CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

VOLUME 4

A Journal of the
Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

"The great end of education is to discipline
rather than to furnish the mind;
to train it to the use of its own powers
rather than to fill it with the accumulation of others."
~Tyron Edwards

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching is published annually as a free, refereed resource highlighting scholarly contributions to advance the practice and profession of teaching. Limited print journals are available upon request; online versions are available at http://www.insightjournal.net/.

"Let us think of education as the means of developing our greatest abilities, because in each of us there is a private hope and dream which, fulfilled, can be translated into benefit for everyone and greater strength for our nation."
~John F. Kennedy

CONTENTS
VOLUME 4 • 2009

Park University
InSight
A Journal of Scholarly Teaching
CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

EDITORIAL

SCHOLARLY ARTICLES

"I cannot teach anybody anything,
I can only make them think."
~Socrates

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"It is the supreme art of the teacher to awaken
joy in creative expression and knowledge."
~Albert Einstein

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

In 2005, Park University created the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to support its goals for academic excellence. A faculty-driven resource, CETL provides University-wide resources to faculty and creates opportunities for reflection, dialogue and exchange of best practices. The mission of CETL is to promote the practice and profession of teaching at Park University. As a faculty resource, CETL works collaboratively across the University community to:

- Connect faculty with resources to enhance academic excellence.
- Promote a culture of reflective teaching practice to stimulate instructional innovation.
- Create opportunities for cross-disciplinary faculty collaboration and exchange.
- Recognize and reward faculty contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching is a refereed journal published annually by CETL. The editorial staff invites submissions of research and scholarship that support faculty in improving the practice and profession of teaching. With an emphasis on classroom application, *InSight* articles highlight current practices in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

In this volume…

The articles in this volume each make a significant contribution to our understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning and to enhancing the quality of postsecondary education. From the timely, thought-provoking overview provided in the introductory editorial to the classroom investigations, theoretical discussions and instructional innovations reflected in the faculty articles, the pieces in this volume inspire, spark debate, and advance scholarly reflections on teaching. We wish to sincerely thank the authors who contributed to this volume of *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*. These pieces represent a commitment to quality teaching, innovative instruction and academic excellence in higher education. It is our hope that readers will be inspired to reflect upon their own teaching and continue the quest toward enhanced student learning.

--B. Jean Mandernach, Emily Donnelli-Sallee, and Amber Dailey-Hebert

"A master can tell you what he expects of you.
A teacher, though, awakens your own expectations."
~Patricia Neal

"He who dares to teach must never cease to learn."
~Anonymous

The Costs of Scholarly Teaching and Learning

Amy M. Goodburn, PhD
Associate Dean for Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences
Professor, Departments of English and Women and Gender Studies
Co-coordinator, Peer Review of Teaching Project
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

At the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) I come to SoTL work from several different locations: As an English professor in composition and rhetoric; as an associate dean for faculty within the College of Arts and Sciences; and as co-coordinator of a faculty teaching development program. This past spring was especially challenging as the country's economic free-fall led to a year filled of budget-planning exercises, which then turned into budget-cut proposals, and now impending--but still not determined--budget cuts. In many ways, UNL has fared better than most other universities nationwide. The state of Nebraska received national attention when it was named the financially "happiest state" in the country by MainStreet.com based on factors of economic well-being. UNL did not face the mid-year budget cuts that forced other institutions to freeze hiring, fire and furlough staff and faculty, and/or increase teaching loads. While the threat of budget cuts was a cloud that hovered over us throughout the year, the actual financial impact for this year was negligible. Indeed, because we were one of the few institutions continuing to hire, we benefited from a buyer's market, hiring a wonderful group of new faculty who might not otherwise have given UNL a second look. Wearing the hat of associate dean for faculty, I can say it was definitely a good year.

The numerous budget and strategic planning meetings in which I participated did give me pause, however, in thinking about the institutional structures that support the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). As I began to see how budget decisions were being made, I began to view UNL's institutional structures that support SoTL as highly vulnerable, spurring me to think more critically about the about the costs entailed in SoTL work and the ways that SoTL advocates might better argue for its value in economic terms.

What I had not fully considered is how my institution's structures lack mechanisms for making visible SoTL's centrality to the academic mission in economic terms.

It is not that I haven't considered the costs of engaging in SoTL work before. But previously I viewed the issue of cost primarily in relation to the faculty members who sought to engage in such work. In other words, I understood the issue in terms of how to support and reward faculty who seek to do SoTL, and how, equally, to combat other faculty members' perceptions that time spent on SoTL is "wasted" time not spent on generating grant dollars and scholarly publications.

What I had not fully considered is how my institution's structures lack mechanisms for making visible SoTL's centrality to the academic mission in economic terms. For instance, as I prioritized the budget planning proposals from the 29 departments, programs, and centers in my College, here are some of the primary metrics I was asked to consider:

- the number of student credit hours generated,
- the amount of research grant dollars funded,
- the ratio of student credit hour production per faculty FTE, and
- the number of undergraduate majors per program.

While these metrics were useful in comparing and evaluating programs across different departments, they led me to wonder how the faculty development project that I co-coordinate and which is funded out of the Senior Vice Chancellor's Office could compete. How could these metrics be used to assess a SoTL program

that is focused on helping faculty improve teaching across an institution? How can a program that does not directly produce student credit hours, that does not visibly generate grant dollars, that does not directly increase the number of student majors, claim centrality to the institution's academic mission?

A February meeting with the Senior Vice Chancellor's team posed similar questions about this program, which supports faculty throughout a year to document and make visible teaching and learning in a target course. While the SVCAA's Office has been highly supportive of this program (funding it to the tune of about $80,000 per year), this year the team requested more quantitative data that the project is having a direct impact on student learning. While we have collected survey data from previous faculty participants demonstrating that over 94% feel that the project has helped them to 1) better define course goals, 2) identify and articulate learning objectives, 3) revise course design, and 4) better articulate their expectations for students' learning, we still haven't figured out a way to collect data that shows a *direct* impact on students' learning. We haven't developed a way to speak directly to the metrics that the university is using to assess economic impact in relation to academic mission.

From its inception SoTL work has relied on collecting data and evidence to make arguments about what constitutes best practices in teaching and learning. Such work has been framed as systematic and ongoing, cycling back into practice for continuous improvement of teaching and learning, and making such work public and available for use by others, both institutionally and disciplinarily. But I suggest that in the present academic climate, SoTL advocates need to be more concrete about how to frame SoTL's benefits in economic terms.

Lee Shulman (2000), former president of the Carnegie Foundation, has similarly argued for the need to engage in policy discussions about SoTL's economic value:

> Those who make policies and approve budgets for our institutions are increasingly asking for evidence that we are making measurable progress toward our educational goals…. I envisage a scholarship of teaching and learning offering the kinds of evidence that can be powerful in these policy and free market discussions. (p. 52)

So how can those of us who care about SoTL work help educate university decision-makers about its economic value?

One example was illustrated in the March 13th 2009 edition of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. In an editorial titled "On the Bottom Line, Good Teaching Tops Good Research," Frank Heppner, an honors professor of biological sciences at the University of Rhode Island, compares the money that faculty at his institution generate with grants to money that faculty with strong teaching practices generate in tuition when they retain students. Heppner (2009) argues that by retaining five students who normally would drop out each semester, his teaching recovers about $250,000 in lost tuition, a sum comparable to the average grant earners at his school.

But I suggest that in the present academic climate, SoTL advocates need to be more concrete about how to frame SoTL's benefits in economic terms.

Heppner's overall argument is that institutions benefit economically by supporting faculty teaching development (2009). What I also find valuable about Heppner's argument, however, is that the approach he took to retain his students was systematic, documented, and based on collection of data--the same principles that undergird scholarly approaches to teaching and learning. Although he does not use the language of SoTL within his editorial, the headline easily could have been titled "Scholarly Teaching is Cost-Effective" or "SoTL Approaches Retain Students and Save Money." Heppner's argument raises questions that I think SoTL advocates need to consider more fully. How can we ground our claims for SoTL's importance

within terms that policy makers and university administrators can understand and act upon? What are the economic benefits to institutions that value and reward SoTL? And what are the costs to institutions that do not? As a teacher, administrator, and faculty developer, these are the SoTL questions that I am continuing to wrestle with as I prepare for the next academic year.

References

Heppner, F. (2009, March 13). On the bottom line: Good teaching tops good research. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A72.

Shulman, L. (2000). From minsk to pinsk: Why a scholarship of teaching and learning? *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*, 48-53.

Amy Goodburn is Professor of English and Associate Dean for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her research and teaching interests include critical and multicultural pedagogies, ethnographic and teacher research, and documenting and assessing teaching and learning in postsecondary education. Her recent books include Inquiry into the College Classroom: A Journey Toward Scholarly Teaching *(with Paul Savory and Amy Burnett) and* Making Teaching and Learning Visible: Peer Review and Course Portfolios *(with Dan Bernstein, Paul Savory, and Amy Burnett). Since 2001 she has co-coordinated UNL's Peer Review of Teaching Project, a year-long program that supports faculty in documenting and assessing student learning. In 2002, Dr. Goodburn was inducted into UNL's Academy of Distinguished Teachers.*

Beyond Boyer: SoTL in the Context of Interesting Scholarly Things

Bruce B. Henderson, PhD
Professor, Department of Psychology
Western Carolina University

The positive effects of Ernest Boyer's broader definition of scholarship have been attenuated by stress on published outcomes as indicators of all his scholarships, including the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). At universities outside the research university sector, we need to find ways to recognize and reward a wide variety of interesting scholarly things related to teaching that are not likely to meet the formal assessment criteria that have come to define the SoTL category of scholarship. The faculty's scholarliness in teaching should be recognized and evaluated directly.

