

DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING STAFF LEARNING COMMUNITIES: AN EFFECTIVE APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Milton Cox

Miami University, Oxford, USA
coxmd@muohio.edu

***Abstract:** Miami University's Staff Learning Communities Program (SLCP), developed over a 22-year period, adapts the well-known student learning community approach to staff development. Each Miami University staff learning community (SLC) is a cross-disciplinary group of 8-10 staff engaged in an active, collaborative, year-long curriculum focused on enhancing and assessing learning with activities that promote learning, development, scholarship of teaching and learning, interdisciplinarity, and community. A staff participant in any of the year's six SLCs selects a focus course to try out innovations, assess resulting student learning, and prepare a course mini-portfolio; engages in biweekly seminars; works with student associates; and presents project results to the campus and national conferences. Evidence shows that SLCs increase staff interest in teaching and learning and provide safety and support for staff to investigate, attempt, assess, and adopt new (to them) methods such as using appropriate technology, problem-based learning, team teaching, active learning, inclusive classrooms, ethics across the curriculum, and student-centered learning. Evidence indicates that the type and degree of student learning is enhanced greatly in SLC participants' courses. Over 5% of Miami's staff participates in a learning community each year. Grants from the Ohio Board of Regents (the state governing board) and the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) now support Miami's mentoring of other institutions in the SLCP approach.*

***Keywords:** Development; Community; Scholarship of teaching*

Significance of the Program

The Staff Learning Communities Program (SLCP) at Miami University addresses the challenge of encouraging and supporting staff to investigate and attempt new methods of enhancing student learning using a learning community approach and involving the scholarship of teaching. Seven year-long *topic-based* staff learning communities (SLCs) have focused on enhancing learning using the topics of cooperative learning, team teaching, technology, problem-based learning, ethics, teaching portfolios, or diversity—understanding and implementing ways to create inclusive classrooms and curricula. These topics may change annually as new teaching and learning issues or opportunities need to be addressed. *Cohort-based* SLCs meet the challenge of providing the additional developmental support for a group of staff that may have

been affected by change, isolation, fragmentation, or a chilly climate in the academy. Two notable cohort-based SLCs at Miami are the Teaching Scholars Learning Community for Early-Career Staff (in its 23rd year) and the Senior Staff Learning Community for Teaching Excellence (in its 11th year). In 2002-03 cohort learning communities for graduate teaching associates (Preparing Future Faculty) and department chairs will occur. Building communities and collaboration among staff is a challenge since most training and rewards are for individual accomplishments.

The concept and design of the SLC Program has potential for far-reaching impact. The literature and outcomes of *student* learning communities are well known (MacGregor, Tinto, & Lindblad, 2001), and this model for *staff* learning communities generates similar outcomes for staff. The program is adaptable on other campuses as recent dissemination grants from The Ohio Board of Regents and FIPSE attest. In conjunction with the enhancement of learning, the program has also been a change agent (Cox, 2001a), helping to build a culture around teaching and learning, contributing to transforming the institution into a learning organization (Senge, 1990) (see the collateral materials, Table 2), and providing a holistic, connected, and flexible approach to staff development. Multidisciplinary SLCs foster connected colleagues, courses, and a coherent curriculum.

The SLC Program represents a fresh direction beyond a conventional response. Most staff development programs in the U.S. involve individual consultations or campus-wide workshops rarely lasting for more than a day. Miami's SLCs are year-long intensive communities resulting in deep learning rather than surface learning. In the U.S., Miami's SLC program has been unique in its community approach to staff development. In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, Gillespie, Hilsen, & Wadsworth (2002) do not mention SLCs. Kurfiss and Boice (1990) surveyed members of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) to determine existing and desired staff development practices. The staff learning community approach was not mentioned in the 26 reported practices. Wright and O'Neil (1995) surveyed key instructional role players at institutions in the US, Canada, the UK, and Australasia to determine the potential of 36 staff development practices that could improve teaching on their campuses. Again, staff learning communities or their equivalent are not included on this list, confirming the absence of a holistic, connected approach to staff development.

The SLC Program supports the diverse, multicultural aspects of education. One of the goals of each of the Program's SLCs is "to investigate and incorporate ways that difference can enhance teaching and learning" (Cox, 2001b, p. 4). The Community Using Difference to Enhance Teaching and Learning, in place for 4 years, specifically addresses this objective. Participants in each SLC are chosen to create a gender balance and a group representing a variety of disciplines, experiences, and needs.

