
Reaching out: cultivating a learning community to facilitate video-based peer coaching on teaching practice in the ‘extended’ and online classroom

Dave Gatrell

Bristol Institute for Learning and Teaching,
University of Bristol,
Bristol, UK
Email: dave.gatrell@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract: This exploratory, qualitative study investigated four Hong Kong university teachers’ experiences of video-based peer coaching and their understanding and potential enactment of a learning community that may develop around this approach. It also explored teachers’ perceptions of the ‘extended’ classroom, an approach in which the same instructor teaches on-campus and online students at the same time. Video-based peer coaching was regarded as efficient, focused and characterised by peer support, provided peers had sufficient background information regarding the observed lesson. It was agreed that this approach could be effective within a cross-departmental learning community, although leadership and institutional recognition would be needed to ensure focus and a sustainable culture of collaboration. Despite inherent challenges, the extended classroom was perceived as a positive development which afforded new forms of interaction.

Keywords: video; peer coaching; learning communities; online teaching; extended classroom; hybrid teaching.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Gatrell, D. (2023) ‘Reaching out: cultivating a learning community to facilitate video-based peer coaching on teaching practice in the ‘extended’ and online classroom’, *Int. J. Mobile Learning and Organisation*, Vol. 17, Nos. 1/2, pp.32–44.

Biographical notes: Dave Gatrell is a Lecturer in academic development and digital learning specialist. He is studying towards a PhD in Technology Enhanced Learning. His professional and research interests are in blended and hybrid learning, assessment and feedback, and the use of video annotation tools for peer assessment and learning.

This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper entitled ‘Reaching out: cultivating a learning community to facilitate video-based peer coaching on teaching practice in the ‘extended’ classroom’ presented at eLearning Forum Asia 2020, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 7 December 2020.

1 Introduction

In June 2020, the large public university in Hong Kong where I was based adopted an approach referred to as the ‘extended’ classroom. This involved the same instructor teaching on-campus and remote students simultaneously, with the latter joining by video

conference. This presented significant challenges but also opportunities for staff development.

Staff development at the university is largely formal. It includes longitudinal programs and individual workshops. Though ‘communities of practice’ exist, these are widely seen as being part of institutional structures, rather than a means of informal learning. Teachers may be able to learn from each other, but within the context of institutionally derived processes. While peer observation of teaching may take place during the annual appraisal process, it is referred to as *peer review*, not *coaching*.

During the six-week summer term, in my role as an educational developer at the institution, I sought to cultivate a ‘learning community’ to facilitate video-based peer coaching. I attempted to engage participants in cycles of reflection, peer feedback, and discussion around recordings of their extended classroom practice. This is a report on aspects of this experience.

1.1 Research topic, problem and purpose

My small-scale exploratory qualitative study investigates teachers’ experiences of video-based peer coaching and their understanding and potential enactment of a ‘learning community’ that might develop around this approach. I intend to use my findings to cultivate such a community over a longer period and conduct larger-scale research. This study also explores perceptions of the extended classroom.

2 Literature review

In this section, I review the stand-out literature on learning communities and video-based peer coaching for HE staff development and research on teacher experiences of extended classroom practice.

To select relevant studies I searched Google Scholar and Scopus using a profile that combined different keywords (learning communities, peer coaching, video, staff development, ‘extended’ classroom, synchronous hybrid teaching, and blended synchronous teaching). I then searched these for references to other works, selecting those I felt had most in common with my context.

2.1 Learning communities for staff development in HE

The concept of the *learning community*, with its emphasis on information sharing, knowledge formulation and professional development, through social participation and interaction, is not a new one (Eib and Miller, 2006). Learning communities are characterised by “supportive and shared leadership, collective learning, shared personal practice and shared values and vision”, including mutual commitment to ‘thinking, growing and enquiry’ [Eib and Miller, (2006), p.3]. This is echoed in Wenger et al. (2002). Using the metaphor of *communities of practice*, they maintain that ‘openness’ is needed in order to achieve ‘collective enquiry’ (p.37).

