions minimized their potential as a vehicle for sharing specific ideas and modeling effective teaching skills. I suggest that the intent and format of these groups be made clearer, even if it is only to say that they are intended for the informal sharing of experiences and ideas.

In the early years of the Wakonse Conference, the majority of attendees were either tenured or pre-tenure faculty. By the 2010s, more than half of the faculty attendees

were in NTT positions, and the conference also included Future Faculty, other higher education professionals from academic advising, residential life, and student affairs. With the increased heterogeneity, conference attendees offered several suggestions regarding how the structure of the conference could accommodate the needs of the various contingencies. As early as 1991, attendees suggested separate sessions for “junior faculty, mid-career faculty, and senior faculty.” Although most individuals who provided feedback appreciated that Future Faculty were included in all Community Forums, Concurrent Sessions, and Dialogue Groups, a 2005 Future Faculty attendee from the University of Missouri recommended having a few sessions designated specifically for Future Faculty in order to provide an opportunity for mentorship from experienced faculty attendees:

Mentoring is becoming less and less of the graduate education experience. It seems well suited to a conference that draws faculty from so many different institutions, and all with a love of teaching, to offer a mentoring experience for future faculty couched within the primary focus of the conference: teaching and learning.

All conference agendas from 2006 through 2014 contained one or more sessions designated specifically for Future Faculty.

After the establishment of the concurrent undergraduate student leadership conference, several Wakonse Conference attendees expressed desire for more interaction with the undergraduate students, beyond the student-led team challenges. A 2005 attendee recommended having few meals with assigned seating to intentionally mix together faculty and undergraduate students. Another 2005 attendee suggested that undergraduate students should be invited to attend a few of the Dialogue Groups, stating “While I am aware of the mixed feelings on this issue from both sides, and think some of

the arguments have merit, too little involvement feels a little like the doctor who writes prescriptions without seeing the patient.”

Attendees also had opinions about making the purpose of the conference clear to participants, particularly on the first night when the focus of discussion focused more on conference logistics such as location of meeting venues and meals. One attendee from 2005 suggested providing an opening night discussion of “current buzzwords in higher education, such as active learning, student engagement, and collaborative learning” so attendees would have a sense of what to expect. A 1997 faculty attendee recommended explicitly discussing the opportunity for personal and professional renewal. However, another attendee from 1991 had a very different opinion on this matter:

Maintain the open ended character of the conference. If the objective becomes too precise or the plan becomes too regimented, then the spontaneous exchanges and serendipities will decrease or be lost altogether....I believe that the aim of personal renewal and personal self-evaluation should not be stated – advertising these may preclude them from happening. Avoid striving for products from the conference. The products should be taken home in people’s experiences.

Topics. Of the archived documents that I reviewed, the participant feedback forms from 1991 and 1992 contained the majority of suggestions for additional topics to be addressed at the Wakonse Conference. Attendees suggested more sessions on how to help graduate students develop teaching skills during their doctoral education. In addition, attendees wanted more concrete suggestions about what to do in large lecture classes to engage students. Multiple attendees recommended including more sessions on multicultural, gender, race, and sexual orientation issues in higher education. All suggested topics appeared multiple times in subsequent agendas.

Attendees. Past Wakonse attendees offered several suggestions about who should be participating in the conference. Some wanted to see a larger contingent of math and science educators. Others wanted to see more small college representation. Several people commented that Wakonse attendees were overwhelmingly White and recommended inviting more minorities, particularly faculty from Tribal Colleges and Historically Black Colleges and Universities who could offer different perspectives on diversity. Attendees also voiced concern about the proportion of faculty to other higher education professionals. A 2005 returning faculty attendee from Missouri suggested that the number of non-instructors be limited to just a few per year:

I think having a few non-faculty (like residence life staffers who aren't classroom instructors and aren't headed in that direction) is fine for the conference. But it seemed like there were a lot more of them this year than the past couple years. I would suggest keeping their numbers limited. Although they add their own dimension, having too many of them changes the overall nature of the conference.

Outcomes of attending. In reviewing the archived documents, I gained a better understanding of the history of the Wakonse Conference, aspects of the conference that attendees liked best, and suggestions that they had for improvement. Although all of that information was beneficial in contextualizing this research study, I found the attendee comments about outcomes of the conference to be most relevant in helping answer my research questions about the conference's influence on teaching and how communities of practice in different contexts shape overall faculty development experiences. In the subsections below, I will summarize feedback provided by past Wakonse attendees about changes in the classroom, impact on the campus community, insights gained, and the sense of personal and professional renewal. I will also discuss feedback from the few individuals who did not report significant outcomes from the conference.

Classroom changes. Wakonse attendees listed numerous changes that they made in their classrooms after attending the conference and getting new ideas about teaching strategies. For example, many attendees reported collaborating with students to establish class norms and expectations, set class objectives, and develop grading criteria. One attendee from 2005 described a fill-in-the-blank syllabus that allowed students input on the topics covered in her course.

Faculty attendees also reported changes in student assignments to facilitate deeper learning. Many attendees reported reducing the number of lectures and tests and moving toward small group discussions and student writing assignments. In order to facilitate collaborative learning, some faculty designed peer review of individual writing assignments and also assigned group writing projects. Others designed opportunities for students to observe or engage in “real work.” For example, a 1991 faculty attendee from Westminster College described sending students out to local schools to demonstrate science experiments to elementary school children. Attendees also implemented new technology that had been introduced to them at Wakonse. A 1995 faculty attendee from the University of Missouri explained:

First, I put the syllabus for my Cognitive Psychology course on the World Wide Web. This may seem like a novelty at this stage (I think many students saw it that way), but in the future it will be possible to make all kinds of information (e.g., lecture notes and the like) available to students via the World Wide Web....I’m really excited about the possibilities this technology affords....Second, I’ve been using a computer and Microsoft PowerPoint to present my lectures and demonstrations in the same course. Again, this may seem like a bit of a novelty, but this technology makes possible a number of demonstrations of experimental procedures and tasks used by cognitive psychologists that wouldn’t be feasible otherwise. Moreover, I don’t have to worry about dropping a big stack of transparencies!

In addition to specific changes in assignments and content delivery, attendees also reported changes in how they interacted with students. A 1996 faculty attendee from the University of Missouri - St. Louis described efforts to “harmonize my teaching style with their learning styles.” A 1991 attendee from Westminster College stated:

More than anything, I discovered how important it is to listen and not to speak. I saw and heard too many professors who had too little time to listen to others....Now I profess less and listen more to what my students think and say.

In 2005, a Kansas State University attendee reported making similar changes in how she approached teaching:

The most critical change I’ll be making in my classes has to do with the spirit I foster in students. I’m taking a good hard look at how my tone is in class. Could I adjust my approach to be more enthusiastic in a genuinely passionate way about the opportunities for learning and self-enrichment available to us as we all travel through this class together?

Several attendees also commented on changes they had made to connect with students. A 1991 attendee from the University of Michigan described going to all 16 discussion sections at least once per semester in order to make the large lectures more personal for his 400 course enrollees. Other attendees reported increased sensitivity to classroom dynamics, particularly in regard to gender and cultural differences among students. A 2005 University of Missouri attendee described how interactions with the undergraduate students at the Wakonse Conference changed how he approaches the first day of class:

We invited the undergrads to come to our [Dialogue Group] on Monday and their insight was better than anything we had talked about before in our group. Our main conversation was the first day of class, how to make an impression, and what students expected of us as teachers. I have to tell you, this summer I totally changed the way I approach the first day of teaching...now I take time to find out why they are there, what they expect, what they can expect of me, and a variety of things.

Impact on campus community. Beyond classroom changes, Wakonse attendees also described changes in their respective campus communities as an outcome of attending the conference. A 1991 Westminster College attendee stated, “This conference has spurred a college-wide discussion about curriculum – how to make it more cohesive and effective.” Other institutions reported sharing Wakonse materials and ideas with other faculty on their campuses. In the early 1990s, Wakonse attendees from the University of Missouri established monthly luncheons to discuss topics related to teaching. “A network of colleagues from across campus was formed with whom teaching is discussed regularly in a supportive, non-threatening, friendly atmosphere, both as a large group and also one-on-one.”

University of Missouri attendees described other campus outcomes such as influence on the Campus Writing Program, development of a new “Survey of Majors” course, and the establishment of the Wakonse Residence. The Wakonse Residence was a living and learning community in one of the residence halls, developed around the concept of students and faculty collaborating on projects such as undergraduate research, career exploration, and service learning. As of the writing of this dissertation in early 2015, Wakonse still exists as a Thematic Learning Community within the residence halls (University of Missouri Residential Life, 2015).

Throughout the archived documents, I discovered numerous testimonials from University of Missouri attendees who described a sense of camaraderie and community that came from meeting institutional colleagues who also highly valued teaching. A 1991 attendee explained, “The most important and unexpected outcome has been learning that so many faculty are truly dedicated to teaching and to improving their own ways....a

sense of community across disciplines and universities.” Two other attendees from the 1991 and 1992 Wakonse Conferences described similar outcomes:

Perhaps the greatest long-term value of attending the conference is the relationships established with other colleagues from this institution and the other institutions which were represented. Such relationships enable establishment of a wide-reaching network of those dedicated to enriching the learning experiences of our most important clientele – our students.

For me, one of the real highlights was the opportunity to really get to know superb folks on my own campus with whom I share a number of common interests, but with whom I otherwise would likely never cross paths, and to participate more effectively, therefore, in the building of community back on campus. These connections are the sort of things that will cause the term scholarship to reclaim its real meaning. So, friends, thanks for one of those rare and remarkable moments in life after which nothing is ever quite the same again, and from which one emerges with a commitment that is reaffirmed and refined.

Insights. Many Wakonse attendees described insights about students, teaching, and higher education as a result of attending the conference. A 1991 University of Missouri faculty attendee recognized the need to mentor new faculty and described “a realization that pedagogy must be taught formally and informally to PhD candidates who desire to be college teachers.” The same individual went on to explain how the Wakonse Conference offered a great opportunity for mentoring new and aspiring faculty:

I particularly enjoyed watching the building of enthusiasm of new faculty, the spreading of wisdom of old faculty, and the contribution of new ideas and concerns. I encourage you to continue purposely putting that type of group together. The critical need we have is for us older faculty to encourage and inspire younger faculty. Wakonse is a perfect place to accomplish such an objective.

Another 1991 attendee from the University of Missouri recognized the importance of developing and utilizing a pedagogical philosophy. Many others reported developing new insights into feminist issues, an understanding of teaching and learning styles, and an increased awareness of institutional differences. A University of Missouri

attendee from the 1992 Wakonse Conference described an overall better understanding of how to be a better teacher:

There are many things you can read that tell you how to become a better teacher, but there are different levels of knowing. At the Wakonse Conference, some things that I ‘knew’ came together in an especially meaningful way. I got new insights into problems and saw interrelationships that I had not seen before. The presentations, discussions, and one-on-one sharing of ideas and concerns among the faculty at the Conference made me realize that in order to get students to learn you have to get them actively involved in the learning process. I knew that before, but now I understand it at a more profound level than I did previously.

Other attendees reported insights about students that arose from participation in various activities throughout the conference:

During the Team Challenge, I learned a lot about teaching in the sense that we are always throwing new activities at our students without noticing how difficult some of these assignments might be, yet expecting them to complete them without any difficulties....Each student is different and perceives problems / assignments differently. It’s my job as a teacher to guide each student through the assignment. (University of Missouri – Future Faculty – 2005)

Some attendees described the Wakonse Conference as a “transformational experience” that fostered increased excitement about their academic careers. A tenured University of Nebraska attendee from 1991 stated:

I have become more enthusiastic about teaching and have learned that teaching can be an enjoyable, informative experience. My academic career has been mostly involved with research, and teaching is considered a necessary, time-consuming duty. I was happy to learn that it doesn’t have to be so.

A pre-tenure University of Nebraska attendee, also from 1991, expressed similar insights about his academic career, but noted limitations about changes that he could before achieving tenure:

As a junior faculty member with a long way to go before I'm freer to do what I think is most effective in teaching, the greatest impact the conference had on me was in the area of inspiration, both professionally and personally. There was something unique about the mix of participants and conference structure that allowed intense mentoring, that has significantly influenced my thinking as to whether or not a career in higher education is worth it!! I started seeing myself within an institution as an agent of change rather than a minority swimming against the tide whose only option was to go with the flow or get out of the water. More specifically, I picked up some ideas on how to avoid burnout personally and how to motivate students to take advantage of their higher education.

Personal and professional renewal. As I examined the feedback from previous conference attendees, I developed a code I called the "Re-Factor," a play on the term "X-Factor," which refers to a circumstance or variable that has a significant yet unpredictable impact on the outcome of a situation (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Attendees used a variety of "re" words to explain the sense of personal and professional renewal that they experienced during the Wakonse Conference. For example, a 1991 University of Michigan attendee explained, "The conference renewed and reinvigorated my commitment to teaching. It was a worthwhile consciousness-raising experience."

Another 1991 attendee from Westminster College said, "It rejuvenated me as a teacher, a colleague, and an individual, and brought home to me more clearly than ever how important it is to empower students with the opportunity for hands-on learning." Yet another 1991 attendee from the University of Iowa stated, "The conference provided a superb opportunity for exchange, review, self-assessment, stimulation, and regeneration." Other terms that fell under my "Re-Factor" code included reaffirmation, refined, re-inspired, regeneration, re-energized, rededication, reflection, reinforcement, restorative, refreshing, reordering priorities, and "reigniting pride in being an MU [University of Missouri] faculty member." The following excerpts illustrate the profound impact that

two University of Missouri attendees anticipated as a result of attending the Wakonse Conference:

What a week! Now, two weeks after returning home, Wakonse still burns bright! Teaching is magic stuff. Getting good folks together to talk about it - to share in its joys and frustrations, successes and failures - to be very analytical about it at the same time, to remind ourselves that there are a lot of great teachers among us, however dulled some may have become, and that we can self-sharpen again, all these are among the reasons I am writing to express my most sincere appreciation for your vision in configuring Wakonse in the first place, for support from my own dean, and for including me in this year's class. Neither I nor my classes will ever be quite the same again. (1991)

I feel renewed and energized to make changes for the better in my teaching after attending this conference. I found a group of dedicated, talented, passionate, and compassionate individuals from all over the United States who shared my commitment to excellence in teaching. New friendships were made, professional contacts established and a pool of resources found to help me in my journey to be the best that I can be....The barriers between faculty and students were broken as we interacted and learned from each other. (1998)

Lack of outcomes. Although most attendees reported positive outcomes from attending the Wakonse Conference, two individuals described less of an influence on their academic careers. Although I recognize that there may have been other attendees who experienced a lack of outcomes but did not provide feedback to conference organizers, I found it interesting that the individuals who did report a lack of outcomes were both in pre-tenure positions and described competing responsibilities for research as the reason for not implementing changes in teaching. For example, in 1991, a University of Michigan attendee explained, "Except for individual ideas that I found helpful, I haven't thought too much about the conference. As an assistant professor, too much pressure to think about things other than teaching." A 1995 pre-tenure attendee from the University of Missouri also cited time required for research as an obstacle to

implementing changes in his teaching. “I’m not currently as involved in Wakonse activities as I would ideally like to be. Should the P & T [Promotion and Tenure] process smile upon me next year, I will gladly focus more attention on Wakonse stuff.”

General concerns regarding higher education. In their feedback about the Wakonse Conference, some attendees voiced concern about the state of higher education, particularly the long-standing dichotomy between teaching and research. A 1996 tenured attendee from the University of Missouri stated:

Among the younger people, the pressure to do research and publish came up time and time again in conversations. At least two young faculty members said they had been told bluntly by their department chairs not to waste time on teaching. Such near-sighted pressure raises major concern about the long term future of higher education.

A 1991 University of Missouri attendee expressed a similar concern that faculty were so concerned about evaluation for tenure that they forgot that teaching students was perhaps the most important function of a higher education institution:

I think the main accomplishment for me was the strengthening of the characteristics of tolerance and trust, especially among teachers. We teachers are quite diverse in our approaches and styles. Yet we strive to mightily stimulate student learning. Evaluation of teaching for awards, P & T, and salary increases seems to squeeze the rich diversity of teaching talent through standardized weights and measures. Talking about teaching is an only too rare event around the hallways, in offices, in all the many ways that universities celebrate their daily existence. And when we do talk teaching, the novelty makes one feel and look as if s/he were standing on a soap box, testing freedom of speech! The Wakonse Conference created and strengthened the desire to become better teachers in all of the attendees. It was no less than a rededication to the basic and first mission of a land-grant university: teaching students so that the world will be a better place!

Although many attendees had positive reactions to Wakonse’s emphasis on teaching, a few individuals commented that conference organizers overemphasized teaching without consideration for research expectations, thus sending the wrong

message to pre-tenure attendees. A tenured 1997 attendee from the University of Missouri cautioned:

I think I heard, a little too often, attempts to valorize college teaching in terms that looked somewhat askance at our research obligations. In our group, the idea that one could advance to tenure and promotion on simply a teaching dossier was explicitly floated. The idea is a debatable one...but I do believe that today's tenure and promotion climate makes it unwise to speak, particularly to the untenured, in terms that suggest that a teaching emphasis only will lead to a secure position in the academy. A tragic case in point is the Kemper winner this year who failed to win tenure. I would prefer to see at Wakonse and related gatherings attempts to bring the two worlds of research and teaching into closer dialogue: How can we be successful at both? How can we really make them the symbiotic chemistry they are supposed to be? In other words, let's not talk about teaching in isolation. It is the dual obligation, after all, that separates us from secondary school teachers.

Communication with campus administrators. Several of the archived documents that I reviewed were letters and emails from University of Missouri attendees to campus-level administrators, copied to Wakonse Conference Director Joe Johnston, summarizing their Wakonse experiences and encouraging continued administrative support for the conference. I am not certain if attendees were encouraged by conference organizers to write these letters and emails, or if they initiated the communication with campus administrators on their own.

All of the authors of the letters and emails praised the Wakonse Conference as an excellent faculty development experience. For example, a tenured 1995 attendee stated, "My recent trip to the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching was the best faculty development activity I have had in eleven years at the University of Missouri." The same individual went on to state, "I envision that it might be possible to put the 'uni' back in

university, instead of always working through departments and colleges with their political baggage. The network of Wakonse Fellows can help make that vision a reality.”

A few individuals reviewed specific new teaching strategies that they planned to implement, but more faculty members emphasized the impact on institutional climate and ultimately on the students served by the institution. For example, a 1998 attendee stated in an email to the Provost and Chancellor, “I continue to feel very blessed to be in such a rich environment where faculty and students are supported by administration in their efforts to strive for excellence in teaching, learning, and living.” A tenured professor who attended the 1992 Wakonse Conference explained in a letter to the Provost and Interim Chancellor:

Perhaps the greatest long-term value of attending the conference is the relationships established with other colleagues from this institution and the other institutions which were represented. Such relationships enable establishment of a wide-reaching network of those dedicated to enriching the learning experiences of our most important clientele – our students.

A 1994 attendee from the University of Missouri’s Office of the Registrar and Admissions expressed similar thoughts about the Wakonse Conference in a letter to the Vice Chancellor:

For each of the last four years I have heard from participants how valuable the conference was, but only as a participant myself could I appreciate the potential this event has for initiating change in the campus learning environment. With its focus on students’ learning styles as well as teaching styles, the conference enables teachers to break out of their disciplines and communicate productively and creatively with each other in a very supportive environment. The result is refreshing collegiality, and I saw a commitment on the part of the participants to replicate that climate on campus....Wakonse reassures me of the institution’s commitment to demonstrate that good teaching matters and that students matter.

I discovered in the archived documents a 1997 email from the University of Missouri Chancellor to the Chancellors of the University of Missouri System's other three campuses:

The Wakonse Conference has served as a catalyst for very substantial improvement in the quality of the learning environment for undergraduate students at MU. From a small nucleus of faculty interested and involved in this program several years ago, we now have a fairly large number of faculty who are graduates of the Wakonse Conference. Most of these faculty build in a very positive way on the Wakonse experience to improve their own interactions with undergraduate students. Most important, I believe that the Wakonse Conference and the core group that has grown up around this conference have begun to change the faculty culture – the quality of the undergraduate experience at MU is a major value to these faculty members.

The intent of the letter was not clear. Other archived documents indicated that at least one faculty member from the University of Missouri - St. Louis campus had attended the Wakonse Conference in 1996, one year before this email was written. Perhaps the University of Missouri Chancellor was reaching out to administrators from the other campuses to garner collaboration in planning or financial support for the conference.

I found no letters to campus administrators dated beyond 1998. However, the binder of archived documents did not contain any materials from 1999 through 2004. Several possibilities exist regarding this gap in documents. It is possible that no one wrote to campus administrators about the Wakonse Conference beyond 1998. However, I think it is more likely that either Joe Johnston was not copied on letters and emails, or he simply did not print them out and add it to his binder of miscellaneous Wakonse documents.

Article by Wakonse Attendee

During my data collection process, I obtained an article by a 2002 Wakonse Conference attendee. One of my interview participants, a long-time Wakonse attendee and staff member, provided me with a printed copy of the article during our final interview. The article, entitled “Getting Engaged: Reflections on Professor Camp,” was written by a tenured professor from Eastern Illinois University (EIU), and it was published in the English Department’s online journal of creative expression. I have included discussion of this article as part of my data analysis because it contained personal reflections about the author’s Wakonse experience, which I felt were relevant to this study. Furthermore, in initial discussions with Joe Johnston about this research study, he had mentioned this article but did not have a copy of it in his archived documents.

The author reviewed her Wakonse experiences, key points from several books about college teaching, and EIU’s results from the 2001 National First Year Initiative Survey. Noting that Wakonse was one of several faculty development opportunities she had attended in recent month, the author stated:

Much of what I knew has been reshaped by the experiences and conversations I’ve had over the last year. I see the academic world differently now; what I or anyone else might do with that insight is still open to possibilities.

