# Taking the Lead in Faculty Development: Teacher Educators Changing the Culture of University Faculty Development through Collaboration

**Susan R. Adams, Ph.D.**
College of Education, Butler University

**Elizabeth K. Mix, Ph.D.**
College of Education, Butler University

## Abstract

As pedagogy experts, teacher educators should lead the charge for improved teaching and learning, but are under-utilized pedagogy resources in liberal arts universities. In this paper, the collaborators, one a teacher education assistant professor and the other an associate professor of art history, identify critical friendship group approaches (Allen & Blythe, 2004; McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2007) which have the potential to create transformative learning opportunities for liberal arts educators. Cross-disciplinary faculty partnerships hold promise for a sustainable, innovative approach to faculty development, with the potential to improve teaching and learning in liberal arts universities.

*Keywords:* **faculty development; pedagogy; K–12 expertise; critical friendship**

The 2014 Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education (AILACTE) conference theme, *Catalyst for Change: Liberal Arts and Teacher Education,* acknowledges that universities are experiencing unprecedented waves of change which challenge practices, traditions, and perspectives that have historically gone unquestioned in institutions of higher learning. Particularly troubling is the questioning of the value, contributions, or sustainability of teacher education programs and colleges of education within the liberal arts university. In many states, long-standing and established teacher preparation programs have abruptly experienced unprecedented public scrutiny. Gonzalez and Carney (2014), for example, point to the negative impact of the media's use of ideologically charged rhetoric to influence policy-makers' perceptions of teacher education, resulting in sweeping teacher licensure reforms in Indiana when schools of education were framed as inadequately preparing Indiana's teachers (p. 21).

Kimball (2013) notes that United States Secretary of Education Arne Duncan's (2009) call for teacher education reform and the proliferation of alternative licensure pathways like Teach for America for liberal arts graduates have called into question the relevance and necessity of locating teacher education programs within liberal arts universities. Observing that some universities have eliminated their colleges of education altogether, Kimball (2013) concludes that teacher preparation programs are more urgently needed than ever, especially in light of a shrinking pool of liberal arts students from which to recruit licensure candidates and the impending retirement of thousands of professional educators (National Commision on Teaching and America's Future, 2010).

But in addition to recruiting, retaining, and preparing future K–12 educators, what more might colleges of education contribute to the liberal arts university? This paper highlights the deep pedagogical knowledge held by teacher educators and focuses on the unique contribution teacher educators are poised to offer the university as a whole. Using a critical friendship approach (Adams & Peterson-Veatch, 2012; Dunne & Honts, 1998; Dunne, Nave, & Lewis, 2000; McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2007;

School Reform Initiative, n.d.), teacher educators can partner with university colleagues from other disciplines to slowly change and improve the teaching culture of a university. Working together, we hope to show the strength of interdisciplinary collaboration and what is possible when we choose to share our individual teaching practice and to work across knowledge bases, rather than remaining artificially divided and isolated into discipline-specific departments and programs.

## Literature Review

Critical friendship groups have their origins in K–12 professional practice (School Reform Initiative, n.d.). A critical friendship group (CFG[1]) is a group of 6-10 professional educators that meets regularly to discuss professional practice, to listen carefully to one another, to ask thoughtful questions about teacher and/or student work, to collaborate on teaching dilemmas, and to surface, name, and excavate beliefs, practices or assumptions which inhibit effective teaching (Allen & Blythe, 2004; McDonald, et al., 2007). CFG practices and approaches have been shaped and informed by adult learning theory and by critical thinking.

Mezirow's (1991) landmark text, *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*, has profoundly impacted those who create professional development for adults, thus the term "transformative learning" has been applied to nearly any kind of change. As Mezirow himself says however, "not all learning is transformative" (1991, p. 223). He defines transformative learning as "reflectively transforming the beliefs, attitudes, opinions, and emotional reactions that constitute our meaning schemes or transforming our meaning perspectives (sets of related meaning schemes) (1991, p. 223). He identifies three elements necessary for adult transformative learning: excavating and naming assumptions; exploring and taking on

---

1    The terms critical friendship group, Critical Friends Group, and CFG will be used interchangeably-an acknowledgement of the multiple, sometimes contested terms for these educator groups. An elaborate, detailed discussion of the legalities or political differences that are sometimes suggested by a particular choice of terms is beyond the scope of this article.

multiple perspectives; and engaging in critical reflection.

