1

Faculty learning communities create connections for isolated teachers, establish networks for those pursuing pedagogical issues, meet early-career faculty expectations for community, foster multidisciplinary curricula, and begin to bring community to higher education.

Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities

Milton D. Cox

> The growth of any craft depends on shared practice and honest dialogue among the people who do it. We grow by trial and error, to be sure—but our willingness to try, and fail, as individuals is severely limited when we are not supported by a community that encourages such risks.
>
> —Palmer, 1998, p. 144

Community is playing an increasing and important role in our classrooms and institutions, connecting us with our students and colleagues (Cox, 2002). However, this growth has been slow, and there are many obstacles to implementation (Palmer, 2002). Creating a faculty learning community program is one approach that engages community in the cause of student and faculty learning and of transforming our institutions of higher education into learning organizations (Cox, 2001).

Community has played an important role in the development of the United States. Alexis de Tocqueville, visiting the new country in the 1830s to determine the reasons for the success of democracy, concluded that it was a result of the social capital—"the ways our lives are made more productive by social ties" (Putnam, 2000, p. 19)—generated by Americans of all dispositions who were very active in forming and participating in local associations. However, community has faced barriers, as noted by Putnam (2000) in his findings and concerns about the collapse of small, traditional communities during the last third of the twentieth century. With this all-too-brief comment about community in U.S. culture, we turn to needs for community in higher education.

The isolation of college teachers in the 1920s was reported by Waller (1932). Even now, "The heart of the crisis in American education is the lonely work of teachers who often feel disconnected from administrators, colleagues, and many of their students" (Baker, 1999, p. 95). For example, in interviews with a random sample of 120 professors regarding their work as teachers and researchers, Baker and Zey-Ferrell (1984) noted distinct patterns: Research work involved elaborate and strong networks of support and collaboration, while teaching did not. There were two types of lonely teachers: the *splendid isolationists*—rugged individualists who were the best teachers in their department and expressed no need to consult about teaching—and *demoralized loners,* who consulted with no one because of bitter disappointments about students and colleagues.

Learning Communities

Boyer (1990) described colleges and universities as learning communities, which he characterized as purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative. In higher education, the term *learning community* has many meanings. Baker (1999) uses the term to mean "a relatively small group that may include students, teachers, administrators, and others who have a clear sense of membership, common goals, and opportunity for extensive face-to-face interaction" (p. 99). He notes that classes, committees, advisory groups, interdisciplinary teaching teams, departments, and residential colleges have the potential to be—but may not be—learning communities. In some cases, the likelihood of having community is small. Duffy and Jones (1995) note that community in classrooms is a great opportunity that is often missed opportunity and that, if community is to be established, it needs to be done early in the term. Palmer (2002) comments: "Students are gathered in one place, called the classroom, not for the sake of community, but merely to make it unnecessary for the professor to deliver the information more than once" (p. 185). Palloff and Pratt (1999) describe requirements and methods for building virtual communities in cyberspace, noting that relationships established there can be stronger than those in face-to-face groups. A national study of departments found collegiality to be "hollowed" (Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck, 1994), with community usually absent from meetings, curricular planning, and pedagogical work. Angelo (2000) suggests ways to transform departments into learning communities, and Senge (2000) reports that department chairs, as local line leaders, must model the behavior necessary to build community. In learning communities, all members of the group are learners, and the group is organized to learn as a whole system (Baker, 1999).

Student Learning Communities

In order to understand faculty learning communities (FLCs), it is helpful to look at student learning communities (SLCs).

Background. The search for student community in higher education (Dewey, 1933; Meiklejohn, 1932) started long before Boyer's search for community in campus life (Boyer, 1990). In the 1920s and 1930s, Dewey and Meiklejohn became concerned about the specialization and isolation of faculty and curriculum in departments and disciplines. To address the absence of active and student-centered learning (Dewey, 1933) and a coherent curriculum connecting disciplines (Meiklejohn, 1932), they independently proposed the concept of cohorts of students taking courses in common across disciplines. This approach sputtered for fifty years, with flashes of success at a few institutions (Tussman, 1969) quickly followed by dissolution of programs unable to surmount various obstacles in academe. The student learning community movement finally was solidly established at Evergreen State University (Jones, 1981), then at other institutions in the state of Washington and across the United States.

Institutions have incorporated variations of five SLC models that differ in complexity, faculty involvement, and residential components. Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, and Smith (1990) provide an excellent explanation of the five models, including the roles, challenges, and successes of faculty and students. The community formed by a student cohort plays a key role in achieving better student learning outcomes for students in SLCs compared with those who are not in SLCs.

