

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345553610>

Teacher design teams as a strategy for professional development: the role of the facilitator

Chapter · October 2018

DOI: 10.4324/9781315123431-3

CITATIONS

0

READS

89

5 authors, including:



[Heleen Becuwe](#)

Ghent University

11 PUBLICATIONS 136 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Jo Tondeur](#)

Vrije Universiteit Brussel and University of Wollongong

255 PUBLICATIONS 14,795 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Natalie Pareja Roblin](#)

University of Amsterdam

44 PUBLICATIONS 3,404 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Jeroen Thys](#)

UC Leuven-Limburg

10 PUBLICATIONS 145 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Educational Research and Evaluation

An International Journal on Theory and Practice

ISSN: 1380-3611 (Print) 1744-4187 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/nere20>

Teacher design teams as a strategy for professional development: the role of the facilitator

Heleen Becuwe, Jo Tondeur, Natalie Pareja Roblin, Jeroen Thys & Els Castelein

To cite this article: Heleen Becuwe, Jo Tondeur, Natalie Pareja Roblin, Jeroen Thys & Els Castelein (2016): Teacher design teams as a strategy for professional development: the role of the facilitator, Educational Research and Evaluation, DOI: [10.1080/13803611.2016.1247724](https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2016.1247724)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2016.1247724>



Published online: 23 Oct 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=nere20>

Teacher design teams as a strategy for professional development: the role of the facilitator

Heleen Becuwe^a, Jo Tondeur^{a,b}, Natalie Pareja Roblin^{a,c}, Jeroen Thys^d and Els Castelein^d

^aDepartment of Educational Studies, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; ^bInterfaculty Department for Teacher Education, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium; ^cLearning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, USA; ^dUC Leuven – Limburg Teacher Education, Leuven, Belgium

ABSTRACT

The goal of the current study was to explore the role and importance of the facilitator in teacher design teams. The study took place in the context of a pre-service teacher education institution in Belgium, where teacher design teams were set up to facilitate the professional development of teacher educators. The findings from focus-group discussions with team members and semi-structured interviews with facilitators confirm that the perceived importance of a facilitator depends on several factors, such as team characteristics and the design phase. Moreover, we found that a facilitator can fulfil three roles in a dynamic way: (a) providing logistic support, (b) scaffolding the design process, and (c) monitoring the design process. The discussion centres on how these results can be used to support facilitators for successful Teacher Design Teams.

KEYWORDS

Teacher design teams; professional development; curriculum design; facilitator

Introduction and background of the study

Professional development of teachers

The professional development of teachers plays a crucial role in improving the quality of education and classroom practices (Loughran, 2014). Because one-day events such as seminars are not effective enough in bringing change to the teaching practice (McConnell, Parker, Eberhardt, Koehler, & Lundeberg, 2013), teachers' professional learning arrangements are shifting towards demand-driven models with teachers as active participants (Lim & Lee, 2014). In this respect, communities of practice can play a role in the professional development of teachers and can encourage innovation (Bruining, 2007). Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better through regular interaction (Wenger, 2011; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). Collaboration in communities of practice produces a common repertoire of perceptions, vocabulary, and routines (Bruining, 2007).

In education, communities of practice can take multiple forms (e.g., knowledge networks, professional learning communities). Often, communities of practice engage in collaborative design. Several studies suggest that the involvement of teachers in

collaborative design constitutes an effective strategy for professional development (e.g., Bakah, Voogt, & Pieters, 2012; Simmie, 2007; Voogt et al., 2011). In this study, we therefore focus on a specific form of teacher collaboration within communities of practice, known as teacher design teams. A teacher design team (TDT) can be described as a group of two or more teachers who (re-)design curriculum materials together (Handelzalts, 2009). A distinctive characteristic of TDTs is the sort of design task at hand. Several studies show that to facilitate a successful design process, sufficient time and support are necessary (Handelzalts, 2009; Huizinga, Handelzalts, Nieveen, & Voogt, 2015).