Elements of learning communities have long been discussed in studies of staff development in HE (Eib and Miller, 2006). Palmer (1999), for example, calls for a social constructivist process (Vygotsky, 1978) where teachers reflect on and discuss ‘critical

moments' in their practice. To enhance university teaching effectiveness, Duffy (1996) proposes 'collaborative and collegial' initiatives, recognising that 'knowledge is something people do together', whilst Stahl (1996) advocates 'open systems dialogue', ongoing discussion among faculty, an approach also rooted in principles of social constructivism (cited in Eib and Miller, 2006). In Zuber-Skerritt's (1992) analysis of teacher experiences of staff development in HE, participants indicated a preference for enquiry-based approaches. Drawing again on the work of Vygotsky (1978), Zuber-Skerritt (1992, p.75) argues that these processes of 'learning about teaching' take place within a social constructivist framework, in which teachers formulate knowledge by 'sharing and comparing' their learning.

More recent studies have highlighted the role that learning communities can serve in building support among teachers for *pedagogical or technological innovation* (Furco and Moely, 2012; Ward and Selvester, 2012) and in ensuring they can develop the *confidence and competence* to implement new approaches (Daly, 2011; Engin and Atkinson, 2015). In a study of eight USA institutions seeking to gain buy-in for service-learning, Furco and Moely (2012) found that learning communities were more likely to succeed if they involved regular meetings, and if participants sensed that their individual needs, as well as the needs of the community, were being addressed. This was achieved by creating 'safe spaces' where participants could discuss challenges openly and receive peer support [Furco and Moely, (2012), p.133], a finding echoed in Ward and Selvester's (2012) study of adoption of accessible technology in their institution and Engin and Atkinson's (2015) paper on iPad integration at a university in the UAE. In the latter case, the learning community was effective because it offered activities that were relevant and meaningful; learning was "contextualised, situated in each participant's challenges and concerns" [Engin and Atkinson, (2015), p.172]. This was achieved using a blog, which enabled members to engage in focused discussions, outside of fixed in-person meetings, working together to solve problems whenever they occurred. The authors concluded that this community might have benefited from a larger, cross-disciplinary, membership where participants were more willing to take on a leadership role.

Drawing on data from seven institutions and using Deci and Ryan's (2000) self-determination theory as a framework, Daly (2011) found that learning communities created opportunities for members to achieve *autonomy*, through self-organising and directing their own developmental activities; gain *competence* in pedagogical and curricular reform by engaging in research; and through extended conversations, develop a sense of *relatedness* and commitment to long-term collective goals for teaching improvement. Unlike in Engin and Atkinson (2015), teachers *did* assume leadership roles, which resulted in the sharing of expertise and recognition of existing good practice. It was also the more *interdisciplinary* nature of this community that contributed to a greater degree of relationship-building [Daly, (2011), p.12].

2.2 Video-based peer coaching in staff development in HE

Peer coaching is a specific form of professional learning where colleagues with a similar level of experience engage in mutual observation and feedback (Gottesman, 2009). Typically taking place within a staff learning community, it offers *problem-based, contextualised* opportunities to reflect on and improve classroom practice (Huston and Weaver, 2008). This can include the implementation of new technologies or techniques (Dysart and Weckerle, 2015).

Peer coaching may also be facilitated *using* technology, notably video, an approach described by Gottesman (2009, p.28) as “one of the most successful coaching models.” Yet, while there is a vast body of research on video-based peer coaching in teacher education and professional development among primary and secondary school teachers (Baecher et al., 2018; Gaudin and Chaliès, 2015; Marsh and Mitchell, 2014), there are relatively few studies of its use in HE. In an evaluation of a program to support tutors of medicine in problem-based learning, Garcia et al. (2017, p.313) found a combination of video-mediated self-reflection and peer feedback to be “a powerful technique for improving performance.” This individualised approach raised teachers’ awareness of the effectiveness of new strategies and helped them address underlying difficulties, leading to improved application of learned skills and long-term changes in practice (Garcia et al., 2017). However, the authors note that the approach is highly time-intensive and must be adapted to account for local and institutional cultural differences (Garcia et al., 2017).