Student Learning Community Outcomes. Tinto (1995) and MacGregor, Tinto, and Linbald (2000) review a compilation of assessment studies of SLCs and report promising results:

1. The support of a community aids retention. Students in SLCs, especially those at risk, underrepresented, and making C's and D's, fare better academically, socially, and personally.
2. Students' learning goes deeper, is more integrated, and is more complex. For example, student intellectual development (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986; Baxter Magolda, 1992; Perry, 1970) takes place at a faster rate, because students are exposed to ambiguity through opposite points of view in team-taught courses or a proseminar.
3. SLCs play an important role in faculty development. Faculty involved in SLCs achieve significant gains in personal, social, and professional development.
4. Sensitivity to and respect for other points of view, other cultures, and other people are enhanced for both students and faculty.
5. Civic contributions such as participation in student government and in service learning programs are higher.

In answer to the questions "Why learning communities? Why now?" Cross (1998) gives three reasons: "*philosophical* (because learning communities fit into a changing philosophy of knowledge), *research based* (because learning communities fit what research tells us about learning), and *pragmatic* (because learning communities work)" (p. 10).

But like general society (Putnam, 2000), higher education has barriers to community. As some faculty members attempt to move institutions from the instruction paradigm to the learning paradigm (Barr and Tagg, 1995), SLCs provide an example of just how difficult the learning paradigm is to implement (Barr, 1998). Registrars, department chairs, and faculty find it challenging to deal with tasks such as scheduling a cohort of students, rewarding team teaching, and teaching outside of one's department. Shapiro and Levine (1999, jacket) note: "When campuses begin to implement learning communities, whether they know it or not, they are embarking on a road that leads to a profound change in culture." Unfortunately, "learning communities always seem to push against an institutional glacier that grinds away at innovation, smoothing it out and trying to make it like everything else" (Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, and Smith, 1990, p. 92).

Faculty Learning Communities

After the major research on learning outcomes in SLCs was published in the 1990s, we at Miami University noted similar outcomes in our faculty development program, in which groups of eight to twelve faculty members spent a year working on teaching and learning topics (Cox, 2000). As a result, we renamed these groups *faculty learning communities*. For a history of FLCs, see Cox (2002).

Definition of an FLC. At Miami University, we define an FLC as a cross-disciplinary faculty and staff group of six to fifteen members (eight to twelve members is the recommended size) who engage in an active, collaborative, yearlong program with a curriculum about enhancing teaching and learning and with frequent seminars and activities that provide learning, development, the scholarship of teaching, and community building. A participant in a Miami University FLC may select a focus course or project in which to try out innovations, assess student learning, and prepare a course or project mini-portfolio; engage in biweekly seminars and some retreats; work with student associates; and present project results to the campus and at national conferences.

There are two categories of FLCs: cohort-based and topic-based. Cohort-based FLCs address the teaching, learning, and developmental needs of an important group of faculty or staff that has been particularly affected by the isolation, fragmentation, stress, neglect, or chilly climate in the academy. The curriculum of a cohort FLC is shaped by the participants to include a broad range of teaching and learning areas and topics of interest to them. Five examples of cohorts with FLCs are junior faculty, midcareer and senior faculty, department chairs, deans, and graduate students preparing to be future faculty. More details about cohort FLCs are given in Chapter Two of this volume.

Each topic-based FLC has a curriculum designed to address a special campus teaching and learning need, issue, or opportunity. Faculty and

professional staff members propose topics to the FLC program director, who then advertises a call for applications across the university. These FLCs offer membership and provide opportunities for learning across all faculty ranks and cohorts and make appropriate professional staff members available to focus on a specific theme. A particular topic may be new and involve an FLC for one or many years, ending when the teaching opportunity, interest, or issue of concern has been satisfactorily addressed. Topics addressed by these FLCs are listed in Chapter Two.

Our FLCs offer a more structured and intensive program than most groups of faculty that meet and work on teaching and learning issues, such as teaching circles (Quinlan, 1996), book clubs, seminars, or brown-bag luncheon discussion groups. Of course, if certain components, such as projects and community, are present, those types of groups may also be FLCs. Research teams long have been disciplinary groups that work together on discovery scholarship, but they may proceed without an emphasis on community. Multidisciplinarity and community are the elements that allow FLCs to excel in teaching and learning pursuits. An FLC is a particular kind of community of practice (Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder, 2002).

