Ricerche

Inquiries

Exploring the Impact of a Teacher Study Group
in an Italian University
Esplorare l'impatto di un Teacher Study Group
in una Università Italiana

Monica Fedeli
Università degli Studi di Padova
monica.fedeli@unipd.it
Edward W. Taylor
Penn State University, Harrisburg, Middletown, PA, USA
ewt1@psu.edu

ABSTRACT
This study explored the impact of a teacher study group involving twelve senior faculty over a five month period at University of Padova, Italy. The objective was to improve teaching and promote community building by reflecting, sharing and practicing teaching and learning activities within a small group. Theoretically the study is framed from a model of faculty development and transformative learning theory. Using a qualitative design this study explored what motivated faculty to participate in this group, the benefits of the group experience and the impact group experience on how participants thought about teaching and learning. Findings reveal for this group they had a real passion for teaching and desire to improve their practice. However, despite the power of the learning community change was small, incremental and reflected more in new ideas about teaching and not definitive change. The outcomes of this study have significant implications for faculty development within an Italian higher education setting, such that teacher study groups need to be long term, capitalize on learning through faculty relationships and that the responsibility of change doesn't reside exclusively within the faculty, the larger institutional context plays a significant role as well.

Il presente studio esplora l'impatto di un teacher study group che ha coinvolto 12 professori senior per un periodo di cinque mesi presso l'università di Padova. L'obiettivo è stato quello di migliorare le pratiche didattiche e di promuovere la creazione di una comunità attraverso la riflessione, la condivisione di pratiche di insegnamento e di attività di apprendimento all'interno di un piccolo gruppo. Dal punto di vista teorico lo studio si inserisce nel modello di faculty development e della teoria trasformativa. Usando un disegno di ricerca qualitativo esplora la motivazione dei docenti a partecipare a questo gruppo, i benefici dell'esperienza in gruppo e l'impatto dell'esperienza stessa sulle loro credenze rispetto all'insegnamento e apprendimento. I risultati rivelano che il gruppo è stato motivato dalla passione per l'insegnamento e dal desiderio di miglioramento delle pratiche. Nonostante il potere esercitato dalla comunità di apprendimento, il cambiamento è stato molto lento, di tipo incrementale e si riflette maggiormente nella elaborazione di nuove idee rispetto all'insegnamento e non in cambiamenti definitivi. I risultati del presente studio hanno delle implicazioni significative nello sviluppo delle competenze del docente universitario in higher education, tra cui la constatazione che un teacher study group dovrebbe avere una durata lunga, capitalizzare l'apprendimento attraverso le relazioni e che la responsabilità del cambiamento non risiede esclusivamente nei docenti, ma l'istituzione in senso ampio gioca un ruolo significativo.

1. Introduction

Recently a Higher Level Group (2013), formed by the European Commission, to explore the modernization of higher education concluded that when it comes to high quality teaching in Europe: "the truth about the daily lived reality… is an embarrassing disappointment. For research shows that serious commitment to best practice in the delivery of this core teaching mission is not universal, is sporadic at best and frequently reliant on the enlightened commitment of a few individuals" (p. 14). In response to the European Commission recommendations and recognizing that no formalized training exists for faculty in Italian Universities, the University of Padova Executive recently developed a faculty development program (Fedeli, Serbati, & Taylor, 2016). This project, titled "PRODID" (Preparazione alla Professionalità Docente e Innovazione Didattica) involved the creation of a permanent unit devoted to improving the teaching profession, based on current research about effective teaching (Felisatti, & Serbati, 2014).

After an extensive survey of faculty needs and interest PRODID's first faculty development endeavor involved 12 senior scholars participating in a teacher study group (TSG) over a 5-month period in 2015. The goal of the TSG was to create on-site experts across a variety of disciplines as well as initiate the creation of a faculty development system in which educators can mentor each other in more effective teaching practices. TSG are predominantly self-lead groups with the intent to develop a learning community that fosters professional development based on a critically reflective practice among select faculty (Stanley, 2011; Wildman et. al, 2000). Although, conceptually these groups are recognized as powerful mediums for faculty development and change, little research exists as to how they impact faculty, particularly senior faculty and their teaching practice. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the nature of change about teaching, both in conception and practice, expressed by participants in a TSG within an Italian higher education setting.

