PRE-CONFERENCE HALF-DAY MORNING WORKSHOPS
TUES., JUNE 17, 2014 | 9AM – 12PM | Duncan McArthur Hall (511 Union Street)

PC.AM.01 – Transforming Learning Experiences: Mind Mapping, Learning Objects, and Proverbs (A227)
Ernest Biktimirov, Brock University

This pre-conference workshop will present three innovative learning techniques that I have been practicing and publishing on over the last ten years: mind mapping, learning objects, and proverbs. Upon the completion of this workshop, the participants will learn a variety of ways of using mind mapping, learning objects, and proverbs for teaching and learning.

This workshop relates to the conference theme by suggesting different ways of transforming learning experiences to embrace diverse student needs. For example, mind mapping introduces colours and images into the learning process to engage visual learners. Foreign proverbs transform the learning process by establishing connections between new concepts and diverse cultural backgrounds of students.

In the first segment, a brief history of mind mapping, which visually depicts concepts and their interrelationships in a non-linear way, and its main rules will be discussed. I will show different ways of using mind mapping in teaching and learning based on my experience and the experiences of other instructors. I will also provide a review and summary of mind mapping computer programs, and will demonstrate the creation of a mind map with Inspiration mind mapping software. In the conclusion, participants will work in small groups to draw a mind map of the mind mapping technique. Several groups will present their completed mind maps to all participants. By the end of this segment, the participants will not only appreciate the pedagogical benefits of mind mapping, but also will be able to use this technique themselves.

In the second segment, I will define key elements of a learning object and present several learning objects developed at Brock University. I will discuss the results of my empirical study on the learning impact of a learning object. From these results, the participants will learn what type of students tends to benefit the most from the use of learning objects. Several major depositories of learning objects will be presented, and participants will explore them and identify objects for use in their disciplines. Several participants will present the identified learning objects to the whole audience.

In the final segment, I will share my experience with using English, Chinese, Spanish, and French proverbs in teaching finance to English and foreign-speaking students. I will also show different examples of using proverbs for teaching from other disciplines. The participants will practice the use of Chinese, Spanish, and French proverbs in the classroom. The participants will also learn where to find relevant foreign proverbs and how to incorporate into their teaching. In conclusion, the participants will have an opportunity to suggest English proverbs that can be used to illustrate concepts in their disciplines.

PC.AM.02 – Transforming Teaching and Learning through Reflective Practice (Room A236)
Loretta Howard (Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College [CMCC]); and Eleanor Pierre, (EJPCommunications)

Purpose and Participant Outcomes: Two critical aspects central to transformative learning (Cranton, 2006; Mezirow, 1981, 1994, 1997) are reflective practice and critical reflection. Schön (1983) describes reflective practice (RP) as "a dialogue of thinking and doing through which I become more skillful". Murray and Kujundzic (2005) define critical reflection (CR) as "the process of analyzing, reconsidering and questioning experiences within a broad context of issues". Learning is progressively more complex in a twenty-first century world that increasingly utilizes emerging technologies to provide expanded learning opportunities. This requires students to use educational technologies to apply knowledge to new situations, analyze information, collaborate, solve problems and make decisions and demands that educators reconsider traditional approaches to teaching practice. Today, both learners and teachers are expected to demonstrate reflective practice and critical reflection, yet all too often neither is afforded the opportunity to develop skills in these critical processes. Schön (1983) suggested that one of the defining characteristics of professional practice is the capacity to reflect on action so as to engage in a process of continuous learning. In this intensive, evidence-informed, practice-based workshop participants will engage in a collaborative process to:

1. Identify the critical components of transformative learning;
2. Discuss the benefits of, and common barriers to, critical reflection and reflective practice in a transformative teaching/learning process;
3. Experience several applied models and methods of RP and CR to promote transformative learning; and
4. Discuss how to incorporate opportunities for critical reflection and reflective practice in the design of 21st century learning.

Relevance of Proposal to Conference Theme: This workshop relates directly to several key aspects of the conference theme of transformation, including: the transformation of students from passive to active learners; the shift in the nature of classroom learning experiences; the transition in the use of physical and virtual learning spaces into integrated learning environments; single perspectives into diverse worldview perspectives and, changing professional teaching practices within and beyond the classroom.