2.3 *Teacher experiences of the extended classroom in HE*

Referred to as *HyFlex* (Leijon and Lundgren, 2019), *blended synchronous learning* (Bower et al., 2015; Szeto, 2014) and *synchronous hybrid learning* (Raes et al., 2020), the original aim of the ‘extended’ classroom was to make learning more flexible or accessible by enabling remote students to participate in face-to-face classes via video conference (Bower et al., 2015). While it has now been adopted on a much larger scale in response to COVID-19 (Maloney and Kim, 2020), the same challenges are likely to be present: the difficulty of addressing students’ needs in both modes, and promoting interaction between them; the need for teachers to multitask and manage a variety of complex technologies; and a lack of opportunities for teacher professional development and training (Bower et al., 2015; Maloney and Kim, 2020).

2.4 *Research questions*

No studies were found exploring the use of *video-based peer coaching* or *learning communities* to support *university* teachers with synchronous online teaching, let alone *extended classroom practice*. This study attempts to address these gaps in the literature, a task that feels especially urgent, given current and possible longer-term realities in HE where new teaching approaches may require novel forms of staff development.

Unlike much of the existing literature which addresses the *impact* of video-based peer coaching or learning communities on a larger scale, this small-scale study aims to generate rich, nuanced descriptions of teachers’ *experiences* of the former, and their *requirements* for the development of the latter, to inform future research. My first two research questions are therefore:

- RQ1 How do teachers experience video-based peer coaching on their ‘extended’ and online classroom practice? What do they identify as the main success factors in this approach to staff development?
- RQ2 Do teachers feel video-based peer coaching could be effective within a larger learning community? If so, how would the community need to be designed?

The study also seeks to capture individual teachers' perceptions of the 'extended' classroom in the early stages of implementation in a markedly different context from studies conducted pre-COVID. My third research question is therefore:

RQ3 What are teachers' perceptions of the 'extended' classroom?

3 Methodology

This section briefly describes the participants and setting for this 'exploratory' case study (Yin, cited in Cohen et al., 2017). It then outlines the data collection and analysis methods used.

3.1 *Participants and setting*

Both male participants (M1 and M2) were Hong Kong Chinese, whilst the female participants (F1, F2) were from Australia and the UK. Participants were aged between 39 and 48.

The four participants were from different faculties and departments (accounting and finance, applied biology and chemical technology, applied social sciences, and English), and had from five to ten years' teaching experience. By June 2020, all four teachers were using synchronous online learning technologies for one 13-week semester to deliver lectures. In addition, prior to COVID, teacher M1 had used the university's video content management system (Panopto) to create short instructional videos, whilst F2 had three years' experience in asynchronous and synchronous online teaching from her previous institution.

None of the four had prior experience in 'extended' teaching. They were invited to take part in this research on the basis that they had attended my staff development workshops on extended classroom practice. F1 and F2 were teaching in extended mode during the summer term, and viewed the study as an opportunity to develop their skills in a novel teaching approach. While M1 and M2 did not have summer courses, they were motivated to participate because they felt video-based peer coaching would give them an opportunity to reflect on and share their online practice from the previous semester. Pairing F1 with F2, and M1 with M2, made it possible to focus on two cases of *peer coaching* while also generating 'rich, vivid descriptions' [Hitchcock and Hughes, cited in Cohen et al., (2017), p.377] of each *individual* experience.

Teachers conducted and recorded their online and extended classes in Blackboard Collaborate Ultra, the video conferencing tool in Blackboard, the university's learning management system. F1 and F2 were physically present in their classrooms, and captured themselves and their students using wireless microphones and ceiling tracking cameras. M1 and M2's lectures were fully online, so their recordings only captured their webcams, students who chose to switch on their webcams, audio contributions, and the PowerPoint slides they shared.

