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4. Study Overview
5. Conclusions and Next Steps
6. Q & A
Canada’s LARGEST university

COMPLEX & decentralized institutional model

CONTEXT

87,000+ students

3 city campuses

17 faculties/divisions

14,000+ faculty
Our Inquiry Focus

What role can Knowledge Mobilization (KMb) strategies, used by a teaching centre, play in providing a framework for faculty development focused on advancing the practice and impact of mentoring for teaching?
Mentoring for Teaching at U of T: 
Previous Research

TWO U OF T INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS:

1. Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE, 2012)
2. Speaking Up (2014)
3. Qualitative Follow-up Study (2016)

Goals:
• To Review the literature and situated mentoring for teaching within the broader faculty mentoring field
• To Capture current faculty mentoring for teaching initiatives and faculty experiences at U of T, especially personal stories
• To Provide U of T-specific context and data to inform an evidence-based series of resources for various stakeholders
• To Guide evidence-based programming for our T&L Centre
Mentoring for Teaching at U of T: Previous Research
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1. Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE, 2012)
2. Speaking Up (2014)
3. Qualitative Follow-up Study (2016)
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- To Capture current faculty mentoring for teaching initiatives and faculty experiences at U of T, especially personal stories

- To Provide U of T-specific context and data to inform an evidence-based series of resources for various stakeholders
- To Guide evidence-based programming for T&L Centres.
LIKE MANY UNIVERSITIES WORLDWIDE...

“...Canada’s universities and Tri-Council Agencies are placing more emphasis on knowledge mobilization in order to generate research with a high social utility and to get research into the hands of decision-makers, policy-makers, and practitioners” (McKean, 2016, p.2)
Knowledge Mobilization is ...

... how generated knowledge will be put to use, inform practice, or advance research.”

(SSHRC, 2016).
Related Literature

- Focused review: education realm (health and business have longer histories of work on KMb)

- Levin (2004); Cooper (2014): processes and context where KMb takes place – and the role of intermediaries (e.g., the role of Teaching Centres as a place to connect research producers and users, is one area of interest)

- “Intermediaries often play a significant role in interpreting, packaging, and distributing research evidence for policymakers and practitioners.” (Tseng, 2007, p. 18)
Cooper (2014, p. 46), in her study of 44 Canadian research brokerage organizations, whose mission is to mediate between knowledge producers and knowledge users, she identified at least 5 KMb strategies (*more frequently used):

1. Research products*
2. Capacity-building and support
3. Events*
4. Networks*
5. Non-research based products
Literature Review

While having the capacity to strengthen research-practice linkage in higher education teaching and learning, **KMb as a framework for faculty development** at this time, is a severely **underexplored area** of design and research.
(A) ISOLATION: Exacerbated through these high-stakes activities
• Tenure and promotion guidelines for teaching (e.g., summative observations of teaching)
• Course evaluation data

(B) ENABLING POSITIVE TEACHING CLIMATES & CULTURES:
• Role of “Places and Spaces”
• Enhanced opportunities for teaching conversations at all levels
ISSOTL 2016: Next Steps

CTSI KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION STRATEGY:

- Full report released to stakeholders, presentation to senior administration, community roundtables/webinars, etc.
- Development of evidence-based practical resources
- CTSI to pilot evidence-based mentoring for teaching program: Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Mentoring for Teaching at U of T
Peer-2-Peer Faculty Mentoring for Teaching (P2P)

**Description:** CTSI Pilot, Dec 2016-May 2017
- Cohort of 32 U of T instructors
- Matched in dyads (by stream, campus, but cross-discipline)
- Focused on improving the quality of course & student learning experience

**GOAL:** to provide a supportive space for instructors to try new strategies, approaches and build confidence in their teaching through a range of support

**Program structure/commitments:**
- Attend 3 facilitated cohort workshops and engage in regular partner interactions
- Recruitment and pairing
- Workshops
- Peer Observation
- Mid-course feedback with students
- Regular dyad interactions
## KMb Approaches: P2P Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMb Approaches</th>
<th>U of T Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research products*</td>
<td><em>Mentoring for Teaching Report</em> (CTSI, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capacity-Building and Support:</td>
<td>2 Webinars; Peer Mentor; New Resources (3 guides, 2 tip sheets, and a book); CTSI staff support; 2 external facilitators for Workshop #1 and &quot;When Mentoring meets Coaching&quot; published resource text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Events*</td>
<td>3 Workshops facilitated by CTSI staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Networks*</td>
<td>P2P Cohort; other U of T networks that participants could connect to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-research based products</td>
<td>Promotional Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cooper, 2014, p. 46*
Data Sources:

