

A Virtual Community of Practice for Enhanced Teaching and Convergence to Strengthen Student Learning, Engagement, and Inclusion

Tracy Hammond¹, Randy Brooks³, Shawna Thomas¹,
Charles W. Peak², Pauline Wade¹, Charles Patrick Jr², Samantha Ray¹, Paul Taele¹
Department of ¹Computer Science & Engineering, ²Biomedical Engineering, ³Engineering Academies
Engineering Education Faculty
Institute for Engineering Education & Innovation
Texas A&M University
College Station, USA

hammond, randy_brooks86, sthomaspeak, paulinewade, cpatrick, sjr45, ptaele@tamu.edu

Abstract—With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, faculty are suddenly thrown into a world where they have to teach virtually, forcing them to innovate in their teaching practice without the ability to “chat with their colleagues” next door. Additionally, many faculty do not know how to create an inclusive classroom, which is crucial for students who have also lost their learning community and support structure. Many faculty are afraid to include issues of inclusion and diversity, feeling ill equipped and unsupported. As tensions rise across the US, there is a critical need for engineering students to be able to discuss issues involving inclusion in the classroom as well as apply their abilities as engineers to make a significant impact (both positively or negatively) on inclusion through their applications and innovations. Without the proper support for the faculty to innovate and foster inclusive classrooms, millions of students will suffer in their education. Additionally, without a trusting support group, most engineering faculty would not choose to assume the risk. In response, we developed a community of practice with six teaching fellows who shared, watched, commented on, and emulated each other’s classroom recordings. The teaching fellows learned a significant amount from each other, courageously implemented activities focused on inclusion and awareness in their classrooms, observed greater awareness among their students on inclusion issues, and were able to mentor faculty and publish about the data driven best practices that they completed.

Index Terms—community of practice, virtual, inclusion, student engagement, convergence

I. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic instilled significant strains on teaching, thrusting many faculty into entirely new instructional situations. It also severed faculty from many of their professional development support structures and communities. With inherently-flawed student evaluations that continue to be a primary measure of teaching success, faculty have limited resources to grow in their discipline.

While our current teaching climate brought significant challenges to overcome, it also provided new opportunities for faculty to grow. With the push towards online learning, most

faculty now have videos of their teaching. As many faculty are uncomfortable with having peers sit in their classroom for fear of changing the dynamic, being judged, or simply just having a bad teaching day, faculty need a safe space to be coached. Online and hybrid learning environments provide us with a new opportunity to comfortably and safely share teaching experiences without feeling the interruption of having a peer in the classroom.

In response, the engineering education faculty formed a community of practice with six teaching fellows from different engineering disciplines, spanning different levels of teaching experience from less than three years to more than 30 years, assisted by two instructional consultants. The pilot program united both tenure-track faculty and academic professional track faculty under a common goal to improve engineering education, starting with themselves. The group met weekly throughout the fall 2020 semester with an immediate focus on optimizing the operation of their in-person/remote courses. Participants engaged in evidence-based peer feedback and reflection activities after watching short clips of their classroom videos. The group also focused on personal strength building, designing impactful teaching resumes, and building descriptive and appropriate teaching philosophies.

Participants quickly developed a peer-led safe space in which to share their past and current experiences and concerns. Throughout the semester, several participants encountered difficult times and felt comfortable bringing the issues to the group for assistance wherein they were built back up emotionally and professionally. Faculty realized that rather than simply improving their delivery content and media, what made them a better teacher was more teaching with empathy, improving the sense of connection and community in the classroom, and the creation of an inclusive classroom.

All participants observed value and success in the program, choosing to continue into the winter break and spring 2021 semester. Participants worked together to rebuild syllabi, teaching CVs, and explore qualifications for various teaching

Thanks to funding support in part by The Texas A&M University College of Engineering Institute for Engineering Education and Innovation

awards to which they might apply.

The most effective teachers are those who continually pursue growth by boldly trying new approaches, reflecting on their efficacy, and repeating the process. Faculty need a supportive community of practice that nurtures them while challenging them to explore and employ advanced teaching practices. The program allowed faculty to share experiences, best practices, and provide a safe environment for collaboration and fellowship.

This paper presents qualitative and quantitative data describing both objective and subjective outcomes and experiences in the community of practice. It describes a framework of collaboration, a process, and KPIs (key performance indicators). The framework's KPIs were selected to measure the community's success in achieving the expected outcomes, which ultimately guides participants toward a path leading to quality teaching practices.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Professional Development in Teaching

Professional development (PD) interventions in teaching are based on a variety of learning theories [42], [43]. While it is either required or encouraged across most institutions, there is little agreement on what the most effective approach is. Often program participants experience the *problem of enactment* whereby they learn about a different idea or approach, are willing to try it in their teaching, yet fail to do so in practice [41]. New ideas or approaches which often supplant existing ones require development time, thus many participants are unable to implement them in practice.