Mezirow claims that "Feelings of trust, solidarity, security, and empathy are essential preconditions for free full participation" in the discourse of transformative learning (Mezirow, 2000, pp. 12-13). Like CFGs, transformative learning emphasizes "finding agreement, welcoming difference, 'trying on' other points of view, identifying the common in the contradictory, tolerating the anxiety implicit in paradox, searching for synthesis, and reframing" (Mezirow, 2000, pp. 12-13). This kind of discourse is what Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Trule (1986) have dubbed "real talk." Unlike normal conversation, "real talk" demands "careful listening; it implies a mutually shared agreement that together you are creating the optimum setting so that half-baked or emergent ideas can grow…reach[ing] deep into the experience of each participant…draw[ing] on the analytical abilities of each." (1986, p. 144).

Stephen Brookfield (2000) cautions against the rampant, careless use of the term "critical" if all that is meant is something which is rigorous, deep, or emotional. Brookfield contends that for reflection to also be critical, the learner must "engage in some sort of power analysis of the situation or context…[and] try to identify… hegemonic assumptions" (p. 126). More specifically, he states that "Critical theory views thinking critically as being able to identify, and then to challenge and change, the process by which a grossly iniquitous society uses dominant ideology to convince people this is a normal state of affairs" (2009, pp. 126-127).

Kegan's (1980; 1994; 2000; Kegan & Lahey, 2001) research on resistance to change connects his theory to Mezirow's theory of transformative adult learning and to transformational learning, stating that transformative learning represents "an epistemological change rather than merely a change in behavioral repertoire or an increase in quantity or fund of knowledge" (Kegan, 2000, p. 48). Kegan (2000) explores the roots of the word *trans-form-ative*, noting that the form itself is changed and not merely the content, likening traditional, informative learning to simply pouring new liquid (content) into an existing cup. No matter what is poured into the cup, the cup maintains its shape. By contrast, transformative

learning causes the cup itself to change its size, shape, color, etc. as a result of the content that is poured into it.

## Processes and Approaches of CFGs

CFGs manage themselves through shared leadership and shared decision-making. Although CFGs are a form of professional learning community (PLC), specific dimensions, beliefs and practices set CFGs apart from other PLCs (Dufour, 2004; Dufour & Eaker, 1998). The work of CFGs differs from other kinds of PLCs in their explicit attention to the creation and maintenance of a safe space in which educators may engage in "open and honest conversation; meeting habits that support inquiry, dialogue, and reflection;…and facilitative leadership capable of encouraging participation, ensuring equity, and building trust" (McDonald, et al., 2007, p. 2).

While each CFG is unique, in general CFG's hold these precepts and practices in common (Adams & Peterson-Veatch, 2012):

- Voluntary membership
- Flattened hierarchy and shared responsibility
- Deep trust and confidentiality
- Members move toward a de-privatization of practice, voluntarily sharing teacher work, student work, and teaching dilemmas.
- Acknowledging the social, emotional and personal nature of sharing work
- Co-negotiated meeting agendas
- Working norms or agreements are established by the members of the group and are constantly examined for possible changes according to the needs and wishes of the group.
- Regular reflection on meeting content and processes inform next steps and future agendas.
- Protocols, or prescribed turn-taking mechanisms, are the methods used to structure activities and discussions during meetings.

CFGs create spaces in which educators enter into discomfort and embrace what Zembylas and Boler (2002) call a "pedagogy of discomfort in which to "move beyond inquiry as an individualized

process and raises issues of collective accountability by exploring the possibilities to embrace discomfort, establish alliances and come out of this process enriched with new emotional discursive practices" (2002, Patriotism Interrupted section, para. 18). CFGs choose to flatten the hierarchy generally associated with traditional meetings; this flattened hierarchy is maintained by the use of agreements. Agreements, or norms, specify ways the group will be, act, and work together, reflecting the goals, personalities, and needs of the individuals in balance with the needs of the group. McDonald, et al. (2007) stress that norms are meant to develop into habits of mind and ways of being which allow the members to experience purposeful discomfort, and "to view discomfort not as an avoidable aberration but as a necessary part of the learning process" (p. 19).

