2021

Developing new faculty voice and agency through trustful, overlapping, faculty-faculty and student-faculty conversations

Alison Cook-Sather
Bryn Mawr College, acooksat@brynmawr.edu

Emily Hong
Haverford College

Tamarah Moss
Bryn Mawr College, tmoss@brynmawr.edu

Adam Williamson
Bryn Mawr College, awilliams6@brynmawr.edu

Citation

Developing New Faculty Voice and Agency through Trustful, Overlapping, Faculty-Faculty and Student-Faculty Conversations

Alison Cook-Sather, Emily Hong, Tamarah Moss, and Adam Williamson

Abstract

Faculty-faculty conversations and student-faculty conversations typically unfold as separate forms of faculty learning. We present an approach to new faculty development through which faculty-faculty conversations in pedagogy seminars overlap with student-faculty conversations in pedagogical partnerships. Writing as three new faculty members and one academic developer in a bi-college consortium, we review scholarship on building trustful conversation in faculty development; present the overlapping forms of faculty-faculty and student-faculty conversation that constitute our approach; share how the three new faculty members developed voice and agency in their pedagogical practices; and note both challenges and other versions of this approach.

Introduction

Academic developers have explored the benefits to faculty learning of trustful faculty-faculty conversation (Condon, Iverson, Manduca, et al., 2016; Goedereis and MacCartney, 2019; Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009). They have also called for the inclusion—and trust—of students in

1

academic development (Addy et al., 2019; Doctor et al., 2019; Felten et al., 2019). Here we present an approach to academic development for new faculty through which faculty-faculty and student-faculty exchanges overlap and inform one another. In our approach, semester-long pedagogy seminars offered to cross-disciplinary groups of incoming faculty constitute an intensive version of workshop series offered through many teaching and learning centers. Overlapping with these seminars are semester-long, one-on-one, pedagogical partnerships between each participating faculty member and an undergraduate student—a model gaining increasing popularity on several continents. These students take on the role of 'student consultant,' are typically not in the faculty member's discipline, and are not enrolled in the faculty member's courses.

In the following sections we introduce our context, ourselves, and our autoethnographic method. We then review scholarship on building trustful conversations in faculty development. Next we analyze how our approach creates multiple spaces for reflection and dialogue permeated by trust and deep engagement that nurture partnership attitudes and practices. We discuss how the overlapping interactions among faculty and students support new faculty in thinking about personal experiences of teaching, developing voice, and experiencing agency in changing pedagogy in the broader culture of our bi-college consortium. Finally, we note the challenges of this approach and mention versions of it that have developed in other contexts.

Our context and who we are

We all work in a bi-college consortium located on the land of the Lenape in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges are historically Quaker, selective liberal arts institutions that enroll approximately 1,300 undergraduate students (and 260 graduate students at Bryn Mawr College) from diverse socio-economic and cultural

2

backgrounds. Both have high teaching and research expectations for faculty and low student-to-faculty ratios, and provide opportunities for faculty-student collaborations and relationship-building less common at large research universities. In addition to providing a flexible curriculum that encourages exposure to multiple disciplines, both colleges are known for supporting student autonomy and self governance, through practices such as proctor-less exams and a student-led councils that adjudicate remedies to issues such as plagiarism.

Developed with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Teaching and Learning Institute (TLI) at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges supports faculty in a variety of ways, two of which overlap in our approach to new faculty development. The faculty pedagogy seminar is offered through the TLI to incoming faculty. It affords faculty an opportunity to devote the time they would typically spend on another course to developing as faculty in this new context. In any given semester, between eight and 12 new faculty joining Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges participate.

The student-faculty pedagogical partnerships are supported by the Students as Learners and Teachers (SaLT) program. Any student can apply for the role of student consultant if they commit to engaging respectfully and responsibly. Students sign a confidentiality agreement and are paid by the hour for their work. That work includes weekly observations of faculty partners' classrooms and periodic gathering of feedback from enrolled students, weekly meetings between student-faculty partners, and weekly meetings of the student consultants and Cook-Sather in her role as facilitator of SaLT (Cook-Sather, 2016).

