

## CHAPTER 21

---

# TRANSFORMING DISCUSSIONS FROM COLLEGIATE TO COLLEGIAL

**Paul Michalec and Hilary Burg**

---

The creation of discussion guidelines based on Courage to Teach practices and principles help to create an environment which fosters individual learning and expression while developing classroom community and intellectual engagement. Survey results indicated appreciation for clearly articulated norms of behavior, increased sense of classroom community, increased respect for peers, and heightened levels of authenticity and intellectual engagement. This chapter offers higher education faculty a new framework for organizing and facilitating discussion in their classroom.

*The whole idea of it makes me feel  
Like I'm coming down with something,  
Something worse than any stomach ache...*

—Billy Collins (1995)

The classroom slowly fills with college students. A few students exchange greetings but most are busy reading articles for class, listening to music, or checking e-mail on their laptops. The professor enters and begins

---

*Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*  
Volume 9, Numbers 1 & 2, 2007, pp. 297–312  
Copyright © 2007 by Information Age Publishing  
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

organizing his class materials for the day's lesson. He has enjoyed teaching this class but feels slightly nervous as he anticipates the uncertainty of what is about to transpire. Today he is planning an activity that involves discussion; his gut tightens ever so slightly. He generally believes in discussion because as a college student he enjoyed wrestling with ideas alongside his classmates, and he learned so much from hearing other students and their diverse points of view. A good discussion opens up learning for everyone in ways that few other teaching strategies can accomplish. He also knows from reading about effective instruction in higher education that students value discussion because it provides an element of empowerment that is sometimes absent in more traditional teaching formats.

He can see so many positive and compelling reasons for discussion but is unsure because his discussions have not always gone well. Teaching is such a mystery at times, full of unexplained successes and failures. He has noticed that sometimes a few students will dominate the discussion and by the end of the class period, the conversation is limited to a handful of students; everyone else is left out and disconnected. At other times, the discussion feels shallow and skims over the course material. No one seems ready or secure enough to commit to a deeply held belief or understanding that would enliven the day's readings. And, most troubling is the potential for the discussion to deteriorate into a heated argument where polarization and loud voices become the norm instead of shared inquiry and the vigorous unpacking of ideas.

Yet, despite these drawbacks, he is committed to holding a discussion tonight. As he scans his class, he wonders what pedagogical stumbling blocks lay hidden in the dance of ideas that often accompany a good discussion. Ignoring his rising uncertainty he takes a deep breath, a breath that reaches to the heart of his teaching self. He pushes on, beginning the class with a warm smile and friendly welcome.

Is it possible for the instructor in this vignette to feel more comfortable with discussion, more willing to use it in his classroom, and better prepared to avoid the pitfalls that often accompany the use of discussion? What might be the conceptual underpinnings supporting a different, more collegial form of classroom discourse that is more inviting for both the professor and students? Can a discussion allow for individual articulation of knowledge that also broadens and deepens everyone's understanding of the course material? In this chapter we will argue for a new approach to facilitating discussion that decreases the pedagogical uncertainties associated with discussion, honors the collegial inclinations of students and faculty, and holds true to the value of academic rigor. The data for this article suggest that it is possible to organize discussions to increase intellectual engagement of the course material, build a nonconfronta-

tional academic culture, sustain respectful interpersonal relationships and encourage students to carry discussion practices and principles beyond the classroom to other classes or professional and personal experiences.

### **DISCUSSIONS AS AN EFFECTIVE TEACHING METHOD**

According to Peter Gomes, Harvard University Chaplain, most universities and colleges hold a narrow view of the learning needs of students and treat them primarily as brains-on-a-stick (Lewis, 2006). In other words, almost every characteristic or aspect of a student beyond his or her intellect is left outside the classroom. In the face of this description, Lewis (2006), argues that faculty in higher education should treat students more holistically and consciously attend to both the cognitive and affective dimensions of learning. Many professors are responding and their classrooms are learner-centered environments where discussion, active engagement, and interpersonal relationships form the basis of the classroom culture (Cross, 2002; Muller, 2000). In these student-centered classrooms the interactions between students and the professor are more cooperative and collegial in nature, rather than hierarchical. Increasingly, studies are showing a direct relationship between student-centered forms of pedagogy and learning; as the level of student-centered teaching increases, there is a corresponding increase in student course-satisfaction and learning (Kolitch & Dean, 1999; Weimer, 2002; Young & Shaw, 1999).