2. Teacher Study Groups, Faculty Learning Communities & Critical Friendships Groups

A teacher study group in higher education is a collaborative learning community of faculty designed to promote professional development within the context of the work place. The aim is to improve teaching, promote scholarship development and community building by engaging, sharing and practicing teaching and learning activities within a small group (Adams & Mix, 2014; Cox, 2004; Cox, 2013; Stanley, 2011; Wildman, et al., 2000). Depending on the institution and intent they are referred to in a variety of ways, such as: faculty learning communities (Cox, 2004; Daly, 2011; Nugent et al., 2008; Schlitz, et al, 2009); learning communities (MacKenzie, et al. 2010; Sherer, Shea & Kristensen, 2003); critical friendship groups (Holmes & Kozlowski, 2014); faculty study groups (Wildman, et al, 2000); collaborative teacher study groups (Stanley, 2011); research learning community (Holmes & Kozlowski, 2014); peer mentoring (Angelique, Kyle, & Taylor, 2002; Darwin & Palmer, 2009); and teacher groups (Heinrich, 2014). Characteristically, they are generally small groups of faculty volunteers (8-15), organized with a symmetrical relationship among participants, collaborative planning of meeting agenda's and group norms, often interdisciplinary and diverse in rank, and meeting regularly over sustained period of time. Adams and Mix (2014) when discussing critical friends groups see "members moving towards a de-privatization of teaching" through an open sharing of their practice alongside recognizing the "social, emotional, and personal nature of sharing such work" (p. 41). Structural-

ly they can range from independent organic entities that emerge in response to a particular issue, self-managed, and dissolve over time, to institutionally established, organized, and involve outside persons as facilitators and leaders. They operate from the assumption that these groups are essential for change because they provide the ideal setting for faculty to "reinvent themselves as educators" in concert with their peers "experimenting, reflecting, discussing, and assessing" their conceptions and approaches to teaching and learning (Sturko & Gregson, 2009, p. 36). This collaborative orientation is theoretically informed by the tenets (implicitly or explicitly) of educational inquiry (Dewey, 1916/2004); collaborative learning (Bruffee, 1987); and community of practice (Sherer, Shea & Kristensen, 2003; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). The collaboration evolves from the development of a learning community.

At present the major research findings, although tentative at best, emerge from a variety of case studies where programs have been implemented and evaluated. These teacher groups have been discussed in the literature has having "multiple benefits for faculty members including increased feelings of support within the university setting, increase sense of professional identity, higher rates of achieving tenure, as well as increased skill and knowledge base" (Holmes & Kozlowski, 2014; p. 36). TSG's provide mentoring opportunities for early career faculty to connect with senior faculty, leading to for some faculty to become: more open-mindedness and civic-minded (Cox, 2004), have a greater appreciation for ambiguity, and more competent and confident concerning particular skills about teaching (Adams & Mix, 2014; Daly, 2011). Some of the most extensive research on FLC's has been carried out at Miami University in Ohio, which has for over 32 years initiated a new group for early career faculty (Cox, 2013). The success of this program is reflected in the high degree of participation by faculty, both in early career faculty, but as well senior faculty as mentors. Survey over the years reveal a significant impact on practice, an increase interest in the teaching process and scholarship by participants.

Despite these findings research about teacher study groups (TSG) is sparse at best and methodologically difficult to compare because of the varied range, size, objectives, settings and structures that have been reported. There is often little critique about inherent limitations and explanation of why this approach of faculty development has not caught on among most higher education institutions. Also, there is a related body of literature in the field of K-12 education where this approached to faculty development originated that at times is reviewed and thrown into the mix, further complicating the analysis. Most the research is descriptive case studies (qualitative) which limits the ability to generalize the findings. Significant to this study, is that even less is known about how these groups manifest, evolve, and benefit faculty outside North America. In response to these shortcomings in the literature this study reflects an effort to explore a recently established teacher study group and involving exclusively senior faculty, across multiple disciplines at an Italian university.