While our focus in this discussion is on the overlapping conversations as an approach to new faculty development, student consultants consistently report that participating in pedagogical partnerships has a number of beneficial outcomes. Such participation: deepens their

learning; informs their academic engagement in their own classes; builds their confidence; nurtures a sense of belonging; inspires a sense of empowerment; fosters understanding of teachers and teaching; promotes understanding and appreciation of other students; contributes to their sense of their evolution as active agents in their own and others' development; and builds their job skills (Cook-Sather, Bahti, and Ntem, 2019).

As authors, we are a cross-disciplinary group of colleagues who met in the fall of 2019 in the TLI faculty pedagogy seminar. Cook-Sather is a faculty member in Education with 27 years of experience teaching education courses and 14 years of experience facilitating TLI and SaLT at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges. Moss is a faculty member in the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research at Bryn Mawr College and a community practitioner and evaluator interested in good practices related to co-creating teaching and learning environments that are inclusive and culturally responsive. Williamson is a faculty member in the Biology Department at Bryn Mawr College] and an immunologist interested in defining the fundamental biology of the immune response and building cellular machines for therapeutics. Hong is a faculty member in Anthropology and Visual Studies at Haverford College and a filmmaker and anthropologist with a background in social justice facilitation and training.

Method

In spring of 2020, Moss, Williamson, and Hong engaged in a form of collaborative, autoethnography facilitated by Cook-Sather. Autoethnography draws on researchers' lived experiences to illuminate the workings of broader cultural realities through self-reflexive insight (cf. Griffin 2008; Anzaldúa 2015). 'Collaborative autoethnography' is the result of 'a group of researchers pooling their stories to find some commonalities and differences … to discover the meanings of the stories in relation to their sociocultural contexts' (Chang et al., 2013, p. 17).

4

To capture their beliefs, practices, and experiences in this new context, Moss, Williamson, and Hong wrote responses to these open-ended questions posed by Cook-Sather:

1. In what ways does the pedagogy seminar support generative conversations? What characterizes these conversations?

2. In what ways does your work with your student consultant support generative conversations? What characterizes these conversations?

3. How do these overlapping spheres/sets of conversations work together to support your growth and development as faculty new to this context?

We then talked through the written responses to each question with Cook-Sather adding her perspective as facilitator of the pedagogy seminar and the pedagogical partnerships. Next we transcribed our dialogue and separately identified key points that captured 'the meanings of the stories' that emerged from the written responses 'in relation to their sociocultural contexts' (Chang et al., 2013, p. 17). Finally, we moved through multiple iterations of drafting, meeting to discuss, and revising. To honor both shared perspectives and individual experiences and insights, some portions of our discussion are written in a single, collective voice and some highlight individual perspectives.

Building trustful conversations in academic development

Simon and Pleschová (2019) have noted that there has been little research on the relationship between trust and academic development programs and, relatedly, little discussion of what 'trust' means in this context. They define trust as 'a reaction to risk and uncertainty' characterized by 'willingness to accept vulnerability to another individual' based on the expectation that the intentions and the behavior of that individual are positive (Simon and Pleschová, 2019, p. 3). They affirm what other scholars have found: that trust can help counter

institutional resistance to innovations in academic practice (Neame, 2013; Stocks and Trevitt, 2016) and increase constructive conversations among colleagues about teaching in higher education (Roxå and Mårtensson 2015).

While some of what Roxå and Mårtensson (2009) have called 'backstage conversations' can be anecdotal, student blaming, and non-intellectual, when such conversations 'are permeated by trust,' Roxå and Mårtensson (2009) argue, they have 'an intellectual component of problem solving or idea testing' (pp. 554-555) and can constitute a particularly powerful form of peer learning (Berg, Caulkins, Felten, and McGowan, 2017; Condon et al., 2016). Goedereis and MacCartney (2019) describe the importance for cross-disciplinary faculty in particular of 'creating common ground'—another form of trust building—to analyze their teaching.