Rationale Appropriate to Achieving the Program's Objectives

Founded in 1809, Miami University is a state-assisted research intensive institution (9 doctoral programs as compared to research extensive in while about every department has a PhD program), with 14,500 undergraduates, 1,500 graduate students, and 950 full time staff on the Oxford campus, plus two regional, urban, commuter campuses, each with 2,000 students and 50 staff. Miami has a history and tradition of emphasis on undergraduate education. The program's objectives—emphasizing enhanced undergraduate learning, the ways that difference can enhance teaching and learning, development of staff in learning

communities, and the scholarship of teaching—are consistent with the mission of the university. These objectives and expectations are clearly communicated in a book distributed each year to all staff (Cox, 2001b) and on the program’s Web site at <<http://www.muohio.edu/celt/>>.

In designing and implementing the SLC Program, the university has incorporated a careful analysis and strategy. In higher education in the U.S., this is a time of increasing interest in learning communities. Palmer (1998) searches for “an image of teaching that has challenged me for years, one that has an essential but seldom-named form of community at its core: *to teach is to create a space in which the community of truth is practiced*” (p. 90). Cross (1998) poses the question “Why Learning Communities? Why Now?” She gives three reasons: “*philosophical, research based, and pragmatic*” (p. 4). Students who have participated in learning communities develop an educational citizenship (Tinto, 1995). Tinto also reports that students “learned more, found academic and social support for their learning among their peers, and . . . became actively involved in their learning” (p. 12). Retention increased. Students made “a significant and unusual leap in intellectual development during their learning community experience” (Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, & Smith, 1990, p. 66). Although the comments above are about *student* learning communities, we have found them to be true for *staff* learning communities. Staff become students when they are members of a staff learning community. Fulton and Licklider (1998) claim that “New visions of professional development suggest that the practices needed to support staff learning are analogous to those needed to support student learning” (p. 55). It is no surprise, then, that learning and development outcomes for staff in learning communities are similar to those for students who are members of student learning communities.

Resources are used wisely. Time is the most valuable resource; thus, SLC components are designed to be productive. According to Fulton & Licklider, “Staff, like their students, learn by reading, experiencing, reflecting, and collaborating with others” (1998, p. 55). Each year the components of these communities vary somewhat but are likely to include the following.

Focus course. Each community member selects a course on which to focus each semester. The members contribute their syllabi to a booklet that they share. Members engage in classroom assessment techniques, small group instructional diagnosis, preparation of a course portfolio, and implement ways to assess student learning.

Biweekly seminars on teaching and learning. Seminars in an SLC go “beyond the individual ponderings of good teachers to a community of conversation where teachers cannot only express their conceptions of teaching in discussion and reflection with others, but go beyond mere technical elements or classroom practice to the richer dimensions of human understanding” (Harper, 1996, p. 263). Recent topics include assessing student learning, enhancing the teaching/learning experience through awareness of developmental stages, and sharing student and staff views of teaching and learning (the community members and their student associates share). In the second semester, individuals or the group present a seminar to the entire campus. This contributes to curricular and organizational change.

Teaching projects. Members of all communities individually pursue self-designed teaching projects, for which they receive financial support. Past projects have included developing expertise and courseware for computer-assisted instruction or redesigning an ongoing course to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Staff partners. Each cohort-based community member selects a colleague to work with during the year. In the case of junior staff, the person is an experienced staff mentor. Senior staff community members pair up with someone inside that community, as in the New Jersey Partners in Learning model.

Student associates. Each participant selects one or two students who provide perspectives for that participant's teaching and teaching project, as well as about seminar topics discussed in that community. Students interested in investigating careers in higher education find this experience helpful. They may negotiate to receive an hour of independent study credit, student wages, or recognition on their transcript.

National Conferences and retreats. In the early fall, a "bonding" retreat occurs at another campus or national teaching conference, a setting for seminars with staff from other universities. Each community participates in a Lilly Conference on College Teaching where members present their projects. SLCs may also attend national conferences on higher education, such as AAHE or AAC&U.

