

Teaching Matters

The Teaching and Learning Center of the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia

Volume 4, Issue 3

2002 Spring Issue

Creating a Culture of Student-Centered Learning

By Phyllis Blumberg, Ph.D

For almost a decade the literature in higher education¹⁻⁴ identified the need to reform how college students are taught and how they learn. More recently, as more institutions have been adapted these principles, evidence is accumulating that student-centered learning leads to better retention and better prepared graduates. In my objectives for 2002, I proposed initiating a campus-wide effort to become more learning-centered. Parallel, and independent to my objective, the Strategic Planning group proposed a bold step of creating a culture of student-centered learning and living. With the confluence of the call from the literature, the accumulating evidence, my personal conviction, and the bold step from Strategic Planning group, I believe that USP needs to begin discussions to lead to actions to create a culture of student-centered learning. In this newsletter article I will describe some ideas to consider as we initiate discussions on creating a culture of student-centered learning and living. The plenary session scheduled right after lunch at the Talking About Teaching Day on Tuesday, May 7, 2002 will continue this dialogue. I will outline some characteristics of learning-centered institutions and contrast them with our present model.

Characteristics of learning-centered institutions. Seventy faculty and administrators from twenty-six diverse institutions of higher education formed the Student Learning Initiative.⁵ As a result of their collaborations, they developed a framework of characteristics learner-centered institutions.⁵ How these twenty-six institutions

(continued page 2)

IN THIS ISSUE

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 1-3 | Creating a Culture of Student-Centered Learning |
| 4-9 | Abstracts of Nominations for the Patricia Leahy InnQvations <u>W</u> ith <u>L</u> earning OWL Award |
| 10 | Call for the Document of Innovations and submission form |
| 11 | Talking about Teaching Day May 7, 2002 Registration Form |
| 12 | Technology Days and Faculty/Staff Enrichment Weeks Registration Form |
| 13-14 | Overview of previous events |
| 9,13 | Announcements |

Teaching Matters is published by the Teaching and Learning Center of the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia.

Phyllis Blumberg, Ph.D., Director
The Teaching and Learning Center, WH 230
University of the Sciences in Philadelphia
600 South Forty-third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-4495
Phone: (215) 895-1167 or (215) 895-1168
FAX: (215) 895-1112
e-mail p.blumbe@usip.edu or m.raffer@usip.edu

The Teaching and Learning Center is an educational resource for all USP faculty who are interested in helping their students become more effective learners. It maintains a current collection of books and periodicals relating to teaching and learning and student assessment. The Teaching and Learning Center web page is www.usip.edu/teching

Creating a Culture of Student-Centered Learning

(continued from page 1)

defined each of the four characteristics of this framework differed. This framework can be a stimulus for our exploration of creating a student-centered culture for learning and living.

According to the Student Learning Initiative,⁵ the four key characteristics are:

- Achieving clarity about learning outcomes
- Coordinating teaching and assessment to promote student learning
- Aligning structures and resources to serve student learning
- Working continuously to improve the environment for learning

Each characteristic has specific questions that we can use in our on-going dialogue.

While I was thinking about these characteristics, I conceptualized how USP would be different if we really created a culture of student-centered learning and living. Table 1 summarizes my reflection from the literature of what a student-centered learning environment would mean for USP. I contrasted this vision to what I perceive we are now. This table should help us to focus the discussion to help us determine the direction we may pursue. I look forward to on-going dialogue in the near future and hopefully some concrete actions will follow.

References:

1. Barr, RB.& Tagg, J. From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. Change, 1996, 28 (2), 42-47.
2. DeZure, D. (ed.) Learning from Change. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2000.
3. Fink, LD. Higher-level learning: the First Step toward more significant learning. In Lieberman, D & Wehlburg, (eds.) To Improve the Academy, Bolton, Mass: Anker Publishing Co., Inc., 2001
4. Gardiner, LF. Redesigning Higher Education: Producing Dramatic Gains in Student Learning. Report No. 7. Washington, D.C. Graduate School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University, 1994

5. Doherty, A. Riordan, T. Roth, J. Student Learning: A Central Focus for Institutions of Higher Education. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Alverno College Institute, 2002.