There is considerable evidence that university faculty members outside the research university sector have felt increasing pressure since the 1970s to publish scholarly work in order to be awarded tenure, promotion and merit increases (e.g., Boyer, 1990; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000). One concern about this long-standing trend is that faculty members engaged in traditional forms of published scholarship will neglect teaching and public service activities. Perhaps most notably, Boyer (1990) and his colleagues at the Carnegie Foundation felt that the emphasis on publication meant that faculty members who were doing other useful things were not getting sufficient credit. In response to this concern, Boyer and his Carnegie colleagues offered a broader view of scholarship. It included faculty work on teaching (SoTL) and on public service (the scholarship of application or engagement) as well as on more traditional forms of scholarship (the scholarships of discovery and integration). They envisioned universities where a wide array of scholarly activities would be recognized and rewarded. They thought that the broader model of scholarship would be of special help to faculty members at comprehensive universities and small liberal arts colleges where what "counted" as scholarship tended to be most problematic (Boyer, 1990; Leatherman, 1990; Rice, 2005).

The "Boyer Model" has been widely discussed and often included in the evaluation of faculty at many universities of various types over the past two decades (O'Meara, 2005). However, the model has also stimulated controversy. SoTL has proved to be the most controversial aspect of the model in several ways. It has been difficult to define SoTL (Richlin, 2001); SoTL has been seen as an illegitimate form of scholarship (Ziolkowski, 1996); and SoTL has not been linked directly to improved teaching practices (McKinney, 2006). Despite these criticisms, it is clear that SoTL has established itself as an important form of faculty activity.

The model for faculty who work outside the research university should be one in which the effective faculty member is encouraged to be engaged in a wide variety of "interesting scholarly things."

In this essay, I emphasize SoTL within a broader scope than that which it has come to occupy. Elsewhere (Henderson, 2007; Henderson, in press) I have argued that outside the research university sector, faculty members should not be caught up in the traditional publish-or-perish approach to faculty development and evaluation. Instead, the model for faculty who work outside the research university should be one in which the effective faculty member is encouraged to be engaged in a wide variety of what I term "interesting scholarly things." Indeed, SoTL fits into this broad category of "interesting scholarly things." Central to my argument is the notion that all forms of scholarship have their roots in the scholarliness of faculty members, something that is rarely directly assessed. There are good reasons to avoid using published

scholarship, including SoTL publications, to indirectly assess a faculty member's scholarliness and good reasons instead to begin to develop means for more directly identifying, developing, and evaluating interesting scholarly things.

Why the Emphasis on Publication?

In order to put the interesting scholarly things model into perspective, it is useful to explore why the emphasis in developing and evaluating faculty members is so focused on publications. Faculty want to share their ideas and discoveries; they feel a desire and an obligation to be actively involved in their disciplines; and they know the rewards tend to go to those who publish (Fairweather, 2002). But what is behind the external (peer and administrative) pressure at the institutional level on faculty members to publish? One impetus is that there is a strong desire to increase status and prestige (Brewer, Gates & Goldman, 2002; Rhode, 2006). Status and prestige are sought by most universities, often through imitating those institutions of perceived higher status (Brint, Riddle, & Hanneman, 2006). Because of resource limitations, of the three major status generators in higher education (Brewer et al., 2002)—selectivity, big-time athletic success, and research—only the research status is practical for most institutions to pursue to "get to the next level." Publications can bring attention to institutions. Unlike good teaching, publications travel well (Winston, 1994) across campuses and across disciplines. Universities use publications to maximize prestige (Brint et al., 2006; Youn & Price, 2009; Winston, 1994). A second impetus for encouraging faculty publishing is that publications are used as indicators of quality in the tenure and promotion process and, increasingly, in the hiring process. The tacit assumption is that if individuals can produce peer-reviewed publications, their teaching and service must be scholarly.

Faculty members at all kinds of colleges and universities perceive that there is increasing pressure to publish. However, outside the research university sector, publishing in meaningful ways presents a number of problems (Marek, 2003). Faculty members do not have the time or physical and fiscal resources for conducting cutting-edge research in many disciplines. At many universities, faculty members need to be generalists (Marek, 2003). They cannot afford to be specialists and their institutions cannot afford for them to specialize. Too much emphasis on specialization at a small or moderately-sized university can limit an institution's flexibility to innovate and to differentiate faculty assignments (Youn & Price, 2009).

The way to demonstrate the new scholarships, especially SoTL, has increasingly taken the form of publications; because of this emphasis on traditional publishing, Boyer's expanded vision of scholarship has realized fewer and fewer practical consequences.

Boyer (1990) recognized that many faculty members at institutions outside the research sector were expected, by themselves and others, to be productive scholars but found themselves consumed by the demands of teaching and service. Boyer thought that the broader view of scholarship would be more inclusive, providing those faculty members outside the research university with opportunities to be scholarly and to feel better about themselves (Boyer, 1990). However, the way to demonstrate the new scholarships, especially SoTL, has increasingly taken the form of publications (Boyer, 1996; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997); because of this emphasis on traditional publishing, Boyer's expanded vision of scholarship has realized fewer and fewer practical consequences. Colleges and universities outside the research sector have always celebrated publications in teaching- and engagement-related journals. Thus, using the Boyer model changed how scholarship is functionally viewed very little at most colleges and universities. Even at research universities, where those kinds of publications once might have been seen as third-rate, or more likely, not counted at all, work in SoTL or scholarship of engagement has been seen as a useful add-on to one's résumé, not a substitute for disciplinary scholarship (O'Meara, 2005).

Interesting Scholarly Things

Publications in all of Boyer's categories of scholarship are interesting scholarly things. However, there are several reasons why interesting scholarly things should not be limited to publications only. First, scholarly publications are of limited use as prestige generators. There are too many of them, with some estimates of as many as 100,000 journals worldwide (Rhode, 2006). Relatively few publications have an impact. The modal number of times a publication is cited by another is 0 (Hamilton, 1990, 1991; Schwartz, 1997). Relatively few contributors to any field make a significant impact (Allen, 2003; Bensman, 2001; Ioannidis, 2006). Second, publications are of limited usefulness as indicators of quality. The peer review process in the publication world is fraught with problems of disciplinary politics, variation in the quality of referees, and low inter-observer reliability between referees (Weller, 2001). At the local level, publications are frequently counted, not systematically evaluated for their quality (Boyer, 1990). Moreover, no documented connection exists to prove a relationship between publishing (even in SoTL journals) and quality of instruction (Marsh & Hattie, 2002). Third, publications simply reflect too small a proportion of the many scholarly activities of most faculty members. Within the research university sector, scholarly peer-reviewed publications will probably remain the *sine qua non* (Daly, 1994). Outside the research university, however, a singular focus on publications makes little sense.

Interesting scholarly things are teaching-, research- and service-related activities that use a scholar's disciplinary expertise. They include publications, but they also include unpublished forms of scholarliness in teaching, research and public service (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2006). For example, in teaching they include the scholarly construction of syllabi, modification and updating of lectures, and the development of innovative exercises and assessments. In research they include exploratory research and research projects with students that because of their preliminary nature or distance from the mainstream may be considered un-publishable. In public service they may include the provision of scholarly expertise through consulting of various types or the conducting of workshops for a variety of audiences. These unpublished activities are interesting scholarly things that do not "count" as scholarship at many colleges and universities until they can be converted into publications. Interesting scholarly things do not include obsolete lectures, consulting based on common sense or outdated research, or the chores that must be done at every institution, including most committee work that does not depend on one's expertise.

Interesting scholarly things are teaching-, research- and service-related activities that use a scholar's disciplinary expertise.

In the interesting scholarly things model, faculty evaluation and development can be seen as developmental processes. When unpublished faculty activities are scholarly and carefully encouraged and evaluated they may lead to publications. For example, while new faculty members might be intimidated by the idea of doing a full-blown SoTL project, they might respond well to consuming the literature on the pedagogy of their disciplines, sharing teaching ideas and then systematically collecting data on teaching effectiveness.

Consumatory Scholarship

The common factor in the wide variety of interesting scholarly things, including the unpublished forms of scholarliness, is that they are all based in a faculty member's developing expertise. This expertise comes from what I have called "consumatory" scholarship. "Consumatory" is used here in the sense of consume as "taking in" or "absorbing." The category of interesting scholarly things intentionally blurs the lines between scholarliness and scholarship. Richlin (2001) and others have argued for a clear distinction between SoTL and scholarly teaching

to elevate SoTL in prestige and visibility, perhaps fearing that disciplines will not accept SoTL as scholarship unless it is similar (especially in terms of peer review) to traditional scholarship. Unfortunately, this emphasis leads to a focus on status and prestige rather than on the underlying quality of faculty work. Also, an emphasis on external peer review limits review to more traditional forms (i.e., publications) and excuses faculty from doing the hard work of developing means for conducting effective evaluation of scholarly teaching, unpublished scholarly research, and scholarly engagement.

SoTL in the Perspective of Interesting Scholarly Things

Thinking about faculty work as interesting scholarly things has several advantages. For example, SoTL has become an accepted form of scholarship in many settings, yet it is not established that SoTL activities lead to the improvement of teaching (McKinney, 2006). I suspect that like the much touted but mythical relationship between discovery research and teaching, a SoTL-teaching quality connection is unlikely to be found. Yet many interesting scholarly activities that may lead to SoTL (or may never be formalized in that way) probably have a more direct relation to the quality of instruction. These range from relatively minor pedagogical techniques often called "teaching tips" to major course innovations. Central to scholarly teaching is the development of what Shulman (1987) has called pedagogical content knowledge. Pedagogical content knowledge is the thoughtful combining of knowledge of disciplinary concepts, teaching methods, and creative reflection on how concepts and methods can be interwoven in ways that results in student learning. Good teachers at all levels have always engaged in this fundamental activity. It is frequently a trial and error process that evolves over time. I suspect much of the best work in SoTL has involved and will involve the systematization of this scholarly work, based in pedagogical content knowledge, resulting in traditional peer-reviewed outcomes.

Pedagogical content knowledge is the thoughtful combining of knowledge of disciplinary concepts, teaching methods, and creative reflection on how concepts and methods can be interwoven in ways that results in student learning.