Informed by Theory, Practice and/or Research: This workshop seeks to model evidence-based teaching and learning theories (Petty, 2009; Pitler, Hubbell & Kuhn, 2007) in a learning-centred (Tagg, 2004) manner reflective of 21st century principals of education (Shaw, 2013). Drawing on Bolton (2010), Brookfield (2005) and Cranton (2006) the construct of transformative learning will be explored by several experiential processes to promote critical reflection and reflective practice.

Contribution to the Conference and/or to the Field: This workshop reflects the conference theme of transformation by exploring experiential methods and models to promote transformative learning by developing reflective practice and critical reflection skills. This practical session contributes significantly to the conference by creating opportunities to connect with others engaged in promoting transformative learning and experience formal and informal tools that can be immediately applied in teaching practice.

PC.AM.03 – Practical Strategies for Designing and Conducting Program Evaluation (Room A240)
Chi Yan Lam and Laura Kinderman (Queen's University)

Educational developers and faculty members are increasingly expected to manage programs using evidence-informed practices. They must be ready to understand and communicate the impact of their educational programs in systematic, rigorous ways that go beyond simple metrics. In addition to satisfying accountability pressures, evaluation can help improve existing program models, develop new ones, determine the effectiveness and efficacy of programs, and demonstrate end-user impact. Program evaluation draws upon social scientific methods to determine the merit, worth, significance of a program.

In this workshop, participants will progress through a crash course on the principles and practices of designing and conducting program evaluation. Specifically, we will introduce the utilization-focused evaluation framework (Patton, 2008, 2012), a dominant approach to conducting program evaluation that ensures both the process and the output can be useful and meaningful to those who have a vested interest in the program and the evaluation:

> *Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) begins with the premise that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use; therefore, evaluators should facilitate the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, from beginning to end, will affect use. Use concerns how real people in the real world apply evaluation findings and experience the evaluation process. Therefore, the focus in utilization-focused evaluation is on intended use by intended users. (Patton, 2008)*

This workshop will cover the following topics:

- What is program evaluation?
- What are five dominant purposes for evaluating program?
- How is evaluation different from research?
- What does quality evaluation look like? What are dimensions of quality to program evaluation?
- Identify stakeholders and focusing an evaluation.
- Question the underlying program logic, its theory of change, and theory of action?
- How do student-level and course-level evaluation data feed into larger program evaluation?
- Crafting an evaluation design that balances concerns of utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, and evaluator accountability.

Using practical, hands-on learning, participants will assume the role of a novice evaluator and work through a case scenario. In so doing, participants will be able to:

- Design and make informed decisions concerning the evaluation of programs and services
- Apply evaluative thinking about programs to every-day decisions-making
- Craft a defensible argument for an evaluation design
- Access the program evaluation literature, its major theoretical propositions, and its practical strategies

Participants are invited to bring to the workshop questions and issues related to program evaluation encountered in their own work contexts. Participants should have some working understanding of basic research methods (e.g. surveys, interviews, focus groups, basic quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques).

PC.AM.04 – Zenify Your Presentation (Room A239)
Trent Tucker (University of Guelph)

Explore the art and science of presentation design thinking and ideas from the world of storytelling. Learn how to apply principles from the "Presentation Zen" design philosophy to remake a tired presentation into something an audience can really connect with.

Let's face it. Presentation software (e.g., Microsoft's PowerPoint, Apple's Keynote, and others like Prezi) is a de facto classroom teaching technology. Publishers bundle pre-authored chapter summary PowerPoint slide decks with their textbooks, students clamour for copies of your slides, every meeting room at every conference (STLHE included) is set up with a data projector, a screen, and a computer capable of delivering a presentation. Presentation software is ubiquitous in higher education but it is rarely used as effectively as it could be. The purpose of this workshop is transform your thinking about presentations -- to give you the tools to put more "power" into your "PowerPoint"!

Using design principles from best selling authors Garr Reynolds (Presentation Zen, The Naked Presenter) and Nancy Duarte (slide:ology, resonate) plus ideas from others like Edward Tufte (The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint, The Visual Display of Quantitative Information), we will do just that -- transform our presentations. It is important to stress that the CONTENT of the presentations doesn't change, only the DELIVERY of the content changes. Like the notion of the conservation of energy from physics: "Content is neither created nor destroyed through the presentation zenification process."

The first part of the workshop deals with the technical side of this transformation -- recasting the design of our slide materials. This is a BYOD (bring your own device) hands-on workshop. The device you bring (laptop / tablet) should be capable of editing / authoring presentations, not just displaying them. Also bring a presentation or two that you don't mind sharing with others and having dissected in the name of presentation "zenficiation"!