In her article, the author focused on student engagement, how students perceive the educational process, and how faculty engagement with students shapes students’ perceptions. She recalled her conversations with undergraduate students at the Wakonse Conference who told her that student engagement “involves the professor taking an interest in how well I am doing inside and outside of the classroom.” She also explained that she “had the opportunity to discuss the rather fine line between challenge and

frustration with students who know that I really cared about their opinions.” The author proposed that the structure of the conference and the Camp Miniwanca context facilitated the epiphanies that many Wakonse attendees experienced during the conference:

While at Wakonse, many of us concluded that we naturally experienced these epiphanies because we had all chosen to attend the conference and were thus ready to experience a change in attitude. I now believe, however, that the nature of the conference itself, a retreat into the woods for an intensive four-day experience focused on how we teach and why we teach, makes it a transformative experience.

The author reported that the Wakonse Conference had a significant influence on her both personally and professionally. She had initiated a peer program for new tenure-track hires and was introducing Wakonse concepts to the campus through her role as Chair of the Faculty Development Steering Committee. Furthermore, she was also making intentional efforts to increase student engagement in her courses. She also described herself as more reflective, stating that “lifelong learning must for me extend beyond learning more about my research fields to learning more about my goals and motivations in the classroom.” In conclusion of her article, the author stated:

I’m not the teacher I was when I left for Wakonse last May. I haven’t had the time or the opportunity to change everything I want about the way I go about my work, but I have a far better awareness of what I need to do to make it good.

1995 Qualitative Report of Wakonse Conference

In addition to the old conference agendas and archived participant feedback, Joe Johnston also provided me with a copy of a nine-page unpublished report from 1995 that contained a qualitative evaluation of the Wakonse Conference. Joe explained that the report was used by Wakonse Conference organizers to plan future conferences and to share outcomes with campus administrators in order to continue financial support of the

conference. The study described in the report involved interviews from 15 former Wakonse attendees from the University of Missouri and participant observation by the report's author as a 1995 Wakonse Conference attendee. I include discussion of this document because it serves as yet another opportunity to understand the influence of the Wakonse Conference and to compare attendees' experiences over time. Furthermore, the report included a section on factors that "might impede or mitigate a positive experience" at the conference, a topic on which I obtained very little data from my other sources.

According to the report, Wakonse Conference attendees reported overarching benefits including "the experience of learning about their teaching and connecting in significant ways with colleagues from across campus." However, "the nature of benefits gleaned from Conference experience appears strongly influenced by the primary role within the University of the Conference participant." Pre-tenure faculty appreciated the opportunity to garner advice from tenured faculty in what they perceived as a "safe" environment. Likewise, tenured faculty reported enjoyment from the opportunity to serve in a mentoring capacity and to reconnect with the campus community. Attendees in non-teaching roles reported that the conference helped them better understand the importance of their own responsibilities to students and the overall university mission.

Interviewees in this study described the importance of the Wakonse Conference context and structure of the conference:

With respect to the setting, the isolation of the facility appears to be particularly important insofar that the participants are removed from what many refer to as the 'distractions' of their daily lives. Despite the commitment to teaching excellence reported by those interviewed, both personal and professional demands appear to interfere with the pursuit of thinking, dialogue, and activities that might serve to enhance their pedagogical practices.

Furthermore, attendees believed that the informal nature of the conference, including the expected casual attire of jeans and sweatshirts and that attendees were called by first name only, helped to break down barriers typically perceived by faculty based on academic rank and hierarchy. “In the absences of external cues to identify title and position, respondents noted that conversations and connections were influenced by mutual personal interests and enjoyment rather than according to agenda related to position and rank.”

The author of the report suggested several factors that could impede a positive experience at the Wakonse Conference, including “mitigating external circumstances, both personal and professional, that appear to detract from focus and integration of the Conference experience, as well as coercion or influence to attend the Conference against one’s will or preference.” For example, one attendee had experienced a significant personal loss just before attending the conference. Another attendee reported that she was faced with departmental downsizing, inadequate funding, and job expectations that prioritized research over teaching, thus limiting her potential for positive outcomes from attending Wakonse. Some attendees did not like the rustic camp setting, and one person explained that she had a “miserable set of group dynamics in her discussion section which were characterized by a dominating, opinionated member who went unchallenged by other members.” Another attendee reported that he had been sent to the conference against his will after his department chair identified his teaching as problematic.

Participant Observations

I conducted my official participant observation during the 2014 Wakonse Conference. However, 2014 was the third year that I attended the conference, and my

perceptions from the 2010 and 2013 conferences certainly shaped my experiences and observations in 2014. Furthermore, because attendees must make choices about which sessions to attend and in which extracurricular activities to participate, it is impossible to observe all of the events of a single conference. My collective observations from three different conferences provide a better overall representation of the Wakonse Conference. Therefore, I will include some details from my 2010 and 2013 experiences in the discussion of my participant observations.

In 2010, I had been in a full-time faculty role for just 1 year, and I was getting ready to start my doctoral coursework. My initial impression of the conference was that it was for new faculty like me, designed to give us a good start in our academic careers. I was surprised when I learned that some faculty had attended the Wakonse Conference numerous times. I remember thinking sarcastically to myself, “Did they not get it the first time?”

My 2010 experience was very enjoyable, with the exception of my Dialogue Group, which I perceived to be somewhat akin to a psychotherapy support group, with much of the time focused on a few group members who seemed to have a lot of personal and professional issues to talk through. Although I connected with a few members of my group and felt that my group leader did a good job of redirecting monopolized discussions, I found many of the topics of discussion irrelevant to my NTT role. I attended every scheduled session and got up early most mornings to enjoy some time alone watching the sunrise and exploring the woods and sand dunes of the Camp Miniwanca property. I spent much of my free time in the afternoons and evenings socializing with a group of faculty from my own institution, many of whom were also

School of Health Professions faculty who I had never met, despite our offices being located in the same building. I intentionally avoided spending much time with the one other attendee from my own department, in part because I already considered her personality abrasive based on previous interactions in our work context. When I returned from Wakonse in 2010, my husband said he noticed a difference in my overall happiness. He stated, “I don’t know what they did to you up there, but I like it.”

A few years later, I began to understand why faculty would choose to attend Wakonse multiple times. By then, I was well established as valued member of my department, and my course evaluations indicated that students appreciated the changes I had made to my courses as a result of attending Wakonse. Yet I found myself frustrated by departmental, school, and campus meetings that emphasized the importance of grants and research with little to no mention of quality teaching. I wanted to return to Wakonse to regain the connection I had felt in 2010 with other faculty who placed a high value on excellence in teaching. I also hoped to learn some new pedagogical strategies to incorporate into my classes. In addition, I was well into my doctoral coursework and had begun considering Wakonse as a topic for my dissertation research, but I had not yet formulated my research questions.

Knowing that it might later serve as a data source, I kept a detailed electronic journal of my 2013 Wakonse experience, and I will include details of my 2013 observations and experiences in the paragraphs that follow. At the 2013 conference, I felt much more connected to the members of my Dialogue Group, many of whom had similar interests and professional concerns. I spent a lot more time alone, often declining invitations to go questing with new and old acquaintances. I intentionally spent more time

with the undergraduate students and with faculty from other institutions. I also tried to engage in some of the optional activities in which I had not participated in 2010, such as the Polar Plunge, a tour of a local cemetery, and the Sunday morning Ecumenical service. I returned from Wakonse with new teaching strategies, new University of Missouri contacts, and a firm topic for my dissertation.

I have organized my observations below categorically by features of the conference agenda including Community Forums, Dialogue Groups, Concurrent Sessions, Meals, Optional Activities, Free Time, and Other Scheduled Events. I also include discussion of the pre-conference orientations held at the University of Missouri and the bus travel to and from Michigan.

Pre-Conference Observations

I maintained contact with Joe Johnston throughout the 2013 – 2014 academic year to finalize plans for my dissertation research. My participant observation began during the first orientation meeting in April 2014, where several individuals who had been selected to attend the 2014 conference gathered to learn more information about the Wakonse Conference. A group of 15 individuals met in the basement of the Student Success Center, where Joe's office is housed. I had sent out the first recruitment email just a few days before, and two individuals saw my nametag and offered themselves as participants in the study. During formal introductions, Joe encouraged me to discuss my research, and by the end of the orientation session, I already had 6 volunteers to participate in the study.

When I attended orientation sessions in 2010 and 2013, Joe and other Wakonse staff members explained the purpose of the conference and reviewed many logistics

about travel, lodging, and what to bring. I remember leaving the 2010 orientation session excited but still a little unclear about what to expect. During the 2014 orientation, Joe discussed the conference purpose and logistics, but we were also shown a 3-minute video that included a compilation of photographs from Camp Miniwanca and previous Wakonse Conferences. Many of the first time attendees asked questions related to things that were shown in the video, such as the rustic dormitories and the extracurricular outings. Some attendees smiled about conference features shown in the video and engaged in light conversation with others at their table. I got the impression that the video gave first-time attendees a better idea of what to expect when they arrived at Camp Miniwanca.

For many years, Joe Johnston has hosted a second orientation session at his home one week before the Wakonse Conference. The session is intended as a final opportunity to meet other attendees before embarking on the 11-hour bus trip from Columbia, Missouri, to Shelby, Michigan. Joe and other Wakonse staff members also review final logistical details and answer questions that participants may have. In 2014, after about 20 minutes of eating appetizers and engaging in small talk indoors, we were ushered outside to a large deck where attendees introduced themselves, providing name, department, and academic role. We got through approximately two-thirds of the group before a sudden torrential downpour sent us fleeing back indoors. A few people started to make their exits, but one attendee pointed out that we had yet to hear from some members of the group, so we continued with introductions. Afterward, that same attendee introduced himself to me and offered to participate in my research interviews.

Travel to Wakonse

On the morning of departure, conference attendees from the University of Missouri are asked to meet in front of the Reynolds Alumni Center by 5:30 A.M. to board a charter bus. I rode the bus roundtrip during the 2010 and 2013 conferences. In 2014, in order to ride the bus to Wakonse on Thursday, I would have had to miss my youngest daughter's 8th grade promotion ceremony. Although I was disappointed to miss the bus ride, the emphasis on life balance that I had encountered at previous Wakonse conferences helped me decide that my daughter's event was more important than the opportunity for data collection, particularly since I already had already experienced two other bus trips.

In 2014, although I was not riding the bus to Wakonse, I did still arrive at the Alumni Center at 5:30 A.M. to greet first-time attendees and to help Wakonse staff load the bus. Later that day, I attended my daughter's ceremony, and then embarked on an overnight road trip to Camp Miniwanca with my best friend, who drove my car back home from Michigan so I could ride the bus back from Wakonse. My descriptions below of the bus ride to Michigan are a compilation of memories from my two previous Wakonse trips, particularly the 2013 trip when I kept a journal of detailed observations. I also conferred with attendees who rode the bus in 2014, and they reported similar observations to what I describe below.

During the early morning hours of the trip, many people nap while a few others engage in quiet conversation. During the late morning and early afternoon, conversations become louder and more animated. Periodically throughout the bus trip, designated bus hosts offer snacks and drinks to the Wakonse attendees. The bus stops once mid-morning

for a 15-minute rest break, once midday for lunch at a town with several fast food options, and once mid-afternoon for another 15-minute rest break. By late afternoon, some attendees resume napping and other voice frustrations with the long bus ride. Once the bus exits from the main highway and begins travelling down the rural lanes to Camp Miniwanca, there is a noticeable increase in the excitement level amongst the attendees on the bus. The bus finally arrives at Camp Miniwanca between 5:30 and 6:00 P.M., and Joe Johnston is waiting in the parking lot to greet everyone. Hugs are exchanged with old acquaintances and everyone is greeted with a hearty “Welcome to Wakonse!” from Joe.

The bus is not able to travel down the one-lane path to the main camp, so attendees put their large luggage in the back of a truck, and head out on a 10-minute trek through a hilly, sandy, wooded path carrying other personal items. Many individuals, particularly first-time attendees, exclaim about the beauty of their surroundings. Upon arrival to the main camp area, attendees are directed to a check-in area to receive their room assignments and conference materials. Attendees from many other institutions have already arrived, settled into their rooms, and explored the camp by this time, but due to the impending dinner hour, most University of Missouri attendees have only enough time to drop their belongings in their dorm rooms and rush to the dining hall for the first meal.

Meals

Camp Miniwanca staff announce mealtime by ringing a traditional dinner bell to let conference attendees know that the dining hall (see Figure 9) is open. Wakonse attendees serve themselves meals buffet-style and sit at old wooden tables with approximately seven other people. A few times throughout the conference, attendees are directed to sit with their Dialogue Group members or to sit with someone they have not

yet met. During the majority of meals, attendees are free to choose their dining company. I observed several attendees who sat with the same individuals at nearly every meal. Other attendees made an intentional effort to sit with someone new at every meal. Joe Johnston and the Camp Miniwanca staff used meal times to make announcements about conference logistics and to educate attendees about the self-service expectations of meal place settings, bed and bathroom linens, and clean-up of dormitory rooms and meeting areas.

On the final evening of the Wakonse Conference, the Wakonse staff members welcome attendees into the dining hall with a round of applause and direct attendees to sit at the tables, now rearranged into a long L-shape and covered in white tablecloths. Rather than going through the buffet line, attendees are served their meals by the Wakonse staff. At their place settings, they also receive a piece of pottery with the Wakonse logo as a memento of their conference experience (see Figure 10). Unless they have been told about the event by returning attendees, most first-time Wakonse attendees are very surprised by this celebratory meal, and there is a general feeling of happiness and excitement. During the 2014 conference, I sat next to a Future Faculty attendee from my Dialogue Group, and she said, “Wow! They really made us feel special tonight, like we accomplished something over the last several days.”

Figure 9. Buffet-style dining inside Camp Miniwanca Dining Lodge.

Figure 10. Commemorative pottery given to attendees of Wakonse Conferences.

Community Forums

The 2014 Wakonse Conference included nine different Community Forums, large group meetings intended for all conference attendees. Held in Upper Tipi, attendees wandered into the Community Forum sessions, many people chatting in small groups while others explored the Wakonse memorabilia available for purchase. The first few

Community Forums were inspirational and motivational in nature, while the later Community Forums addressed pedagogical topics such as problem based learning and teaching high ability students. During the first Community Forum on Friday morning, Bill Bondeson, one of the Wakonse founders, was introduced and provided a lecture on the topic of “Building a Community of Support for College Teaching.” Based on my review of the old Wakonse agendas and my own experiences in 2010 and 2013, Bill’s message has remained the same throughout the conference’s history.

Bill talked first about the “magic of Miniwanca” and explained that Wakonse Conference is structured on the basis of the MSRP algorithm. He also emphasized, “We don’t have big speakers. We rely on the synergy, enthusiasm, and ideas of those who are here. We learn from one another.” Bill also talked about whether or not the Wakonse Conference has met the objectives set by the founders 25 years prior. “Have we changed the commitment of individual teachers? Absolutely. What we haven’t done is change the culture of support, encouragement, and nurturing for teaching.”

Bill discussed the ongoing dichotomy between research and teaching. “Researchers look out their windows and see these little creatures called students walking by.” He also opined that “this is not a good time for the academy,” citing concerns about the budget, financial support from the state legislature, and the decrease in proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty over the past few decades. “Being an assistant teaching professor is not a great life,” he stated. My academic title at the time of the 2014 Wakonse Conference was assistant teaching professor, and I found myself frustrated by his assumption, as I love my teaching position and feel that I have considerable autonomy and job security. In the handwritten journal of observations that I was keeping, I

scribbled, “WHAT?!” next to his quotation. I observed several other attendees raise their eyebrows and whisper to neighbors in response to his statement.

Bill drew the crowd back in with a few jokes and some profound reminders about the importance of teaching. I noticed that other attendees write down some of the same quotes that I did, including, “For many of our students, we are their only image for what our discipline is” and “When our love and their need come together, that is where true teaching happens.” Bill ended his lecture with the same questions that he has been asking for years to challenge attendees: “You had a great time at Wakonse. So what? What are you going to do about this when you get home?”

Craig Benson, Director of Career Exploration and Strengths Development at the University of Missouri and director of the undergraduate leadership conference at Wakonse, led the second Community Forum of the day, entitled “Teaching Using Your Strengths.” Prior to the conference, all selected attendees were asked to complete an online survey through the StrengthsQuest™ program, which identifies an individual’s “top five talent themes, along with action items for development and suggestions about how you can use your talents to achieve academic, career, and personal success” (Gallup Inc., 2010, para. 2). Craig reminded attendees of the Camp Miniwanca motto “My Own Self, At My Very Best, All the Time,” which is posted in various locations throughout the camp (see Figures 8, 11). Craig asked attendees, “What would it mean for you to translate that into the classroom?”

Figure 11. Camp Miniwanca motto on sign near exit of West Camp.

Craig asked attendees to talk briefly with a neighbor about a time in the past semester when they felt particularly engaged in the classroom and then provided the group with suggestions about using their strengths in teaching. He also provided attendees handouts with detailed action items for teaching related to their personal top five talent themes. Most attendees simply placed the handouts in their agenda folders, but during the break I observed several first-time attendees reading through the handouts and engaging in conversation with each other about the suggestions.

Mel George, President Emeritus of the University of Missouri, led another Community Forum entitled “Lighting the Fire.” He encouraged conference attendees to “take a reasonable risk” in their academic careers and personal lives. “Always look through a door that opens. You don’t have to walk through it, but at least look.” He also discussed a change in the emphasis in the presentations at Wakonse that he had observed over the years of his involvement with the conference. He explained that the early years

of the conference focused more on content and disciplinary concerns, and that the Wakonse Conference had evolved to place more emphasis on teaching as imparting a passion for learning. “We make a mistake if we think about teaching as anything other than lighting a fire for learning.” He also recalled something that a previous attendee of the Wakonse undergraduate leadership conference had said. ““What you think of me as a student makes a difference in what I learn.””

Although I did not count the exact number of attendees at each Community Forum, I did notice a drop off in attendance from the Community Forums on Friday to those scheduled on Saturday and Sunday. Many of the individuals who did not attend were returning conference attendees. Some of the topics, such as PBL, teaching high ability students, and positive coaching, had been offered in recent years, so it is possible that returning attendees did not feel a need to attend those presentations again. However, the inspirational Community Forums on Friday were also similar to the presentations in recent years, yet attendance at those sessions was very high.

During one of the Community Forums, a schedule adjustment was made because conference planners had inadvertently left off a topic intended to be scheduled for a Community Forum. Two returning Wakonse attendees gave an abbreviated presentation of their “Rock the First Day” concept, which encourages faculty to get their students engaged immediately during the first day of class rather than simply reviewing the syllabus. This topic had been included on the previous year’s agenda and the presenters were given more time. In 2014, their presentation was rushed because they were trying to allow the speaker scheduled for that session adequate time to complete his presentation. I

overheard several first-time attendees saying that they wished more time had been devoted to the “Rock the First Day” presentation.

Dialogue Groups

Wakonse attendees are assigned to a Dialogue Group. Joe Johnston reported that conference organizers attempt to create groups that represent different institutions and disciplines. Because Dialogue Groups are considered a “safe space” in which to share personal and professional problems, I chose not to report anything from my participation in these groups that would be attributable to a particular individual. I experienced a different Dialogue Group dynamic at each of the three Wakonse Conferences that I attended. In 2010, I did not look forward to attending the sessions. I felt most connected to my 2013 group members and enjoyed each of our meetings. In 2014, I missed the first Dialogue Group meeting on Thursday night due to my delayed arrival, and a few other members skipped group meetings later in the conference. Although I enjoyed our sessions, I did not feel the same level of connection to the group that I did in 2013. However, I found myself particular drawn to an international graduate student from another institution who was eager to learn everything she could from those around her. We spent a lot of time together during the free time and optional activities and maintained occasional communication after the conference.

Most of the attendees who I interacted with in 2014 reported positive impressions of their Dialogue Groups. However, I also heard stories of individuals who monopolized group conversations or brought up controversial topics that resulted in other group members feeling uncomfortable in sharing their beliefs and opinions. Those stories reminded me of my 2010 Dialogue Group experience. Additionally, in my 2013 Wakonse

journal, I noted that my roommate at the conference reported having a “miserable Dialogue Group experience,” and she skipped at least a few of the sessions “because I just can’t stand to listen to such self-absorbed people.”

Concurrent Sessions

The 2014 Wakonse Conference offered six different sets of concurrent sessions, with each 45- to 60-minute session focused on a pedagogical strategy or current issue in higher education. For example, pedagogical topics included using mindfulness strategies in the classroom, teaching nontraditional students, using interdisciplinary group projects, evaluating student writing, instructing large classrooms, and using technology in and out of the classroom. Other sessions addressed pre-tenure issues, peer teaching evaluations, balancing life in the academy, mentoring students and faculty, assuming administrative roles, and dealing with student mental health issues. In my own experiences as both an attendee and leader of concurrent sessions, I observed sessions that had anywhere from just a few attendees to so many that some attendees had to stand because there were not enough seats in the scheduled room. A few leaders of the concurrent sessions arrive at the Wakonse Conference with handouts or other visual aids, but most presenters simply facilitate a small group discussion about their respective topics.

In both 2013 and 2014, conference organizers scheduled 60-minute “Speed Connecting” sessions involving 12 roundtable discussions. Each discussion lasted approximately 30 minutes, thus allowing attendees to select two roundtable discussions in which to participate. During both years, I observed some roundtable discussion leaders sitting alone at their assigned tables with no discussion participants. Those leaders eventually left the session or joined another roundtable discussion. Several of the

roundtable discussion topics had also been included as Concurrent Sessions, and I heard several participants say, “I already went to another session on that topic.” I also heard a few of the assigned roundtable discussion leaders question why they had been scheduled to present on the same topic multiple times. I estimated that at least one-third of Wakonse attendees skipped the roundtable discussions entirely.

Optional Activities

The 2014 Wakonse Conference agenda included the following options for activities on Friday, Sunday, and Monday afternoon: golf, Zentangle, canoeing / stream clean, cemetery tour, camp tour / hike, group run, basketball, choir practice, high ropes course, horseback riding, farmer’s market, pottery studio, and meditation. The optional activities were similar to those offered in the other years that I attended Wakonse. The high ropes course (see Figures 12, 13) typically draws a large contingent of Wakonse attendees, and most individuals, particularly those who have not previously participated in a high ropes course, return to camp exhilarated by their experiences. The canoeing and stream clean activity offers faculty another opportunity for interaction with the undergraduate students as students and faculty are paired in each canoe.

Figure 12. Camp Miniwanca high ropes course.

Figure 13. Wakonse Conference attendee on high ropes course.