FLCs are different from, but in many ways like, most action learning sets (ALSs) in that they are "a continuous process of learning and reflection, supported by colleagues, with an intention of getting things done" (McGill and Beaty, 2001, p. 11). Both FLCs and ALSs are more than just a seminar series, committee, project team, or support, self-development, or counseling group. FLCs and ALSs have several aspects in common. Both meet for a period of at least six months; have voluntary membership; meet at a designated time and in an environment conducive to learning; treat individual projects in the same way with the group contributing suggestions and a timely schedule to completion; employ the Kolb (1984) experiential learning cycle; develop empathy among members; operate by consensus, not majority; develop their own culture, openness, and trust; engage complex problems; energize and empower participants; have the potential of transforming institutions into learning organizations; and are holistic in approach. FLCs differ from ALSs in that FLCs are less formal; for example, they do not focus extensively on negotiated timing of discussions or other formal structures at meetings. FLCs concentrate less on efficiency and more on the social aspects of building community; off-campus retreats and conferences include times for fun, and some gatherings during the year include family and guests. FLCs place more emphasis on the team aspect of support (while still consulting on each individual's project) and on the ultimate beneficiaries of the program: the students in the participants' courses and students participating as FLC associates (Cox and Sorenson, 1999).

Goals of FLCs. The long-term goals of an FLC program at most institutions are similar to those at Miami University:

- Build universitywide community through teaching and learning
- Increase faculty interest in undergraduate teaching and learning
- Investigate and incorporate ways that diversity can enhance teaching and learning
- Nourish the scholarship of teaching and its application to student learning
- Broaden the evaluation of teaching and the assessment of learning
- Increase faculty collaboration across disciplines
- Encourage reflection about general education and the coherence of learning across disciplines
- Increase the rewards for and prestige of excellent teaching
- Increase financial support for teaching and learning initiatives
- Create an awareness of the complexity of teaching and learning

FLC Outcomes. Paralleling the student learning community outcomes listed earlier in this chapter are the following results for Miami University (MU) faculty in FLCs:

1. Pretenure faculty are at risk for stress-related health problems and not acquiring tenure (Sorcinelli, 1992). As reasons, they cite a lack of community, the disconnect between their personal and academic lives, and incomprehensible tenure systems (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000). However, the pretenure faculty in MU's Teaching Scholars Faculty Learning Commmunity shared talk and advice about how to achieve tenure, reduce stress, and integrate family and academic worlds. Members of this FLC were tenured at a significantly higher rate than MU faculty who were not members (Cox, 1995). While one cannot claim that FLC participation was the reason for obtaining tenure, it is easy to see that a yearlong, intensive program on teaching, learning, and community did not harm their chances, a view that has been expressed by some department chairs in this research-intensive institution.
2. Faculty in MU's FLCs move quickly through stages of intellectual development in the area of teaching and learning (Cox, forthcoming). For example, many faculty members begin their academic careers as dualists (Perry, 1970) or in silence (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986), unaware of the scholarship of teaching and knowing only one way to teach. They see the authorities as experts who make the teaching evaluation instruments used in their department or division. FLC participants encounter and learn to embrace ambiguity through multidisciplinary perspectives and an increasing awareness of differing teaching and learning styles.
3. FLCs play an important role in faculty and student development. MU's FLC Program has twice (in 1994 and 2003) received Hesburgh Award recognition as an excellent faculty development program that

increases undergraduate learning. MU's FLC model has also been adapted by other institutions (see Chapters Two and Six).

4. In FLCs, sensitivity to and respect for other points of view, other cultures, and other people are enhanced for both faculty and students. In assessment of the impact of FLCs on the participants' faculty development outcomes, the reported rating across all FLCs with respect to "your awareness and understanding of how difference may influence and enhance teaching and learning" was 7.6 on a scale from 1 (very weak impact) to 10 (very strong impact) (Cox, 2002). The Faculty Learning Community on U.S. Cultures Course Development, involving ten participants designing seven courses, completed the task in 1.5 years, resulting in six courses approved for scheduling. The group collaborated on strategies for working with chairs and curriculum committees to get courses approved and offered (Heuberger and others, 2003).
5. FLC graduates make more civic contributions than those who have not been in FLCs. For example, a greater percentage serve as members of the University Senate, department chairs, and mentors for pretenure faculty (Cox, 2001).

Evidence That FLCs Work. At MU, evidence that student and faculty learning is improved through FLCs is found in the analysis of student learning that appears in the participants' course miniportfolios, in the results of teaching projects, and in final reports. Evidence documenting improvement in undergraduate learning outcomes is given in the results of surveys of fifty past FLC participants who reported (1) how and the degree to which student learning in their courses changed as a result of faculty learning community participation, (2) how they knew that it changed, (3) what processes or approaches resulted in increased learning, (4) the categories of their FLC teaching projects and the degree to which learning changed as a result of those projects, and (5) the degree of change in student learning due to a change in faculty attitude as a result of FLC participation. The learning objectives were categorized using the Angelo and Cross (1993) Teaching Goals Inventory. The degree to which student learning changed was rated as 0 (students learned less), 1 (no change), 2 (learned more to a small degree), 3 (learned more to a medium degree), or 4 (learned more to a great degree). Some highlights of the results follow, and more details are in Cox (2004):

1. An increase in students' "ability to apply principles and generalizations already learned to new problems and solutions" was reported by 94 percent of the respondents (average of the reported degrees of change is 3.0 on the 4-point Likert scale). The same results were reported for students' "ability to ask good questions" and their "ability to develop an openness to new ideas"; 96 percent reported an increase in students'

ability "to work productively with others" (3.2); 92 percent reported an increase in students' capacity to think for themselves (3.0); and 98 percent reported an increase in students' "ability to synthesize and integrate information and ideas" (3.1).

