Developmental Stages of New Graduate Student Instructional Consultants: Implications for Professional Growth

Mary C. Wright
MARY C. WRIGHT IS DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENT AND AN ASSOCIATE RESEARCH SCIENTIST AT THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON LEARNING AND TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN. SHE IS A FORMER COORDINATOR OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING CONSULTANTS GROUP.

Laura N. Schram
LAURA N. SCHRAM IS ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFICER AT RACKHAM GRADUATE SCHOOL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN. SHE IS A FORMER COORDINATOR OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING CONSULTANTS GROUP.

Kristen S. Gorman
KRISTEN S. GORMAN IS AN EDUCATION PROGRAM SPECIALIST AT THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Volume 34, Issue 1–2, 2015

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0034.111 [http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0034.111]

(cc) BY-NC-ND [http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/]

Abstract

Effective consulting is a key skill for educational developers. Although most educational developers are new to the field, there is limited research about how new practitioners develop consulting skills. The key research question this study explores is: How do new graduate teaching consultants develop as practitioners? This study empirically applies several "classic" models of consulting to better understand new consultants' perceived development of expertise, preferred consulting approaches, and reflection about them. The findings are generally confirmatory of the ways that classic frameworks map onto the development of consultants. They also suggest greater attention to supporting new consultants beyond "getting started," as well as to preparing new consultants for the differences between intra and interdisciplinary consultations.

Keywords: instructional consultations, graduate students, professional development

Educational developers work in a field of beginners. Most are new to the field, with five or fewer years of experience (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2005; A. L. Beach, personal communication, June 24, 2014), yet there is limited scholarship about the development of new practitioners. Similarly, faculty development competency models identify "effective consulting" as a key requisite skill (Dawson, Britnell, & Hitchcock, 2010; Little & Palmer, 2012), but how do new instructional consultants achieve proficiency in this area? The lack of research on educational developers' evolution as consultants is especially puzzling, considering the depth of scholarship about the need to understand the development stages of clients' careers. For example, Nyquist and Sprague's (1998) research on the stages of Teaching Assistant development (from "senior learner" to "colleague in training" to "junior colleague") offers a helpful perspective for designing programs responsive to them. Similar work on graduate students (Gardner, 2009) and faculty (Austin, 2010; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981) allows us to create programs targeted to participants' developmental needs. However, there is limited prior empirical research on the development of new teaching consultants.

Our key research question is: How do new instructional consultants develop as practitioners? We create an empirically based framework to understand differences in approaches among new graduate student instructional consultants by years of experience. Our research prompts ideas about best practices for supporting new practitioners. A second area of interest addresses application of "classic" theories of faculty development consultation to actual practitioners. In what ways are these empirically descriptive of the experiences of new consultants?

Prior Models of Consultant Development and Interaction

Tiberius, Tipping, and Smith (1997) present a useful model that describes developmental stages in educational consultants' expertise, basing their work on a framework developed for understanding how other professionals learn to solve unstructured problems (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986). Tiberius and colleagues suggest that development proceeds as a result of experience and practice, with consultants moving through five stages: novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient, and expert. Their model resembles others regarding the development of expertise (e.g., Ericsson, 2006), with novices and advanced beginners being guided by "to do" checklists for consultation. In turn, competent or proficient professionals are able to recognize the framing issue that drives an instructional dilemma, but they also need to think carefully about what strategy to apply, while "expert" consultants do so with facility. Given that the model was developed from work on other professionals, we seek to validate it for educational developers.

A second theoretical framework that we apply here is Brinko's (1993, 1997) typology, which categorizes consultation interactions as five models, or approaches: product (i.e., expert), prescription (solver of problems), collaborative (facilitator), affiliative (counselor), and confrontational (devil's advocate). Although there is no implied ranking in Brinko's framework, new consultants may have a "preferred style of interacting with clients" (Brinko, 1993, p. 578). If so, we seek to examine new educational developers' favored approach and to understand if and how this preference changes with experience.