Trust is also key to the success of student-faculty pedagogical partnership, which Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten (2014) define as faculty and students contributing 'equally, although not necessarily in the same ways, to curricular or pedagogical conceptualization, decision making, implementation, investigation, or analysis' (pp. 6-7). Student-faculty partnerships recognize 'the key role students may…play in learning and teaching conversations' (Bovill, 2017, p. 156). Trust is one of the values that guide partnership in practice (Healey, Flint, & Harrington, 2014), and it is key to reimagining the role of students in academic development (Felten, Abbot, Kirkwood, et al., 2019). Successful student and faculty partners strive to create a partnership of 'relative equals' and to 'establish trust with one another given the inherent power dynamics between a faculty member and an undergraduate student' (Reyes and Adams, 2017, p. 2; see also Mercer-Mapstone, Dvorakova, Matthews, et al., 2017). Often 'built through empathy,' trust 'enables frank dialogue and deep learning' (Goldsmith, Hanscom, Throop, et al., 2017, p. 2) for both student and faculty partners.

Descriptions of overlapping conversations in our approach to new faculty development

Several components of the semester-long faculty pedagogy seminars aim to foster reflection and trustful conversation through which new faculty think about personal experiences of teaching, develop voice, and experience agency in changing pedagogy in the broader culture of our bi-college consortium. The first is weekly, two-hour, semi-structured meetings of the cohort of new faculty. These faculty participants discuss their shared and different experiences, ideas, questions, successes, failures, hopes, concerns, and plans in these new institutional contexts. The only time during which new faculty members do not participate in this exchange is when they are scheduled to take detailed notes on the way the conversation in the seminar unfolds for a 30-minute segment of the two-hour session. Faculty are on scheduled rotation for notetaking as a cohort. Each participant signs up for one session of the seminar and uses a note-taking template provided by Cook-Sather. This affords participants a different angle/perspective on the seminar—much like that of the student consultant in their own courses. It also puts Cook-Sather as facilitator in the position that each new faculty member is in of being observed and offered feedback.

The weekly meetings are informed by a second, asynchronous component: weekly, informal, one-page reflections written by each new faculty participant in response to prompts provided by Cook-Sather and posted to a closed blog. For instance, one prompt is, 'In what ways are your assessment approaches aligned and/or misaligned with your teaching philosophy and learning goals?' In response Williamson wrote about a structured response paper in his biology course on which he offers feedback, and then mused: 'I wonder if in future years it will make sense for students to grade their own drafts since I am starting to see that some in the class are hesitant to submit papers to me that they deem incomplete.' Similarly, reflecting on an

7

assignment for her film course, Hong wrote: 'I think if I thought more carefully about this, I probably should have scaffolded this assignment a bit more. Perhaps it's not too late?' These posts offer each individual faculty participant a space and a structure within which to explore, reflect, unearth assumptions, and articulate commitments. They also generate a series of such reflections over time that document development, themes, and insights as well as clarify commitments and areas for continued development. Finally, they offer participants glimpses into one another's pedagogical and personal commitments, priorities, questions, uncertainties, accomplishments, approaches, and more.

A third key component of the seminar is weekly, written, facilitator reflections. These identify themes that are in dialogue with key ideas from pedagogical literature, but with faculty ideas driving connections (as opposed to leading with theory). They put points from participants' posts into dialogue with one another, highlighting interesting resonances and juxtapositions that might not have surfaced in spoken conversation. For instance, under the umbrella of the prompt, 'In what ways are you becoming the teacher you want to be?' offered in week 13 of the semester, Cook-Sather identified the theme 'preserve your vision and integrity even while growing.' She juxtaposed excerpts from faculty participants' responses, including lines from Moss's and Williamson's responses. Moss wrote about 'the importance of the learning community in creating trust, respectfulness, and a space to make mistakes, learn and grow when it comes to knowledge building on research in social work.' Williamson wrote about 'starting to build learning environments that embrace exploration and are aligned with my professional values.'