In 2014, I was persuaded by my new Future Faculty friend from my Dialogue Group to go horseback riding. She had never been on a horse before and described being “somewhere between terrified and excited” at the opportunity. Although I had been on a horse several times before, I found the experience very enjoyable, particularly as I watched my friend struggle initially and then gradually master a new skill. I noted in my journal that the experience reminded me of working with students. “I often present them with challenging tasks, but a little encouragement and praise along the way can make such a difference in their learning.”

Free Time

The Wakonse Conference agenda included several times designated as “Free Time.” In addition, some conference attendees skipped the optional activities or scheduled sessions to take time for themselves. I observed attendees walking on the beach, some alone and some with one or two friends. I saw others exploring the many wooded paths of Camp Miniwanca, and small groups sitting on benches or on the beach chatting with one another.

Some attendees quickly tired of the camp food offered in the dining hall and instead walked to Stony Lake Inn for a restaurant meal. There was also a small convenience store in Stony Lake that served hand-scooped ice cream from a local dairy, and I saw several attendees getting ice cream and sitting at picnic tables in the nearby park with other attendees.

Although Wakonse attendees were encouraged to “disconnect” from cell phones and computers during the conference, the Wakonse staff provided four computers for attendees to use as needed to check email and complete other work and personal tasks.

Those four computers were occupied during most breaks and free time. Most people had no cell phone service in the main part of Camp Miniwanca, but many attendees took short walks into Stony Lake or to the top of a sand dune to acquire a signal and call or text loved ones. In 2010, I initially tried to give up my cell phone and email completely, but I quickly realized that I would have a more enjoyable experience at Wakonse if I checked in with my family at least once daily and checked work emails at least once daily to avoid having dozens of emails to sort through upon my return. For the last few days of the 2010 conference and throughout the 2013 and 2014 conferences, I texted or called my husband and daughters at least once daily, and I checked my work email either early in the morning or late in the evening.

Other Scheduled Activities

In addition to the Community Forums, Dialogue Groups, Concurrent Sessions, Optional Activities, and Free Time described above, the conference organizers included several other activities in the agenda that provided professional development experiences unique to Wakonse. Some of the activities gave conference attendees opportunities to discuss ideas presented at the conference while other activities were entirely social in nature. I will discuss my observations of each of these events below.

Interaction with undergraduates. On Friday, the Wakonse undergraduate students led the Dialogue Groups in a series of team challenges. They began with an activity for the entire group called “Bear, Ninja, Cowboy,” similar to Paper, Rock, Scissors, but with charades. The activity had most people laughing and cheering as attendees were knocked out one at a time until one attendee was declared the champion. Other activities included trying to complete drawing tasks with verbal cues but no visual

cues, and attempting to form designated shapes with string while blindfolded, with only some group members allowed to speak. Each of the activities was concluded with a brief discussion about how the activity could serve as a metaphor for the teaching and learning process.

During the student-led activities, I was particularly aware of an attendee who used a wheelchair for mobility. Many of the activities included a significant physical component and were intended to be completed outdoors. The students in charge of her Dialogue Group selected several activities that could be completed indoors where she had more freedom of mobility and modified the activities to maximize her inclusion. However, she was still left out of a few activities. Furthermore, because Camp Miniwanca is not accessible, she had difficulty navigating several other camp locations throughout the conference, despite her ability to walk short distances with crutches. Again, I was left wondering about the exclusion of certain Wakonse attendees.

On Saturday, the undergraduate students were invited to attend one of the Dialogue Group sessions, with three to five students in each of the groups. During this session, students and faculty discussed the concept of “mutual expectations,” which encourages faculty to go beyond laying out course expectations to students in their syllabi and to ask the question, “What do you expect from me as an instructor?” Students reported that simply being asked that question made a huge impression on them. Students also reported that their learning was influenced by whether they felt the instructor was passionate about the subject and cared about students. In addition, students stated that they did not mind high expectations as long as instructors were clear in their expectations.

The undergraduate students were encouraged by their leadership conference leader to invite a faculty or Future Faculty member to lunch or dinner as an opportunity for one-on-one discussion. The students and their selected faculty members met in the Camp Miniwanca dining hall during a regularly scheduled meal. I heard multiple attendees describe the experience as “amazing” and “eye-opening.”

Questing. I learned during the 2010 Wakonse Conference that “questing” was the nickname for late night gatherings at the Stony Lake Inn for drinks and social interaction. Questing was listed only on Thursday night of the 2014 Wakonse agenda, although each night of the conference I observed several attendees heading to Stony Lake Inn after the day’s scheduled events had concluded. Although I went questing with other attendees several times in 2010, in 2013 I only went on the final night of the conference.

I realized in 2014 that questing was not understood by all attendees, particularly first-time attendees whose primary language was not English. On Sunday afternoon, after returning from horseback riding, I walked into Stony Lake with a small group of people, three of whom were originally from India. One of them asked me, “What is the questing thing that so many people do at night?” I explained that it just meant going to the bar. He replied, “Oh, well, I do not drink so it is good that I have not gone.” I further explained that anyone was welcome to accompany the groups that go, that a formal invitation was not necessary, and that many people just order food and water, iced tea, and other non-alcoholic beverages. “So it is OK if I go and do not drink?” he asked for clarification. I assured him that was indeed the case and invited the group I was with to go questing later that evening with me. They all readily accepted and that night we enjoyed soft drinks and fried asparagus, a favorite food among the Michigan locals. However, I was left

wondering how many other people had felt confused or excluded by the questing ritual. This occurrence also heightened my awareness of the lack of diversity at the Wakonse Conference, and that the few individuals from minority populations appeared to be excluded, perhaps inadvertently, from some conference activities.

Dunes tunes. On Saturday evening, a group of about 30 attendees gathered in Upper Tipi to enjoy the musical talents of other Wakonse attendees. The Wakonse staff had wine and cheese available throughout the performances. I noticed that after the performance, one of the Wakonse founders asked an attendee, who happened to be one of my study participants, to help carry the items back to the Danforth House. The Danforth House is a residence on the Camp Miniwanca property where several of the Wakonse staff stayed throughout the conference. It is located in a secluded area of the camp, away from the dormitories and meeting locations.

When I attended Wakonse in 2010, I was unaware that the house even existed or that the Wakonse staff did not sleep in the dormitories with the rest of the attendees. In 2013, my roommate and I were invited up to the residence by one of the conference staff after the musical performances, and I got the impression that we were supposed to feel privileged to learn about this secret location. I remember feeling out of place, like some of the staff were wondering why we were there. Based on my observations and discussions with other attendees in 2014, I believe that most first-time attendees, and perhaps some returning attendees, do not know that the Danforth House exists unless they are one of the few to have received a personal invitation to the residence by one of the Wakonse staff.

Ecumenical service. On Sunday morning, an Ecumenical service was held at the Church of the Dunes, a rustic open-air facility in a wooded section of Camp Miniwanca (see Figure 14). In 2010, I was unable to locate the church, could not locate my camp map, and could not find anyone to tell me how to get there, so I missed the service. I attended the service in both 2013 and 2014. There were approximately 50 students, faculty, and Wakonse staff in attendance both years. A member of the Wakonse staff explained that the service was structured similar to Quaker meetings in which attendees gather in silence until someone feels moved to share a story, read a poem, or ask others to join them in singing a song. The pews of the church contained fragile, musty hymnals from the 1930s and some attendees selected readings and songs from the hymnals. In addition, attendees who had volunteered to be part of the Wakonse Choir sang a few songs they had rehearsed.

Figure 14. Church of the Dunes.

Polar plunge. Shortly after the conclusion of the Ecumenical service, most Wakonse attendees gathered on the beach near the main camp and prepared for the Polar Plunge (see Figures 15, 16). Each year approximately 20 conference attendees, mostly undergraduates and few brave faculty members, dash into Lake Michigan just long enough to fully immerse themselves in the cold water, while the other conference attendees laugh and cheer them on. Having an extreme dislike for cold temperatures, I was a bystander in 2010 and 2014, but in 2013 I intentionally tried several things at Wakonse that I had never done before, including the Polar Plunge. Each participant in the Polar Plunge received a commemorative t-shirt (see Figure 17), and many individuals wore them during the final days of the conference.

Figure 15. Wakonse attendees preparing for Polar Plunge.

Figure 16. Wakonse attendees participating in Polar Plunge.

Figure 17. Commemorative t-shirt from Wakonse Polar Plunge.

Chautauqua. Chautauqua is the annual talent show held on Sunday night at each Wakonse Conference. The 2014 talent show included musical performances, poetry, skits, personal reflections, and a group dance performance by the undergraduate students. I saw similar types of performances during my other Wakonse Conferences, as well as martial arts performances and sharing of rituals from attendees' various cultures. During the three Chautauquas that I attended, I witnessed a roller coaster of emotions. I saw attendees moved to tears over particularly inspirational stories, poetry, and musical performances. I saw people who were typically shy and reserved get up and dance with other attendees when the undergraduate students and other performers encouraged everyone to participate in a particular dance. I saw attendees in tears for a second time, this time because they were laughing so hard at the comical skits, many of which made fun of Wakonse staff and conference features, such as Dialogue Groups and StrengthsQuest. The timing of Chautauqua seems well placed in the overall conference agenda, occurring after 3 busy days of conference activities. By that time, most attendees have become familiar with several other attendees and appear very comfortable laughing and crying with each other.

Breakfast by institution. On the final morning of the conference, attendees were asked to meet with others from their institution to discuss "how to take Wakonse home" and to set institutional goals. I do not have any specific memories regarding this session in 2010, but I had a particularly negative perception of the 2013 institutional meeting. This is an excerpt from the journal I kept that year, written immediately after the conclusion of the meeting:

I am so ready to go home! I'm glad I wrote my goals last night when I was in the right mind set for it. All of the positive energy of my experience at Wakonse was sucked away in a 90-minute "Breakfast by Institution" meeting in which we were to develop plans for how to take Wakonse back to our campus. I got to witness the White male dominance in higher education that I have often read about in my ELPA coursework. There were several first-time Wakonse attendees who had ideas (some good, some not so good in my opinion), but two older White males in the room shot down every idea that was raised. I left that session very frustrated. No, that's not true. I was angry! And, the undergraduates had been invited to this meeting. They were not included in the discussion. In fact, their presence wasn't even acknowledged and they ended up leaving.

In 2014, the institutional discussion was less contentious and more productive. A returning attendee encouraged everyone to send positive feedback about Wakonse to the Provost and Chancellor, a suggestion that I had heard at the previous conferences I attended. Others suggested events to help the 2014 University of Missouri attendees stay in touch, such as a "Rock the First Day" gathering to share ideas on how to engage students on the first day of class and teaching workshops for graduate students led by Wakonse faculty attendees. Another person suggested that Wakonse should be involved in the planning for the Center for Teaching Excellence that had been proposed by the Chancellor the previous week at a campus teaching conference. An individual who had been involved with the conference for many years suggested the need for conference evaluation to present to campus administrators. Joe Johnston mentioned my dissertation research, but several others dismissed qualitative research as ineffective in communicating Wakonse's influence on conference attendees to administrators. "What we need are numbers. We have to develop a scale." A small group volunteered to work on creating such a scale to be used in surveying former Wakonse attendees.

Solo time for goal writing. After the institutional meeting, Wakonse attendees were encouraged to "find a favorite place where you can be alone" to write personal and

professional goals on a carbon copy form that was in their folders. Attendees were instructed to keep one copy in order to share their goals with their Dialogue Group members and to place the other copy in a self-addressed stamped envelope that would be mailed to them the following January as a reminder. In 2010, I walked about a mile down the beach and found a sunny spot on a sand dune to write my goals. In 2013 and 2014, I wrote my goals the night before the scheduled time to do so, hoping to have more free time the next day. In my Dialogue Groups, I heard goals that ranged from incorporation of specific pedagogical strategies to a total change in approach to teaching.

Virtual Wakonse. A few designated Wakonse staff members take candid pictures and video clips throughout each conference, and the pictures are set to music for the Virtual Wakonse presentation that occurs on Monday night. Like Chautauqua the night before, this event brings out a variety of emotions in the conference attendees. At the three Wakonse Conferences I attended, I saw attendees laughing and applauding at some of the funny moments that had been caught on camera, then wiping away tears a few minutes later as they enjoyed photographs of the picturesque Camp Miniwanca setting. Immediately after the conclusion of Virtual Wakonse, all Wakonse attendees gathered in Council Circle (see Figure 18) for a brief conference wrap-up by Joe Johnston and to say goodbye to their fellow attendees. Wakonse attendees typically depart from Camp Miniwanca in the early morning hours on Tuesday, so Virtual Wakonse and the gathering in Council Circle are the final group events of the conference.

Figure 18. Council Circle.

Return Bus Trip

University of Missouri attendees were asked to have their luggage ready and be on the bus by 5:45 A.M. on Tuesday morning to begin the long drive back to Missouri. Many attendees had been out late the night before, questing after Virtual Wakonse and the closing ceremony in Council Circle, and went straight back to sleep for several hours after boarding the bus. After the mid-morning rest stop, the noise level on the bus picked up as most attendees were engaged in conversations with their seat partners and others nearby. Knowing that it would be difficult for many of my participants to find time for the interviews once we returned to our busy workplaces, I completed five of my second-round interviews during the bus trip. Interestingly, the group that had volunteered to create a survey to collect quantitative data about the Wakonse Conference sent around a notebook asking each person to write down something they intended to do differently as a result of attending the conference, in effect gathering more qualitative data.

Chapter 5: Cases and Cross-Case Assertions

The analyses of the archived documents and participant observations described in the previous chapter serve to provide the reader with a contextual basis for understanding the quintain, or phenomenon of interest of this study: the influence on teaching that the Wakonse Conference has on faculty participants from the University of Missouri. In this chapter, I introduce the 10 individual cases and discuss the cross-case assertions that arose through merging individual case findings. I also discuss notable differences among the cases that were identified during the development of the cross-case assertions. Finally, I conclude with a summary of the findings across data sources.

Table 4 lists characteristics of each of my study participants including demographics, designation of faculty role, length of time in a faculty position, and the number of Wakonse Conferences attended. In an effort to minimize the likelihood of identification of individual participants, I chose to provide information regarding their academic homes in aggregate form only. My 10 participants represented nine different departments, programs, and units across seven different disciplines throughout six schools and colleges at the University of Missouri:

- College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources
- College of Arts and Science
- Trulaske College of Business
- College of Education
- School of Health Professions
- Honors College

One of the features of the Wakonse Conference is that nametags include only the attendee's name and institutional affiliation, without designation of academic title. In keeping with the Wakonse tradition, I present the cases below using only first name pseudonyms. Eight of my participants selected their own pseudonyms during the final interview, ranging from family members' names, to favorite television and movie characters, to famous people in their disciplines. Two participants expressed no preference for pseudonym.

Table 4. Participant Characteristics

Participant Pseudonym	Sex	Race	Designation of Faculty Role	Years in a Faculty Position	Number of Times Attended Wakonse
Rocco	Male	White	NTT	1	1
Dylan	Male	White	Pre-Tenure	2	1
John	Male	White	NTT	1	1
Delores	Female	White	NTT	15	15
Sumita	Female	Asian	NTT	1	1
Wayne	Male	White	Tenured	19	15
Emma	Female	Black	NTT	3	1
Richard	Male	White	NTT	8	1
Lewis	Male	White	Tenured/Retired/Now NTT	35	10
Anne	Female	White	NTT	3	1

Rocco

Rocco was in his first year of an NTT faculty position in a new online graduate program that was experiencing rapid growth in enrollment. He had previous classroom teaching experience with undergraduate students in the Honors College and described that experience as “the single largest quantity of joy I’ve had in my life professionally because it aligned perfectly with my values, and it’s the most fun I’ve ever had.” He explained that the joy he took from that teaching experience stemmed from:

just being in the classroom, being in a small, intimate setting, and having this crazy responsibility of being called a teacher. Imparting knowledge and spurring curiosity and having this dialectic relationship between teaching and learning and student and teacher. For me, it was life forming, it was transforming, it was purposeful and meaningful and it was like this identification of passion. Like this is what I want my life's work to be.... It was my first experience in a college classroom per se, where you're not a G.A., you're not a T.A. You're solely responsible for curriculum, you're solely responsible for syllabus and such.

In contrast, Rocco expressed a lack of job satisfaction with his current online instructional duties as assistant teaching professor. "It's all online. I'm not in the classroom. I don't have autonomy with the curriculum.... There's not a lot of ownership in it, and not a lot of identity in it. And quite frankly, there's a huge reduction in passion." He explained that several people had recommended that he go to Wakonse "because it seems like my values align with the Wakonse philosophy." During the first interview, he explained that he was looking forward to his first Wakonse Conference because it was in Michigan and he considered that state "my second home" after spending a few years there with a previous job. He also saw Wakonse as a possible "lifeline to the passion" that he was missing in his current academic role. "I'm just hoping to go up there and do some soul searching and some exploration."

Dylan

Dylan, also a first-time Wakonse attendee, was in his second year in a pre-tenure faculty position. He explained that he taught upper-level undergraduates as well as graduate students. He had heard about Wakonse from other faculty in his department and from a close acquaintance in academic advising. Ultimately it was his pre-tenure mentoring committee that encouraged him to attend the conference. The committee members, which Dylan met with once per semester to ensure that he was on track to meet

expectations for tenure, knew that Dylan was interested in developing his teaching skills and felt that Wakonse “would be a good place for me to learn some strategies that will help me improve on what I am already doing in the classroom.”

Dylan explained that most of his previous faculty development trainings had focused on grant writing and other aspects of his research responsibilities, and that he was looking forward to a conference specifically about teaching. He reported already implementing some pedagogical strategies on his own such as interspersing lectures with small group interactions, taking walking field trips during class, and designing assignments that appealed to multiple student learning preferences. “But I’m always looking for new ideas to keep students engaged. Given that I do have a range of different audiences that I teach, I think it’s important to broaden the way I approach teaching.”

Prior to the conference, Dylan voiced concern about the holistic approach and flexible schedule of the conference, stating, “I’m just not really sure what to expect. I’m used to conferences with a lot of structure.” However, after attending, Dylan explained that the conference exceeded his expectations:

In looking at the agenda and the book that was recommended for reading, I thought it was going to be very touchy feely. But it flowed really well and the structure was great.... I think it was less touchy feely than I thought it was going to be.

John

Another first-time Wakonse attendee, John was finishing his first year as an assistant teaching professor in a professional program in which he previously had served in an adjunct capacity. He described having a heavy teaching load of both graduate and undergraduate courses and no research responsibilities. John’s department chair suggested that he attend the Wakonse Conference and he readily agreed:

I kind of see teaching as a continuous quality improvement process. Every semester or every lesson, you try to make a little bit better, and it's a learned skill, so I'm trying to look for anything I can do to improve those skills, especially with teaching more undergraduate courses. I think you get a little spoiled teaching the graduate courses because it's a more selective program and more likelihood that people are directly paying for it so they have a stronger motivation at times. So there are some challenges with the undergraduates in terms of motivating them and getting things across to them.

In addition to the recommendation from his department chair, John also valued the reputation of the Wakonse Conference that he had heard from others. He explained that he was looking for ideas that would allow him to make positive changes in the classroom:

I know Bill Bondeson was involved in starting [Wakonse] and Joe I hadn't met before. They both seem like very good thinkers and people who care a lot about education, so I guess I feel a natural confidence that there will be something good that comes out of it, but I'm not really sure yet what that will be. I like listening and hearing other people's ideas about what they do, so I think that helps give me new ideas. I hope to learn about new ideas I can use in the classroom, or perhaps learn about something I should stop doing. I would consider that a positive change as well.

Delores

Unlike my first three participants, who were all relatively new to their academic positions at the University of Missouri, Delores had been in her NTT role for 15 years. She was currently in a part-time faculty position, working primarily with graduate students during their practicum placements. She also assisted with a campus committee that planned semi-annual events focused on creativity, one of which is held each year in May in conjunction with the Celebration of Teaching Conference. Delores first learned about Wakonse from Joe Johnston during her job interview. "He was so passionate in describing it, and I just knew I would love it." Delores had attended Wakonse nearly every year since coming to the institution, serving in a Wakonse staff position each year

that she has attended. “I always serve as a Dialogue Group leader, and then I usually have at least one other responsibility as well.”

Delores described numerous friendships and professional relationships that she had developed over the years at Wakonse. “Those are invaluable connections, both on this campus and from other institutions. We know we have common values, and it’s easy to share ideas and learn from someone when you share the same values about teaching.” She also explained that that she still gets new ideas each year, particularly as a result of interacting with individuals from other disciplines. “They give me new ideas, new ways to think about things, to think about ways in which I can incorporate the broader world into the things that I do.” Furthermore, Delores stated:

Personally, I’ve used the conference as a way to push myself or challenge myself to do things outside of my normal comfort zone. Like for example, I’ve done the high ropes course twice. And another would be climbing Mt. Baldy [sand dune]. We did that once at midnight with a full moon. Learning how to use a GPS, and different ways of being creative....All of those things helped me grow personally and professionally because those types of activities make you think and reflect.

Sumita

Sumita was another first-time Wakonse attendee. She was just finishing her first year as an assistant teaching professor in a professional program. She had no research responsibilities beyond co-mentoring a graduate student research project for a class. Prior to coming to the University of Missouri, Sumita had taught on an adjunct basis at a community college. She learned about the Wakonse Conference from a faculty colleague in her department who had previously attended the conference:

She told me it would be a great opportunity to learn some new ideas for teaching. I am still just trying to understand the whole university, how things work, because as an adjunct I never really got into that. I just did my lecture and got out of there. To know how academia runs, the

hierarchy, and understanding the difference between tenure and non-tenure, these were all new terms for me. All the committees you have and all the different areas, and the University is so spread out, there's just a lot to learn.

Sumita expressed that she felt “like sometimes people think that things are too much for me, or I might not be capable of something. I sometimes get that feeling. I mean, I am very new, but I am very open to learn and grow.” Following the initial orientation session in which Joe Johnston showed a brief video about the Wakonse Conference and Camp Miniwanca, Sumita stated that she was very excited about attending the conference:

It looks like a beautiful place to be. There are a lot of fun activities. I met a lot of people who have been running this program and they seemed to be really into helping new faculty and they seem really dedicated, and it sounds like the program has been successful for a long time. So I'm looking forward to having a great experience.