2. Respondents reported that they were aware that student learning had increased because of the successful achievement of existing (62 percent) or new or more (58 percent) learning objectives; better class discussion or engagement (84 percent); greater student interest (64 percent); better classroom atmosphere or engagement (68 percent); more positive student evaluation comments (54 percent); and better papers or other writing assignments (52 percent).
3. Reported approaches that resulted in increased learning (and their average degree of change) included cooperative or collaborative learning (92 percent; 3.0), active learning (92 percent; 3.1), discussion (88 percent; 3.1), student-centered learning (84 percent; 3.0), writing (82 percent; 2.7), and technology (74 percent; 2.6).
4. The average rating for the degree to which student learning increased as a result of participants' FLC teaching projects was 2.9 out of 4.
5. The percentage of faculty respondents indicating a change in student learning due to a change in the faculty member's attitude as a result of FLC participation (listed by type of faculty attitude, with the degree of change indicated after the percentage) was as follows: general enthusiasm about teaching and learning (98 percent; 3.3); scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching (92 percent; 3.2); being more reflective (94 percent; 3.2); being more comfortable (88 percent; 2.9); being more confident (90 percent; 2.8); being revitalized (90 percent; 2.7).

FLCs are also successful at changing or providing new curricula. At Miami University, the Faculty Learning Community Revising the American Studies Curriculum received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the next year received the Provost's Award for Best Program Review. Members of the Faculty Learning Community Integrating the Arts and the Curriculum have added various modules and perspectives to their courses (Reed and others, 2003), and participants in the Faculty Learning Community on Ethics Across the Honors Curriculum each developed a course in his or her discipline that contains a significant degree of ethical inquiry and that is offered for honors credit at least three times over a five-year period.

Over 10 percent of Miami University's faculty participate voluntarily in FLCs each year. There were eleven FLCs in 2002–03 and ten in 2003–04. A complete list of the eighty-one Miami University FLCs (twenty-three types) that have been implemented over the lifetime of the FLC Program (1979–80 through 2003–04) is available from Miami University (Cox, 2004, or http://www.units.muohio.edu/flc/flcdesc.shtml). One third of Miami University faculty have participated in FLCs, a percentage that

remains constant as faculty come and go, a kind of institutional faculty community quotient. This implies that two thirds of Miami University faculty do not find the FLC approach attractive or feasible. This may be due to a lack of awareness, a greater commitment to individual disciplinary research and scholarship, a discomfort with or disinterest in working in a community, or lack of time to invest in the commitment. Even some of the faculty members who are working on individual projects join FLCs, because they find that results can be obtained faster, more efficiently, and with greater insights when shared with supportive and inventive colleagues in an FLC (see Chapters Eleven and Twelve).

State and National Dissemination of the FLC Model. In 1999, MU received a grant from the Ohio Board of Regents to encourage adaptation of MU's FLC for junior faculty by Ohio institutions. The Ohio Teaching Enhancement Program (OTEP) was initiated to accomplish this project (Cox and Jeep, 2000). By 2001, seven institutions had implemented successful variations of such FLCs, and more institutions have joined OTEP and created FLCs since.

In 2001, following its success in Ohio institutions, MU received a three-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) to mentor the development of FLCs at five adapting institutions: Claremont Graduate University and Consortium, Kent State University, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, The Ohio State University, and the University of Notre Dame. In the third year of the grant, 2003–04, the five institutions have implemented sixty FLCs of thirty-one different types. Twelve of the FLCs are cohort-based, and forty-eight are topic-based. Each institution initiated two or three FLCs in its first year in the program, four to six in the second year, and four to seven in the third year. As a result of the OTEP and FIPSE project successes, in 2002–03 the Ohio Learning Network, a state agency, adapted the FLC model to develop thirty-one FLCs on technology-related topics at thirty-two institutions of higher education (see Chapter Six). The FIPSE FLC project has spawned a growing interest in FLCs, and by 2003–04, a wide range of institutions have established various versions of FLCs (see Table 1.1). These are discussed in Chapter Two.

Need for FLCs. Why has the FLC model attracted so much interest? In addition to the needs for community in higher education that were described earlier in the chapter, recent studies have reconfirmed evidence of the need for community for graduate students and early-career, midcareer, and senior faculty.