The roles of facilitators

In the context of professional development programmes, a TDT is often supported by a facilitator. This can be someone from within the institution (e.g., Faas, 2012) or an external supporter (e.g., Handelzalts, 2009). For example, in the study of Faas (2012), the facilitator is an “internal designer” who thinks together with the team (not apart from the team) and guides them in the right direction. On the other hand, Handelzalts (2009) sees facilitators as “external experts” who provide the TDTs with new options and venues for development, thereby bringing in new knowledge and enriching the discussion.

Multiple studies have defined the role of the facilitator in different ways and attribute multiple roles to the facilitator (e.g., Faas, 2012; Fulton & Britton, 2011; Handelzalts, 2009; Huizinga, Handelzalts, Nieveen, & Voogt, 2013; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Marsh, Bertrand, & Huguet, 2015; Petrone & Ortquist-Ahrens, 2004; Truijen, Slegers, Meelissen, & Nieuwenhuis, 2013). Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al. (2013) identified three gaps in teachers’ design expertise (curriculum design expertise, pedagogical content knowledge, and curricular consistency expertise) and formulated guidelines for facilitators to address them. According to these authors, it is crucial that TDTs receive support in every stage of the design process to address the lack of curriculum design expertise, especially during the analysis and evaluation stages, as TDTs experience most knowledge and skill-related problems while enacting these activities (Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013). To prevent valuable time being lost in creating already available materials, it would seem useful for the facilitator to offer some technical support as well (Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013). The facilitator can close the third gap (i.e., lack of curricular consistency expertise) by introducing activities to align the visions of the team members (Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013).

In the study of Truijen et al. (2013), managers adopted the role of facilitators in teacher teams in a vocational education context. These authors suggest that the support of a facilitator is most necessary when there is no natural leader in the team itself. Facilitators need to embrace transformational leadership, which leads to a shared vision and trust within the team (Truijen et al., 2013). They must help teams to determine their direction. According to Nieveen, Handelzalts, Van den Akker, and Homminga (2005), a facilitator can provide pro-active support, helping to outline the design process, and re-active support, following the team’s enacted design process. Facilitators determine the type of support based on the needs of the teams. Several studies show that the role of the facilitator depends on the situation (Patton, Parker, & Neutzling, 2012), contextual boundaries (Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013; Huizinga, Handelzalts, Nieveen, & Voogt, 2015; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001), and the preferences of the facilitator (Huizinga, Handelzalts,

et al., 2013). Aligning teachers' and facilitators' preferences for support is vital, as it prevents conflicting expectations of the role of the facilitators (Nieveen et al., 2005).

Process of facilitating

Looking at the process of facilitating, Erickson, Brandes, Mitchell, and Mitchell (2005) emphasize three important issues. First, there has to be consensus on the goal of the work, as sometimes teachers and facilitators have different agendas. Second, facilitators should introduce a formal theory in the work of the team. Providing the right tools can facilitate the design process (Linder, 2011). This should be done with the utmost care, as the theoretical perspective might not be embraced by teachers when it does not match with their practical perspective formed by class experiences. Third, it has to be clear who "owns" the team's agenda. Therefore, the facilitator needs to find a balance between the required and offered support (Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013; Nieveen et al., 2005). This support should be offered just in time and as an integrated part of the design process (cf. Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Nieveen et al., 2005; Van Driel, De Jong, & Verloop, 2002).

Teacher educator design teams

There is growing evidence about the potential benefits of TDTs for the professional development of teachers (e.g., Voogt et al., 2015). However, much less is known about the implementation of this professional development strategy with teacher educators. Teacher educators must increasingly professionalize to ensure the quality of teacher education (Smith, 2003; Tack & Vanderlinde, 2014). Also called "second order teachers", teacher educators not only teach a certain subject, they also teach others how to teach. Their tasks are therefore somewhat different from the tasks of a teacher (Loughran, 2014). It could therefore reasonably be argued that an important difference between the notion of professional development in relation to teachers and teacher educators is enmeshed in the sense of professional autonomy and responsibility attached to the respective roles and their accompanying expectations (Loughran, 2014). If teacher educators have different roles than teachers, questions arise about the implementation of TDTs that consist of teacher educators.