Both the disciplinary knowledge and the pedagogical knowledge in scholarly teaching have their roots in consumatory scholarship. My argument is that all kinds of scholarship, including SoTL, are likely to flourish in climates in which interesting scholarly activities, and the consumatory scholarship they stimulate, are encouraged. The traditional focus on the products of scholarship rather than scholarly process has put the cart before the horse. Let me illustrate with an example from my own recent experience. I am in my fourth decade of teaching child psychology to undergraduate students. Despite many and varied efforts, there are concepts and theories in my discipline that I have had difficulty teaching, as indicated by student performance on exams and in other written work. I am currently trying some new approaches based on what I have read about my discipline and about ways to teach it (my thinking is closely aligned with that of McDevitt & Ormrod, 2008). What I am doing is scholarly teaching and its scholarliness could be assessed by my departmental peers. I am also systematically studying my new approach with the use of pre- and post-measures, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, and documentation of my efforts. If I can show my new approach works, I can write it up and try to get it published in a SoTL journal. If it does get published, it will become SoTL instead of just scholarly teaching. If it does not succeed, it will not be published (failures, no matter how instructive, are essentially impossible to get published), but my effort will remain an interesting scholarly thing that nonetheless should be recognized and evaluated.

Interesting Scholarly Things and Student Learning

What might the interesting scholarly things model do for student learning? In the preface of his 1990 book, Boyer expressed his concern about the effect of focusing on faculty publishing on teaching and learning. His expanded view of scholarship was designed to broaden what "counts" in faculty assessment to include the scholarly improvement of teaching and work with students. The interesting scholarly things model "counts" those scholarly activities closest to students, including pedagogical innovations, informal research projects, and service-learning that has a scholarly base. When scholarly work with students leads to paper presentations or publications, so much the better, but learning can occur when it does not result in peer reviewed articles.

Objections

A number of likely objections to the interesting scholarly things model can be anticipated. I will address a few that have particular relevance to SoTL.

Slouching toward scholardom. Ziolkowski (1996) argues that broadening the concept of scholarship weakens it. Just as the core beliefs of Christianity were diluted in the development of the "official Christianity" of the European state churches (Christendom), using the term "scholarship" to refer to activities other than traditional research and publication makes it meaningless. Faculty members will want credit for chairing the social committee, traveling abroad to gain teaching-related experience, publishing in the local gardening newsletter, or belonging to the local service clubs. The model of interesting scholarly things prevents dilution of that kind. It suggests that we attend to the scholarliness of everything we do. The faculty member who claims credit for an activity (teaching, service, or research) would have to demonstrate how it reflects disciplinary expertise.

The scholarly pumpkin. The concern with devolution into scholardom has a special application in regard to SoTL. Quality control has been a central issue in debates about SoTL (Dewar, 2008). I recently talked with the members of a department of mathematics resistant to adding requirements of any form of scholarship to their annual review and tenure documents. I suggested that there were many different kinds of useful and interesting scholarly things they could (and should) be doing, such as finding better ways to teach mathematics to the many students who struggle with math. One faculty member responded that he had carved mathematical symbols into a pumpkin one Halloween, but that he did not think that was scholarship. Nor is it an interesting scholarly thing. Faculty members who want credit for doing interesting scholarly things need to be able to show how those things reflect their scholarly expertise in meaningful ways (Andresen, 2000).

Faculty members who want credit for doing interesting scholarly things need to be able to show how those things reflect their scholarly expertise in meaningful ways.

Measuring interesting scholarly things. There are challenges to measuring a wide array of interesting scholarly things. New forms of peer review involving different kinds of peers inside and outside one's units and disciplines are required. Regional consortia may be needed to share peer review responsibilities across institutions and disciplines. There are technical issues with all kinds of peer review (Weller, 2001) but the issues in evaluating interesting things are less questions of technical possibility than of the willingness to make the effort to find new ways of judging faculty work. Perhaps too much energy has been spent trying to distinguish what is and what is not SoTL. Assessing a broader range of interesting scholarly things should reduce the likelihood of border wars about what does and does not "count." However, until unpublished interesting scholarly things are considered to be important enough to measure, the hard work of developing ways to measure them within disciplines will not occur.

Issues of collegiality. A concern many faculty members and administrators have about faculty evaluation is the effect of collegial relationships on objectivity. Peer reviews by those within one's own unit are seen as being ineffective or useless either because peers are too positive or too petty. I am not so naïve to believe this is not a problem. But I am also convinced that academics are smart enough to develop professional attitudes and control mechanisms that can minimize the effects of a loss of objectivity. Regional inter-institutional arrangements like those referred to above are one mechanism, but the possibility of effective intra-institutional mechanisms should not be abandoned. Many SoTL and scholarly teaching activities can be evaluated across disciplines, lessening the bureaucratic difficulties of peer review within smaller units.

The accrediting agencies say we have to do research. Administrators at all kinds of colleges and universities push their faculties to do more research and publication (Youn & Price, 2009). They are creatures of the culture that for some 60 years has provided a single standard for judging the quality of faculty members and institutions, the publication of books and articles in peer-reviewed journals (Lynton, 1983). Imitation of institutions whose faculties are most successful at meeting this standard has led to the snake-like procession Riesman (1965) described many years ago. The most commonly heard cries for more traditional scholarship are "we won't get accredited if we don't publish more" and "we need to take this institution to the next level." However, not all faculty members need to be doing traditional forms of scholarship all the time or throughout their careers. On the other hand, all faculty members should be doing interesting scholarly things all the time and throughout their careers.

The status/prestige problem. Perhaps the single greatest source of problems for the interesting scholarly things model is the attitude that activities (including SoTL) other than traditional scholarship and publication are simply not important enough to count (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002). Real scholars publish; that is all there is to it. This problem may be insurmountable in the research university where faculty members who spend a lot of time on SoTL activities do so at their own peril (Daly, 1994; Shapiro, 2006). At comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, however, strong leadership should be able to overcome the hegemony of the research university model. It will not be easy. All faculty members with doctorates are prepared to be publishing scholars and, too often, to look down upon those who are not (ironically, whether or not they are publishing scholars). They are not generally well-prepared for the kinds of jobs outside the research university sector most of them obtain (Austin, 2002). The truth is that there really is not that much traditional scholarship and publishing going on at the comprehensive universities and most of the liberal arts colleges (e.g., Toutkoushian, Porter, Danielson, & Hollis, 2003). On many campuses, the ratio of rhetoric about publishing to the reality of publishing is quite high. On the other hand, SoTL-related publishing has been shown to be a special niche for faculty members at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges (Henderson & Buchanan, 2007). The even broader category of interesting scholarly things may be able to find acceptance in the comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, thus allowing the development of distinctive missions and breaking the procession of institutions mindlessly following the lead of the research universities (Morphew, 2002).

The even broader category of interesting scholarly things may be able to find acceptance in the comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, thus allowing the development of distinctive missions and breaking the procession of institutions mindlessly following the lead of the research universities.

Conclusion

Faculty members do all kinds of interesting scholarly things. In our current systems of faculty development and rewards, the faculty members who get recognition are those who garner prestige by becoming published scholars. Yet what may be most important to the central mission of the majority of colleges and universities, to the learning of students and to the development of effective teaching, are those scholarly activities resulting from consumatory scholarship in disciplines and pedagogy that never get reviewed by peers from outside one's institutional units. These more "local" activities, including nascent forms of SoTL and scholarly teaching, *can* be reviewed and evaluated if faculty members will make the time and effort to develop ways to do so (Diamond, 2002; Trower, 2000).

References

Allen, W. B. (2003). *Habits of mind: Fostering access and excellence in higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Andresen, L. W. (2000). A useable, trans-disciplinary conception of scholarship. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *19*(2), 137-153.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*(2), 119-144.

Bensman, S. J. (2001). Urquhart's and Garfield's laws: The British controversy over their validity. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *52*(9), 714-724.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). From scholarship reconsidered to scholarship assessed. *Quest*, *48*(2), 129-139.

Braxton, J. M., & Del Favero, M. (2002). Evaluating scholarship performance: Traditional and emergent assessment templates. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 114*, 19-32.

Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2006). Ideal and actual value patterns toward domains of scholarship in three types of colleges and universities. *New Directionsfor Institutional Research*, *129*, 67-76.

Brewer, D. J., Gates, S. M., & Goldman, C. A. (2002). *In pursuit of prestige: Strategy and competition in U.S. higher education.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Brint, S., Riddle, M., & Hanneman, R. A. (2006). Reference sets, identities, and aspirations in a complex organizational field: The case of American four-year colleges and universities. *Sociology of Education, 79*(3), 229-252.

Daly, W. T. (1994). Teaching and scholarship: Adapting American higher education to hard times. *Journal of Higher Education, 65*(1), 45-57.

Dewar, J. M. (2008). An apology for the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *3*, 17-22.

Diamond, R. M. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *90*, 73-79.

Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 26-48.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hamilton, D. P. (1990, December 7). Publishing by-and for-the numbers: New evidence raises the possibility that a majority of scientific papers make negligible contributions to knowledge. *Science*, *250*, 1331-1332.

Hamilton, D. P. (1991, January 4). Research papers: Who's uncited now? *Science*, *251*, 25.

Henderson, B. B. (2007). *Teaching at the people's university: An introduction to the state comprehensive university*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass/Anker Series.

Henderson, B. B. (in press). Mission creep and teaching at the master's university. *College Teaching.*

Henderson, B. B. & Buchanan, H. E. (2007). The scholarship of teaching and learning: A special niche for faculty at comprehensive universities? *Research in Higher Education*, *48*(5), 523-543.

Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2006). Concentration of the most-cited papers in the scientific literature: Analysis of journal ecosystems. *PLoS one*, *1*(1), e5. Retrieved September 11, 2008 from http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0000005

Leatherman, C. (1990, December 5). Definition of faculty scholarship must be expanded to include teaching, Carnegie Foundation says. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *37*, A1, A16-A17.

Lynton, E. A. (1983). A crisis of purpose: Reexamining the role of the university. *Change, 15*, 18-23, 53.

Marek, J. (2003). *Scholarship Reconsidered* ten years after and the small college. *Profession 2003,* 44-54.

Marsh, H. W., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs? *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(5), 603-641.