After introducing various design ideas and walking through the redesign of a typical presentation using a "before & after" approach, we will get into the hands-on work where participants will re-work various aspects of their presentations using the principles and ideas from the first part of the workshop. Like Miss Fizzle of The Magic School Bus used to exclaim: "Take chances, make mistakes, get messy." We will do just that. The technical portion of the workshop will conclude with "show and tell" where participants will share aspects of their redesigned presentations with everyone in the workshop.

The final part of the workshop will bring the "zenfied" presentation back into the larger context of a typical university course. In the course of transforming our presentations, we can also transform our lectures from places where our students are passive PowerPoint "consumers" to more active and engaged learners. To this end, I will present a case study of a management science course that has transformed from a PowerPoint-only approach to course content to an eBook + presentation approach.

PRE-CONFERENCE HALF-DAY AFTERNOON WORKSHOPS

TUES., JUNE 17, 2014 | 1:30 – 4:30PM | Duncan McArthur Hall (511 Union Street)

PC.PM.01 – Creating Concept Questions to Increase Engagement and to Improve Learning (Room A227)
Jim Davies (Carleton University)

In this workshop we describe how to effectively use concept questions in the classroom and interactively help educators create concept questions for their classes. The workshop will be a mix of lecture, group work, and feedback from the presenters.

The basic method of using concept questions follows. The instructor uses lecture to teach a particularly difficult concept and answer any questions. Then, a "concept question" and a multiple-choice answer set appear on the screen. Using clickers or some other polling software, the students choose what they believe to be the correct answer from the choices presented. The instructor privately looks at the results. If fewer than 70% of the students get the answer correct, then the instructor asks each student to find a classmate who picked a different answer and try to convince that classmate that he or she is right. The poll is cleared and after a few minutes the students guess again. Usually over 90% of the students get the right answer after consulting with their peers.

Concept questions (Mazur, 2009; Crouch & Mazur, 2001) have a wide range of benefits. They break up a lecture to decrease boredom, and the discussion generates peer-learning. Instructors report increased student engagement (Mazur, 1997). It encourages deep processing of course material long before test time, which in effect forms a kind of spaced learning (Dempster, 1988) and interleaved practice, or, seeing information in multiple contexts (Carpenter, 2001). The immediate feedback provides self-regulated learning (Butler & Winne, 1995), and asking students to predict the outcome of an experiment increases their conceptual understanding of it (Crouch, Fagen, Callan, & Mazur, 2004). Further, it makes the students very interested in learning the correct answer. They also transform the learning experience by offering a novel, interactive engagement differentiated from lecture, videos, class discussion, and reading.

In this workshop, we will review the process of using concept questions and give advice, based on our own experience, on the best way to create them. We will review the efficacy of clickers, index cards, and polleverywhere.com for answer collection. We will discuss strategies for choosing which topics deserve concept questions, and how to make concept questions from difficult material (e.g., anatomy).

The workshop will be interactive. We will encourage participants to create concept questions for their own courses and as a group will give feedback to make them better. Participants will learn how to make concept questions and leave the class with at least two excellent ones for immediate use in teaching, and we will discuss the literature on the benefits of concept questions.

PC.PM.02 – Your Professional e-Presence: Online Strategies for Academic Branding with Social Media (Room A236)
Sidneyeve Matrix (Queen's University)

According to the 2014 Horizon Report, one of the most significant challenges to innovation in higher education is the low digital fluency of faculty. Not having a professional online presence, digital media literacy, and social networking skills makes it difficult for faculty to use the web to disseminate research, teach socially, and find collaborators. For graduate students the stakes are even higher due to the fiercely competitive job markets in several industries and sectors.

Those academics who have an established online presence, social visibility, and platform reach may have an easier time sharing research, getting published, finding professional opportunities and project collaborators, discovering funding opportunities and grant reviewers, internships or mentors, and connecting with relevant publics.

This practical, hands-on workshop is designed to help you construct or update your professional e-presence using popular social media tools you're likely already familiar with. The workshop is organized around a 3-step strategy to assess your existing online impact, design professional content to share online, and engage in purposeful social networking. We'll consider examples of academic social publishing, content curation, and digital networking from across the disciplines.