Purpose of the study

In the context of a professional development project for teacher educators, several TDTs were implemented in a teacher educator institution in Flanders. Each TDT consisted of three to four teacher educators and was supported by a facilitator from the same institution. The aim of the current study was to explore the different roles of a TDT facilitator of teams consisting of teacher educators. The current study therefore adds to the existing literature about the implementation of TDTs in teacher education institutions by contributing insights about the facilitation of teacher educator teams. The two main research questions guiding this study were:

- (1) What are the specific roles of the facilitator in a TDT?
- (2) What is the (perceived) importance of the facilitator in a TDT?

Methodology

Descriptive case study

To gain in-depth insight into the role of the facilitator, a case study was conducted in a teacher education institution. This was accomplished by collecting and triangulating the views of the participating teacher educators and the facilitators of three TDTs. Specifically, data were drawn from focus groups with participating teacher educators. Semi-structured interviews collected the perspectives of the facilitators (see [Table 1](#) for an overview). We used the data collection from one source (i.e., teacher educators participating in TDT), to validate data from the other source, (i.e., facilitators of the TDTs) (Kimchi, Polivka, & Stevenson, 1991).

Context of the study

The case is situated in the context of a teacher education institution in Flanders, the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium. The implementation of TDTs in this institution originated from the specific training needs of teacher educators concerning technology-enhanced learning, (curriculum) research, and assessment. Each of the TDTs had its own focus and worked together on a regular basis, though differing in intensities. [Table 1](#) gives an overview of the respondents' characteristics. In the results section, more contextual information is given about each TDT.

Instruments and analysis

The focus-group discussions provided the participants of the three TDTs a chance to talk about the affordances and limitations of working in their teams with a specific focus on the role of the facilitator. The researcher assured that discussions addressed the participants'

Table 1. Summary of respondents.

TDT		Gender	Years of experience in TEI	Position in TEI	Role in TDT
Communicative Skills	Respondent 1	female	5	teacher educator Communication	participant
	Respondent 2	female	3	teacher educator Communication	participant
	Respondent 3	female	12	teacher educator Communication	participant
Languages	Respondent 4	female	9	teacher educator French	participant
	Respondent 5	male	6	teacher educator English	participant
	Respondent 6*	female	5	teacher educator Dutch	participant
Communicative Skills & Languages	Respondent 7	male	12	educational developer	coach
Natural Sciences	Respondent 8	female	9	teacher educator Physics	participant
	Respondent 9	female	4	teacher educator Biology	participant
	Respondent 10	male	23	teacher educator Bio- technics	participant
	Respondent 11*	female	8	teacher educator Bio- technics	participant
	Respondent 12	female	8	research coordinator	coach

*not present during focus-group discussion.

views about the role and importance of the facilitator, and that all respondents were given sufficient opportunity to contribute their views. In order to triangulate the views of the teacher educators, in-depth interviews were conducted with the facilitators of the teams. Examples of questions are presented in [Table 2](#).

All interviews and focus groups were audio recorded with the informed consent of participants. Next, case-specific data were first analysed and then systematically subjected to cross-case analysis. A technique of inductive thematic analysis was used. Inductive codes were assigned to segments of data that described a new theme observed in the text (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Finally, patterns and differences across the participants and facilitators from the different TDTs were identified through constant comparisons.

Results

In this section, we describe the roles attributed to the facilitator and the perceived importance of the facilitator. For each case, we present this from the viewpoint of the facilitator and the team members.

Team A (Communicative Skills)

The members of Team A focused on “Communicative Skills”. In the previous academic year, these three teacher educators taught specific topics concerning communicative skills to the same groups of students, and now wanted to use shared cases. The activities of the team were therefore focused on developing these shared cases and setting up a blog for the student teachers aimed at contributing to set goals for linguistic development in education. The facilitator of this TDT is an educational developer, mainly for technology-enhanced learning. He was assigned to this TDT because of his experience with ICT integration in language courses.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator of Team A enumerated several tasks for which he was responsible within his team. “Contacting external experts”, “taking notes”, and “reserving a conference room” were some administrative tasks he performed. He further tried to keep an eye on the process and to stimulate collaboration without being overbearing by “stimulating interaction and communication” and “structuring the process by asking questions and rephrasing what team members had said”. There was one teacher educator in this team “who took on a leading role”, and the facilitator confirms it was probably the best not to interrupt this process. The facilitator thought it would be better to follow the process instead of intervening:

Table 2. Examples of interview and focus-group topics and questions.