Semester-long, student-faculty pedagogical partnerships through SaLT constitute the second form of conversation in our approach and also include several components. Each student-faculty pair develops their particular version of partnership, guided by a set of recommendations

(see Cook-Sather, Bahti, and Ntem, 2019). The first component of this approach is classroom observations, through which student consultants visit one class session of their faculty partner's course each week and take detailed observation notes on pedagogical areas on which the faculty partners want to focus. These notes offer faculty a perspective on classroom practice from a different angle of vision and inflected with student experience. As one faculty participant noted:

> There were a number of times when [the student consultant] was bringing positive observations that I wouldn't necessarily have known—that so-and-so was feeling particularly interested and engaged by a topic or a teaching approach that I wouldn't have necessarily thought about. I often felt like, 'Oh, I didn't see it that way, and now I do; now I have that perspective.'(Quoted in Cook-Sather, 2014, p. 37)

A second component is weekly meetings between student and faculty partners intended to provide space for sharing experiences, ideas, questions, successes, failures, hopes, concerns, and plans analogous to but different from the faculty-faculty dialogue in the seminars. Moss often began conversations with her student consultant, 'How do you think class went in terms of understanding the content and teaching style?' Williamson and the student consultant often used general questions like, 'What makes a problem effective in the context of this course?' to develop strategies that promote student engagement.

These student-faculty exchanges are supported by a third component: weekly meetings between Cook-Sather and the student consultants in which the student consultants develop the language and the confidence to participate in trustful conversations with their faculty partners. For instance, a student consultant describes how the trustful conversation with other student consultants helped her 'figure out why' she believed an approach her faculty partner had planned

to use caused her concern. She then was able to express to him her reasoning in their own trustful conversation, and that conversation had an impact on the faculty member's classroom practice. She explains: 'When I framed my belief this way, with a clear reason behind it, my faculty partner immediately changed his focus and began to think about his practice differently' (Mathrani, 2018, p. 5).

Discussion of our overlapping conversations

The overlapping conversations we describe create multiple spaces for reflection and dialogue permeated by trust and deep engagement and foster complex interactions among faculty and student consultants that nurture partnership attitudes and approaches in faculty members' developing pedagogical practice. They support new faculty in thinking through personal experiences of teaching, developing voice, and experiencing agency in changing pedagogy in the broader bi-college culture.

Creating multiple spaces for reflection and dialogue permeated by trust and deep engagement

The multiple forms of modeling, inviting, and supporting vulnerability in the faculty pedagogy seminar can inspire trust as 'a reaction to risk and uncertainty' (Simon and Pleschová, 2019, p. 3) regarding teaching in these new contexts. If new faculty expect that 'the intentions and the behavior' of those in the seminar are positive (Simon and Pleschová, 2019, p. 3), then the seminars become 'permeated by trust' (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009, p. 554). Similarly, as Williamson has noted elsewhere (Weiler and Williamson, 2020), faculty can build 'a solid foundation' and an 'effective approach to collaboration' (p. 2) with their student consultants 'built on trust and open, honest communication' (p. 6).

It is in part the cross-disciplinary nature of these overlapping conversations that builds both trust and faculty voice and agency. As Williamson noted, 'the fact that it is a

group of new faculty from very diverse disciplines' supports 'learning from different

voices that extend beyond who I usually talk to, listen to, and learn from,' such as

'departmental colleagues and other new faculty occasionally.' Because, as Williamson

continued, 'a lot of the advice that you are getting from different contexts is actually

orthogonal to one another, …you have to think about your own priorities and your own

sense of purpose and then develop accordingly.'

Likewise, because by design the student-faculty partnerships also bridge disciplines, the

student consultant feedback is not rooted in field-specific content or engrained practices but

rather enables big picture evaluation of the course. While student and faculty partners alike often

assume that disciplinary knowledge is necessary for faculty learning, both come to see the

benefits Williamson notes. For instance, a student consultant—a political science major

partnered with three faculty in different STEM disciplines—opened a reflective essay about her

experience this way: '"I don't know anything about chemistry," I thought, as I read an email

informing me that my first placement as a student consultant with the [name of program] would

be in an organic chemistry lab' (Daviduke, 2019, p. 1). In the essay she reflects on how this work

'convinced me that my non-STEM identity was an asset to my faculty partners and our work

together' (Daviduke, 2019, p. 1).

Notetaking in both the seminar and the student-faculty partnerships creates another space

for reflection and dialogue permeated by trust and deep engagement. As Moss reflected

regarding the notetaking in the seminar, it puts each member of the group in a

'participant/learner role, where you are immersed as a notetaker yet you make critical

observations of the group dynamics, individual and collective responses to discussions and

nonverbal communication.' Having this simultaneously insider and outsider perspective on the

exchanges among faculty participants affords different insights both to the person taking the notes and to other participants when the note-taker reports back to the group at the end of the session. Often the note-taker notices strategies in Cook-Sather's facilitation that are not obvious when one is participating rather than observing, such as making connections between different participant contributions or guiding the focus back to the theme of the session, and these inform new faculty members' own practice.