3. The Italian Context and PRODID

Before getting into the specifics of the study it is important to discuss factors that emerge from the Italian context and how the play a role in shaping faculty development located in a university system that is one of the oldest in world. These factors include student population, history and traditions, central management and class size, all situated within a society regulated by very old rules and laws. Although, none of the factors are unique in of themselves compared to other universities, but together pose a significant challenge when promoting change

(e.g., didactics) within a university system. Starting broadly, University of Padova was founded in 1222, almost 800 years ago. It is located in an Italian University system that counts 88 Universities and around 1.7 million students, (Data referred to the academic year 2013/2014 from Students National Register http://anagrafe.miur.it/php5/home.php). University of Padova is one of the 10 largest public universities in Italy and is quite representative of the Italian higher education system particularly of Northern Italy. The state–run universities of Italy represent the main part of the education in Italy and are managed at a central level from the Italian Ministry of Instruction, University and Research.

Both the large number of students in classes and the strict hierarchical system throughout Italian universities reinforces a very formal didactic tradition that is rooted teaching and learning methods used by instructors who are still acting as a "sage on the stage" instead of "guide on a side" (Morrison, 2014, p. 4). This hierarchical system is also reinforced in ways by the larger societal setting. Italy, as many old countries, has a system of relationships that is very formal and regulated by old rules and laws. This strong societal trait and old academic system represent a considerable influence in the use of traditional and asymmetric teaching and learning methods in higher education. The dominant didactic is content centric, where delivering is uni-directional, with little consideration about the knowledge of the students and their professional and personal experiences. Within this frame and context, University of Padova funded a two-year pilot experience with the aim to create a teaching and learning center (TLC) to promote innovation and improve the pedagogical skills of the faculty. The data collected during the first year of the project PRODID and the debates at national and international level, related to the way in which instructors teach, illuminated our choices in planning the training and reinforce the will to look for contextual elements in order to innovate the didactics in Higher Education in Italy. The efforts are now going into the direction of creating and promoting an "Italian way" of faculty development within the constraints of this institutional setting (Fedeli, Serbati & Taylor).

The theoretical frameworks that inform PRODID's conception of training the group of 12 professors was *learner-centered teaching* and *student voice*. *Learner-centered* approach is based on students' existing knowledge and on the importance of reflection in order to foster interactive teaching methods and authentic relationships among students and teachers Cranton, 2006; Weimer, 2013). Furthermore, reflection was enriched by the *student voice* construct, that encourages students-teacher relationships in a partnership where all actors are involved in the teaching and learning process through dialogue and reciprocity (Cook-Sather & Luz, 2014; Seale, 2009; Fedeli, Felisatti, & Giampaolo, 2013). This approach aims to create a participatory setting in which students' voices inform the pedagogical practices and fostering an interactive learning context (Cook-Sather, Bovill, & Felten, 2014).

In the light of these emerging approaches and theories our efforts were to support faculty in developing awareness, skills and competencies consistent with this theoretical framework within the unique Italian setting. At the same time PRODID was an attempt to respond to the European 2020 Strategy, in which the *High Level Group on the Modernisation of Higher Education* (2013) has been established, whose aim is *improving the quality of teaching and learning in Europe's higher education institution*s.

4. Theoretical Frameworks

Two theoretical frameworks inform the design and implementation of this study. They included transformative learning theory which was used to understand a change in perspective (frame of reference, meaning schemes) of professors (Mezirow, 2000) and a developmental model of teaching, based on an extensive review of the college and adult development literature describing the perspectives of educators at various developmental stages (Robertson, 1999). Together these two frameworks offer both an understanding of the nature and developmental process of change as senior faculty learn to engage in a participatory approach of higher education in Italy.