Component	Question
a) Role of the coach	<i>Could you describe your role in the TDT? Could you describe the role of the coach in your TDT?</i>
b) Perceived importance of the coach	<i>What role did you have in changing the practice? What role did the coach have in changing your practice?</i>

I kept an eye on it from the sideline, rather informal, to avoid giving the impression of interfering too much, because that was not the intention. I just wanted something to happen, and if they could take action without lots of help, okay, no problem.

Interestingly, the team members stated that they did not get any support from their facilitator: "We didn't see him; he was never there. But it wasn't a problem because we didn't need him". The facilitator also presented some design frameworks and tools to structure and facilitate the design process. However, the team members indicated that they did not like the digital environment the facilitator provided at the start: "The digital environment proposed by the facilitator was not a good idea at all".

Perceived importance of the facilitator

The teacher members of this team questioned the importance of a facilitator. "I didn't like it; why should he monitor us?", one of them asked. They said they would have preferred being supported by an expert. "If the facilitator had been a specialist, it would have been real quality support". The facilitator, in turn, felt that he was not welcomed into the team. He states: "Having people skills are the most important skills a facilitator needs". According to him, "You need people skills to sense what sort of support a TDT needs" and "A facilitator is important to provide structure to the collaboration and design process".

Team B (Languages)

Due to practical reasons, the facilitator of Team A also supported Team B, which consisted of one teacher educator who taught Dutch, one who taught French and one who taught English. As language teachers, they focused their design work on aligning their assessment principles. After informing themselves and getting advice from an external expert, they made up a visual representation of the relative importance of grammar, linguistic creativity, and of teaching languages in relation to one another for each phase of the curriculum. This had the additional goal of making assessment clear and transparent for all language students throughout their training.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator stated that he had more or less the same tasks in Team B as he had in Team A. He performed the administrative tasks. The members of team Languages mentioned that the facilitator indeed sent e-mails to arrange meetings and that he presented some useful design models to structure the design process. As with Team A, the facilitator monitored the process and supported the collaboration from the sideline. "It doesn't help to disturb the process at every turn", he said. He tried to record the process by posting it on a blog, as a form of an archive team members could return to. "Too much meddling is a trap facilitators have to be aware of", according to this facilitator. The team members said that the facilitator played an important role at the start: "He set us in motion, but further on, we didn't see him anymore. And that was okay".

Perceived importance of the facilitator

According to the facilitator, he was more present during meetings in Team B than he was in Team A, because no-one emerged as a specific leader in Team B. But he still offered

subtle support, he said. The members of Team B thought that a facilitator was not really necessary because teacher educators have enough experience working in a team without the support of a facilitator. “If a design team can’t work on his own, it isn’t a design team”, said the members of the team. “If members of a design team don’t agree on a shared goal, a facilitator will only push them, which would have a negative effect”.

Team C: Natural Sciences

Team C focused on “Natural Sciences”. Four teacher educators (one expert in biology, one in physics, two in bio-technics) joined forces in a TDT to integrate natural sciences into their own courses. They focused on content and on how to free up space in the teacher education institution (TEI) curriculum for a natural sciences course. Natural sciences is not a specific course in the TEI, although it has recently become part of secondary education curricula through the combination of several science subjects. The TEI’s research coordinator acted as a facilitator for this team. At the time, she was also the vice-dean of the TEI and wanted to facilitate a TDT because of her role in supporting innovation within the institution.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator of the team Natural Sciences states: “Archiving and documenting the process were some of my tasks”. She also mentions that she planned and facilitated events in the institution. She was involved in integrating (a) the TDT collaboration during professionalization days and (b) TDT presentations during meetings in the institution. Besides making it possible for a TDT to work together and presenting their work, this facilitator added that “team members proposed some content-related matters, and I needed to find out whether it was possible to program them”. The team members also referred to the facilitator’s organization of practical matters: “Our facilitator sent all the necessary e-mails, took care of arrangements and officially recorded our ideas”.