Finally, we align these findings with a measurement of consultants' sense of self efficacy (Bandura, 1977), to assess how new practitioners develop a sense of competence in their consulting practice in different contexts. Self efficacy has been tied to positive outcomes that would facilitate effective consultation, such as problem solving skills, creativity, and cognitive flexibility (Gecas, 1989).

Research Context and Methodology

This study focuses on former members of the University of Michigan's Center for Research on Teaching and Learning Graduate Teaching Consultant (GTC) program. This group of advanced graduate students and postdoctoral scholars are trained to offer formative feedback and consult with other graduate students on teaching. The consultants studied here represent 13 disciplinary backgrounds: communications, education (5), English (6), engineering, language, information science, law, natural resources, political science, public health (2), psychology (4), social work (2), and sociology (2). Fourteen consultants are female, and eight are male. One is an international graduate student.

Consultants are selected based on their teaching experience, effectiveness, and reflectiveness on teaching, and they are screened through an extensive interview and selection process. (For more about this process, see Pinder Grover, Wright & Meizlish (2011).) All GTCs have at least two terms of teaching experience prior to being hired, with a range of two to eight prior terms of university teaching experience. The primary role of a GTC is to consult with instructors on one of the following topics: video feedback, student ratings, syllabus design, teaching philosophies, or early student feedback (SGIDs). Consultants are expected to meet with instructors (most frequently graduate students but sometimes faculty) across the university; therefore, the interaction is most frequently interdisciplinary. Based on teaching center records, about 40% of consultations are with graduate student instructors who are required by their departments to engage in a service because they are new to teaching at the university.

GTCs receive training about ways to engage in all of these consultations, and they are also introduced to the Brinko model in a two hour interactive workshop about consultation strategies. (See Pinder Grover, Milkova & Hershock (2012) for the workshop agenda.) Because consultants most frequently work with instructors outside of their discipline, many times they are novices in the subject matter of their clients and cannot share pedagogical content knowledge with clients. GTCs do receive training on general pedagogical knowledge (course design, learning objectives, active learning), which they bring into consultations with clients from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Each GTC is required to conduct at least one consultation a term, and most work with 5–10 clients a term.

Some GTCs also have prior experience as Graduate Student Mentors (GSMs). GSMs are advanced graduate students appointed by their academic departments to mentor peer Graduate Student Instructors around teaching. Responsibilities of GSMs vary considerably but typically include consulting with new instructors in the discipline about teaching, such as after an observation, videotaping or collection of early student feedback. Seven of the GTCs in this study had prior work as a GSM, ranging from one term to two years of experience.

To research these new educational developers' consultation approaches, we collected four sources of data, qualitative and quantitative:

1. *Surveys*: For 2010–2011 and 2011–2012, surveys were distributed at the first and penultimate meetings of the academic year. The surveys assessed GTCs' prior experience in instructional development, self confidence in consulting, preferred consulting approaches as categorized by Brinko's (1997) typology, as well as self identified position in Tiberius and colleagues' (1997) theoretical stage model. The pre survey was administered before GTCs were introduced to the Brinko approaches, and therefore consultants responded to the definitions we developed for the instrument, rather than the terms themselves. For example, instead of using the term, "prescriptive," the consultants responded to our operationalization of the approach, "[It is important for me to] draw on my expertise to diagnose and solve problems for my clients." (See Appendix for pre and post surveys.)
2. *Essay reflection*: Midway through the Fall Term, after each new GTC had conducted one (but no more than two) consultations, we prompted a written reflection on the following: "Below, please describe an anonymized consultation you had with an instructor this term. What were the key issues you faced and the consulting approaches you used throughout the discussion?" At the penultimate meeting of the year, we returned the reflection and instructed the GTC, "Attached, you'll find the minute paper that you wrote in the fall. Reflecting again on the consultation approaches you used, is there anything you would change? If so, what and why?" These reflections were analyzed by two professional consultants at the University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, with particular attention to common themes about what the GTC would and would not change in their consultation strategies. These themes were coded according to their alignment with Brinko's (1997) approach. More details about this coding framework are noted below.
3. *Member check*: "Member checks" are a strategy in qualitative research designed to increase validity of findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Data and interpretations are presented back to the population being studied, in order to check emerging analyses. After each year's data collection was finished, we presented our findings to the consultant group and asked how they understood the trends we documented, as well as if they agreed with our interpretations. Notes were taken of this discussion and further contribute to the analysis.
4. *Client feedback*: Given the phenomenological focus of this study, our main source of information derives from self reports. For additional validation, we also collected feedback from clients about satisfaction with and application of the consultation interaction. (The feedback survey instrument can be found in Finelli, Pinder Grover & Wright (2011).)

