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Using a Collaborative Course Reflection Process to Enhance Faculty and Curriculum Development

Debra Sellheim and Mary Weddle
St. Catherine University

Reflective practice is a vital skill of effective teachers and a precondition for professional growth. Lack of time, poorly developed reflective skills, or academic cultures that are not supportive of reflection may curtail reflective practice. This article describes a peer-led course reflection process designed to increase the reflection and teaching skills of faculty as well as support course and curriculum development. Department faculty perspectives on the process were examined via a survey that included open-ended and forced-choice questions (N = 10; 91% return rate). The vast majority of respondents indicated this reflective process had improved administrative aspects of their teaching (90%); enriched and informed course development (100%); was time well spent (100%); and helped faculty see how their course fit into the overall framework of the curriculum (80%). The guided, cyclical, and structured nature of this reflection process appears to be effective. The collaborative, non-hierarchical process became part of the program’s culture over time. A systematic course reflection process may be of interest to academic faculty who wish to enhance and document course and curricular development.
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BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Reflective practice is a vital skill of effective teachers and a precondition for professional growth and lifelong learning (Bell 2001; Brookfield 1987; Karm 2010; Mezirow 1990). In particular, peer-supported reflective practice has been found to be an effective process for the development and implementation of ideas about teaching and for developing teaching skills (Bell 2001). Faculty, however, often teach alone in the classroom, and when not in the classroom get caught up in other teaching, research, or service responsibilities leaving little time to reflect individually, much less with colleagues, about teaching and learning. A faculty member may recognize when a class session or the course as a whole was successful or not and may make a mental note of something to retain or change the next time the course is taught assuming it will certainly be remembered. Nevertheless, when teaching the course again, memory of course-related issues may fade if not documented (Purcell 2013). Recognizing the opportunities for faculty, course, and curriculum development inherent in reflective processes, the purpose of this paper is to describe a peer-led course reflection and curricular development process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Reflection in education is not new. Numerous philosophers and educational scholars offered varied perspectives on the meaning, definition, and use of reflection (Dewey 1933; Boud 1999a, 1999b; Brookfield 1987; Schon 1983; McCormack and Kennelly 2011). In his work from the 1930s, Dewey (1933) identified reflective thinking as a goal of education, maintaining it moved teachers away from “impulsive and routine activity” (Raines and Shadiow 1995, 272). Kolb (1984) has written about the role of reflection in the experiential learning cycle. Schon (1983) introduced the concept of the “reflective practitioner” who engages with his or her experience in ways that result in meaningful knowledge. He further described reflective practice as a process of thinking and doing through which one becomes more skilled (Schon 1987, 31). Similarly, Shulman (2004) argued that learning requires reflection on actions. Experience on its own may not be sufficient to
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Guided reflection processes foster the improvement of university teachers’ reflection skills and habits (Karm 2010). Reflection and discussion of problematic aspects of teaching can expand one’s knowledge in teaching and learning, resulting in development as a teacher (McAlpine et al. 2004; Rossouw 2009). Schon (1987) and other educational researchers (McAlpine et al. 2004; Pinsky and Irby 1997; Jensen and Mostrom 2013) have written about forms of reflection that can occur at different points in time in order to understand and evaluate a situation. Reflection-on-action occurs after the event and provides a time for contemplation and a way to make sense of things. The teacher is engaged in revising experiences and knowledge and may reformulate foundational knowledge and beliefs upon which classroom practices are based (Raines and Shadiow 1995, 273). Reflection-in-action occurs during the event and alteration of action may occur as new information arises (Jensen and Mostrom 2013). Reflection-for-action occurs outside of the event and involves planning for a future event in light of experience (Jensen and Mostrom 2013).

In addition to reflection occurring at different points in time, three domains or levels of reflection have been described in the literature: reflection on content, process, and premise (Kreber and Castleden 2009; Kreber 2005; McAlpine et al. 2004). Reflection on content relies on existing knowledge and beliefs to interpret a situation and solve a problem (Kreber and Castleden 2009). Process reflection focuses on the effectiveness of the method chosen to address the problem; it questions knowledge within the boundaries of one’s core beliefs but does not yet question the beliefs themselves (Kreber and Castleden 2009; McAlpine et al. 2004). In premise reflection individuals sincerely question the knowledge and core beliefs used to define the problem and are best positioned to construct new knowledge and transform their conceptual structure (Kreber and Castleden 2009; McAlpine et al. 2004).