Along with this logistic assistance, the facilitator promoted learning in the team by monitoring the process, as illustrated by her own words: “It was facilitating by providing the impetus to start and then keeping the process running by asking how it’s going”. The team members mentioned this too: “(When we were planning to meet, she said): No, not next week, but this week. In that way, a facilitator can improve a team’s efficiency as well”. According to the facilitator, “adequate support at the beginning was necessary because they were not familiar with the methodology”. It was particularly in the beginning, then, that this facilitator was present to get teachers started. The team members stated that “our facilitator brought the team together” and “she provided the incentive to collaborate”.

The facilitator of team Natural Sciences added: “I gave process-oriented support, but I couldn’t help them with content issues; that was not my task”. Team members indicated as well that the facilitator structured the process by providing a framework: “When we were sitting together that day, she told us where to go, what to do: She provided a framework”.

According to the facilitator, she sometimes needed to be a decision-maker as well: “A team is not always capable of taking decisions, and then the facilitator needs to do that”.

Perceived importance of the facilitator

Regarding the perceived importance of the facilitator, the opinions of facilitator and team members are more or less the same. The facilitator of this team said that it is important that a TDT is supported by a facilitator. "Without a facilitator, it is too informal", she said. "A TDT needs someone who is available for support; a facilitator has an added value". The team members were also positive about the presence of the facilitator. Only once was the co-dean referred to as more important than the facilitator, as the co-dean had to take some institutional decisions. Teacher educators of this team, just like their facilitator, were convinced that the facilitator has an added value in a TDT, especially in teams that take less initiative. "A facilitator can increase efficiency", they stated. Generally, the team members concluded that their facilitator was a good leader: "She's a good leader. She does not do it in a very compelling way, but she's a leader all the same".

Discussion and cross-case analysis

The aim of this study was to find out what kind of support a facilitator can provide and how important a facilitator is according to team members and facilitators themselves. Based on a cross-case analysis, we can conclude that there are three roles a facilitator of a TDT consisting of teacher educators can fulfil: (a) providing logistic support, (b) scaffolding the design process, and (c) monitoring the design process.

The results show that the usefulness of these roles depends on several factors: the design phase, team characteristics, and team members' relationship with the facilitator. Each team, therefore, needs specific support depending on the context. The members of Team A, for example, indicated they did not need any support from their facilitator. This section ends with considerations for future research and practical implications.

Roles of the facilitator

Providing logistic support

In each TDT in this study, the facilitators provided logistical support in the practical organization of team activities, thereby adopting the role of administrator. The facilitator of the first two teams, for example, made external contacts, took notes, sent emails, and reserved the conference room. The facilitator of Team C archived and documented the process. Team members confirmed that their facilitator took responsibility for archiving, corresponding with outside contacts and reporting. McLaughlin and Talbert (2014) also state that a facilitator should be able to coordinate and organize a TDT.

Scaffolding the design process

A facilitator supports a TDT by providing scaffolds to structure the process. This may be a formal framework to work with, a useful design model or an online learning environment to share information. Providing the right tools can facilitate the design process (Linder, 2011). In the cases studied, facilitators presented possible design models and digital tools that could structure the design process. The presented scaffolds were not meant to be mandatory, just supportive. Nevertheless, Team A did not like the scaffold they got from their facilitator. This is in line with the recommendations that Erickson et al.

(2005) make. Facilitators should indeed introduce a formal theory in the work of the team, but they should do this with the utmost care (Erickson et al., 2005).

Monitoring the design process

Next to providing logistic support and scaffolding the design process, facilitators also monitor the design process so the collaboration runs smoothly. Both facilitators in this study indeed address the importance of finding a balance between monitoring the design process and interrupting too often. They felt that teacher educators are able to act autonomously on many occasions. Team members indicated that they did not need a facilitator and can work on their own. Therefore, both facilitators in this study felt that they need to be there to provide support when necessary but from outside the general discussion. Huizinga, Nieveen, Handelzalts, and Voogt (2013) call this integrated just-in-time support. The authors advise facilitators to look for a balance between support that is offered and support that is requested.

Perceived importance of the facilitator

The value of a facilitator depends on several factors. The multiple roles a facilitator fulfils vary in importance throughout the design process and depend on the team, illustrated by Figure 1.