Human subjects approval was received to conduct and disseminate this research. All 22 GTCs consented to participate in the research and 20 completed both the pre and post surveys, while 16 completed both essay reflections.

For the analysis, we divide respondents into the following groups:

T_0: These respondents had no prior consulting experience as a GSM or GTC. In other words, this grouping represents pre survey results for those who are just beginning as consultants (n = 13).

T_1: This category represents those with *one year* of experience as a consultant, including post test surveys of those finishing up their first year (n = 13) as well as pre test surveys of those beginning their second year (n = 6).

T_2: This small group includes consultants who have two years of experience as consultants (n = 7).

In other words, in addition to trends over the full group, we are able to examine reflections of consultants with no experience compared to those with to one year of experience (T_0 to T_1). We are also able to make a second comparison, those with one year vs. two years of practice (T_1 to T_2). However, it is important to also note that these are two separate groups of people, and so the analysis is not a longitudinal examination of the development of new consultants over two full years. Because of the small sample size, we were not able to meaningfully explore variation across other demographic variables (i.e., gender, discipline, and nationality), and we do not present tests of statistical significance; therefore, the descriptive findings should be treated as exploratory.

Analysis and Findings

Below, we present findings from the three groups of consultants (T_0, T_1, T_2), drawing comparisons between the responses about confidence, self reported stage of expertise, and consultation approaches.

Consultation Expertise

First, we asked GTCs to self identify their consultation stage, using categories adapted from Tiberius and colleagues (1997). To simplify the survey, we consolidated Tiberius and colleagues' "novice" and "advanced beginner" stages, given the common emphasis on following rules, and we joined "competent" and "proficient," given the similar stress on problem recognition.

Based on our survey data, we do see consultants progressing through the model as expected with experience, with a general movement away from checklists to a more facile recognition of "types" of instructional issues and strategies to address them (Table 1). For example, about a quarter (23.1%) of those with no experience indicated that they are most comfortable following a specific list, while by the end of their first year, a majority of consultants reported more advanced instructional problem solving capacities. By the beginning of the second year, about three quarters of consultants (71.4%) indicated that with facility, they can recognize pedagogical problems and offer a repertoire of solutions to address them.

Table 1. Percent (No.) of Consultants Selecting Stage of Consulting Expertise as Characteristic of Them, by Experience Level

Stage of Consulting Expertise	**T_0 (n = 13)**	**T_1 (n = 19)**	**T_2 (n = 7)**
Expert: With facility, I can recognize a classroom problem … and I have a repertoire of solutions.	7.7% (1)	57.9% (11)	71.4% (5)
Competent/proficient: After some careful thought, I can recognize key types of classroom problems … and have a toolbox of specific suggestions.	69.2% (9)	42.1% (8)	28.6% (2)
Novice/advanced beginner: I am most comfortable following a specific list of questions and procedures for doing a consultation.	23.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)

It is striking that after even only a year of experience, a majority of consultants selected a more advanced approach to consulting, or self reporting the ability to recognize a classroom "problem" and address it with a repertoire of solutions based on information from previous cases. This suggests a number of possible interpretations. Certainly, such high estimates could be a matter of overconfidence or inaccurate perceptions of one's performance. Indeed, the difficulty in making accurate self assessments is well documented (Blanch Hartigan, 2011; Ehrlinger & Shain, 2014). Therefore, the self assessments documented here may suggest a naive outlook about the challenges of consulting.