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Each community engages in a sequence of activities designed to introduce its members to a scholarship that is new to most of them: the scholarship of teaching and learning. Our staff development office has an extensive library and subscribes to newsletters and multidisciplinary journals that publish the scholarship of teaching. Seminars early in the program address topics from the community's focus book (purchased by the program) or articles that provide introductions to key topics.

Leadership. As we form new communities, we select as coordinators former SLC participants who have been exemplary members in one or more of the communities. These are successful seminar presenters or members of past junior staff communities who have later served as mentors and exhibited talent in staff development and the topic they lead. They also share the results of their communities locally and nationally; all have presented at national staff development or teaching conferences. They are front-line leaders who model the attributes of the teaching-learning scholar (Senge, 2000).

SLCs are more structured and intensive than most approaches that gather together a collection of faculty to meet and work on teaching and learning issues, for example, teaching circles (Quinlan, 1996) or a group coming together each week over "brown bag" lunches to read and discuss articles on teaching. SLCs are different from but in many ways like most action learning sets in that they both are "a continuous process of learning and reflection, supported by colleagues, with an intention of getting things done" (McGill & Beaty, 2001, p. 11). Both are not seminar series or formal committees. They are more than project teams, or support, self-development, or counseling groups. SLCs and action learning sets have several aspects in common: both meet for a period of at least 6 months; have voluntary membership; meet at a dedicated time and in an environment conducive to learning; treat individual projects in the same way; employ the Kolb 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.

SLCs differ from action learning sets in that SLCs are less formal, for example, not underscoring negotiated timing or other formal structures at meetings. SLCs include more focus on the social aspects of building community: off-campus retreats and conferences

include times for fun, and a dinner or two during the year includes spouses or partners. Some SLCs continue to meet on a social basis after the project cycle is finished. SLCs include more emphasis on the team aspect (while still developing each individual's project) and on the ultimate beneficiaries of the program: the students in the participants' courses.

The early implementation strategy for Miami's SLC Program was to develop one SLC and assess its effectiveness for a few years before initiating a second, and perhaps then adding additional ones. Inclusive planning includes Miami's Committee for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (staff and students). They plan with and advise the office of Teaching Effectiveness Programs, which administers the SLC Program. To broaden participation and funding, topics and cohort foci are chosen based on staff interest in certain innovations and needs. Assessment of components and development outcomes takes place each year in all communities. Pre- and post-syllabi are compared in some SLCs. The quality of participants' campus presentations is evaluated by peers. The Program now cosponsors SLCs with other units, for example, with the Honors Program. There is high staff participation. Each year in each SLC, 8-10 staff participants are selected from applicants to create a diverse community across disciplines, experience, and needs. For the first ten years of the SLC Program there was only one SLC and during the next five there were only two SLCs. During this time there would be as many as 20 to 30 applicants for the 8-10 places. Now that there are six to eight SLCs, the number of applicants for each usually varies from 8 to 12. Applicants are voluntary, participating because of community, multidisciplinary connections, support to try innovations, and desire to improve learning. With six to eight SLCs, over 60 staff (over 5% of Miami's staff) are engaged each year in a year-long intensive program to enhance student learning and develop staff.

Members of the current staff who have participated in SLCs number 314 through 2001-02. Strong institutional support comes from the university senate, provost, deans, chairs, and senior and junior staff. The provost commits substantial financial and human resources, with an annual budget of \$150,000 USD that goes to the staff participants and leaders in the six SLCs. Staff participants receive either one course-reassigned time or \$1,000-\$1,500 for professional expenses. The staff coordinator of each SLC receives a course reassignment both semesters. Staff teach 2 to 4 courses each semester, so the reassignment amounts to a half to one-fourth reduction in teaching responsibilities that semester. On the other hand, an SLC coordinator leading a seminar is teaching, so the time commitment is a wash. In addition, Teaching Effectiveness Programs, its staff (director, two administrative assistants, five student workers) and office operations are funded by the provost. For the last 19 years, the contributions of Miami Alumni have provided the \$150,000 for the programming components.