This notetaking in the seminar parallels the notetaking in which student consultants engage weekly in their faculty partners' classrooms, which can 'open up…the space in the classroom in ways which I have not seen before' (faculty member quoted in Cook-Sather, 2015). The student consultant working with Moss noted the increased level of non-verbal attention to the lecture portion of the course when examples of professional and firsthand experience in research were linked with the topic of the lecture. Notes recorded from the students' perspective taught Williamson the importance of accessible, simplified diagrams.

Supporting complex interactions that nurture partnership attitudes and approaches

The roles of faculty participant in the pedagogy seminar, facilitator of the seminar and SaLT, student consultant, and student enrolled in the faculty members' courses each carries expectations. However, engaging in overlapping, trustful conversations can expand standard understandings of learner and teacher roles and carry partnership approaches beyond the formal partnerships and into faculty members' courses. For instance, Hong recalled a moment in the seminar when faculty were discussing amongst themselves how to address a particular classroom challenge, and Cook-Sather said, 'When you have a question, you can ask the students. Just ask them directly.' That moment in the seminar, in a conversation among trusted faculty colleagues, offered, for Hong, a profound insight into the possibility of bringing questions of learning and

teaching directly to students. It contributed to Hong's understanding of the existing 'culture of trust and respect' at Haverford College and how pedagogical choices can in turn shape that culture. It was for Hong 'a revelatory experience as a result of the seminar/student consultant model'— a result of engaging in overlapping conversations and reimagining teacher and learner roles. Moss described this phenomenon as 'the layers' of conversation that happen between her as the instructor with the student consultant 'to process the next steps in addressing concerns and strengths' in relation to her teaching.

SaLT partnerships as a form of conversation play a key role in supporting new faculty not only in developing their own pedagogical voices but also in building partnership culture in the classroom. As Moss reflected:

> …the term "consultant" connotes the idea of advisement in a behind-the-scenes
>
> sort of way, where conversations are happening outside of the classroom in
>
> preparation for the ones that occur inside and in creating and maintaining an
>
> inclusive teaching and learning environment.

Hong added that the term signals that the work with the student consultant 'is not a hierarchical dynamic, that this is—to the extent possible, recognizing the ways that we're differently positioned—that the student consultant is someone we can speak to on a level playing field.' Experiencing these dialogic, non-hierarchical relationships with student consultants supports faculty in conceptualizing all students 'more as colleagues, more as people engaged in similar struggles to learn and grow' (faculty member quoted in Cook-Sather, 2015).

Moss, Williamson, and Hong all found the process of gathering mid-semester feedback, discussed in the pedagogy seminar and facilitated by the student consultant, key moments of expanding roles both in their student-faculty partnerships and with enrolled students. Williamson

13

explained how his student consultant 'led the conversation' with students in his class 'and then about a week later we sat down and synthesized'—what we discussed in our conversation as a layered process or an iterative process. Moss described not only the role her student consultant played in gathering mid-semester feedback but also how in some ways the student consultant had their own trustful, open-minded 'backstage conversation with the students when I wasn't there.' Hong noted that while some conversations with her student consultant 'were focused on tweaking and problem-solving from week to week as the course unfolded, others involved problem-solving at a bigger-picture level.' Ideas for big-picture pedagogical revisions first emerged 'in a mid-semester review survey and discussion which my student consultant led without my presence.' These ideas were revisited in 'an end-of-semester evaluation discussion led by my student consultant and myself.' It was this conversation co-created in the classroom, with everyone in an expanded role, that led to the most significant changes for future iterations of this course and Hong's other courses, including reversing the order of film screenings and reading-based seminars so that (option 1: discussions can draw from rather than inform film viewings or option 2: to better encourage the integration of textual and film analysis). One of the reasons for this is that student, faculty, and student consultant insights could be synthesized by everyone involved rather than the typical way that student evaluations are often seen as simply 'data' to be synthesized by faculty alone.