However, there are features of the program's work context and professional development opportunities that may explain this high level of expertise. First, GTCs consult primarily with other graduate students with relatively similar classroom contexts (smaller recitations), and the ability to build consultation experience over time with these relatively similar settings may help build a sense of expertise. Certainly, if asked to consult with instructors who are teaching in a broader range of settings (e.g., large lectures and experiential settings) or career stages, their sense of expertise may not have been as high.

More importantly, the training program places a good deal of emphasis on "progressive problem solving" and mentoring needed to develop professional expertise (Tiberius, Tipping, & Smith, 2012, p. 162). Nearly every meeting is devoted to a discussion of one or more challenging cases in consulting, which encourages problem solving, suggests new ways of thinking about these interactions, and supports a culture of continuous improvement. In addition, for some early feedback sessions, more experienced consultants are paired with new consultants, which also offers different perspectives on consultations and helps to illustrate problem solving processes.

Finally, these perceptions were reinforced by client feedback as well. All returned client surveys rated these consultants "effective in implementing the process and discussing the feedback." Because performance accomplishments are a key source of efficacy information (Bandura, 1977), feedback may be an important component in enhancing consultant's sense of competence.

It is important to acknowledge that our definition of expertise relied primarily on the model presented by Tiberius and colleagues (1997). Certainly, if other models of expertise were assessed, results may be different. For example, according to Chi (2006), an even more advanced level of expertise involves the articulation of tacit knowledge. In other words, if we had asked new consultants to articulate their own consultation approaches or guidelines, they may have indicated less of a sense of expertise.

Self Efficacy

Paralleling the move to a sense of development of consulting experience, the new educational consultants also reported a greater sense of self efficacy about their work over time. On both the pre and post surveys, we asked GTCs about their confidence in consulting effectively with clients in and outside of their discipline. For all GTCs, confidence about consulting with same discipline clients rose slightly, from a mean of 4.7 to 4.9 (on a scale of 1–5, where 1 = *strongly disagree* about confidence in effective consultation and 5 = *strongly agree*). The initial high level of agreement is likely attributable to the fact that about a third of the group reported that they previously had mentored students in their own departments about teaching related issues. For the full group, confidence about interdisciplinary consulting rose from a mean of 4.3 to 4.6.

For same discipline consulting, new consultants' confidence went up with one year of experience (+0.21 from T_0 to T_1) but moderated after that (0.04 from T_1 to T_2) (Table 2). Confidence to consult effectively with clients outside of one's discipline showed growth for those moving from no experience to one year (+0.45), but comparing the groups of consultants who have one and two years of experience, there were fewer gains (+0.11). Again, because that the focus of GTC practice over the year was primarily a new work context—with different discipline clients—it makes sense that the new consultants would report more growth in this area. However, interdisciplinary consulting confidence remained lower than intradisciplinary efficacy at every experience level, suggesting room to develop in this area.

Table 2. GTCs' Mean Reported Confidence in Consulting With Types of Clients, by Experience Level

Mean (Standard Deviation)	**T_0 (n = 13)**	**T_1 (n = 19)**	**T_2 (n = 7)**
Confidence consulting with same discipline clients	4.69 (0.48)	4.90 (0.31)	4.86 (0.38)
Confidence consulting with different discipline clients	4.15 (0.38)	4.60 (0.50)	4.71 (0.49)

Note. Scale is 1–5, with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree* about consulting effectiveness.

Consulting Approaches

On both the pre and post tests, we asked GTCs to rank the Brinko consultation models in order of importance to their consultation practice. As is typical of instructional consultations, no one single approach emerged as the "one way" to engage in a productive interaction. However, collaboration was the process model most frequently named as important to consultants (i.e., selected as the top or second "most important" approach for their consulting style), in both the pre test (named by 66.7% of respondents) and the post test (65.0%). This finding is in line with Brinko's (1997, p. 7) argument that "most researchers believe that consultative interaction must be client centered and collaborative if it is to be effective in producing behavior change." The GTC training does emphasize the collaborative model as a

key modality in consultations, although all approaches are identified as useful in certain times and contexts.