Transformative learning theory (TL) was used to understand a possible change in perspective of faculty as a result of their participation in the TSG, particularly concerning their orientation towards teaching life (Mezirow, 2000). TL brings understanding to a deep shift in perspective experienced by adults during which habits of mind become more open, more permeable, and better justified (Mezirow, 2000; Taylor & Cranton, 2012). It is based on several assumptions about learning such that adults are active, not passive participants in their lives who are instinctively driven to make meaning of their world. Two, adults have significant life experiences, rooted in the tenets of constructivism which provide the bases for an established belief system and for constructing meaning of what happens in their lives. It is a re-interpretation of prior experiences that is explained by transformative learning theory. Generally, it occurs when a person, group, or larger social unit encounters a perspective that is at odds with the prevailing perspective (interpretation of a prior experience). The discrepant perspective can be ignored or it can lead to an examination of previously held beliefs, values, and assumptions, leading to a perspective transformation. According to Mezirow (1990), the process of transformative learning centers on critical reflection on prior experience and dialogue with self and others. However, other theorists (Dirkx, 1997; Taylor & Cranton, 2012) place imagination, intuition, and emotion at the heart of transformative process.

The second theoretical framework that informs this study is a developmental model of teaching, based on an extensive review of adult development literature describing the perspectives of educators at various developmental stages (Robertson, 1999). This model comprises of several interrelated stages that offer an understanding of educators, in the case of faculty in higher education, as they develop a more participatory approach to teaching. The first, and dominant state of most educators is the stage of *egocentrism*, where the teacher is centered on his/her own needs. At this stage in most every "aspect of the professors-as-teachers' perspective— view of content, process, learners, self, and context—they operate from their own frame of reference" (p. 276). This stage is followed by a transition, shaped both by internal resistance and external forces where faculty realize that this egocentric focus of teaching is often not successful and that teaching is much more than disseminating knowledge and teachers looking after their own interest. The second phase is *aliocentrism*, where the teacher predominantly focuses on learner-needs, seeing "themselves primarily as facilitators of learning…they are interested in the learning process and in the individual characteristics of the learners whom they are trying to help (e..g, learning style…biography in general…learning agendas) as well as in the pertinent contexts of those learners (e.g., work, family, and friendship networks, gender/race/class profile; spiritual community)" (p. 280-281). Despite the interest in the learners needs and interests, it is somewhat of a naïve development, whereby the learners are seen as central to the teaching learning process, however overlooking the needs/interests of the educator and their relationship to the teaching experience. Like the

previous transition period experienced between previous two phases, generally due to accumulation of unsuccessful teaching experiences, teachers begin to realize they must include themselves in the teaching equation. This insight leads to the *systemocentrism* stage (Teacher/Learner – Centeredness), also referred to as a relational perspective. A defining feature of this stage "is that professor-as-teachers not only attend to the inner experience of the learners and that experience's origins [biography]…, immediate social networks and so forth—professors-as-teacher also attend to similar dimensions of their own unique experience" (p. 286). Furthermore, teachers at this stage regularly reflect on their own personal and teaching experiences, how they interact with the inner experiences of the learners when fostering good learning, and not being mastered by course content. Using these frameworks offers both an understanding of the learning and developmental process of change as faculty learn how to respond to the demands of their learners.