3.2 *Data collection and analysis*

Participants were asked to select two lesson recordings, upload them to Panopto, and then add time-stamped written reflections using the discussion tool. They were encouraged to

reflect on six critical moments in each lesson: three where they felt that their teaching was effective, and learning was taking place, and three where they felt it was less effective. They then shared the videos and time-stamped reflective comments with their partner, who posted feedback on each critical moment and comment. The annotated recordings were then shared with me.

Once participants had taught, reflected, and received peer feedback on two lessons, they were interviewed individually using a ‘guide approach’ (Patton, 1980, cited in Cohen et al., 2017) to ensure that the same questions could be covered whilst keeping the interviews ‘conversational and situational’ (Cohen et al., 2017). The interview questions are listed in Appendix.

Interviews were transcribed and analysed using grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), a qualitative analytical process that allows ideas and concepts to ‘emerge’ from the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1994), which may then be grouped and categorised. Themes were identified based on each research question: *experiences* of video-based peer coaching, *design requirements* for learning communities and *perceptions* of extended classroom practice. Areas of agreement and disagreement among participants were highlighted, making it possible for the transcript data to be categorised into more specific themes. The initial findings were then triangulated using data from the annotated videos. Lastly, evocative participant quotes from the interviews and videos were selected to illustrate each theme.

Ethical approval was obtained on 22 June 2020.

4 Findings

This section presents findings on each of the research questions: teacher experiences of video-based peer coaching, conceptualisations of learning community development, and experiences of the extended classroom. Findings are grouped by research question and then organised into specific themes within each question.

4.1 *Experiences of video-based peer coaching*

Three themes regarding *video-based peer coaching* emerged from an analysis of the video and interview data: *efficiency and focus*, *peer support* and *contextualisation*.

4.1.1 *Efficiency and focus*

Each of the participants reported that video-based peer coaching was more *time-efficient* than other forms of staff development: “You’re not taking teachers out of their jobs. They can teach and be videoed, then do their reflection, as opposed to being taken out of their work context to take a course” (F2). It was an approach staff could engage in ‘anytime, anywhere’ (M1), using the platform to *focus* on ‘critical moments’ in lessons and receive peer feedback within a short time frame. As F1 added: “I like the fact you can base discussions around specific bits without needing to watch the whole lesson.” In the second peer coaching cycle M1 focused on a single activity (managing a quiz), while in both cycles M2 analysed his technique of guiding students through case studies with effective questioning. F1 and F2’s video-based discussion pinpointed shared challenges

at different stages of extended classes: opening, closing, giving instructions and gathering feedback on group activities.

4.1.2 Peer support

Both male participants reported that they valued the different perspective their partner offered on their online teaching. M2 commented, “I always design my lectures using my own teaching approach, but another teacher can tell me more about how to improve my technique.” All four recordings shared by M1 and M2 displayed evidence of *peer support* and encouragement: ‘it’s good practice’ (M1) and ‘questioning is useful to enhance learning’ (M2). F1 reflected on how the process raised her confidence:

“In online teaching, you tend to focus on the negative things, but being asked to look for three positives, you have to think about that too. I liked watching my teaching and realising it wasn’t so bad. That process of reflection using video is valuable.”

Having felt nervous at first about a colleague observing her teaching, she valued the input she gained from F2. F2’s comments frequently showed empathy (“I agree it’s very hard to explain the structure: face-to-face and online require quite different presentation of information, which is challenging” and “it’s so hard to remember to repeat students’ questions for the recording”). Her positive comments were always supported with evidence from the recording (“I liked how you connected the subject to what students may go on to do in later careers” and “including the photos as well as having your narration explained the relevance of this activity very well”). Watching F2’s lessons and reading her colleague’s reflections gave her ‘insights into new ways of doing things, how she dealt with particular moments’, reassuring her that ‘we’re all having the same issues and uncertainties’ (F1). She reflected:

“I wish we had done this earlier, particularly when we moved online. It would have been good to get input from experienced teachers, even inexperienced ones – what works, what doesn’t.”