The longevity of the SLC Program at Miami is due to several factors, some national, some local. In the US, for decades higher education has become increasingly compartmentalized by discipline and department (Meiklejohn, 1932). Staff at Miami who have felt this isolation—at least one third of the staff—have joined SLCs to learn from and collaborate with colleagues across disciplines. Especially junior staff desire to meet and work with peers in communities (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). Some senior and mid-career staff join because they feel rusted out or unappreciated by their departments (Karpiak, 1997). Dewey (1933) advocated for a neglected facet of higher education that was not remedied even by the 1980s: active, student-centered learning. Inquisitive Miami staff have been eager to explore opportunities such as cooperative, problem-based, or team-taught courses. Local factors contributing to the development of SLCs involved needs that gave faculty and administrators concern and opportunity: racial problems, technology glitz, assessment inadequacies, ethical concerns,

poor writing, disappearing loyalty to the institution, etc. Other initiatives such as campus-wide workshops or grants to individuals failed to solve the problems, providing only surface learning.

At each developmental need and step, the institution's director of teaching effectiveness programs, the teaching committee mentioned above, and the provost (many over a 20+ year period) engaged SLCs to help address a current concern because the effectiveness of SLCs was well documented over the years by consistent assessment of staff and programmatic outcomes. Most initiatives have been bottom up from staff who have experienced the benefits of SLCs. Changes over the years have included the addition or adaptation of SLC components to engage promising approaches to development, for example, course mini-portfolios and the scholarship of teaching. The number of topics and cohorts served has increased dramatically in the last 5 years as other units have become cosponsors. The appropriateness of SLCs is confirmed by research into the way academics respond to pressures to adopt more flexible teaching practices: Taylor (1997), in analysis of the Evaluations and Investigations Program funded by the Australian government, identified four themes: tribalism (in the disciplines), community, the need for refuge (safety), and the value of guiding principles to the development of new practices. The 5 principles that Taylor proposes to accomplish staff adoption of innovations are time to do intensive learning, opportunities for cross-tribal conversation and collaboration about teaching, probing of belief systems and evaluation of teaching practices, refuges in which to explore new practices, and organizational support for these behaviors. These principles form the heart of an SLC Program.

The Program's Proven Success and Impact

Evidence of systemic change is discussed below for several of the communities. The early-career staff community provides a safe place for pre-tenure staff in their second through fifth years to meet and work on teaching opportunities with peers from other disciplines. Most participants develop into "quick starters" (Boice, 1992). The outcomes noted in Table 1 indicate that they also become very interested in the teaching process and gain a perspective of teaching, learning, and higher education that extends beyond their disciplines. They become comfortable in the university community, overcoming the great stress often felt by junior staff (Sorcinelli, 1992). Evidence shows that the staff partner—an experienced staff mentor—has a strong impact on the development of junior staff members (Cox, 1997). At Miami, participants are tenured at a significantly higher rate than junior staff who do not participate in this community (Cox, 1995). The senior staff community offers participants time, safety, funds, and collegiality across different disciplines in order to reflect on past teaching and life experiences and investigate and chart new directions. Evidence indicates that this community values most of all the collegiality and learning from the other participants. Table 1 reports outcomes similar to those for junior staff community members. The senior community fulfills Karpiak's (1997) recommendations of what the university administration should do for professors at mid-life: to provide opportunities for them to be members of a team, to help each other grow as intellectuals, to develop support networks, and to counsel each other on career matters.

We created the Staff Community Using Difference to Enhance Teaching and Learning in order to involve staff in addressing serious diversity issues on campus. The strategy hinged on the belief that if staff could connect diversity issues with ways to increase the learning of their students, instructors would get involved. The safety offered by this staff learning community has been important in opening a constructive dialogue and fostering risk taking. According to

Gabelnick et al., “Learning communities have features that feminist literature suggests are important, such as cooperation and shared power, development of a personal connection to the material being studied, and emphasis on the affective aspects of learning” (1990, p. 79). Table 1 notes that members in this community have a level of “comfort in the university community” below those in other groups, a concern raised by their investigations.

The SLC Using Cooperative Learning to Enhance Teaching and Learning provides a safe place for staff to try this aspect of active learning. A staff learning community provides an excellent place to accomplish these goals. This community also rates highly the impact of the scholarship of teaching (Table 1). In almost every department a former SLC member has published the scholarship of teaching.