In summary, CFGs aspire to create spaces and opportunities in which adult learners can experience transformative learning using critical thinking in order to examine their teaching practice within a collegial community of support. Potential outcomes include new perspectives, examining and changing beliefs, and improving teaching and learning outcomes. CFGs may be composed of educators from within a particular school, department, or district, but also may include educators from across different settings and educational levels (elementary, secondary, university, etc.). Although Curry (2008) recommends that CFGs be formed within a specific department or discipline, in our experience, the most productive collaborations are possible when the group members represent a rich diversity of teaching roles and subject expertise.

### The Beginnings of Our Collaboration

Susan is an assistant professor of middle and secondary education in the College of Education at Butler University, where Elizabeth is an associate professor of art history. We first met during a week-long CFG seminar facilitated by Susan in 2009. Elizabeth had been invited and urged to attend by another education colleague, but arrived with little understanding of the week's goals or approaches. To her great surprise, she found herself deeply engaged with other university colleagues, building new

collegial relationships and discussing substantive issues of teaching and learning. At the conclusion of this week-long seminar and over the next three years, we stayed in close contact and sought opportunities to collaborate whenever possible. At the conclusion of the 2012-2013 academic year, the Provost posted a call for faculty to apply for a new position, Faculty Development Fellow, initially envisioned for one faculty member to lead the university faculty in faculty development in a part-time capacity. We applied for the position together and proposed that we share the position, leveraging the power and possibility inherent in two faculty members sharing faculty development across two colleges and disciplines. This was extremely important because of the nature of Butler University, which features a mix of liberal arts and professional education, divided into six colleges that frequently inhibited cross-college engagement. The Provost agreed, sharing the vision for how the authors' diverse skills, experiences, and perspectives would inform faculty development.

Our differences are strengths that we believe both broaden and deepen the capacity of the Fellow position. Elizabeth is tenured, is entering her eighth year at Butler University, has broad visibility across different areas of campus, and is seen by faculty as enthusiastic, trustworthy and a natural creative thinker, but had no formal teacher training in graduate school. Susan is in her third year of tenure-track, previously was relatively unknown outside of her college, and has extensive professional development and teacher training experience. We represent two different colleges and two distinct disciplines, and are members of different networks of constituents and committees within the larger university community. However, we also bring complementary skill sets, dispositions, and faculty development commitments and were eager to merge these assets to spearhead relevant, timely, and data-informed faculty development engagements and resources. Together we share a strong sense of faculty development events which will be most inviting, effective and accessible to the majority of faculty members across the university's diverse perspectives.

### Analysis of Faculty Needs

Prior to launching a plan for the 2013-2014 academic year, we collected and analyzed existing feedback and surveys collected from the faculty during the previous two academic years, during which time faculty development had been the purview of an Associate Provost. Analysis of faculty surveys and focus group responses indicated a strong desire for safe, supportive environments in which university faculty members could learn effective teaching methods, new approaches for increasing student engagement, and strategies for deepening student learning. Many respondents asked specifically for a teaching and learning center, a physical space in which vulnerability and risk could be explored without fear of evaluative reprisals.

Though currently no physical teaching and learning center exists at our university, the many requests for help with teaching, lesson design, and with creating authentic and effective classroom assessments indicated a collective readiness to move beyond traditional approaches for faculty development. In addition, we identified feelings of isolation and of a longing for collegial engagements specifically connected to teaching and learning, especially experiences that crossed disciplinary boundaries and utilized or shared non-discipline-specific pedagogies. Our shared Faculty Development Fellow position's open collaboration and explicit focus on teaching and learning is a radical departure from past practices which inadvertently privileged privacy of practice cloaked under the banner of academic freedom. These qualities were exacerbated by relatively new assessment developments that became interwoven with faculty evaluation, simultaneously making faculty hyper-aware of their teaching strengths and weaknesses and raising their levels of personal insecurities.

We inherited several discreet elements from the prior administrative-led faculty development, including a two-day new faculty orientation and a series of events aimed specifically at faculty to introduce them to resources on campus, a brown bag lunch series during which faculty reported on their recent research, and a series of events called "Food for Thought" that had a soft thematic focus

on pedagogical strategies. While we did not view each of these parts as equally valuable (and in fact did not believe that some parts were really "faculty development," but in reality were simply faculty presentation opportunities), we decided not to radically alter this structure. Maintaining existing programming provided a sense of stability for faculty in this relatively new faculty development environment. This familiarity allowed us to make strategic, creative changes in these existing elements and to introduce significant new events, many of which are described below.