Faculty experience what Hong described as 'risk taking and trust and tinkering' in the context of the pedagogy seminar and the SaLT partnerships. The creation of trustful conversations with their student consultants supports processes of growth and change that become integrated into relationships with faculty members' own students. For example, in our conversation Hong reflected on how, instead of doing end-of-semester course evaluations, she

14

and students wrote reflection letters to each other that were shared after the submission of grades. Hong explained her surprise that such letters expressed the extent to which her expression of trust to students through self-evaluation resulted in the permeation of trust and a 'feedback loop' of risk-taking. Hong noted that the very students who, at the beginning of the semester, had looked to her for affirmation and were focused on grades, were the ones who later reflected in their letters that: "'it was less about the grade and feedback from you and we started to trust ourselves and each other.'"

Through spoken exchanges, written reflections, and reading across both, new faculty work with both student consultants and enrolled students in 'problem solving or idea testing' (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009, pp. 554). Through 'building empathy' and engaging in 'frank dialogue and deep learning' (Goldsmith, Hanscom, Throop, et al., 2017, p. 2), new faculty and their student consultants come to challenge more conventionally hierarchical roles of teacher and learner and put into practice classroom-based partnership approaches.

Developing voice and agency in changing pedagogy in the broader bi-college culture

The expanded roles facilitated by overlapping, trustful conversations lead faculty to develop their own pedagogical voice that not only conforms to but also further shapes existing institutional norms. The pedagogy seminar provides an important forum for sharing the collective wisdom of colleagues and student consultants for what Williamson described as 'an immense amount of knowledge about institutional culture that I was able to learn trying to navigate a new place.' An example of this, Hong recounted, was a visit to the seminar by several junior faculty a few years ahead of her, Williamson, and Moss. These faculty shared their radical and continued experiments with expanding student roles in the classroom, giving Hong a sense

not only of existing culture, but also 'encouraging us to find our own space within that and challenge some of that as well.'

Student consultants play an important role in the process of new faculty developing voice and agency by serving as conversation partners who prompt faculty to rethink pedagogical goals and methods that may become second nature over time. Finding a sense of voice and belonging—where one's pedagogical practices fit within broader institutional culture—is important for all faculty, but especially for underrepresented faculty as they strive to 'establish "home"' (Mayo and Chhuon, 2014, p. 227; Cook-Sather, 2020). The partnership culture built through trustful overlapping conversations can make more spaces home and such a home a place of growth and change; agency; not just assimilation.

Challenges of this approach

The main challenge of these overlapping forms of conversation is tackling the fear and anxiety many, if not most, new faculty feel around having 'observers.' Their colleagues in the seminar, they can worry, may measure performance in ways that are 'institutionalized and normalized in everyday life' (Lynch, 2010, p. 55). Their student consultants may evoke 'the anxious expectancy of classroom observation as a (real or perceived) form of benevolent surveillance' (Reckson, 2014). Most faculty, including Moss, Williamson, and Hong, find the seminar affirms and supports them and that their student partners offer 'observation without judgment—a rare gift—and along with it, a sense of camaraderie and shared purpose' (Reckson, 2014). However, a small number of faculty feel unproductively vulnerable, initially resist and dismiss the approach, or reject the approach altogether. Challenges students have reported include feeling vulnerable to their faculty partners or traumatized by a partnership, frustrated with non-partnership frames and practices, hyper-responsible as a result of increased awareness

and capacity, and disenchanted with non-engaged work. Other challenges include managing everyone's complex schedules and lives, differentiating teaching assistants and student partners, considering diversity of identities and roles, and acknowledging and managing the emotional labor involved in partnership. All of these challenges are addressed in *[Pedagogical Partnerships: A How-to Guide for Faculty, Students, and Academic Developers in Higher Education](#)* (Cook-Sather, Bahti, and Ntem, 2019).

Could this approach to new faculty development be implemented in other contexts?