5. Research Design

The methodological design of this study involved an interpretive qualitative orientation. This orientation provided the means to explicate how the faculty made meaning and understanding from their participation in the TSG. Secondly, the process was inductive, which allowed the study to build a greater understanding of the TSG as a construct and its relationship to promoting transformative learning. Third, the outcome of this study is revealed in rich descriptive data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). Twelve participants in this study were a purposeful group meeting the following criteria: a) were senior faculty (12 years or more teaching experience), b) had a high interest in improving their teaching identified from a university faculty survey, and c) came from wide range of disciplines (e.g, engineering, veterinary science, physics, language education, philosophy, computer science, biology, forestry, chemistry). They all participated in the TSG at University of Padova over a period of five months in a series of collaborative workshops (e.g, 12 – 4 hour sessions). The emphasis of these workshops fell within five general areas, each drawing on an external faculty development specialist involved in the project. The first three areas (6 sessions), focused on importance of developing an awareness of teaching beliefs, developing a safe and positive learning community and introducing faculty (practically, theoretically) learner-centered and participatory approaches to teaching. The third area focused on student motivation and ways to motivate students (3 sessions) in the classroom. A fourth area (3 sessions) involved an exploration into how the faculty can implement innovative teaching practices within the confines of an institution constrained by strong traditional approaches of teaching and learning.

Data collection involved individual semi-structure interviews with 12 senior faculty who participated in the entire TSG experience. Semi-structured interviews allowed for the flexibility requiring the researcher to be reflexive and to explore and probe interviewee responses as they arise. The interviews focused on four areas: the conception and practice of teaching prior to participating in TSG; reasons for joining the group; a deep discussion on the FLC experience itself, and the impact of participating in the TSG on in how they thought about teaching and what they plan to change when they begin teaching in the Fall. Individual interviews were conducted predominantly in English on-site at University of Padova. Through the use of multiple interviews (wide range of participants) and observations, triangulation across sources of information greatly enhanced the trustworthiness of this study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). In addition to interviews data also included observation notes from the TSG experience and course feedback forms.

The data was analyzed using a constant comparative approach. The two researchers, one a member of the host culture, systematically reviewed each transcript, observation notes and feedback forms and coded responses in an inductive manner where themes were developed based on emerging similarities and differences of expression. As a result, common themes were identified and grouped into main and sub categories. Analysis continued until there was a consensus on interpretation and each category was '*saturated*', that is no new information seemed to emerge from further analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The subheadings in the findings section of this article represent the overall themes that emerged through this process express by the TSG participants. In order to safeguard the anonymity of the learners, pseudonyms were used in the article in relation to direct quotations.

6. Findings

The findings of this study reveal six categories including: a) a passion for teaching; b) teaching is about organization and clarity of ideas; c) joining the group is about improving; d) the power of community; e) small changes and new ideas; f) learning through relationships; and d) teaching is about learning. Each category is discussed below and provided with examples of data.

The first two categories of the findings offer insight into their feelings and perspectives held by these participants as they entered the TSG and a baseline from which to help better capture change. Also, they provide a picture of the group as a whole and how that might inform the development and outcome of this TSG. Beginning with their feelings about teaching the participants were very *passionate* about their work as an educator. For instance, Francesco, an engineer:

> Well, perhaps I should first say that I love teaching, that is not very common among university professors.... I've always loved it, to teach, when I was a boy, I taught my schoolmates, the people who were around me.... So for me, teaching is a joy.

Similarly, Maria, a French professor stated: "I'm happy of teaching; I was born teaching. I have begun teaching very early to my dolls and to my little brother, so now I'm very happy to learn and then to teach." Alongside this passion to teaching, for most participants, was a perspective of teaching that was about *organization and clarity of ideas*. For example, Silvia, an animal biologist, states:

> I always consider teaching as a very logical process, if you do things in a logical way, take care of the organization, give the students the right material, prepare good resources, give good lectures, it is supposed you get a good result.

Much like's Silvia' was Sara's view of teaching. She stated: "Planning and having clear aims. I have clearer objective....I studied astrophysics and was working just with computers, galaxies, evolution of the universe."

The previous category, that of a passion, helps give meaning to a third category, *joining the group is about improving*. For example, Francesco stated: "The fact that I am satisfied does not mean that I cannot improve. And it doesn't even mean that what I perceive or think is a good thing is a really good thing. The fact that I am satisfied with the course does not mean that the course necessarily is good. Probably it does mean that the course is not bad at all, but I think there is room for improvement." Similarly, Giovanni a Professor of Philosophy states: "I think that I can learn more and even now after 35 years. My interest is to learn

strategies and techniques, to improve my lesson and to create emotions (to move) among the students." These first three categories reveal several themes about the participants of the TSG despite the fact that what originally bound them was that were senior faculty and to join the group was a voluntary act.