Impact of the design phase

In this study, the facilitators indicated that the biggest part of their role was in the starting phase of the design process. A facilitator can provide the impetus to start the process. The importance of the facilitator in the starting phase is confirmed by several authors (e.g., Handelzalts, 2009; Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013), who stress the importance of a facilitator during the entire design process, but particularly during the analysis (and evaluation) phase. The less familiar members of the team are with the concept of TDTs, the more




Figure 1. Diverse roles of a TDT facilitator depending on several factors.

support is needed at the start. However, although members of both Teams A and B said that the facilitator put the process in motion, they did not react to that positively.

Influence of team characteristics

The most striking finding in this study was how much the role of the facilitators differed depending on team characteristics. In one team, for example, a team member took the lead, so the facilitator did not have to guide the team as a leader. This finding is consistent with previous research (e.g., Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al., 2013; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Patton et al., 2012). There are some common roles attributed to the facilitator of a TDT, but it seems that flexibility is the most important characteristic. This means that a facilitator adjusts the level of support to the needs of a specific TDT. Teams A and B were supported by the same facilitator, but he felt that he had to behave differently in each team. With just-in-time and hands-on support, a facilitator can respond to team characteristics and specific team needs. The Delphi study of Becuwe et al. (2015) also indicates that a flexible facilitator was perceived as important by multiple stakeholders involved in TDT.

Relation between facilitator and team members

In this study, two teams were rather negative about the presence of their facilitator, whereas the third team was more positive about the facilitator. The team with the positive attitude towards the facilitator, however, suggested that support by a facilitator is more important for teams that take less initiative. This is consistent with the idea that exists within teams that have a more negative attitude towards the facilitator: A facilitator is not necessary because teacher educators are capable enough to do it on their own. This is in line with Loughran's (2014) definition of teacher educators as those who have more autonomy and control over their work than teachers per se, because they are "second order teachers". It is worth noting that the facilitators in this study were part of the same institution, which might have raised some power issues. According to Little (1990), teachers' autonomy is mostly grounded in norms of privacy and non-interference: They want to be certain of controlling their work. Working with others exposes them to criticism and conflict. In the cases studied, facilitators were often seen as peers and not as experts who could make a contribution to the team. This may explain why team members felt that they did not need support from a facilitator. However, their negative perceptions could also be due to personality characteristics of the facilitator instead of the perceived importance of a facilitator.

Focus-group conversations with both teams make clear that the support of the facilitator was considered not necessary, although one team really appreciated what their facilitator did. We can hypothesize that teams with a more negative attitude towards the facilitator have other basic assumptions about the role of the facilitator than teams who are more open to their presence. This suggests that some teams presume that the facilitator will be too controlling, while other teams view the facilitator as simply a member of the team.

We can consider a fourth factor influencing the perception of the facilitator: the task or goal of a TDT. Some tasks (e.g., aligning assessment principles may be of a different kind and require different external support – Team B – than integrating natural sciences – Team

C) imply a different role for the facilitator and different expectations from the teacher educators.

Considerations for future research

Related to the conclusion that the role of a facilitator depends on the context, we can assume that not every TDT needs the same type of facilitator. The roles and the importance of the facilitator depend on several factors, mentioned above. This study shows that teacher educators participating in a TDT are sometimes sceptical about the importance of a facilitator. They do not accept support by a facilitator because he/she does not have the expertise they expect, or they feel like they are autonomous enough to fulfil the design task on their own. Further research could investigate the implementation of TDTs in which teacher educators choose their own facilitators (this was not the case in our study), and what the effects of this are on the functioning of the team.

For this study, we do not know in what way teams succeeded in their assignment or task. Therefore, further research can focus on the relationship between the roles of the facilitator (and in particular on the team's perception of his/her roles) and the effectiveness of teams. Will the effectiveness of the teams be dependent on the role of the facilitator and the team's perception of the facilitator? Research could also be conducted into whether successful teams are more positive about the role of the facilitator and whether teams tend to attribute their success to their own functioning and their failure to the facilitator. Further research could also investigate the impact of the facilitator on the effectiveness of the TDT and on the innovativeness of the design tasks TDTs engage with.