After careful review of many PD research studies, insights emerge into what works and what does not work in addressing the problem of enactment. Effective PD often involves collective participation, such as a community of teachers learning together to improve their teaching [6]. Collaboration can range from one-on-one coaching [2], [14] to group workshops [1], [2], [30] to school-wide endeavours [13], [39], [49] while coaches and mentors may include specially trained master instructors [23], [33] and university faculty [58]. Even informally, there is benefit in learning from one another and sharing experiences and strategies [53].

Interestingly, there is conflicting evidence for how significant the focus should be on content knowledge, which many programs require [7], [19], [73] and lean on for their motivation [30], [33]. Recent findings indicate that programs focused only on content knowledge have less impact on learning. [42], [43]. Instead, effective programs are those that emphasize participant implementation within their own courses, follow-up activities to reflect on their experience, and longer duration programs extending over multiple months [6], [18], [28], [30], [54], [63], [68], [69].

B. Peer Review of Teaching

Although student evaluations of teaching are widely used, they lack the ability to assess important aspects of teaching that only faculty are equipped to discern, hence the need for

peer evaluation according to engineering education researchers [50]. For example, faculty have a greater ability to evaluate the impact of provided examples, which elements are critical and which can be dropped, and what authentic inquiry looks like in their discipline [38]. Peer review in this context has been shown to be effective in promoting best teaching practices [44].

Participation in peer review is transformative. The American Association for Higher Education Teaching Initiative found that faculty who participated in intensive peer review observed a significant shift in how they perceived their course design and the requirements they placed on the students because of the realization that they are accountable for the effects of their teaching on students [36], [37]. Once participants experience constructive peer review, they find that both written and verbal feedback are helpful for improving their teaching [67] and in general see the process as effective [61]. Peer review also benefits the faculty providing the review as it exposes them to new teaching practices and applications [30].

There are significant challenges to implementing peer review. Across disciplines and campuses, teaching is largely perceived as a private undertaking [38]. It is rare that faculty invite others to observe their teaching live as they often find it embarrassing or worse. Other barriers include lack of resources (especially the time required to conduct peer review), scheduling difficulties, reviewer fairness, and lack of training and incentives [26], [61]. The participant's perception of peer review of teaching itself has a great impact on its effectiveness and the role it plays in transformation [48], [59].

C. Using Video Annotation Tools for Peer- and Self-Evaluation Feedback

Video annotation and analysis is a key element in evaluating teaching sessions. They allow both peer- and self-reflection on the teaching and learning experience [55]. Using videos to evaluate teaching, as opposed to classic physical observations, has had a positive impact on improving teaching practices [4], [15]. When peer feedback is involved, both the observed faculty and the peer observer benefit as there are more opportunities to get and share teaching practice ideas [5]. Because recordings capture live interactions between faculty and students that can be analyzed, they are adept at examining the complex process of teaching and learning [60].

Video annotation tools can either be online or offline. They allow users to identify segments of the video and provide space for adding reflections and comments, either spoken or written. These annotated segments can then help users identify patterns in the faculty's teaching practice [55], [57]. They also can support evaluation in specific teaching contexts [66].

A recent study on self- and peer-evaluation of videos showed that while novice teachers often struggled with under-criticizing themselves and over-criticizing their peers, they felt that both types of evaluations were positive, constructive experiences [74]. This evaluation bias has also been seen in other studies [51], [52]. As novice teachers participated in these types of activities, they began to develop deeper

reflections and were more open to input [35], [52]. These experiences also created a support structure for mentoring and continued development [74].

D. Communities of Practice

Teachers' PD is intensely multifaceted and involves more than the learning of new practices but also includes issues of identity development. Thus, situated learning, and specifically a community of practice (CoP) [72], can address these varying needs [34]. Often single workshops or courses do not meet these situated needs [3], [21], [32]. Instead, a community-based approach helps give needed context and support [10], [29], [46], [64], [65].

Situated learning posits that learning occurs when a person, situated in a social environment or community, begins to move from the periphery to the core of that community [45]. They increasingly identify with the CoP they are in. In order to have truly transformative changes in their teaching practice, faculty must also engage in a personally transformative experience over time [11]. A CoP supports learning as it supports both experience and identity [72] and is essential because effective teaching is difficult to learn alone [38].

One critical element of any CoP is the group's commitment to each other. It is only through member commitment that the CoP can face the challenges of sharing experiences and critically examining them as they create situated knowledge of teaching and learning [62]. It is argued that this is also essential for the localized CoP to contribute to the larger body of knowledge on teaching and learning. When these experiences include critical inquiry, community dialogue, and constructive reflection, transformation of identity and learning take place [16], [65].

It is also important for a CoP to have a transdisciplinary composition [70]. When constructed with people at multiple career stages, a CoP naturally has a mentoring thrust. These groups can mentor and support junior faculty as they navigate the promotion and tenure process.