McDevitt, T. M., & Ormrod, J. E. (2008). Fostering conceptual change about child development in prospective teachers and other college students. *Child Development Perspectives*, *2*(2), 85-91.

McKinney, K. (2006). Attitudinal and structural factors contributing to challenges in the work of the scholarship of teaching and learning. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *129*, 37-50.

Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *Journal of Higher Education*, *71*(4), 454-475.

Morphew, C. C. (2002). A rose by any other name: Which colleges become universities? *Review of Higher Education, 25*(2), 207-223.

O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education, 46*(5), 479-510.

Rhode, D. L. (2006). *In pursuit of knowledge: Scholars, status, and academic culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Law and Politics.

Rice, R. E. (2005). Scholarship reconsidered: History and context. In K. A. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (pp. 17-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, *86*, 57-68.

Riesman, D. (1965). *Constraint and variety in American education (2nd ed.)*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Schwartz, C. A. (1997). The rise and fall of uncitedness. *College and Research Libraries*, *58*(1), 19-29.

Shapiro, H. N. (2006). Promotion and tenure and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Change*, *38*(2), 38-43.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Toutkoushian, R. K., Porter, S. R., Danielson, C., & Hollis, P. R. (2003). Using publications counts to measure an institution's research productivity. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2), 121-148.

Trower, C. A. (Ed.). (2000). *Policies on faculty appointment: Standard practices and unusual arrangements*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Weller, A. C. (2001). *Editorial peer review: Its strengths and weaknesses*. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Winston, G. C. (1994). The decline in undergraduate teaching: Moral failure or market pressure? *Change*, *26*(5), 8-15.

Youn, T. I. K., & Price, T. M. (2009). Learning from the experience of others: The evolution of faculty tenure and promotion rules in comprehensive institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, *80* (2), 204-237.

Ziolkowski, E. J. (1996). Slouching toward scholardom: The endangered American college. *College English*, *58*(5), 568-588.

Bruce Henderson is a Professor of Psychology at Western Carolina University. He received his PhD in Child Psychology from the University of Minnesota and conducts research in both developmental psychology and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Specifically, he has research interests in curiosity and exploratory behavior, development of intrinsic motivation, memory development, effects of school bus experiences on child development, and issues in higher education.

Applying the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Pursuing a Deeper Understanding of How Students Learn

Michael Kiener, PhD, CRC
Assistant Professor, Rehabilitation School of Health Professions
Maryville University

The research discussed within is one example of how to move from scholarly teaching to the scholarship of teaching and learning. This transition began with a desire to better understand the teaching and learning process and evolved into the development of an empirically-based emerging theory called Mutual Engagement (ME). Mutual Engagement reinforces how group formation and a safe learning environment can benefit teaching and learning. Mutual Engagement embraces classroom research with the goal of making teaching and learning more visible for others to critique and to build theory and pedagogy.

It is safe to say that most educators would like to be scholarly teachers. Staying current professionally, updating course material, and examining student understanding are all examples of scholarly teaching. However, scholarly teaching is not synonymous to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Huber and Hutchings (2005) define SoTL as an emerging construct with its foundation in pedagogy, assessment, and in classroom and action research. SoTL involves critically questioning practice, collecting and analyzing appropriate data, implementing action(s) based on data analysis, and disseminating results (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). The transformation from scholarly teaching to scholarship of teaching and learning requires a deliberately constructed research context, a lens to view and apply content and pedagogical knowledge in a learning environment focused on student understanding.

The transformation from scholarly teaching to scholarship of teaching and learning requires a deliberately constructed research context, a lens to view and apply content and pedagogical knowledge in a learning environment focused on student understanding.

Inherent in developing research are the integration of past research from multiple disciplines and the dissemination of findings (Kelley, 2008). A unique aspect of SoTL research is the ease with which this integration can happen because of the diversity of sources at the SoTL researcher's fingertips. Arguably, most SoTL research can integrate content from SoTL, education, assessment, classroom research, and the content domain of the researcher.

Because of their similarities, research from the fields of SoTL, instructional communication, motivation, and counselor education can be effectively integrated to gain a deeper understanding of the intricate interaction among students, teachers, course material, and the learning environment. SoTL, communication, and counselor education research all deal, at least in part, with interactions between two or more individuals. Moreover, motivation theory is linked to these disciplines as it seeks to describe how motivation influences communicating, learning, and changing. Therefore, utilizing research from multiple disciplines to examine SoTL research questions can provide a rich context to view phenomenon under investigation and can yield outcomes potentially beneficial to multiple disciplines.

In counselor education, Sexton (1998) and Guiffrida (2005) have called attention to the need to examine a deeper understanding of the teaching and learning process due to a lack of research focused on counseling pedagogy. The majority of research in counselor education focuses on learning has been centered on specific skill development rather than class design (Granello, 2000; Sexton, 1998). Thus, counselor education has the ability to benefit from other disciplines by examining how those disciplines have framed SoTL-based research questions.

Instructional communication and the motivational theory of self-determination focus on the learning environment as a means to understand the learning process. One aspect of instructional communication research focuses on the communication patterns of instructors. Specifically, teacher "immediacy" refers to the verbal and nonverbal processes that can increase and decrease a student's feeling of closeness to the teacher. Examples of positive immediacy behaviors include humor, teacher narratives, eye contact, and smiling; these behaviors have been linked to increases in affective and cognitive learning (Witt, Wheeless, & Allen, 2004). Self-determination examines student motivation in the learning process. Researchers have found that students who express higher levels of self-determination are more likely to be internally motivated and demonstrate more ability to apply course material in other settings (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). From this perspective, it is feasible to believe that counselor education also will benefit from a SoTL-framed research question that incorporates the multi-faceted learning environment to support the need for counseling pedagogy research.

This brief literature review illustrates the opportunity for scholars within the fields involved in counselor education to implement the principles of SoTL to discover not only what effective teaching looks like but also to discover how these students learn (and perhaps why they do not). This article describes how a series of research studies evolved to become an emerging theory to describe the teaching and learning processes of counseling students. The primary objective of the manuscript, following the principles of SoTL research, is to make this emerging theory public and to invite other researchers to apply and critique its usefulness. However, we also offer our experience as a potentially generalizable model for how to utilize SoTL inquiry to improve teaching and learning.

Research Origins

The genesis of these projects originated out of a desire to become a better teacher, specifically to better understand how students learn beginning counseling skills (Kiener, 2007a). The initial research questions were posed as part of a collaborative action research project which collected and analyzed data using grounded theory. Strauss and Corbin (1998) defined grounded theory as "theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process. In this method, data collection, analysis, and eventual theory stand in close relationship to one another" (p. 12). Out of this first investigation, additional studies were conducted to further understand the teaching and learning process (Kiener, 2008a; Kiener, 2008b; Kiener, 2007b). In general, this research focused on the conditions and context in which learning occurred—the learning environment. The culminating effort of the research was an emerging theory termed Mutual Engagement.

Framing the Research Questions: Methodology

Due to the nature of the research questions, specifically the focus on the context influencing teaching and learning processes, a qualitative methodology was employed. Grounded theory was chosen due to the researcher's desire to hear from students directly about what they learned and what impacted their understanding. Thus, the research viewed questioning, data collection, and analysis as emanating from the students and instructor (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Moreover, the meta-methodology of action research was used to frame and guide the research.

Participants, Data, and Procedures

All four of the classroom-based research studies were conducted at a small private mid-western university. All of the participants (n=48) were graduate

students enrolled in a rehabilitation counseling program. The research was carried out in introductory, culminating, and clinical courses employing a variety of teaching methods to engage student learning.

Stringer's (2007) action research method of systematic ongoing investigation was used to frame the data collection and analysis. Strauss and Corbin's (1998) grounded theory approach of coding, constant comparison, and theoretical sampling were used to develop all themes and core categories. In general, data collection and analysis were conducted simultaneously to answer the research questions. The data was continually analyzed to better understand the emerging categories and to gain a deeper understanding of the research questions.

The primary data consisted of classroom observations made by the instructor, individual class planning notes, formal and informal class assignments, and student evaluations. To help increase credibility of the data, preliminary findings were discussed with other qualitative and action researchers; ongoing analysis was discussed with the participants; and all the studies were conducted over the entire semester. Approximately 500 pieces of data were collected and analyzed. Examining the four original research studies provided greater understanding of the creation of the core categories and how the data were utilized (Kiener, 2008a; Kiener, 2008b; Kiener, 2007a; Kiener, 2007b).

The findings of the four studies found "mutual engagement" and a comfortable learning environment as core categories; revealed that the teaching process emerged as an ongoing cyclical pattern of investigation; studied how student learning matched course outcomes; and examined how students experienced their understanding through service- learning. The following section provides an in-depth discussion of the teaching and learning theory, Mutual Engagement, that emerged from this application of SoTL research.

Mutual Engagement

Mutual engagement (ME) is an emerging theory that guides teaching and student learning. ME is not a specific set of rules about learning but rather offers guiding principles that embrace the formation of group dynamics as the basis of learning, applicable to all disciplines. Simply put, ME is the process in which students and their instructor co-construct a safe environment in which to give and receive feedback for the betterment of learning. A "safe" environment can be defined as one in which individuals are comfortable to voice their opinion and are respected inside and outside of class. As expressed by students on their course evaluations, a safe environment "encourages participation and facilitates the learning process" and the professor's "teaching style lends itself to everyone feeling safe enough to have and voice an opinion."

Mutual engagement is not a specific set of rules about learning but rather offers guiding principles that embrace the formation of group dynamics as the basis of learning, applicable to all disciplines.

An essential component of ME involves viewing each course as a group. Many of the techniques group leaders employ to encourage group formation are also used by instructors. For example, discussing the syllabus and class expectations is a key way to form the norms or behaviors of a group. Group leaders and teachers function as guides as a means to engage all participants in discussion or content. The importance of feedback in teaching and group dynamics is also central to group formation; whether it is in the form of direct or peer feedback, the group leader or instructor models appropriate feedback with the goal of improvement for students or group members.