4.1.3 Contextualisation

F2 and M2 both felt that their recordings, and those of their peers, captured very little of what took place during the online lessons beyond the lecture slides and the teacher’s voice, making it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about student engagement and learning. This could explain M2’s decision to focus predominantly on the use of PowerPoint in each cycle. M2 and F2 also reflected that to be effective, peer coaching required each participant to understand the other’s teaching *context*. While F2 and F1 worked in related disciplines, and did not encounter this challenge, M2 felt he and M1 would have benefited from prior knowledge of each other’s ‘content, structure, learning outcomes and assessment method’. This, he acknowledged, would take time to study in detail.

In contrast, M1 felt that overall “it was easy to understand the reflective comments, even if the subject matter was different.” For F1, the video provided context “so I understood what F2 was talking about. I didn’t need much information, as I understood through the presentation” (F1).

4.2 Conceptualisations of learning community development

Participants were able to draw on experience from this project to suggest how a larger learning community built around video-based peer coaching might be developed. Three specific themes were identified for learning community development: *leadership and institutional recognition, time, and size and scope*.

4.2.1 Leadership and institutional recognition

Participants agreed that a successful learning community would require *leadership*. F1 felt that this ought to come from the University's Educational Development Centre, as this would lend it more authority and maximise the chances of cross-departmental collaboration. Having some form of *institutional recognition* would also incentivise teachers to take part (M1). For F2, the role of the leader would be to establish the necessary structure and focus for video-based peer coaching, stepping back as the group became more autonomous over time. For M1, the degree of involvement would depend on individual members' needs, with some requiring more 'hand holding'. F1 argued that leadership was needed to bring about a shift in culture: "there's not a lot of sharing of experience here. I think we need to do more of it."

4.2.2 Time

F2 reflected that "becoming a good online teacher takes *time*, and you need to fit that time in." To this end, M2 recommended that participants spend time every week "sharing and reviewing their teaching performance to make improvements to the coming lessons." To keep the process as time-efficient as possible, participants could limit their reflections to shorter activities (M1) or individual lesson stages (F1). Having received peer feedback, participants could archive the recordings so other members could refer back to their discussions around each critical moment (F1). Through regular, focused interactions *over a sustained period*, teachers would be able to experience longitudinal development: "to see how your teaching had developed, you'd benefit more from having a *longer connection with someone over the course of a semester*" (F2).

4.2.3 Size and scope

Participants agreed that the community could be *large* and *cross-departmental*. Yet whereas F1 perceived size and diversity as benefits ("we can all learn from each other and help each other out"), others were more sceptical. While involving more people could result in more input and insights, it could also make the community less focused (M1). To prevent this, teachers would need to be paired for peer coaching with a colleague from a similar discipline (F2) or exchange detailed subject information before they could start (M2).

4.3 Experiences of the extended classroom

In mid-July, faced with a resurgence in local COVID-19 cases, the university reverted to fully online teaching. However, by that stage, F1 and F2 had completed two cycles of

peer coaching based on extended classroom recordings. Two themes emerged from their video and interview data: *connection and contact* and *cognitive load and multitasking*.

4.3.1 *Connection and contact*

Both participants welcomed the ‘extended’ classroom after five months of online teaching. As F1 reflected, “I’d missed face-to-face teaching. It was nice having one or two students in class just to have that *connection*.” For F2, it was an ‘optimistic’ development: “I felt hopeful that I could get some face-to-face *contact* again.” This physical presence gave the teachers a greater sense that students’ needs were also being addressed; that students were engaged and learning was taking place: “it reinforced how much I respond to their feedback. In any activity, I watch to see when they stop or when they start to drift off to gauge how long they need” (F2). For F1 it gave in-person students opportunities for interaction that were impossible to achieve online: “they can’t always follow the lesson online, they’re not participating, some of it is lost.”

