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ABSTRACT
This paper introduces one type of reflective professional development (PD) training for in-service instructors in their first year of employment at Rikkyo University’s Center for English Discussion Class (EDC) – a compulsory EFL program for freshmen undergraduates at a private university in Japan. In their first semester, instructors participate in weekly PD sessions to practice discrete components of EDC methodology. In their second semester, PD sessions then explore the theory underpinning the same methodology. Instructors are encouraged to reflect on and discuss the principles behind their individual teaching approaches in light of relevant academic literature and second language acquisition (SLA) theory attached to each training. The paper provides an account of these second-semester, reflective PD sessions using examples to highlight their aims and content, as well as to outline some basic steps in their planning and delivery for others who may wish to replicate them in similar teaching and training contexts.

INTRODUCTION
All in-service teachers hold beliefs about learning that inform their pedagogical, in-class decisions (Bailey, 2006; Johnson & Golombek, 2011). Some of these beliefs can be easily and readily articulated, while others remain tacit and more instinctual (Tsui, 2003). Ellis (2014) acknowledges that an intuitive approach can be successful; yet, he also argues that if teaching practitioners are to appropriately evaluate their own classroom performance, then the principles directing their actions ought to be explicitly known to them. This explicitness is significant since conscious recognition connects strongly with effective critical reflection (J. M. Murphy, 2014; Walsh, 2013), which itself is widely regarded as essential for sustained professional growth (Crandall, 2000; Bailey, Curtis, & Nunan, 2001; Crandal & Miller, 2014; Murray & Christison, 2011).

Reflective practice is a form of professional development (PD) that helps teachers develop greater self-awareness and a more principled understanding of not only what they do, but more importantly why, as well as the consequences of doing so (Richards & Farrell, 2005; Farrell, 2008). This, in turn, can be useful when appraising how well learning objectives are being met, when problem-solving, or when trying to identify alternative strategies to help achieve more productive learning outcomes (Ortaçtepe & Akyel, 2015). In short, reflection is central to what D. F. Murphy (1999) referred to as a ‘culture of evaluation’, which can contribute to bringing more robust, professional accountability at both an instructor and institutional level. Moreover, it is considered something akin to a lynchpin in the increasingly inquiry-based, collaboration-type of PD prevalent in L2 teacher education (Johnson, 2006, 2009; Richards, 2008; Wright, 2010).

Various attempts have been made to categorise teaching and learning beliefs pertaining to second language acquisition (SLA). For instance, H. D. Brown (2007) distinguished between cognitive principles (relating to mental and intellectual functions), socioaffective principles (for emotional and identity-based concerns), and linguistic principles (associated with forms, language systems, and communication competencies). In addition, Dörnyei (2010) highlighted seven CLT-specific principles to guide what he termed the ‘Principled Communicative Approach (CPA)’, which focused on meaningful input and interaction, and target-language automatization, while Ellis (2014) drafted a set of instructional principles framed largely by Lantolf’s (1996) computational model of SLA to again emphasise learners’ attention to and processing of meaningful input. More recently, Long (2015) outlined a rationale to guide task-based language teaching in terms of methodological principles (for what is done in class), pedagogical procedures
(for how it is done), and evaluation criteria (to judge its quality and effectiveness). As the search for best practice continues, there is much that has been written for teachers to draw on, become influenced by, and compare with their own beliefs.

Given the depth of insights in SLA-related literature, the propensity and variety of teachers’ personal views about language learning, and the proclaimed benefits of reflection for professional development, it is perhaps a natural choice to combine all three for the purposes of teacher training. This decision is arguably more necessary for a teaching program that requires a high degree of standardisation in support of a strongly-unified curriculum that caters to the learning needs of several thousand students, which is precisely what Rikkyo University’s Center for English Discussion Class (EDC) does. What follows is brief description of the teaching context to which the aforementioned reflective PD sessions are attached and an account with examples of how they are sequentially planned, delivered, and reviewed.