With its focus on the growing necessity of establishing a professional public-facing e-presence, this workshop will make one of the conference themes very personal, namely, the existence of new digital and social learning paradigms and pressures on faculty and students in higher education. It will deliver strategies and actionable ideas to inspire and help develop the professional you, online. This is a BYOD workshop -- participants are invited, but not required, to bring a mobile device to the session.

PC.PM.03 – Implementing Large-Scale Institutional Pedagogical Change (Room A240)
Brenda Ravenscroft (Queen's University)

Educational institutions thrive on stability; teaching norms, practices and beliefs are well established, as is the infrastructure that supports them. In this environment, pedagogical change, such as innovative instructional strategies or the inclusion of the rapidly evolving world of technology-enhanced learning, is often viewed as disruptive and is challenging to implement (Mehaffy, 2012).

In the Faculty of Arts and Science at Queen's University, a large-scale course redesign project, initiated in 2011, is transforming the student learning experience through high-enrolment introductory lecture courses being redesigned into blended models using evidence-based approaches (Garrison & Vaughn, 2008). Aimed at enhancing student engagement and improving student learning by focussing classroom time on active and collaborative learning and replacing some of the passive lecture components with online learning activities, the project currently involves 11 courses, in subjects from the sciences, social sciences, arts and humanities, and nearly 9,000 students. Data from a longitudinal research study comparing student engagement in the traditional and blended versions of each course indicate that academic and pedagogical goals are being met, and there is evidence that the project is positively influencing the institutional culture.

The proposed pre-conference workshop will use this project as a case study to identify and examine the issues associated with the implementation of large-scale pedagogical change within a traditional institutional environment. An overview of the institutional context and of the project will be followed by two

small-group discussion sessions in which participants will brainstorm solutions to specific challenges common to projects of this size and nature.

The first set of discussion topics will deal with structural and operational issues relevant to large-scale institutional change. What are the key strategies? What kind of support is needed from units across the institution to implement pedagogical change? How does one measure cost-effectiveness and ensure that a project meets those standards? How can course design changes be sustained instead of reverting to the status quo? How do you measure success?

The second set of discussion topics will turn to the institutional community and explore the challenges of buy-in from faculty members, students and institutional administrators. What incentives motivate faculty members? How does one manage student expectations? How can a project like this influence the learning culture at a traditional institution?

For each topic, the issue will be presented to participants as a problematic scenario, with a series of questions to stimulate discussion and draw out a range of creative solutions. Following each of the two discussion sessions, individual groups will report back to the room and the workshop leader will respond to the emerging themes and strategies, as well as expand on solutions developed in the case study project.

This workshop offers other traditional institutions considering similar large-scale projects invaluable insight into the mechanics and approaches to enable effective pedagogical transformation. Through small-group discussion focused on developing solutions to common institutional challenges, and through the sharing of knowledge and experience by colleagues representing different perspectives, participants will learn a range of specific strategies to employ when embarking on large-scale, transformational projects.

PC.PM.04 – Realizing the Transformative Promise of "Experiential Learning (Room A239)
Sheldene Simola (Trent University)

"Experiential learning" has become increasingly popular as a transformative pedagogical approach, with strong potential to facilitate the development of a diverse range of skills and values that are salient for citizenship and leadership at both local and global levels. However, despite its apparently obvious and commonsensical meaning, "experiential learning" is a contested term, in which various underlying philosophies are associated with different experiential methods and hence, different types of anticipated outcomes. Moreover, despite the potential benefits of experiential learning opportunities, various methods can also pose an assortment of ethical, pragmatic and risk management challenges, which sometimes go unacknowledged and therefore unaddressed. Understanding the differences among various experiential methods, being able to select the "best fit" for particular courses and learning goals, and, effectively planning for and managing the challenges inhering each method will help educators and students alike to more fully realize the transformative promise of experiential learning.

PRE-CONFERENCE TAGSA MINI-CONFERENCE

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2014 | McArthur Hall, Room A234

See at-a-glance schedule on page 22

TAGSA.01 – Supporting Innovative Practice in Teaching and Learning Among GTAs: Fuller's Stages of Concern model (10:30am – 10:50am | Room A234)
Natasha Patrito Hannon, Karyn Olsen, and Aisha Haque (Western University)

GTAs are constantly faced with the challenge of innovating instruction. From leading their first laboratory or tutorial, to facilitating online learning, GTAs progress through predictable stages of development on their way to mastering new dimensions of teaching. This workshop introduces participants to Fuller's (1969) Stages of Concern model (SCM), a framework for understanding the evolution of teachers' fears, preoccupations, and aspirations as they enter into and work through unfamiliar instructional situations. The SCM is a valuable tool for GTA developers seeking to effectively support GTAs through the process of instructional innovation. Research suggests that addressing stages of concern in the design of professional development opportunities reduces participant anxiety, lessens resistance, and promotes the transition of GTAs from teacher- to learner-centered instructors (Ferzli et al 2012).