Although a collaborative approach was most frequently labeled as important, breaking down the findings by years of experience, we see that very new consultants' approaches show a lot of dispersion at the start, and there continues to be a spread for those with one year of experience (Table 3). In the member check, GTCs explained this pattern by the increasing experimentation afforded through experience. The clearest pattern appears to be an increasing weight given to a collaborative approach (25.0% of strategies named by T_0 GTCs, compared to 31.6% by T_1 and 41.7% by T_2 consultants), although more experienced GTCs also valued toolbox building (i.e., product approach).

Table 3. Top Two Most Important Consulting Approaches, by Experience Level (No. of GTCs Naming)*

	T_0 (*n* = 13)	**T_1 (*n* = 19)**	**T_2 (*n* = 7)**
Confrontational	5	6	0
Prescriptive	3	7	1
Affiliative	6	8	1
Product	4	5	5
Collaborative	6	12	5

Notes. Counts reflect the number of consultants identifying approach with a 4 or 5, where 1 = *least important* and 5 = *most important* approach. T_0 values total 24 and T_2 values total 12 because one GTC from each of these groups did not give a unique ranking for each of these approaches.

This pattern is also seen in the reflective response about what GTCs would change about their practice. At the beginning of each year, consultants wrote about a client interaction they had, and at the end of each year, consultants were asked to write a written response on the prompt, "Reflecting again on the consultation approaches you used, is there anything you would change? If so, what and why?" These responses were coded by two professional staff consultants at the teaching center, using the Brinko (1997) framework.

Table 4 summarizes categories of responses to the questions: (a) In what ways would your consulting approaches and understanding of key issues stay the same? (b) In what ways would your consulting approaches and understanding of key issues change?

Table 4. Number of Consultant Descriptions Fitting into Brinko Approach, by Intention to Continue (Same) or Change (Change) Approach

Brinko Approach	**# Same**	**# Change**
Confrontational	0	2
Prescriptive	4	4
Affiliative	2	2
Product	1	7
Collaborative	1	11

Note. Consultants' responses could fit multiple categories.

In identifying what they would change, 11 respondents indicated that they would take an even more collaborative approach if engaging in a "do over" with the consultation, as suggested by these illustrative quotes:

- "The greatest change in approach I perceive in myself is a shift from at first thinking about and employing a diagnostic approach toward a more collaborative, generative dialogue with the Graduate Student Instructor."
- "I might try, instead, to make the process more self reflective on the part of the client, as a way to increase his/her ownership over the consultation process."
- I now would "ask her which area she would like to work on based on the student feedback and provide resources in that one specific area rather than share every idea and resource I prepared."

The second most frequent theme about change addressed the “product” approach, with seven consultants indicating that they would now apply this lens to the consultation. For example, one consultant described developing “an even stronger toolbox of resources and variety of solutions from which to draw.”

In summary, a collaborative approach was favored by consultants at all experience levels. In addition, over time, when reflecting on how their interactive approach changed, our respondents indicated that they became even more collaborative in their consultations, although some also indicated increasing preference for a “product” approach. However, it should be acknowledged that choice of consultation strategy cannot be reduced to experience level but rather is a complex interaction influenced by multiple factors, such as the interplay between an instructor and consultant’s identity, experience, and the topic of the discussion.

Limitations, Implications, and Next Steps

One limitation of this study is that it represents the experience of a relatively small group of new graduate student and postdoctoral consultants at one research university. Their self assessments of expertise and consulting strategies largely represent characterizations of working with graduate students, as graduate students. Because graduate student educational development experiences are an important pathway to faculty development careers (Linder et al., 2011), their development as consultants is an important area of study. However, their experiences may not best approximate the transitions that faculty to faculty developers encounter. While it could be that the developmental process is similar—given that faculty development has been described as a “craft that must be mastered largely experientially” (Neal & Peed Neal, 2009, p. 15)—there are likely intersectional dynamics between career and consulting development, suggesting further research.