**Teaching Context**

EDC is a large-scale EFL program that teaches the entire first-year undergraduate student body, which comprises approximately 4,700 students grouped by department into more than 550 micro-classes of 7-9 students per class. Each of these classes is streamed into one of four proficiency levels based on TOEIC scores from placement tests administered at the point of enrolment. EDC is one of four compulsory freshmen English courses, and it is taken in both the Spring and Fall semesters over two 14-week periods. Classes meet once a week for 90 minutes.

The EDC course has two main aims of developing students’ speaking fluency and improving their academic discussion skills (Hurling, 2012). Week to week, the primary objective is to hold fluent, interactive discussions in groups of four people for 16 minutes on a single topic. Discussions should be balanced, interactive, and co-constructed by all participants, importantly without intervention or assistance from the teacher. A functional syllabus is used with target language items, such as giving and asking for justification and taking speaking turns that support students in maintaining these extended discussions.

To accommodate the program’s considerable teaching load, 42 full-time instructors teach 12-13 classes a week. Instructors typically enter the EDC program with previous experience of teaching at university, if not at the high school level. Most arrive with an educational background in applied linguistics and TESOL, but not always. The majority also hold, or are working towards, master’s qualifications, and in some cases, PhDs. As such, there is a range of knowledge and experience across the teaching staff, which is an asset during PD sessions.

A defining feature of EDC is its use of a strongly unified curriculum. This means that the learning aims, methodology, materials, and assessment used in the course are standardised (J. D. Brown, 1995). EDC instructors have the flexibility to meet objectives and aims as they see fit, although there are certain aspects of lesson aims and content, such as new target language forms and the total number and duration of group discussions, that must feature and are therefore prescribed.

As part of EDC’s strongly unified curriculum, students’ performance in regular lessons is assessed according to a common grading rubric. In addition, students are assessed three times a semester in formalized, criterion-referenced discussion tests. Instructors receive standardization training before each of these discussion tests to ensure inter-rater reliability (Doe, 2012). To further help meet course goals, EDC produces an in-house textbook with students’ specific language levels and cultural context in mind. An accompanying teacher’s guide is also created to help instructors understand the rationale behind the lesson materials and provide suggestions for how to use them. This understanding is initially supported through lesson observations of all teachers in their first few semesters, with reference to common criteria based on our teaching methodology.
EDC’s teaching methodology is firmly grounded in CLT and every lesson contains a strong focus on meaningful repetition of target structures with formative feedback featuring at frequent intervals. The methodology prioritizes student-to-student interaction to meet lesson aims and sets 50 out of a total 90 minutes as a general minimum amount of student talk-time per class. This student-to-student interaction includes very little reading from textbooks and handouts or working together to complete gap-fill exercises. Instead, it is primarily used to jointly construct and consider ideas on discussion topics.

Regular EDC lessons follow a uniform structure (see Figure 1). Each lesson starts with a short quiz based on a homework reading. Students then complete a speaking fluency task modelled on Nation’s (1989) 4/3/2 activity (itself based on Maurice’s (1983) design), before new functional language items are presented and practiced in controlled and semi-controlled conditions. This practice feeds into two group discussions in which students first complete a preparation activity (usually involving pair-work) and then have a group discussion, when they can repeat their ideas from the preparation task with new partners. Feedback is provided after each discussion to help improve future performances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 min.</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>Fluency Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 min.</td>
<td>Target Language Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 min.</td>
<td>Target Language Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 min.</td>
<td>Discussion 1 (Preparation &gt; Discussion &gt; Feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35 min.</td>
<td>Discussion 2 (Preparation &gt; Discussion &gt; Feedback)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Regular Lesson Structure.

A successful application of lesson methodology and unified curriculum conducted on a scale as large as the EDC program clearly relies on instructors having a shared understanding of all goals, assessments, materials, and methodologies at both a program and lesson level. This requires routine training to maintain, which will be briefly described in the next section.

Professional Development Context

In the EDC, PD is designed to support and maintain the unified curriculum and also be a source of motivation for instructors (Livingston & Moroi, 2015). There are several opportunities for professional development, including teacher training (known internally as faculty development or FD sessions), observations of their own and other instructors’ lessons, reflective tasks related to teaching, and small-scale classroom research projects that are published annually in the in-house EDC Journal. The scope of this paper will be limited to the teacher training sessions, particularly to the reflective FDs that link closely to specific stages of EDC lesson structure and methodology.