Evidence indicates that staff learning communities produce team learning and community for their members: The program impact of “colleagueship and learning from other participants” is ranked first by those in each community. With respect to outcomes, the greatest impact across all communities is on the participants’ interest in the teaching process. Research indicates that students learn more from enthusiastic, interested teachers. Another measure of success is the support received from administrators. This is evident in that Miami’s provosts have tripled funding over the last 15 years to enable the initiation of new communities. Evidence that communities foster civic responsibility is found in SLC participants’ contributions to leadership of the university. Currently, two of Miami’s six deans are former participants of SLC, as well as 19 of 46 department chairs and almost half of the university senate staff membership. Of the 142 staff still at Miami who have served as mentors in the early-career staff community, over one third (55/142) are former SLC participants.

Evidence that student learning is enhanced is found in the analysis of student learning that appears in the participants’ course mini-portfolios, the results of teaching projects, and in final reports. Objective, hard data documenting improvement in undergraduate learning outcomes is given in the results of surveys of past SLC participants who report (1) how and the degree to which student learning in their courses changed as a result of SLC participation, (2) how they knew it changed, (3) what processes/approaches resulted in increased learning, (4) the categories of their SLC teaching projects and the degree to which learning changed as a result of that project, and (5) the degree of change in student learning due to a change in staff attitude as a result of SLC participation. The learning objectives were categorized using the Angelo and Cross (1993) Teaching Goals Inventory. The degree to which student learning changed was rated using the following scale: 0 ((students learned less), 1 (no change), 2 (learned more to a small degree), 3 (learned more to a medium degree), 4 (learned more to a great degree).

Some highlights of the results follow:

- Ninety-four percent of the respondents reported an increase in students’ “ability to apply principles and generalizations already learned to new problems and solutions” (degree of change: 3.0). The same results were reported for “ability to ask good questions” and students’ “ability to develop an openness to new ideas;” 96% reported an increase in students’ ability “to work productively with others” (3.2); 92% reported an increase in students’ “capacity to think for oneself” (3.0); 98% reported an increase in the “ability to synthesize and integrate information and ideas” (3.1).

- Staff were aware that student learning increased because of successful achievement of existing (62%) or new/more (58%) learning objectives; better class discussion/engagement (84%); students more interested (64%); better classroom atmosphere/engagement (68%); student evaluation comments (54%); better papers or other writing assignments (52%).
- Some approaches that resulted in increased learning and their degree of change included cooperative or collaborative learning (92%, 3.0); active learning (92%, 3.1); discussion (88%, 3.1); student-centered learning (84%, 3.0); writing (82%, 2.7); technology (74%, 2.6).
- The overall rating for the degree to which student learning increased as a result of the participants' SLC teaching project was 2.9.
- The percentage of SLC respondents indicating the item and the degree of change in student learning due to a change in staff attitude were as follows: your general enthusiasm about teaching and learning (98%, 3.3); your scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching (92%, 3.2); more reflective (94%, 3.2); more comfortable (88%, 2.9); more confidence (90%, 2.8); revitalization (90%, 2.7).

Evidence that the program has an impact on the academic community is provided by its emulation and adaptation by others. Miami has received a three-year \$324,000 FIPSE grant to mentor the development of SLCs at the Claremont Graduate University and colleges, Kent State University, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, The Ohio State University, and the University of Notre Dame. This grant and the resulting SLCs at each institution (2 SLCs at each in 01-02, 4 in 02-03, and 6 in 03-04) will provide interesting comparisons to the outcomes of the Action Learning Project at seven tertiary institutions in Hong Kong (Kember, 2000). The Ohio Board of Regents awarded Miami a grant to establish the early-career SLC program statewide, and Miami has led adaptations that are enthusiastically underway at Bowling Green State University, Kent State University, The Ohio State University, Ohio University, Sinclair Community College, Shawnee State University, and The University of Cincinnati-Raymond Walters College. We have made presentations about the program at AAHE, AAC&U, and seven Lilly Conferences on College Teaching.

In conclusion, we note what Gabelnick et al. (1990) implore: "to create programs that bring us together structurally in some cases, intellectually and emotionally in others". Learning communities are one way that we may build the commonalties and connections so essential to our education and our society" (p. 92). Staff developed in a learning community environment are improved learners and citizens who are transformed and energized, as are their students.

References

- Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cox, M. D. (1995). The development of new and junior faculty. In W. A. Wright and Associates (Eds.), *Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies for higher education* (pp. 283-310). Bolton, MA: Anker.

