

Coordinate Status Consultation

A Strategy for Instructional Improvement

Kathleen A. Dalgaard
*Family Practice and
Community Health
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455*

Deborah E. Simpson
*Family Practice and
Community Health
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455*

Carol A. Carrier
*Curriculum and Instruction
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455*

Abstract. College and university instructional development programs frequently rely on seminars and workshops as methods for assisting faculty. Group formats alone are unlikely to provide the individual assistance faculty need to explore problems in their unique teaching environments. An alternative approach is coordinate status consultation in which a faculty member and teaching improvement consultant collaborate to address the faculty member's concerns. The faculty member brings his knowledge of his content area and his teaching environment to the relationship. The consultant provides his expertise in examining teaching concerns and facilitating change. This paper defines coordinate status consultation, summarizes its conceptual bases, describes the major phases in the consultation process, and provides an example to illustrate its use.

This project was supported in part by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education.

For purposes of clarity the faculty member will be referred to as "he" and the consultant as "she."

Many instructional development programs are limited in approach and scope. Some concentrate on teaching methods, preparation of instructional materials, or evaluation of teaching. Group seminars or generation of evaluation instruments may be the approach. At times faculty members' problems are redefined to fit into the service offered by the program. More often, faculty who perceive their problems as matching the available service receive help, but others do not. The difficulties with this instructional development approach are that a faculty member may not understand how the service could be useful and thus not use it, or that even those who receive help may not have their major problems solved if those problems are not addressed by the faculty development program.

Some programs rely primarily on seminars and workshops as the delivery systems for their services. While group seminars are useful for providing information, group support, and a format for sharing problems, they are not optimal for giving faculty the opportunity to use new teaching approaches and to receive individual feedback and suggestions for improvement. The changes we seek to encourage in faculty are conceptual and behavioral ones which are individualistic; the methods for encouraging such changes must be flexible enough to meet the variety of needs which a diverse faculty will have.

Recognizing the need for individual assistance, some programs have used individual consultation (or supervision) as their primary method for assisting faculty. Three views of the consultant (supervisor) are common in such programs: consultant as counselor, consultant as expert, and consultant as problem solver. Each role definition has different implications for the faculty member and the consultant.

The "consultant as counselor" role definition assumes that if the consultant can help a faculty member address his personal problems, then teaching development will follow. The counselor-consultant may focus on the faculty member's feelings of stagnation in his personal and professional lives. She would not necessarily address any specific teaching concerns.

The "consultant as expert" viewpoint assumes that the instructional development consultant has knowledge and insights about teaching and her primary role is to convey that expertise selectively to individual faculty. The expert-consultant decides which of her insights are relevant to her faculty member consultee and offers those insights.

The "consultant as problem solver" definition suggests that the consultant assumes responsibility for solving an instructional problem. A consultant using this approach might design and test microcomputer materials for the faculty member. In this model the consultant is usually responsible for identifying the problem and implementing solutions.

While we accept the notion that instructional development will best be accomplished through individual consultation, our assumptions about adult change lead us to a fourth model: "consultant as collaborator." This paper will describe those assumptions, outline the model which results from them, define the roles for consultant and faculty implied by the model, and illustrate its use through an extended example.

Assumptions Leading to the Model

Literature on adult learning gives a number of important suggestions for structuring an effective environment for change. Knox (1977) summarizes these findings. He states that:

Usually, when an adult sets out to learn about something it is related to a large amount of experience and information that the adult already possesses. The person's current understanding of the topic or problem is typically organized around his or her previous encounters with it. (Knox, 1977, p. 428)

David Hunt (1976) concludes that faculty members have a set of theories about students and the teaching-learning process. As would be implied from Knox's comment, these theories are based on the faculty members' experiences and previous learning. Thus, any individual consultation approach should focus on knowledge and experiences the faculty member has accumulated during his teaching and on his theories of teaching.

Knox also states that adults are more likely to be motivated to learn when they help to identify objectives, select learning tasks, and understand the general procedures to be used in the change process. The models of expert-consultant and problem solving-consultant leave little room for the faculty member's influence on the

theories should help him change his behavior, alter his theories, or both.