The fourth category of this study, *the power of community*, starts to reveal insight into the nature of the group and its role in fostering teacher change among the participants. This medium for learning is explained by Maria:

> The group had that common frame. They all wanted to reflect about teaching and they wanted to learn more...We are very happy to see each other.... I'm not enjoyed only the group, but I enjoyed all the experience and I knew and experience once more, and sometimes few words in a special context, enhance your thinking, make you discover some truth.

Francesco expands on this common frame as a community: "If you feel part of a community...learning is easier... I mean, you can personalize the teaching, and now I am starting to think: How can I personalize the teaching. The fact that you are in a class with your peers, doing the same thing, I am starting to think that is part of the learning." I was within the context of this healthy and enjoyable learning community participants became more appreciative of *learning through relationships*. Giovanni states as a matter of fact when speaking about his students: "I will put more attention to the relationships with my students; this was for me an important insight that I learned." For Maria it is a bit more complex. A core element of relationships, empathy and its role in education is affirmed through her experience in the TSG. She states:

> I already feel empathy for the students, but it gave me one way more to deepened it and also the permission that it was worth to do it, even if the institution still think we shouldn't do that.... It legitimates that kind of discussion with the students, it is the legitimation for the Italian institutions to allow that to the teachers.

This part of the data is at the beginning stage of analysis and other characteristics are starting to emerge (e.g., experiential activities, trusting environment) that provide insight into the medium of a "de-privatization of teaching" and change. The final category, small changes and new insights, offers a beginning picture of the nature and degree of change about teaching found among participants in the TSG after roughly 5 months. What is starting to emerge from the data is the acceptance of the importance of negotiating with students the classroom experience. Although the insight is starting to emerge, the action is cautious and small. For example, Silvia states:

> A little bit of change of the view I'm the teacher, the one who knows what to do and how to do it, to a vision that we both are here to work, it's not a party, but we have a common aim because you want to be the best vet in the world and I want you to be the best vet in the world I think negotiating with the students this aspect maybe could give them more responsibility, more involvement in the process, more active, responsible I hope.

Again Giovanni, equally significant, where he shares his insight: "Sometimes I could ask the students to prepare a presentation and to organize the class on their own." Others findings are emerging as well, but are still evolving as we work through the data, such the recognizing the importance of students working in groups and where the objective is not about teaching about finding ways help students learn.

7. Conclusion

Based on these findings that a TSG can be an effective medium for setting the context for change, although long term or significant change seems fleeting and illusive. Looking back at the literature on TSG's the findings are consistent with previous research, in that it found change in practice, although in this case small changes, tentative and mostly instrumental and somewhat conceptual in nature. Participants clearly were pondering change in their practice, but are cautious, particularly when it came to a more participatory approach to teaching. Understanding the small nature of change could be explained by a variety of factors, such as in Robertson's (1999) faculty development model, where the faculty are continually bound by their own "egocentrism" with an overemphasis on control in the classroom. Transition to a more learner-centered teaching would seem to require a transformation, particularly considering that these are senior faculty. Likely "both person and the person's environment resist fundamental changes in the person's perspective" (p. 277), having to resist an inherent drive to maintain homeostasis. Likewise, considering the environmental setting, the strong and historical institutional norms and traditions within the Italian university were also likely constraining the process of change. However, this was something that the senior faculty did not readily discuss, as if they lacked an awareness of how the setting was shaping their practice. More work needs to be done to help to make sense of the nature of the degree of the institutional context, the traditional Italian culture of teacher-centered teaching in shaping faculty's conceptions of teaching.