Class discussion is one form of student-centered pedagogy that treats students as more than just brains-on-a-stick. Discussion encourages students to take responsibility for their learning by offering them the opportunity to suggest topics of conversation (DiMarco, 2005; McKeachie, 2006;). But discussion, like many teaching techniques, has pitfalls that instructors must anticipate if they hope to maximize its educational benefit. For instance, faculty must watch for the potential of one or two students to dominate the discussion, decrease the likelihood of student to student confrontation around a controversial topic, and create a classroom where students speak from interest in the course material, not from grade-driven necessity. In an effort to guide instructors around these pitfalls, Nilson (2003), suggests taking a proactive stance at establishing norms of interaction early in the academic term: “Some instructors have reduced classroom incivilities by having their students collectively draw up a ‘contract’ or set of rules for behavior on which they all agree” (p. 58). And Cross (2002), writes about the importance of establishing structured but flexible guidelines for classroom discussion: “Discussion is more likely to be productive if there is a flexible plan to begin with—structured enough to take advantage of unexpected events” (p. 11).

We are encouraging faculty to consider a new strategy for structuring class discussion that is responsive to two interrelated instructional goals. One goal is to move discussion from a collegiate format, which is often argumentative in style, to a collegial orientation that encourages vigorous and supportive dialogue around an idea. The second goal is to increase the level of comfort faculty experience with class discussion by providing a structure designed to increase student participation while reducing the likelihood of encountering the pitfalls associated with discussion. The instructional strategy central to this study is based on the norms of discussion pioneered in the Courage to Teach (CTT) framework for professional renewal of K-12 educators and administrators (Palmer, 2004).

Courage to Teach emphasizes community, self-reflection, listening, speaking for yourself and invitation to participate—all grounded in the belief that teachers and leaders hold within the heart of their professional identity the strength and wisdom to respond effectively to the challenges characteristic of their workspace (Intrator, 2002; Palmer, 1998, 2004). However, given the high-pressure environment associated with many schools (e.g., accountability, testing, large class sizes, and mandated curriculum), most teachers and leaders have lost the ability to fully hear and tap into their inner strength. CTT, through a series of weekend retreats over a two-year period, offers educators the opportunity to slow down and reconnect with their deep sense of professional calling and passion (Palmer, 2004). Each retreat begins with a reading and discussion of the following “touchstones” for community interaction while on retreat (Jackson & Jackson, 2005):

- Come to the work with 100% of ourselves;
- Presume welcome and extend welcome;
- Believe that it’s possible to emerge refreshed;
- There is always invitation, never invasion;
- No fixing, saving, advising;
- Openness to learning from others;
- When the going gets rough, turn to wonder;
- Speak for yourself;
- Listen to the silence; and
- Observe confidentiality.

These touchstones are strictly followed and retreat facilitators gently resist any movement away from these norms. In practice, these touchstones help foster the creation of a communal space where individual members of the circle are empowered to give voice to deeply held beliefs

and understandings, often divergent from their peers' points of view. With the successive sharing of insights, observations and questions; the knowledge base of the circle is deepened and a sense of respectful community emerges.