Conditions for Reflection

McAlpine and Weston (2000) researched the reflection practices of six professors considered exemplary in their teaching. Using the model of metacognitive processes of reflection that emerged from this study, the researchers then explored why some teachers seem unable to reflect productively on their teaching and why some who do engage in reflection don’t use it to improve their teaching. They discussed three reasons why faculty may not naturally engage in reflection: 1) a lack of knowledge about teaching and the role of reflection; 2) a lack of motivation (not valuing being a good teacher); and 3) a fear of taking risks, which could be either internally imposed (loss of face with students) or externally related (tenure) (McAlpine and Weston 2000, 380). Barriers between reflection and action to improve teaching are similar—lack of experience and knowledge base needed to reflect effectively; lack of time; nature of the disciplinary knowledge and amount of content to cover; insecurity or fear of taking risks with teaching; or an inability to successfully carry out a decision once made (Mäkikki and Lindblom-Ylänne 2012; McAlpine and Weston 2000). Limited awareness of what one could reflect on or departmental cultures that are not conducive to engaging in reflective practice on teaching can also be significant barriers to reflection (Kreber and Castleden 2009). To promote reflection on teaching among faculty, dialogue should be intentionally encouraged, faculty need to feel safe, and development activities should focus on specific reflective processes (Kahn et al. 2006; McCormack and Kennelly 2011). A model by Bell (2001) (Teaching Development Program) describes keys to an effect reflective process. These keys are a supportive environment involving the participant as a reflective practitioner who is open to criticism and willing to act upon feedback; a support colleague who provides critical but supportive feedback; and an educational developer who provides support through written feedback on the participant’s reflections. She notes that this program “supports the development of a collegial approach to teaching within faculties and departments by opening classroom doors to colleagues and encouraging pedagogical discourse” (Bell 200, 38). When rooted in the participant’s own experience and workplace context, guided reflection may be more powerful and meaningful than other developmental activities and more likely to drive change (Jones and Stubbe 2004, 190-1).

A supportive or non-supportive environment is just one aspect of the context that can affect the reflection process. Assumptions and practices of the teachers’ culture, demands and expectations of the educational institution, attitudes, and ways of operating that are dominant in the teacher’s discipline, peer group influences, and social expectations all play a role (Boud 1999b; Boud and Walker 1998). Formal knowledge about teaching influences the extent to which faculty engage in reflection (Kreber 2005; Kreber and Castleden 2009). Kreber (2005) found faculty reflection to be oriented primarily toward personal experience (i.e., how they were taught) as a basis for decisions about instruction rather than formal knowledge of teaching and learning. In addition, there was a difference in the extent to which faculty said they reflect and whether they could actually show they did so (Kreber 2005).

Boud (1999a) writes about academic reflection and development as a local practice and a process for peer learning in the workplace. He notes that peer learning builds on the collegial view of academic work and that reflecting and exploring ideas with colleagues is more effective than doing so with a designated “teacher.” Pickering (2006), who followed four novice university lecturers...
through an academic year, supports the potential impact of peers. She found that experienced colleagues provided novice teachers with high levels of support, information, and a sense of possibility that encouraged risk-taking in teaching. Convery (1998, 197) further argues that for reflection to fundamentally influence practice, it must be informed by collaborative discussion, as individual reflection tends to focus on immediate rather than underlying problems. There is a need to embed reflection and development into the regular practices of faculty so they become a common and familiar aspect of academic life (Boud 1999a; Pickering 2006). Without doing so, reflection and development may remain theoretical and abstract rather than applied (Boud 1999a).

Although reflection is in large part about the development of individual faculty, the outcomes also meet collective needs (Boud 1999a, 1999b). Exploration of how faculty can relate their practices with those of others resulting in teaching innovation is one possible outcome (Boud 1999a, 1999b). Kahn and colleagues (2006) noted several benefits of reflective practice, including the enhanced capacity for practice, establishment of supportive relationships among those involved in the reflection process, and transformation of practice. Through smaller scale reflections (individual teaching sessions and courses), we can promote and influence the direction of large-scale reflections (curriculum development across a program/department), ultimately impacting the organization of learning environments and the quality of student learning outcomes (Kreber and Castleden 2009; Huber and Hutchings 2005; Harris and Bretag 2003).