Reflecting on the findings through the lens of transformative learning theory an explanation of small and incremental change among participants could be seen as a change in meaning scheme (beliefs, values) about teaching, not indicative of a perspective transformation (a major paradigmatic shift about teaching) (Taylor & Cranton, 2012). Incremental change is consistent with previous research about TL, particularly considering that the catalyst for change seemed to be a response by most participants to "improve practice," not a crisis in practice (Taylor & Cranton, 2012). Most of the participants did not choose attend this group because of a major problem with their in practice, it was more a desire to improve their practice.

The source for fostering change in this TSG was the group itself, which over time created a community of practice that provided a setting for building trusting and supportive relationships with like-minded others leading to a de-privatization of teaching and learning (Adams & Mix, 2014). It is the synergistic process among faculty as they share personal experiences, practices and emotions about teaching, that trusting relationships are developed leading to further de-privatization of teaching. Consistent with the research on TL concerning significant personal change among adults it is "trustful relationships that allow individuals to have questioning discussions, share information openly and achieve mutual and consensual understanding" (Taylor, 2007, p. 179). Both the degree and nature of change is shaped and determined by the relationships with others within the group. In addition, it is apparent that practices associated fostering transformative learning (learning through relationships, holistic orientation, encouraging critical reflection) work effectively in engaging faculty in the study and practice of learner-centered/participatory approaches to teaching.

Despite the small successes found in this particular TSG there are limitations that have to be recognized. For one, it is a qualitative study and its generalizability is limited, however it does offer much insight into the everyday practical realities, foremost in Italy, for those who are interested setting up one of these groups. Second, is that the participants self-selected to be a part of the group be-

cause they had a very interest in teaching and improving their practice. These limitations challenge this group of researchers to begin a series of "next steps" related to this area of research, particularly if change in teaching is going to occur in Italy, an area that needs further explanation as we continue to explore the data. One of the first tasks will be to recreate this same experience with other kinds of groups, such as groups of less experienced faculty, groups of mixed rank faculty, and most significantly faculty who received consistently below average student evaluations of their teaching. Second, we want to engage scholars from other Italian universities to establish TSG as well, allowing for case-based approach analysis. Once multiple groups have been initiated over a course of several years this will allow an opportunity to initiate follow-up research and statistically capture the changes among faculty and potentially how students of TSG participants have shaped their teaching experience.

References

Adams, S. R. & Mix, E. K. (2014). Taking the lead in faculty development: Teacher educators changing the culture of university faculty development through collaboration. *AILACTE*, *11*, 37–56.

Angelique, H., Kyle, K., & Taylor, E. W. (2002). Mentors and muses: New Strategies for academic success. *Innovative Higher Education, 26*(3), 195-210.

Bruffee, K. A. (1987). The art of collaborative learning. *Change,19*(2), 42-47.

Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Cook-Sather, A., & Luz, A. (2014). Greater engagement in and responsibility for learning: What happens when students cross the threshold of student–faculty partnership. *Higher Education Research & Development,* 1-13. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.911263Cox, M. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 97*(97), 5–23. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1002/tl.129. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Cox, M. D. (2013). The impact of communities of practice in support of early-career academics. *International Journal for Academic Development, 1324*(September), 1–13. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.599600. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Cranton, P. (2006). Fostering authentic relationships in the transformative classroom. In E. W. Taylor (Ed.). Teaching for change: Fostering transformative Learning in the classroom. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education,* No. 109, pp. 5-13.

Daly, C. J. (2011). Faculty learning communities: Addressing the professional development needs of faculty and the learning needs of students. *Currents in Teaching and Learning, 4*(1), 3–16.

Darwin, A., & Palmer, E. (2009). Mentoring circles in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(2), 125–136. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1080/07294360902725017. [Last access: 25/10/2016].

Dewey, J. (1916/2004). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: Macmillian.

Dirkx, J. M. (1997) (Ed.) Nurturing the soul in adult education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 74,* 79-88.

Fedeli, M., Giampaolo, M., & Coryell, J. (2013). The use of learning contracts in the Italian university system. *Adult Learning, 24*(3), 104-111.