Huizinga, Handelzalts, et al. (2013) suggest that support from a facilitator is important to develop teachers' curriculum design expertise. Interestingly, our findings reveal that facilitators only provided limited support in this regard. One possible explanation for this is that the TDTs were in earlier stages of their development. In a study of the roles of facilitators throughout the development of professional learning communities, Margalef and Pareja Roblin (this issue) found that the roles of facilitators changed once teams were consolidated. While in initial stages facilitators' roles were mainly concerned with organizational tasks, in later stages their focus shifted to explicitly supporting teacher learning. Longitudinal studies could contribute further insights on the changing roles of the facilitator within TDTs consisting of teacher educators.

Practical implications

Supporting a TDT is not an easy task. It requires compatible people who are able to respond to the needs of TDT participants in a flexible way. We believe that the way facilitators support their team can benefit from them having the opportunity to learn more about their different roles and reflect upon them (Nelson, Slavit, Perkins, & Hathorn, 2008). Based on the findings of this study, new projects could support TDT facilitators through a professional development trajectory. This study and other research show that the roles of a facilitator are highly dependent on the context. Therefore, the design of such a trajectory should consider enough opportunities where facilitators could exchange experiences and reflect on their role(s) as a facilitator in the specific context of their TDT. Clearly, the facilitators involved in the current study felt the need to talk about how they fulfilled their roles, the challenges they faced, and the issues they had to deal with.

Conclusion

The implementation of TDTs is a type of demand-driven professional development strategy with teachers as active participants. When teacher educators collaborate in a TDT, the question arises as to what kind of support they need. Literature about TDTs consisting of teachers emphasizes the importance of the support of a facilitator. Since teacher educators have a double role (they not only teach a certain subject, they also teach others how to teach), we asked the question if they need a different kind of support. This study revealed that a facilitator can have three different roles when supporting a TDT consisting of teacher educators, namely, providing logistic support, scaffolding the design process, and monitoring the design. These roles are represented in an overarching model that illustrates how the roles of the facilitator are influenced by various factors such as the design phase, team characteristics, and the relationship that the facilitator has with team members. The model conveys the main results of the case study to policymakers and professional developers interested in supporting teacher design teams.

Funding

This work was supported by School of Education.

References

- Bakah, M. A. B., Voogt, J. M., & Pieters, J. M. (2012). Updating polytechnic teachers' knowledge and skills through teacher design teams in Ghana. *Professional Development in Education, 38*, 7–24. doi:10.1080/19415257.2011.576265
- Becuwe, H., Pareja Roblin, N., Tondeur, J., Thys, J., Castelein, E., & Voogt, J. (2015). *Conditions for the successful implementation of Teacher educator Design Teams for ICT-integration: A Delphi study*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Bruining, T. (2007). Didactische ergonomie voor leergemeenschappen [Didactical ergonomics for learning communities]. *VELON Tijdschrift voor Lerarenopleiders, 28*, 1–20.
- Erickson, G., Brandes, G. M., Mitchell, I., & Mitchell, J. (2005). Collaborative teacher learning: Findings from two professional development projects. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 787–798. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.018
- Faas, H. (2012). *Het functioneren van een docentontwerpteam met een interne ontwerper/deskundige* [The functioning of teacher design teams with an internal designer/expert] (Master's thesis, Universiteit Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands). Retrieved from <http://essay.utwente.nl/62316/>
- Fulton, K., & Britton, T. (2011). *STEM teachers in professional learning communities: From good teacher to great teaching*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/1098-executive-summary.pdf
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 915–945. doi:10.3102/00028312038004915
- Handelzalts, A. (2009). *Collaborative curriculum development in teacher design teams* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands). Retrieved from http://doc.utwente.nl/67385/1/thesis_A_Handelzalts.pdf
- Huizinga, T., Handelzalts, A., Nieveen, N., & Voogt, J. M. (2013). Teacher involvement in curriculum design: Need for support to enhance teachers' design expertise. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46*, 33–57. doi:10.1080/00220272.2013.834077
- Huizinga, T., Handelzalts, A., Nieveen, N., & Voogt, J. (2015). Fostering teachers' design expertise in teacher design teams: Conducive design and support activities. *Curriculum Journal, 26*, 137–163. doi:10.1080/09585176.2014.990395