METHOD/MODEL DESCRIPTION

Supported by the research on reflective practice discussed above, this article describes a method of course reflection used in a 3-year clinical doctorate-level physical therapist education program. The course reflection process was designed to (1) be systematic and collaborative; (2) promote continuous quality improvement in teaching and learning; (3) support faculty development; (4) assure integration and progression of content from course to course in the major; (5) document how course outcomes are linked with course and curricular development; and (6) provide data for curriculum and program assessment.

The impetus for incorporating a course reflection process was two-fold. One of the program faculty members attended a faculty development presentation on using reflection as part of course evaluation. Given recent significant changes to the program’s curricular structure (Weddle and Sellheim, 2009), she recognized the utility in designing a similar process as a means to monitor the continuity and logical advancement of content from course to course throughout the new curriculum. The continuity and progression of content in this curriculum may be similar to the progression of content throughout other academic majors, such as mathematics or chemistry, in which content and concepts presented in lower level required courses must precede material presented in upper-level courses.

Based on the course evaluation process described at the presentation referred to above, the program’s curriculum co-directors drafted a reflection process. The curriculum co-directors’ responsibilities included curriculum assessment; course content organization and development; and support of program faculty development in teaching/learning. The proposed process was reviewed and discussed by all 11 program faculty members prior to implementation, which was an essential step to establishing the process as collaborative and developmental rather than judgmental or hierarchical.

The course reflection process involves several steps. Upon completion of a course and after the students’ written course evaluations are available, course coordinators write responses to the questions on the Course Reflection Form (see Appendix A). The form contains reflective questions about 16 course management items, such as review of course objectives, pacing of student learning, faculty and student workload, content depth, breadth, and integration; and teaching strategies used during the course. In addition, faculty reflect on how professional core values and part-time clinical education experiences are integrated into the course. Other disciplines could modify these items to address their specific questions or standards. Course or curricular issues needing review by the full program faculty are identified. Assessment data from several sources in the reflection process, such as students’ written course evaluations, the faculty member’s observations, and program outcomes survey data are considered. Changes incorporated into the course as a result of the previous year’s assessment data are documented along with the outcome of the change.

Following the self-reflection, the course coordinators submit the completed form to the curriculum co-directors and schedule a meeting between the course coordinators and curriculum co-directors. During the 45-to 60-minute meeting, the curriculum co-directors ask clarifying questions, provide feedback, and engage in problem-solving discussion with the course coordinators. Discussion includes aspects of the course that are working well; items needing development; and strategies to diversify, enhance or modify the teaching/learning experience. Plans for course revision or enhancement are established and documented on the form as “to-do” lists with time-lines for course coordinators and curriculum co-directors.

After the meeting, the curriculum co-directors write supportive and developmental summary comments for the course coordinators on the reflection form. The course coordinators review and make needed corrections to the completed draft of the reflection form. Once finalized, the program director and course coordinators receive copies. The entire program faculty discusses and takes action on
items needing follow-up, such as continuity of content between courses. See figure 1 for a graphic representation of the course reflection process.

Initially, the course coordinators were to have the first draft of the reflection form submitted to the curriculum co-directors within 3 weeks of course completion. The program would then provide lunch for the meeting between the course coordinators and curriculum co-directors to review the reflection form. This provided an incentive to complete the reflection in a timely fashion and helped to establish the process as collegial rather than hierarchical in an effort to promote open dialogue during the meeting.

OUTCOMES

Three years after initiation of the course reflection process, the curriculum co-directors developed a survey to collect qualitative and quantitative data from the program faculty about the course reflection process. See a copy of the survey and summary of quantitative results in Appendices B and C. Each faculty completed the survey anonymously. Ten of the 11 faculty completed the survey (91% response rate). Most of the faculty (80%) reported that completing the course reflection form took two hours or less, and all faculty believed that the time spent completing the entire reflection process (completing the form, scheduling and meeting with curriculum co-directors) was time well spent. Approximately half the faculty (60%) indicated that completing the reflection process yearly (each time the course is taught) was an appropriate frequency, while half the faculty (50%) would prefer using the process every other year (some respondents marked more than one answer). Given this feedback, the curriculum co-directors altered the process so that faculty would submit a shortened version of the reflection form every other year with an optional meeting with the co-directors, at the discretion of the course coordinators or curriculum co-directors. The shortened form includes the course management items and the assessment information, which the curriculum co-directors felt was important to retain on an annual basis.