Lovitts (2001) argues that student persistence is connected to integration into the life of a department and gives four reasons that graduate students leave doctoral study: the absence of community, lack of information about doctoral study and inability to navigate the system, disappointment with the learning experience, and an unsatisfactory adviser relationship. Learning communities for preparing future faculty provide the community,

Table 1.1. Number and Type of Faculty Learning Communities Established at Five Institutions Through FIPSE Grant

Type of Faculty Learning Community	*Claremont Graduate University & Consortium Institutions*	*Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis*	*Kent State University*	*The Ohio State University*	*University of Notre Dame*	*Total*
Cohort-Based Junior or Early-Career Faculty			3	3	1	7
Midcareer and Senior Faculty				2		2
Preparing Future Faculty	3					3
Topic-Based Electronic Technology (General)	1			1	1	3
Collaborative Technology			3			3
Online Teaching and Learning			1			1
Electronic Technology in Society					1*	1
Navigating the Information World			1			1
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning on Instructional Technology Impact		1* 2				3
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (General)	1			1		2
Multicultural Course Transformation		1*				1
Multicultural Course Transformation in First-Year Learning Block Courses		3				3

Table 1.1. (Continued) Number and Type of Faculty Learning Communities Established at Five Institutions Through FIPSE Grant

Type of Faculty Learning Community	*Claremont Graduate University & Consortium Institutions*	*Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis*	*Kent State University*	*The Ohio State University*	*University of Notre Dame*	*Total*
First-Year Student Experience Great Starts: Connecting the Mosaic			2	2		4
Problem-Based Learning		2			1	3
Psychology of Learning	1					1
Faculty Work		1				1
Capstone Experience		2				2
Teaching Statistics					1*	1
Teaching Writing-Enriched Courses	1					1
Graduate Teaching Fellows to Be Leaders in Their Home Departments				3		3
Faculty and Future Faculty (including graduate students)			2			2
Advisory Group for Preparing Future Faculty		1				1
Teaching and Learning of Ethics in a Laboratory Setting					1	1
Tablet PC Initiative					1	1

Table 1.1. (Continued) Number and Type of Faculty Learning Communities Established at Five Institutions Through FIPSE Grant

Type of Faculty Learning Community	*Claremont Graduate University & Consortium Institutions*	*Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis*	*Kent State University*	*The Ohio State University*	*University of Notre Dame*	*Total*
Teaching Foreign Language					1	1
Integration of Catholic Social Thought					1	1
Professional Teaching and Training	2					2
Teaching Research Methods Across the Curriculum	1					1
Teaching Women's Studies Courses	1					1
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning on Assessment in Gateway Courses		1				1
Teaching and Learning in Large Classes		1	1			2
Total: 31 FLC Types	11	15	13	12	9	60

* FLC continued into a second year with the same participants.

information, and support needed to address these issues (see Chapter Thirteen).

In higher education, early-career faculty are arguably our most important human investment. A working paper of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation* (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000), reported on results of structured interviews with new faculty and graduate students preparing for faculty work. They were asked about their hopes and experiences and what would make a faculty career more resilient and self-renewing. The findings echoed the results of research done a decade before (Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992). The situation has not changed much. The study identifies three core, consistent, and interwoven concerns of prospective and early-career faculty: lack of a comprehensible tenure system, lack of community, and lack of integration of their academic and personal lives. The researchers reported: "Interviewees told us they want to pursue their work in communities where collaboration is respected and encouraged, where friendships develop between colleagues within and across departments, and where there is time and opportunity for interaction and talk about ideas, one's work, and the institution" (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000, p. 13). FLCs provide early-career faculty with opportunities for discussion as well as a community in which participants can explore together their tenure systems and options for integrated lives (Cox, 1995).

The AAHE report concludes with ten recommendations for good practice. The first four deal with establishing a more comprehensible tenure system; the next three call for one-on-one mentoring of graduate students and new faculty by senior faculty and department chairs; and the final three advocate support for teaching (provide model syllabi, encourage visits to the teaching center), disciplinary scholarly development, and a balance between professional and personal life. Remarkably, none of the recommendations speaks directly to forming community, another indication that higher education is not interested in or equipped to deal with the yearning expressed so eloquently by our early-career colleagues. The report itself says, "It's not that we don't know what to do, it's that we don't do what we know" (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000, p. 22). While the recommendations of the report address some of the faculty concerns, the concept of faculty learning community is not mentioned, and again, the barriers to community in higher education are exposed.

Is there a need for community among senior and midcareer faculty? Reporting on her study of midcareer faculty in a Canadian university, Karpiak (1997) found that one cohort experienced a malaise that included burnout and a need for renewal and found teaching unrewarding. This group felt isolated and on the periphery. The ten recommendations in this report (Karpiak, 1997) included three that spoke directly to forming community: promote among faculty a sense that they are involved in a joint enterprise and that they are members of a team; foster an environment in which colleagues

stimulate one another's intellectual interests and help each other develop and grow; and develop support networks so that faculty know they are not alone—sponsored networks, wherein colleagues can offer support to others. An FLC program that includes an FLC for midcareer and senior faculty can accomplish these recommendations (see Chapter Twelve).