Further, we found ourselves to be sought out by a wide range of faculty and university leaders who wanted to brainstorm ways to develop their own faculty development events. We also engaged extensively with the academic instructional technology support staff, brainstorming ways to create shared faculty development.

Our current faculty development approaches are founded upon critical friendship group principles. As Susan (Adams & Peterson-Veatch, 2012) has written elsewhere, CFGs:

> revolutionized our teaching, our professional relationships, our friendships, our parenting of our own children and our individual understandings of ourselves….the group processes and "social technologies" we practice in these groups serve not only to bond the group's members to one another, but serve to create a commitment to one another and one another's students that invites us to dive deeply to those places in ourselves that we rarely visit, places where our assumptions live and rest unexamined, protecting us from whatever forces might "dis-integrate" us…our groups aim to become places in which we can critically examine instructional decisions to surface assumptions that influence instructional design. (p. 33)

As we described earlier, CFGs are spaces in which educators can safely make themselves vulnerable to do the hard work of excavating previously unexamined assumptions about philosophy, pedagogy, and epistemology, all of which can unconsciously drive instructional design and pedagogical decisions when left unnamed

and unnoticed. The "social technologies" of structured turn-taking, learning to ask carefully constructed questions, and realizing over time that colleagues will reliably keep confidences come together to create this safe, productive space.

While Susan had extensive work with critical friendship, Elizabeth had limited experience, but importantly had attended a week-long CFG workshop during which she had a transformational experience, so she was comfortable promoting the approach. This group was facilitated by Susan and was composed of ten local secondary teachers, four College of Education faculty members from Butler University, and two university faculty members from other colleges. This five-day workshop introduced norm-setting, dilemma protocols, protocols for looking at teacher and student work, and reflective responses to challenging texts. Elizabeth was astonished to discover how quickly trust was developed and how much she learned about her own teaching practice within such a diversity of teaching roles and disciplines. Like this week-long workshop's approach, the university faculty development events we designed and facilitated for 2013-2014 sought to create a theoretical space in which faculty participants were safe to examine assumptions, reveal vulnerabilities, and try on new teaching identities within a collegial, collaborative, and supportive interdisciplinary setting.

## Getting Started

The academic year commenced with the Provost's gathering of the faculty, academic staff members, and academic administrators for a morning just prior to the first day of classes. Although attendance is voluntary, most faculty members make a point of attending this kick-off to the new academic year. The group included full-time faculty, adjuncts and instructors, deans, associate deans, the Associate Provost, and directors and staff members from academic divisions like Student Disability Services, Academic Affairs, and the Learning Resource Center. At this event, Susan led the nearly 300 participants in a custom-designed thinking, writing, and talking protocol in which each participant had time to excavate and refine

inquiry questions emerging from her/his own teaching practice. Each step of the protocol allowed participants to identify specific steps, resources, and supports necessary to sustain a personal inquiry cycle over the academic year.

Using an existing CFG protocol (School Reform Initiative, n.d.) as a model, a customized protocol was developed for the event. Thoughtful and generative questions embedded in recursive rounds of reflective writing and partner sharing provided support for participants to sketch out an initial plan for a year-long cycle of experimentation, exploration, implementation, revision, assessment, and evaluation, with the process potentially producing new questions which generate emergent and deepening inquiry cycles. Here below we outline the steps and the process of the Inquiry Cycle Development Protocol.

**Inquiry cycle development protocol process and prompts**

Participants were asked to pull chairs close together into groups of three. A PowerPoint program revealed each question on a large screen. Participants prepared to respond to each prompt in writing as it was revealed on the screen. Participants were asked to keep their writing hand moving the entire writing time, to get their thoughts down without corrections or self-censorship. They were also asked to commit to listening to one another without interruption. Talking was limited to sharing what was produced during writing rounds. Time was kept strictly for each round of writing, speaking, and listening. Each of the following steps was featured individually on the big screen to allow participants to focus on one question at a time.