Finally, CoP supports inclusive teaching. There has been a concerted effort within STEM faculty to make their teaching practice more inclusive, especially as the diversity of incoming students increases [27], [40], but many faculty are still slow to change due to lack of training or incentives [12]. Without a change in teaching practice, students increasingly find classes to be disengaging and devoid of interaction [8] and leave STEM altogether [71]. To foster inclusive teaching, faculty must develop self-awareness, empathy for students, consider their classroom climate, and embrace a community effort [22], [25]. Inclusive pedagogy employs practices that give all students equal access to knowledge [24] and specifically take into account marginalized identities [20].

III. COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE (CoP) METHODOLOGY

We formed a teaching community of practice (CoP) among engineering faculty of all levels interested in improving their teaching. We intentionally chose a CoP because it supports situated learning required for effective professional development

in teaching [34], [72]. It is also essential to include faculty of all levels so this community would have members at both the periphery and the core and naturally support mentoring [70].

We focused on the following outcomes with corresponding KPIs used to measure progress:

- **Improved teaching**—measured by self-reported improvement in teaching and the magnitude of any change, a change in how participants prepare teaching materials and activities, a change in how participants approach to teaching, increased comfort with trying new teaching techniques, and observed improvements in student engagement in their classes
- **Improved comfort in and increased frequency of both peer- and self-evaluation of teaching**—measured by self-reported increased comfort levels with the peer-evaluation process including feedback, discussion, and reflection, as well as a change in the frequency of watching and evaluating their own class videos
- **Improved knowledge about what makes for effective teaching**—measured by observed improvements in inclusivity and connecting with students
- **Improved knowledge of how to evaluate teaching**—measured by self-reported increased confidence in assessing teaching practices and providing valuable feedback
- **Construction or refinement of electronic teaching portfolios**—measured by creation or revision elements of their teaching portfolio including a teaching CV

To accomplish these outcomes, this CoP centered around peer evaluations which can provide more substantive faculty-driven feedback to the instructor on how to improve their teaching than end of course student evaluations. We also focused on watching videos of recorded lectures as sitting in a live class can be awkward for the teacher and the students in the class, artificially affecting the normal teaching environment. This element of iterative peer review requires participants to implement practices in their own courses and supports reflection of both their own teaching and others, both of which have been shown to be ingredients in effective development programs [6], [18], [28], [30], [54], [63], [68], [69].

We solicited participants from all departments in the College of Engineering at a large university. Participants were required to apply to the program to ensure sufficient interest and level of commitment. Commitment is critical in CoP success [62]. In their application, they discussed how they could contribute, what they would gain, and what they have recently changed about their teaching. These questions helped identify people with a growth mindset and that had departmental buy-in, as well as begin to establish a sense of community. From the applications, six engineering faculty were identified from three different departments spanning less than three years to more than 30 years teaching experience and covering both tenure-track and non-tenure-track positions. They were joined by two instructional consultants from the university.

The group met throughout the fall 2020 semester in a single two hour long session each week. Sessions were guided by

the instructional coaches who set the agenda and modeled effective feedback techniques. During a session, participants first engaged in activities to develop and support community among the group. Participants also articulated an appreciative agreement, or norms and expectations for interacting with each other [31]. This was essential for maintaining a safe space for participants to share and receive feedback. During early sessions, participants were trained in how to give effective feedback based on best practices from the instructional consultants as often faculty lack training in peer review of teaching and may have misconceptions about what is effective [26], [48], [59], [61]. Many sessions were then devoted to sharing short clips of classroom videos and providing immediate feedback. Often participants then reflected, adjusted their teaching, and brought subsequent videos to share for iterative feedback from the group. Some later sessions focused on personal strength building [56], designing high-impact teaching resumes, and building descriptive and appropriate teaching philosophies.

Participants quickly developed a peer-led safe space in which to share their past and current experiences and concerns. Throughout the semester, several participants encountered difficult situations and felt comfortable bringing the issues to the group for help. At other times, participants specifically chose teaching videos where they sensed had a greater need for improvement to get an outside perspective and ideas on how to adjust. Each time, the group deepened their sense of community and support of each other.

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A. Research Questions and Hypotheses

- 1) **What is the impact on this community of practice on the participants?** What exact skills will the participants gain from being part of this group? Will they exclusively develop their teaching skills, improve their communication skills, adopt new teaching practices, or a combination thereof?
- 2) **Is it possible to obtain the necessary level of commitment and vulnerability to be successful in a virtual environment?** Many of the participants have never met each other in person, having a solely online relationship. In order for a community of practice to thrive, there is a certain amount of commitment and vulnerability required. In face-to-face interactions, there is a certain level of commitment implied when you are in the room together. Can people choose to be invested in a community where they are only involved virtually?
- 3) **What is the impact on this community of practice on the students of the participants?** How does this practice effect the environment they fostered in their classroom? Does being in a successful virtual community of practice cause the participants to focus more on creating a community within their classroom, even though they have a different relationship with their students?