FDs in the EDC are a mix of teacher training workshops and seminars held in pre-semester orientations and throughout the regular semester. They support the running of the program and give instructors the tools they need to work effectively under a unified curriculum. FDs have a range of reflective and strategic targets, including teaching practice and theory, testing and assessment, and program administration. They are held for specific instructor groups, depending on their length of time in the program and types of students that they teach. Most FDs are led by one of four program managers (PMs), but some, such as weekly lesson-planning FDs, are facilitated by teachers.

FDs are characterized by collaborative idea-sharing and open discussions, and are predominantly, trainee-centred. However, for instructors new to the program, particularly in the
initial orientation trainings and first semester, a relatively top-down approach is taken, and PM feedback is generally quite direct, for example, regarding what is appropriate EDC methodology. After this first semester, there is a definite transition towards greater instructor autonomy and this is reflected in a more bottom-up training and management style. The lead PM for any FD also rotates from session to session, which ensures a fresh delivery and hopefully, an improved one, since the rotation includes an update of the previous FD plan based on participant feedback from the last time it was held.

During their first semesters working in EDC, new teachers attend several training sessions, including four teaching demonstration FDs. In these FDs, new teachers practice handling specific aspects of EDC methodology, as well as pre-assigned target language for upcoming lessons in the course. The purpose is to help address some of the common challenges that teaching EDC poses for new instructors. The first of these teaching demo sessions is for presenting target language. The next is on controlled and semi-controlled conditions practice of target language. The third session focuses on handling feedback before a final FD on discussion preparation activities. In these demonstration FDs, new teachers plan an assigned part of an upcoming lesson and deliver it to their peers, i.e. to more experienced teachers who join the sessions as guests and participate as students during each role-play. After each demonstration, instructors reflect on the performance, receive feedback and input from other members in their group, and discuss strategies to improve their delivery. In this way, the knowledge and experience of all teachers benefits the collective.

In the second semester, teachers revisit the same lesson aspects of EDC methodology as those of the first-semester teaching demo FDs, only now they engage critically with their own teaching beliefs, as well as principles found in relevant academic literature. The format of these more reflective FDs is styled in much the same way as a regular EDC lesson in that participants complete two extended group discussions, each preceded by a preparation activity characterised by partner exchanges, and meaningful repetition of ideas. An outline of the pre-, during, and post-stages of these FDs will follow in the remaining sections of the paper.

**Academic Literature**

An important aspect of the second-semester reflective FDs is the inclusion of academic articles and book chapters as pre-FD reading material. Literature is selected based on relevance and readability to help introduce new ideas, concepts and/or arguments about each session’s topic. This is crucial to lessen the risk of discussions in the FDs being redundant or unproductive and to help ensure that the training is meaningful for all participants (Nation & Macalister, 2010; Richards & Farrell, 2005). Instructors know they will have to recall what they read beforehand and respond to it in discussion with their peers, which is a useful incentive. The current literature used in FDs in the 2017-2018 academic year is listed in Appendix A, while readings considered viable for additional FDs for the future are included in Appendix B.

**Pre-FD Procedures**

What happens before the FD can be broken down into five steps:

1. Teachers submit their principles
2. PM collates submitted principles
3. PM sends out article with pre-FD reading questions
4. Teachers read article and consider their answers to the questions
5. PM plans FD and creates handout materials

First, teachers are asked to submit their teaching principles regarding a specific aspect of EDC methodology. Google Forms is used for this submission because of its very simple, entirely open
format. Once the principles are collected and collated, the PM sends out an article with pre-FD reading questions (see Appendix C). Depending on the needs of the FD, these questions may be quite brief, covering only the main points of interest in the article’s content, or they may explore the paper in detail. Instructors typically have a week to read the paper and consider the questions. The answers will not get reviewed explicitly in the FD, but the content will be incorporated into materials used in the training. These materials, of course, have to be made.