Qualities Necessary for Community in FLCs. Community is a key part of an FLC (Cox, 2002). Across institutions, the FLC program directors have found that the following ten qualities need to be present in an FLC to foster community and thus the process of synergistic knowledge development (Mu and Gnyawali, 2003). These qualities are listed in Appendix A.

Components of an FLC. At this point in FLC program development, the developers have identified thirty components of an FLC (Cox, 2002). The degree of engagement in the components selected for an FLC may vary, depending on the type of FLC and institution. As an institution's experience with FLCs increases, the degree of engagement with each component and the number of components involved will usually increase. When appropriate, the components should be considered both globally with respect to the overall FLC program and locally for each particular FLC. Examples, memos, and more details are in Cox (2004). The components are in Appendix B.

Conclusion

Community has not been included in survey questions or responses to determine existing or effective faculty development practices (Centra, 1978; Erickson, 1986; Kurfiss and Boice, 1990; Wright and O'Neil, 1995). Workshops and consulting can provide only surface or single-loop learning (acting to achieve a result without much deep reflection on value or appropriateness) for the participants, but an FLC provides deep, double-loop learning (careful reflection on the appropriateness of actions with respect to outcomes and social structures) for the topics that the participants address (Argyris, 1993). Thus, a member of an FLC on any topic will not only learn about that, but over the course of the year will design and implement it in a focus course, with many opportunities to reflect with other FLC participants on its effectiveness and the assessment of resulting student learning and feedback. An FLC program can include many bridges linking faculty to deep learning, early-career faculty to experienced faculty, isolated teachers to new colleagues, departments to departments, disciplinary curricula to general education, and faculty to students and staff. Through FLC programs at some point we will have established sufficient connections in our institutions to support a learning organization and overcome the isolation in higher education.

Appendix A: Qualities Necessary for Community in FLCs

1. *Safety and trust.* In order for participants to connect with one another, they must have a sense of safety and trust. This is especially true when participants reveal weaknesses in their teaching or ignorance of teaching processes or literature.

2. *Openness.* In an atmosphere of openness, participants can feel free to share their thoughts and feelings without fear of retribution.
3. *Respect.* In order to coalesce as a learning community, members need to feel that they are valued and respected as people. It is important for the university to acknowledge their participation by financially supporting community projects and participation at FLC topic–related conferences.
4. *Responsiveness.* Members must respond respectfully to one another, and the facilitator(s) must respond quickly to the participants. The facilitator should welcome the expression of concerns and preferences and, when appropriate, share these with individuals and the entire FLC.
5. *Collaboration.* The importance of collaboration in consultation and group discussion on individual members' projects and on achieving community learning outcomes hinges on group members' ability to work with and respond to one another. In addition to individual projects, joint projects and presentations should be welcomed.
6. *Relevance.* Learning outcomes are enhanced by relating the subject matter of the FLC to the participants' teaching, courses, scholarship, professional interests, and life experiences. All participants should be encouraged to seek out and share teaching and other real-life examples to illustrate these outcomes.
7. *Challenge.* Expectations for the quality of FLC outcomes should be high, engendering a sense of progress, scholarship, value, and accomplishment. Sessions should include, for example, some in which individuals share syllabi and report on their individual projects.
8. *Enjoyment.* Activities must include social opportunities to lighten up and bond and should take place in invigorating environments. For example, a retreat can take place off-campus at a nearby country inn, state park, historic site, or the like.
9. *Esprit de corps.* Sharing individual and community outcomes with colleagues in the academy should generate pride and loyalty. For example, when the community makes a campus presentation, participants strive to provide an excellent session.
10. *Empowerment.* A sense of empowerment is both a crucial element and a desired outcome of participation in an FLC. In the construction of a transformative learning environment, the participants gain a new view of themselves and a new sense of confidence in their abilities. Faculty members leave their year of participation with better courses and a clearer understanding of themselves and their students. Key outcomes include scholarly teaching and contributions to the scholarship of teaching.

Appendix B: The Components of an FLC

In the list below, no asterisk denotes a component that is the primarily the responsibility of an FLC facilitator. One asterisk denotes a component that is the primary responsibility of the FLC program director, and two asterisks denote components that are the responsibility of both.

Mission and Purpose

1. * Goals for the institution (What do you want the FLC program to accomplish?)
2. ** Objectives for each FLC (How do you plan to bring about the above goals through specific objectives for each FLC?)