In addition to the similarities between groups and courses, there are other aspects of group dynamics that can be utilized to promote teaching. In most groups, the leader's role diminishes as the group progresses and leadership shifts to members. ME embraces this process and encourages students to direct class activities to better meet their needs as learners. In essence the students and

instructor become partners, mutually engaged in the teaching and learning process. The following student feedback provided on a course evaluation speaks to group formation and learning. The instructor "gave us the opportunity to develop the class based on our learning styles and needs. This created a bond in the class and a comfortability (sic) level between all of us that encouraged class participation and learning," "[the p]rofessor welcomed participation and guided us as a group," and the instructor "[facilitated] my learning about all aspects of rehabilitation counseling and encourage[d] our class to direct our own learning."

A pedagogical technique that can be used to facilitate group formation is pre-quizzes (Kiener, 2008c). Pre-quizzes are non-graded questions given at the beginning of class that can serve as an ice-breaker, review of material, and or an anticipatory set. Pre-quizzes are interwoven in ME as a means to keep students engaged in class material throughout the semester. Pre-quiz questions can be posted weekly on a course management tool (e.g., WebCT, Blackboard, Desire 2 Learn) or anywhere students have access to them. Pre-quiz questions are used to assess students' prior knowledge, misconceptions, and as a means to facilitate participation from all students. Examples of pre-quiz questions used in this study included: (1) What does strengths-based counseling mean to you? (instructor-developed) and (2) What could threaten construct validity? (student-developed).

Students can also develop pre-quiz questions as a method to assert their voice in their learning. Examining student pre-quiz questions can allow the instructor to "see" what the students view as important and can thus indicate student understanding. Student pre-quiz questions that address analysis or synthesis may indicate a deeper understanding of course material. Here is one comment from a student evaluation regarding pre-quizzes and student understanding. "I believe the pre-quiz questions and the journal/portfolio really helped to increase our awareness of other perspectives as well as our own perspectives on disability. I have gained a lot of insight into myself and others."

Emphasizing ongoing assessment throughout the course is another pedagogical technique promoted by ME to develop group formation. In addition to ongoing assessment, multiple forms of assessment (formative, summative, peer, graded, ungraded) facilitates assessment as a norm. This norm can establish a developmental approach to learning as opposed to learning being seen as a relatively constant trait. Thus, time to practice, manipulate, and master course content is paramount in ME. To effectively capitalize on multiple forms of ongoing assessment, an "intellectually safe atmosphere" (Schrader, 2004) has to be created. Students can more effectively benefit from assessment when they feel supported by their instructor and classmates. As observed throughout the study, when this atmosphere is established, students have a better opportunity to experience the difference between being *evaluated* and having their learning *assessed*.

A goal of mutual engagement is for students to increase their sense of ownership in their learning and to gain a greater sense of their affective learning.

Instructor flexibility is crucial in ME for supporting emerging student curriculum, encouraging creativity in learning performances, and letting students experience ambiguity in assignments and content. A goal of ME is for students to increase their sense of ownership in their learning and to gain a greater sense of their affective learning. ME increases the ability to create an environment for students to see a connection between class content and its utility in their profession. It is feasible to believe that when students take a greater responsibility for their learning and how content is presented, discussed, and integrated in class, they will see its connection not only to other courses but to their profession. The following quote from a student evaluation illustrates this point:

> *[The] professor creates a learning environment by integrating lectures, group work, class participation, critiques, case studies and videos for understanding. Asks questions for critical thinking.*

Allows class to have input on the agenda for each class and respects comments and adjusts accordingly.

One way to capitalize on student creativity is by developing classes that are inductively organized. Instead of stating a theory, giving specific examples, and then inquiring with students on their understanding, start by asking students their thoughts on a topic, create additional examples as a class, and then finish with the theory. Inductive teaching emphasizes students as active participants instead of passive recipients.

Utilizing case studies can also highlight flexibility in class structure and allow students to deal with ambiguity in course content. Case studies can break up the normal routine of classes. Case studies can also be employed to connect multiple classes and assess student application. Allowing time in class for students to work with case studies provides experiential learning and allows the instructor to immediately give feedback on student understanding. Employing multiple pedagogical techniques can increase students' ability to handle ambiguity by preventing a routine class structure.

A final component of ME is action research. Utilizing ME as a framework to monitor and assess student understanding requires a rigorous ongoing pattern of inquiry, action based on class inquiry, and reflecting on actions taken (instructor planning notes). The collaborative environment of ME fits well with participatory principles of action research and allows instructors and students to engage in ongoing assessment on the teaching and learning process. Overtly introducing the principles of action research into curriculum and modeling an ongoing pattern of inquiry to students can provide a valuable tool for developing critical thinking skills and thus the potential for becoming a reflective practitioner (Kiener & Koch, in press).

Utilizing mutual engagement as a framework to monitor and assess student understanding requires a rigorous ongoing pattern of inquiry, action based on class inquiry, and reflecting on actions taken.

"Moving from an outsider perspective to an apprentice" captures how students were thinking about course material throughout the action research studies. This phenomenon is similar to the transition from novice to expert. However, students at this level have an understanding at a pre-novice stage and progress towards a novice stage. This conceptualization may be beneficial to other professional programs as a means to identify pre-novice misconceptions in students and to develop strategies for developing desired understanding.

For example, in rehabilitation counseling, students with an outsider perspective may not have a complete knowledge of what it means to be a rehabilitation counselor in terms of employment and/or scope of practice. Limited awareness and misconceptions are common to this perspective. As students progress through the curriculum and interact with the material, they develop experiences that expand their awareness and dismantle or reinforce misconceptions. As students progressed towards becoming apprentices, students develop the ability to better handle ambiguity in their learning and realize there are multiple ways to solve problems. While apprentice rehabilitation counselors may be able to define the profession in terms of their personal career interests, they may still have limited knowledge of career opportunities outside of those interests. In other words, individuals who have an outsider perspective do not know what they do not know, whereas the apprentice can begin to ask questions of his or her skill and seek avenues to build his or her practice.

Application of Mutual Engagement to other Disciplines

Conceivably the greatest benefit ME has to counselor education and to other disciplines is its ability to frame the contextual aspect of instructor and student learning. In addition to employing pedagogical techniques to facilitate group formation, ME emphasizes mutual collaboration between students and instructors to

create a safe learning environment, as a safe environment is a prerequisite to establishing group formation. Therefore, instructors can consider the communication and motivation patterns of their students and themselves, in addition to content-driven pedagogical techniques, as means for enhancing and increasing student learning.

Perhaps the first step for other disciplines looking to utilize ME is to think about the communication patterns of their profession. For example, health professions advocate therapeutic communication—empathetic and nonjudgmental. Modeling and employing therapeutic communication in the classroom is one method for students to learn the technique and, equally important, can serve as the foundation for establishing a safe environment for asking questions and receiving feedback. Thus, the creation of a safe learning environment can provide a greater potential for a class to form as a group. Additionally, once a class has formed, pedagogical techniques like the pre- and post-quizzing can be used to increase student understanding. More challenging content can be taught with the possibility of student feedback being perceived as beneficial and not unjust or unwarranted.

Conclusion

Mutual engagement (ME) emerged out of a need to better understand teaching and learning processes in a particular discipline. At its core is a generalizable view of the teaching and learning process as parallel to group formation, and the importance of creating learning environments as safe places to risk for the betterment of learning. It can be usefully applied to understand how rehabilitation counselors learn content and develop as professionals, and similar applications could be discovered for other disciplines.

In keeping with the goals of SoTL inquiry, mutual engagement is an example of making teaching and learning more visible for others to critique so as to build theory and pedagogy.

Although there is a foundation of research establishing the principles of ME, more research is required to establish its utility as an example of or model for SoTL inquiry. Future research to expand ME could examine students' ability to retain and apply course work throughout the curriculum and as a beginning professional. Research could also focus on other pedagogical techniques to facilitate group formation. Additionally, in order to assess its effectiveness in broader content areas, ME could be utilized in other disciplines.

Mutual engagement is one example of moving scholarly teaching to the scholarship of teaching and learning. What started with a desire to better understand the teaching and learning process evolved into an empirically-based emerging theory illustrating how group formation and a safe learning environment can be beneficial to teaching and learning. A process for viewing student learning and professional identity formation emerged out of ME, and this process has provided means for the continued development of counseling pedagogy. In keeping with the goals of SoTL inquiry, ME is an example of making teaching and learning more visible for others to critique so as to build theory and pedagogy.

References

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G, & Ryan, R, M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26,* 325-346.

Granello, D. H. (2000). Contextual teaching and learning in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 270-284.

Guiffrida, G. A. (2005). The emergence model: An alternative pedagogy for facilitating self-reflection and theoretical fit in counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 201-213

Huber, M, T, & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning building the teaching commons.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Kelley, B. (2008). Trading zones: Building connections to past research in the scholarship of teaching and learning. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 3,* 10-16.

Kiener, M. S. (2008a). Engaging conversationally: A method for engaging students in their learning and examining instruction. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 3,* 23-30.

Kiener, M. S. (2008b). Teaching service learning to enhance reflective practice and research skills. *Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Journal, 2 (*2*),* 50-49.

Kiener, M. S. (2008c). The use of pre and post quizzes to increase student engagement in their learning. In Blythe, H., & Sweet, C. (Eds.), *It works for me in scholarship shared tips for the classroom*.

Kiener, M. S. (2007a). Scholarship of teaching in rehabilitation counseling practicum. *Rehabilitation Education*, *21,* 169-178.

Kiener, M. S. (2007b, March). Re-visiting the value of action research as a means of expanding pedagogy and understanding. *Paper Presented at The 6th Annual Qualitative Research Conference*, University of Missouri-St. Louis, MO.

Kiener, M. S., & Koch, L. (In press). Action research in rehabilitation counseling. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling.*

Schrader, D. E. (2004). Intellectual safety, moral atmosphere and epistemology in college classrooms. *Journal of Adult Development*, *11*, 87-101.

Sexton, T. L. (1998). Reconstructing counselor education: Supervision, teaching, and clinical training revisited. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 2-6.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (*2nd ed*.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stringer, E. (2007). *Action research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Witt, P. L., Wheeless, L. R., & Allen, M. (2004). A meta-analytical review of the relatationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. *Coummunication Monographs, 71,* 184-207.