- Huizinga, T., Nieveen, N., Handelzalts, A., & Voogt, J. (2013). Ondersteuning op curriculumontwikkel expertise van docentontwikkelteams [Supporting teacher design teams in curriculum design expertise]. *Pedagogische Studiën*, 90(3), 4–20. Retrieved from <http://doc.utwente.nl/88198/>
- Jenlink, P. M., & Kinnucan-Welsch, K. (2001). Case stories of facilitating professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 705–724. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00025-7
- Kimchi, J., Polivka, B., & Stevenson, J. S. (1991). Triangulation: Operational definitions. *Nursing Research*, 40, 364–366.
- Lim, C. P., & Lee, J. C.-K. (2014). Teaching e-portfolios and the development of professional learning communities (PLCs) in higher education institutions. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 20, 57–59. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.10.002
- Linder, S. M. (2011). The facilitator's role in elementary professional mathematics professional development. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development*, 13(2), 44–66.
- Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record*, 91(4), 509–536.
- Loughran, J. (2014). Professionally developing as a teacher educator. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65, 271–283. doi:10.1177/0022487114533386
- Marsh, J. A., Bertrand, M., & Huguet, A. (2015). Using data to alter instructional practice: The mediating role of coaches and professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record*, 117(4), 1–40.
- McConnell, T. J., Parker, J. M., Eberhardt, J., Koehler, M. J., & Lundeborg, M. A. (2013). Virtual professional learning communities: Teachers' perceptions of virtual versus face-to-face professional development. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 22, 267–277. doi:10.1007/s10956-012-9391-y
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001). *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nelson, T. H., Slavit, D., Perkins, M., & Hathorn, T. (2008). A culture of collaborative inquiry: Learning to develop and support professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record*, 110(6), 1269–1303.
- Nieveen, N., Handelzalts, A., Van den Akker, J. J. H., & Homminga, S. (2005, September). *Teacher design teams: A scenario for school-based curriculum innovation*. Paper presented at the annual European Conference on Educational Research (ECER), Dublin, Ireland.
- Patton, K., Parker, M., & Neutzling, M. M. (2012). Tennis shoes required: The role of the facilitator in professional development. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 83, 522–532. doi:10.1080/02701367.2012.10599141
- Petrone, M. C., & Ortquist-Ahrens, L. (2004). Facilitating faculty learning communities: A compact guide to creating change and inspiring community. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 97, 63–69. doi:10.1002/tl.133
- Simmie, G. M. (2007). Teacher Design Teams (TDTs): Building capacity for innovation, learning and curriculum implementation in the continuing professional development of in-career teachers. *Irish Educational Studies*, 26, 163–176. doi:10.1080/03323310701295914
- Smith, K. (2003). So, what about the professional development of teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26, 201–215. doi:10.1080/0261976032000088738
- Tack, H., & Vanderlinde, R. (2014). Teacher educators' professional development: Towards a typology of teacher educators' researcherly disposition. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 62, 297–315. doi:10.1080/00071005.2014.957639
- Truijen, K. J. P., Slegers, P. J. C., Meelissen, M. R. M., & Nieuwenhuis, A. F. M. (2013). What makes teacher teams in a vocational education context effective? A qualitative study of managers' view on team working. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 25, 58–73. doi:10.1108/13665621311288485
- Van Driel, J. H., De Jong, O., & Verloop, N. (2002). The development of pre-service chemistry teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. *Science Education*, 86, 572–590.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 80–91. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004

- Voogt, J., Laferrière, T., Breuleux, A., Itow, R. C., Hickey, D. T., & McKenney, S. (2015). Collaborative design as a form of professional development. *Instructional science*, *43*, 259–282. doi:10.1007/s11251-014-9340-7
- Voogt, J., Westbroek, H., Handelzalts, A., Walraven, A., McKenney, S., Pieters, J., & De Vries, B. (2011). Teacher learning in collaborative curriculum design. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 1235–1244. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.07.003
- Wenger, E. (2011). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/Rt4sCd>
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.