B. Data Collection

The participant pool contained six engineering faculty with varying backgrounds: one full Professor, one full Professor of Practice, two Associate Professors of Practice, and two Assistant Instructional Professors. Teaching experience ranged from less than three years to over 30 years. The participants were split half male and half female. In their engineering discipline, half of the participants represented minorities.

A fifty-question retrospective survey was administered to all participants ($n = 6$) via Qualtrics. The retrospective survey was not sent to the two instructional coaches guiding the group.

C. Data Evaluation for Closed-Ended Questions

The fifty-question retrospective survey contained five pairs of before/after question with respect to participation within the peer group. A paired two tailed t-test with an $\alpha = 0.05$ was used to test for significance in before and after pairs. The null hypothesis for each pair is that there is no difference between the before participation and after participation in the peer group. Close-ended questions that were tested for significance and given in Table II. A five point Likert scale [47] was used for each question. Responses were then coded 0-4 for t-test analysis and their p -values are provided in the Table II. Although there is some contention about using t-test on Likert values, Researchers de Winter and Dodou have shown that even though Likert scales are not continuous values and thus not normal, most data is non-normal and is appropriate for use in t-tests [17]. Lastly, participants were asked what amount their teaching has improved by participation within the peer teaching group.

D. Data Evaluation for Open-Ended Questions

The survey also contained nine open-ended questions where the answers to each provided insight into how participating in the CoP benefited its members, what worked well, and what needs improvements. These questions are given in Table I.

TABLE I
OPEN-ENDED SURVEY QUESTIONS

#	Question
1	What worked well about this group?
2	What could be improved?
3	What is important to know when trying to replicate this?
4	What was your overall experience?
5	How have your teaching practices changed?
6	How has your perception of what makes a good teacher changed?
7	What evidence can you share regarding how the impacts of this community have impacted your students' success? (i.e., increased student engagement, Deeper student reflection, More students showing greater initiative, Improvements in levels of mastery.)
8	Moving forward, how has your approach to classroom teaching changed as a result of being a part of this fellows group? (no change, slight, moderate, significant)
9	Do you feel that there were any tangible results from this peer group that was shareable to outside the group (would be of benefit). Have you shared anything that you have learned this semester with faculty from outside of this group?

To extract patterns in the responses and draw conclusions, grounded theory was performed by two independent

researchers on the responses to the open-ended questions. This type of analysis extracts the most significant of the participants' answers to the open-ended questions as 'codes.' These codes are then grouped into categories to further understand and summarize the major takeaways of the data. This technique is a common practice for qualitative data analysis to create evidenced-based conclusions about the data [9].

Following standard practice, the researchers independently read through and annotated the anonymized data, marking repeated topics and ideas as codes. These codes went through multiple passes to determine if rare codes should be merged with other codes or if they were outlier responses. Once the codes converged, the refined codes were then analyzed and grouped into categories. The code counts were tracked during this process for later analysis. Each researcher performed the coding task independently to avoid biasing the final output.

V. RESULTS

A. Data Findings for Closed-Ended Questions

One-hundred percent of respondents indicated that improvement occurred (66% major improvement, 33% minor improvement). Our sample size was quite small at only six participants, but surprisingly, we had statistically significant differences using a paired t-test on our before and after Likert questions (see Table II). That said, because of the small sample size we need to be cautious of the generalization of our findings.

TABLE II
CLOSE-ENDED SURVEY QUESTIONS

#	Question	p-value
1	How well were your students engaged in the classroom?	0.0117
2	What is your comfortable level with trying a new teaching technique in your classroom?	0.0041
3	How often did you watch videos of yourself teaching?	0.0127
4	What is your level of comfort in having others review your work/teaching practice?	0.0007
5	How confident were you in assessing others' teaching practice and providing valuable feedback?	0.0198
6	How often did you think you had information to share with others on how they could improve their teaching?	0.0127

Improved teaching. Participants were asked about the influence of the program on teaching improvement, to which all participants marked improvement with 66% reporting major improvements. Further, upon completion of the program, 50% anticipate keeping the significantly changed approach to teaching, 16% the moderate change, and 33% the slight or minor change in approach to teaching. The data suggests that students were more engaged due to the educator's participation in the program (Question 1). Further, participants felt more comfortable at the end of the program (Question 2) compared to the beginning.

Improved comfort in and increased frequency of both peer- and self-evaluation of teaching. Before joining the CoP, 66% of the participants had never watched a video of themselves (Question 3) teaching. The program drove all CoP members to incorporate this practice as a common reflection

action. By the end of the program, 50% of the participants indicate watching themselves on video "most of the time" thereby suggesting a newfound comfort in observing and critiquing their teaching. Similarly, prior to the CoP, participants were more than "slightly uncomfortable" in regard to having others review their work. After participation (Question 4) participants had grown to solidly "somewhat comfortable" with sharing their work.