The role of the consultant, then, is to help the faculty member explore his espoused theories, understand his theories-in-use (behaviors), perceive the discrepancies, and alter his theories and behaviors in appropriate ways.

Growing from these and a number of other theories is coordinate status consultation for instructional development. Coordinate status consultation is a collaborative process. The faculty consultee enters into consultation as a content expert and primary provider of teaching to his students. The faculty member is recognized for his expertise and his experiences as an instructor are acknowledged to be legitimate. He retains responsibility for his students. The teaching improvement consultant serves as the catalyst for the faculty member who wishes to examine and perhaps change aspects of his teaching. Kurpius and Robinson (1978) summarize the outcomes of such a process: "This collaborative approach results in an efficient and effective

relationship is paramount to the success of the consultation.

The role of the consultant, then, is to help the faculty member explore his espoused theories, understand his theories-in-use (behaviors), perceive explore his theories of teaching and his concerns about teaching, (2) assist the teacher in gathering information about the way he actually teaches and how well students are learning, (3) if appropriate, help the teacher expand his theories and select more effective teaching strategies, (4) assist the faculty member in evaluating outcomes of the new teaching strategy. Figure 1 outlines the phases in coordinate status consultation and some typical strategies used by the teacher and consultant.

Coordinate Status Consultation—Its Implications

Coordinate status has a number of implications for the roles and responsibilities of teacher and consultant and for their relationship. Understanding these implications is crucial to understanding how the model works.

In coordinate status consultation the consultant's focus is the faculty member. The faculty member's concern is his students. Their joint focus is the teacher's instructional improvement goals. However, the consultant does not intervene directly in the classroom nor does she take responsibility for teaching the students. The consultant realizes that ultimately the faculty member must be responsible for his course and his students. Thus, solutions which rely on the consultant teaching a class or creating materials will not be long-term solutions. The consultant's focus on the teacher and the collaborative approach to instructional improvement define the consultant's and the teacher's roles and responsibilities in coordinate status consultation.

Faculty Member Roles

In coordinate status consultation the teacher owns the problem. He is responsible for his own teaching behavior, for student learning, and for changes in his teaching. The teacher cannot shift responsibility to the consultant. He uses the consultant as a collaborator to facilitate his change but he must decide how best that can be done.

Along with retaining responsibility and ownership of his problem the teacher retains power for making decisions. He has the right to determine the focus of consultation. He may decide

"In coordinate status consultation the consultant's focus is the faculty member. The faculty member's concern is his students. Their joint focus is the teacher's instructional improvement goals."

direction of consultation. An alternative model is one in which the faculty member has responsibility for his own change with the consultant assisting in that process.

Argyris and Schoen (1974) contend that people have inconsistencies between their espoused beliefs and their behaviors. The authors say that if a dilemma demanding behavior or theory change is to occur, "events must emphasize the conflict between espoused theory and theory-in-use in ways that overcome normal attempts to avoid noticing the conflict" (p. 31). Merely presenting the faculty member with information from an expert or helping him to resolve personal problems is not likely to produce lasting changes in teaching behaviors. The consultant must collect data and information about the way the faculty member actually teaches, the way he would like to teach, and the way he thinks he teaches. The contrast between the data and the instructor's

alternative process through which members learn to analyze and change their own behaviors..." (p. 5).

Coordinate status consultation is similar to process consultation (Schein, 1969) which is commonly used for organizational development. The similarities are the basic assumptions about change and creating environments conducive to change. But coordinate status consultation and process consultation are different in three important respects:

1. The individual teacher is the focus of change efforts. Changes may have effects on the organization, but those effects may not be significant and they are not the focus of consultation.