One of the researchers in this study uses discussion extensively in his teaching. He believes it is pedagogically egalitarian because it gives students nearly equal opportunity to influence the direction of learning in the class. Additionally, discussion allows for a greater range of perspectives on a topic than more didactic forms of instruction. He is also a trained Courage to Teach facilitator and has witnessed the potential of CTT to transform the professional lives of teachers through the creation of a collegial community where all voices and perspectives are welcomed. While reflecting on the changed patterns of social interaction characteristic of retreat participants, he began to wonder if the CTT touchstones could be modified for a college classroom for the purpose of enhancing discussion. Would the changes in discourse and learning evident in retreat settings also materialize in a college classroom? This study begins to answer this question. If successful, these modified CTT touchstones could offer professors a new process for deepening discussion through the surfacing of diverse ways of thinking while avoiding many of the known pitfalls associated with discussion.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To answer the question as to whether or not a modified version of the CTT touchstones is instructionally effective and appropriate for guiding class discussion, we conducted a study involving four classes taught by one of the researchers. We chose the methodology of action research for this study because it offers a researcher the ability to be both a critical observer of his/her teaching while actively facilitating student learning (Hubbard & Power, 1993). The data for this study were collected using an open-ended survey posted electronically. The study participants consisted of all of the students in four classes taught between the spring of 2005 and the summer of 2006. In all four classes the students were either MA or PhD students in the following program areas: curriculum and instruction; counseling psychology; and child, family, and school psychology. The titles of the classes included: history of american education, teacher as researcher, introduction to curriculum, and spirituality in psychology and education.

We emailed 52 students describing the study and reviewing the discussion norms established in their class. Because the norms were collaboratively developed and therefore unique to each class, every student in the

study was directed to a class-specific anonymous survey of their learning experiences associated with the modified CTT touchstones. The survey questions included:

1. In what ways, if any, have the classroom discussion guidelines affected the sense of community in the classroom? Provide specific examples.
2. In what ways, if any, have the discussion guidelines affected intellectual/pedagogical relationships (e.g., student-to-student, student-to-faculty, other: gender, program, cohort year) in the classroom? Provide specific examples.
3. Think about your experience working with the discussion guidelines.
  - a. What have you learned about yourself?
  - b. What have you learned about the subject matter of the class?
  - c. What else have you learned?
4. How have you applied these learnings in other areas of your life (professional, personal, academic)? Provide specific examples.
5. How have the discussion guidelines contributed to your intellectual engagement with the class? Provide specific examples.
6. How has your experience in this class compared with other classes you've taken not using these discussion guidelines? Provide specific examples.
7. What three adjectives, or metaphor (e.g. type of music, restaurant, holiday), would you use to describe your experience with the discussion guidelines?

The data were compiled by the university's research and assessment department and e-mailed to the researchers as a text file. Fifteen students responded to the survey, four from teacher as researcher, two from history of american education, five from introduction to curriculum, and three from spirituality of psychology and education. Thirteen respondents were generally supportive of the modified CTT touchstones, one was neutral, and one student felt the discussion guidelines were restrictive. The data were analyzed using Spradley's (1980) thematic analysis and assertion analysis and sorted into dominant themes. Finally, we e-mailed a draft of the article to all 52 participants seeking their feedback, which we included in the final version of the paper.

## FINDINGS

The data suggest that using a modified form of the CTT touchstones enhanced discussion and learning outcomes for students. This finding is in keeping with the literature in higher education encouraging faculty to establish norms for discussion (Cross, 2002; Nilson, 2003). In general, the CTT norms increased the sense of classroom community, led to an appreciation for clearly articulated norms of behavior, increased levels of respect for peers, and heightened levels of authenticity and intellectual engagement (see the Appendix). In short, the classroom climate shifted from collegiate to collegial while maintaining a sense of academic rigor. There was also a hint in the data that the application of CTT norms had its limitations and will likely not be applicable to all classes in higher education or equally embraced by all students. The dampening effect of the norms voiced by one student suggests that even with the best of intentions and a conscious effort to build supportive and challenging instructional relationships, issues of autonomy and voice are still present in higher education.

### Classroom Culture

One of the striking outcomes of this study was the way CTT norms fostered a classroom culture defined by the following characteristics: respect, safety, and a non-confrontational intellectual community. As one student observed, “By establishing clear rules there was a more informed sense of what the classroom community could be.” And by community, students meant honoring the voice of individuals for the purpose of increasing everyone’s learning experience: “I found the guidelines helpful because they reminded me to think of the learning of the group, not just my own learning.”