Table 1

Key:

1. Assessment criteria for each domain characteristic will need to be determined by USP working group
2. Backward assessment - tests on what was covered in the class
3. Forward assessment - tests on ability to use what was covered in the class in a new way (career applications)
4. Deep learning - material integrated, many associations made among concepts, allows for understanding and reflection

Tips:

Tips for understanding this table: Read table from central column, "domain characteristic" and then left and right

Left side describes present model; right side describes student-centered learning model

Traditional instructional model that has been employed at USP for many years

Proposed student – centered learning model

Specifics within this model	Characterized by	– Domain characteristic ^{® 1}	Specifics within this model	Characterized by
Instructionally driven	Teacher determines what, how students will learn	Focus	Student-learning driven: engaged students	Consistency between teaching/learning transactions and assessments of
High grades, high grade point averages, Dean's List	Competitive model, bell shaped curve of student performance	Definition of student success	Ability to demonstrate competencies in varied areas	Collaborative learning where many students succeed
Credit hours, GPA	Uniform curriculum	Graduation criteria	Demonstration of learning outcomes	Learning in core curriculum within major for undergraduate application, lifelong learning values
Homogeneous, full time student	All students can be treated alike, students must adapt to system	Views of students	Varied needs of diverse student population:	Addresses needs of
Traditional (backward assessments ²) exams to evaluate students	May evaluate content at the expense of other objectives such as values	Student evaluation	Emphasis on varied outcomes, forward assessment ³	Multiple assessment purposes of feedback improvement & making competency decisions for students
Emphasis on coverage rather than understanding	Rote memorization of large body of information	Content coverage	Emphasis on deep learning, ⁴ understanding, application	Student learning activities show understanding, depth, breadth
How instructors were taught	Isolated innovations	Guiding principles for instruction	Evidence-based support for why and how of teaching/learning transactions	Innovations lead to widespread, consistent implementation
Lecture, lab, recitation, discussions	Instructor driven	Instructional modalities	Objectives determine format, varied modalities	Student-centered learning
Content expert	Instructor conveys material	Role of the instructor	Designers of learning environments for students	Facilitator of active-learning for students

**Patricia Leahy InnOvations With Learning Award Nominations
2001-2002**

This award was established in memory of Patricia Leahy, a PT faculty member here, to acknowledge faculty's innovative efforts to increase their students' learning. Faculty members' use of new instructional strategies typically require much planning time, a willingness to take risks, reflection on what is happening, and an ability to make changes when necessary. As the title implies, this award's emphasis is on innovations that increase student learning.

This year we have 10 excellent nominees for the OWL award, all of which are summarized here. These innovations will also be showcased during the poster session during lunch on Talking about Teaching Day, May 7, 2002. The authors will be available to answer questions from 1:30 – 2:15 on May 7, 2002. The Leahy winner will be announced at the Faculty Council Luncheon, June 6, 2002.

**The Connecting Threads that Interweave Freshman Math Analysis I/II (MA 101-102) & Freshman
General Biology (BS 103-104).**

Barbara Bendl, Amy Kimchuk, Alison M. Mostrom, and Kevin C. Wolbach

The rationale behind this project is two-fold. First, we hope that students will see “connecting threads” between different disciplines, in this case Mathematics and Biology. It is a first step in building a “culture” in which students make connections between courses. Second, we hope that teams of faculty in different disciplines are enhanced by this innovative approach. In order for students to understand how potentially disparate courses emphasize similar themes, faculty must first understand the manner in which the “connecting threads” are taught by lectures in other disciplines.

Three “topics of overlap” that were selected by the participating Math and Biology faculty are: (1) Scientific Method (including scientific notation and graphing); (2) pH and logarithms; (3) The Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium Equation.

Outcome (1 Early Assessment of the Outcome of Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium Questions):
Students in the “experimental group” (enrolled in both Barbara’s or Amy’s Math Analysis I, and also in Alison’s General Biology II) received a mean score that was very similar (with overlapping standard deviations) to student in the “control group” (enrolled in Alison’s General Biology II, but not in either Barbara’s or Amy’s Math Analysis I). Additionally, a z-test comparing the means of the two groups showed no statistically significant difference.

**Patricia Leahy InnOvations With Learning Award Nominations
(continued)**

**Just in Time Teaching (JiTT)
Bernard Brunner**

Just in Time Teaching (JiTT) is an active learning technique that is described as a 'blend of high tech and low tech.' The instructor typically posts three questions on a web site. The questions may be a discussion question, a puzzle, a multiple choice question or a question that makes use of a simulation run as a Java applet. Students may respond at any convenient time after the questions are posted up to a deadline set by the instructor of from one to three hours before class. The student answers are posted at the web site, but only the instructor can read the responses. The instructor selects student responses which show a good approach to the question or that illustrate common misconceptions. The student responses are projected on a screen using a computer and projector or by using a transparency. These responses form the basis for classroom discussion of the topic for that day.