In 1969, Frances Fuller developed the SCM through her work with pre-service K-12 teachers. Informed by interviews, she described patterns of needs and preoccupations common to teachers at different stages of their careers. The model suggests that teachers' concerns evolve along a continuum of stages housed within the broad categories of 1) self, 2) task, and 3) impact. In the SELF stage, teachers are pre-occupied with issues of personal survival and feelings of adequacy (Am I qualified to teach this? Will students accept me? Will I get good evaluations?). In the TASK stage, instructors focus on the management of learning, and are likely to follow a prescribed teaching plan, finding it difficult to adapt to unexpected situations or diverse student needs. The IMPACT stage is characterized by increased teacher confidence and a more student-centered approach to learning in which teachers consider student needs, collaborate with peers to improve student outcomes, and redesign lessons, curricula, or entire programs (Evans and Chauvin 1993).

Since Fuller's (1969) work, the SCM has been used as a lens to evaluate and design the professional development of faculty (Evans and Chauvin 1993) and, most recently, GTAs (Ferzli et al 2012). At Western, we are experimenting with the SCM as a means of evaluating our existing suite of GTA professional development programs, and as a guide-post for developing new initiatives. Using the Western Certificate in University Teaching and Learning and our new Lead TA initiative as case studies, workshop participants will explore ways in which the SCM can be used to identify gaps or redundancies in existing programming and inform the development of ambitious new projects.

Through case study analyses, individual and small group work, and facilitated discussion, participants in this session will a) map their home institutions suite of existing GTA professional development programs to the SCM, b) identify opportunities for growth and highlight sequencing challenges in these programs, and c) apply SCM-informed design to new or existing interventions to better support GTAs through the process of instructional innovation.

TAGSA.02 – Second Teachers in the Classroom (11:00am – 11:50am | Room A234)
Shelagh Crooks, Marc Heller, and Aaron Richter (Saint Mary's University)

In this presentation, each graduate student will provide a reflective account of his experience of the second teachers' role – focusing on what he learned about his discipline, and about how it can be communicated to others. In addition, each student will give a narrative account of how he negotiated his particular identity transformation. The course instructor will provide perspective on what it takes to make the second teachers model work in the classroom, and she will discuss the impact on the junior students of having their senior peers operate as second teachers. She will argue that the presence of the second teachers altered the nature and quality of the discourse in the classroom. Following the model of the second teachers, the junior students were considerably more willing to enter into the fray of discussion, and so moved beyond the passive reception of information, to become active developers and evaluators of ideas.

Thus, the conference theme of transforming learning will be addressed in 2 ways: via a discussion of 1. the identity transformation of the grad students; and 2. the transformation of the learning environment which occurred in the critical thinking class. The transformation theme will be grounded in research into the transformative learning theory of Jack Mezirow (1997 , 2000) and Patricia Cranton (1994)

It is intended that this presentation will be interactive, and conference participants will be invited to compare and contrast the second teachers' model with other models of graduate student work in the classroom that they may know. In addition, participants will have an opportunity to evaluate the benefits and deficits of this model along with the speakers, and will be challenged to think about how (or indeed whether) this model could work in other institutional contexts and other disciplines.

TAGSA.03 – Not a "Real" Teacher: Undergraduate TAs' Conceptions of Teaching (1:30pm – 1:55pm |Room A234) Betsy Keating (University of Windsor)

At the University of Windsor, a large writing class (150 students) has been transformed into an online program that is mandatory for all students in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (approximately 2,200). The two-part course now requires a coordinator, three sessional instructors, and approximately 45-50 undergraduate teaching assistants (Singleton-Jackson, 2008). This presentation is a summary of research examining how this model affects the TAs and their conceptions of teaching.