Curriculum

3. * What FLCs to offer (cohorts, topics)
4. ** What issues and topics to address within each FLC

Administration

5. ** Facilitator qualities and criteria for the FLC program and for each FLC
6. ** Selection procedures and criteria for membership in each FLC (striking a balance among disciplines, needs, gender, experience)

7. ** Public relations (advertising each FLC, recruiting applicants, and publicizing FLC activities and accomplishments)
8. ** Financial support and budgets

Connections
9. Community (bonding within; support; safety)
10. ** Partnerships (bridging to and cosponsoring with other programs and units inside and outside the institution)
11. ** Engagement (serving the broader community: student and faculty organizations, K–12, statewide, and so on)

Affiliated Participants
12. ** Faculty or administrative partners (for example, mentors, consultants)
13. Student associates (for example, undergraduate peer mentors, teaching assistants, consultants)

Meetings and Activities
14. Seminars (length, frequency, topics)
15. Retreats (getting away; working and learning together)
16. Conferences (getting away; learning from others)
17. Social amenities and gatherings

Scholarly Process
18. The literature (articles, focus book)
19. Focus courses or projects (syllabus; teaching goals inventory; classroom assessment techniques; small group instructional diagnosis; pilot; assessment)
20. Individual teaching projects or other projects
21. ** Presentations, both on campus and at conferences (by individual members of the FLC or the entire group)
22. Course or project miniportfolio (prepared by each FLC member for his or her focus course or project)
23. Publication (usually in a year after the FLC)
24. The scholarship of teaching and learning

Assessment
25. ** Of faculty or staff development
26. * Of FLC program components
27. ** Of student learning in the classes or projects of FLC participants

Enablers and Rewards
28. ** Reassigned (release) time for participants and the FLC facilitator
29. ** Professional expenses for participants and the FLC facilitator
30. ** Recognition by the provost, deans, department chairs, colleagues

References

Angelo, T. A. "Transforming Departments into Productive Learning Communities." In A. F. Lucas and Associates (eds.), *Leading Academic Change: Essential Roles for Department Chairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Angelo, T. A., and Cross, K. P. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Argyris, C. *Knowledge for Action: A Guide to Overcoming Barriers to Organizational Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Baker, P. "Creating Learning Communities: The Unfinished Agenda." In B. A. Pescosolido and R. Aminzade (eds.), *The Social Works of Higher Education*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press, 1999.

Baker, P., and Zey-Ferrell, M. "Local and Cosmopolitan Orientations of Faculty: Implications for Teaching." *Teaching Sociology,* 1984, *12,* 82–106.
Barr, R. B. "Obstacles to Implementing the Learning Paradigm." *About Campus,* Sept.–Oct. 1998, *3*(4), 18–25.
Barr, R. B., and Tagg, J. "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education." *Change,* Nov.–Dec. 1995, *27*(6), 13–25.
Baxter Magolda, M. *Knowing and Reasoning in College: Gender-Related Patterns in Students' Intellectual Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
Belenky, M. B., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., and Tarule, J. M. *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind.* New York: Basic Books, 1986.
Boice, R. *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
Boyer, E. *Campus Life: In Search of Community.* San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
Centra, J. A. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." *Journal of Higher Education,* 1978, *49*(2), 150–161.
Cox, M. D. "The Development of New and Junior Faculty." In W. A. Wright and Associates (eds.), *Teaching Improvement Practices: Successful Strategies for Higher Education.* Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 1995.
Cox, M. D. "Comparing Student Learning Communities and Faculty Learning Communities: Similar Successes, Similar Obstacles." Paper presented at the 12th annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching–West, UCLA Conference Center, Lake Arrowhead, Calif., Mar. 2000.
Cox, M. D. "Faculty Learning Communities: Change Agents for Transforming Institutions into Learning Organizations." *To Improve the Academy,* 2001, *19,* 69–93.
Cox, M. D. "The Role of Community in Learning: Making Connections for Your Classroom and Campus, Your Students and Colleagues." In G. S. Wheeler (ed.), *Teaching and Learning in College: A Resource for Educators.* Elyria, Ohio: Info-Tec, 2002.
Cox, M. D. "Proven Faculty Development Tools That Foster the Scholarship of Teaching in Faculty Learning Communities." *To Improve the Academy,* 2003, *21,* 109–142.
Cox, M. D. *Faculty Learning Community Program Director's and Facilitator's Handbook.* Oxford, Ohio: Miami University, 2004.
Cox, M. D. "Fostering the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Through Faculty Learning Communities." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching,* forthcoming.
Cox, M. D., and Jeep, J. M. "Taking Your Best Faculty Development Program Statewide in the 21st Century: Mentoring Other Campuses Regarding Junior Faculty." Paper presented at the 25th annual conference of the Professional and Organizational Development Network, Vancouver, Canada, Nov. 2000.
Cox, M. D., and Sorenson, D. L. "Student Collaboration in Faculty Development: Connecting Directly to the Learning Revolution." *To Improve the Academy,* 1999, *18,* 97–127.
Cross, K. P. "Why Learning Communities? Why Now?" *About Campus,* July–Aug. 1998, 4–11.
Dewey, J. *How We Think.* Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1933.
Duffy, D. K., and Jones, J. W. *Teaching Within the Rhythms of the Semester.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.
Erickson, G. "A Survey of Faculty Development Practices." *To Improve the Academy,* 1986, *5,* 182–196.
Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., and Smith, B. L. (eds.). *Learning Communities: Creating Connections Among Students, Faculty, and Disciplines.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
Heuberger, B., Briscoe, M., Fitch, F., Greeson, L., Hieber, M., Hulgin, K., and Paternite, C. "It Takes a Faculty Learning Community: Creating and Implementing Innovative