2. The focus is on individual problem solving rather than group processes.

3. The teaching improvement consultant is usually part of the same organization as the teacher. Thus, maintaining a coordinate status rela-

Phase	Sample Consultation Strategies
1. Explore the teacher's theories and concerns about teaching. theories and concerns about teaching.	Elicit information through questions Active listening Summarize problem statement Probe for additional information through questions Active listening Summarize problem statement Probe for additional information Reach agreement on problem statement Ask for examples of teaching situations which illustrate the problem Ask for hypothetical ideal teaching situations
2. Gather data about teaching and student learning.	Examine course materials Observe classroom teaching Interview students, examine written evaluation Elicit information through questions Use a framework to focus data gathering activities Examine student written work
3. Examine teacher's theories, select, design, and implement more effective teaching strategies build teacher's skills as needed.	Summarize pertinent information Use a framework to organize feedback Contrast espoused theories with theories in use (data) Oral feedback Written feedback Task analysis Brainstorming Use a framework to analyze interactions Present alternatives and evaluate them Examine feedback: student interviews Prepare materials Change materials, strategies as needed during implementation Provide individual tutoring of students Provide methods for teaching skill acquisition Provide references for reading Model new strategies Conduct group seminars Consultant acts as student Pilot-test in seminar group
4. Evaluate outcomes of new strategies	Pilot-test in classroom Collect data Compare to first set of data Adjust strategies, reevaluate

Figure 1. Coordinate status consultation model and strategies.

to withdraw from consultation rather than change. He might solicit ideas from the consultant, but he can select the idea he considers best, or he can reject all of the ideas. The faculty member determines the type of data the consultant will help to collect. In other words, the teacher has power over the change and problem solving processes because ultimately he is responsible for the effects on student learning caused by those processes.

Because the faculty member does retain power when he engages in coordinate status consultation, he must also agree to take some responsibility for the content, structure, and progress of consultation. He will give information as honestly as he can. He may engage in thought processes as suggested by the consultant. He will gather data for use in the process of examining his teaching. While the faculty member has ultimate power for decision making he knows that the consultant can assist him in the change process. For that purpose he delegates some power to the consultant.

Consultant Roles

If the faculty member has responsibility for solving the problem and power to select the solution, what are appropriate roles for the consultant? The consultant's most important role is facilitator of change. She leads the teacher through an examination of his teaching which consists of the four steps outlined earlier. As a collaborator in this investigation the consultant plays one of a variety of roles depending on the needs of the faculty member. The consultant may be an interviewer, listener, collector and organizer of data, student, teacher, source of information, interpreter, model, mirror, evaluator, or source of reinforcement. At all times the consultant is a negotiator. She helps the faculty member to specify his needs from consultation while she maintains the balance between their responsibilities as defined in coordinate status consultation.

The consultant's power comes from her ability to help the faculty member examine his own teaching. For example, her expertise in collecting, synthesizing, and presenting useful data about the faculty member's teaching is a unique contribution to the relationship. These and other areas of expertise and her ability to play a variety of roles make the consultant a valuable collaborator to the faculty member and thus give her equal status within the relationship.

Consultant-Faculty Relationship

By definition, in coordinate status consultation the relationship between consultant and faculty member is a collegial co-equal one. Consultant and teacher are mutually dependent on one another (Caplan, 1970). The teacher depends on the consultant for the support and the stimulus to change which a second party provides (Peck and Tucker, 1973). In turn, the consultant depends on the faculty member for information about his teaching environment and his conceptualization of the teaching-learning process. The consultant also depends on the faculty member for indications of her own success in encouraging instructional improvement through consultation.

Such a relationship means that the consultant and faculty member must develop a mutual respect. Each learns to trust the expertise of the other while retaining the right to make his own decisions. The teacher and consultant learn to make use of one another's expertise during the consultation process. The consultant might use a faculty member's ability to perform a task as the basis for a task analysis and subsequent teaching strategies. The faculty member might notice the consultant's adept use of questions and ask her to explain the questioning process she uses.

therefore, both consultant and teacher. The example which follows provides an illustration of how the collaborative relationship is established, maintained, and concluded.