In the Foundations of Academic Writing (FAW) program, each TA supervises 50 to 80 fellow undergraduate students. The TAs must be entering at least their third semester of university, and the main criterion for hiring is academic achievement in the FAW courses; no knowledge of teaching and learning is considered necessary. The TAs' training consists of one four-hour orientation session near the beginning of classes, the majority of which covers "housekeeping," such as union rules, important dates and procedures, on-line learning system protocols, timesheets, office hours, etc.

The TAs' tasks are either teaching or teaching-related: they handle assessments and offer feedback; they facilitate peer editing, facilitate discussions, hold weekly office hours, answer students' questions about the course material and procedures, and they are the first—and sometimes the only—point of instructor contact. In most cases, students will have minimal, if any, interaction with the sessional instructors who supervise the TAs.

What are the implications or consequences of hiring undergraduate TAs to teach first-year students? What are the TAs learning about teaching practices? What effect might that have on the students' learning? How might this course model affect our institutions' quality of education?

In a 2004 study, Gibbs and Coffey discuss student-focused vs. teacher-focused teaching. They demonstrate connections between conceptions of teaching, approaches to teaching, training, and student outcomes. They conclude, "Without the support of training, teachers may move in the opposite direction and reduce the extent to which they adopt a Student Focus." They add, "Whereas the positive impact of training is easy to understand, the sometimes negative impact of no training requires some explanation (p. 98).

In pre- and post-semester surveys, I asked the FAW TAs about their conceptions of teaching, and I conducted early-semester and post-semester interviews with 10 of them. This short presentation will summarize the research results and leave time for participant questions. Participants will have the opportunity to discuss the potential consequences of overburdened institutions offloading some of their pedagogical responsibilities onto untrained undergraduate TAs.

TAGSA.04 – Teaching Assistant (TA) Orientations: Are we Laying a Transformative Foundation? (2:00pm – 2:25pm | Room A234)
Cynthia Korpan (University of Victoria) and Suzanne Le-May Sheffield (Dalhousie University)

Teaching assistant (TA) orientations, whether delivered within a home department or as a university-wide event, are the most common structured professional development opportunities offered to graduate students. Since these events are typically the first exposure graduate students have to professional development and to the culture of teaching and learning at their graduate institution, orientations set the tone for their future engagement in learning and teaching professional development.

This session will present results from a research project that conducted a comprehensive survey and subsequent analysis of university-wide TA orientations across Canadian post-secondary institutions. The project was initiated and undertaken by the Teaching Assistant and Graduate Student Advancement (TAGSA) Executive Committee and generously supported by an Educational Developers Caucus (EDC) grant. The way that TA orientations are organized across the country differs immensely. Our research closely examined the content covered at TA orientations and other indicators such as length of orientation, timing, and form of presentations, to try to understand how TA orientations are being approached as an instructional entity. Our results will highlight the range of content being covered across the country, plus evidence of the use of active and innovative learning strategies.

Disseminating our research results will enable us to show the similarities and differences in how TAs are introduced to teaching, share best practices, and help further the development of transformative learning experiences that will contribute to establishment of TAs as life-long learners and support the professional development of leaders. Additionally, with the increased concern about the quality of undergraduate education and teaching at post-secondary institutions, it is time to ensure that initial introductions to teaching are of the highest quality.

To date, there has only been one cross-institutional survey of TA orientations (Robinson, 2011). Robinson (2011) surveyed 20 institutions, two in Canada and 18 in the United States, to elicit both a broad and focused view. Although department- and university-level research exists for single institutions (Boman, 2008; Lucas, 2001; Temple et al., 2003), which can offer ideas and be useful for future planning at those

institutions, such research fails to provide an in-depth analysis that works towards the identification of best practices across multiple institutions. Building from Robinson's (2011) survey, our research adopts a comprehensive and thorough understanding of best practices across Canadian post-secondary institutions.

 Participants in this workshop will find the presentation useful as they strive to provide the best teaching preparation possible for TAs before they take up their TA role on Canadian campuses. The results of our study will serve as a useful tool within institutions to develop future instruments for measuring the efficacy of orientations and their impact on other professional development programs offered by departments, faculties, and/or learning and teaching centres. Additionally, the results of the research (a) could aid in the development of some national standards, (b) may inspire some research initiatives cross-institutionally to measure the impact of standards and programs, and (c) will further initiatives. Participants will be encouraged to contribute information, ask questions, and engage in discussion.