4.3.2 *Cognitive load and multitasking*

Despite their prior experience in online learning, F1 and F2 found it difficult to overcome some challenges inherent in the extended classroom approach. F1 had identified the need to provide differentiated instruction to online and in-person students, but found this unworkable, because of the high *cognitive load* and *multitasking* required. She felt unable to ‘blend two pedagogical approaches’, and taking an ‘online-first’ strategy which prioritised the needs of online students ‘felt wrong’ for those who had ‘made the effort’ to attend in person (F1). Overall, however, F1 and F2 saw the extended classroom as a ‘positive experiment’:

“Before COVID-19, it might have seemed like the worst possible combination of modes... but given that the world is so crazy now, I don’t mind that we tried it.” (F2)

5 Discussion

This small-scale study aimed to investigate teachers’ experiences of video-based peer coaching and their understanding and potential enactment of a ‘learning community’ that might develop around this approach. It also explored their perceptions of the extended classroom. This section attempts to explain some of the findings from the previous section.

5.1 *Making sense of teachers’ experiences of video-based peer coaching*

Though it is not yet possible to measure the impact of peer coaching on performance, teachers benefited from the “combination of video-mediated self-reflection plus peer feedback” (Garcia et al., 2017) it offered. The strong peer support evidenced in the discussions between F1 and F2 on extended classroom practice could be explained by the *focus* and *shared context* created by the adoption of a challenging mode of teaching. Discussions were problem-based, and this led to the feeling of *relatedness* found in Daly (2011), a ‘needed backdrop for intrinsic motivation’ and, over time, the development of *competence* (Daly, 2011). In contrast, discussions between M1 and M2, based on

different episodes of online teaching from the previous semester, lacked the focus and structure that a shared teaching problem or context could have afforded. Though these teachers had the *autonomy* (Deci and Ryan, 2000, cited in Daly, 2011) to choose ‘critical moments’ to reflect on, they might have benefited from more guidance in their selection. Left to do this independently, both teachers tended to focus on how they presented subject-specific content rather than on more generic online teaching practices. The result was that although the *reflection* process might have been contextualised, the *peer coaching* process was not. Instead of requiring teachers to undertake a lengthy analysis of subject content and assessment, as M2 suggested, the solution might be the use of a *structured observation form* covering agreed best practices, as supported by Fukkink et al.’s (2011) extensive review of video feedback. Such an approach would have the added advantage of keeping the process time-efficient.

Greater contextualisation could also be achieved through *more guidance in the use of learning technologies*, including video conferencing software and classroom recording equipment. This would enable teachers to capture more of the in-class and online learning that takes place in an extended classroom, including in-person group activities, student presentations and interactive online activities, such as polls, quizzes, or editing a shared document. Teachers could then use Panopto to combine the online recording with in-class footage, allowing peers to observe more of the learning context. Nevertheless, these technologies have inherent limitations. Blackboard Collaborate Ultra, like other video conferencing software, does not record more than a handful of webcams while a PowerPoint or other content is being shared. Breakout discussions cannot be recorded. Though chat messages are recorded within the platform, they are not saved when recordings are downloaded and uploaded to Panopto. In the classroom, the ceiling camera and microphone cannot capture all teacher and student activity; to do so would require multiple re-cording devices and a teaching assistant, which may not be feasible.

Each of the four teachers had *prior experience* of engaging in reflection and feedback based on recordings of their practice, but the nature of this experience was different. During their initial university teacher training courses, M1 and M2 reflected on their teaching using video, before being assessed by the tutor. This may explain their reluctance to share moments in their online teaching that had gone less well than expected, though this is also normal when sharing lesson recordings with an unfamiliar coaching partner for the first time (Baecher et al., 2018; Gaudin and Chaliès, 2015; Marsh and Mitchell, 2014). In contrast, F1 had experienced developmental audio-based coaching in her training as a therapist, while F2 had used a video approach as part of postdoctoral research. This, together with their closer relationship, may have contributed to their greater openness when reflecting and engaging in discussion. It is likely that with further *experience* in video-based peer coaching as part of a learning community, teachers will gain in confidence.