The students are assigned readings on the topic before the material is covered in class and the questions are taken from these readings. This prepares the student for the in class discussion and develops a curiosity about the answers to the assigned questions.

**Integrating Reading, Vocabulary and Dictionary Skills with Grammar, Writing and Critical Thinking
Skills in EL 095 and EL 096
Miriam Diaz-Gilbert**

The majority of students in my non-credit EL 095 and EL 096 classes are 3rd year ESL pharmacy transfer students with weak vocabulary, reading, grammar, writing and critical thinking skills. To address these needs, my courses integrate the teaching and learning of these skills in a meaningful and purposeful manner. The students play a very active role in their learning. The activities and methods used to help students develop and improve these skills, and the manner in which students' progress is evaluated, encourage students to learn from their own and each others' mistakes, to learn how to minimize errors, to develop critical thinking skills, and to approach new learning challenges with a greater degree of confidence. In addition, students learn about aspects of American society and issues unfamiliar to them and about issues in pharmacy.

The majority of the students demonstrate reasonable to remarkable progress in all skill areas at the completion of both courses. In fact, in spring 2001, 3 out of 5 3rd year PharmD students passed the Writing Proficiency Exam on their first attempt. The students consider the courses extremely demanding, but express their skills definitely improve, and even apply their new skills to other courses.

**Patricia Leahy InnOvations With Learning Award Nominations
(continued)**

Students making connections between courses through experiential learning activities

**Rogert I. Ideishi, Gina Collier,
Susan Santalucia and Pam Kearney**

The purpose of the innovation is to plan and implement a curricular design that links courses and uses experiential learning activities in real situations. The students integrate knowledge that allows them to make connections between courses. This purpose will be measured by the following two goals: Students will state that there were connections between courses in the spring semester 3rd year curriculum. Students will state that their spring semester 3rd year curriculum prepared them for their summer session 4th year.

The innovation is a planned curricular design that incorporates real world experiential activities to meet the requirements of more than once course (Diamond, 1998). One of the methods of implementation is that faculty concretely and explicitly make connections between courses. In addition, the faculty facilitates the students' ability to make connections through higher level reflective learning. Multiple opportunities are provided for the students to reflect on interrelated concepts from several courses while applying course concepts to real situations. For example, students gain concepts of the educational uses of technology, and the teaching and learning process in OT 452 and 360 respectively. Then, the students apply the knowledge and skills from these courses to create a health education brochure for a community institution in OT 382. Course surveys indicate that 87% of the students are able to articulate connections between courses and 83% of the students are able to articulate connections to subsequent courses.

Concept Mapping as a Learning Strategy

Peter Miller

Concept mapping is the graphical representation of a learner's knowledge, where all of the elements that define a concept or topic are arranged hierarchically and their inter-relationships clearly described. Third year MPT students used concept mapping in their Kinesiology course in two ways. First, they created a series of individual concept maps about their understanding of human gait that became progressively more complex as the semester proceeded. Second, they worked in small groups to create concept maps about patient case studies. Students reported that the individual maps were a helpful learning strategy in studying a complicated topic, and the group maps demonstrated a more thorough exploration of the case studies than group written papers, which were used previously in the course. The group concept maps also produced much better collaboration within groups than had been reported in the writing of group papers. The group concept maps were also put on display, and served as a source of discussion and positive feedback from other students and faculty. Students also reported that they felt that they learned more from concept mapping than paper writing, and that it was more interesting and enjoyable to do.

**Patricia Leahy InnOvations With Learning Award Nominations
(continued)**

**Implementation of Supplemental Instruction in Physiology, a traditionally difficult course
Diane W. Morel, with John Moore, Christine Schuller and Raymond Gonzalez**

Physiology is a traditionally difficult course for students, with many needing to repeat the course in order to demonstrate sufficient mastery. Supplemental Instruction (SI) is a nationally recognized program of peer-assisted study sessions that promotes development of self-awareness and essential learning skills in students. Our goal was to encourage interactions among students, promote critical analysis and prioritization of information, and to enhance student self-awareness, learning approaches and comprehension. The program utilizes "SI leaders", previously successful students of the course, as model students and facilitators at SI study sessions. Christine Schuller and Ray Gonzalez, graduate students in Pharmacology/Toxicology, served as SI leaders. They completed the course as undergraduates, were trained in the principles of SI with John Moore (Academic Success Center), and worked closely with faculty throughout the course. SI leaders attended all the lectures and conducted several 1-2 hour study sessions per week with interested students, scheduled in conjunction with students' free time. The positive impact of SI on student performance in the course was measured by comparison of the mean for students attending SI to that for the entire class, with the SI mean (for consistent attendees) 3-6 points higher than that of the class as a whole.