**Post-pilot Survey**
- 23 out 32 participants (72%)
- 12 mentor; 11 mentees

**Focus Groups:**
- Mentee groups (5 & 4 individuals) & 2 mentor groups (5 & 6 individuals)
- Facilitated by CTSI staff not involved in pilot
Analysis:

Post-pilot Survey
• Descriptive quantitative and qualitative analysis

Focus Groups:
• Transcribed and coded into initial codes and then clustered into common themes
  (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Glaser & Strauss, 1967)
FINDINGS:

5 Key Findings that address previous research findings:

1) Value of Relationships

2) Community-building (space and place to talk about teaching)

3) Resources to support teaching development

4) Program Structure (formalized)

5) Capacity-building and Influencing Broader Culture
FINDINGS:
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FINDINGS:

1) Value of Relationships

“we will continue to work together. I hope to work with her in new course development this year.”

“One of the most eye-opening things... was how much we have in common even though we are in different departments and different faculties altogether”
FINDINGS:

2) Community-building (space and place to talk about teaching)

Psychological

“it gives you someone to talk to and a relationship where you can feel comfortable trying new things out. So it was kind of a safe area...”

Physical

“In one of our **Second Cup conversations** we we asked each other: “So, what’s the most brutal teaching evaluation you’ve received?”

♡
FINDINGS:

2) Community-building (space and place to talk about teaching)

61.9% have met since the end of the program

81.82% plan to meet in the future
“We’d like to keep the connection going forward.”

“We plan to continue to meet indefinitely! We both teach online, and have been assisting one another with online teaching strategies and technology.”
FINDINGS:

3) Resources to support teaching development
“This was added on [Bluepulse tool], and we hadn’t anticipated or planned for it; also concerned about the glitches…”

“The most valuable thing for me was the… peer observation. This caused me to look at my teaching style from a different perspective and I gained a lot…”

“Coffee chat is a good way to establish trust...through informal chatting and a relaxed environment out of office”

“It’s a bit disingenuous... to pretend it’s symmetric because I’ve been teaching for 24 years... there was a lot of pressure in a way to come up with new things” (mentor-coach model)
FINDINGS:

4) Program Structure (formalized)
FINDINGS:

4) Program Structure (formalized)

“I think there was a real advantage to the fact that we were in a formal mentorship project that gave it some credence”

“It was really good to have a framework”

“I was really happy that the workshops were focused and concrete”

“Loved it. Specifically, working with the mentor in an unscaffolded setting with the general context of encouraging high-quality learning and teaching.”

“Parts were interesting, but the parts where we were directed to communicate with our partner in a very specific way were awkward and felt inauthentic (workshop 1)”
5) Capacity-building and Influencing Broader Culture

**FINDINGS:**

- ✔ Pilot with strong long-term possibilities and potential outcomes
  
  If there are future iterations of this program would you want to be involved again?
  
  81.82% (18/22) ‘YES’

- ✔ Overall Success
  
  If there are future iterations of this program would you recommend it to others?
  
  100% (22/22) ‘YES’
“Hope to use **this approach to mentor instructors in my own department**. Was interested to learn more about listening – has helped in my interactions with others.”

“Programs like this are vital to **developing a teaching community** at U of T.”
CONCLUSIONS
Our knowledge mobilization effort to:

1) REDUCE ISOLATION:
   - Formative opportunities to visibly engage in traditionally invisible high stakes activities (e.g., observation, course evaluation) with peers supported capacity building and networking at multiple levels
   - A positive culture around teaching and learning is being fostered by pairs and cohort

2) ENABLING POSITIVE TEACHING CLIMATES & CULTURES
   - CTSI (Teaching Centre) serves as a mediator between research/practice. (e.g., development of resources). This was a major factor in relative success and adoption.
   - CTSI models and provides opportunities, places, and spaces for development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMb Approaches: P2P Pilot</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research products*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capacity-Building Support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Events*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Networks*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-research based products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attention to intentional KMb strategies can create synergy and make a direct link between findings from research and demonstrate “**how generated knowledge will be put to use, inform practice, or advance research.**” [SSHRC, 2016]
IMPLICATIONS

• Consideration of the role of KMb strategies that can be used to not only distribute knowledge, but to also help ensure such knowledge is accessible, relevant, and used.

• The potential for a greater mediation role that Teaching Centres could play in KMb
“Intermediaries (third party research brokering organizations that connect research producers and users).... and the impact these third parties do play, could play, or should play in educational improvement initiatives” (Cooper, 2014, p. 182)
Contact/Report

Contact:

Carol.rolheiser@utoronto.ca

P2P Pilot Report:

http://teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/fmt/p2p
THANK YOU