There are characteristics of our particular contexts—small size, liberal-arts emphasis, commitment to faculty-student collaborations and relationship-building—that might seem necessary for engaging in trustful conversations as an approach to new faculty development. However, teaching and learning centers at institutions around the world with different defining characteristics and emphases have developed pedagogical partnership programs among their academic development offerings. Examples include Florida Gulf Coast University, a mid-sized, Master's level member of the Florida state university system (Gennocro and Straussberger, 2020), Victoria University of Wellington, a research-intensive university in Aotearoa / New Zealand (Leota and Sutherland, 2020), Kaye Academic College of Education in Beer-Sheva, Israel (Narkiss and Naaman, 2020), and Lahore University of Management Sciences in Lahore, Pakistan (Waqar and Asad, 2020).

Regarding new faculty development in particular, less intensive versions of such exchanges through, for instance, one-time conversations between students and faculty during faculty orientation, are emerging forms of new faculty development at liberal-arts institutions such as Lafayette College (Addy et al., 2019) and large public research institutions such as the University of Virginia (Doktor et al., 2019). Iterative, trusting conversations among faculty

colleagues and between students and faculty expand conceptualizations and enactments of teaching and learning and the roles of teacher and learner across contexts. This holds true whether the conversations take the form of more intimate, semester-long dialogues or more periodic conversations among larger groups of faculty and students.

Conclusion

Our approach to new faculty development can be successful in supporting new faculty in orienting themselves to unfamiliar institutional contexts, in developing voice and agency as the educators they want to be in those contexts, and in building partnership practices. We therefore recommend that academic developers consider ways of creating multiple, overlapping conversations such as those we describe here to support new faculty. Such an approach is conducive to development that supports opportunities to engage in complex interactions in both expected and expanded roles and to building a partnership culture in the classroom. The complexities of student and faculty identities, experiences, and teaching and learning needs are increasing. The opportunity to embrace multiple forms of partnership can help faculty and students stay nimble, animated, and attentive to others' as well as their own development.

References

Adams, T. E., Linn, H. J. S., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Addy, T., & DeVault, A. (2019, November 13-17). *Students as critical partners for inclusive pedagogical practices*. [Conference presentation]. Conference of the Professional and Organizational Development Network. Pittsburgh, PA.

Anzaldua, G., & Keating, A. (2015). *Light in the Dark/Luz en lo Oscuro: Rewriting Identity, Spirituality, Reality*. Duke University Press Books, Duke University Press.

Berg, J., Caulkins, J., Felten, P., & McGowen, S. (2018). Raising the Curtain: Encouraging Backstage Conversations That Lead to Student Success. Presentation at POD Conferences.

Bovill, C. (2017). Breaking down student-staff barriers: Moving towards pedagogic flexibility. In I. Kinchin and N.E. Winstone. *Pedagogic frailty and Resilience in the University*. (pp. 151-161). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, W. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. London: Routledge.

Condon, W., Iverson, E., Manduca, C., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Respecting Voices: How the Co-creation of Teaching and Learning Can Support Academic Staff, Underrepresented Students, and Equitable Practices. *Higher Education, 79*(5), 885-901. https://rdcu.be/bQfu5

Cook-Sather, A. (2016). Undergraduate Students as Partners in New Faculty Orientation and Academic Development. *International Journal of Academic Development*, *21*(2), 151-162.

Cook-Sather, A. (2015). Dialogue Across Differences of Position, Perspective, and Identity: Reflective Practice In/On a Student-Faculty Pedagogical Partnership Program. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(2).

Cook-Sather, A., Bahti, M., & Ntem, A. (2019). *Pedagogical partnerships: A how-to guide for faculty, students, and academic developers in higher education*. Elon University Center for Engaged Teaching Open Access Series. doi.org/10.36284/celelon.oa1

19

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

Daviduke, N. (2018). Growing into pedagogical partnerships over time and across disciplines: My experience as a non-STEM student consultant in STEM courses. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, *2*(2), 151-156. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i2.3443

Doktor, S. D., Bach, D., Abbot, S., & Hardin, J. (2019). At the threshold: A case study of a partnership between a student organization and an educational development center. *International Journal for Students as Partners* 3(1): 150–59. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v3i1.3511

Felten, P., Abbot, S., Kirkwood, J., Long, A., Lubicz-Nawrocka, T., Mercer-Mapstone, L., & Verwoord, R. (2019). Reimagining the place of students in academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 24(2), 192-203, DOI: 10.1080/1360144X.2019.1594235

Gennocro, A., & Straussberger, J. (2020). Peers and colleagues: Collaborative class design through student-faculty partnerships. In *Building Courage, Confidence, and Capacity in Learning and Teaching through Student-Faculty Partnership: Stories from across Contexts and Arenas of Practice,* edited by Alison Cook-Sather and Chanelle Wilson. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Goedereis, E. A., & MacCartney, D. (2019). Creating common ground: A process to facilitate interdisciplinary conversation among university faculty. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, *8*(2), 173-183.