5.2 *Cultivating a learning community based on peer coaching with video*

Engin and Atkinson (2015) identify four characteristics of successful learning communities in HE. They must be *collective*, composed of ‘like-minded professionals’ pursuing common goals (Eckert, 2006, cited in Engin and Atkinson, 2015) and *collaborative* (Wenger, 1998), offering opportunities for sharing and advising. They also need to be *contextualised*, focused on ‘actual and timely activities that support teaching’ (Eckert, 2006, cited in Engin and Atkinson, 2015), and *problem-based* (Engin and

Atkinson, 2015). Related to this are the ideas of ‘openness’ and peer support (Furco and Moely, 2012; Ward and Selvester, 2012). Underpinning this, add Eib and Miller (2006, p.3), is ‘supportive, shared *leadership*’.

This is consistent with interview findings. Through effective leadership, a learning community could engage members from across the University in meaningful, focused, regular interactions over a sustained period, developing ‘confidence and competence’ (Daly, 2011) in their hybrid and online teaching. It could also ensure that both ‘individual and community needs’ were met (Furco and Moely, 2012).

6 Conclusions

Teachers’ experiences of video-based peer coaching were positive overall. While the approach was seen as time-efficient, focused and characterised by peer support, its future success would require greater contextualisation, achieved through the exchange of more detailed information around each teacher’s subject. Teachers felt that the approach could be effective within a cross-departmental learning community, but that it would require leadership and institutional support to create the necessary focus, structure and a sustainable culture of sharing and collaboration.

The small group size and the fact members engaged in peer-based video coaching of their own volition mean the findings are not generalisable to other contexts. However, it could be argued that since membership of any future learning community and participation in video-based peer coaching would be *voluntary*, and as the community would more than likely be relatively small in size, the findings *are* generalisable to *the university’s context*. Another important limitation is the short duration of this study, which meant only eight annotated videos were analysed and it was not possible to measure teachers’ longitudinal development. It was also not possible for teachers to peer-coach other group members apart from the partner they had been allocated, so any conceptualisations of learning communities-based around video-based peer coaching were not grounded in lived experiences of them.

Future studies might investigate the impact of video-based peer coaching and the membership of a learning community on *the quality of online teaching*, measured through student feedback or lesson observation, or *the development of reflective practice and peer coaching skills*, based on discourse analysis of video discussion, over a longer period. They may also explore the role of *gender, subject discipline* and *local or institutional culture* in mediating experiences of peer coaching. If these studies could involve a greater number of teachers, creating a larger number of videos, reflections and feedback comments, the findings would in turn be more reliable and generalisable.

If the extended classroom is reintroduced, it may be possible to design peer coaching activities based on recordings of both in-person *and* online learning. This will open up new opportunities for research into extended classroom practice. It could also enhance the effectiveness of video-based peer coaching by enabling teachers to focus more on observations of student learning.

Acknowledgements

This paper draws on research undertaken as part of the Doctoral program in E-Research and Technology Enhanced Learning in the Department of Educational Research at

Lancaster University. The author would like to thank Professor Murray Saunders for his supportive, detailed feedback on both the draft and final version of the assignment that this paper is based on. The author would also like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions.