Fedeli, M., Felisatti, E., & Giampaolo, M. (2013). Ascoltare le voci degli studenti universitari. Il Learning contract uno strumento per la personalizzazione dell'apprendimento in contesto universitario. In V. Grion & A. Cook-Sather (Eds.), *Student Voice. prospettive internazionali e pratiche emergenti in Italia.* Milano: Guerini, 260-272.

Fedeli, M., Serbati, A., & Taylor, E. W. (2016), Developing teaching and learning methods to innovate the Italian context of Higher Education. The case of university of Padova. *Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning. Research and Practices.* Milano: Franco Angeli.

Felisatti, E., & Serbati, A. (2014, June 16-18). The professional development of teachers: From teachers' practices and beliefs to new strategies at the University of Padua, Proceedings of

the ICED conference educational development in a changing world. Retrieved from: http://www.iced2014.se/proceedings.shtml. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Heinrich, E. (2014). Towards using relevant collegial contexts for academic development. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *15*(3), 215–230. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1177/1469787414544873. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

High Level Group on the Modernization of Higher Education (2013). Report to the European Commission on improving the quality of teaching and learning in Europe's Higher Education institutions, Belgium: European Union.

Holmes, C. M., & Kozlowski, K. a. (2014). Faculty experiences in a research learning community, *Journal of Faculty Development, 28*(2), 35-42.

Lincoln, Y& Guba, E. (1985), *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.

MacKenzie, J., Bell, S., Bohan, J., Brown, a., Burke, J., Cogdell, B., Cogdell, B., Jamieson, S., McAdam, J., McKerlie, R., Morrow, L., Paschke, B., Rea, P., & Tierney, A. (2010). From anxiety to empowerment: A learning community of university teachers, *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*(3), 273–285. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1080/13562511003740825. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). Qualitative research. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1990). *Transformative dimensions of learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezriow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morrison, C. D. (2014). From 'Sage on the Stage' to 'Guide on the Side': A good start. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8*(1), 4.

Nugent, J. S., Reardon, R. M., Smith, F. G., Rhodes, J. a, Zander, M. J., & Carter, T. J. (2008). Exploring faculty learning communities: Building connections among teaching, learning, and technology. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 51–58. Retrieved from: http://www.mendeley.com/import/bookmarklet/?key=49c4a363d85e0a0b3db08b32064c2ba7. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Organization for the economic co-operation and development. (2013), *Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2013-en

Robertson, D. L. (1999). Professor's perspective on their teaching: A new construct and developmental model. *Innovative Higher Education, 23*(4). 271-294.

Schlitz, S. a, Connor, M. O., Pang, Y., Stryker, D., Markell, S., Krupp, E., Byers, C., Joes, S. D., & Redfern, A. K. (2009). Developing a culture of assessment through a faculty learning community: A case study. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 133–147.

Seale, J. (2009). Doing student voice work in higher education: An exploration of the value of participatory methods. *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(6), 995-1015.

Sherer, P., Shea, T., & Kristensen, E. (2003). Online communities of practice: A catalyst for faculty development. *Innovative Higher Education*, *27*(3), 183–194. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1022355226924. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Stanley, A. M. (2011). Professional development within collaborative teacher study groups: Pitfalls and promises. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *112*(2), 71–78. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2011.546692. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Sturko, P. a., & Gregson, J. a. (2009). Learning and collaboration in professional development for career and technical education teachers : A Qualitative multi-case study Dr . Patricia A . Sturko Washington State University Dr . James A. Gregson University of Idaho. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, *45*(3), 34–61.

Taylor, E. W. (2007). An update of transformative learning theory: A critical review of the empirical research (1999-2005). *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 26*(2), 173-191.

Taylor, E. W. & Cranton, P. (2012). *Handbook of Transformative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (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*, *24*(4), 247–263. Retrieved from: http://doi.org/10.1023/B:IHIE.0000047413.00693. [Accessed: 25/10/2016].

Exploring the Impact