An Extended Example

Professor Solomon is a Political Science faculty member at a large university. He teaches two courses each semester, one on the undergraduate level and the other on the graduate level. Solomon called the instructional improvement consultant for his college and requested help in improving his teaching. Solomon explained that his undergraduate course was not going as well as he would like. The consultant and Solomon agreed to meet to discuss his concerns, to determine if the consultant would be able to provide assistance which addresses these concerns, and to outline their responsibilities for consultation.

At this point in the consulting process, the consultant has responsibility for clearly explaining her role and her ability to address the needs of the client before agreeing to collaborate. The teacher has the right to know that the consultant will not be serving as an expert or a problem solver. If Professor Solomon is seeking something other than the assistance she is willing to provide, the consultant may wish to

conversation about Solomon's courses, the consultant and Solomon began to explore his perceptions about teaching. Initially the consultant asked for information about Solomon's perceptions of his strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. As a strength, Solomon identified his ability to explain complex concepts by using simple language and concrete examples. As the discussion continued Solomon began to talk about the factors which he considered to be important for good teaching. The one factor he stressed was his concern for students and whether they are learning what he teaches. Solomon attributed his use of class discussions to that factor. He expressed his concern, however, that those discussions were not going as well as he would like. As necessary, the consultant used questions to elicit Solomon's perceptions of crucial issues in his teaching.

Faculty and consultant responsibilities. During phase one of consultation the consultant's role is to ask questions and the faculty member's role is to provide information. Both are equally important to the collaborative process. The consultant has responsibility to listen carefully and to check her understanding of the faculty member's conceptualization. The faculty member is responsible for providing relevant information as truthfully as he can and for honestly correcting consultant misperceptions.

The consultant seeks to understand the faculty member's concerns for preliminary examination. During this initial phase they usually identify broad concerns such as Solomon's desire to improve classroom discussion. Within this broad area, and usually in the context of a specific course, the consultant asks the faculty member to help her understand salient features of his teaching situation. Without this understanding the consultant cannot collaborate with the faculty member on an equal basis.

New information—the faculty member's espoused theories. In all phases of consultation the faculty member and the consultant will collect and categorize new information about the faculty member's teaching situation. During the initial interview of phase one the consultant is categorizing information about the faculty member's espoused theories and perceptions of his teaching.

Example: The consultant's summary of Solomon's theories and perceptions was as follows:

"Coordinate status consultation is less likely to be successful when one participant has formal authority over the other."

Both consultant and teacher must be assured that the content of consultations will be confidential unless agreement is reached to use the information publicly. This confidentiality is the basis for trust; trust is an essential element in any consultation relationship.

No decisions which affect the direction of consultation can be made unilaterally in a collaborative relationship. Crucial decisions about goals and solutions are considered and negotiated. Areas of disagreement are openly discussed. While the faculty member ultimately makes decisions, he makes them in light of the consultant's comments. Because of their mutual dependence, every decision affects the consulting relationship and,

suggest other resources to meet those needs.

Initial Interview (Phase I)

During the initial interview the consultant seeks to understand the instructor's assumptions about teaching and learning and his perceived strengths and weaknesses. The consultant seeks information about the professor's instructional goals and objectives, students, course content, and teaching strategies. The teacher usually identifies a primary area of concern and the consultant pursues that area by listening to the faculty member's description of his assumptions about teaching and about what occurs in the classroom.

Example. After some general con-

Goals: Wants his students to analyze and evaluate world political events by using knowledge and processes from the course. He seeks active participation by students. He wants them to look at issues from a variety of perspectives.

Students: They are intelligent but not very well informed on current events. They usually complete assigned textbook readings before coming to class. Students are probably motivated to do well in the course. They seem to have difficulty analyzing issues from anything but their own perspectives. They don't interact with one another. Class size is about 30 students.

Content: Theories about power, balance of power, countervailing forces. The possibility of reaching different conclusions based on level of analysis—individual, group (national), societal (world).

Methods: Assigned readings are rarely supplemented by lectures. Short explanations are given to clarify confusing points. Main focus in class is policy analysis. He uses discussion questions for the class.