The opening writing prompt asked participants to respond silently in writing to these questions:

> *What is one element of your (teaching, program, leadership, etc.) with which you feel dissatisfied, frustrated, bored, or insecure? What is it about this element that has caused you to feel this way? Why is this element important to you?*

At the conclusion of the three minutes, each member of the triad

read aloud his/her reflection writing with no response from the others. This was followed by a second round writing prompt:

> *What supports, resources, conditions, and/or collaborations do you need in order to explore, engage and experiment with the element you identified in Round 1? Where do these supports, resources, conditions, and/or collaborations already exist? How will you gain access? Who might help you? How will you begin?*

Again, each member of the triad simply read aloud his/her reflection writing with no response from the others. This was then followed by a third round writing prompt:

> *At the end of the year, how will you know your exploration, engagement and experimentation with your element were successful? What outcomes do you hope for? How will you celebrate your success? What new questions will emerge from your inquiry?*

Once again, each member of the triad read aloud his/her reflection writing with no response from the others. A fourth writing round then commenced:

> *On the provided calendar, map your steps across an academic year. Identify and tentatively schedule events, meetings, or timeframes for:*
> > *• Identifying collaborators;*
> > *• Locating resources;*
> > *• Experimentation or implementation cycles;*
> > *• Data collection and data analysis cycles;*
> > *• Requesting and gathering collegial feedback;*
> > *• Sharing and publishing outcomes and new learning;*
> > *• Identifying new questions for future inquiry; and*
> > *• Celebrating an exciting, relevant, and productive year of inquiry.*

After calendars were completed, each person shared the map with their triad partners. This was followed by a final prompt in the fifth round:

> *At the bottom of the organizer, identify 3 specific people by name to whom you commit to contacting within the next*

*24 hours to explain your inquiry cycle plan and to request accountability, support, and collaboration.*

It was exciting and gratifying to observe the energy and level of engagement of the participants during the writing and talking portions of the protocol. Nearly 300 people were seated at round tables in a ballroom setting. During the writing cycles, heads were bent over notebooks or laptops, feverishly writing in silence. Body language during talking and listening cycles indicated interest in hearing the ideas and questions of others as participants leaned close and listened carefully. During Round 5, many decided to ask their triad partners to serve as accountability partners, not simply out of convenience, but because after an hour of working together, participants often felt invested in the success of their partner's inquiry project.

Prior to the Provost's gathering, we shared some anxiety about how this new approach might be received by the university's academic community. In previous gatherings, it was not uncommon for the Provost to be verbally challenged or questioned about policy decisions; in fact, these moments of confrontation, though generally not combative, were often eagerly anticipated as part of the tradition of the gathering. Our goal was to make productive use of the time, to set a new tone for faculty development, and to allow each participant to develop a plan that would allow a closing of the loop, beginning with the identification of the inquiry question in August to celebrating the new learning in April. Nothing like this had ever been done before. To make matters even more challenging, Elizabeth was traveling abroad on this date and was not physically available to stand together with Susan to facilitate the protocol. To say we were nervous was an understatement.

To our great relief, almost everyone participated with enthusiasm and good will. When one person called attention to herself by laughing loudly in the middle of a writing round, she was soundly ignored by nearly every other person in the room, a response she had not expected. Follow-up surveys were overwhelmingly positive; most said the time was well spent and that this was the best

gathering they had ever attended.

In the two weeks immediately following this session, more than 30 individuals approached Susan to request a copy of the Inquiry Cycle PowerPoint presentation to adapt it for use in their work or in their teaching. Many of these reported using the protocol in classrooms with great success. One staff director used the protocol with her entire staff in an academic division and reported that the process opened doors to richer discussion and to greater clarity of purpose. Academic staff teaching exploratory classes for incoming students successfully adapted the Inquiry Cycle so that undeclared major students gained personal clarity on majors that would best suit their skills and interests. A communications professor made slight adaptations in the questions and used the protocol to introduce an inquiry project in her undergraduate course, reporting that students found the writing, listening, and talking rounds gave them time to think deeply about their projects.

### Supporting Pedagogical Inquiry and Innovation During the Academic Year

At the conclusion of the Inquiry Cycle protocol, participants left with a plan to continue thinking about and working on their identified Inquiry Cycle question for the academic year. They also left with a printed schedule of the year's monthly events sponsored by the Faculty Development Fellows, which included workshops on teaching topics such as getting to know our students, engagement strategies that really work, and approaches for creating authentic assessment of student learning. Each of these sessions were co-hosted and co-facilitated by both of us; each session included a wide variety of university faculty known for good teaching practices. Many of the featured presenters were teacher education faculty who were delighted to find their university colleagues eager to learn new teaching strategies and approaches with explicit steps and advice from K–12 pedagogy experts.