Of equal or greater importance, in terms of learning, is the sense that a CTT infused discussion is thought provoking and encourages students to critically examine their thinking, the thinking of their peers, and the ideas raised by the course material: “I think that the guidelines improved my relationships with my peers, as the guidelines reminded me that I do not have to agree with my classmates and more importantly that I do not have to save anyone when I think they are wrong,” and “Using ‘I’ statements allowed me to feel free to share my story and know that others would respect what I had to say.” The transformative educational potential of individual storytelling (the use of “I” statements), as it relates to the course content, is consistent with the centrality of telling one’s story and only one’s story in the CTT model of professional renewal (Palmer, 2004).

Another element of the classroom culture was a sense of comfort: “I was more comfortable in your class than [other] classes [I took],” and “Feeling comfortable in a class discussion is often hard to come by, these guidelines made me, a typically shy person in class discussion, feel comfortable.” The third feature of the collegial classroom was the feeling that students could offer their opinions and understandings of the course material without fearing that their comments would elicit a disrespectful challenge from a peer: “Because of the guidelines, I knew I could say what I wanted, and others would not treat me as less of a person.” The final feature of the intellectually engaged, CTT-informed classroom was a feeling of being safe: “[The norms] allowed for a safe environment, which allowed for a more authentic discussion and consequently more intellectual engagement on my behalf,” and “[The norms] made sharing with the group or student to student much more personal, expressive, and intellectual because I felt confident that what I was saying was respected and invited.” It is this culture of sharing one’s deep understanding of the readings, without feeling overly guarded for fear of being disrespected that greatly improved the quality of the class discussions.

### **Norms**

When the professor in this study, in cooperation with his students, defined the norms for class discussion, his expectations for classroom behavior also became explicit. This study suggests that explicit classroom norms are highly valued by students because implicit norms are difficult to identify and leave students guessing about appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Students found the modified CTT touchstones helpful because they clearly communicated the professor’s and peers’ expectations for norms of discussion and interaction within the classroom: “These norms set up a basis for discussion and behavior that helped us understand what was expected of us.” As another student observed, there was little doubt as to what the norms of behavior in class should be: “The guidelines made evident otherwise unspoken rules and kept me in check.”

In addition to being clear, explicit norms are also more efficient than implicit norms because they reduce the time it takes to figure out what is acceptable or unacceptable behavior in a class: “In other classes where we haven’t used them I think people spend more time trying to figure out the way in which to operate and exchange their ideas.” Once the guidelines were in place, the value of CTT norms became clearer to even students who were initially skeptical: “It is somewhat surprising to see that it can be useful and helpful to stipulate such guidelines so that everyone feels heard and their dignity recognized.” The gift of being listened to



and treated with dignity in the context of a conversation is a hallmark of a CTT retreat and it seems that this norm of social interaction is also helpful in structuring discussion in a college course.

In all four classes, the professor reminded students, at times throughout the term, of the purpose and function of the discussion guidelines. Students understood his actions as an affirmation of his belief in the importance of hearing everyone's voice and developing a shared collegial understanding of the course material: "I remember one time ... someone talked over someone and [the professor] gently reminded that person that the rule in our class was not to prove that we are right or listen to our own voice, but to listen to others as well." Additionally, students developed an understanding for the importance of guidelines that limit the ability of any one student to dominate class discussion: "The classes I took that followed this one were lacking in any guidelines for discussion. This allowed those who loved the sound of their own voices to talk and talk. Ultimately this allowed a certain level of hostility to percolate and tarnish my experience in the classes."

The explicit message from the professor was that the course had clearly stated norms, which many students seemed to internalize, that were developed cooperatively, and monitored by the professor. And a link was drawn between following these norms and enhanced learning opportunities, both in terms of the content knowledge of the course and in relation to more personal understandings of what it means to be a learner: "My confidence level in class discussion has been greatly improved. I no longer spend as much time worrying, will my classmates find what I have to say to be silly." Taken in their totality the norms developed in all four classes reduced the time it took students to figure out the rules of participation, linked the professor's walk with his talk about respecting the voice of all students, and decreased the chance that any one student would dominate the discussion.