Wayne

Like Delores, Wayne was another long-time conference attendee and current Wakonse staff member. He was a tenured associate professor and also held multiple administrative roles within his department and across other entities on campus. He first attended Wakonse in 1996 shortly after beginning his academic career at the University of Missouri. Wayne explained that a faculty colleague had asked him to help do a presentation about mentoring new faculty during his first Wakonse Conference. Because he was busy with pre-tenure accomplishments, he did not attend Wakonse again for the next few years, but he returned in 1999 as a Dialogue Group leader and has been a member of the conference staff ever since. In addition to his Wakonse involvement, Wayne also reported providing various presentations at the annual Celebration of Teaching Conference held each May at the University of Missouri.

In reflecting upon his many Wakonse Conferences, Wayne stated, “I still get something every time I go. Sometimes it’s a new idea or a new professional contact. Some of the new things I’ve tried didn’t necessarily come from Wakonse but came later from someone I met at Wakonse.” Wayne also discussed his concerns about the future of Wakonse. “There really isn’t a clear plan for succession of leadership....Maybe this year up at camp there will be more of a discussion about where we go from here. I just don’t know where the discussion is going to go.”

Emma

Emma was completing her third year as an assistant teaching professor and was also a first-time Wakonse Conference attendee. Like Rocco, she was also in a relatively new program that was experiencing exponential growth in student enrollment. As a result, she had a high teaching load. She also had several service responsibilities including advising a Freshmen Interest Group, a sorority, and an honor society. Furthermore, she was involved in multiple community organizations. Although her previous career in public service involved educating others, she explained that she was still learning “the ins and outs of being a college professor. I was really surprised at this new generation of students.” She elaborated:

I was surprised at how much students had changed. I think part of that has to do with the fact that I came from a very competitive program. Most people there were very much Type A, very driven. And then to come here, some of our students don’t have much direction, not sure what they want to do, not sure what they are going to do. Writing papers isn’t their strong suit, so I had to adjust my teaching style and how I graded and set some more realistic expectations and meet students where they were and try to get them where I wanted them to be or where they needed to be for their professional careers. So that was just kind of a challenge at least in the lower level classes...those were lessons I had to learn the hard way the first couple of years.

Emma learned about Wakonse from her department chair. “During my evaluation last year, she mentioned it and thought it would benefit me. Several people from my department have gone in recent years.” Of all my study participants, Emma voiced the most concern about the remote context and the rustic accommodations. “I’m not a camp person or an outdoorsy person so we’ll have to see how this goes. I just don’t know.” She did, however, state she was “excited to go meet some new people and come back with innovative ideas for teaching.” Emma also expressed that she was a little unclear about the overall purpose of the conference:

I know some of the activities that they do there from talking to my colleagues that have gone, but I don’t know much about Wakonse itself, exactly what its goal is. I don’t know if it’s teambuilding, I don’t know if it’s networking, I don’t know if it’s to offer support to other faculty, I’m not sure exactly what the focus is.

Richard

Richard was another first time Wakonse attendee, but unlike many of my other participants, he had been in his faculty role for 8 years. He began at the University of Missouri as a visiting teaching professor and transitioned into a permanent assistant teaching professor position. During the course of my study, he was promoted to associate teaching professor. Richard reported having a heavy teaching load from courses for undergraduate non-majors to specialized graduate courses within his discipline. He explained that he loved teaching all levels of students:

I love the non-majors. They come into the class with the mindset that they just have to get through it, and then by the end of the semester, they are able to see something from a different perspective because of my class. That’s the exciting part....And my grad students, I get very sentimental with my grads....A lot of the stuff I do with the grads is just helping them understand research, helping them understand how to develop their projects, talking with them about it, putting pressure on them. And I am an advocate for my students. I try to push them to their potential.

Although he was not required to do research in his NTT faculty role, Richard described several grants and projects that he had been involved in. His service responsibilities included coordinating multiple campus events and day camps for high school students interested in his discipline. He learned about Wakonse from another faculty member in his department who had attended the conference several times. “She knew my teaching philosophy and she knew Wakonse would be a good fit for me.” Richard explained his reasons for attending:

I’ve been thinking about it, and the main things I’m interested in is just seeing how other professors understand their role. How they understand what they do. And I just want to see how people who have been down the path before me understand that and how they have dealt with that over the years. And I don’t want to get burnt out. I’m the type of person emotionally who could definitely get burnt out.

Being somewhat familiar with the Wakonse Conference approach from his departmental colleague, Richard reported a better understanding of what to expect than most of the other first-time attendees in my study.

From what I understand about Wakonse, there’s sort of this Venn diagram between safe zone, comfort, and taking risks and learning new things about yourself, so trying to get to the sweet spot in the center. It seems to me that the people who get something out of Wakonse are the ones who find that sweet spot between being comfortable and relaxed and getting recharged and talking about things that will create change.

Lewis

Lewis was one of the original founders of the Wakonse Conference and had attended the conference approximately 10 times over the course of its 25-year history, although he had not attended in several years. After 35 years in various academic positions, Lewis had recently retired from his role as tenured full professor at an

institution in another state and was serving in an NTT adjunct teaching position at the University of Missouri during the course of this study. He was also taking college courses in a few areas of interest. He explained, “That’s my hobby, like golf or fishing would be for other people.” Lewis served in a Wakonse staff role at the 2014 conference, but explained that he had personal goals he hoped to address at the conference:

So my goals are to talk to people about my retirement, about how to make this transition an especially exciting, positive, regenerative one rather than, you know, settling in. I don’t want retirement to be blah. I want it to be energized. And I feel like this is a really good place to talk to people about it.

Having been involved with the founding of the Wakonse Conference, Lewis was able to provide some unique insights and perspectives about the conference. For example, he discussed the original goals of the conference:

I think there were several goals. One was to affirm the value of teaching and to encourage participants to see teaching as valuable. Another was to, in a practical sense, encourage people to try new modes of teaching or think about new strategies of teaching, try out new things. A third goal was to bring people from different disciplines closer together in a sense of community. Not closer together in terms of being research collaborators, but just together in terms of being a part of the same place. And a fourth goal was helping people to achieve greater professional balance. Balancing their time, their value commitments to different parts of their profession, regenerating to enjoy part of their job more, finding passion for their work. So those would be main goals, and I think those goals have remained.

Lewis also shared his thoughts about Wakonse attendees who do not find the conference as beneficial as other attendees:

One type of person is someone who is extremely introverted and just doesn’t like group activities. And Wakonse is pretty isolated, so not only are you with a group of people kind of constantly and intensely, but you can’t really escape. I mean you can walk over into the woods, but that’s about it....And another type of person who doesn’t do well at Wakonse is one who is going through a difficult time, maybe in the family, a psychological problem, a health problem. Wakonse could be a good place

to reflect on important issues related to those things, but it's not really a setting for working through those things.

Lewis added that it is important for Wakonse staff to recognize individuals who may not be enjoying the conference and make sure they do not become "casualties of the conference. It may not help them tremendously because they are not in a position to be influenced by it, but it shouldn't hurt them."

Anne

Anne was completing her second year as an NTT visiting assistant professor when she attended the Wakonse Conference for the first time in 2014. She taught two to three courses per semester and was also in charge of teaching assistants in her specific subject area. Anne explained that she had limited expectations for research and service in her visiting NTT role, but she reported involvement in those activities anyway:

So I'm not required or expected to do research, but at the same time I am because I have to get another job at some point. And similarly, I'm not required to do service in that I'm not required to do University committees, but it looks good if I do. So I could just sit on my hands and not do anything, but I try to help out where I can. But my main role is teaching.

Anne had first learned about Wakonse in 2013 through an email from her department chair, and having had positive experiences with pedagogical training at her previous institutions, she was very interested in attending. "But at that point, I was in a 1-year position, and I didn't think I'd even still be here at this point. And I also didn't understand that it wasn't just a Mizzou-thing, so I just thought, 'Well, I can't go.'" In 2014, she did not receive an email about Wakonse, but learned about it from another 2014 Wakonse participant who happened to be enrolled in one of her courses. "Visiting professors don't usually get these kinds of opportunities, so when I found out I could go,

I jumped on the opportunity. I just think it's poorly advertised. How many others are missing out on this?"

Cross Case Assertions

Following a combination of data analysis strategies from Lichtman (2013) and Stake (2006), I coded the interviews from each case, categorized the codes, and identified concepts and themes across cases that ultimately were merged into the following cross-case assertions:

1. Participants' personal and professional backgrounds influenced their perceptions of and experiences at the Wakonse Conference.
2. The remote context of the Wakonse Conference played an important role in the participants' faculty development experiences.
3. Participants described personal and professional growth resulting from the holistic approach of the Wakonse Conference, specifically the mix of educational, social, and recreational activities.
4. Participants perceived a sense of community that emerged from the interaction amongst undergraduate students, future faculty, faculty and professional staff attendees, and Wakonse Conference staff.
5. Participants reported changes in thinking and action as a result of attending the Wakonse Conference.
6. Support for faculty development in general, and specifically related to teaching, varied greatly across departments and schools on the University of Missouri campus.

7. To ensure the conference's continued longevity and to maximize the faculty development experiences of attendees, Wakonse organizers should plan for changes in conference leadership and staffing and consider changes to conference structure and logistics.

Participants' Backgrounds

Across several cases, participants reported personal factors that influenced their perceptions and overall Wakonse experiences. This cross-case assertion emerged from codes including "familiarity with Michigan," "been there, done that," "lifelong camper," "previous retreat experience," "family commitments," and "personal stressors." For example, Rocco, Delores, and Richard all described a previous connection to Michigan that led to excitement about returning to the region. Delores also reported positive experiences at church camp and Girl Scouts camp as a young child, "so I knew I would love it before I ever went." Like Delores, Anne also reported positive experiences at summer youth camps, "so the camp atmosphere was familiar to me." Conversely, prior to Wakonse, Emma described herself as "not much of an outdoorsy person, so I'm not looking forward to that aspect of the conference." After the conference, she added, "I didn't like not having a door that locked and having a room right next to men. I just wasn't comfortable with that."

Beyond previous experiences, several participants also reported concurrent life stressors that influenced their overall conference experiences. Emma had two young children and, due to her husband's overnight work hours, had to make arrangements for a live-in nanny to help out while she was gone to the Wakonse Conference. Richard also had two young children at home, and his wife was pregnant with their third child. "We're

used to texting frequently throughout the day, so the lack of phone service will be a challenge for us.” However, he later reported that he communicated daily with his wife through emails, calls, and texts.

Of all my study participants, Sumita was particularly distracted by outside life stressors. She found out just a few weeks before the conference that her teenage daughter was 36 weeks pregnant and due to deliver the baby within a few days of the conclusion of Wakonse. She contemplated cancelling her trip to Wakonse but eventually decided, “I need to do this for me. My daughter’s situation is totally changing other aspects of my life, but this training is still important to my career, particularly with my new job coming up soon.” Several times per day, Sumita walked to locations at the edge of camp where she could call or text to check on her daughter, and she had a plan in place to get a ride to the airport if she needed to leave the conference early.

A few participants described previous experiences with similar conferences or pedagogical training that influenced their perceptions of the Wakonse Conference. For example, Rocco reported previously attending an inspirational conference outside of academia. “It was amazing, I left the event very motivated, but nothing came from it.” He voiced concern that the same thing would happen with his Wakonse experience:

So I think there is that preconceived notion that I’m going to go up there, it’s going to be great, but there’s a fear that it won’t have any impact on action. But that’s on me. That’s not on Wakonse to change that. It’s on me to not let Wakonse be wasted.

Unlike Rocco, Anne was optimistic that she would come back from Wakonse with ideas that could be implemented in her teaching. She had previous experience with pedagogical training as both a graduate student and faculty member from two former institutions:

They had monthly meetings for new faculty that you could participate in, and I found those to be very helpful both for learning things and also once I knew the things, just for discussing them. And there was nothing like that at Mizzou. And so for me, Wakonse was that opportunity for pedagogical training that I was already trying to pursue and continue. So really it fulfilled the need I perceived for myself.

Anne felt that she gained a lot from Wakonse. “It was exactly what I had hoped it would be. I think it was really nice to have several days in a row where I was allowed to just think about teaching, and I came away with some new ideas to try in my classes.”

Remote Context

Similar to the archived attendee feedback presented in Chapter 4, several participants perceived the remote context of Camp Miniwanca as influential to their faculty development experiences at the Wakonse Conference. Initial codes relating to this cross-case assertion included “nature,” “off-campus,” “spiritual setting,” “peaceful setting,” “remote location,” and “place conducive to reflection.” Rocco emphatically voiced the importance of the conference being far away from campus:

You can hold a teaching conference on campus or even somewhere else in town and call it a ‘retreat,’ but this is where we live. This is where we work. This is where we grind. You can’t divorce yourself from that if you’re at a ‘retreat’ in your hometown.

He further explained:

It’s remote, and therefore it’s cleansing. I think that maybe it’s a chance for many people that go to return to default. Like, ‘Why did I get into this?’ Because I love teaching and I want to serve students. And yet what do I find? That the committees and the meetings take us further away from our purpose. So it seems like Wakonse is a chance to Ctrl-Alt-Delete.

John and Emma also felt that the remote context helped maximize their experiences at the Wakonse Conference. John stated:

I just think it was a good thing to get away and focus. It’s different than other professional development opportunities on campus where you still

have all your various things going on. Getting into a different environment really has its advantages in terms of being able to focus.

Emma had similar thoughts about the conference being held far away from work and home:

Because it takes you away from work and personal commitments, you get the opportunity to unwind and disconnect and reflect and think and journal and goal-set, and those are things that we don't always have the opportunity to do in our everyday lives as faculty. So just the 5 days to be alone and to think and to reassess your career is very powerful.

Holistic Approach

Across cases, my study participants highlighted Wakonse's unique holistic approach of mixing educational, social, and recreational activities into the same faculty development event to promote personal and professional growth. This assertion, which also aligned with the archived attendee feedback, arose from initial codes such as "loose conference structure," "balance in conference approach," "flexibility in activities," and "the way it all fits together." Furthermore, the concepts of personal and professional growth in this cross-case assertion emerged from the same "re-factor" code that I described in Chapter 4, with participants using terms and phrases such as personal renewal, refreshed, revitalized, and "re-inspired my passion for teaching."

Delores reported that she resonated with how the Wakonse Conference was structured around the MPSR symbol:

I look at Wakonse as being social. Everything that people do is interactive, and I think people learn a lot through relationships. And people can do things alone or they can do things with other people. And the Dialogue Groups and the presentations are all presentations for interacting, and the social events, so connecting. And then it's cognitive and intellectual in terms of talking about ideas, talking about ways of teaching, ways to incorporate various technologies. It's also physical, just by the setting. People can go for walks or hikes or high ropes or horseback riding or play golf, so there's the physical aspect. And then also it's spiritual, from the standpoint of being renewing by basis of the setting, and it allows time for

people to spend time reflecting on themselves both as teachers and also in all the roles that people have in life. And then I always like to go to the Sunday morning service. I think it's so nice to sit in the outdoors in the quiet.

Like Delores, Dylan also appreciated the holistic approach of the conference. In addition, he felt that the sequence of the various conference events was influential in shaping attendees' experiences:

It kind of started out inspirational, kind of broad looks at teaching, why we do what we do, and then it got into more technical things, and then the last day it was about how do we bring it back, how do we not leave here and forget about it? It just all seemed very logical, the sequence of sessions, the Dialogue Groups, the teambuilding activities, I thought it was all just perfect. It just went together so well.

Sumita found the Dialogue Groups particularly influential for her faculty development experience. "It was really a time where I could open up about myself, and it helped keep me on pace with what I was learning and making sure I was getting what I was really there for." Richard also viewed the Dialogue Groups as one of the best features of the Wakonse Conference:

As educators, so often it's like we are trying to facilitate a conversation and no one wants to talk, and it was nice to be with a group of people who know how to do that. And you can instantaneously get into a good conversation. You can start to talk about ideas. You can start to sort of stir up things.

John also found the required Dialogue Group meetings beneficial and appreciated the flexibility of the conference schedule. "I thought it was good that they had the requirement that you meet with your Discussion Group, but then if you felt like your brain was full, you could go do something else for a while."

Sumita felt that she learned as much from the recreational and team building activities as she did from the more formal sessions on pedagogy. "I got to do so many

things that I had never done in my life like canoeing and high ropes and Polar Plunge. I learned so much about myself.” She also explained that the team building activities led by the undergraduates “opened my eyes to different aspects of working as a team, how students learn to take risks, so I think those activities helped me learn how to be a better teacher.” Emma also described the interactions with the undergraduate students as “very eye opening.” She further explained:

I met some really cool young people who asked me a lot of questions and I could give them feedback. And in our small group, we had our two undergrads come back to our group and they told us what they didn’t like about their professors and what things they struggled with as students. It was interesting to hear their perspectives and it makes you think, ‘Well, do I do that? Do I need to pay attention to that and make sure I’m not doing that to my students?’ It was really helpful to have that interaction with students.

Sense of Community

Across cases, my participants described a sense of community that emerged from the interactions amongst the diverse attendees of the Wakonse Conference. Primary codes that led to this cross-case assertion included “new campus network,” “building relationships,” “making connections,” and “sense of community,” a phrase used by multiple study participants and previous conference attendees. Participants were surprised at how quickly they felt a connection with other attendees, particularly in their Dialogue Groups and other interactive sessions. For example, John stated:

I was impressed with the sense of community that developed in our discussion groups and even in some of the larger sessions where you were engaging in a discussion about the topic. It was a whole lot of sharing so that knowledge was really created by the participants rather than a conference where you go and watch a 50-minute presentation on this and a 50-minute presentation on that. While those are valuable, I thought the structure of the Wakonse Conference was interesting, and I think it helped develop a sense of community very quickly.

Rocco also appreciated the opportunity to share personal experiences and receive feedback in his Dialogue Group and other informal small group conversations. Rocco described Wakonse as a means of increasing social capital through meeting and interacting with other attendees.

I really liked the social capital of the conference. A bunch of people collected on a single spot, all interested in teaching. Everyone could identify with the struggle that I was having, and it felt good to open up, be vulnerable, be authentic, state the issue, and then hope to get solid feedback.

Like Rocco, Anne also appreciated the connections that she made at the conference. “One of my problems at Mizzou is that I’ve felt somewhat alone, so this has really helped, just knowing that there is a community at Mizzou that cares about teaching and actively wants to improve it.”

Lewis and Delores, as returning Wakonse attendees and Dialogue Group leaders, both viewed themselves as facilitators of connections, particularly for first-time Wakonse attendees. Lewis stated:

My role at Wakonse is to help people find connections. I don’t pretend that I’m going to be a very interesting person for all of those people to talk to, but I can find someone who is. So connecting, that’s what I do.

Delores expressed similar views of her staff role at Wakonse, explaining that she helped facilitate positive experiences at the conference by helping attendees connect with others who have similar interests.

For some participants, questing helped augment the sense of community that was established through Dialogue Groups and other conversations during the daytime hours of the conference. Dylan explained:

You get a bunch of faculty members out in a camp setting, and you see them act like college students, and I guess I didn't expect to see that so much. So many people going out and having fun, and seeing that different side of people, I think that really helped to build a strong relationship and sense of community. We're really serious and passionate when we talk in our Dialogue Groups, talking about our experiences and our work, and we take that very seriously. You really get to know people when they start talking about their experiences, and then you go out questing and you talk about those experiences again, but you're in a different environment and you hear a different side. Hearing and seeing both sides of people helps that sense of community.

Rocco expressed similar perceptions of questing helping to facilitate a sense of community among faculty peers as they discussed work issues in a more relaxed setting.

Participant Changes Resulting from Conference

All participants in my study reported changes in thinking or action as a result of attending the Wakonse Conference. However, the amount and type of change varied greatly among the participants. I developed this broad cross-case assertion based on numerous codes, including "philosophical changes vs. practical changes," "ideas from people vs. ideas from content," "classroom changes," "new way of thinking," "insights," "increased awareness," and "enlightening."

First time Wakonse attendees with few years of teaching experience and limited pedagogical training prior to the conference reported numerous specific changes that they made in regard to teaching. For example, within a few weeks of returning from Wakonse, John had already revised one of his fall courses, incorporating several pedagogical strategies that he learned at Wakonse including "Rock the First Day" plans, discussion of mutual expectations between instructor and students, "Ticket to Leave" quizzes and activities, and asking students on the first day of the semester to visualize their end-of-semester grades and think about how to go about achieving the desired grade. John also

described having a better understanding “of my personal strengths as well as the confidence to know how to utilize those strengths in the classroom.” Furthermore, John felt that he gained a better understanding of higher education in general:

I really got a better understanding of the norms in academia. This is kind of a second career for me, so just to understand the culture and norms of academic life. To talk to some of the faculty and try to understand some of the things that seem important to them that may seem trivial to me, you know like titles and those sorts of things, and their feeling of status within their various departments and institutions. So I thought that was really valuable to just broaden my perspective on what everybody’s different positions may be and the stresses they may be under.

Like John, Dylan also made several pedagogical changes to his fall semester courses including “Rock the First Day” activities, incorporation of more videos into his lectures, and small group discussions. John and Dylan befriended each other at the conference and planned to conduct cross-disciplinary teaching evaluations for each other after learning about the strategy at Wakonse. Dylan also modified some writing assignments, stating, “There was a session at Wakonse that gave me so many ideas about how to better evaluate student writing.” In the final interview, Dylan reported that he received good course feedback from the students. He mentioned one student who had retaken the course after failing it during a previous semester. The student reported that he disliked the class the first time he took it, but considered the class his favorite after the revisions that Dylan had made.

Sumita was another first-time Wakonse attendee who reported significant gains from attending the conference. She taught a course during the summer semester, immediately after the Wakonse Conference. Sumita reported that the course had been organized by another faculty member in her department who previously attended Wakonse. “Now I understand the activities that she had planned and why the course was

organized the way it was. It incorporated so many of the principles that I learned at Wakonse.” She also described an overall increase in her confidence as a teacher:

I think it just gave me a little more confidence overall, connecting with students, so many subtle things that I never thought of before. It’s made a difference in my classroom and with my colleagues. Like paying more attention to students’ personal backgrounds, things they are going through. Just being more aware of what they are dealing with other than just being in my classroom. It really helps me to connect with them better.