One Saturday morning session invited faculty members to bring with them a specific teaching dilemma for individual consultation protocols facilitated by education faculty members experienced

in critical friendship approaches. Making oneself vulnerable by revealing a teaching dilemma requires careful facilitation and the creation of sufficient trust amongst group members so the dilemma presenter can be honest and transparent about their issue without fear of ridicule or gossip.

Elizabeth shared a current significant dilemma in her art history survey classroom that had arisen in part from flipping the classroom using technology, changing the pedagogy from lecture to discussion, creative activities, and assigning students to "teach" the material to each other using activities they designed themselves. The class had the added pressure of being the only required art history course and spanning an enormous time period from prehistory to postmodernism in a single semester.

Because Elizabeth believes strongly in diversity, visual culture from around the world was added to the course, creating even more challenge. The agency assigned to the students to develop learning activities about cultures other than their own inadvertently created a condition in which students could potentially represent other cultures and religions disrespectfully as students struggled to develop learning activities that their classmates would consider fun. Elizabeth presented the dilemma and anonymous examples of student writing in a fishbowl setting that allowed participants to learn the protocol process used, as well as the language and tone of the talk produced in the protocol. She also spoke openly about the value and transformative power of making her teaching practice more transparent within a critical friendship group setting, which allowed novice participants to relax and try the dilemma protocol with less apprehension.

One of the most pleasant surprises was the level of attendance and participation in faculty development events by academic staff members not directly responsible for classroom teaching. Unbeknownst to us, academic staff had previously sometimes been left off of distribution lists or had even been quietly discouraged from engaging in faculty development events in the past. Our commitment to including all academic personnel – whether tenured,

tenure-track, instructors, adjunct, or Learning Resource Center staff members – was received warmly and established a new sense of welcome, creating opportunities for cross-collaboration for all stakeholders in the university. At the conclusion of several events, academic staff members' feedback indicated appreciation for opportunities to engage directly in discussions of pedagogy and for gaining direct access to important information previously unavailable to them.

It was important to us to end the year as we had begun, by returning to the Inquiry Cycle plans created back in August. Near the end of the academic year, the Faculty Development Fellows hosted an exciting new event, the Celebration of Innovation in Teaching. A call for proposals invited all teaching faculty to share teaching innovations, whether big or small, at a festive, open event in which attendees circulated, asked questions of presenters, and gathered new ideas for their own teaching while congratulating the presenters on their innovations. Presenters brought video, photographs, student work artifacts, and assessment ideas developed and test-driven during the year. Fancy appetizers, wine, door prizes, and good company made this event a rousing success. Plans are already in place to host the Celebration of Innovation in Teaching again in 2015. Fittingly, in the inclusive spirit of the faculty development events, the 2015 Celebration will also include presentations by academic staff members.

## Conclusion

Though this shared Faculty Development Fellow role is still in its infancy, at the conclusion of Year 1 we already are seeing early signs of a changing faculty culture. Language shifts, a willingness to talk about failed approaches in supportive settings, and the sustained engagement of faculty members from many programs, departments and colleges all suggest that we are heading in a fruitful direction. Survey data and exit ticket evidence continue to emerge that our approach of keeping the conversation open, collegial, and transparent is one way to create conditions for meaningful and sustainable change in our teaching practice.

The power of faculty development being created and led by a cross-disciplinary partnership lent credibility and fostered creativity; two heads really are better than one. Elizabeth tapped her network across the other five colleges at the university to strategically invite faculty members to experience critical friendship thinking and approaches. Susan, as a member of the College of Education faculty, invited many of her education colleagues to share ideas for engagement, discussion protocols, projects, and assessments in faculty development events, shining light on the expertise of the teacher education faculty. After all, in the liberal arts university no one is better prepared to foster this collegial, collaborative environment than teacher educators who understand well the power and impact of critical friendship approaches.