**Learning about Learning Through Collaborative & Cooperative Learning
Michele Mulhall**

Daily professional relations require frequent collaborative and cooperative interactions. Yet, collaborative and cooperative learning models, while every effective, remain under-utilized designs of teaching in higher education. The purpose of this innovation was to incorporate collaborative and cooperative learning theory/philosophy into a course that was formerly taught in a traditional, pedagogical format.

The objectives of the learning format were to parallel the collegial relationships that occur in the healthcare environment, to foster an environment of adult learning, and to enhance learning through construction of knowledge amongst peers. A team-oriented approach to learning was developed to facilitate the aforementioned objectives. Teams were responsible for the 1) development of presentations, 2) consensus of peer assessment, and 3) consensus of presentation assessments.

Outcome assessments (project assessment and course evaluations) were favorable. Establishing interdependency amongst learners does not appear to diminish the quality of the learning experience. Rather, combining collaborative and cooperative learning models effectively enhanced learning and enhanced the learner's willingness/ability to assume responsibility for his/her own learning.

**Patricia Leahy InnOvations With Learning Award Nominations
(continued)**

**A Repertoire of Teaching Strategies: Unleashing the Learning Potential in Underprepared College Students
Lois H. Peck**

Most students enrolled in BS103/130 during the spring semester are repeating the course. Students are challenged to become active learners, thus taking responsibility for their learning. The following strategies are introduced, modeled and practiced throughout the semester: a) A Learning Styles Inventory is administered. I model how to use these strategies to enhance student learning. b) During the first week of classes, students are required to sign a contract stating the responsibilities of the professor and students. c) During recitation, students are given real-life scenarios of students challenged by a variety of learning situations. d) Students identify important ideas and show relationships among and between these ideas by creating concept maps. e) Jigsaw Method allows student teams to conduct research, ask questions, develop teaching tools, and teach. f) After reading material not in the text, students find an article on this topic and write a review of the article.

Students' engagement levels have increased resulting in enthusiasm for group activities, and problem solving. Students' products and improved grades provide evidence of their enhanced commitment to learning. Students expressed their excitement for these new learning approaches. Students reported that they were more actively involved in the learning. Evaluations indicate that they have learned more and understand the material in greater depth.

**Longitudinal Ambulatory Care Experience in a Laboratory Course
Cathy Poon**

A longitudinal ambulatory care (AC) experience was incorporated into the pharmacotherapeutics laboratory course. The goals of this experience were to expose students to an AC setting, encourage students to incorporate knowledge and apply clinical skills, and introduce the concept of continuity of care. An AC clinic was developed utilizing the physical assessment laboratory as the practice site. Patient cases and charts were created with a variety of disease states. Students played the role of the pharmacist while instructors played the patient. Throughout the semester, three patient clinic visits were completed and students were responsible for conducting patient interviews; identifying and assessing disease and/or drug related problems; recommending initial and alternative pharmacotherapies; using biomedical literature resources; and educating patients. For each visit, different complications (often dependent on previous visits) for each patient were introduced to reinforce the concept of continuity of care. After each patient encounter, students were responsible for documenting their findings and recommendations in a patient's chart. The following outcomes were assessed during the various exercises associated with this experience: communication skills, biomedical literature utilization skills, understanding of disease states, pharmacotherapy knowledge, application of clinical skills and ability to make decisions.

**Patricia Leahy InnOvations With Learning Award Nominations
(continued)**

**Using Interaction Analysis to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Active Learning Activities
Susan Wainwright**

Interacting Analysis (IA) is a qualitative method for assessing verbal interaction. Using IA, baseline values were established for “teacher – student talk” during lecture. A variety of active learning activities were then implemented. These learning activities include guided questions, case studies; and patient problems. Two goals guided development of these instructional activities: 1) increase student participation, 2) students to apply lecture material to demonstrate clinical decision making skills.