Instructor's major concerns: Lack of desired type of student participation in course. Inability of students to analyze issues from a variety of perspectives.

By talking about his teaching, Solomon helped the consultant understand his beliefs about teaching and learning in general, as well as his perceptions of his specific teaching situation. Based on this new information and understanding, the consultant and Solomon agreed to collect additional information which would either support or contradict Solomon's theories.

Collecting Other Data

Once the consultant develops a basic understanding of the faculty member's instructional theories, the focus of consultation shifts. Consultant and teacher explore and discuss the teacher's classroom performance. In order to base their discussion on as much information as possible, the collaborators seek information from a variety of sources. The consultant might suggest a rationale for each type of information, but the instructor ultimately decides which sources seem best suited for his purposes.

Example. In working with Solomon, the consultant offered suggestions and rationale for various types of data which could be col-

lected. She mentioned classroom observation, videotape of the class, a list of the questions the teacher planned to use, and student interviews. In addition, she inquired about examining student performance on relevant quiz or examination questions.

Solomon thought they should begin with the consultant observing his class. At the consultant's suggestion he decided that his contribution to data gathering would be a list of the questions he planned for classes which the consultant would observe. The consultant suggested that Solomon could provide additional insight into the observations by making notes after each class concerning his perceptions of student responses, his role in the discussion, areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and an assessment of student performance.

"Solomon was able to identify three areas in which students might be unprepared and thus unable to give the ideal answer."

Faculty and consultant responsibilities. By the end of the discussion the consultant and Solomon had agreed on an area for preliminary analysis and the methods they would use for examining Solomon's current teaching practices. They specified the consultant's and Solomon's responsibilities for bringing data to future discussions. The ability of both collaborators to contribute needed information is a major factor in maintaining the coordinate status relationship.

New information—the faculty member's teaching practices. Each of the three types of information collected contribute to the understanding of how the faculty member actually teaches. The consultant noted the following during her observations of Solomon's class:

Students: The students try to answer when a question is posed. They seem to be ignorant of current events, especially those related to international news which does not involve the United States. Students perceive "multiple perspectives" as meaning all perspectives are (only) opinions. It is questionable whether students have a framework or process they consciously apply when analyz-

ing an issue. Instead, they focus on bits of content for their analysis. When leading a discussion about the realignment of British political parties, the teacher had very little success or student participation.

Methods. The first part of each class was devoted to answering student questions about the readings. Students listen to one another's questions and ask further questions if they don't understand a response. The pattern for most questioning (90%) was instructor question-student response or student question-instructor response.

When conducting the issue analysis discussion the instructor begins with a comprehensive question based on an issue in current events. Primarily he expects students to work from their own current events knowledge. Solomon functions as discussion organizer. He recognizes various stu-

dent volunteers, reinforces contributions, and decides when to move on to another issue. Usually he lets student comments stand. Occasionally he probes for more explanation. The patterns from the earlier discussion are repeated here. Approximately eight out of 30 students participated in this part of the discussion.

Solomon provided a written copy of the discussion questions he asked during class:

1. How would the theory of countervailing power explain the seizing of the American Embassy in Iran?
2. What aspects of the Iranian situation do not fit the theory?
3. What might be some competing interest groups in Iran? How might the authors of the readings on interest groups explain the action of the "students?"
4. What national interests and world interest are in conflict in such a situation?
5. How would the various power theories we have studied explain the recent shift in alignment in British political parties?

Finally, Solomon noted that the class was typical. Students gave superficial answers to the first questions but

did not respond to the last one. He was not satisfied with their performance.

The data gathered reflect the difference in perspectives between the faculty member and the consultant. Data from each of these perspectives are vital if the faculty member's teaching practices are to be clearly understood.

Using Data (Phase III)

The purpose in collecting data is to enable the faculty member to examine his beliefs and assumptions about teaching in light of information about his teaching practices. By comparing and contrasting the instructor's perceptions of the class with the information gathered by the consultant, the faculty member's understanding of what occurs in the classroom is enriched. The enriched understanding frequently enables the faculty member to redefine his assumptions about teaching and subsequently leads to changes in his teaching.