### **Intellectual Authenticity and Learning**

The CTT norms encouraged the formation of a collegial learning environment where many students developed a sense of intellectual responsibility to the whole class: "You know as a student what your classmates are expecting from everyone." And in the context of this study, expectation was less a sense of demand to participate and more of an invitation for students to offer their knowledge when they had something of value to offer the community of learners. As one student observed, in order to contribute to the class discussion it was important to not only think about the course material, but to also make that knowledge personally meaning-

ful and genuine: “[The] invitation to participate and bringing my authentic self to class impacted me academically. I had to dig down and discover what I was thinking.”

As intellectual engagement became increasingly the norm of the class, more and more students participated in discussions: “By and large I learned that such guidelines can help people engage in the material better. I think the guidelines did help me to engage more in the class because others were more engaged.” Finally, it is important to note that because CTT norms emphasized listening, many students were able to share their understandings with relative ease: “I have learned to listen more attentively, and I am not afraid to speak out.”

As students became increasingly comfortable speaking from the heart of their personal and intellectual understanding, they began to uncover insights about themselves as learners and academics: “I felt that I gained self-awareness by participating in discussion with established boundaries.” And as self-awareness grew, many students learned that remaining quiet during a discussion is actually an important aspect of learning: “I learned I have to focus on listening and not trying to jump in or give advice,” “The guidelines brought to my attention that sometimes I try to save or fix instead of listen,” and “I have learned to not be so quick to judge and try to dump my opinion on others.” Other students encountered characteristics of their personality that they rarely considered before or understood as potential liabilities or assets to their learning: “I learned that it is very difficult for me to take risks ...” and “I learned that I’m a very vulnerable person; very deep emotions were stirred in me during class.” The emphasis on individual learning and self-awareness did not exclude the importance of keeping the learning needs of classmates in mind: “I learned that I enjoy the intellectual spotlight. This knowledge of myself along with my understanding of the guidelines forced me to sit back at times and be a more sensitive listener.”

The impact of the guidelines on the ways students interacted with one another and with the professor radiated beyond the classroom to include the personal and professional lives of students outside of class. Many of the college students in this study were also practicing teachers and many began teaching and responding to their students in new ways: “I try to instill in my students the belief that we are all smart and have something wonderful to teach each and every person in the classroom,” and “I’m more aware of kids and wait time in the classroom. I find myself listening more and talking less ...”

For one student, the discussion guidelines offered a new lens through which to understand and respond to the challenges associated with parenting: “I think my parenting has improved as I allow my children to hash out an issue to their fullest extent before stepping in.” It is interest-

ing to note that the intellectually enriching nature of the CTT informed discussion spread beyond the course content, and beyond peer-to-peer interactions to include the personal and professional lives of students when they were not in class. This seems like a noteworthy outcome for a few minor changes to a more traditional discussion format.

### **CAUTIONS**

Like an inkblot test, the discussion norms described in this study took on different meanings and a contrasting sense of purpose for each student in the course. The data suggest that many students saw value in the norms while others struggled with the importance of the norms. One student, for instance, felt that the guidelines were at best neutral: “It is not clear to me that they affected the sense of community much, if at all. Community arises from the good will ... and spirit of a group of people, not from artificial, external rules imposed upon them.” And one student felt the norms were disrespectful and distrusting of graduate students and, therefore, dampened discussion: “The guidelines may have dampened discussion and intellectual relationships as students felt chilled from pursuing ideas.” Yet given the generally positive response to the norms we believe that professors should consider using them in their classes while being watchful for those students who find the norms a limitation.