Emma, another first-time Wakonse attendee, described several practical tips that she took away from the conference such as how to improve her PowerPoint presentations and how to incorporate case studies and PBL concepts into her courses. However, she felt that more importantly she “came away with a better understanding of how important faculty can be in the lives of students....I learned that I need to make time to really actively engage with my students and get to know them better.” Emma described additional changes as a result of attending Wakonse:

The other thing that I took from the conference was mindfulness...this whole idea of taking a breath and slowing down, thinking things through, not being in such a hurry to teach the material and instead letting things emerge organically and letting the class lead and taking my time. That’s something I kept in mind as I was preparing my syllabi this time, taking some things out to allow me time to pay more attention to the really important topics that deserve more attention.

Although Anne was also a first-time attendee, she went into the Wakonse Conference with prior pedagogical training. She did, however, come away with a few ideas that she incorporated during the fall semester such as “Rock the First Day” activities to make her subject more relevant, assignment of brief essays to encourage students to reflect on readings and lectures, and the establishment of a drop-in coffee hour at the Student Center to increase engagement with students. She explained that

Wakonse also reinforced some of the teaching concepts with which she was already familiar:

I think mostly Wakonse was for me a good reminder of the things I already know....There weren't a lot of things at Wakonse that were new to me, but it was a good chance to be actively reminded of things that I already know, and to sort of push me to be very intentional with those things that I know to be good pedagogical strategies.

Richard was also a first-time Wakonse attendee, but he entered the conference with more years of teaching experience than some of the other participants and had already made considerable revisions to his courses in recent years. He explained that Wakonse reinforced some of his previous pedagogical decisions and gave him a renewed sense of excitement for incorporating significant technological changes into an online course that he was teaching. After returning from Wakonse, he spent much of the summer months working with campus educational technology staff to create a series of instructional videos for his course. "I decided it was time to just jump in and do it. Figure it out. Just go. Just try it. I haven't been this excited about an academic endeavor before." Richard also reported thinking a lot about his teaching philosophy while at Wakonse and recognizing that there are other faculty on campus who care about teaching as much as he does:

For me it was just reinforcing, that you're not alone...that the academy is not like this cold place where people are just monetizing students and don't care about teaching, but it's this place where people do care and there are people who have authority and do have institutional presence who definitely value teaching. And I know the good thing is I'm going to see these people again on campus and that's going to be a good connection.

Unlike many of the other first-time attendees, Rocco described minimal professional benefits from attending Wakonse. He incorporated just a few specific ideas

from Wakonse into his online courses. For example, he explained in his course syllabi that he would not respond to emails after 7:00 P.M. He also began providing digitally recorded feedback on student assignments instead of spending several minutes typing feedback on every assignment. However, after the fall semester, he reported that this particular change actually ended up taking even more time because of the time to record and upload the digitally recorded files. As a result, he returned to using his previous grading techniques. He explained that he would like to incorporate more “Wakonse-like principles” in the future, if he ever gets the opportunity to teach in the classroom rather than online. Although Rocco reported limited professional benefit from attending the Wakonse Conference, he explained that it did influence his personal life:

I went to Wakonse and it was great and it was wonderful, but it hasn't made a big difference professionally. I think it's made a huge difference personally. And maybe that's the greatest value of Wakonse. I can definitely profess that I have a greater appreciation for life balance. I have a greater appreciation for setting boundaries, and I'm a better husband.

Lewis, Delores, and Wayne had all attended Wakonse numerous times and served as Wakonse staff members during the 2014 conference. All three individuals reported that they had taken away several new pedagogical strategies from Wakonse over the years. However, unlike the first time attendees, most of whom identified several ideas that they planned to incorporate into their courses, the multi-year attendees had more difficulty articulating changes in thinking or behavior resulting specifically from the 2014 Wakonse Conference. Wayne explained:

It's always the case that I meet people who re-inspire me and, even if I'm the expert and I'm talking to new faculty about why I do mid-lecture breaks or why I do my Class Council, then it's still important for me to rearticulate that and understand a little bit better why I'm doing that. Even if I'm not coming away with something new, talking about it with

someone who's never considered that kind of stuff before I think is still valuable. That's still useful.

Delores described that she continues to refine strategies that she has learned at Wakonse. For example, as a Dialogue Group leader at Wakonse, she often seeks feedback from group members as to whether or not their diverse needs are being met in the group. She described a similar scenario in a recent course involving both master's- and doctoral-level students who had considerably different background experiences and learning needs:

I recognized that we had a different mix of students in the course than we typically do, and I thought it was important to discuss that as a group and find ways to make sure that each person was getting what they needed to out of our time together.

Lewis stated that “sometimes Wakonse just leaves you with a change in thinking and that can be a good thing too.” He elaborated:

If someone leaves with a new way of thinking, that would be a powerful indication of the impact of the conference. So for me this year, what stuck with me is that I need to be even more respectful of students as colleagues than I have in the past....Just because I am more knowledgeable doesn't mean that I have to develop a condescending relationship in order to impart knowledge. I can impart knowledge in a more collaborative, collegial relationship.

Delores agreed that a change in thinking can be an important outcome of a faculty development event. “So I think to myself, ‘Does it change the way I look at something?’ And if so, then it was worth attending.”

Departmental and School Support for Faculty Development

Across cases, faculty reported different levels of support in their department and schools for faculty development in general and specifically related to teaching. Initial codes that led to the eventual development of this cross-case assertion included “lack of

guidance for new faculty,” “learning the faculty role,” “learning as I go,” “campus events,” “support from departmental colleagues,” “support from department chair,” “poor advertisement of events,” and “What’s even available?” My study participants came from diverse disciplines, academic role expectations, and departmental structures. In discussing their workplace contexts, multiple participants expressed concern about having negative comments regarding their department, school, or institution attributed specifically to them. Because of these concerns, in this section I will not identify which of my participants made comments, either positive or negative, about their workplace contexts.

In regard to other faculty development activities related to teaching, several participants reported attending the annual Celebration of Teaching Conference that occurs each May at the University of Missouri immediately after the conclusion of the spring semester. However, some participants, particularly those who had summer teaching responsibilities, explained that it was difficult to attend the 2014 Celebration of Teaching Conference because it fell during the same week as Wakonse. “There was no way I could attend that conference on Tuesday and Wednesday and then leave for Wakonse on Thursday.” Another participant mentioned that she had heard of the Celebration of Teaching Conference, “but I don’t really even know what it is. I haven’t been to it because I thought it was just some sort of award ceremony for people being good teachers.”

Four study participants reported participation in campus level educational technology training, and three participants reported previously attending seminars offered by the Campus Writing Program. One participant was involved with campus workshops

on faculty creativity, and another participant was considering applying for the year-long University of Missouri Faculty Scholars program designed to support early career faculty in their teaching and scholarship. Some participants expressed frustration at not knowing what opportunities were available on campus to aid them in their teaching. One person explained, “It seems like there isn’t a great way at getting information out to people. If you don’t stumble upon it in a mass emailing or hear about it through word of mouth, you never even know these things exist.” Another participant stated, “I think my department is supportive of doing what’s available, but I’m not sure we always have a lot of information about what is available, or even if there is anything at all.”

Not surprisingly, several participants identified lack of time as the primary barrier to participating in faculty development activities related to teaching. As one participant explained:

I wish I could take advantage of the opportunities offered in my school and on campus, but there’s just never enough time. I have grading and advising and committee meetings and family obligations. And our program is a big money maker right now, so we keep enrolling more and more students and my teaching load just keeps growing. I’m supposed to teach more students in more classes but I never have time to learn how to be a better teacher.

Participants reported various levels of departmental mentorship related to teaching and other academic responsibilities. One participant described a formal departmental mentorship program for new faculty. Two others reported informal mentorship by senior faculty members in their departments. “It’s nothing official, but I know that’s who I should go to if I have questions or need guidance.” The same participant explained:

It’s helpful just knowing that there are people I can lean on or get advice or assistance from and recognizing that I don’t have to do this by myself. I

am from a larger team and we can fill in for each other, and making sure that I offer the same to my colleagues. Being at Wakonse helped me realize that your experiences as a professional can be so much better if you have good relations with the people in your department. I was hearing some horror stories from people there and it made me realize how good we have it here and I need to take advantage of that.

Another participant explained, “There’s nothing really formal or informal in my department. If I wanted mentorship, I had to seek out those relationships on my own.”

Yet another participant reported “no support for faculty development. No mentor. No time. Nobody to take me under their wing and say, ‘Let me teach you.’”

Multiple participants reported that support for faculty development related to teaching was influenced by a perceived tension between the research and teaching missions of the institution, particularly in regard to tenure expectations and recent pressures from the campus and system level to improve the University of Missouri’s performance on criteria set forth by the Association of American Universities (AAU).

Regarding tenure, one participant stated:

My department is supportive of faculty development related to teaching, but in the grand scheme, teaching has little impact on the tenure process, but it does have some. In my discipline it is more focused on research, but also in my discipline and here at the University of Missouri, the impression I get is that deficiencies in teaching can keep you from reaching tenure. I mean obviously a lack of research will keep you from getting tenure, but teaching deficiencies can impact it as well. But then again, you won’t get tenure just for being a great teacher.

Another participant expressed frustration about the focus on AAU criteria:

We are getting this sort of weird thing with the AAU, because on the one hand we’re hearing, “‘Oh, well you have a comparatively low-ranking department so we can’t give you things because you don’t deserve them.’” On the other hand, even if we turn out massive amounts of research, we don’t count for AAU metrics, so they’re still not giving us anything. So we’re getting this mixed message of “‘Yes, you need to publish a lot because otherwise you’re not special. But, we’re not going to reward you

at all for publishing because you're not a department that matters much for AAU rankings.'"

Future of Wakonse Conference

Although most of my study participants expressed that the Wakonse Conference was a positive and beneficial faculty development experience for them, each participant also had several suggestions for ways in which to improve the Wakonse Conference in the future. In discussing the future of the conference, a few participants were hesitant to have specific quotations or suggestions attributed to them. As in the previous section about workplace context, I will not attribute any comments regarding suggestions for improvement to a particular study participant. Below I will provide several suggestions for conference organizers, each of which was synthesized from multiple participant recommendations, along with brief discussion of each suggestion.

Leadership transition plan. Several study participants, particularly returning conference attendees, expressed concern about their perceived lack of plan for transitioning conference leadership from the original founders, who are at or near retirement. They described only ambiguous plans for a leadership transition. A Wakonse staff participant described Joe Johnston and Bill Bondeson as "the continuity of the conference." Another returning participant agreed, stating, "Wakonse won't be the same without Joe, but if we don't figure out a plan soon, there won't even be a Wakonse." That same participant explained:

Joe does a lot to make Wakonse happen, probably more than anyone even understands. If there is a transition plan in place, it seems vague at best. We have to identify multiple people who can take over the reins and start learning how to do this.

Even first-time attendees recognized the need for a transition in conference leadership in the near future:

I think the main thing that they have to worry about is establishing continuity. Because it seems like there's a big gap between the younger leaders and the older leaders. And a lot of the long-timers don't want to stay there for like 30 more years. I suspect that some of the others don't want to stay there for 30 years either. So how do you establish that continuity from one group to the other? So mostly just issues of structural leadership and making sure that there are people who share the same vision.

Another first-time attendee voiced concern about the “survival of the conference. It seems that Wakonse has a good reputation on campus in certain circles, but maybe not with the people who have the power to decide if it continues.”

Mentoring new Wakonse staff. Along with planning for a transition in overall conference leadership, study participants who served as Wakonse staff expressed the need to “mentor a younger generation of individuals to take over some of the staff roles, particularly in terms of Dialogue Group leaders and those who help with other conference logistics.” Another participant stated, “We need to be mentoring people who are invested in Wakonse and value it and want to see it continue.” Multiple first-time attendees expressed interest in being involved with Wakonse in the future. However, as one participant explained, “I don't know how to go about that. Who do I approach? I'm not even sure what all the staff roles are, but I would like to be involved.” The same individual went on to suggest, “Maybe they can create a way to identify individuals who would like to help with future Wakonse conferences and pair us up with an existing staff member to learn their duties.”

Collaboration with Center for Excellence in Teaching. At the annual Celebration of Teaching Conference, held just a few days prior to Wakonse 2014, the

University of Missouri Chancellor described his vision for the development of a Center for Excellence in Teaching. The proposed center was a topic of discussion throughout Wakonse 2014, particularly at the “Breakfast by Institution” meeting on the last full day of the conference. Study participants who had been involved with Wakonse for many years explained that the conference previously had a connection with the former Program for Excellence in Teaching (PET) at the University of Missouri and recommended that Wakonse organizers collaborate with the new center proposed by the chancellor.

During the meeting, a Wakonse-staff participant stated, “We need to figure out a way to be involved with the new center. Maybe that entity could help provide the administrative support needed to keep the Wakonse Conference going.” Several other participants, both first-time and multiple-time attendees, mentioned collaboration with the proposed center in the follow-up interviews. One first-time attendee suggested that collaboration with the proposed center “could help keep the spirit of Wakonse alive on campus all year long.” Another first-time attendee stated, “From what I gathered during the institutional breakfast yesterday, Wakonse is at a turning point. Either figure out a way to survive by working with other campus entities, or cease to exist.”

Collecting and reporting participant outcomes. Wakonse organizers collect participant feedback each year to make changes when planning future conferences. Additionally, some conference attendees and Wakonse staff provide individual anecdotal feedback to campus administrators in an attempt to garner continued financial support for the conference. As recently as the 2014 Wakonse Conference, University of Missouri attendees expressed the need for an organized mechanism of collecting and reporting participant outcomes to campus administrators, but other academic responsibilities limit

the time that individuals and even small groups of interested attendees have to devote to such efforts. Participants suggested that Wakonse organizers consider establishing consistent methods of collecting and reporting both quantitative and qualitative data about participant outcomes to campus administrators. One participant suggested, “Collaboration with the Center for Excellence in Teaching could provide an avenue for development of the data collection methods that we need to justify continuation of the conference.”

Another participant offered additional insights about issues between campus funding for Wakonse and documenting campus outcomes:

And maybe the problem and what you’re addressing with this research is that they don’t see campus-wide outcomes. Although I don’t know that there were campus-wide outcomes from the Sir Ken Robinson lecture from a few years ago at the Celebration of Teaching Conference. I mean everyone liked it, but I’m not sure that campus-wide outcomes from his lecture were documented. So Bill [Bondeson] would be the first to tell you that the institutional change has not been to the magnitude that they first envisioned, but that the change and the transformational experience for individuals has probably been stronger than what they actually anticipated. And we can talk about money or not, but everyone can go to Wakonse for less than what it costs to bring in the big names for a single plenary lecture at the Celebration of Teaching Conference.

Conference participants. As the Wakonse Conference has evolved over its 25-year history, so has the mix of conference attendees. In the early years of the conference, nearly all attendees held either tenured or pre-tenure academic positions. The 2014 Wakonse Conference roster listed 92 attendees, and 26.1% of them were considered official Wakonse Staff. Another 16.3% of attendees were tenured professors not specifically designated as Wakonse Staff, but many of them served in some sort of conference leadership capacity such as Dialogue Group leader or facilitator of various conference sessions and events. Of the remaining Wakonse attendees, 17.4% were in

NTT faculty positions, 16.3% were Future Faculty, 14.1% were in some other professional staff position, and only 9.8% were pre-tenure faculty.

First time attendees expressed appreciation of having a mix of academic roles represented at the Wakonse Conference, including tenured faculty, pre-tenure faculty, NTT faculty, Future Faculty, and other professionals such as academic advisors and staff from residential life and student affairs. However, a few participants who served as Wakonse staff voiced concern that the mix of conference attendees can affect the overall nature of the conference. One study participant explained:

Obviously we have to have a mix of returning attendees and new attendees for the conference to serve its purpose, but I think we need to take a closer look at the number of returning attendees each year. There's a difference between those who come every year and serve in some sort of staff or leadership capacity at the conference, those who come occasionally because they need a bit of professional renewal, and those who come just because Wakonse is a fun place to be. I want to make sure that the conference is still serving its primary purpose of helping newer faculty, and I think we need to look carefully each year at the mix of participants we have coming.... We also need to consider the number of non-faculty attendees, such as res life staffers and advisors and the like. Their participation is certainly valuable, but if you get too many, it changes the original focus of the conference away from teaching.

Conference sessions for specific groups of attendees. Given the evolving mix of conference attendees, I was not surprised to hear several study participants suggest sessions that addressed the needs of their particular academic positions. For example, one NTT participant felt that “the tenured faculty really don’t even understand my role as a non-tenure-track faculty.” Another NTT participant stated:

And there were some other things, I mean it was great to hear, but some of the tenured faculty, they just sat and told a story, and it really wasn’t helpful for me per se. It was great to hear, but it’s not going to impact my teaching.

Another Wakonse staff participant commented:

We have a few separate sessions for Future Faculty, and we have sessions about tenure issues. But I'm not sure we are addressing the needs of all the different groups we now have represented, like non-tenure-track folks and professional staff. I wonder if maybe the Wakonse agenda has become a little bit stale over the past several years. We may need to take a look at the focus of some of our sessions.

Although several study participants expressed desire for separate sessions specific to their own needs, others wanted to understand more about what was going on with each group outside of the Community Forums where everyone gathered together:

At times I guess I wanted to know more about what the undergrads and the Future Faculty were doing. I guess there are some separate things, and it's not necessary for me to know, but I was curious, so I'd talk to some of them and they'd tell me. And to see their agenda. And obviously the undergrads had more of a separate thing going on, but the Future Faculty participated a lot with us but sometimes they had their own meetings and stuff, but I was really curious about how that fit into the overall scheme of the conference. What were they doing? What if there's a grad student that I want to come in the future, how do I make that happen?

A few participants expressed a desire for increased engagement with attendees in a variety of academic roles. For example, one participant stated, "It would be nice to know what the other groups at the conference are doing. I learned so much from people who held a different academic position than me."

Interaction with undergraduate students. Eight of the study participants were teaching undergraduate students only, or a combination of undergraduate and graduate students. Although the other two participants were teaching only graduate students at the time of the study, they both had previous experience teaching undergraduate students. Every participant in my study provided positive feedback about the interaction between Wakonse Conference attendees and the students from the concurrent undergraduate leadership conference. Several participants said they wished there had been even more

opportunities for interaction with the undergraduate students. “They led the team building exercises, and came to one of our Dialogue Groups, but I wish I could have spent more time with them. That was the best aspect of the whole conference!” Another participant, who got invited by one of the undergraduates to have dinner together, shared:

The Wakonse undergrads are freaking amazing people! I know it’s not logistically possible for every Wakonse participant to get invited to a meal by a student, but I wish there was time or opportunity in the schedule for more interaction with them.

Advance notice of session responsibilities. Similar to the attendee feedback that I read in the archived Wakonse documents, my study participants expressed mixed feedback regarding the Wakonse approach of not telling participants in advance which sessions they have been scheduled to lead. “Some of the sessions turned out OK, particularly if a lot of people were interested in discussing the topic. But others seemed like they would be better if the session leader had had time to prepare.” Another attendee shared the same opinion:

A lot of the information being presented is too generalized. It needs to be much more applied. But then that changes the heart of Wakonse, because for it to be more applied in terms of the sessions, then people have to prepare, and then it becomes stressful, so then it’s stressful to go to Wakonse because you have to prepare for going to Wakonse. So I understand that it changes the spirit of it, but I also think it would make it more impactful than it just being a retreat. Most of the stuff that I took back came from those breakout sessions, but we still spend a lot of time in [Community Forums], and other than Problem Based Learning, I don’t know that I took anything from the [Community Forums]. The legends are great to hear, and that has its place, but it’s been my experience that passion fades quickly. Passion applied to work persists.

Another study participant suggested that it would be helpful to understand the expectations of the different types of sessions and that advance notice may be needed depending on the type of session to which an attendee has been assigned:

I would have been comfortable leading a Roundtable Discussion on a topic with no advance notice, but if I'm leading a Concurrent Session, then I want to know in advance so I have the option to prepare. They can explain that you don't have to prepare, but at least it gives you the option. If the purpose of Wakonse is to send people away with new ideas for teaching, then let attendees do the best job they can in sharing their ideas.

Orientation information. Although Wakonse staff members provide some orientation information at a few of the initial sessions on the first night and morning of the conference, multiple first-time attendees expressed desire for additional orientation information to understand unfamiliar terms and locations. For example, one participant stated, "It seemed like there were a lot of inside jokes between Wakonse staff and terms that the new people didn't understand. I mean, how are we supposed to know that 'questing' just means going to the bar?" A Wakonse staff participant agreed:

We shouldn't be using secret terms and not explaining them. It's not a camp where there are traditions and secrets that it's part of the initiation process to come to understand. That's more of a camp philosophy, or with social fraternities or sororities where you feel more a part of things because you have inside knowledge of the group. This should not be that kind of a conference at all.

One participant suggested that a brief camp tour on opening day would have made it easier to find the location of conference events:

I think maybe there was a map in the folder they gave us, but I spent the first day and a half trying to figure out where I was supposed to be for the different sessions and activities. It would be nice to have everyone meet outside the first day and have the organizers just point out where things are.

Another participant expressed :

It would be nice during the first big gathering to talk about some general ground rules for the entire conference. My Dialogue Group leader did a good job of that, but I went to a couple sessions where I felt like we needed some ground rules, that we all agree on some norms for the session before we get started. I was in at least two sessions where discussions got very heated, to the point that it turned some people off and they just got up

and left. I felt like it would have been better and those situations could have been avoided if we had some ground rules and expectations going into the conference.

Limiting schedule options. Several study participants expressed feeling rushed throughout the conference and overwhelmed by the number of session and optional activity choices. One person stated, “It’s like they tried to schedule a session on every great idea from the past 10 or 20 years. Sometimes there were too many things to choose from and I hated missing one thing to attend another.” Another person explained, “It was like there was almost too much going on. Some sessions went way too long and others were crammed into a 10 or 15 minute discussion when they could have been longer.” A Wakonse staff participant suggested, “Maybe we should alternate the years we offer certain topics instead of trying to cram in everything every year.” Regarding optional activities, one participant stated:

The recreational activities you select determine who you interact with. For example, I had a great time canoeing with the undergrads, but I also wish I could have gone on the camp hike and heard more about the history of Wakonse and Miniwanca. Each of those activities were only offered once, and I was disappointed to have to choose. It would be great if some of those activities could be offered multiple times.