Goldsmith, M., Hanscom, M., Throop, S.A., & Young, C. (2017). Growing student-faculty partnerships at Ursinus College: A brief history in dialogue. *International Journal for Students as Partners 1* (2) https://mulpress.mcmaster.ca/ijsap/article/view/3075.

Griffin, R. A. (2012). *I AM an Angry Black Woman: Black Feminist Autoethnography, Voice, and Resistance: Women's Studies in Communication: Vol 35, No 2*. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07491409.2012.724524

Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education. York, UK: Higher Education Academy.

Leota, A., & Sutherland, K. (2020). 'With your basket of knowledge and my basket of knowledge, the people will prosper': Learning and leading in a student-staff partnership program. In *Building Courage, Confidence, and Capacity in Learning and Teaching through Student-Faculty Partnership: Stories from across Contexts and Arenas of Practice,* edited by Alison Cook-Sather and Chanelle Wilson. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Lynch, K. (2010) Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education, arts and humanities. *Higher Education*, 9(1), pp. 54–67.

Mårtensson, K., & Roxå, T. (2015). Academic development in a world of informal learning about teaching and student learning. International Journal for Academic Development 20(2), 109-112.

Mayo, J. B. Jr., & Chhuon, V. (2014). Pathways to the tenure track: Reflections from faculty of color on their recruitment to a research university. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 23*, 3, 223–239.

Mercer-Mapstone, L., Dvorakova, S. L., Matthews, K. E., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P.,

    Knorr, K., Marquis, E., Shammas, R., & Swaim, K. (2017). A systematic literature

    review of students as partners in higher education. *International Journal for Students As*

    Partners, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i1.3119

Narkiss, D., & Naaman, I. (2020). Voicing and reflecting in a pedagogical partnership. In

    Building Courage, Confidence, and Capacity in Learning and Teaching through Student-

    Faculty Partnership: Stories from across Contexts and Arenas of Practice, edited by

    Alison Cook-Sather and Chanelle Wilson. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Neame, C. (2013). Democracy or Intervention? Adapting Orientations to Development.

    International Journal for Academic Development, 18(4), 331-343.

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2015). Microcultures and Informal Learning: A Heuristic Guiding

    Analysis of Conditions for Informal Learning in Local Higher Education Workplaces.

    International Journal for Academic Development, 20(2), 193-205.

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2009). Significant conversations and significant networks:

    exploring the backstage of teaching arena. *Studies in Higher Education, 34* (5), 547-559.

Reckson, L. V. (2014). The weather in Hemingway. *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher*

    Education, 11.

Reyes, V., & Adams, K. (2017). Navigating a difficult journey: Reflections on how a student-

    faculty partnership helped address racial tensions in a social science course. *International*

    Journal for Students As Partners, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i2.3262

Simon, E., & Pleschová, G. (2019). The role of trusting relationships in facilitating change in

    teaching practices at the university level. A study prepared as part of the collaborative

project: Extending and reinforcing good practice in teacher development, 2016-1-SK01-KA203-022551

Stocks, C., & Trevitt, C. (2016). The place of trust in Continuing Professional Learning programmes: Supporting authentic reflection in portfolio assessment. *International Journal for Academic Development, 21*(3), 219-229. doi:10.1080/1360144x.2016.1188819

Waqar, Y., & Asad, A. M. (2020). Student as co-designer: Processes of planning and teaching with the student in mind. In *Building Courage, Confidence, and Capacity in Learning and Teaching through Student-Faculty Partnership: Stories from across Contexts and Arenas of Practice,* edited by Alison Cook-Sather and Chanelle Wilson. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Weiler, K., & Williamson, A. (2020). Partnering to build responsive learning communities that support students in crisis. *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education*, 30. https://repository.brynmawr.edu/tlthe/vol1/iss30/3