Before the FD, the PM uses the teachers’ submitted principles to create materials for the first of two discussions, comprising a pair of discussion Qs and a related preparation task, as in a regular EDC lesson (see Appendix D). Then, using the principles and theory in the assigned reading, a second discussion task with a preparatory activity and set of questions are created. Both discussions are compiled into what will become a printed handout to use in the FD that resembles the format used in the regular EDC textbooks.

FD Structure and Procedures
The FD itself follows this structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>Introduction / Warmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35 min.</td>
<td>Discussion 1 (Preparation &gt; Discussion &gt; Feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 min.</td>
<td>Discussion 2 (Preparation &gt; Discussion &gt; Feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. FD Structure.*

The FD begins with a brief introduction to outline the session aims and confirm the agenda. Instructors are then put in pairs and/or groups of three for a warmer activity that links that day/week’s lessons with the specific methodological focus of that FD, i.e. in the presentation principles FD, instructors discuss how they have been presenting the new target language, what successes or failures they have experienced, what modifications they have made for different levels or types of students, etc. Following this, instructors complete two extended discussions. Discussion 1 (D1) addresses the instructors’ own principles submitted prior to the FD, while Discussion 2 (D2) considers those in the academic literature. Like regular EDC lessons, D1 and D2 both comprise a preparation task, a group discussion, and a final feedback stage, which in this case references just the idea content of the discussions, ignoring use of target discussion skills as it would with actual EDC students.

During the FD, instructors are asked to have their copies of the pre-FD reading materials to hand, as well as their answers to the assigned questions, and they are encouraged to reference either whenever they wish. As in many EDC lessons, members of different groups are asked to report their findings to each other at the end of the discussions. The PM then concludes with a few wrap-up comments to encourage teachers to experiment with that lesson stage in light of the principles and theory they have explored, and to consider them as potential targets for future classroom research. Many instructors act on this invitation in their second year of teaching in the program, when part of their professional development includes a year-long project to design a classroom activity based on language teaching and learning principles. These activities are implemented, refined, and variations on their use are trialled to help evaluate their effectiveness ahead of an eventual formal write-up for publication in the EDC’s in-house Journal.
Post-FD Procedures
After the FD, the following steps are taken:
1. Lead PM collects feedback on the FD
2. PMs collectively review and discuss the feedback
3. Potential revisions for future sessions are documented in the FD plan

Having delivered the FD, feedback is collected from three sources to review the effectiveness of the training. The first source is that of the lead-PM’s own reflections, which are recorded in the notes section of the FD plan (see Appendix E). These notes typically include advice or reminders for the next lead-PM to consider. The second source of feedback comes from discussions between PMs in weekly meetings, when the lead-PM reports on how the FD went. All PMs share thoughts, ask questions, and provide input, which gets recorded in the minutes of the meeting. When required, new information is added to the post-FD notes of the FD plan, again, so that the next lead PM can use them. The final feedback source is that of the teachers who participated in the FD through formalized teacher surveys that examine the purpose, procedure, and overall impact of each FD they took part in. All feedback sources are discussed and evaluated as part of the process for creating the next updated version of the same FD plan (Lesley, 2017).

CONCLUSION
This paper began with a literature review to help establish the potential for a meaningful relationship to be forged between in-service teachers’ own beliefs about language learning and findings in relevant SLA theory for the purposes of reflective professional development training. It gave an overview of Rikkyo’s University’s English Discussion Class – firstly, in terms of its course aims, unified curriculum, teaching methodology, and lesson structure, and next in terms of its professional development systems, to provide context for a specific type of faculty development (FD) training used with instructors in their first year working in the EDC program. It then provided a sequential roadmap for how such reflective training sessions are planned, delivered, and reviewed. It is hoped that by actively striving to unite language learning theory with classroom practice, this avenue of professional development will promote positive learning outcomes for participants and further their professional growth.
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**APPENDIX A – Academic Literature Used in FDs in 2017-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Principles</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**APPENDIX B – Academic Literature for Possible Future FDs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Principles</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX C – Example Pre-Reading Questions

Read the assigned article “The Differential Effects of Three Types of Task Planning on the Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy in L2 Oral Production” (Rod Ellis, 2009) and answer the questions below.