Notable Differences in Cases

As described in the sections above, I identified a number of similarities amongst cases in developing the cross case assertions. I also identified several instances in which particular cases had notable differences from most or all of the other cases. For example, Sumita was the only participant who transferred to a new institution during the study. She explained that she had originally intended to remain at the University of Missouri for several years. She accepted her academic position knowing that she would have to live in an apartment Monday through Thursday and return home to her family several hours

away to spend time with them Friday through Sunday. She explained that her original plan was to move her family closer to the University of Missouri after her oldest daughter graduated from high school. However, her family convinced her to remain in their hometown and she explored other academic positions closer to her home. Although she had limited teaching experience at the community college level and only one year of full time academic experience at the University of Missouri, she was named program director of a new professional program at a large public university. She described passing on many of the ideas that she learned at Wakonse to her new faculty members, most of whom had little to no prior academic experience. “It’s like suddenly now I am the expert when just a short time ago I was trying to learn all these things myself!”

Another participant stood out from the other cases because of his academic role. Of my 10 participants, 3 were Wakonse staff members, and 6 were in NTT faculty positions. Dylan was the only study participant in a pre-tenure faculty position. Although he heard “some horror stories” from other pre-tenure Wakonse attendees, he reported a very supportive department in terms of faculty development. “It was actually a member of my pre-tenure committee that recommended that I attend Wakonse.” In addition to making changes in the courses he taught, Dylan also reported taking ideas away from Wakonse that will help him connect with the graduate students working on his research projects. “I came away with several ideas to help us all get to know each other a little better, and I’m hoping to get them scheduled for a team-building exercise at the outdoor challenge course here on campus.”

Although most of my participants reported minor frustrations in their faculty roles, particularly related to heavy teaching loads and limited time, they also reported

generally supportive departments and programs in terms of overall faculty development. Nine of 10 participants felt that Wakonse was a very worthwhile faculty development experience, and they reported several changes that they attributed specifically to attending the conference. In contrast, Rocco, who was the only participant whose teaching duties were 100% online, described being so busy and stressed from his workload “that it’s difficult to even think about making any changes. I can barely keep up with grading and emails and advising and committees and all my other duties.” Rocco expressed a desire to get back to classroom teaching at some point and to pursue a tenure-track position later in his career. While other participants reported considerable benefits of attending Wakonse, Rocco identified only a few specific positive changes and explained that the conference primarily was a reminder for him of what he hoped to achieve in the future:

For me obviously, right now I’m very far from my purpose. I’m very far from my passion. So I think it’s always nice for me to continue to fan those flames and make sure that I don’t lose sight of and don’t lose traction on the plan to get back into the classroom and the plan to continue to write and research, even though that’s nowhere near what my current responsibilities entail.

I noted another significant difference between Emma and the other cases. The other nine participants reported very positive perceptions of the social aspect of the Wakonse Conference. Emma, in contrast, described feeling somewhat excluded at the conference:

I know it wasn’t intentional, but I felt at time that it seemed to be kind of clique-y. Like the old timers stayed together, the staff stayed together, certain schools stayed together, that there wasn’t a lot of chance to interact with people that you didn’t know, or that people didn’t take advantage of that. And then those of us that were here and not knowing people, we kind of had to find each other. Like last night [at the bar] we had to find our own little table, and then there was the cool people table, and the other

cool people table, and we had to just find some of the other outsiders and sit with them.

Emma mentioned that feeling of exclusion in both the second and third interviews, suggesting that her perceptions at the conference left a lasting impression:

You just kind of feel left out of some of the things and not in the know. It just seemed like there were all of these inside jokes between the people that had been coming for years, and it's just like, 'Why was that funny? I have no idea why that was funny.' And I don't want to say that anyone was mean or anything, but here were all the founders together, and here were all the people from a particular discipline or institution together. And I don't know how you avoid that.

Although Lewis did not experience any feelings of exclusion, he explained that he understood how first-time attendees might have that perception. Lewis stated, "It seems that the conference has developed a kind of social class structure. There seems to be an inner group and outer group." He elaborated that the inner group was comprised primarily of the "old timers" and a few others who gathered at the Wakonse staff residence each night to socialize, and that the outer group included mostly first-time attendees who gathered each evening at the bar. Interestingly, he did not mention the many attendees who do not participate in either of those social activities.

Summary of Findings

In review, Chapters 4 and 5 provided detailed findings from analyses of multiple data sources. I analyzed archived documents including old conference agendas, decades of participant feedback, a 2002 online article, and a brief 1995 qualitative report to gain a better understanding of the history of the Wakonse Conference and the influence of the conference on past participants. By triangulating the data from the archived documents with the 10 individual cases and my own participant observations in 2010, 2013, and

2014, I concluded that many features of Wakonse remained unchanged over the conference's first 25 years. As of the writing of this document in 2015, the conference continues to be held in its original location of Camp Miniwanca in Shelby, Michigan, and continues to serve the founders' original purpose of bringing together faculty members from various institutions who recognize the importance of quality teaching in higher education.

Attendees of recent conferences were more diverse in terms of their academic roles, with a notable transition from predominantly tenured and pre-tenure attendees to a larger proportion of NTT faculty and professional academic staff. In addition, Future Faculty were added to the list of conference attendees several years before my study commenced, and a concurrent undergraduate student leadership conference was also established. Conference attendees reported that the interaction between individuals from various stages and positions in academia was beneficial to their overall Wakonse experiences. However, the limited racial and ethnic diversity identified in the early years of the conference was still evident in 2014. Furthermore, some participants, particularly those from minority populations and those who have physical disabilities, experienced unintentional exclusion from certain aspects of the Wakonse Conference.

Some topics presented at the Wakonse Conference remained consistent over its 25 year history, while others changed from year to year in response to contemporary issues and conference attendee feedback. With the exception of the increased interaction with Future Faculty and undergraduate students, the overall structure of the conference remained intact from its inception with a holistic approach of mental, physical, social, and spiritual activities scheduled each year. Although attendees' personal and

professional backgrounds influenced their conference experiences, a majority of past attendees and current study participants appreciated the remote context of Camp Miniwanca, reported positive overall experiences at the conference, and described a sense of community at the conference. In addition, attendees described subsequent changes in thinking and action as a result of attending the Wakonse Conference, but the ability to implement changes in teaching was often tempered by contextual factors at the departmental, school, and campus levels. Finally, attendees across the years provided suggestions for improvement of future Wakonse Conferences, with the most immediate concern being a transition in leadership to ensure conference longevity as Wakonse Director Joe Johnston nears retirement.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Implications

The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the influence on teaching of the Wakonse Conference for faculty attendees from the University of Missouri. Furthermore, this study explored how communities of practice at the conference and in attendees' workplaces influenced their overall faculty development experiences. In this chapter, I begin with a discussion of the significance of the study in contributing to the existing literature on faculty development. Next, I address how the findings of this study help to answer the research questions through the lens of the guiding conceptual frameworks. Finally, I conclude with implications for educational research, policy, and practice.

Significance of the Study

I sought to address multiple research gaps with this study. Scholars have called for rigorous qualitative studies that go beyond assessing participant satisfaction and expected outcomes at the conclusion of an event and instead explore faculty development as a longitudinal process with consideration of the influence of context and individual differences (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Gardiner, 2007; Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981). In this study, I had the opportunity to gather data as a participant observer at the 2014 Wakonse Conference and to interact with each participant periodically over a span of 8 to 10 months to explore both anticipated and actual outcomes of attending the conference. Additionally, my review of archived documents from the conference's 25-year history helped to contextualize the current study and allowed for comparison of outcomes between my study participants and past Wakonse Conference attendees. The

longevity of my data collection, the opportunity for triangulation among data sources, and the reflexive process of participant observation and journaling throughout the research process added to the rich, thick description I was able to provide when reporting the findings.

Furthermore, previous research into faculty development has been critiqued for lack of strong theoretical grounding and for taking place in distinct silos (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Steinert et al., 2006; Stes et al., 2010). I addressed these research gaps by synthesizing conceptual frameworks from the related fields of K-12 education and medical education to explore faculty development experiences in the general higher education setting. Although this study focused on a particular faculty development event and attendees from a single institution, the cross-case assertions will advance the scholarship around faculty development at both the campus level and beyond by helping administrators understand how to support faculty in improving their teaching to provide quality educational experiences for students.

Research Questions

Throughout this study, I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What influence on teaching does the Wakonse Conference have for faculty attendees from the University of Missouri?
2. How do the communities of practice at the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching and in the participants' work contexts influence their overall Wakonse faculty development experiences?

In the subsections below I use the lenses of the guiding conceptual frameworks to discuss how the findings of this study help to answer these research questions.

Influence on Teaching

Desimone's (2009) conceptual model identified core features of effective professional development, which in turn affect the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs of participants, thus leading to changes in instructional practices, and ultimately improved student learning. Although I allowed the cross-case assertions to emerge inductively from the data during analysis, I will use the structure of the Desimone model here to discuss the findings in relation to the research question regarding the Wakonse Conference's influence on teaching.

Core features. In the Desimone (2009) model, core features of a faculty development event that influence attendees' overall faculty development experiences include content, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation. Camblin and Steger (2000) proposed that, if well-designed, a single professional development conference can be one of the most beneficial and influential experiences of a faculty member's career. Interviews of my study participants coupled with the review of past conference feedback suggested that most conference attendees appreciated the unique features of the conference and found Wakonse to be very influential in their academic careers, with some describing it as the best conference they had ever attended. Although three of the interview participants were long time attendees of Wakonse and likely invested in the future livelihood of the conference, the other seven participants' perceptions were based solely on their experiences at the 2014 conference.

Some of the topics addressed at the conference have remained consistent across the conference's 25-year history, while new topics have been introduced in response to changes in the higher education environment and the characteristics of Wakonse

attendees. Including travel to and from the conference, Wakonse attendees from the University of Missouri spend 6 days together and are engaged as conference presenters and active participants in the mix of educational, social, and recreational activities. The Dialogue Groups, Community Forums, meals, Chautauqua, and Virtual Wakonse serve to provide coherence throughout the conference, complementing specific Concurrent Sessions and optional activities in which each Wakonse attendee chooses to participate.

Change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs. In the next phase of Desimone's (2009) model, individuals experience a change in thinking as a result of attending a faculty development event. Consistent with previous literature on faculty development (Knight et al., 2006; Van Eekelen, 2005), my study participants and past Wakonse attendees reported significant learning that resulted from the formal sessions as well as the spontaneous, unstructured interactions with colleagues during the conference. Given the recent trends in higher education toward more NTT faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2011; Kezar & Sam, 2010), I was not surprised that what participants learned was influenced by their personal backgrounds and professional roles. The NTT participants were primarily interested in learning specific teaching strategies and understanding academia. I had only one pre-tenure participant and two others who expressed interest in transitioning to tenure-track positions in the future, and those participants were interested in learning teaching strategies as well as strategies for balancing research obligations and other life roles. The challenges of achieving work-life balance in academia are well-documented (Sallee, 2008; Seritan et al., 2010; Vijayalakshmi & Navaneetha, 2013; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007). Study participants reported that the Wakonse Conference served to reaffirm the importance of striving for

that balance, and the tenured and other late career stage attendees were able to provide practical suggestions for achieving a work – life balance to their colleagues in earlier career stages.

The remote context and holistic approach of the Wakonse Conference offered attendees at all career stages the opportunity for critical reflection, which previous scholars have identified as an important aspect of faculty development (Clayton & Ash, 2005; Huston & Weaver, 2008; Knight et al., 2006; McAlpine et al., 2006). On the final full day of Wakonse, time was set aside for attendees to spend time alone engaged in reflection and to set personal and professional goals based upon what they gained from Wakonse.

Another change in thinking that can occur from faculty development is a sense of renewal and rededication to good teaching (Intrator & Kunzman, 2006; Morris, 2012). Across career stages, my participants and past Wakonse attendees reported a sense of renewal from attending the conference. For some, the sense of renewal related specifically to their understanding of students and their own sense of teacher identity (Palmer 2007; Skelton, 2012). For others, the sense of renewal was on a more personal level, which may indirectly affect their academic roles.

Change in instruction. In the third stage of Desimone's (2009) model, individuals move beyond a change in thinking and employ action in the form of a change in instruction. Desimone described her model as basic and positivist, and she predicted research challenges in knowing how and what to measure in each stage of the model. Furthermore, she suggested that interviews allow teachers to self-identify and explain small but important changes in curricular planning and instruction that may not be

evident through other methods of data collection, such as observation protocols that look only for particular behavior-based constructs.

In the interviews, all of the participants reported at least a few changes in how they approached teaching, ranging from small syllabus changes intended to establish course expectations, to providing electronic feedback on student assignments, to complete overhauls of courses to increase student engagement. However, Rocco found that some of the instructional changes he made were too time consuming in his online courses, and he returned to previous pedagogical strategies that he considered more efficient. Most participants also described incorporation of active learning strategies, which have been a focus of considerable educational research (Chism et al., 2002; Davis & Desselle, 2013; Michael, 2007).

Also, consistent with previous research (Caffarella & Zinn, 1999; Henry et al., 2012), the participants and past Wakonse attendees identified several barriers that limited their ability to incorporate all the instructional changes they would like and to participate in additional faculty development related to teaching. They reported competing work demands, personal commitments, and overall lack of time as primary barriers to implementing instructional changes. In addition, multiple participants reported a lack of awareness of faculty development opportunities available to them, including the Wakonse Conference, which many had learned about through word of mouth or from a department chair.

Change in student learning. The final stage of Desimone's (2009) model is a change in student learning resulting from a change in instruction. Because this study followed participants for only a portion of the academic year following Wakonse and

relied on self-reported outcomes during interviews, I gained only limited insight into potential changes in student learning that resulted from instructional changes made after attending the Wakonse Conference. Several participants reported a perception of improved student learning, and a few reported specific improvements on end-of-course student evaluation forms. However, student course evaluations are not a proxy for student learning (Fletcher, Meyer, Anderson, Johnston, & Rees, 2012). The most concrete example came from Dylan's description of a student who had taken the same course before and after his Wakonse-related changes and reported improved learning and satisfaction the second time he took course.

Communities of Practice

The faculty development model proposed by Desimone (2009) is somewhat positivist in nature and did not sufficiently address the concept of sociocultural context in the faculty development process. Therefore, I also utilized concepts from the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model that considers communities of practice that exist during a faculty development event as well as in participants' workplaces. As a reminder, this model expanded traditional definitions of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002), and proposed that the academic workplace is indeed a community of teaching practice, regardless of how close-knit or well-defined that community may be. I will use the structure of the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model here to discuss findings related to my research question regarding the influence of communities of practice on faculty development experiences.

Faculty development event. According to the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model, faculty development experiences are influenced by the transitory community of practice

at the event resulting from the combination of program, participants, context, and facilitator. Study participants and past Wakonse attendees consistently reported that the holistic approach of the Wakonse Conference made a significant contribution to their overall faculty development experiences. The conference included intellectual, physical, social, and spiritual factors in the program, and organizers even use the word “community” in introductory conference materials: “At the Wakonse Conference, faculty attendees form their own community of learning and have several opportunities to take on the learner role through simulations of active-learning strategies” (Wakonse Foundation, 2014a).

Many of the participants perceived a strong sense of community at the conference across the faculty, Future Faculty, and undergraduate student attendees. Additionally, participants learned from other attendees through formal presentations, Dialogue Group conversations, and informal interactions with other participants. Furthermore, multiple opportunities existed for faculty, Future Faculty, and undergraduate student attendees to swap their traditional roles of teacher and learner. For example, on the first full day of the conference, the undergraduate students led the faculty in an afternoon of group challenges and team-building activities, followed by reflective conversations about how it felt to be placed in opposite roles.

Another key feature of the Wakonse Conference was the Dialogue Groups that served to create a sense of community and continuity throughout the conference. Similar to the group process and mentoring circles described by Darwin and Palmer (2009), the Dialogue Groups allowed Wakonse attendees to share experiences and concerns with others in a safe environment and to provide feedback to each other outside of the

constraints of a formal evaluation process. However, as Boettcher (2013) suggested, the dynamics within a given Dialogue Group can be the deciding factor in whether a conference attendee has an overall positive or negative experience at Wakonse. Although the current study participants all reported positive perceptions of their Dialogue Groups, review of the archived documents, conversations with other past conference participants, personal experience at the 2010 Wakonse Conference, and previous research (Coppola, 2002) suggest that some Dialogue Groups do not facilitate a sense of community.

Consistent with the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model, the context of the Wakonse Conference played an important role in the faculty development experiences of conference attendees. Although many faculty development conferences are held away from campus workplaces, the Wakonse Conference is unique in that it is held at a remote camp setting rather than a hotel or conference center. By reducing work and personal distractions and limiting technological access, the Camp Miniwanca context allowed Wakonse attendees to focus on teaching for 5 days while also engaging in unique social interactions and recreational activities not typically available in traditional conference contexts.

O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) identified the important role that a conference's facilitator can play in attendees' faculty development experiences. Study participants and past Wakonse attendees consistently praised Wakonse founder Joe Johnston and the other Wakonse staff for developing the conference and maintaining it for 25 years. However, Boettcher (2013) raised concerns about future leadership of the Wakonse Conference as the original founders near retirement, and I heard the same concerns among both first-time and returning participants in this study. As of early 2015 when I concluded my data

collection, any plan for transitioning conference leadership remained unclear, even to those participants who had been involved with the conference for many years as Wakonse staff.

Academic workplaces. In the O’Sullivan and Irby (2011) model, after the conclusion of a faculty development event, participants return to their academic workplaces where a community of practice exists. “The educational workplace is as important to the success of the faculty development participants as are the program components” (O’Sullivan & Irby, 2011, p. 425). This statement aligns with earlier research that suggested the social context in which an individual works can have a significant influence on whether or not a behavioral change occurs (Cervero, 1988; Cervero & Rottet, 1984). However, as previous scholars have noted (Wenger et al., 2002), the workplace community of practice may not be well-defined or even recognized. According to the O’Sullivan and Irby (2011) model, the community of practice in the academic workplace is comprised of teaching tasks and activities, mentoring and coaching among faculty colleagues, professional relationships and networks, and the organizational system and culture. Among the participants, the perception of a community of teaching practice varied greatly.

In regard to teaching tasks, several participants reported not having sufficient time to make all of the instructional changes that they would like to. That issue was particularly challenging for Emma and Rocco, the two participants in departments experiencing considerable growth in student enrollment. However, Rocco described a lack of peer support in his program, while Emma perceived her department to be collegial and supportive. Schrod et al. (2003) suggested that faculty feel a sense of connectedness

to their institution when they experience collegiality and mentorship, and the participants reported similar perceptions. Like Emma, most other participants reported supportive peers and department administrators. Some had formal mentoring relationships while others described informal mentoring processes, but with the exception of Rocco, all other participants described a feeling of belonging within their departments and the larger institutional context.

In addition, multiple participants described new campus connections with other Wakonse attendees. In some cases, the interactions were limited to occasional social gatherings and general peer support. Dylan and John, however, planned to conduct cross-disciplinary peer teaching evaluations for each other. However, as of the last round of interviews, they had not yet carried out their plans, citing time as a barrier. Two other first-time participants expressed a desire for periodic Wakonse gatherings on campus throughout the year to “keep the spirit of Wakonse alive,” but no formal gatherings of Wakonse attendees were held.

The final component of the academic workplace community of practice relates to the culture of the institution. As described in Chapter 2, although institutions may have various types of organizational culture at play at any given time, most institutions have one dominant culture (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). As a research institution, the University of Missouri appears to have maintained a collegial culture that values faculty research and traditional forms of scholarship. Meanwhile, the Wakonse Conference embraces more of a developmental culture, characterized as learner-centered and promoting instructional improvement.

Some of my participants described departments and programs that were characterized by a developmental culture, but they consistently described conflicting messages from the institutional level between the importance of teaching and the primacy of research, particularly in regard to the institution's increased focus on AAU metrics. Although only one of my participants was in a pre-tenure position with an expectation of research, many of my NTT participants expressed a perception that teaching was not as valued at the institutional level as was research. Consistent with findings from Henry et al. (2012) on the same campus, faculty reported that they would like to see more commitment from campus administrators in supporting and recognizing quality teaching. The results of this study, therefore, call into question the authenticity of the workplace community of practice proposed by O'Sullivan and Irby (2011), who suggested that "work being done in these smaller transitory faculty development communities can and should transform larger university environments" (p. 424). Rather than the faculty development and workplace communities of practice affecting institutional change, I believe that institutional and departmental cultures influenced participants' perceptions of a community of practice related to teaching.

Implications

The findings of my research contribute to the extant literature on faculty development in higher education. By utilizing conceptual frameworks from K-12 and medical education, I was able to explore faculty development as a longitudinal process within multiple sociocultural contexts. Although this study focused on a specific conference and attendees from one campus, the findings will be useful to campus administrators and others involved with faculty development across higher education in

designing, sustaining, and improving faculty development events that support teaching.

As a conclusion to this study, I offer several implications for educational research, policy, and practice.

Research

To date, this is the first study to combine the frameworks of Desimone (2009) and O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) in exploring the faculty development process within multiple sociocultural contexts. This combination of frameworks may prove useful in future research on faculty development. My study focused primarily on the first three components of Desimone's model, with little emphasis on the final component of improved student learning. Student learning and change in student learning over time are challenging constructs to investigate but should not be ignored (Desimone, 2009; Ekman & Pelletier, 2008). Future researchers should gather both qualitative and quantitative data on student outcomes before and after individuals attend a faculty development event and implement instructional changes.

In regard to the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model, my exploration of departmental differences among multiple cases was limited to participant self-report during interviews. Additional insights may be gleaned from deeper exploration of departmental and divisional contexts through additional data sources. Furthermore, this study was limited to participants who had self-selected to attend a particular faculty development event, suggesting a predisposition and motivation for change after attending. Future research should explore differences in progression through Desimone's (2009) stages between individuals who electively attend professional development events and those who are mandated to attend.

