

FACULTY PARTNERSHIP

Readiness Self-Assessment

Complete this assessment with your co-teacher before your mid-development check-in with the program's Instructional Designer, Suzanne Healy. Come with honest answers — not a status update.

COURSE INFORMATION

Course Title / Number	Program Year
Weatherhead Faculty	Healthcare Practitioner
Assessment Date	Check-In Date with Suzanne Healy

1. COURSE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

☐	We have met at least twice to design this course — not just exchange outlines.
☐	We have identified a central problem — not a set of topics — that organizes the course.
☐	We have mapped what each of us brings honestly, including where we have gaps.
☐	We have had at least one genuine disagreement about course direction — and worked through it.
☐	We can each describe what a strong DRIVE Innovation Project deliverable from this course looks like.
☐	We can also each describe what a struggling DRIVE Innovation Project looks like — in plain language.

2. ASYNCHRONOUS CONTENT (WEEKS 1-4)

☐	Both voices appear in asynchronous video content — in dialogue, not as alternating presenters.
☐	Each async module (including week 4) has a clear DRIVE Innovation Project connection, not just a reflection prompt.
☐	AI impact and regulatory/compliance threads are woven into async content — not saved for a separate week.
☐	We have reviewed each other's async modules and given substantive feedback.
☐	The async content creates productive tensions that the panel and full-day session are designed to resolve.

3. PANEL DISCUSSION & FULL-DAY SESSION

☐	Our panel questions are designed to surface productive tension — not just provide information.
☐	We have rehearsed at least one moment of productive disagreement together before the live session.

- ☐ The full-day session design does not have clear "your time" and "my time" blocks.
- ☐ We have planned at least one explicit DRIVE Innovation Project working session during the full day.
- ☐ Both instructors are present and actively engaged throughout — not just during their own segments.

4. PROGRAM INTEGRATION

- ☐ We know what the course before ours established — and we build on it explicitly.
- ☐ We have shared our course outline with the faculty pair coming after us.
- ☐ We have attended — or committed to attend — monthly faculty alignment meetings.
- ☐ Our course references at least one concept from another course in the program arc.
- ☐ Our DRIVE Innovation Project deliverable clearly advances the work participants began in prior courses.

5. THE CO-TEACHING STANDARD

- ☐ If a participant were asked "who teaches this course," the honest answer would be: "both of them, together."
- ☐ We can model uncertainty and epistemic humility in front of participants — without discomfort.
- ☐ We are prepared to learn from each other — visibly, in front of the room.
- ☐ We have planned at least one "named tension" moment where we disagree constructively in front of participants.
- ☐ We can point to where Andragogy, Community of Inquiry, and Multimedia Learning principles appear in our design.

REFLECTION PROMPTS — Bring written responses to your check-in with Suzanne Healy

1. Where are you most confident in your partnership so far?

2. Where is the biggest gap — in content coverage, collaboration quality, or DRIVE Innovation Project alignment?

3. What do you need from the Instructional Designer to move forward?

SUPPORT RESOURCES

Instructional Design Consultant	Program Logistics	Media & Production Support
Suzanne Healy healy@case.edu	Julia Kious Zabell julia.zabell@case.edu	Abby Ernst abigail.ernst@case.edu
Content structure, multimedia guidance, and mid-development check-ins.	Scheduling, logistics, room bookings, and panel guest coordination.	Recording studio access, remote production, and technical video setup.

"You are not teaching a course. You are shaping what healthcare leadership looks like a decade from now."