TAGSA.05 – Evaluating for Transformation, Transforming in our Evaluation: How do we Envision Support for Graduate Students and TAs? (2:30pm – 3:20pm | Room A234)
Carolyn Hoessler, (University of Saskatchewan) and Lorraine Godden (Queen's University)

How are graduate students supported in their transformation from students to teachers? This workshop draws on prior literature and the results of Carolyn's recent doctoral dissertation to invite discussion on how graduate students are supported, why diverse supports can be valuable, and what their evaluation might look like.

The times are changing. Universities are challenged by increasing enrolments and demands for accountability (Ryan & Fraser, 2010) while their graduate students face fewer faculty positions demanding greater productivity and talents (Austin, 2002), or more diverse potential career paths requiring more transferable skills (Maldonado, Wiggers, & Arnold, 2013; Sekuler, Crow, & Annan, 2013). Are the supports we offer now fluid enough for these dynamic needs?

The scope of support is expanding. Formal programming for graduate students is well-documented (e.g., Marincovich, Prostko, & Stout, 1998; Park, 2004), but has shown mixed results. Trained TAs provided better grading and feedback for students and TAs with greater range of responsibilities utilized more student-centred activities in Rolheiser and colleagues' (2013) research. However, other studies found challenges of limited awareness (Barrington, 2001), attendance (Golde & Dore, 2001; 2004) and impact on teaching (e.g., Buehler & Marcum, 2007; Morris, 2001). Informal supports including socialization (Austin, 2002), scuttlebutt (Lovitts, 2004), and communication networks (Wise, 2011) are increasingly linked with graduate students' success.

This growing mixture of available support, and rising pressures suggest a transformation may be needed in how we evaluate support for graduate students. Evaluating this expanded vision of support requires adapting current methods and focus to encompass the full range of formal and informal supports including formally offered (e.g., workshops), facilitated (e.g., mentors), and spontaneous (e.g., chance advice).

The broader field of career development is also evolving, with people now expected to be fluid and dynamic in order to respond to ever changing work contexts (Bell & Benes, 2012; Bimrose, 2006; Coiffait, 2013; Watts et al., 1996). Therefore, to encourage graduate student self-development, support must be informed yet should also reflect fluidity and adopt a dynamic approach.

TAGSA.06 – Teaching Assistant (TA) Competencies: Provoking change (3:30pm – 4:30pm | Room A234)
Cynthia Korpan (University of Victoria) and Roselynn Verwoord (University of British Columbia)

The development of a national set of teaching assistant (TA) competencies for use by Canadian higher education institutions was initiated in the fall of 2012 by Teaching Assistant and Graduate Student Advancement (TAGSA), a special interest group (SIG) of the Society of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE). As stated in the SIG's mission statement, "TAGSA seeks to bring together as a community of practice, professionals and students who, through the sharing of resources and through active scholarship, are interested in improving and enriching the training and support provided to teaching assistants in postsecondary institutions, as well as the overall professional skills development of graduate students."

It was in the spirit of this mission statement that a group of professionals came together last year at the Educational Developers Caucus (EDC) conference, February, 2013 to begin development of TA competencies that led to further development at the June, 2013 STLHE conference and the EDC 2014 conference. The competencies are inspired by STLHE's (1996) Ethical Principles in University Teaching and take into consideration the needs of all TAs, independent of their experience and the discipline involved. The goal is that the competencies will guide educational developers, faculty, and departments as they design teaching assistant programming, and TAs as they assume teaching roles.

The development of the competencies takes the following movements currently affecting teaching assistant (TA) preparation as its starting point:

1. There is a growing expectation that graduate education programs provide professional development opportunities to complement disciplinary knowledge and more effectively support graduate students' success (Professional Skills Development for Graduate Students, 2008), including teaching preparation.
2. Graduate students, intent on "enhancing their human capital" (Saunders, 2010, p. 63), are seeking ways of incorporating teaching preparation skills training into their programs aiming to equip themselves for future employment.
3. Universities are facing the pressing concern of ensuring high quality undergraduate educational experiences.

This session takes these movements into consideration as members of TAGSA and others interested, help finalize the set of national competencies and ensure that all perspectives and voices have been consulted and addressed. Participants will confirm that the competencies are applicable to different institutions and forms of use. To attend this session, it is not necessary that you have attended previous sessions about this topic. Having new perspectives at the session will be most welcome.

The intended audience for the development of these competencies is anyone involved in the preparation of TAs for teaching duties, teaching assistants, graduate students, and other interested institutional members. The session will involve a mix of presentations, small and large group sharing, and discussion.