Given the increasing number of NTT faculty across higher education (Kezar & Sam, 2010), future research should also explore in depth the differences between NTT and research faculty in terms of how they experience the different stages of Desimone's (2009) model of professional development, particularly in regard to how they define instructional changes and improved student learning. In addition, specific to Wakonse, the design used in my study could be utilized to explore the influence of the conference on Future Faculty attendees. The multiple case study methodology would also be beneficial in exploring the influence that other faculty development events have for various attendees. Stake (2006) offered multiple options of design and data analysis to accommodate a smaller or larger number of cases, noting that there is a constant struggle for emphasis between the individual cases and the quintain.

Policy

The findings of this study have multiple policy implications for administrators, at the University of Missouri and beyond. Administrators need to carefully examine policies related to how teaching is valued in the tenure process. Increasing the merit given to quality teaching and acquisition of teaching grants may improve the emphasis on quality teaching among pre-tenure faculty. In addition, administrators should consider a parallel tenure system for faculty currently in contingent positions. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), "tenure was not designed as a merit badge for research-intensive faculty or as a fence to exclude those with teaching-intensive commitments" (AAUP, 2014, para. 4). The AAUP suggests that conversion to tenure would help stabilize a faculty infrastructure that is now dominated by individuals in contingent positions with heavy workloads, low compensation, and little job security.

As the University of Missouri strives to maintain and improve its distinction as an AAU institution, administrators should emphasize not only the metrics related to research, but also the AAU performance standards regarding undergraduate and graduate education. For example, administrators could create policies that reward faculty members who participate in postdoctoral mentoring, contribute to comprehensive academic offerings, or “use student-centered, evidence-based, active learning pedagogy in their classes,” as encouraged by the AAU Undergraduate STEM Education Initiative (AAU, 2013). Such rewards might include salary increases or one time bonuses.

Another policy that would elevate the status of teaching is mandated faculty development related to teaching. For example, as part of annual performance reviews, faculty who have teaching responsibilities as part of their academic positions could have an expectation of participation in a minimum of one campus or divisional level faculty development event per year. Furthermore, allocating a portion of indirect costs from research grants to teaching endeavors would help address the long standing dichotomy between teaching and research by recognizing the importance of financially supporting the dual obligations of a research institution.

Practice

The findings of my study suggest a number of practice implications for the Wakonse Conference specifically, and for higher education in general. The Wakonse Conference appears to be effective in helping many attendees learn new teaching strategies and experience a sense of personal and professional renewal, often leading to a rededication to improving teaching practices on campus. However, if the conference is going to continue, organizers must implement a transition plan for conference leadership

in the immediate future and also consider mentoring other individuals to serve as future Wakonse staff.

During this study, the university chancellor endorsed the establishment of a Center for Teaching Excellence on the University of Missouri campus, and faculty received electronic surveys gathering information about the perceived need for such a center. The campus currently hosts a Celebration of Teaching conference each May and also recently revived the University of Missouri Faculty Scholars (UMFS) program to support early career faculty. A Center for Teaching Excellence has the potential to serve as a centralized entity for coordinating existing events such as the Wakonse Conference, the Celebration of Teaching Conference, and the UMFS program. In addition, the center could develop new ways in which to promote and recognize excellence in teaching. As Hahn and Lester (2012) proposed, the most effective opportunities for training and development occur at the institutional level.

In addition to considering partnership with the proposed center, conference organizers should consider a leadership model that involves individuals from other institutions who send faculty to Wakonse, perhaps distributing the workload and financial burden of the conference among multiple institutions. Organizers also need to decide the target audience for future conferences and be prepared to make changes that address the diverse professional development needs of those individuals. One of the long-time attendees who participated in this study suggested that Wakonse had strayed from one of the primary goals of helping new faculty get off to a good start in their academic careers. I believe that Wakonse is well poised to address the two stages of faculty socialization described by Tierney and Rhoads (1994). Future Faculty experience anticipatory

socialization into the faculty role at the conference, and early career faculty experience organizational socialization through interactions with senior faculty at the conference.

A significant concern regarding the conference that was identified through observations, interviews, and review of archived documents was the perception of exclusion experienced by some conference attendees. Wakonse staff should be cautious not to limit their social interactions to other returning attendees. Furthermore, if unfamiliar terms such as “questing” continue to be used, Wakonse staff should ensure that they are clearly explained at the beginning of the conference so first-time attendees can make informed decisions about whether or not they want to participate. Organizers should also strive to increase the overall diversity of conference attendees, particularly in terms of race and ethnicity. Finally, although the context of Camp Miniwanca appears to contribute significantly to the overall Wakonse experience, conference organizers should consider the limitations that the inaccessible setting places on attendees with physical disabilities.

Wakonse organizers should also develop a consistent method of collecting and reporting outcomes to campus administrators through both quantitative and qualitative data and make improvement decisions based on these data. Additionally, in an effort to reach as many faculty members as possible, organizers should ensure that the Wakonse Conference is well advertised across campus. Furthermore, in order to confront the perception that the conference is “very touchy feely,” as one participant described, organizers should ensure that the Wakonse website, advertisement efforts, and pre-conference orientation sessions address the content and potential outcomes of the conference in a way that is not overshadowed by the conference’s holistic approach.

Finally, with the growing emphasis on evidence-based practice, conference organizers should strive to ground the content of the conference in scholarly research. Several other specific recommendations regarding conference content and logistics are also discussed in Chapter 4.

Throughout higher education, administrators should recognize that the needs of faculty are different across types of academic appointment and career stage (Huston & Weaver, 2008; Ponjuan et al., 2011). They should lend support to the establishment and continuity of faculty development experiences that support the diverse learning needs of all faculty members. Furthermore, administrators at the departmental, divisional, and campus levels should continue to develop and support programs that focus specifically on teaching. The Wakonse Conference serves as one example of a program that addresses these diverse learning needs by bringing together faculty, academic professionals, and graduate and undergraduate students with the collective vision of improved teaching.

Conclusion

Although this study focused on participants from a single institution, the findings contribute to the scholarly literature about faculty development and communities of practice. Using Desimone's (2009) model as a means of understanding professional development over time, the findings of this study indicate that some faculty members experience only a change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs as a result of attending a particular faculty development event. Others translate those changes in thinking into instructional changes in the classroom, ranging from small changes in curricular planning to complete overhauls of pedagogical approaches. Although changes in thinking and changes in instruction were evident within weeks to months of attending

the conference, the final stage of Desimone's model, improved student learning, could not adequately be explored within the scope and duration of this study. What was clear, however, is that each faculty member experienced a different amount and rate of progression through the various stages of professional development.

In regard to communities of practice, the findings of this study supported the portion of the O'Sullivan and Irby (2011) model that described a transitory community of practice that exists during a faculty development event. However, I found less support for their concept of an academic workplace community of practice related to teaching.

Although some participants described departmental workplaces in alignment with the notion of a community of teaching practice, the components of mentoring among faculty colleagues and organizational culture supportive of teaching were less evident across cases.

The Wakonse Conference was established 25 years ago to promote quality teaching in higher education, particularly in the context of a research university. The conference has influenced more than 2,500 attendees over the years, and many of those individuals describe the conference as a positive and transformational professional development experience. As organizers contemplate that future of the conference, they must find a balance between preserving the Wakonse legacy and planning for innovations in content and format to address the diverse learning needs of conference attendees.

Appendix A

First Email Invitation Protocol

Dear _____:

I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis (ELPA), and I am conducting research on the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching and the influence that the conference has for faculty attendees in regard to how they teach and how they think about teaching. I will also be a 2014 attendee at the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching, so I will be a participant observer at the conference. Dr. Jeni Hart is my ELPA doctoral advisor for this research.

I am seeking participants of the 2014 Wakonse Conference on College Teaching who are willing to complete a series of short interviews before, during, and after the conference so that I may gain an in depth understanding of the participants' faculty development experiences during the conference and upon return to their campus workplaces where teaching actually occurs. I am focusing specifically on attendees from the University of Missouri campus. It is my hope to have a diverse group of participants in terms of demographic background, academic discipline, faculty career stage, faculty appointment (Tenured, Tenure-Track, Non-Tenure-Track), and number of times attending Wakonse. Therefore, any 2014 faculty attendees from this campus are considered eligible for participation in this study.

Participation involves two activities. The first is completion of a brief written form that collects demographic information and information about your academic background. The second is a series of four short interviews, each lasting approximately 30 minutes. The interview schedule is as follows:

- 1st interview – Completed April or May 2014 before the conference
- 2nd interview – Completed in late May 2014 either during or shortly after the conference

The interviews will focus on your general thoughts about faculty development, your experiences at the conference, and any influences that the conference may have on your approach to teaching once you return to campus.

In addition to this email, I will further explain the opportunity to participate in this research project at the upcoming informational meetings for Wakonse attendees to be held on April 4th 2014 and May 12th 2014.

If you are willing to participate, please respond to this email by May 15th or speak with me at one of the upcoming informational meetings, and I will work with you to find a mutually convenient time to schedule the first interview. Participation is completely voluntary, but I do hope you will help with this project. Your participation in this study will help conference organizers and campus administrators better understand how to address the faculty development needs on this campus in order to enhance teaching.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to consider participation in this research.

Sincerely,

Crystal Gateley
ELPA Doctoral Student

Appendix B

Second Email Invitation Protocol

Dear _____:

I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis (ELPA), and I am conducting research on the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching and the influence that the conference has for faculty attendees in regard to how they teach and how they think about teaching. Dr. Jeni Hart is my ELPA doctoral advisor for this research.

You are receiving this email because you have previously participated in interviews for this research project. I am now seeking participants of the 2014 Wakonse Conference on College Teaching who are willing to complete two additional interviews:

- 1st interview – Completed in August / September 2014 near the start of the Fall 2014 semester
- 2nd interview – Completed in January / February 2015 near the start of the Spring 2015 semester

The interviews will focus on your general thoughts about faculty development, your experiences at the conference, and any influences that the conference has had on your approach to teaching now that you have returned from the conference.

If you are willing to participate, please respond to this email by August 15th so that we may set up a mutually convenient time to schedule the first interview. Participation is completely voluntary, but I do hope you will help with this project. Your participation in this study will help conference organizers and campus administrators better understand how to address the faculty development needs on this campus in order to enhance teaching. Additionally, this study will advance the scholarship on faculty development in higher education.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to consider continued participation in this research.

Sincerely,

Crystal Gateley
ELPA Doctoral Student

Appendix C

Demographic & Academic Background Form

Researcher's Name: Crystal Gateley

Project #: 1211157

Project Title: Wakonse Conference on College Teaching: Influence on University of Missouri Faculty Attendees

This demographic and academic background information is being collected for purposes of describing my study sample. Information may be tied to interview data via use of a pseudonym or participant number.

Questions regarding the purpose or procedures of the research should be directed to **Crystal Gateley** at gateleyc@health.missouri.edu or 573-884-7312.

1. What is your gender? **Check one.**

- ☐
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

The U.S. Census indicates that many individuals have a complex identity. In order to help me understand the racial / ethnic backgrounds of my participants, I ask you to answer the following two questions:

2. Do you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino? (A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.) **Check one.**

- ☐ No, not Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Yes, Hispanic or Latino

3. The previous question was about *ethnicity*, not *race*. No matter what you selected above, please continue to answer the following, if applicable, by marking one or more boxes to indicate what you consider your **race** to be. **Check all that apply.**

- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ White
- ☐ Other; Please specify_____

4. Please provide the following information about your educational background:

Year	Institution	Degree	Discipline

5. What is your current academic title? (Ex: Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, etc.)

6. In what department do you hold that title?

7. Which of the following best describes your current academic appointment?

- ☐ Tenured
☐ Tenure-Track
☐ Non-Tenure-Track

8. How many years have you been in a faculty role at MU? _____

9. If your position at MU is not your first faculty role, how many total years have you been in a faculty position? _____

10. Have you attended the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching prior to 2014?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes

If yes, how many previous times have you attended Wakonse? _____

Appendix D

Wakonse Interview #1 Protocol

1. Tell me about your faculty role with the University of Missouri.
2. Describe your responsibilities related to teaching, research, service, and other duties.
3. How did you first learn about the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching?
4. Why do you want to attend Wakonse this year?
5. What do you hope to gain from the conference? (if not addressed in previous question)
6. Tell me what you know about Wakonse at this point.
7. What other faculty development opportunities, if any, have you participated in?
8. How do you determine whether a faculty development opportunity was beneficial for you?

Appendix E

Wakonse Interview #2 Protocol

1. Tell me about your experiences at Wakonse.
2. How did your expectations for the conference compare to your actual experiences at Wakonse?
3. What did you like best about the conference?
4. What did you like least about the conference?
5. What are your thoughts about the context and format of Wakonse?
6. What, if anything, do you feel that you have gained from the conference?
7. What impact, if any, do you think this conference will have on your faculty role when you return to campus?
8. Is there anything that surprised you about Wakonse?
9. Was Wakonse a successful faculty development experience for you specifically?
Please explain.
10. What recommendations do you have for Wakonse organizers about future conferences?

Appendix F

Wakonse Interview #3 Protocol

1. It's been a few months since we attended Wakonse. Now that you've had more time to reflect on your experiences at Wakonse, what are your general thoughts about the conference?
2. What, if any, influence has Wakonse had on teaching as you prepare for the upcoming semester?
3. What, if any, influence has Wakonse had on other aspects of your faculty role as you prepare for the upcoming semester?
4. Tell me about your first day of class this semester. (If after semester has begun)
 - a. What role, if any, did Wakonse play in how you organized and taught that class?
5. Describe specific changes in either the way you think about teaching or in how you plan to teach this semester that you would attribute to your experience at Wakonse?
6. In which other faculty development opportunities have you been involved since attending Wakonse?
7. What plans do you have to participate in other faculty development opportunities during this academic year?
8. How does your workplace context influence your ongoing faculty development?
9. How do the people within your workplace context influence your ongoing faculty development?
10. What supports do you encounter in your workplace related to improving your teaching?

11. What barriers do you encounter in your workplace related to improving your teaching?
12. If you encountered a faculty member who was interested in attending Wakonse for the first time next year, what would you tell him or her?

Appendix G

Wakonse Interview #4 Protocol

1. How did your Fall semester go in terms of the courses you taught?
2. And how did the Fall semester go in terms of your responsibilities for research, service, and other duties?
3. What did you do during the Fall semester that you would say was influenced by your experience at Wakonse? Please explain.
4. How was student learning influenced by the way you approached teaching your courses?
5. Describe contact you have had with anyone from Wakonse that is not within your immediate workplace context?
 - a. What was the form of contact (i.e., face-to-face, social media, email, etc.)?
 - b. What was the nature of the contact (i.e., regarding personal or professional matters)?
6. In early January, we received a copy of the personal and professional goals that we wrote for ourselves while at Wakonse. What was your reaction to reading those goals 6 months later?
7. As you prepare for the upcoming Spring semester, what changes in how you think about teaching or how you plan to teach are influenced by your experience at Wakonse?
8. Tell me about any other faculty development opportunities in which you have been involved since we last met.
9. What upcoming faculty development opportunities do you plan to pursue?

10. How does your workplace context influence your ongoing faculty development?
11. How do the people within your workplace context influence your ongoing faculty development?
12. What supports do you encounter in your workplace related to improving your teaching?
13. What barriers do you encounter in your workplace related to improving your teaching?
14. Do you have any plans to attend Wakonse again in the future? Why or why not?
15. Is there anything else that we haven't discussed about Wakonse that conference organizers and campus administrators should know?

Appendix H

IRB Consent Form

Wakonse Conference on College Teaching: Influence on University of Missouri Faculty

Attendees

Informed Consent

Researcher's Name: Crystal Gateley Researcher's Doctoral Advisor: Jeni Hart
IRB Project #: 1211157

INTRODUCTION

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This study is being done to explore the faculty development experiences of faculty attendees during the 2014 Wakonse Conference on College Teaching.

When you are invited to participate in research, you have the right to be informed about study procedures so that you can decide whether you want to consent to participation. This consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask the investigator to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

You have the right to know what you will be asked to do so that you can decide whether or not you want to be in the study. Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to be in the study if you do not want to. You may refuse to be in the study and nothing will happen. If you do not want to continue to be in the study, you may stop at any time and nothing will happen.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?

The purpose of this study is to understand how the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching influences faculty members in terms of how they teach and how they think about teaching. In addition, this study explores how the contexts of the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching and the participants' workplace influence their overall faculty development experiences. Your participation in this study will greatly enhance our understanding of how conference organizers and campus administrators can support faculty in improving their teaching.

HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL BE IN THE STUDY?

About 10 to 15 people from your institution will take part in the study.

WHAT AM I BEING ASKED TO DO?

You will be asked to participate in two interviews, each lasting approximately 30 minutes. In addition, you will be asked to complete a brief written form to collect demographics and information about your academic background.

HOW LONG WILL I BE IN THE STUDY?

The interview schedule is as follows:

- 1st interview – Completed April or May 2014 before the conference
- 2nd interview – Completed in late May 2014 either during or shortly after the conference

You can stop participating at any time without penalty.

AUDIORECORDING

All interviews will be audiorecorded, unless you prefer to have the interview conducted without recording. If you agree to have the interview recorded, you have the right to request that the recording be stopped at any time, either to stop the interview completely or to continue the interview unrecorded.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information associated with project participants will be kept in a locked office accessible only to the investigator. In accordance with Federal regulations, the research materials will be kept for a period of 7 years after the completion of the research project. No comments will be attributed to you by name in any reports or publications related to this study. You may be identified by category (e.g., Associate Professor), but a pseudonym will be used in place of your name in all reports.

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND CONCERNS OF BEING IN THE STUDY?

This study involves no foreseeable risks to participants. Findings of this project will be integrated into reports, presentations, and publications that can advance the scholarship around faculty development on this campus and beyond. Findings may be used in articles, presentations, and other publications to inform a national and international audience.

WHAT ARE THE COSTS OF BEING IN THE STUDY?

There is no cost to you.

QUESTIONS

Please contact the investigator Crystal Gateley (573-884-7312 or gateleyc@health.missouri.edu) or her doctoral advisor Jeni Hart (573-882-8221 or hartjl@missouri.edu) with any questions or concerns. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the MU Campus Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585 or email www.umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu

Bibliography

- Algozzine, B., Beattie, J., & Bray, M. (2004). Student evaluation of college teaching. *College Teaching*, 52(4), 134-141. doi: 10.3200/CTCH.52.4.134-141
- Amundsen, C., Abrami, L., McAlpine, C., Weston, M., Krbavac, A.,...& Wilson, M. (2005, April). *The what and why of faculty development in higher education: An in-depth review of the literature*. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Conference, Montreal, Canada.
- Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions?: A conceptual review of the educational development literature in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 82(1), 90-126. doi: 10.3012/0034654312438409
- Association of American Universities. (2013). *Undergraduate STEM education initiative*. Retrieved from <https://stemedhub.org/groups/aau>
- Association of American Universities. (2014). *AAU membership*. Retrieved from <http://aau.edu/about/default.aspx?id=4020>
- Aultman, L. P. (2006). An unexpected benefit of formative student evaluations. *College Teaching*, 54(3), 251-285. doi:10.3200/CTCH.54.3.251-285
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2002.0001
- Baepler, P. (2010). A teaching, technology, and faculty development timeline. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 24(2), 40-48.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Barnes, B. J., & Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(5), 297-315. doi: 10.1007/s10755-008-9084-x
- Bash, L. (Ed.). (2005). *Best practices in adult learning*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Battey, D., & Franke, M. L. (2008). Transforming identities: Understanding teachers across professional development and classroom practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(3), 127-149.
- Beckerman, N. L. (2010). Teaching the teachers. *Academe*, 96(4), 28-29. doi: 10.3402/meo.v15i0. 5063

- Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). *Engaging the six cultures of the academy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1975). Components of an effective faculty development program. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 46(2), 177-211.
- Bieber, J. P., & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1009-1035. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2006.0046
- Blanton, M. L., & Stylianou, D. A. (2009). Interpreting a community of practice perspective in discipline-specific professional development in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 34(2), 79-92. doi: 10.1007/s10755-008
- Boctor, L. (2013). Active learning strategies: The use of a game to reinforce learning in nursing education. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 13(2), 96-100. doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2012.07.010
- Boettcher, M. L. (2013). *Professor camp: A phenomenological study of the origin and persistence of the Wakonse conference on college teaching and learning*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames, IA.
- Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bondeson, W. B. (1992). Faculty development and the new American scholar. *To Improve the Academy*, 11, 3-12.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Boucher, B. A., Chyka, P. J., Fitzgerald, W. L., Hak, L. J., Miller, D. D., Parker, ... Gourley, D. R. (2006). A comprehensive approach to faculty development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 70(2), 1- 6. doi: 10.5688/aj700227
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer Commission. (1998). *Report on reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's universities*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer Commission. (2001). *Reinventing undergraduate education: Three years after the Boyer Report*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2011.0011
- Brancato, V. C. (2003). Professional development in higher education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 98, 59-65. doi: 10.1002/ace.100
- Brennan, J. (2008). Higher education and social change. *Higher Education*, 56(4), 381-393. doi: 10.1007/s10734-008-9126-4
- Bromley, P. (2013). Active learning strategies for diverse learning styles: Simulations are only one method. *Political Science and Politics*, 46(4), 818-822. doi: 10.1017/S1049096513001145
- Brookfield, S. D. (1988). Understanding and facilitating adult learning. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 16(2), 99-105.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2009). The concept of critical reflection: Promises and contradictions. *European Journal of Social Work*, 12(9), 293-304. doi: 10.1080/13691450902945215
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities of practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40-57.
- Burbach, M. E., Matkin, G. S., & Fritz, S. M. (2004). Teaching critical thinking in an introductory leadership course utilizing active learning strategies: A confirmatory study. *College Student Journal*, 38(3), 482-493.
- Caffarella, R. S., & Zinn, L. F. (1999). Professional development for faculty: A conceptual framework of barriers and supports. *Innovative Higher Education*, 23(4), 241-254.
- Camblin, L. D., & Steger, J. A. (2000). Rethinking faculty development. *Higher Education*, 39(1), 1-18.
- Carmichael, D. L., & Mertens, R. P. (2012). Midwestern magic: Iowa's statewide initiative engages teachers, encourages leadership, and energizes student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 33(3), 22-26.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2013). *Classification descriptions*. Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/>

- Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning. (2015). *Mission*. Retrieved from <http://www.cirtl.net/mission>
- Cervero, R. M. (1988). *Effective continuing education for professionals*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cervero, R. M. (2000). Trends and issues in continuing professional education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 86, 3-12.
- Cervero, R. M., & Rottet, S. (1984). Analyzing the effectiveness of continuing professional education: An exploratory study. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34(3), 135-146.
- Chesebro, J. W. (1991). Preparing for the future: Faculty development issues in the year 2000. *ACA Bulletin*, 76, 11-24.
- Chism, N. V. N., Lees, N. D., & Evenbeck, S. (2002). Faculty development for teaching innovation. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 34-41.
- Clark, J. (2008). Powerpoint and pedagogy: Maintaining student interest in university lectures. *College Teaching*, 56(1), 39-45. doi: 10.3200/CTCH.56.1.39-46
- Clark, M. C., & Rossiter, M. (2006). "Now the pieces are in place...": Learning through personal storytelling in adult classrooms. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development*, 20(3), 19-33. doi: 10.1002/nha3.10258
- Clayton, P., & Ash, S. (2005). Reflection as a key component in faculty development. *On the Horizon*, 13, 161-169. doi: 10.1108/10748120510618187
- Cook-Sather, A. (2014). Multiplying perspectives and improving practice: What can happen when undergraduate students collaborate with college faculty to explore teaching and learning. *Instructional Science*, 42(1), 31-46. doi: 10.1007/s11251-013-9292-3
- Cook-Sather, A., & Alter, Z. (2011). What is and what can be: How a liminal position can change learning and teaching in higher education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 42(1), 37-53. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01109.x
- Coppola, B. P. (2002 , August 9). Treating graduate students with dignity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

- Darwin, A., & Palmer, E. (2009). Mentoring circles in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(2), 125-136. doi: 10.1080/07294360902725017
- Davis, T. S., & Desselle, S. P. (2013). Perceptions of a faculty cohort using education scholar as a basis for faculty development in active learning strategies. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 5, 394-401. doi: 10.1016/cptl.2012.06.001
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1-19). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199. doi: 10.3102/0013189X08331140
- Dodson, M. V., Fernyhough, M. E., Holman, B. B. (2006). Advising graduate students: Mentor or tormentor? *NACTA Journal*, 50(4), 37-41.
- Drew, S., & Klopper, C. (2014). Evaluating faculty pedagogic practices to inform strategic academic professional development: A case of cases. *Higher Education*, 67(3), 349-367. doi: 10.1007/s10734-013-9657-1
- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a "professional learning community"? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6-11.
- DuFour, R. (2012). When districts function as professional learning communities. *The Education Digest*, 77(9), 28-29.
- Dunham-Taylor, J., Lynn, C. W., Moore, P., McDaniel, S., Walker, J. K. (2008). What goes around comes around: Improving faculty retention through more effective mentoring. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 24(6), 337-346. doi: 10.1016/j.profnurs.2007.10.013
- Eagan, K., Lozano, J. B., Hurtado, S., & Case, M. H. (2013). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2013*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Eib, B. J., & Miller, P. (2006). Faculty development as community building. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 7(2), 1-10.
- Ekman, R., & Pelletier, S. (2008). Student learning: A work in progress. *Change*, 40(4), 14-19.