As universities face increased pressure to make pedagogical changes to improve student learning for their continued future viability, faculty-led and faculty-created teaching and learning discourse holds great promise. In addition, leading the charge for meaningful faculty development offers colleges of education and teacher educators the opportunity to make available their pedagogical knowledge and skills, and to improve university teaching and learning through collaboration with university colleagues across all disciplines.

## References

Adams, S. R., & Peterson-Veatch, R. (2012). Critical friendship and sustainable change: Creating liminal spaces to experience discomfort together. In J. Faulkner (Ed.), *Disrupting pedagogies and teaching the knowledge society: Countering conservative norms with creative approaches* (pp. 32-45). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Allen, D., & Blythe, T. (2004). *The facilitator's book of questions: Tools for looking together at student and teacher work*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Trule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.

Brookfield, S. (2000). Transformative learning as ideology critique. In J. Mezirow and Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 125-148). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (2009). Engaging critical reflection in corporate America. In Jack Mezirow, E. W.Taylor, and Associates (Eds.), *Transformative learning as practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education* (pp. 125-135). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Curry, M. (2008). Critical friends groups: The possibilities and limitations embedded in teacher professional communities aimed at instructional improvement and school reform. *Teachers College Record, 110* (4), 733-774.

Dufour, R. (2004). What is a "professional learning community"? *Educational Leadership, 61*(8), 6-12.

Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Duncan, A. (2009, October). *Teacher preparation: Reforming the uncertain profession* (Speech presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, NY). Retrieved fromhttp://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/teacher-preparation-reforming-uncertain--profession

Dunne, F., & Honts, F. (1998). "The group that really makes me think!": Critical friends groups and the development of reflective practitioners. *American Educational Research Association annual meeting.* San Diego, CA.

Dunne, F., Nave, B., & Lewis, A. (2000). Critical friends: Teachers helping to improve student learning. *Phi Delt Kappa International Research Bulletin, 28,* 9-12.

Gonzalez, Gerardo M. and Carney, Charles L. (2014) "Challenging the Spectacle: A Case Study on Education Policy Advocacy," *International Journal of Leadership and Change:* Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 3, 19-27. Available at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/ijlc/vol2/iss1/3

Kegan, R. (1980, January). Making meaning: The construc-
    tive-developmental approach to persons and practice. *The
    Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 373-380.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of mod-
    ern life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. (2000). What "form" transforms? A constructive-
    developmental approach to transformative learning. In J.
    Mezirow and Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation:
    Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 35-70). San
    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L.L. (2009). *Immunity to change: how to
    overcome it and unlock potential in yourself and your organi-
    zation*. Boston: Harvard Business Press. ISBN 078796378X. O
    CLC 44972130.

Kimball, B. A. (2013), Do the study of education and teacher edu-
    cation belong at a liberal arts college? *Educational Theory, 63*,
    171–184. doi: 10.1111/edth.12016

McDonald, J., Mohr, N., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. C. (2007).
    *The power of protocols: An educator's guide to better practice*
    (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.*
    San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts
    of transformation theory. In Jack Mezirow and Associates
    (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a
    theory in progress* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

School Reform Initiative. (n.d.). *School Reform Initiative.*
    Retrieved from www.schoolreforminitiative.org

National Commision on Teaching and America's Future. (2010).
    *Who will teach? Experience matters.* Retrieved from http://
    nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NCTAF-Who-Will-
    Teach-Experience-Matters-2010-Report.pdf

Zembylas, M., & Boler, M. (2002). On the spirit of patriotism:
    Challenges of a "pedagogy of discomfort". Retrieved from
    http://www.tcrecord.org/library

*Susan R. Adams is currently an assistant professor of middle and secondary Education in the College of Education and the co-Faculty Development Fellow at Butler University in Indianapolis, IN. A Teacher Consultant with the National Writing Project, Susan is the author of several scholarly articles and book chapters on a variety of education topics. She was selected for the 2014 Scholar Award by the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education (AILACTE).*

*Elizabeth K. Mix is an associate professor of art history in the Jordan College of Arts at Butler University in Indianapolis, IN. Dr. Mix has published extensively in the areas of 19th and 20th century art history, contemporary art history, Postmodernism, popular culture, New Media art, gender in art, design history and theory, and graphic art. Recently appointed Director of the Butler University Core Curriculum, she shared the 2013-2014 Faculty Development Fellow role with her co-author, Susan.*