When asked to compare and contrast his/her practice of reflection about courses prior to and after implementation of the course reflection process, all comments suggested positive changes as exemplified in the following quotes:

Prior to the course reflection formal process, I would make note of things I wanted to change in a course as the course was going on...Now I do the same thing but this formal process requires me to reflect more broadly!

I think reflection always happened, but it wasn’t as comprehensive, and it lacked accountability.

Similar to process that I engaged in previously. Most significant difference that I particularly appreciate is link to assessment.

Conversations during reflection meeting helps problem-solve issues, gives me additional ideas, etc. that I would [not] have on my own.

All faculty reported that the course reflection process enriched their teaching and informed course development:

The process helps me see a greater picture of my role as course coordinator and the course itself within the greater context of our curriculum. It helps me to see things from many views.

Most faculty (70%) indicated that the process improved their teaching and one person said:
I believe this process has helped me see things I may have missed or not considered. Truly I see the process as a brainstorming session for how to improve my courses.

Most faculty (90%) reported that the course reflection process helped them with administrative aspects of their courses, such as course structure, syllabus details, and scheduling issues. For example, one faculty member stated:

"It provides a document that I can refer to as I prepare for my next course the coming year to be sure I have not forgotten any details.

Course reflection helped 80% of respondents see how their course fits into the overall framework of the curriculum as shown in the following quotes:

Helps provide “big picture” look at where the course fits with overall curriculum; improves integration.

The reflection process allows me to re-think the spiraling of content, progression of material and how it is integrated.

The following were typical responses to the question about how faculty felt about the course reflection process:

[I feel] supported, positive—the process has been instrumental to my development as a new faculty member.

Supportive—I appreciate the helpful suggestions in regard to other ideas that may enhance a course that I am teaching.

I feel very supported, positive, satisfied and pleased to have an opportunity to think and discuss more deeply about what occurred in the courses I coordinate.

Additional comments further illustrate faculty support of the reflection process:

I like the formalized process—really gets you to reflect back on the entire course and make changes instead of just talking about doing it.

I think we need “forced” reflection in order to take the time to deeply reflect. It’s time consuming and takes a lot of energy—so it would be too easy not to do it!

DISCUSSION

This paper describes a course reflection process that helps an academic professional program support the development of faculty as reflective practitioners and establish reflection as an ongoing academic practice. When surveyed after three years of using the reflection process, all of the faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the time invested in the process was well spent. This suggests that a formalized guided reflection process versus one that is ‘hit or miss’ is valued. Because this process occurs following the completion of a course, the focus is on reflection-on-action (i.e., what occurred during the course) and reflection-for-action (i.e., what should or should not be changed). Completing the course reflection process on a routine basis has helped facilitate the development of faculty members as reflective practitioners (Schon 1983) by honing their reflection skills of self-assessment, self-awareness, introspection, and openness.

It is important to note the initiation of this course reflection process was not imposed on faculty; rather the idea was vetted at a faculty meeting with a decision by the entire faculty to implement and see how the process worked. Initially, combining an off-campus lunch with the reflection helped to facilitate the collaborative, non-hierarchical nature of the process. Discontinuation of the lunch event occurred over time, as the process became part of the program culture and day-to-day work of the faculty.

Similar to the experience of the participants described by Jones and Stubbe (2004), the focus and grounding of the reflection process in their own experience was valued and meaningful to faculty. As a result, the process was engaging and the faculty were invested in acting upon their reflections. This effect supports Boyd’s (1999a) argument that to be effective, reflection and development must be a routine part of academic life and faculty practices. Reflection and development that is only theoretical and abstract, rather than applied, may have only marginal effects on actual teaching practices or outcomes. This process addresses many of the barriers to reflection and between reflection and action. For example, the course reflection form provides guidance on items to reflect upon for faculty with limited awareness about what to consider (McAlpine & Weston 2000). The faculty member responds to the guided questions in the context of his/her course. Doing so facilitates a more meaningful process and increases the likelihood of subsequent action (Jones and Stubbe, 2004). The process includes time for contemplation about what occurred in the class sessions and course, which is further enhanced through in-depth pedagogical discussion with the curriculum co-director colleagues. In these discussions, the curriculum co-directors provide mentorship to the faculty by offering feedback on the faculty member’s reflection and supporting the faculty member while simultaneously encouraging him or her to question assumptions. This role is similar to that of the “educational developer” described in Bell’s (2001) Teaching Development Program model. These discussions also provide an opportunity to share knowledge about teaching and learning, helping facilitate engagement with the reflection process and the confidence to take action on reflection ideas. Faculty report feeling supported which reduces one of the significant barriers to reflection (Kreber and Castleden 2009). Given that our
faculty had a desire to improve teaching, a lack of motivation to reflect on teaching was not a barrier as described by McAlpine and Weston (2000).