Subsequent classroom sessions, using the developed active learning activities, were then audiotaped, transcribed, coded and assessed. These sessions were evaluated specific to two objectives: 1) My effectiveness in facilitation and supporting the students. 2) The quantity and nature of the student’s interaction with me, and their classmates.

Assessment of this data revealed a shift from “teacher → student talk” to “student → teacher talk”, and “student → student talk”, affirming that these objectives were met. Student performance on examinations and practicals improved this past year.

Reflection upon the results of “student – teacher talk” allows me to use objective data to refine my interaction with the students, as well as to refine the instructional activities used. This level of reflection has been an integral part to my growth. This maturation directs more refined questions and higher level analysis when using IA as a self-assessment tool. Sustained improvement in student performance will provide evidence for the effectiveness of these active learning activities.

Deadline for nomination for outstanding adjunct or part-time faculty award is May 26, 2002. Submission forms may be obtained from and returned to the Teaching and Learning Center.

Congratulations to Ken Thomulka for winning the Alpha Lamda Delta Freshman Professor of the Year 2002 Award.

The Document of Innovations in Teaching and Learning at the University of the Sciences

The Teaching and Learning Center of USP will produce the third annual document of educational innovations within the university. The aim of these innovations is to improve teaching and learning within our educational programs. This document is disseminated throughout the campus to give increased recognition to individual faculty who strive to improve their teaching as well as to others who assist students to learn more. Hopefully, the document will help faculty in collaborating on new ideas and will inspire others to try new methods to improve their teaching and learning.

All faculty, including full time, part time or adjunct, graduate student instructors, and staff who do formal or informal teaching or supervising clinical experiences are eligible to submit a description of their innovation.

Each innovation will be summarized in a one- two page standard abstract form (on the next page and available electronically).

More space can be used to describe aspects of the activity than shown on the form, these are specifications on what to include. The total abstract should fit on one – two pieces of letter sized paper. Use 12 font size and a standard easy to read font. Faculty who submitted a nomination for the OWL award in 2002 will automatically be included in this edition.

Faculty who received Teaching and Learning Center grants will be encouraged to describe the innovation they implemented as a result of the grant.

Deadline for submission is May 17, 2002. All submissions must be sent electronically or with a disk copy.

Innovations in Teaching and Learning at the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia 2001-2002 Submission form (limited to 2 pages)

Title of innovation _____

Name of innovator _____

Telephone number _____ email address _____

Department _____ Type of students _____

Type of course: required___ elective___, core curriculum___, professional or advanced ___

OWL Award submission: Yes___ No___

Course or activity where implemented _____

Describe rationale or goals of innovative educational activity

Describe the innovation and its implementation

Describe outcomes, especially learning outcomes, and impact of the innovation

Reflect on what's working and why it is working

Describe student reaction to the innovation

Will innovation be sustained within the course? Yes___ No___

If yes, will you do anything differently? Describe

Will you implement this innovation in other courses? Yes___ No___

Describe

What advice would you give to other people adapting this innovation?

Other comments

TALKING ABOUT TEACHING DAY, MAY 7TH 2002

REGISTRATION FORM

In the spaces provided, please mark your choices with a number in order of preferences with 1 being your top choice. We will try to accommodate you for each session but due to limited space this may not be possible. Register early as workshops and roundtable sessions are reserved on a first come first serve basis.

Please send your registrations to the Teaching and Learning Center, Box #68, or e-mail m.raffer@usip.edu

Name of Registrant (please print) _____

Department: _____ Box #: _____ e-mail: _____

Workshops

9:00 -10:30 AM

Developing concept maps for use in curricular planning or course assignments

P. Miller, L. Peck _____ WDL 110

Grading essay exams efficiently (bring papers from your students to work on)

C. Flanagan _____ WDL 115

Just in time teaching with technology

B. Brunner _____ WDL 116

Transforming your teaching into scholarship of teaching and learning

P. Blumberg _____ WDL 112

Making reflection a valuable learning experience for students

B. Hogan _____ WDL 117

10:45 - 12:15 pm

Making labs a meaningful learning experience for the students

C. Poon _____ GR LAB 208 B

Are you going up for promotion or tenure: Some tips to get started

P. Halpern, M. Zanger _____ WDL 201

Developing assignments to prevent plagiarism

M. Adams _____ WDL 202

Innovative course assessment tools

P. Blumberg, S. Wainwright _____ WDL 110

Examples of integrated within Service-Learning courses

Lori Pompa from Temple _____ WDL 112

10:45-12:45

Streamlining your grade book with Excel Getting started Part 1

A. Kimchuk _____ GR LAB 208 N

Plenary Session

2:30 – 3:45 PM

How can the faculty proactively implement the academic Bold Steps mandates from the new Strategic Plan. _____ WDL 107