Michael Kiener, PhD, is an assistant professor at Maryville University. He is on the advisory council of Maryville University's Center for Teaching and Learning focusing on action research and the scholarship of teaching and learning. He has published articles on career decision making, learning strategies, counseling pedagogy, and action research.

Integrating Service-Learning Pedagogy: A Faculty Reflective Process

Carmen Carracelas-Juncal, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
University of Southern Mississippi

Jenny Bossaller, PhD
Assistant Professor, School of Library and Information Science
University of Southern Mississippi

Gallayanee Yaoyuneyong, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing and Fashion Merchandising
University of Southern Mississippi

Research on service-learning has focused mainly on student outcomes. However, this study addresses the transformative change that three faculty members from different disciplines experienced during a semester-long fellowship on service-learning as a pedagogical method. Through their personal reflections, the authors show how service-learning and the scholarship of teaching were intertwined as they engaged in course redesign. This experience went beyond creating an academic service-learning course to transforming the teachers into reflective practitioners actively engaged in systematically improving their teaching practice.

Introduction

For the last two decades, there has been a movement in academia to provide students with a richer academic environment that includes real-world experience. More and more professors are turning to service-learning pedagogy to achieve this goal. This article documents the first steps that three faculty members, each from different disciplines, went through to learn about service-learning and to design their first service-learning course. We analyze the transformative change that we experienced during a semester-long fellowship focused on service-learning as a pedagogical method and its application in the classroom. First, however, it is important to define what service-learning is—and is not—before describing how it can lead faculty to the scholarship of teaching.

What is Service-Learning?

Service-learning is a model of education which combines traditional classroom learning with experiences that engage the student with the world outside of the university. The Community College National Center for Community Engagement defines service-learning as "a teaching method which combines community service with academic instruction as it focuses on critical, reflective thinking and civic responsibility" (Campus Compact, 2003, p. 9). The service component often takes place through community partnerships with nonprofit agencies. Service-learning students work with community organizations and then engage in reflective activities, such as journaling and self-critiques couched within academic papers, which provide them with another lens through which to view their civic engagement as a part of the learning process. This three-pronged teaching pedagogy (traditional classroom learning, service, and reflection) is often viewed as a transformational educational experience, with each component enhancing the other.

Service-learning is a model of education which combines traditional classroom learning with experiences that engage the student with the world outside of the university.

It is important to emphasize that service-learning is not merely volunteering; it requires the same rigorous academic component as traditional classroom learning. As Howard (1998) explains, "The service and the learning are reciprocally related; the service experiences inform and transform the academic learning, and the academic learning informs and transforms the service experience" (p. 21). Furco (1996) emphasizes that there must be a finely integrated "balance between learning goals and service outcomes" (p. 3). Service-learning not only helps students gain a deeper understanding of their subject matter but also increases their civic awareness and engagement: "Service-learning is a method through which citizenship, academic subjects, skills, and values are taught. It involves active learning—drawing lessons from the experience of performing service work" (Campus Compact, 2003, p. 7). Additionally, service-learning has been found to increase student retention, sense of inclusion in the campus community, and student-faculty relations by breaking down some of the barriers that exist in the traditional classroom environment (Eyler, Giles, Stenson & Grey, 2003, p. 17).

What Service-Learning is Not

Howard (1998) points out that service-learning "is not about the addition of service to learning, but rather the integration of service with learning" (p. 21). Service-learning is not to be confused with internships, which put the student in a mock-work, or pre-work situation, or with community service. It must combine academic learning with service, thus the hyphenated "service-learning"[1] (Eyler and Giles, 1999, p. 2-5). As Bringle and Hatcher (1996) note:

> "Unlike practica and internships, the experiential activity in a service learning course is not necessarily skill-based within the context of professional education" (p. 222). In other words, the purpose of service-learning assignments is not just to improve the technical, discipline-specific effectiveness of student skills. It is also "to gain…a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (p. 222). In this regard, service-learning shifts attention away from an exclusive preoccupation with education as private gain and seeks to balance that concern with a focus on the common good (Zlotkowski, 1999, p. 102).

What is the Importance of Service-Learning?

Service-learning has been shown to provide distinct benefits for students. As a teaching methodology, service-learning, by its very nature, can accommodate different types of learning styles. Zlotkowski (1999) pointed out that "by linking theory and practice, reflection and experimentation, as described by Kolb (1984), service-learning opens up the learning process to accommodate a much wider variety of student learning styles than has traditionally been the case" (p. 107). Service-learning helps students develop critical thinking and problem solving skills by encouraging them to apply the theory learned in the classroom to real-life situations. Dewey (1916) wrote extensively about the importance of experiential learning: "[A]n ounce of experience is better than a ton of theory because it is only in experience that any theory has vital and verifiable experience" (p. 144).

Service-learning also seems to help bridge "the gap between traditional curricular content and society's needs for new competencies for workers and citizens," one of the criticisms against higher education. "The emphasis in service-learning on applying knowledge to community problems and the reciprocal application of community experience to the development of knowledge meets many of the concerns about this lack of connectedness" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, pp. 12-13). Zlotkowski (1999) concurs,

> If, (…), Barr and Tagg (1995) are correct and higher education is in the midst of a major conceptual shift from education as a

> system for delivering instruction to education as a system for producing learning (p. 13), service learning's significance only increases. This is a function not only of the way in which it works but also of what it seeks to accomplish. (p. 107)

Service-learning is also a teaching pedagogy that requires a deep involvement and commitment to the scholarship of teaching.

Scholarly Teaching and Service-Learning

It is important to emphasize that service-learning is not simply a learning tool; service-learning is a teaching methodology (Howard, 1998, p. 21). Schön (1995) proposed that "if teaching is to be seen as a form of scholarship, then the practice of teaching must be seen as giving a rise to new knowledge" (p. 31). In other words, teaching has to be approached as research. According to Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, & Prosser (2000), Boyer (1990) argued that rather than separating teaching and research, the two should be joined together in overlapping areas of scholarship, including discovery, integration, application, and teaching (p. 155). Shulman (1993) stated that there are three elements in teaching: Communication, scholarship, and peer review; scholarly communication happens when each member of a particular academic community actively shares findings--discussing, critiquing, exchanging, evaluating, and building on each other's works. Trigwell et al. (2000) suggested that the purpose of scholarly teaching is "to make transparent how we have made learning possible…This involves reflection, inquiry, evaluation, documentation and communication" (p. 156). All of these elements are integral to service-learning pedagogy. In their research on the scholarship of teaching, Trigwell et al. (2000) developed a multi-dimensional model of scholarship of teaching (see Table 1)[2].

Table 1: Multi-dimensional model of scholarship of teaching

	Informed dimension	Reflection dimension	Communication dimension	Conception dimension
Level 1	Uses informal theories of teaching and learning	Effectively none or unfocused reflection	None	Sees teaching in a teacher-focused way
Level 2	Engages with the literature of teaching and learning generally	None	Communicates with department/faculty peer (tea room conversation, department seminars)	None
Level 3	Engages with the literature, particularly the discipline literature	Reflection-in-action	Reports work at local and national conferences	None
Level 4	Conducts action research, has synoptic, and pedagogic content knowledge	Reflection focused on asking what do I need to know about X here, and how will I find out about it?	Published in international scholarship journals	See teaching in a student-focused way

According to their research, Level 4 describes those teachers who are "more likely to be engaging in scholarship of teaching" (Trigwell et al., 2000, p. 164). These are teachers who:

> seek to understand teaching by consulting and using the literature on teaching and learning, by investigating their own teaching, by reflecting on their teaching from the perspective of their intention in teaching while seeing it from the students' position, and by formally communicating their ideas and practice to their peers (p. 164).

Service-learning and the scholarship of teaching share the same aims. In our experience, integrating a service-learning component into our classes led us to demonstrate the four dimensions of Level 4 scholarship of teaching.

Institutional Support for Faculty in Service-Learning

Prior to an analysis of our experiences, it is necessary to point out the role of institutional support in implementing service-learning pedagogy. Zlotkowski (1999) identified two critical areas of institutional support. First, the institution must supply "a comprehensive faculty development effort to help those working in disciplinary areas across the academic spectrum to both understand and appropriate service learning on their own terms" (p. 100). Second, it must include available structures to the faculty "that facilitate establishing and maintaining community partnerships… Successful programs almost always require the leadership of a professional staff person" (p.107). This type of institutional support is already in place at our university. At the University of Mississippi (USM), the Office of Community Service Learning is responsible for providing faculty with seminars to learn about service-learning pedagogy and building and maintaining ties with different organizations in the community.

Service-learning and the scholarship of teaching share the same aims.

While the University enjoys some status in the community, there is a certain amount of credibility that needs to be established in order to work as a volunteer. Thus, USM, through the Office of Community Service Learning, has developed partnerships with a number of community agencies, which facilitates the ability of the faculty to form a relationship with a partner. The Office of Community Service Learning also introduces interested faculty to community partners and maintains a list of agencies to contact for service projects. The University's support in this first crucial step toward establishing service-learning experiences in a course is important, especially in the case of junior faculty who are new to the area. One of the main advantages of having established community partnerships is that many of the agencies already understand the intentions and purpose of the faculty, making it easier for faculty to add a service-learning component to their classes.

The Faculty Fellows Service-Learning Program

At USM, the entire faculty is invited to submit applications[3] to participate in a semester-long fellowship in order to learn about service-learning pedagogy, which involves either revising an existing course or creating a new one based on this teaching pedagogy. Each spring semester, six faculty members from different disciplines and areas of expertise are selected by the Faculty Fellows Advisory Council and the Office of Community Service Learning to participate in the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program. The six faculty fellows are given a course release in order for them to be able to fully participate in the seminar. The seminar covers many different concepts related to service-learning and also gives participants the opportunity to hear reports from program alumni, view different syllabi from the University and from other institutions, discuss course requirements, and scrutinize some of the different teaching and learning approaches used in service-learning. The alumni's academic backgrounds are as varied as those of the participants' and include professors from disciplines such as business, history, math, English, sports management, and sociology. Discussing service-learning with alumni allows participants to engage in conversation with veterans regarding their different

service-learning teaching approaches and to see the varied emphases given to the service-learning component of different courses. Other discussions broach subjects such as publishing opportunities and institutional support for classes. By opening the service-learning seminar to the entire faculty, the University shows its commitment to institutionalizing the service-learning program and, by extension, the scholarship of teaching.