A second key limitation is that we largely rely upon consultants’ self reports, which may not directly map onto practice or outcomes. There are a number of documented challenges in self assessment, and these new consultants’ judgments of their expertise in consulting with other graduate students are relatively high. However, the program offers a number of structures that have elsewhere found to be supportive of self assessment and development of a sense of professional expertise. These include client feedback, frequent discussion of ill structured problems, mentoring of new consultants by experienced consultants, and a learning community that supports continuous professional development. Although we triangulate our findings with survey based client feedback, future research should also incorporate other metrics such as observations.

Our findings are generally confirmatory of the ways in which “classic” theoretical frameworks map onto the development of new consultants, in both development of expertise and emphasis on collaborative approaches. They are also suggestive of several needs for new consultant training, in four key ways. First, this work highlights the need for attention to the differences between intra and interdisciplinary consultation dynamics in preparing new consultants. Our work indicates that consultants had less confidence about their abilities to consult with clients outside their disciplines, compared to same discipline interactions. As suggested by Lee (2000), these dynamics can be highly variable, and consultants need training and practice with both types. Second, findings also reinforce the need to collect feedback from clients (e.g., Jacobson, Wulff, Grooters, Edwards, & Freisem, 2009), not only to evaluate faculty development work but also to support faculty developers’ self efficacy.

Third, our work indicates that although there is an initial rise in new graduate consultants’ consulting confidence over the first year, this trend moderates for second year consultants. This decline may be a positive sign, as consultants more realistically reflect on their work. However, it also suggests the need to support consultants beyond initial training to promote their ongoing development. Interestingly, while there is a robust literature on getting started on faculty development (e.g., Brinko, 2012; Cohen, 2010), there are fewer published resources for experienced consultants to engage in ongoing development. Such professional development opportunities might include in depth discussion with colleagues about case studies that experienced consultants have created, role plays among the consultants of common challenges, reading group discussions of the literature on consulting, and/or regular opportunities to meet and discuss consultation issues. Finally, actual and virtual communities (e.g., colleagues and listservs)

provide helpful cases and exchanges for “progressive problem solving” to develop professional expertise (Tiberius et al., 2012, p. 162).

Finally, for new consultants, the findings suggest making clear the importance that more experienced consultants placed on taking a collaborative approach. Such statements might be affirmed by training adapted from Little and Palmer’s (2012) “coaching framework,” which stresses active listening and asking powerful questions. Another practice we utilize involves a “consultation improv” exercise, where new consultants rotate through different consultation approaches to better understand when and how they might be valuable (see Pinder Grover, Milkova, & Hershock (2012) for more details). Finally, mentoring of new by experienced practitioners can be extremely useful to model best practice and make explicit analytical processes.

References

Austin, A. E. (2010). Supporting faculty members across their careers. In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Robertson (Eds.), A guide to faculty development (2nd ed., pp. 363–378). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 52(6), 598–614.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191–215.

Blanch Hartigan, D. (2011). Medical students’ self assessment of performance: Results from three meta analyses. Patient Education and Counseling, 84, 3–9.

Brinko, K. T. (1993). The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching: What is effective? The Journal of Higher Education, 64(5), 574–593.

Brinko, K. T. (1997). The interactions of teaching improvement. In K. T. Brinko & R. J. Menges (Eds.), Practically speaking: A sourcebook for instructional consultants in higher education (pp. 3–8). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Brinko, K. (2012). Practically speaking: A sourcebook for new consultants (2nd ed.). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Chi, M. T. H. (2006). Two approaches to the study of experts’ characteristics. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance (pp. 21–30). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, M. W. (2010). Listen, learn, lead: Getting started in faculty development. In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Robertson (Eds.), A guide to faculty development (2nd ed., pp. 67–82). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Dawson, D., Britnell, J., & Hitchcock, A. (2010). Developing competency models of faculty developers: Using world café to foster dialogue. In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), To improve the academy (Vol. 28, pp. 3–24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). Mind over machine: The power of human intuition and expertise in the era of the computer. New York, New York: The Free Press.