Orientation to how much these mandates will impinge on what we as faculty do

Then we will divide into 2 groups to discuss: Research focus

R. Wigent, J. Tarloff

Student-centered focus

Joe Ruane, P. Blumberg

Roundtable Discussions

4:00 –5:00

Walking historical tour of Clark Park M. Kasschau _____

(Meet Visitor's Parking Lot)

How we deal with overcrowding In our classes

R. Wigent _____ WDL 112

What are we going to do with all this assessment data we collect?

E. Boyce _____ WDL 116

Are the penalties for cheating and plagiarism strong enough at USP?

A. Breaux, K. Wolbach, S. Murphy, B. Manbeck _____ WDL 115

Incorporating distance learning techniques in your traditional classes

J. McVeigh _____ WDL 117

Luncheon

Luncheon and Poster Session

12:30 – 2:15 PM

WDL 119

Yes, I will attend the luncheon _____ and have the following dietary limitations:

No, unfortunately I am unable to attend luncheon. _____

Posters placed at 12:30
Authors will staff their posters from 1:30-2:15

Posters divided into section:

Leahy-OWL submissions

Service-learning opportunities on this campus

On-line, distance education on this campus

People who presented a poster on an education topic at another meeting post their poster

I would like to put up a Poster _____

Category _____

over

Faculty / Staff Enrichment Weeks

NAME: _____

Department: _____

Monday May 6, 2002

For faculty and staff who work with first year students

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u> Plenary session	<u>Presenters</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>I will attend</u>
9 – 10:30 AM	What are first year student issues and how do we meet their needs?	Jodi Levine From Temple	Rosenberger 101	___
10:45 – 12:15 PM	People who will be teaching First Year Experience Courses	S. Trump, M. Rago	Rosenberger 102	___
10:45 – 12:15 PM	Faculty who teach first year students a. Predicting students at risk b. Teaching effectively to first year students	Faculty who teach first year students	Rosenberger 101	___

Thursday May 9, 2002 Technology Day

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenters</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>I will attend</u>
9:00 – 12:00 PM	Training on the use of Blackboard for all faculty	Blackboard Trainer	Griffith 208 N	___
1:00 – 3:00 PM	Streamling your grade book with Excel: Part II Setting up your grade book Amy Kimchuk	A. Kimchuk	Griffith 208 N	___
3:15 – 4:30 PM	Using a computer software package, Grant Slam, for developing and submitting scientific and health sciences grants	Steve Dubin	Rosenberger 100	___

Technology events, are co-sponsored by the TLTR and the CEDL

Friday – May 10, 2002 Technology Day

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenters</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>I Will Attend</u>
9:00 – 12:00 PM	Training on the use of Blackboard for all faculty	Blackboard Trainer	Griffith 208 N	___
11:30 AM	Social Lunch	You Pay	Rx Restaurant 45 th & Spruce	___
1:00 PM	Nature Walk	Alison Mostrom	Morris Arboretum*Directions can be found T&L Ctr WH 230	___

Monday May 13, 2002

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>I will attend</u>
12 – 1 PM	Power Point- User Group Discussions	Gr 110 C	___

Tuesday May 14, 2002

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>I will attend</u>
12 – 1 PM	Sigma Plot- User Group Discussions	Gr 110 C	___

Wednesday May 15, 2002

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>I will attend</u>
12 – 1 PM	Statistical Packages- User Group Discussions	Gr 110 C	___

Overview of Previous Teaching and Learning Center Events

Faculty Enhancement Workshop Series, January 2002

Addressing issues of Part-time, adult learners Rob Field, John Porter, Rod Wigent