Task Planning Types
1. Ellis distinguishes pre-task planning from within-task planning. What two subcategories does each contain?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Task Planning</th>
<th>Within-Task Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ________________ (perform a complete task)</td>
<td>1. ________________ (limited time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ________________ (plan content/language without performing a complete task)</td>
<td>2. ________________ (unlimited time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which of the above types best represent your approach to D-Prep activities in your lessons?
3. How might EDC lessons incorporate within-task planning and what are some pros and cons of trying to do so?

Rehearsal
4. What are some potential benefits of rehearsal?
5. Bygate (1996) and Sheppard (2006) suggest that some kind of input or post-rehearsal feedback can assist acquisition. How do these findings relate to the D-Prep and the Discussion stage?

Learner Proficiency
6. Strategic planning appears to benefit learners of low or intermediate proficiency, not advanced learners. How does your approach to D-Preps change according to learner proficiency?

Participatory Structure
7. Ellis describes two types of participatory structure - interactive or monologic. A third type of non-interactive or individual might also be included. How do these structures apply to D-Preps?

Design Complexity
8. Ellis outlines four complexity factors of task design that interact with strategic planning: 1) The degree of familiarity, 2) The degree of structure, 3) The number of distinct referents, and 4) Temporal reference. When designing and/or selecting prep materials to use, which of these factors do you consider?

Planning Time
9. The standard planning time in the studies Ellis reviewed was 10 minutes. What is your standard planning time for D1-Prep and D2-Prep? When might these standard time allocations change?
10. Mehner (1998) found that the longer the planning, the greater the fluency in the subsequent task performance. What outcomes have you observed in your classes when providing more/less time for D-Preps?

Planning Guidance
11. What is the difference between guided planning and unguided planning? What type of guidance do you provide in the set-up of your D-Preps?
12. How might EDC lessons incorporate unguided planning and what are some pros and cons of trying to do so?
APPENDIX D – Example FD Materials

D1: Discussion Preparation Principles

- Below are six highlights from the principles for D-Prep activities submitted prior to this FD. How easy is each principle to act on in your lessons? Put a cross (X) on each line to indicate your response.

1. The activity should help students generate ideas • Easy ←——→ Difficult
   for the subsequent discussion.

2. The activity should be communicative and maximise student-to-student interaction and talking time.
   • Easy ←——→ Difficult

3. The activity should provide opportunities for all students to use the target language as both speakers and listeners.
   • Easy ←——→ Difficult

4. Instructions should be simple and use set phrases to quickly focus students on the task.
   • Easy ←——→ Difficult

5. Students grouped together for the prep should be split up for the discussion to share the same ideas with a new audience.
   • Easy ←——→ Difficult

6. Students should discuss all items in the prep content.
   • Easy ←——→ Difficult

- Discuss your ideas with a partner.

Discussion

1. How easy is each principle to act on in your lessons?
2. What other principles, not listed above, do you think are important for D-Prep activities?
   (e.g. scaffold the activity for continued controlled practice; recycle target language from previous lessons; ensure a minimum interaction time of 5 minutes for D1·Prep and 8 minutes for D2·Prep; match D-Prep content to students’ proficiency level)
D2: Pre-Task Planning Factors

- Below are four quotations taken from the Ellis (2009) reading. What are your views on these pre-task-planning factors? What effect do you think each one has on students’ subsequent discussion performance?

Feedback:
“For task repetition to have an effect on acquisition learners need some kind of feedback on their initial performance of the task.” (p.6)

Participatory Structure:
“Strategic planning assisted fluency in all of the studies involving learner interaction but in only four of the six studies involving monologic performance of the tasks.” (p.21)

Planning Time:
“Mehnert (1998) found a clear relationship between the length of the planning time and fluency: the longer the planning, the greater the fluency.” (p.22)

Guidance:
“Foster and Skehan (1996) found that guided planning led to greater fluency on their narrative task... Yuan and Ellis (2007) and Giabert (2007) reported clear effects on fluency for unguided planning. More work is needed to find exactly when guided planning works better than unguided. One possibility is that it may depend on the nature of the task. Another is that it may depend on the proficiency of the learners.” (p.22)

- Discuss your ideas with a partner.