Faculty also note that the process has enriched their teaching by providing ideas they would not have thought of on their own, suggesting that shared knowledge generated through collaboration is greater than an individual’s knowledge (Bell 2001). As one example, in a course reflection discussion of assessment practices, the curriculum co-directors and faculty member collaborated in designing an oral practical exam to take the place of a written exam. The aim of the oral practical exam is to demonstrate the student’s command of content and clinical reasoning. Students receive a “paper case” ahead of the exam. During the oral practical exam, the student teaches two peers and a faculty member about the diagnosis, designs a plan of care, demonstrates treatment techniques, and leads a discussion and question-answer session on the case.

Exploring these new ideas and their effectiveness is a form of process reflection—questioning knowledge within one’s core beliefs about teaching and learning. This questioning may further lead to premise reflection, where a faculty member questions their presuppositions and beliefs and begins to restructure and transform their conceptions of teaching and learning (Kreber and Castleden 2009; McAlpine et al. 2004). For example, with one departmental faculty member, positive results from experimentation with active learning experiences in place of some lectures (process reflection) has led to a shift in that faculty member’s teaching philosophy (premise reflection). That change in teaching philosophy has resulted in a change toward more active student-centered teaching practices. In one instance, lectures on a topic were replaced by a student debate on the same topic in which students prepared arguments for and against the topic prior to class and engaged in an actual debate during class time, rather than listening to a lecture.

Similar to the impact of peers on the development of novice faculty reported by Pickering (2006), newer faculty noted that they received mentoring; information on teaching/learning; and encouragement to take supported risks with new teaching approaches from the reflection process, all of which were instrumental in their development as a teacher. Thus, this reflective process may facilitate more rapid faculty skill development compared to gains only as a factor of time spent as a teacher (Schon 1987).

The structured reflection process led to a discernible change in how faculty reflected on their courses and recorded reflective ideas. On a micro level, the administrative component of the process has served as a memory aid, assisting faculty in keeping track of details and planned changes. “To-do” lists, discussion with colleagues, and the ongoing cyclical nature of the course reflections builds in accountability. On a macro level, chronicling sources of feedback, changes made based on feedback, and the outcome of those changes were linked to program assessment and curriculum development. Faculty considered issues from many views, including the larger or “big picture” context of the curriculum and how content progressed. Integration and complexity spiraled not only within their own course but also within the program/major. How did a change in their course affect another program course or enhance the students’ program/major? Similar to outcomes described by Kahn and colleagues (2006) and Boyd (1999a), the outcomes of this reflection process have helped meet the collective needs of our curriculum and program. For example, the process has facilitated ongoing conversations about teaching and learning and has influenced large-scale curricular changes, such as the enhancement of content across multiple courses or new curricular initiatives that emerge from a reflective idea brought for discussion to the whole faculty. Since the initiation of this reflection process coincided with the implementation of a new curricular model, ongoing collective reflection gave the faculty confidence that content areas were effectively managed, developed, and integrated in this new structure. If a program or department is striving to improve continuity within a major or adopt a new curricular model, as we did, a similar reflective process may be of value.

CONCLUSION

As supported in the literature, the guided, cyclical, and structured nature of the process described in this paper appeared to be effective in increasing the reflection and pedagogical repertoire of our faculty. Within a department, there could be many ways to guide or structure a similar process based on the department’s goals and developmental objectives and initiatives. For example, a department may want to promote critical thinking in students. Examination of course content, teaching strategies, and assessment methods as part of the course reflection process could determine whether they operationalize critical thinking in a manner desired by the department. Alternatively, a department may want to incorporate emerging content in the field. The reflection process could identify content to remove, reformat, or revise in order to accommodate new knowledge, skills, or concepts. Other examples of department initiatives that the reflection process could help guide include changing course delivery systems, such as online learning; incorporation of community work and learning; or civic engagement initiatives. If adopted across departments, a reflective process could inform an institutional assessment plan, assuring the offerings of the institution remain current, dynamic, and valued in a competitive academic marketplace.
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APPENDIX A
Course and Coordinator Reflection Form

Course Number/Name: ________________________________________________________________________________

Term/Year: __________________________________________________ Date of Review: ______________________

Course Coordinator Name/s: ________________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Complete this self-assessment within three weeks of course completion. Provide a copy to the curriculum co-directors prior to meeting for the course debriefing.