Improved knowledge about what makes for effective teaching. As measured by Question 2, all participants are more comfortable trying a new teaching technique after participation in the CoP. Further, when asked how preparations will change going forward, 66% responded that there would be significant preparation changes. This is likely encouraged by their improved knowledge regarding the tenets of effective teaching.

Improved knowledge of how to evaluate teaching. During the CoP, participants gained significant practice in assessing each others teaching practices and providing feedback. They were also coached by an instructional consultant on what to observe for effective teaching and how to analyze those observations. Participants were asked to rate their confidence in assessing others teaching on a Likert scale from "extremely not confident" to "extremely confident" both before and after their experiences with the CoP (Question 5). All participants, save 1, self-reported an increase in confidence levels. The single participant that reported no change already felt "extremely confident" in assessing others teaching before the CoP began. Two participants had significant changes in confidence amounting to 3 levels of improvement (e.g., from extremely not confident to somewhat confident and from somewhat not confident to extremely confident).

Participants were also asked to rate how often they felt they had knowledge to share about improving others teaching on a Likert scale (Question 6). All participants reported an increased frequency in having constructive feedback for others on their teaching after experiencing the CoP as compared to before. Some of the participants had dramatic increases going from "sometimes" to "most of the time" or even "always." Participants found that as they practiced giving and receiving feedback, they grew in their understanding and confidence in the process.

Construction or refinement of electronic teaching portfolios. One goal of the CoP was to aid participants in developing their electronic teaching portfolios. Before the CoP, 2/3 of the participants did not have any materials for their teaching portfolio because they were newer in their teaching in careers. Because of this need, several sessions were devoted to sharing what goes in a teaching portfolio, how they are evaluated by others, and teaching CV providing examples. During these sessions, participants either created or revised their teaching CVs with multiple rounds of peer-feedback and iteration. At the conclusion of the semester, all participants had either a newly constructed or significantly revised teaching CV to include in their teaching portfolio. One of the goals for future semesters is to continue to develop teaching portfolio materials including sample syllabi, course materials, and learning activities.

B. Data Findings for Open-Ended Questions

The researchers' codes and categories aligned, so they were able to create a consensus list of categories and themes. Table III displays the final set of code categories and Table IV displays the derived themes.

TABLE III
SURVEY CODE CATEGORIES

#	Code Category	Count	%
1	Trust/Community	25	12.6
2	Inclusivity	21	10.6
3	Growth and Improvement	20	10.1
4	Willingness to Change and Take Risks	19	9.5
5	Student Engagement	15	7.5
6	Confidence in Classroom	10	5
7	External Accountability	10	5
8	Specific Teaching Improvements	9	4.5
9	Connecting with Students	9	4.5
10	Peer Group Enjoyment	9	4.5
11	Peer Group Support	9	4.5
12	Structure/Objectives	8	4
13	Commitment/Dedication	7	3.5
14	Moderator Support	6	3
15	Real World Connection	6	3
16	Feedback from Peers	6	3
17	Personal Comfort with Sharing	5	2.5
18	Fostering Classroom Empathy	5	2.5

TABLE IV
THEMES FROM SURVEY RESPONSES

#	Theme
1	Trusting and Inclusive Community
2	Structured Group Focused on Skill Development
3	Increased Confidence and Comfort
4	Fostering Classroom Empathy via Inclusion
5	Teaching Improvements Through Change
6	Importance of Moderator and Group Dynamics
7	Commitment and Dedication to Group
8	Connecting Learning to the Real World

These themes produce three main insights. First, having a dedicated, organized group that provides a source of feedback for ideas and techniques helps participants stay engaged and focused on improvement. Second, participating in this group made participants more confident in trying new techniques and comfortable with sharing their practices with others. And third, having increased confidence helps participants focus on connecting with students, keeping them engaged, and fostering an inclusive environment in their classrooms.

The sense of community and development of close relationships between the participants was repeatedly highlighted as a key benefit of the group. Notably, this insight points to keeping the group small as too many participants would make achieving this group environment difficult. Having the structure of a weekly meeting and guaranteed time to discuss helped participants stay dedicated to their goals of self improvement via positive reinforcement.

Having more confidence in trying new classroom techniques enabled participants to be more explicitly inclusive in their classrooms and establish deeper connections to their students.

In fact, all six participants cited how their approach to classroom teaching changed for the benefit of students as a result of this group (Question #8 in Table I). These changes include instilling a sense of community in the classroom, discussing current events in class and through coursework, and simply interacting with the students more.

VI. DISCUSSION

There is a consensus among the participants on the increase of teaching knowledge and skills realized through the activities of the community. There was a general feeling of apprehension among the members at the initial meetings as they adjusted to sharing outside of their comfort space. Some members did not regularly have peers observe their teaching.

The data collected indicate that the CoP was successful in meeting the outcomes. We observed a significant improvement across all KPIs. Participants not only experienced improvement in their teaching practice, they also expressed increased comfort with the evaluation process and improved their knowledge and assessment of effective teaching.