Discussion

1. What effect do the following pre-task-planning factors have on students’ discussion performance?

2. How are Ellis’ four complexity factors of task design relevant to the design and selection of D-Prep materials?
APPENDIX E – Example FD Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Time:</th>
<th>Tuesday, 13 December 2016, 13:30-15:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals:</td>
<td>Develop instructors’ understanding of the principles behind discussion preparation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-PM:</td>
<td>Jamie Lesley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PM Materials:**
- Instructor Handbook
- Level III Textbook
- Pre-FD Reading Questions including PM’s own answers
- FD Handouts
- D1-D2 monitoring sheet for notes and feedback
- Timer and whiteboard markers

**Instructor Materials:**
- Level III textbook; Instructor Handbook; Ellis article; Answers to the Pre-FD Reading Questions

**Pre-FD Tasks and Deadlines:**
- By Dec. 1: Lead-PM creates and sends Google Form to instructors requesting their D-Prep principles
- By Dec. 5: Instructors submit principles by Google Form in free format
- By Dec. 6: lead-PM sends out Ellis article and pre-FD reading questions
- By Dec. 13: Instructors read assigned Ellis article and consider pre-FD reading questions.

**Organization:**
Frame as two EDC types discussions: Prep → Discussion → Feedback

**Procedure:**
1. **Aims:**
   - Explain aim to help develop understanding of principles behind discussion preparation activities
   - Go through agenda: quick warmer related to current week’s textbook content, followed by two extended groups discussions
   - D1 focuses on instructors’ own principles and how easy or difficult it is to act on them
   - D2 addresses the Ellis paper and focuses on four pre-task planning factors of feedback, participatory structure, timing, and guidance, as well as factors relating to the contents of task design (i.e., familiarity, structure, number of referents, and temporal reference)
   - Ellis Article contents and answers to pre-FD reading Qs have been incorporated into today’s FD materials, but instructors are free to reference the pre-FD documents as when needed

2. **Warmer:**
   - Ask instructors to read textbook pages 86-87 for Lesson 12’s D1-Prep and D2-Prep (Crime and Punishment, The Death Penalty)
   - Put instructors in pairs/groups and ask them to discuss their approach to each prep in light of the principles they each submitted prior to the FD for 5-6 min.
   - Provide brief feedback on some ideas raised by instructors as a segue to D1

3. **D1: Discussion Preparation Activity Principles**
   - Allow 1-2 min. for instructors to complete D1-Prep task by reading the list of principles and marking how easy they are on the scales
   - Put instructors in new pairs/groups (PM joining if need be) and allocate 8 min. to share ideas
   - Put instructors into new groups for D1 and allocate 16 min. for group discussions
   - During D1, PM monitors and takes notes on instructors’ ideas
   - After D1, instructors report their group’s findings to a partner from the other group for 2-3 min.
   - PM provides final wrap-up and segue to next discussion by asking instructors how closely their own D-Prep principles mirror those in Ellis’ article

4. **D2: Pre-task Planning Factors**
   - Tell instructors that in the next discussion, they will focus more closely on the Ellis paper
   - Highlight four stations around room and explain that each one contains a quote from the article
   - Pair instructors with new partners (PM joining if need be)
   - Ask instructors if they prefer a fixed or open time limit for each station, i.e. 3 min. per station and change, or change whenever instructors choose to do so within 12 min. total
   - Put instructors into new groups for D2. Allocate 24 min. for discussion.
   - During D2, PM monitors and takes notes on instructors’ ideas
   - After D2, instructors report their group’s findings to a partner from the other group for 2-3 min.

5. **Conclusion:**
   - PM to provide final wrap-up by encouraging instructors to experiment with how they frame D-Preps and to consider them as potential targets for future classroom research

**Post-FD Notes:**
In D2, neither group managed to reach the second question at all. Consider reframing the task in future sessions if a greater focus on this is deemed necessary.