Course Coordinator Reflection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Satisfactory?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>To-do List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensures that syllabus is organized, current, and that content is covered as described in syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Annually reviews/updates course objectives. Email registrar with any changes to course description for online catalog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinates course textbook and supply requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepares the class schedule/sequencing of content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In collaboration with the content threadbearers and curriculum co-directors, monitors content depth, breadth, integration (including integration of ICE), and spiraling of course content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitors the pacing of student and faculty workload (within course and outside)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coordinates speakers (faculty and guest speakers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oversees writing and organization of course tutorial (case, resources, tutor guide, preparation meetings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Schedules for rooms, classes and tutorials—any problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uses varied teaching strategies that promote active learning and address various learning styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coordinates preparation of integrative exams • Alignment of evaluation strategies (exam questions, paper rubrics, etc.) and course objectives is assessed prior to beginning to course • Ensures variety of evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Identifies problems and helps resolve them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is accessible to students, co-coordinator and faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is flexible/accommodating when unexpected circumstances arise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Displays ability to work well in teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Overall, shows initiative and leadership for the coherence and delivery of the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Reflection:

1. Based on assessment information from any source (mid-course feedback, end of course feedback, your observations, changes in other courses, survey data, etc.) and your last course reflection, what changes (actions) did you incorporate into the course this year? Evaluate how these changes worked (outcome).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Data and Source</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please list all practice patterns from *The Guide to Physical Therapist Practice* covered in a substantial way in this course (list system, pattern letter, and name).

3. Is the course content reflective of practices as described by the APTA Vision Statement and Guiding Principles? How?

4. How do you integrate the APTA Core Values (accountability, altruism, compassion/caring, excellence, integrity, professional duty, social responsibility) into this course?

5. How does the PT/PTA relationship enter into this course? If it doesn’t enter in to the course, how could it be integrated?

6. Issues that should be brought to the entire DPT faculty for discussion and/or consideration, if any.

7. Please add anything else that you think would be relevant for either the course or the program as a whole.

8. Suggestions/observations from the curriculum co-directors.

9. **To-do list** for curriculum co-directors.

**APPENDIX B**

Course Reflection Process Survey

1. Compare and contrast your practice of reflection about courses prior to and after implementation of the course reflection process?

2. How much time does it take you to complete the written course reflection?
   a. < 1 hour
   b. 1–2 hours
   c. > 2 hours
   Comments:

3. The course reflection process has improved the administrative aspects of my course (i.e, course structure, syllabus details, scheduling issues)?
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   Comments:

4. The course reflection process has helped me improve my teaching?
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   Comments:

5. At this point in curricular development, an optimal schedule of completing the course reflection process would be:
   a. Yearly
   b. Every other year
   c. At the discretion of the course coordinators
   d. At the discretion of the curriculum co-directors
   e. Other:________________
   Comments:
6. Overall, I find the course reflection process enriches my teaching and informs course development:
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly disagree

   Comments:

7. The total time involved in the course reflection process (completing form, scheduling meeting with curriculum co-directors, meeting with curriculum co-directors) was time well spent:
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly disagree

   Comments:

8. The course reflection process has helped me see how my course fits into the overall framework of the curriculum (content spiral, progression of complexity, integration, etc).
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly disagree

   Comments:

9. How do you feel about the course reflection process (i.e., supported, threatened, overwhelmed, positive, satisfied, pleased, burdened)?

10. The course reflection process could be improved by:

11. Additional comments:

APPENDIX C

Course Reflection Process Survey—Quantitative Results Summary (N = 10/11; 91% Response Rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The total time involved in the course reflection process (completing form, meeting with curriculum co-directors) was time well spent.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I find the course reflection process enriches my teaching and informs course development.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course reflection process has helped me improve my teaching.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course reflection process has improved the administrative aspects of my course (i.e., course structure, syllabus details, scheduling issues).</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course reflection process has helped me see how my course fits into the overall framework of the curriculum (content spiral, progression of complexity, integration, etc).</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>&lt;1 HR</th>
<th>1–2 HRS</th>
<th>&gt;2 HRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much time does it take you to complete the written course reflection?</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>