One participant in particular reported a tangible improvement in end of course student evaluation scores after having just participated in the CoP for one semester. Participating in peer reviews of the syllabus and recordings of teaching sessions, both as the observed faculty and a peer reviewer, were effective. Improvements occurred in two categories: preparation and delivery of teaching materials (referred to as 'Teaching' in Table V) and developing a stronger connection and community in the classroom (referred to as 'Community'). See Table V for the relevant student evaluation questions in each category, along with the percent improvement for each one. Improvement was computed using the formula $(after - before)/before$.

TABLE V
IMPROVEMENT IN END OF COURSE EVALUATIONS

Category	Student Evaluation Question	% Improvement
Teaching	Please rate the organization of this course.	99%
Teaching	Based on what the instructor(s) communicated, and the information provided in the course syllabus, I understood what was expected of me.	73%
Teaching	This course helped me learn concepts or skills as stated in course objectives/outcomes	35%
Teaching	In this course, I learned to critically evaluate diverse ideas and perspectives.	17%
Teaching	In this course, I engaged in critical thinking and/or problem solving.	15%
Community	The instructor fostered an effective learning environment.	97%
Community	The instructor's teaching methods contributed to my learning.	60%
Community	Feedback in this course helped me learn.	41%
Community	The instructor encouraged students to take responsibility for their own learning.	13%

Developing a sense of community was particularly difficult for this participant who needed to learn strategies in connecting with students, for example, starting the class with some

banter and communicating to students the importance of their feedback in improving the course. The CoP itself was an example of an inclusive environment where participants exhibited empathy, thereby fostering trust, which the participant was able to mimic in the classroom.

When replicating the environment, special attention should be given four key elements:

- Ensure that each gathering of the community is a safe space where each member feels free to share their thoughts and fears. Critiques are to be shared with a focus on joint enhancement of teaching knowledge and skills. Share praises in addition to the needs for improvement. All members should feel free to share their perspective at any time without fear of judgement.
- All members commit to regular attendance. Consistent, regular discussion is paramount to creating a space where familiarity and trust are foundational.
- Engaged participation is the norm. The process does not flow smoothly if all members are not immersed in the activity and sharing their perspective and their voice.
- A well-defined format and schedule of video lesson reviews and activities must be managed. Members need to attend each week knowing what to expect and to be able to prepare mentally for the encounter.

Each member identified discernible improvement in video presence when comparing the first and last videos shared with the community.

VII. CONCLUSION

We described a community of practice among faculty to support personal growth in teaching. This community met weekly to share and provide feedback on class session video clips. All participants experienced growth in their teaching practice, increased confidence in experimenting with different teaching techniques, and greater skills in giving and receiving constructive feedback. In addition, as the group experienced an inclusive environment within this community of practice, they became more aware of their role in fostering inclusivity in their own classrooms with their students. An essential component in this community of practice was the support network provided by the group. In the future, we look to grow this community of practice. After participants receive more experience in the program, they will become catalysts for new groups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks to Nancy Simpson and Jean Layne from the Center for Teaching Excellence for facilitating and guiding our community of practice.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. P. Allen, C. A. Hafen, A. C. Gregory, A. Y. Mikami, and R. Pianta. Enhancing secondary school instruction and student achievement: Replication and extension of the my teaching partner-secondary intervention. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 8(4):475–489, 2015.
- [2] J. P. Allen, R. C. Pianta, A. Gregory, A. Y. Mikami, and J. Lun. An interaction-based approach to enhancing secondary school instruction and student achievement. *Science*, 333(6045):1034–1037, 2011.
- [3] N. Anderson and M. Henderson. E-PD: blended models of sustaining teacher professional development in digital literacies. *E-learning*, 1(3):383–394, 2004.
- [4] P. Arya and T. Christ. An exploration of how professors’ facilitation is related to literacy teachers’ meaning construction process during video-case discussions. *Journal of Reading Education*, 39:15–22, 2013.
- [5] P. Arya, T. Christ, and M. M. Chiu. Links between characteristics of collaborative peer video analysis events and literacy teachers’ outcomes. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 23(2):159–183, 2015.
- [6] R. K. Blank and N. de Las Alas. The effects of teacher professional development on gains in student achievement: How meta analysis provides scientific evidence useful to education leaders. Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC, 2009.
- [7] R. K. Blank, N. de las Alas, and C. Smith. Does teacher professional development have effects on teaching and learning? Evaluation findings from programs in 14 states. Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC, January 2008.
- [8] L. Brancaccio-Taras, K. A. Gull, and C. Ratti. The science teaching fellows program: A model for online faculty development of early career scientists interested in teaching. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education*, 17(3):333–338, 2016.
- [9] V. Braunand and V. Clarke. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2):77–101, 2006.
- [10] K. Brosnan and R. Burgess. Web based continuing professional development – a learning architecture approach. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15(1):24–33, 2003.
- [11] J. S. Brown, A. Collins, and P. Duguid. Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1):33–42, 1989.
- [12] S. E. Brownell and K. D. Tanner. Barriers to faculty pedagogical change: Lack of training, time, incentives, and tensions with professional identity? *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 11(4):339–346, 2012.
- [13] S. Buczynski and C. B. Hansen. Impact of professional development on teacher practice: Uncovering connections. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3):599–607, 2010.
- [14] P. F. Campbell and N. N. Malkus. The impact of elementary mathematics coaches on student achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(3):430–454, 2011.
- [15] N. Chang. Pre-service teachers’ views: How did e-feedback through assessment facilitate their learning? *Feedback*, 11:16–33, 2011.
- [16] K. P. Cross. Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 75:5–12, 1998.
- [17] J. F.C. de Winter and D. Dodou. Five-point likert items: t test versus mann-whitney-wilcoxon (addendum added october 2012). *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 15, 2010.
- [18] L. Desimone, A. Porter, M. Garet, K. Yoon, and B. Birman. Effects of professional development on teachers’ instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(2):81–112, 2002.
- [19] L. M. Desimone. Improving impact studies of teachers’ professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38:181–199, 2009.
- [20] S. DeTurk. All students are special (though some are more special than others). In A. Atay and D. Trebingi, editors, *The discourse of special populations: Critical intercultural communication pedagogy and practice*, pages 11–22. Routledge, 2017.
- [21] M. DeWert, L. Babinski, and B.D. Jones. Safe passages: providing online support to beginning teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(4):311–320, 2001.
- [22] B. Dewsbury and C. J. Brame. Inclusive teaching. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 18(2):fe2, 2019.
- [23] Y. Doppelt, C. D. Schunn, E. M. Silk, M. M. Mehalik, B. Reynolds, and E. Ward. Evaluating the impact of facilitated learning community approach to professional development on teacher practice and student achievement. *Research in Science and Technological Education*, 27(3):339–354, 2009.
- [24] D. Fassett and K. B. Golsan. Reading between the lines: Critical communication pedagogy and textbook development. In A. Atay and D. Trebingi, editors, *The discourse of special populations: Critical intercultural communication pedagogy and practice*, pages 39–54. Routledge, 2017.
- [25] S. L. Faulkner, W. K. Watson, M. A. Pollino, and J. R. Shetterly. “Treat me like a person, rather than another number”: University student perceptions of inclusive classroom practices. *Communication Education*, 70(1):92–11, 2021.