- Elton, L. (2009). Continuing professional development in higher education: The role of the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 8(3), 247-258. doi: 10.1177/1474022209339955
- Felton, G. (2000). Perspectives on faculty development. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 31(2), 83-87.
- Finch, J. K., Fernandez, C. (2014). Mentoring graduate students in teaching: The FCCIC Model. *Teaching Sociology*, 42(1), 69-75. doi: 10.1177/0092055X13507781
- Fink, L. D. (2010). The joy and responsibility of teaching well. *The ASHA Leader*, 15(10), 10-13.
- Fletcher, R. B., Meyer, L. H., Anderson, H., Johnston, P., & Rees, M. (2012). Faculty and students' conceptions of assessment in higher education. *Higher Education*, 64(1), 119-133. doi: 10.1007/s10734-011-9484-1
- Forbes, M. O., Hickey, M. T., & White, J. (2010). Adjunct faculty development: Reported needs and innovative solutions. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 26(2), 116-124. doi: 10.1016/j.profnurs.2009.08.001
- Gaff, J. G. (2007). Faculty in the variety of American colleges and universities. In A. L. Deneef & C. D. Goodwin (Eds.), *The academic's handbook* (3rd ed., pp. 11-21). Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press.
- Gallup Inc. (2010). About StrengthsQuest. Retrieved from www.strengthsquest.com/content/141728/index.aspx
- Gandolfo, A. (1997). Identifying lurking alligators: An essay on the ethical dimensions of faculty development. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22(2), 135-150.
- Gardiner, L. F. (2000). *Faculty development in higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.thenationalacademy.org/readings/facdev.html>
- Gappa, J. M., & Austin, A. E. (2010). Rethinking academic traditions for the twenty-first century faculty. *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*, 1, 1-20.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardiner, J., & Belland, B. R. (2012). A conceptual framework for organizing active learning experiences in biology instruction. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21(4), 465-475. doi: 10.1007/s10956-011-9338-8
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

- Guglielmo, B. J., Edwards, D. J., Franks, A. S., Naughton, C. A., Schonder, K. S., Stamm, P. L., ... Popovich, N. G. (2011). A critical appraisal of and recommendations for faculty development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 75(6), 1-10. doi: 10.5688/ajpe756122
- Hahn, T. B., & Lester, J. (2012). Faculty needs and preferences for professional development. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 53(2), 82-97.
- Handzic, M., & Lagumdzija, A. (2010). Global faculty learning community: A case study. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 8, 89-98. doi: 10.1057/kmrp.2009.35
- Hardre, P. L., Ling, C., Shehab, R. L., Nanny, M. A., Nollert, M. U., ... Wollega, E. D. (2013). Teachers in an interdisciplinary learning community: Engaging, integrating, and strengthening K-12 education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(5), 409-425. doi: 10.1177/0022487113496640
- Harper, S. R., & Jackson, J. L. (Eds.). (2011). *Introduction to American higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Henry, A., Kitchel, T., & Hart, J. (2012). *Identifying faculty roles, goals, expectations, and needs for teaching*. Unpublished report, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.
- Herbers, M. S., Antelo, A., Ettling, D., & Buck, M. A. (2011). Improving teaching through a community of practice. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 9(2), 89-108. doi: 10.1177/1541344611430688
- Hill, L., Kim, S. L., & Lagueux, R. (2007). Faculty collaboration as faculty development. *Peer Review*, 9(4), 17-19.
- Hilton, J. (2006). The future of higher education: Sunrise or perfect storm? *EDUCAUSE Review*, 41(2), 59-71.
- Hunt, A. N., Mair, C. A., & Atkinson, M. P. (2012). Teaching community networks: A case study of informal social support and information sharing among sociology graduate students. *Teaching Sociology*, 40(3), 198-214. doi: 10.1177/0092055X12441714
- Huston, T., & Weaver, C. L. (2008). Peer coaching: Professional development for experienced faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(1), 5-20. doi: 10.1007/s10755-007-9061-0
- Intrator, S. M., & Kunzman, R. (2006). The person in the profession: Renewing teacher vitality through professional development. *The Educational Forum*, 71(1), 16-32. doi: 10.1080/00131720608984564

- Jackson-Weaver, K., Baker, E. B., Gillespie, M. C., Bellido, C. G., & Watts, A. W. (2010). Recruiting the next generation of the professoriate. *Peer Review*, 12(3), 11-14.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518-542. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2002.0039
- Johnston, J. A., Kerr, B. A., Bondeson, W. B., Hansen, R. N., & Claiborn, C. D. (1994). The Wakonse conference on college teaching. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72(5), 480-484. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00977.x
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action. In K. Ward & L. E. Wolf-Wendel (Series Eds.), *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 36(4). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Kim, K., Sharma, P., Land, S. M., & Furlong, K. P. (2013). Effects of active learning on enhancing critical thinking in an undergraduate general science course. *Innovative Higher Education*, 38(3), 223-235. doi: 10.1007/s10755-012-9236-x
- Knight, P., Tait, J., & Yorke, M. (2006). The professional learning of teachers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 319-339. doi: 10.1080/03075070600680786
- Knowles, M., Holton III, E., & Swanson, R. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (6th ed.). Burlington, MA: Elsevier.
- Knox, A. B. (1980). Proficiency theory of adult learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5(4), 378-404.
- Kramer, M. W., Benoit, P. J., Dixon, M. A., Benoit-Bryan, J. (2007). Group processes in a teaching renewal retreat: Communication functions and dialectical tensions. *Southern Communication Journal*, 72(2), 145-168. doi: 10.1080/10417940701316476
- Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 27(1), 5-23.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawler, P. A., & King, K. P. (2002). *Planning for effective faculty development: Using adult learning strategies*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

- Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R. J. (1981). Improving college teaching: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 403-434.
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Light, G., Cox, R., & Calkins, S. (2009). *Learning and teaching in higher education* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Linder, R. A., Post, G., & Calabrese, K. (2012). Professional learning communities: Practices for successful implementation. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 78(3), 13.
- MacFarlane, B., & Hughes, G. (2009). Turning teachers into academics: The role of educational development in fostering synergy between teaching and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(1), 5-14. doi: 10.1080/14703290802646214
- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Marriage and baby blues: Redefining gender equity in the academy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 586(1), 86-103.
- Mauksch, H. O. (1986). Teaching within institutional values and structures. *Teaching Sociology*, 14(1), 40-49.
- McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Berthiaume, D., Fairbank-Roch, G. (2006). How do instructors explain their thinking when planning and teaching. *Higher Education*, 51(1), 125-155. doi: 10.1007/s10734-004-6381-x
- McGloin, S. (2008). The trustworthiness of case study methodology. *Nurse Researcher*, 16(1), 45-55. doi: 10.7748/nr2008.10.16.1.45.c6752
- McKeachie, W. J. (1990, November). *What theories underlie the practice of faculty development?* Paper presented at the 15th Annual Conference of the POD Network, Lake Tahoe, CA.
- McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Medina, M. S., Bouldin, A. S., Gonyeau, M., Kissack, J. C., Maldonado, W. T., Melchert, R. B., ...Plaza, C. M. (2012). Report of the 2011-2012 Academic Affairs Standing Committee: The evolving role of scholarly teaching in teaching excellence for current and future faculty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 76(6), 1-16. doi: 10.5688/ajpe766S5

- Mendoza, P. (2008). Socialization to the academic culture: A framework of inquiry. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 31(1), 104-117.
- Merriam, S. B. (2008). Adult learning theory for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 119, 93-98. doi: 10.1002/ace.309
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.) *X-factor* [Def. 1]. Retrieved February 22, 2015 from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/x%20factor>
- Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 1997(74), 5-12. doi: 10.1002/ace.7401
- Michael, J. (2007). Faculty perceptions about barriers to active learning. *College Teaching*, 55(2), 42-7. doi: 10.3200/CTCH.55.2.42-47
- Minter, R. L. (2009). The paradox of faculty development. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 2(4), 65-70.
- Morris, L. (2012). Senior teaching fellows: Renewal and professional development. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(1), 1-2. doi: 10.1007/s10755-011-9205-9
- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 250-260. doi: 10.1037/002-0167.52.2.250
- Mundy, M. A., Kupczynski, L., Ellis, J. D., & Salgado, R. L. (2012). Setting the standard for faculty professional development in higher education. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Myers, C. B. (2008). Divergence in learning goal priorities between college students and their faculty: Implications for teaching and learning. *College Teaching*, 56(1), 53-58. doi:10.3200/CTCH.56.1.53-58
- Nasmith, L., & Steinert, Y. (2001). The evaluation of a workshop to promote interactive lecturing. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 13, 43-48. doi: 10.1207/S15328015TLM1301_8
- Norbury, D. (2014). What faculty want from IT. *Education Digest*, 79(7), 55-61.

- Nyquist, J. D., Manning, L., Wulff, D. H., Austin, A. E., Sprague, J., Fraser, P. K., & Woodford, B. (1999). On the road to becoming a professor: The graduate student experience. *Change*, 31(3), 18-27.
- Ortleib, E. T., Biddix, J. P., & Doepker, G. M. (2010). A collaborative approach to higher education induction. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(2), 109-118. doi: 10.1177/1469787410365655
- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695-705.
- O'Sullivan, P. S., & Irby, D. M. (2011). Reframing research on faculty development. *Academic Medicine*, 86(4), 421-428.
- Palmer, P. J. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life* (10th anniversary edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Plater, W. M. (2008). The twenty-first century professoriate. *Academe*, 94(4), 35-40.
- Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(3), 319-346. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2011.0015
- Preston-Whyte, M. E., Fraser, R. C., & McKinley, R. K. (1998). Teaching and assessment in the consultation: A hospital clinician's preparatory workshop for integrated teaching of clinical method to undergraduate medical students. *Medical Teacher*, 20, 266-267. doi: 10.1080/01421599881066
- Pryor, J. H., Eagan, K., Palucki Blake, L., Hurtado, S., Berdan, J., & Case, M. H. (2012). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2012*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2012). *Reason and rigor: How conceptual frameworks guide research*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Remler, N. L. (2002). The more active the better: Engaging college English students with active learning strategies. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 30(1), 76-81.
- Reybold, L. E., Brazer, S. D., Schrum, L., Corda, K. W. (2012). The politics of dissertation advising: How early career women faculty negotiate access and participation. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(3), 227-224. doi: 10.1007/s100755-011-9200-1

- Rhoades, D. L. (2012). *Faculty engagement to enhance student attainment*. Paper prepared for National Commission on Higher Education Attainment. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Robert, T. E., Pomarico, C. A., & Nolan, M. (2011). Assessing faculty integration of adult learning needs in second-degree nursing education. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 12(1), 14-17.
- Robertson, D. L. (1999). Professors' perspectives on their teaching: A new construct and developmental model. *Innovative Higher Education*, 23(4), 271-294.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285-309. doi: 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000019591.74425.f1
- Ryan, J. F., Healy, R., & Sullivan, J. (2012). Oh, won't you stay? Predictors of faculty intent to leave a public research university. *Higher Education*, 63(4), 421-437. doi: 10.1007/s10734-011-9448-5
- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46(3), 539-556. doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2009.04.015
- Sallee, M. W. (2008). Work and family balance: How community college faculty cope. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 42, 81-91. doi: 10.1002/cc.327
- Sallee, M. W. (2013). Gender norms and institutional culture: The family-friendly versus the father-friendly university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(3), 363-396. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2013.0017
- Scanzoni, J. (2005). *Universities as if students mattered*. Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schrodt, P., Cawyer, C. S., & Sanders, R. (2003). An examination of academic mentoring behaviors and new faculty members' satisfaction with socialization and tenure and promotion processes. *Communication Education*, 52(1), 17-29. doi: 10.1080/0363452939261
- Seritan, A. L., Iosif, A. M., Hyvonen, S., Lan, M. F., Boyum, K., & Hilty, D. (2010). Gender differences in faculty development: A faculty needs survey. *Academic Psychiatry*, 34(2), 136-140.
- Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(1), 63-75.

- Silver, I. L., & Leslie, K. (2009). Faculty development for continuing interprofessional education and collaborative practice. *Foundations of Continuing Education*, 29(3), 172-177. doi: 10.1002/chp
- Skelton, A. (2012). Teacher identities in a research-led institution: In the ascendancy or on the retreat? *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 23-39. doi: 10.1080/0141926.2010.523454
- Smith, K. A., Sheppard, S. D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). Pedagogies of engagement: Classroom-based practices. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 87-101. doi: 10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00831.x
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2007). Faculty development: The challenge going forward. *Peer Review*, 9(4), 4-8.
- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Stein, S., Shephard, K., & Harris, I. (2011). Conceptions of e-learning and professional development for e-learning held by tertiary educators in New Zealand. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(1), 145-165. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00997.x
- Steinert, Y. (2010). Faculty development: From workshops to communities of practice. *Medical Teacher*, 32, 425-428.
- Steinert, Y. (2012). Perspectives on faculty development: Aiming for 6/6 by 2020. *Perspectives in Medical Education*, 1, 31-42. doi: 10.1007/s40037-012-006-3
- Steinert, Y., Cruess, R. L., Cruess, S. R., Boudreau, J. D., & Fuks, A. (2007). Faculty development as an instrument of change: A case study on teaching professionalism. *Academic Medicine*, 82(11), 1057-1064.
- Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. *Medical Teacher*, 28, 497-526. doi: 10.1080/01421590600902976
- Stenfors-Hayes, T., Weurlander, M., Dahlgren, L. O., & Hult, H. (2010). Medical teachers' professional development: Perceived barriers and opportunities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(4), 399-408. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2010.493352
- Stes, A., Clement, M., & Van Petegem, P. (2007). The effectiveness of a faculty training programme: Long-term and institutional impact. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 12, 99-109. doi: 10.1080/01421590125201

- Stes, A., Coertjens, L., & Van Petegem, P. (2013). Instructional development in higher education: Impact on teachers' teaching behavior as perceived by students. *Instructional Science*, 41, 1103-1126. doi: 10.1007/s11251-013-9267-4
- Stes, A., Min-Leliveld, M., Gijbels, D., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). The impact of instructional development in higher education: The state-of-the-art of the research. *Educational Research Review*, 5, 25-49. doi: 10.1016/j.edrev.2009.07.001
- Taylor, L., & Rege Colet, N. (2010). Making the shift from faculty development to educational development: A conceptual framework grounded in practice. In A. Saroyan & M. Frenay (Eds.), *Building teaching capacities in universities: A comprehensive international model* (pp. 139-167). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Teichler, U. (2003). The future of higher education and the future of higher education research. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 9(3), 171-185. doi: 10.1080/13583883.2003.9967102
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Trower, C. A. (2012). *Success on the tenure track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trowler, P. (2008). *Cultures and change in higher education: Theories and practices*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- University of Missouri. (2013). *Brian Foster retiring as Mizzou Provost next January*. Retrieved from <http://munews.missouri.edu/daily-clip-packets/2013/09-19-2013.pdf>
- University of Missouri. (2014). *About Mizzou*. Retrieved from <http://missouri.edu/about/index.php>
- University of Missouri. (2015). *William T. Kemper Fellowships for Teaching Excellence*. Retrieved from <http://kemperawards.missouri.edu/>
- University of Missouri Residential Life. (2015). *Thematic learning communities*. Retrieved from <http://reslife.missouri.edu/tlc>
- Van Eekelen, I. M., Boshuizen, H. P. A., & Vermunt, J. D. (2005). Self-regulation in higher education teacher learning. *Higher Education*, 50(3), 447-471. doi: 10.1007/s10734-004-6362-0

- Vijayalakshmi, B., & Navaneetha, T. (2013). Work life balance of women faculty working in educational institutions: Issues and problems. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics, and Management*, 3, 73-75.
- Wakonse Foundation. (2010). *Wakonse 2010 conference agenda*. Retrieved from <http://wakonse.org/mainpages/FacultyConference/Agenda%202010.pdf>
- Wakonse Foundation. (2013). *Wakonse 2013 conference agenda*. Retrieved from <http://wakonse.org/mainpages/FacultyConference/Agenda%202013.pdf>
- Wakonse Foundation. (2014a). *Wakonse 2014 conference agenda*. Retrieved from <http://wakonse.org/mainpages/FacultyConference/Agenda%202014.pdf>
- Wakonse Foundation. (2014b). *Wakonse defined*. Retrieved from <http://wakonse.org/>
- Wakonse Foundation. (2014c). *Welcome*. Retrieved from <http://wakonse.org/mainpages/FacultyConference/Index.htm>
- Walstad, W. B. & Becker, W. E. (2010). Preparing graduate students in economics for teaching; Survey findings and recommendations. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 41(2), 202-210. doi: 10.1080/00220481003613888
- Weisblat, G., & Sell, C. (2012). An exemplar in mentoring and professional development: Teaching graduate students transferable skills beyond the discipline. *Journal of Research Administration*, 43(1), 60-84.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice.: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wildman, T. M., Hable, M. P., Preston, M. M., & Magliaro, S. G. (2000). Faculty study groups: Solving “good problems” through study, reflection, and collaboration. *Innovative Higher Education*, 3(4), 247-263.
- Wilhelm, R. W., Craig, M. T., Glover, R. J., Allen, D. D., & Huffman, J. B. (2000). Becoming qualitative researchers: A collaborative approach to faculty development. *Innovative Higher Education*, 24(4), 265-266.
- Wilson, A. (2012). Effective professional development for e-learning: What do managers think? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(6), 892-900. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01248.x

- Winkelmes, M. A. (2013). Transparency in teaching: Faculty share data and improve students' learning. *Liberal Education*, 99(2), 48-55.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., & Ward, K. (2013). Work and family integration for faculty: Recommendations for chairs. *The Department Chair*, 23(4), 1-3. doi: 10.1002/dch.20050
- Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Twombly, S. B. (2007). Faculty life at community colleges. *Community College Review*, 34(4), 255-281.
- Wood, L. N., Vu, T., Bower, M., Brown, N., Skalicky, J., Donovan, D., ...Bloom, W. (2011). Professional development for teaching in higher education. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 42(7), 997-1009. doi: 10.1080/0020739X.2011.608864
- Wygall, D. E. (2011). Teaching, scholarship, and sharing: Perspectives on community. *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 20(3), 227-237. doi: 10.1080/09639284.2011.581373
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and method* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

VITA

Crystal Gateley was born in 1974 in Oakland, California, and her family moved to rural Missouri when she was 3 years old. After graduating from Laquey High School in 1991, she attended the University of Missouri, where she earned a Bachelor of Health Science in Occupational Therapy in 1995. After working for many years as an occupational therapy practitioner in the mid-Missouri area, Crystal returned to the University of Missouri for graduate coursework and completed a Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis (ELPA) with an emphasis in Higher and Continuing Education in 2003. She continued to work full time as an occupational therapist and also served as a guest lecturer and adjunct instructor for the University of Missouri – Department of Occupational Therapy. In 2009, she began a full-time, non-tenure track position in the same department as an Assistant Teaching Professor, and she was promoted to Associate Teaching Professor in 2014. Shortly after beginning her full-time academic career, Crystal returned to the ELPA department and pursued a Ph.D. in ELPA with an emphasis in Higher Education and a concentration in Higher Education Leadership and Administration (to be conferred in May 2015). She currently lives in Ashland, Missouri, with her husband and two daughters.