### **STRATEGIES AND IMPLICATIONS**

For faculty considering the use of the CTT discussion norms outlined in this paper, we offer the following account of the first class session for one of the courses we studied. This vignette is presented for the purpose of suggesting that the instructor’s approach is not the only approach, but rather we offer this story as a template for experimentation and visualization of what might work for other faculty in higher education. We believe that the new strategy for organizing discussion outlined in this paper does not require the skills of a trained CTT facilitator. Most instructors who possess a general sensitivity to and awareness of group dynamics and facilitation should be able to implement these teaching strategies. The key is authenticity and making the teaching of these norms a natural part of the professor’s regular classroom routine. The vignette focuses on the first class period because as Nilson (2003) suggests, norms are best established earlier in the course and in a collaborative process between the professor and his or her students.

The professor begins the establishment of norms by distributing a short excerpt from the book *On the Loose*. (The use of poetry or a short text is a common framing process in the CTT tradition.)

One of the best-paying professions is getting a hold of pieces of country in your mind, learning their smell and their moods, sorting out the pieces of a view, deciding what grows there and there and why, how many steps that hill will take, where this creek winds, and where it meets the other one below, what elevation timberline is now, whether you can walk this reef at low tide or have to climb around, which contour lines on a map mean better cliffs or mountains. This is the best kind of ownership, and the most permanent.

It feels good to say “I know the Sierra” or “I know Point Reyes.” But of course you don’t—what you know better is yourself, and Point Reyes and the Sierra have helped (Russell & Russell, p. 37, 1967).

He prefaces the reading of the excerpt with a comment: “On its surface, this quote has nothing to do with the content of the course. But deeper down it has everything to do with the way I hope we will organize discussion and interaction in our class. I invite you to listen for any word, image, or phrase that captures your attention. I also encourage you to approach this text as a poetic Rorschach test (Palmer, 2004). Each of you will likely hear something different and something of importance that our class needs to consider.”

The text is passed around the circle of chairs and read aloud. After a brief moment of silence, the professor asks for any reactions or impressions. One student raises a hand and offers a comment. The instructor thanks her and extends an open invitation for others to share their understanding. The professor ends the opening discussion of norms and offers a summary: “I hope that our class will become a place where each student can say that it ‘feels good’ to know the content of the course and that everyone will have the opportunity to affirm the challenge that ‘what you know better is yourself.’ Given this goal, what guidelines for discussion do you think we should consider?”

The class begins to offer suggestions and the professor writes each comment on the white board: “Listen attentively,” “Be prepared,” “Laughter,” “Keep an open mind,” “Respect differences,” “Take risks,” “Agree to disagree,” “Taking turns,” “No interruptions,” and “Be prepared to grow from others.” At times he offers additional norms, that he states, “are derived from the Courage to Teach tradition and seem to be particularly helpful in norming interaction.” His suggestions include: “No fixing, no saving, or advising,” “Speak your own truth,” “Bring 100% of yourself,” and “Always invitation never invasion” (Center for Courage and Renewal, 2005; Palmer, 2004).

Early establishment of norms is important because it sets a constructive tone for peer interaction that will carry forward throughout the academic

term. Additionally, the course instructor should actively monitor the norms and remind students of their importance in creating an effective discussion structure. As the data from this study suggests, most students were appreciative of the instructor's effort to establish norms because it made the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable behavior clear. And most students also felt that the CTT guidelines allowed for intellectually vigorous and supportive discussions.

The initial purpose of this action research study was to develop a clearer understanding of whether or not modified versions of the CTT touchstones could be used to enhance discussion in higher education. Given the generally encouraging responses from students, we intend to continue using CTT infused norms as a practical and metaphorical framework for structuring discussions.

The final implication for teaching and learning in higher education is a call to consider using the CTT practices and principles in more college classrooms. This call is particularly directed toward faculty who hold a more transformative vision of teaching and learning in their classrooms. As a practice, CTT honors the storytelling of individual learners, and in college classrooms, this means honoring the diverse ways students understand and respond to the essence of the texts they read. As this study points out, the more students are encouraged to share their stories of learning and their knowledge, the more other students in the class are challenged to articulate their own understandings. Through this articulation and sharing, the discussion is deepened and becomes more meaningful.