- Cox, M. D. (1997). Long-term patterns in a mentoring program for junior faculty: Recommendations for practice. *To Improve the Academy*, 16, 225-268.
- Cox, M. D. (2001a). Faculty learning communities: Change agents for transforming institutions into learning in organizations. *To Improve the Academy*, 19, 69-93.
- Cox, M. D. (Ed.). (2001b). *Teaching communities, grants, resources, and events: 2001-02*. Oxford, OH: Miami University.
- Cross, K. P. (1998, July-August). Why learning communities? Why now? *About Campus*, 4-11.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Fulton, C., & Licklider, B. L. (1998). Supporting faculty development in an era of change. *To Improve the Academy*, 19, 51-66.
- Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (Eds.) (1990). *Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gillespie, K. H., Hilsen, L. R., & Wadsworth, E. C. (Eds.) (2002). *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Harper, V. (1996). Establishing a community of conversation: Creating a context for self-reflection among teacher-scholars. *To Improve the Academy*, 15, 251-266.
- Karpiak, I. E. (1997). University professors at mid-life: Being a part of ... but feeling apart. *To Improve the Academy*, 16, 21-40.
- Kember, D. (2000). *Action learning and action research*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Kurfiss, J., & Boice, R. (1990). Current and desired faculty development practices among POD members. *To Improve the Academy*, 9, 73-82.
- MacGregor, J., Tinto, V., & Lindbald, J. H. (2001). 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* (pp. 41-48). Washington, DC: AAHE.
- McGill, I., & Beaty, L. (2001). *Action learning*. (2nd Ed. Revised). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Meiklejohn, A. (1932). *The experimental college*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Patrick, S. K., & Fletcher, J. J. (1998). Faculty developers as change agents: Transforming colleges and universities into learning organizations. *To Improve the Academy*, 17, 155-170.
- Quinlan, K. M. (1996). Involving peers in the evaluation and improvement of teaching: A menu of strategies. *Innovative Higher Education*, 20 (4), 299-307.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century Series (Inquiry No. 7). Washington, DC: AAHE.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P. M. (2000). 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* (pp. 275-300). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 27-37). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, P. G. (1997). Creating environments which nurture development: Messages from research into academics' experiences. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 2 (2), 42-49.
- Tinto, V. (1995, March). Learning communities, collaborative learning, and the pedagogy of educational citizenship. *AAHE Bulletin*, 47 (7), 11-13.
- Wright, W. A., & O'Neil, M. C. (1995). Teaching improvement practices: International perspectives. In W. A. Wright & Associates (Eds.), *Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies for higher education* (pp. 1-57). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Milton D. Cox is University Director for Teaching Effectiveness Programs at Miami University, Oxford, OH, USA, where he founded and directs the annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching. He also is founder and Editor-in-Chief of the Journal on Excellence in College Teaching. He directs the 1994 Hesburgh Award-winning Teaching Scholars Community for Junior Staff and oversees the other five staff learning communities at Miami. He incorporates the use of student learning portfolios and Howard Gardner's concept of multiple intelligences in his mathematics classes.

Table 1*Miami University***STAFF LEARNING COMMUNITIES****ASSESSMENT OF SLC STAFF DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES**

Results from the question, "Estimate the impact of the community on you with respect to each of the following developmental outcomes. '1' indicates a very weak impact and '10' indicates a very strong impact."

Number in parentheses is the ranking of this outcome over the years the question has been asked.

Number on second line is mean for that outcome over the years the question has been asked.