Example. During the first meeting following data collection Solomon expressed his concern about the problems he had in promoting analytical discussions. The consultant began by asking Solomon to identify specific frustrations he felt during the discussion. He focused immediately on the last question from his list. Solomon could not understand the students' lack of response. Based on the first part of the class Solomon concluded that they understood the theories. He had wanted students to apply various theories and to see how they would reach a different conclusion depending on the theory they applied. The consultant suggested that she play the role of the instructor and that Solomon, playing a student, answer the question as he would have liked his students to respond.

Faculty and consultant responsibilities. Both the consultant and Solomon followed through on their responsibilities in the coordinate status consultation model. The consultant did not begin by outlining a laundry list of problems to be cleaned up for the next observation. Instead she asked Solomon to describe his intentions when using a strategy. She encouraged him to evaluate the outcome of the approach and to produce alternative explanations for the outcome. Solomon provided his responses and engaged in the thought processes suggested by the consultant. He brought data to the discussion as did the consultant. While the data are of different types, both are necessary

to the consultation process.

New information—sources of learning problems. The consultant led Solomon through an examination of the sample ideal answer. Together they listed the knowledge and skill which students would need to give the ideal answer. By comparing that list to the available data Solomon was able to identify three areas in which students might be unprepared and thus unable to give the ideal answer:

1. knowledge of relevant current events
2. skill in performing a logical, organized, comprehensive analysis
3. ability to take multiple perspectives, especially ones which differ from their own beliefs

Important pieces of data led Solomon to these potential sources of learning problems. The consultant had provided Solomon with a summary of his assumptions about teaching and learning. One of those assumptions concerned the students' unfamiliarity with current events. A second important piece of data was student performance on the questions about Iran and Solomon's reaction to it. This led him to observe that even when students know the current event they do not analyze it effectively. Finally, Solomon used his recollection of student responses and those quoted by the consultant to test this conclusion; these data corroborated his suspicions that students have difficulty viewing the same event from a number of points of view.

information were both needed for a successful consultation.

Planning New Teaching Strategies

During this part of phase III the consultant works with the faculty member to understand implications of the data gathered on teaching processes. Typically a hypothesis about the factors affecting the particular concern of the instructor is generated. This hypothesis leads to selection of teaching strategies which address these important factors.

Example. Solomon and the consultant determined that their first concern should be the three areas which inhibit students' ability to contribute to discussions. Solomon hypothesized that there was a direct connection between students' ignorance of current events and their inability to answer certain questions. The consultant helped Solomon explore this connection by asking questions to clarify the hypothesis and to specify the data which he used to support that hypothesis.

Solomon concluded that most students are ignorant of current events because they do not read newspapers or hear news broadcasts. He concluded that this severely constrained their ability to answer his questions. Current events knowledge was the material students had to use to demonstrate their ability to use the theories in analysis of issues. The consultant and Solomon decided that their

"The consultant led Solomon through an examination of the sample ideal answer."

Solomon's focus on classroom discussion was only one of many teaching issues that he could have addressed. That focus might have been different than the one the consultant would have selected. But obviously the issue is important to Solomon. He mentioned it during the initial interview, commented on it in his notes about the class, and selected it as his first issue for discussion. All of these provided signals to the consultant that the issue should be explored. Again, the instructor's information and the consultant's skill in interpreting that

first concern should be ways to increase students' knowledge of current events.

Faculty and consultant responsibilities. In this part of phase III, the faculty member becomes a "scientist." He examines the data, generates hypotheses about possible new teaching approaches, and examines the viability of various approaches to testing hypotheses by using data already collected. The consultant offers possible teaching strategies and approaches to testing those strategies, monitors the congruence of the

hypotheses given the available data, and calls attention to any inconsistencies. It is the consultant's responsibility to monitor this congruence and it is the instructor's responsibility to determine the level of congruence needed before trying a new approach in the classroom.