- [26] C. E. Fernandez and J. Yu. Peer review of teaching. *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 21(2):154–161, 2007.
- [27] L. Florian. Preparing teachers to work in inclusive classrooms: Key lessons for the professional development of teacher educators from scotland's inclusive practice project. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(4):275–285, 2012.
- [28] M. Garet, A. Porter, L. Desimone, B. Birman, and K. S. Yoon. What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4):915–945, 2001.
- [29] X. Ge and S. McAdoo. Sustaining teachers' efforts in technology integration. In C. Vrasidas and G. Glass, editors, *Online Professional Development for Teachers*, pages 265–281. Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, CT, 2004.
- [30] C. L. Greenleaf, C. Litman, T. L. Hanson, R. Rosen, C. K. Boscardin, J. Herman, S. A. Schneider, S. Madden, and B. Jones. Integrating literacy and science in biology: Teaching and learning impacts of reading apprenticeship professional development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(3):647–717, 2011.
- [31] T. Hammond, R. Lightfoot, S. Ray, and S. Thomas. Creating and implementing an online course etiquette appreciative agreement: Recommendations and insights for updating course material and social expectations to aid in the transition to online learning during the covid-19 pandemic., 2020. Available electronically from <https://hdl.handle.net/1969.1/188237>.
- [32] W. D. Hawley and L. Valli. The essentials of effective professional development: a new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond and G. Sykes, editors, *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*, pages 127–150. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 1999.
- [33] J. I. Heller, K. R. Dahler, N. Wong, M. Shinohara, and L. W. Miratrix. Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 49:333–362, 2012.
- [34] M. Henderson. Sustaining online teacher professional development through community design. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 24(3), 2007.
- [35] S. E. Higgins. Formative assessment and feedback to learners. In R. E. Slavin, editor, *Proven programs in education: Classroom management and assessment*, pages 11–15. Corwin Press, 2014.
- [36] P. Hutchings. *From idea to prototype: The peer review of teaching*. Stylus, Sterling, VA, 1995.
- [37] P. Hutchings. *Making teaching community property: A menu for peer collaboration and peer review*. Stylus, Sterling, VA, 1996.
- [38] P. Hutchings. The peer review of teaching: Progress, issues and prospects. *Innovative Higher Education*, 20(4), 1996.
- [39] C. C. Johnson and J. D. Fargo. Urban school reform enabled by transformative professional development: Impact on teacher change and student learning of science. *Urban Education*, 45(1):4–29, 2010.
- [40] G. Keller. The new demographics of higher education. *Review of Higher Education*, 24(3):219–235, 2001.
- [41] M. M. Kennedy. The role of preservice teacher education. *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*, pages 54–85, 1999.
- [42] M. M. Kennedy. How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4):945–980, 2016.
- [43] M. M. Kennedy. How we learn about teacher learning. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1):138–162, 2019.
- [44] D. Kumrow and B. Dahlen. Is peer review an effective approach for evaluating teachers? *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 75(5):238–241, 2002.
- [45] J. Lave and E. Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [46] O.T. Lenning and L.H. Ebberts. Learning communities: What are they and why do we need them? *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports*, 26(6):1–137, 1999.
- [47] R. Likert. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140:1–55, 1932.
- [48] L. Lomas and G. Nicholls. Enhancing teaching quality through peer review of teaching. *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(2):137–149, 2005.
- [49] K. Meissel, J. M. Parr, and H. S. Timperley. Can professional development of teachers reduce disparity in student achievement? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58:163–173, 2016.