During the course of the semester the enrolled faculty become students themselves, meeting weekly, discussing the literature, and leading discussions. They also must find and take part in their own service-learning project. The project helps them better understand what their students might experience during their own class, gives them realistic expectations for their course, and ultimately becomes a springboard for their own students' academically-integrated community involvement. During the weekly seminar meetings, the faculty fellows discuss the challenges and successes they are experiencing in their project. Participants are also advised to keep a journal about their service experience, and they are required to write two reflection papers. By sharing journal entries and reflections, the seminar becomes the space described by Shulman (1993): A place for the peer discussion, exchange, and critique which is needed to engage faculty in the scholarship of teaching.

The Beginning and Purpose of this Study

Our desire to critique and better understand the process through which our class and project developed; our reflections on our own learning through a real service-learning experience; and our goal of applying our own experiences to our teaching all led us to write about our experience. We have observed that most research on service-learning focuses on student learning outcomes[4] and does not often address the processes and transformations that faculty undergo adopting a service-learning pedagogy. Although there have been some studies on the effects of service-learning on faculty, those studies primarily commented on obstacles such as research expectations, lack of resources, and lack of faculty reward (Eyler et al., 2003, p. 18). We noted a need to document the process that faculty experience when they decide to adopt service-learning as a teaching methodology. When faculty decide to integrate a service-learning component in the classroom, they seek transformation and greater understanding in their students; yet, there is a lack of information in the published literature about how this very process also transforms and increases understanding within the faculty using the pedagogy, ultimately leading faculty toward the scholarship of teaching.

When faculty decide to integrate a service-learning component in the classroom, they seek transformation and greater understanding in their students; yet, there is a lack of information in the published literature about how this very process also transforms and increases understanding within the faculty using the pedagogy, ultimately leading faculty toward the scholarship of teaching.

This article sheds light on this process of faculty transformation through an account of our experiences. We then compare our observations and experiences during the seminar to the existing literature on service-learning. This analysis contributes to a dialogue concerning faculty understanding of their own learning process and offers faculty readers an overview of the possible stages they will experience when introducing a service-learning component to their curriculum.

Intertextual Analysis of Faculty Reflections on Service-Learning

Reflection is a central element of both service-learning and the scholarship of teaching. Reflection allows the participant to analyze his or her own observations

of the experience, as it unfolds. A longitudinal, or semester-long, reflection exercise can also engage the learner in what Braid (1996) termed experiential meanings—personal narratives that "invoke both the sense of experience as a resource of accumulated wisdom and the sense of experience as an ongoing interpretive process" (p. 6). Despite our very different disciplines, a clear process with three differentiated stages emerged from our narratives: Our initial enthusiasm and conviction, our encounter with reality, and our subsequent recommitment to service-learning. The following section contains excerpts from our individual writing that illustrate this process.

Reflection is a central element of both service-learning and the scholarship of teaching.

Stage 1: Initial enthusiasm and conviction.

We came into the program with a great deal of enthusiasm; our application narratives demonstrate that we knew we wanted to integrate a service component into our courses, and had even conceptualized how to accomplish our goals of providing students with experience outside of the classroom walls. Self assurance and conviction permeate these application narratives, suggesting that we *thought* we had a clear sense of what service-learning would entail. The following excerpts illustrate our motivations for applying to the program, and what we expected to accomplish from our participation in the seminar.

Carmen Carracelas-Juncal (CCJ), first year Assistant Professor in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

CCJ was drawn to the seminar as an avenue to promote social justice through literacy in the home language, specifically Spanish. Before coming to Hattiesburg, she worked with different elementary schools as Foreign Language Coordinator and in afterschool programs in her community introducing Spanish to children from K-6, but she did not have experience volunteering. She decided that it was time to get involved with the community on a personal and professional level, and she perceived that there was a need in the Spanish-speaking community in Hattiesburg, where not only she, but also her students, could be of service. As reflected in the following excerpt from her application essay, she planned on adding the service-learning component to the course: *Introduction to Hispanic Literature*.

> *There is a growing community of Spanish speakers in Hattiesburg with a significant number of children who will experience some level of language attrition in their mother tongue. There is a great need of literacy programs to ensure that these dual language learners acquire, and continue developing, reading and writing skills in their mother tongue. I would like to add a service learning component to my class so my students not only have the opportunity of exploring the fascinating world of literature in Spanish, but also of opening that world to the Spanish speaking children in the community by reading to them and with them in Spanish. This service component would be integrated in the course and would provide a two-way learning experience that would go beyond reading, to communicating and culturally understanding each other.*

She had very clear goals that she wanted to attain through her participation in the seminar. On a personal level, she hoped that the seminar "[would] help me achieve one of my major goals for coming to USM: To serve the Spanish speaking community by helping its children appreciate and be proud of their language and their diverse cultures." On a professional level, she expected the seminar would put her in contact with the right community for her students to perform their service-learning component. She wrote, "this fellowship will allow me

to polish this idea by figuring out how to organize the course and where the service-learning component could be put into practice in the community." She saw the seminar as the necessary step toward getting in contact with the community.

After beginning the seminar, she reflected back on her decision to apply to the fellowship and became more aware of the possible outcomes of growth and enrichment for her students as they shared their skills with the community and reaped learning benefits in return. She wrote:

> *The reason I applied to be a participant in the service-learning seminar was two pronged. I wanted to find a way to help children not only maintain but develop their home language skills, and I wanted my students to see that majoring in Spanish is not just reading about the language or in the language, but that Spanish is a real vehicle for communication, beyond classmates and university contexts, and that the Spanish speaking world is made of many coexisting, complex and rich cultures, at times in conflict with each other.*

Jenny Bossaller (JB), first year Assistant Professor in the School of Library and Information Science

JB applied to the fellowship in order to expose her students to a need and methods for literacy work in libraries, planning to design a course entitled *Libraries and Literacy*. Her dissertation work and previous volunteer experience involved adult new readers, which served as a backdrop for her service-learning goals:

> *The course which I intend to design will connect students at USM with some of the community organizations that serve low-literacy adults and families in the Hattiesburg community. This will enable the students to take this knowledge about adult learners and family literacy programs into their jobs as librarians. …While my focus is on new librarians, I believe that it has the potential to provide a bridge between literacy programs and libraries, or adult educators and librarians. It would bring students from both areas together to work, which could positively affect the administration of adult literacy programs in both community centers and libraries.*

The application essay reflected that JB was well aware that the goal of service-learning is not just to meet the needs of students and faculty but also to meet a community need:

> *Because Mississippi has lower-than-average literacy rates, our new librarians need to be aware of the needs of new readers and ways that they can work with other community agencies in order to coordinate literacy programs. It is especially compelling to bring students into the conversation, because it will expose them not only to theories, but hands-on work to positively affect their motivation to continue work in this important area. There are many well-established literacy programs throughout the state which could give our distance students ample ground to participate and make a difference in their own communities, as well…While public librarians might directly face problems related to adult literacy, they also might come to the job unprepared for such challenges. By challenging students to face this problem in the university setting, they will not be caught off-guard with this common problem, and will be equipped to form community partnerships to combat illiteracy through understanding. This course would enable them to learn about materials in the adult education classroom and how to organize adult and family literacy*

programs, using programs that are already in place in Hattiesburg as a learning laboratory.

An early reflection during the first weeks of the seminar reiterated the initial enthusiasm shown in the application, with the addition of a new goal brought about by the first readings: To break down barriers and stereotypes. "As one student noted when he became involved with a service-learning program, his previous "stereotypes were just destroyed." He had moved beyond friendship or identification with [the people he worked with] to reflection on the nature of the social structure" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 142). This quote prompted JB to write,

> *…I do think that when my students come in, though, they will be presented with a project that will engage them on many levels. They will be able to work with materials that they don't encounter in their own libraries, which will give them another tool in their librarian toolkit…The civic action portion of my program is to help break down social barriers between the students and future library patrons who might fall outside of their perceived norm.*

Gallayanee Yaoyuneyong (GY), second year Assistant Professor of Fashion Merchandising in the Department of Management and Marketing

GY believed that the fellowship would not only open a window of opportunity for her students and herself but also for the university to be part of the community. She strongly believed that education, especially at the university level, should provide students with more than knowledge and theory and through this fellowship she hoped that she could help her students cultivate skills that working with a real community could give them. Before she applied for the fellowship, she heard the news about the dropout rate and the State Dropout Prevention Plan released by the Mississippi Department of Education. She decided that her students could be part of this prevention plan by partnering her class with an agency that helps with the dropout problem. She planned on integrating a service-learning component in the course titled *Textiles*. The following excerpt from her application reflected her hopes,

> *Since Hattiesburg is the home of USM, USM's faculty and staff should be considered to be a part of the Hattiesburg community…and scholastic body. When one part of the body hurts, all other parts suffer as well. Thus, it would be very beneficial if USM could work with the Hattiesburg Public School District (HPSD)…My students and young entrepreneurs would serve as role models for high school students by helping them recognize how high school and college graduation can lead them to a better life….High school graduation is the first key for success. The windows of opportunity open even wider when a student graduates from college. If they try to follow their dreams, graduates can one day own their own businesses.*

In her application, she expressed her expectations about her students' projects:

> *Through the service-learning methods, I expect my students to better understand the class concepts as well as become more creative when coming up with a final project and presenting it to the younger students. Besides academic achievement, I want my students to 1) create a network with the Hattiesburg community, 2) gain contacts with local businesses, non-profit organizations, and academic leaders, 3) gain confidence before they graduate, 4) learn social responsibility through a service-learning project, and 5) learn that they can make an impact and be positive examples for other people. This experience will help my students realize their potential and find ways to achieve their dreams. I believe students should obtain not only academic knowledge through their college education, but also be equipped to be good citizens.*

As illustrated by our application essays and reflection pieces, we all sought to apply to the service-learning fellowship in order to provide our students with a level of learning that would surpass that of the traditional classroom. "If the task, in addition to learning content, is to excite and motivate students to learn during the course and after, to learn new ways of learning, and to develop a set of overall values in the field of study, then we know that the information-dissemination model is woefully lacking" (Howard, p. 61). Moreover, our enthusiasm entering the service-learning seminar mirrored our goals for our future students.