While it is the instructor's responsibility to use the most viable teaching approaches for his circumstances, it is the consultant's responsibility to insure that the faculty member is knowledgeable and skilled in the use of that approach. The consultant may assume the role of model, of student, or of tutor to assist the instructor in learning and practicing the new teaching approach before its actual implementation in the classroom setting.

New information—instructional implications. The teacher's hypothesis reads, "Students' inability to participate in discussion is due in part to a lack of knowledge of current events. In order to get better discussions I must increase students' knowledge of current events." While the test of this hypothesis ultimately occurred in the classroom, the consultant and instructor assessed the viability of several instructional approaches to test the hypothesis. Solomon and the consul-

ing the critical events in a major geographical region of the world each week.

Solomon rejected the first idea (one of his own suggestions); he felt that students needed more direction in their reading if they were going to be quizzed. Since his students were acting responsibly and preparing assigned readings, Solomon felt the quiz would be unnecessary. Solutions 4 and 6 required too much class time. The consultant commented that lecturing also would not encourage students to study current events independently. Merely requiring purchase of a magazine would not assure that students would read it; Solomon rejected option 5. The consultant and Solomon decided to use approaches 2 and 3 and to evaluate which of the two produced the most desirable results.

When searching for these new teaching strategies Solomon frequently called upon the consultant's knowledge of teaching and learning. Their coordinate status relationship was maintained because Solomon had responsibility for using the consultant's information and for providing critical information about his own students, goals, content, and preferred teaching style. Collaboration was necessary to

events reading assignments. On the basis of new observation data, he concluded that both homework assignments to read current event articles and short articles to be read in class increased student participation in discussions. Solomon preferred the outside assignments since they did not require class time, and students could read at their own pace.

But Solomon was not entirely satisfied with the specific article assignments either. He felt that students were doing analyses based on limited data—the one or two articles he provided on the topic. Interviews with students supported his theory. As a result, Solomon modified his approach. Instead of assigning a specific article, he identified current event topics and some general issues students should explore using periodicals. Later when students seemed ready to take additional responsibility, Solomon simply assigned a topic and asked students to seek appropriate information and to identify the critical issues.

Faculty and consultant roles. The faculty member in this phase is responsible for implementing new teaching strategies consistent with his new understanding of students. On this basis, the faculty member can gather information relevant to evaluating the strategy. For example, he can assess students' knowledge through questioning or students' interest in the topic through an assessment of their level of involvement in the discussion. During implementation, the consultant's role shifts to that of an observer of the instructional process in order to gather data to evaluate the success of the new teaching strategy.

As in earlier phases of collaboration, the faculty member and consultant pool their information to arrive at a decision regarding the success of the strategy. Coordinate status remains intact as long as each participant contributes to the effort.

New information—revised theories. Based on the information obtained during the evaluation, Solomon had three new theories to use in understanding his class:

1. Students will keep up with current events when that is part of the course assignments.

2. Students need a significant amount of information about current events if they are going to do meaningful analyses of them.

3. When gradually given less structure, students can learn to explore cur-

"Just as faculty learn to rely on one another's expertise in research methodology, cogent writing, and conceptualization, they can learn to use a consultant's expertise as a collaborator in facilitating improved teaching."

tant began by examining these approaches in light of the information they had collected. Solomon and the consultant compiled a list of six possible instructional approaches:

1. Weekly quizzes on current events
2. Assignments to read specific newspaper articles before coming to class
3. Short articles to read during class before beginning discussions
4. Lectures by Solomon which summarize current events
5. Distribute special student discount coupons to Newsweek and Time magazines and require students to subscribe
6. Break class into groups of six or seven students with one student in each group responsible for summariz-

ing the problem through consultation.

Evaluating New Teaching Strategies (Phase IV)

Evaluation takes place as the instructor experiments with new approaches and also when the consultant and instructor are ready to terminate consultation or focus on a new problem. The first evaluation helps the instructor adjust new teaching strategies and determine whether he is implementing them as intended. The faculty member and consultant may also collect data concerning the effects new strategies are having on student learning.