- [50] M S Nelson. Peer evaluation of teaching. *Academic Medicine*, 73(1):4–5, 1998.
- [51] D. Nicol, A. Thomson, and C. Breslin. Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer-review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1):102–122, 2014.
- [52] G. Ozogul and H. Sullivan. Student performance and attitudes under formative evaluation by teacher, self and peer evaluators. *Education Technology Research Development*, 57(3):393–410, 2009.
- [53] J. P. Papay, E. S. Taylor, J. H. Tyler, and M. Laski. *Learning job skills from colleagues at work: Evidence from a field experiment using teacher performance data*. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA, 2016.
- [54] W. Penuel, B. Fishman, R. Yamaguchi, and L. Gallagher. What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4):921–958, 2007.
- [55] A. B. Pérez-Torregrosa, C. Díaz-Martín, and P. Ibáñez-Cubillas. The use of video annotation tools in teacher training. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 237:458–464, 2017.
- [56] Tom Rath. *Strengths Finder 2.0*. Gallup Press, New York, NY, 2007.
- [57] Peter J. Rich and Tonya Trip. Ten essential questions educators should ask when using video annotation tools. *TechTrends*, 55:16–24, 2011.
- [58] K. J. Roth, H. E. Garnier, C. Chen, M. Lemmens, K. Schwillie, and N. I. Z. Wickler. Videobased lesson analysis: Effective science PD for teacher and student learning. *Journal on Research in Science Teaching*, 48(2):117–148, 2011.
- [59] T. Saarinen. What I talk when I talk about quality. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1):55–57, 2010.
- [60] A. M. Sadalla and P. Larocca. Autocopy: A procedure of research and education. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 30(3):419–433, 2004.
- [61] A. R. Salih. Peer evaluation of teaching or “fear” evaluation: In search of compatibility. *Higher Education Studies*, 3(2), 2013.
- [62] A. Saroyan and M. Frenay. *Building Teaching Capacities in Higher Education: A Comprehensive International Model*. Stylus Publishing, 2012.
- [63] G. B. Saxe, M. Gearhart, and N. S. Nasir. Enhancing students' understanding of mathematics: A study of three contrasting approaches to professional support. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 4(1):55–79, 2001.
- [64] M. Schlager, J. Fusco, and P. Schank. Cornerstones for an on-line community of education professionals. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 17(4):15–21, 40, 1999.
- [65] N. S. Shapiro and J. H. Levine. *Creating learning communities*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 1999.
- [66] R. Stevens. Capturing ideas in digital things: A new twist on the old problem of inert knowledge. In R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron, and S. J. Derry, editors, *Video research in the learning sciences*, pages 547–563. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, 2007.
- [67] P. Sullivan, A. Buckle, G. Nicky, and S. Atkinson. Peer observation of teaching as a faculty development tool. *BMC Medical Education*, 12, 2012.
- [68] J. A. Supovitz, D. P. Mayer, and J. B. Kahle. Promoting inquiry based instructional practice: The longitudinal impact of professional development in the context of systemic reform. *Educational Policy*, 14(3):331–356, 2000.
- [69] Y. D. Trotter. Adult learning theories: Impacting professional development programs. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 72(2):8, 2006.
- [70] A. C. Wade. Faculty learning communities and teaching portfolios as a mentoring model. *Academic Leadership Journal*, 2(4), 2004.
- [71] J. Watkins and E. Mazur. Retaining students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics majors. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 42(5):36–41, 2013.
- [72] E. Wenger. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.
- [73] K. S. Yoon, T. Duncan, S. W.-Y. Lee, B. Scarloss, and K. L. Spapley. *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement*. Institute for Education Sciences, Washington, DC, 2007.
- [74] A. Zaier, I. Arslan-Ari, and F. Maina. The use of video annotation tools and informal online discussions to explore preservice teachers' self- and peer-evaluation of academic feedback. *Journal of Education*, 201:19–27, 2020.