Courage to Teach also places a premium on silence in the learning space and on inviting colleagues into speech, instead of strategizing ways to fix or save them from their perceived intellectual faults. When the CTT norms are an important and ongoing feature of the classroom dialogue, the probability of everyone feeling respected and heard is increased. When students see each other as interesting; competent; and knowledgeable, the conversation shifts away from a potentially argumentative orientation where peers are listening for ways to refute another student's views. What emerges, instead, is a classroom culture where peers are listening for the intellectual and personal wisdom held deep within their colleagues and made evident through discussion.

In many ways, the previous depiction of classroom interaction matches DiMarco's (2005) description of effective discussion as the paradoxical relationship between structure and freedom, "whether we are hindered or not in the expression of our values depends on how closely the people, a critical part of the landscape, follow the basic rules" (p. 403). In a college classroom of free flowing intellectual ideas, neither the professor nor the students need feel a tightening of their gut and a sense of uncertainty sur-

rounding discussion. Instead, they can approach discussion with a hopeful outlook and anticipate the discovery of learning.

I believe in all that has never yet been spoken.  
I want to free what waits within me  
So that what no one has dared to wish for

May for once spring clear  
Without my contriving...  
—Rainer Maria Rilke

### **APPENDIX: DISCUSSION GUIDELINES FOR EACH COURSE IN THIS STUDY**

#### **History of American Education: Spring 2005**

- bring 100% of self
- extend welcome and presume welcome
- no fixing, no saving, no advising
- be prepared to learn from others
- speak for yourself
- listen to silence

#### **Introduction to Curriculum: Fall 2005**

- listen attentively
- be prepared
- take risks
- agree to disagree
- no fixing, no saving, no advising
- be prepared to grow from others
- laughter
- be open to surprise

#### **Teacher as Researcher: Winter 2005**

- listening attentively
- taking turns, no interruptions
- keep an open mind
- agree to disagree
- active participation (welcoming)
- be prepared

- no fixing, no saving, no advising
- speaking your truth
- learning to learn

**Spirituality in Education and Psychology: Spring 2006**

- bring 100% of yourself
- share your story: “I” statements
- confidentiality
- respect differences/commonalities
- always invitation
- no fixing, no saving, no advising
- anticipation (openness to surprise)

**REFERENCES**

- Collins, B. (1995). On turning ten. In *The art of drowning*. CITY: University of Pittsburgh Press. ← Au: add city
- Cross, K. P. (2002). *The role of class discussion in the learning-centered classroom* (The Cross Papers No. 6). Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- DiMarco, D. (2005). Instruction note: Classroom TRAFFIC – A metaphor for encouraging discussion. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 32(4), 403-405.
- Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (1993). *The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Intrator, S. M. (2002). *Stories of the courage to teach: Honoring the teacher’s heart*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jackson, M., & Jackson, R. (Eds). (2005). *Creating circles of trust: Formation facilitator preparation manual* (Manual). Bainbridge Island, WA: Center for Courage and Renewal.
- Kolitch, E., & Dean, A.V. (1999). Student ratings of instruction in the USA: Hidden assumptions and missing conceptions about “good” teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(1), 27-42.
- Lewis, H.R. (2006). *Excellence without a soul*. New York: Public Affairs/Perseus Books Group.
- McKeachie, W. J., & Svinicki, M. (2006). *McKeachie’s teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Muller, H. L. (2000). *Facilitating classroom discussion: Lessons from student-led discussions*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA. ← Au: Month of meeting.
- Nilson, L. (2003). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Palmer, P. J. (2004). *A hidden wholeness: The journey toward an undivided life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rilke, R. M. (1996). I believe in all that has never yet been spoken. In *Book of hours: Love poems to God* (A. Barrows & J. Macy, Trans.). Riverhead Books.
- Russell, J., & Russell, R. (1967). *On the loose*. San Francisco: Sierra Club.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70(6), 670-686.