References

- Baecher, L., Kung, S.C., Ward, S.L. and Kern, K. (2018) 'Facilitating video analysis for teacher development: a systematic review of the research', *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.185–216 [online] <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/181138/>.
- Bower, M., Dalgarno, B., Kennedy, G.E., Lee, M.J. and Kenney, J. (2015) 'Design and implementation factors in blended synchronous learning environments: outcomes from a cross-case analysis', *Computers & Education*, Vol. 86, No. 1, pp.1–17 [online] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.03.006>.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2017) *Research Methods in Education*, Routledge, London.
- Daly, C.J. (2011) 'Faculty learning communities: addressing the professional development needs of faculty and the learning needs of students', *Currents in Teaching & Learning*, Vol. 4, No. 1 [online] <http://www.worcester.edu>.
- Dysart, S. and Weckerle, C. (2015) 'Professional development in higher education: a model for meaningful technology integration', *Journal of Information Technology Education: Innovations in Practice*, Vol. 14, pp.255–265 [online] <http://www.jite.org/documents/Vol14/JITEv14IIPp255-265Dysart2106.pdf>.
- Eib, B.J. and Miller, P. (2006) 'Faculty development as community building: an approach to professional development that supports communities of practice for online teaching', *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, Vol. 7, No. 2 [online] <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v7i2.299>.
- Engin, M. and Atkinson, F. (2015) 'Faculty learning communities: a model for supporting curriculum changes in higher education', *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.164–174 [online] <http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/845304/1/IJTLHE1948.pdf>.
- Fukkink, R.G., Trienekens, N. and Kramer, L.J.C. (2011) 'Video feedback in education and training: putting learning in the picture', *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, Vol. 23, pp.45–63 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9144-5>.
- Furco, A. and Moely, B.E. (2012) 'Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: a multi-campus study', *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 83, No. 1, pp.128–153 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2012.11777237>.
- Garcia, I., James, R.W., Bischof, P. and Baroffio, A. (2017) 'Self-observation and peer feedback as a faculty development approach for problem-based learning tutors: a program evaluation', *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp.313–325 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2017.1279056>.
- Gaudin, C. and Chaliès, S. (2015) 'Video viewing in teacher education and professional development: a literature review', *Educational Research Review*, Vol. 16, pp.41–67 [online] <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.06.001>.
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) 'The discovery of grounded theory', *Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Aldine, Chicago.
- Gottesman, B.L. (2009) *Peer Coaching in Higher Education*, R&L Education, New York, NY.
- Huston, T. and Weaver, C.L. (2008) 'Peer coaching: professional development for experienced faculty', *Innovative Higher Education*, Vol. 33, pp.5–20 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-007-9061-9>.

- Leijon, M. and Lundgren, B. (2019) 'Connecting physical and virtual spaces in a HyFlex pedagogic model with a focus on teacher interaction', *Journal of Learning Spaces*, Vol. 8, No. 1 [online] <http://libjournal.uncg.edu/jls/article/view/1640>.
- Maloney, E.J. and Kim, J. (2020) *Fall Scenario #13: A HyFlex Model*, Inside HigherEd [online] <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/learning-innovation> (accessed 31 October 2020).
- Marsh, B. and Mitchell, N. (2014) 'The role of video in teacher professional development', *Teacher Development*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp.403–417 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2014.938106>.
- Palmer, P. (1999) *The Courage to Teach*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Raes, A., Vanneste, P., Pieters, M., Windey, I., Van Den Noortgate, W. and Depaepe, F. (2020) 'Learning and instruction in the hybrid virtual classroom: an investigation of students' engagement and the effect of quizzes', *Computers & Education*, Vol. 143, p.103682 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103682>.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1994) 'Grounded theory methodology: an overview', in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., pp.273–284, SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Szeto, E. (2014) 'A comparison of online/face-to-face students' and instructor's experiences: examining blended synchronous learning effects', *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 116, No. 21, pp.4350–4254 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.926>.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Ward, H.C. and Selvester, P.M. (2012) 'Faculty learning communities: improving teaching in higher education', *Educational Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp.111–121 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2011.567029>.
- Wenger, E. (1998) 'Communities of practice: learning as a social system', *Systems Thinker*, Vol. 9, No. 5, pp.2–3.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. and Snyder, W. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice*, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA.
- Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1992) *Action Research in Higher Education: Examples and Reflection*, Kogan Page, London.

Appendix

Interview questions used

- 1 How do you feel about video-based peer coaching? Has it helped you to develop as an online teacher? If so, how? Which aspects of this approach to staff development have you found most effective in helping you to develop? What challenges have there been? Would you like to continue using the approach? How could the approach be improved?
- 2 Do you feel the approach could be effective within a larger learning community? If so, how would this community need to be designed?
- 3 How do you feel about using the 'extended' classroom approach? What were the main challenges of this mode of teaching? What techniques worked well? Did your feelings towards the approach change over time?