Contrasting characteristics, as originally defined by authors, of traditional communities of practice and many faculty learning communities.

Faculty Learning Communities (Cox and Richlin, 2004; Cox, 2011) Intentional CoP (McDonald et al., 2012)		Communities of Practice (Wenger et al., 2002; this study) Organic/Nurtured CoP (McDonald et al., 2012)
Learning and development; scholarship; com- munity building	Purpose *Why do it?*	To cooperatively solve problems and develop best practices through sharing and curation of existing and collaboratively innovated knowledge
Initiated by the institution, usually through a faculty development program; created to ad-dress a topic or to serve a cohort of primarily faculty.	Originators *Who starts it?*	Initiated by a group who discovers shared interests and problems in any domain.
Pre-determined facilitator who structures the program and guides community development	Leadership *Formal or Informal?*	Informal organization with distributed leader- ship or coordinators
Defined (usually about 6-15) and determined by a competitive application process; multidisciplinary membership is essential	Membership *How is membership determined? How many members are there?*	Membership open to all who are interested in the domain; no size limit; may/may not be multidisciplinary depending on domain
Compensation, release-time, or other incentives (e.g., books) in addition to interest	Incentive to Participate *Why be a member?*	Desire to develop skills and broaden knowledge base
Members expected to meet participation metrics and typically generate a scholarly product	Level of Participation *What do members commit to?*	Members engage at variable levels depending on available time, relevancy and need for knowledge; scholarship may be generated but is not required
Usually one year	Lifetime *How long does it last?*	Lifetime undefined with potential for cyclical, recreating initiatives
Formally endorsed, and funded (commonly $2000/year/FLC or more) as an institutional program	Institutionalized *Is it supported by the institution?*	May or may not have institutional awareness or funding; does not report to an institutional entity
Topics/tasks established by the institutional director and/or FLC facilitator, commonly with an established curriculum – cognitive learning model is prominent	Programming *Who sets the agenda?*	Topics/tasks negotiated and prioritized by the membership – situated learning model dominates
SoTL component is important and commonly required for participation	Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) *Does it lead to scholarly contributions?*	May or may not lead to SoTL
Administrative support, establish topics, recruit members, develop member-selection committee, provide incentives as stipends/books, budgeting for events and participant travel to conferences, logistical support for scheduled events, assessment of impact, provide or recruit and train facilitators	Faculty-Development Resources *What does it cost in time and money?*	Information provided to support coordinators, consult on request, staff participate as a member if interested

Stark, A.M. & Smith, G. A. (2016, p. 61)