- *Policies relating to part time students that need to be stated in the syllabus:*
 - Work load expectations; incomplete grades, extensions –(follow the University's guidelines, policies); ability to re-do or make up work; number of classes need to attend
- *Expectations:*
 - *Grading standards:* Faculty may assign poor grades for poor quality work and give students the option of re-doing the work for a better grade; however, they must do so in a consistent and fair fashion.
 - *Homework:* We do expect students to do a reasonable amount of homework for each class. Even though students may say other programs do not require homework, all graduate programs here require students to read, do projects or assignments, writing, preparing presentations, and studying for tests, etc. The general consensus was 6-8 hours per week of work outside of class is appropriate for graduate classes, 3-6 hours per week for undergraduate classes.
- *Class participation:* Class participation may count toward the final grade. Components of participation grades might include presentations, each student being responsible for a specific part of an assignment that they share with their classmates, debates and rebuttals, advocating for a specific perspective or stakeholder, etc.
- *Absences:* Work needs to be made up and students are responsible for all material even when they are absent. When students miss class discussions or presentations, it is very difficult to make up this opportunity. Some faculty allow for no more than 3 excused in-advance absences. Others do not make the distinction between excused and unexcused, they just say 3 absences.

- *Group work:* Part-time students often complain that it is difficult for groups to get together. Giving students a little time in class to organize how they will work together, schedule appointments or conference calls, etc. often helps. Students can be encouraged to work together on-line. Faculty can set up course listservs and can generate and distribute a list of names, phone numbers and email addresses (provided students agree).

Understanding university students: From knowledge to action Steve Merritt, Villanova University, panel of USP students

- Digital, computer generation
 - These students are used to getting information, entertainment, communication from computers
 - Are multi-processors - can manage several computer screens at once - listen to music, read or write on computer and talk on instant messenger all at the same time
 - Find lectures too passive
- Parents are more involved in their children's college education than ever before
 - Parents may intervene if they felt their child's grade was not high enough
 - Want to feel getting their money's worth
 - Need to appeal to parents prior to admission also
- Generation Y in college to earn more money, get a good job, not for educational experience
- Students who are carrying full or very heavy credit loads have many other responsibilities
 - Many are employed 10-15 hours per week
 - Many have family responsibilities
 - Many have active social life, other responsibilities

Overview of Previous Teaching and Learning Center Events

(continued)

March, 2002 Faculty Enrichment Day

Promoting interactive engagement within a large lecture environment

Dennis C. Jacobs, University of Notre Dame

- Divide lecture hour into smaller lectures with a formative assessment in between each smaller lecture
- Within each week students should have multiple opportunities to see how well they are learning- formative assessment
 - Formative assessments allow quickly students and faculty to see what students what they understand, areas of confusion; do not count for grades
 - Classroom assessment techniques are examples of formative assessment
 - ConcepTest - is multiple choice question that students answer by holding up answer on card
 - Many ConcepTests have been developed for chemistry
- Have students solve problems, work on concept questions in small groups in class
 - Work through preconceptions, misconceptions
 - Hear multiple perspectives
 - Practice speaking language of discipline
- Have students predict what they think they will observe, observe demonstration, explain what they saw and why
- Stages of Learning - weekly cycle

Setting	Student Activity	Feedback to Student
Home	assigned reading	on-line quiz
Lecture	take notes, do formative assessments	Peer interactions
Lab	Perform experiments	Peer interactions
Discussion Section	Solve complex problems in small groups	groups present solutions to class

What impact do cooperative learning activities have on at-risk students in general chemistry?

Dennis C. Jacobs, University of Notre Dame

- Prior to intervention students at risk had 40% chance of completing a full year of General Chemistry with a grade of a C or better (students had traditional 3 hours of lecture, 1 hour recitation, 2.5 hours of lab)
- With intervention - explained below - students at risk had 75% chance of completing a full year of General Chemistry with a grade of a C or better and many continued into both semesters of organic chemistry, majoring in chemistry
- Intervention
 - Three 50 minute lecture periods used for lecturing, demonstrations, visualizations, answering classroom assessments
 - 2.5 hour lab where students work in pairs
 - One 50 minute period for small group cooperative problem solving
 - Accountability for individual work- weekly graded homework, on-line quizzes
- Differences between cooperative learning and traditional sections
 - Time-on-task
 - Weekly feedback
 - Gain practice verbalizing concepts
 - Witness and contribute to formulation of spontaneous solutions
 - Hear multiple perspectives
 - Socialization
 - One-on-one interaction with instructor/TA
- Accountability

Overviews of all Teaching and Learning Center sponsored events, including the faculty Enhancement Week in January, 2002 and the TableTalks from January 2002 to May 2002 will be available on the Center's webpage www.usip.edu/teaching soon.