Outcomes (Number of years surveyed) Listed in order of impact across all communities	Junior Staff Community (20 years)	Senior Staff Community (10 years)	Difference Community (3 years)	Cooperative Learning Community (1 year)	Problem- Based Learning Community (1 year)	Team Teaching Community (1 year)	Technology Community (1 year)
1. Your interest in the teaching process	8.6	8.7	8.5	9.6	8.3	7.8	8.4
	(1)	(1)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(1)
2. Your perspective of teaching, learning, and other aspects of higher education beyond the perspective of your discipline	8.6	8.4	8.4	7.7	8.6	7.6	8.0
	(1)	(2)	(2)	(10)	(1)	(3)	(2)
3. Your comfort level as a member of the Miami University Community	8.0	8.1	7.5	9.7	7.3	7.6	7.6
	(4)	(3)	(8)	(1)	(6)	(3)	(4)
4. Your view of teaching as an intellectual pursuit	8.2	8.0	7.8	9.6	7.6	6.6	7.3
	(3)	(4)	(5)	(3)	(4)	(8)	(7)
5. Your understanding of and interest in the scholarship of teaching	7.9	7.7	7.8	9.7	7.3	6.4	7.7
	(5)	(6)	(5)	(1)	(6)	(9)	(3)
6. Your awareness and understanding of how difference may influence & enhance teaching and learning	6.8	7.4	8.2	8.4	N/A	7.8	6.8
	(10)	(8)	(3)	(5)		(1)	(9)
7. Your total effectiveness as a teacher	7.7	7.7	7.0	8.3	7.3	7.2	7.6
	(6)	(6)	(9)	(9)	(6)	(6)	(4)
8. Your understanding of the role of a staff member at Miami University	7.1	8.0	7.7	6.9	7.0	7.0	7.0
	(8)	(4)	(7)	(11)	(9)	(7)	(8)
9. Your awareness of ways to integrate the teaching/research experience	7.1	7.2	7.0	8.7	4.7	7.6	6.8
	(8)	(9)	(9)	(5)	(12)	(3)	(9)
10. Your research and scholarly interest with respect to your discipline	6.7	6.4	8.0	8.6	7.4	6.4	6.8
	(11)	(11)	(4)	(7)	(5)	(9)	(9)
11. Your technical skill as a teacher	7.2	6.9	5.9	8.4	6.7	6.0	7.4
	(7)	(10)	(11)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(6)
OVERALL MEAN FOR COHORT	7.6	7.7	7.6	8.7	7.2	7.1	7.4

Other items specific to a particular community were also rated; they are available from the author.

Table 2
Senge's Five Components of a Learning Organization
and Ways That Staff Learning Communities Enable Them

<p style="text-align: center;">General Description Senge (1990)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Transforming Colleges and Universities Into Learning Organizations Patrick & Fletcher (1998)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Ways That Staff Learning Communities Enable Senge's Five Components of a Learning Organization</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Systems Thinking</p> <p>View of the system as a whole, a conceptual framework providing connections between units and members; the shared process of reflection, reevaluation, action, and reward</p>	<p>Creation and recovery of a common language and processes across departments and divisions; setting and honoring institutional missions, goals, actions, and rewards</p>	<p>Time, funding, safety, teams, and rewards to enable multidisciplinary participants to discover, reflect on, and assess pedagogical and institutional systems; members' discovery and appreciation of the synergy of connected campus units</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Personal Mastery</p> <p>Support for individuals to achieve their maximum potential as experts in their fields and to address opportunities and problems in new and creative ways</p>	<p>Support for staff to continue as experts in their disciplines, yet broaden their scholarship beyond discovery to include integration, application, and teaching, particularly multidisciplinary perspectives</p>	<p>Development of individual teaching projects to address opportunities or shortcomings in one's teaching and learning; a developmental introduction to and practice of the scholarship of teaching with multidisciplinary perspectives; becoming an expert teacher inside and outside one's discipline</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Mental Models</p> <p>Culture and assumptions that shape how an organization's members approach their work and its relationship to society; relationship of employees to the organization, peers, and clients</p>	<p>Change from a culture of autonomy and rewards for individual work to one of community building; rewards for staff contributions to institutional goals and solutions of problems</p>	<p>Members' opposition to the isolation and fragmentation of the academy; high value of collegiality across disciplines; participation an honor with financial rewards; discovery and appreciation of differences among students and their development; value of students as associates and sojourners</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Building a Shared Vision</p> <p>Collaborative creation of organizational goals, identity, visions, and actions shared by members; outcomes a result of teamwork, with each individual's contribution an integral part</p>	<p>Sharing of departmental and disciplinary visions across disciplines; identifying joint approaches to issues such as implementing student learning communities, improving student learning, integration of technology, creation of an intellectual community</p>	<p>Development of pedagogical goals and joint approaches in each community and sharing these with the campus, e.g., using technology in teaching, inclusiveness of classroom and curriculum, active learning, assessment of learning; discussion of campus-wide issues; taking positions and action</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Team Learning</p> <p>Creation of opportunities for individuals to work and learn together in a community where it is safe to innovate, learn, and try anew</p>	<p>Colleges and universities with "learning communities for teaching and research with colleagues and students" (p. 162)</p>	<p>Team learning—the heart and purpose of a staff learning community</p>