Ehrlinger, J., & Shain, E. A. (2014). How accuracy in students’ self perceptions relates to success in learning. In V. A. Benassi, C. E. Overson & C. M. Hakala (Eds.), Applying science of learning in education: Infusing psychological science into the curriculum. Washington, D.C.: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/asle2014/index.php [https://teachpsych.org/ebooks/asle2014/index.php] .

Ericsson, K. A. (2006). An introduction to *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance: Its development, organization, and content*. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance (pp. 3–19). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Finelli, C. J., Pinder Grover, T., & Wright, M. C. (2011). Consultations on teaching: Using student feedback for instructional improvement. In C. E. Cook & M. Kaplan (Eds.), Advancing the culture of teaching on campus: How a teaching center can make a difference (pp. 65–79). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Gardner, S. K. (2009). The development of doctoral students: Phases of challenges and support (. ASHE Higher Education Report, 34(6)). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self efficacy. Annual Review of Sociology, 15, 291–316.

Jacobson, W., Wulff, D. H., Grooters, S., Edwards, P. M., & Freisem, K. (2009). Reported long term value and effects of teaching center consultations. In L. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), To improve the academy (Vol. 27, pp. 223–246). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lee, V. S. (2000). The influence of disciplinary differences on consultations with faculty. In M. Kaplan & D. Lieberman (Eds.), To improve the academy (Vol. 18, pp. 278–290). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Linder, K. E., Rohdieck, S. V., Kalish, A., Johnson, T. A., Plank, K. M., & Maynell, L. A. (2011). Graduate student internships as a pathway to the profession of educational development. In J. E. Miller & J. E. Groccia (Eds.), To improve the academy (Vol. 30, pp. 3–30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Little, D., & Palmer, M. S. (2012). Training instructional consultants to use a coaching framework. In K. Brinko (Ed.), Practically speaking: A sourcebook for new consultants (pp. 208–216). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Neal, E., & Peed Neal, I. (2009). Experiential lessons in the practice of faculty development. In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), To improve the academy (Vol. 27, pp. 14–31). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Nyquist, J. D., & Sprague, J. (1998). Thinking developmentally about TAs. In M. Marincovich, J. Prostko & F. Stout (Eds.), The professional development of graduate teaching assistants (pp. 61–88). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Pinder Grover, T., Milkova, S., & Hershock, C. (2012). Training TAs as consultants at the University of Michigan: Workshop series for peer mentors. In K. T. Brinko (Ed.), Practically speaking: A sourcebook for instructional consultants in higher education (2nd ed., pp. 225–245). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Pinder Grover, T., Wright, M. C., & Meizlish, D. S. (2011). Graduate peer teaching consultants: Expanding the Center's reach. In C. E. Cook & M. Kaplan (Eds.), Advancing the culture of teaching on campus: How a teaching center can make a difference (pp. 80–96). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2005). Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Tiberius, R., Tipping, J., & Smith, R. (1997). Developmental stages of an educational consultant: Theoretical perspective. In K. T. Brinko & R. J. Menges (Eds.), Practically speaking: A sourcebook for instructional consultants in higher education (pp. 217–221). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Tiberius, R., Tipping, J., & Smith, R. (2012). Developmental stages of expertise in educational consultation. In K. T. Brinko (Ed.), Practically speaking: A sourcebook for instructional consultants in higher education (2nd ed., pp. 161–163). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Appendix Survey Instruments

Instrument #1 (Pre Survey)

1. <u>Name</u>:

---

2. <u>What experience do you have mentoring and/or consulting with faculty or GSIs on teaching related issues?</u> *(Please circle all that apply.)*

a) I have been a Graduate Student Mentor or a head GSI in my department.