Example. Solomon began building discussions around particular current

rent events on their own.

Solomon's refinement of his new teaching strategy and articulation of the third theory occurred as a result of the evaluation information contributed by both participants. Continuous assessment of consistency between what the faculty member would like to occur in the class and what does occur is essential to effective teaching. Information gathered in these assessments is used to revise and refine a faculty member's theories and consequently his teaching strategies.

Some Cautions

As much as we find coordinate

bly will not be successful with faculty who are required to participate, because they may be reluctant to participate fully. Without that commitment the faculty member and consultant are not contributing on an equal basis. In coordinate status consultation the consultant cannot solve a teaching problem without active participation by the faculty member. This same difficulty occurs with faculty who seek a low-effort solution to instructional problems. Both faculty member and consultant must agree that teaching improvement will require intensive cooperative efforts. Those who participate as col-

and responsibilities throughout the consultation process enables both the consultant and the faculty member to maintain control over decisions. At the same time the faculty member's ultimate responsibility for student learning and his power in the instructional improvement process are acknowledged. Third, the faculty member's ability to analyze his own instructional setting is improved. Consequently the faculty member becomes more responsible for continually examining his own teaching and seeking the help he needs to make desired changes.

Collaborative consultation based on a coordinate status relationship between consultant and faculty member reflects the realities of teaching. Ultimately, the faculty member is responsible for his own classroom and for making changes in his teaching. Coordinate status consultation merely extends to teaching improvement the collaborative approach faculty have used for research projects. Just as faculty learn to rely on one another's expertise in research methodology, cogent writing, and conceptualization, they can learn to use a consultant's expertise as a collaborator in facilitating improved teaching.

"The faculty member brings his knowledge of his content area and his teaching environment to the relationship. The consultant provides his expertise in examining teaching concerns and facilitating change."

status consultation to be a useful model for helping faculty members address teaching concerns and make significant changes, we believe it is not ideal for all settings. Coordinate status consultation is less likely to be successful when one participant has formal authority over the other. This usually happens when the consultant (say a department chairman) is in a position of power over the faculty member. This unequal power relationship violates a basic assumption of coordinate status consultation. Even if the consultant does not see himself acting as an authority over the faculty member, the faculty member is unlikely to forget the power of the consultant. This feeling may constrain the faculty member's ability to openly explore his problems, discuss hypotheses, and critically evaluate his own teaching.

Coordinate status consultation may not be effective when faculty expect the consultant to be acting as an expert or a problem solver. With such expectations come demands for the consultant to implement solutions or give definite answers. At times such expectations can be changed, but if they are not the faculty member will view the consultant as failing to deliver the implied services.

Coordinate status consultation pro-

laborators come to recognize that teaching improvement is not "once and done" but instead is a continuing process. A major goal of coordinate status consultation is to teach faculty a process for examining their own instruction. Learning the process and feeling comfortable with using it demands time and a willingness to struggle through the process.

Conclusions

The effectiveness of coordinate status consultation depends on the consultant and faculty member establishing and maintaining a relationship in which both are responsible for contributing information, hypotheses, and instructional approaches appropriate to the issue under discussion. Participation by both collaborators is necessary to assure an accurate conceptualization of the instructional process which is necessary for making significant changes in teaching.

Coordinate status consultation offers a powerful approach to improving instruction for several reasons. First, it continually focuses on the concerns of the faculty member and his past knowledge and experience; this focus is required for working effectively with adults as learners. Second, the negotiation of each participant's roles

References

- Argyris, C., & Schoen, D. A. *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Caplan, G. *The theory and practice of mental health consultation*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Hunt, D.E. Teachers are psychologists too: On the application of psychology to education. *Canadian Psychological Review*, 1976, 17, 210-218.
- Knox, A. B. *Adult development and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Kurpius, D., & Robinson, S.E. An overview of consultation. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1978, 56, (5 and 6), 4-6.
- Peck, R.F., & Tucker, J.A. Research on teacher education. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.
- Schein, E.H. *Process consultation: Its role in organization development*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.