Diversity Courses Through Interdisciplinary Dialogue." Paper presented at the 23rd annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, Ohio, Nov. 2003.
Jones, R. *Experiment at Evergreen.* Cambridge, Mass.: Shenkman, 1981.
Karpiak, I. E. "University Professors at Mid-Life: Being a Part of. . . . but Feeling Apart." *To Improve the Academy,* 1997, *16,* 21–40.
Kolb, D. *Experiential Learning.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1984.
Kurfiss, J., and Boice, R. "Current and Desired Faculty Development Practices Among POD Members." *To Improve the Academy, 9,* 1990, 73–82.
Lovitts, B. E. *Leaving the Ivory Tower.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.
MacGregor, J., Tinto, V., and Lindbald, J. H. "Assessment of Innovative Efforts: Lessons from the Learning Community Movement." In L. Suskie (ed.), *Assessment to Promote Deep Learning: Insight from AAHE's 2000 and 1999 Assessment Conferences.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
Massy, W. F., Wilger, A. K., and Colbeck, C. "Overcoming 'Hollowed' Collegiality: Departmental Cultures and Teaching Quality." *Change,* July–Aug. 1994, *26*(4), 11–20.
McGill, I., and Beaty, L. *Action Learning.* (2nd rev. ed.) Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2001.
Meiklejohn, A. *The Experimental College.* New York: HarperCollins, 1932.
Mu, S., and Gnyawali, D. R. "Developing Synergistic Knowledge in Student Groups." *Journal of Higher Education,* 2003, *74*(6), 689–711.
Palloff, R. M., and Pratt, K. *Building Learning Communities in Cyberspace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.
Palmer, P. J. *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
Palmer, P. J. "The Quest for Community in Higher Education." In W. M. McDonald and Associates (eds.), *Creating Campus Community.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
Perry, W. J. *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
Putnam, R. D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
Quinlan, K. M. "Involving Peers in the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching: A Menu of Strategies." *Innovative Higher Education,* 1996, *20*(4), 299–307.
Reed, R. A., Armstrong, E., Biran, M., Cowan, D., Fellows, D., Hill, K., Miller, E., and Pan, Y. "Integrating the Arts into the Curriculum: The Approach of a Faculty Learning Community." Paper presented at the 23rd annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, Ohio, Nov. 2003.
Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., and Austin, A. E. *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation.* New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century Series, Working Paper Inquiry no. 7. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
Senge, P. M. "The Academy as Learning Community: Contradiction in Terms or Realizable Future?" In A. F. Lucas and Associates (eds.), *Leading Academic Change: Essential Roles for Department Chairs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
Shapiro, N. S., and Levine, J. H. *Creating Learning Communities: A Practical Guide to Winning Support, Organizing for Change, and Implementing Programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.
Sorcinelli, M. D. "New and Junior Faculty Stress: Research and Responses." In M. D. Sorcinelli and A. E. Austin (eds.), *Developing New and Junior Faculty.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
Tinto, V. "Learning Communities, Collaborative Learning, and the Pedagogy of Educational Citizenship." *AAHE Bulletin,* Mar. 1995, *47*(7), 11–13.
Tussman, J. *Experiment at Berkeley.* London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
Waller, W. *Sociology of Teaching.* New York: Wiley, 1932.
Wenger, E., McDermott, R., and Snyder, W. M. *A Guide to Managing Knowledge: Cultivating Communities of Practice.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2002.

Wright, W. A., and O'Neil, M. C. "Teaching Improvement Practices: International Perspectives." In W. A. Wright and Associates (eds.), *Teaching Improvement Practices: Successful Strategies for Higher Education.* Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 1995.

MILTON D. COX is director of the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching at Miami University, where he founded and directs the Lilly Conference on College Teaching, is editor-in-chief of the Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, *and facilitates the Hesburgh Award–winning Teaching Scholars Faculty Learning Community.*