If so, for how many terms?

b) This year, I will be a Graduate Student Mentor or a head GSI in my department.

c) I have other mentoring/consulting experience with faculty or GSIs on teaching related issues.

If so, please specify:

3. <u>As a GTC:</u>					
I feel confident that I can consult effectively with GSIs in my discipline.	*Strongly Agree*	*Somewhat Agree*	*Neutral*	*Somewhat Disagree*	*Strongly Disagree*
I feel confident that I can consult effectively with GSIs *outside* my discipline.	*Strongly Agree*	*Somewhat Agree*	*Neutral*	*Somewhat Disagree*	*Strongly Disagree*

4. <u>As a GTC, I believe that it is most important to:</u>

(Please rank in order of importance to you, with 1 = least important and 5 = most important)

____Confront my GSI clients about any discrepancies between their teaching behaviors and stated goals for student learning

____Draw on my expertise to diagnose and solve problems for my GSI clients

____Boost the self confidence of my GSI clients so they can grow personally and professionally

____Develop a toolbox to provide resources (e.g., readings) and share new pedagogical techniques with my GSI clients

____Actively engage my GSI clients in the consultation process, so they can take ownership over solutions developed during our conversations

5. **<u>At this point, which of the following statements best describe you as a consultant</u>?** (*Circle <u>one</u>.)*

(a) With facility, I can recognize a classroom problem (e.g., poor climate, confused students), and I have a repertoire of solutions for many different types of classrooms, using approaches that have worked well in previous situations.

(b) After some careful thought, I can recognize key types of classroom problems (e.g., poor climate, confused students) and have a toolbox of specific suggestions to discuss with instructors in these situations.

(c) I am most comfortable following a specific list of questions and procedures for doing a consultation, such as a common set of steps for approaching conversations with GSIs.

Instrument #2: Minute Paper

Below, please describe an <u>anonymized</u> consultation you had with a GSI this term. What were the key issues you faced and the consulting approaches you used throughout the discussion?

Instrument #3: Post Survey

1. <u>Name</u>:

_____

2. <u>Now, as a GTC:</u>					
I feel confident that I can consult effectively with GSIs in my discipline.	*Strongly Agree*	*Somewhat Agree*	*Neutral*	*Somewhat Disagree*	*Strongly Disagree*
I feel confident that I can consult effectively with GSIs *outside* my discipline.	*Strongly Agree*	*Somewhat Agree*	*Neutral*	*Somewhat Disagree*	*Strongly Disagree*

3. <u>As a GTC, I believe that it is most important to:</u>

(Please rank in order of importance to you, with 1 = least important and 5 = most important)

____Confront my GSI clients about any discrepancies between their teaching behaviors and stated goals for student learning

___Draw on my expertise to diagnose and solve problems for my GSI clients

___Boost the self confidence of my GSI clients so they can grow personally and professionally

___Develop a toolbox to provide resources (e.g., readings) and share new pedagogical techniques with my GSI clients

___Actively engage my GSI clients in the consultation process, so they can take ownership over solutions developed during our conversations

4. **At this point, which of the following statements best describe you as a consultant?** (*Circle one.)*

(a) With facility, I can recognize a classroom problem (e.g., poor climate, confused students), and I have a repertoire of solutions for many different types of classrooms, using approaches that have worked well in previous situations.

(b) After some careful thought, I can recognize key types of classroom problems (e.g., poor climate, confused students) and have a toolbox of specific suggestions to discuss with instructors in these situations.

(c) I am most comfortable following a specific list of questions and procedures for doing a consultation, such as a common set of steps for approaching conversations with GSIs.

5. Please take a look at the consultation you described last term.

NOW, thinking about this case, please note below:

- In what ways would your consulting approaches and understanding of key issues stay the same?
- In what ways would your consulting approaches and understanding of key issues change?

Hosted by Michigan Publishing, a division of the University of Michigan Library.
For more information please contact mpub-help@umich.edu.
Online ISSN: 2334-4822