Stage 2: Reality Check, or Facing Reality?

Although we had very clear ideas of what we wanted to accomplish through service-learning and what we expected to gain from our participation in the Service-Learning Fellows Program, we did not foresee how difficult the integration of the service-learning component in our classes would be and how our participation in the seminar would bring to light different issues that would make us doubt our initial ideas and the projects we had envisioned for our students. In this stage, our initial enthusiasm was replaced by self-doubt and fear as we began to realize that the ideal project that we had carefully thought out for our application might not be as easy to put into practice as we had believed. In this stage, three main themes emerged from our narratives: Finding a placement and meeting community needs, drafting the syllabus, and experiencing fears and ethical considerations.

Finding a Placement and Meeting Community Needs

One of the seminar's extensively discussed topics was the requirement that service-learning classes, and projects, must be focused on a real community need. "One of the most significant ways in which service learning differs from many other community-related campus-based initiatives lies in its insistence that the needs to be met must be defined by the community, not the campus" (Zlotkowski, 1999, p. 97). The first opportunity to put this into practice was finding a site for an individual service-learning project, the first assignment of the seminar. For this purpose, we were taken on a tour of some of the agencies by our seminar facilitator and the staff of the Office of Community Service-Learning. We were able to find our individual service-learning projects with relative ease.

CCJ felt lucky when after visiting a number of agencies, she was approached to help with a real need:

> *I believed that the seminar would help me conceptualize and organize my ideas into a coherent and integrated project that would benefit the children in the community and my students. With that in mind and with the help of the Office of Community Service-Learning at the university I went out in search of my own individual service experience. I found my participant, G…, in a community after school program. I was asked to help this trilingual fifth grade to learn to read. G… is a speaker of Mixteco, Spanish, and English, but he could not read in any of his languages. I asked him if he would allow me to come and teach him to read and he said yes.*

GY found her own service project during her visits, but it was different from what she had been looking for, "I have to be honest that volunteering at the Boys and Girls Club was not my original idea. I really wanted to do something that was closer to what I will require my students to do."

JB was presented with an individual project that fit perfectly with her service-learning course the second time she approached her community partner: They needed to reconstruct their lending library. She was able to begin the project by ordering library supplies and books; students in the fall would continue working on the project. However, she had also struggled with the idea of finding the right

site for her students—would it be more helpful for the students to work in a library or a social service agency?

An early reflection demonstrated her relief when the project materialized: "Several weeks ago, I was afraid that I wasn't going to find a place for a project. Fortune managed to shine on me though and I seem to have been blessed with a bigger project than I might be able to complete—one that should bleed into next semester, hopefully with students at the helm."

For the other two of us, the process of identifying a place that would fit our project idea, would meet the needs of the community and the needs of future students, and would help us integrate the service-learning component in the syllabus for our classes occupied our thoughts. The intimidation we felt was linked to our perception that the success of our future class hinged on the project. The emphasis in service-learning on identifying a community need and not imposing an idea or agenda on the community weighed heavily on our mind. We learned how to find a site to conduct research as part of graduate work, but relinquishing our own idea in lieu of a community's need turned out to be difficult, as the following excerpts illustrate:

GY reflected:

> *I have to admit that I struggle with my thoughts and ideas of what service-learning is and how my volunteering experience affects my worldview, especially in the Hattiesburg area. In addition, through the reading assignments, I cannot help thinking about service-learning and my class, how I can create a class that will benefit my students and serve the needs of the community. I have explored several possible community sites for my class; nonetheless, I could not find anything that really matched what I had in mind. Since the Boys and Girls Club was not my original idea, I also explored other service-learning projects. I contacted the high school as well as the Community Education Center.*

CCJ worried:

> *I still haven't found the community that will allow my students to perform the kind of service that I envision for my course, and consequently I have not found the place where the members of the community and my students will be able to meet. The Family Education Center where I work with G… doesn't have enough Spanish-speaking children to allow a class of 15+ students to do the kind of service-learning project I have in mind. This worries me because one of the most important tenets of service-learning is that the service has to fill in a real community need, or in other words, the members of the community have to identify the need and then I can collaborate with them designing the best way to provide the service they need and integrate it into my course.*

As GY's and CCJ's comments reflect, while in this stage, some faculty are forced to face the fact that the reality of the community situation may not match what they had first envisioned for their service-learning component and giving up their original idea might be difficult.

The drafting of the syllabus

All seminar participants felt that the seminar experience was extremely valuable in helping them conceptualize their plans. It created an atmosphere where they could discuss their ideas and problems with their syllabi. Additionally, it provided space for discussing practical issues and fears. It is not easy to transform a more traditional syllabus to a service-learning syllabus. It requires many practical considerations, which sometimes seem to get in the way of faculty member's civically-minded goals.

For GY, her main worry was the integration of the journaling and reflection components of the service-learning project and how to give her students relevant

prompts so they could connect their readings with their experiential learning. She wrote:

> *I struggle a lot with the revision of my class. I try to find similar projects but I cannot find one. The syllabus revision is not difficult to do but the activities such as journaling or writing reflection papers that I will require my students to do are still very unclear to me (though I read about it in the literature). …I am afraid that my students will not receive the full benefit from the project because of my incompetent writing of a guideline or requirements for journal and reflection papers.*

CCJ struggled with the design of her course and the fit of the service-learning component with the subject matter. She needed to connect both in her mind before she could write her syllabus, let alone think about journal prompts and reflection papers:

> *I am still working on the syllabus and the design of my course and wrestling with the seamless integration of the service-learning component with my Introduction to Literature class. At the beginning of our seminar I just couldn't see how a literature course could be conducive to integrating the kind of literacy work I wanted to do with the academic requirements of the course. I am still not over the worry of how home language literacy and the theory about teaching literature can fit together… If I don't know what the service-learning component of my course is going to be how can I think about the topics for my students' reflection papers?*

JB wrote little about the seminar and revising the syllabus in her reflections, though she did discuss this with her peers in class. She reflected about how her own project would make her students' work possible in the class she was preparing: "[This project] is the ideal 'in' for my students next fall."

These comments show that, in this stage of transformation, faculty frustrations with course design are often in direct proportion with whether a site and/or a suitable project has emerged. JB, for instance, worried the least because from the second visit to her service project site she knew what her students were going to be doing in her service-learning course. CCJ, however, struggled the most with her course design and the drafting of the syllabus; by the end of the seminar she still had not found the specific Spanish speaking community for which she was looking.

Fears and ethical considerations

In addition to fears regarding the project's goals, our reflective writings also contained fears of personal failure and explorations of shortcomings regarding our own projects. More problematic, though, were the fears expressed regarding possible ethical problems with our work. These two types of fears were often intertwined in the authors' reflections.

GY expressed doubt that her project would be worthwhile for her students: "Deep down in my heart, I am afraid that my class service-learning project will not succeed. I am also afraid that all my work will be wasted." On the other hand, JB was frightened that she had taken on a project too substantial for her to handle:

> *I don't know how to do this—I've never worked with vendors, and she wants me to send her lists of books to order. I'm working with catalogs and websites, trying to figure out what is best, and I think I'm making some headway, but I don't know how she wants me to order the books!...I hope that I am not exposed as a fraud or as incompetent. She [the program director] also wants books that reflect the population that uses the center. I feel strange ordering 'black parenting' books, because I don't know if that is*

being presumptuous! I have found some good websites for black parenting, but since I'm not African-American I feel a bit like an impostor.

Some of the fears expressed were caused by the fact that in service-learning students work with actual people, not abstract ideas that are presented in a textbook. In fact, imposing one's own research agenda is antithetical to the service-learning concept. This topic kept coming up in seminar discussions, because junior faculty members, in particular, are pressured to write about their research. Putting so much time and effort into teaching, which does not count as heavily in one's tenure docket, was daunting. The seminar participants often discussed this issue, reminding themselves that they could not impose an agenda on their service site even if they felt the pressure to produce publishable research at the conclusion of the service-learning experience.

Some of the fears expressed were caused by the fact that, in service-learning, students work with actual people, not abstract ideas that are presented in a textbook.

JB described the issue in terms of feeling presumptuous: "I don't work there….It is difficult to know exactly what they need, to feel as if I'm helping them like I should be according to the principles of service-learning (to serve, not necessarily guide or impose). The nature of the project seems a bit presumptive, in that I am dictating what I think they need."

Because students will be dealing with real people, ethical considerations are a large issue. The community must be regarded as a partner, not a subject, and students must be sent into the community with the attitude of service to, not of taking from. CCJ said this well when she reported:

There are always ethical considerations when you bring change to a person's life. Before I started working with G…, I was sure that what I was going to do was the right thing for him, but after I got started I began to question the rightness of my thinking. I questioned who or what gave me the right to change G…'s world. How would he feel about his family after he learned to read? How would his reading ability affect his relationships? Would this skill bring him happiness or unhappiness?

After she started working with "G"… she began to worry about her actual teaching:

I also questioned my approach to teaching him to read. I had used a Spanish first and English second approach with my own bilingual children, and it had worked extremely well. Once they learned to read in Spanish, they simply transferred that skill to English. But is this the correct approach with G….?

JB restated her feelings of inadequacy, emphasizing the lack of control when dealing with social situations:

I think that one of the problems that my students will experience that is similar to my own is the feeling of incompetence or of feeling as if we lack control over the project. Service-learning requires the participant to do work for someone else, and in this situation we might not know as much as we would like to know about the people who we are working with.

The common threads above show that, just as we learned in class, "transforming a classroom from a traditional orientation to one that is consistent with the goals and opportunities associated with academic service learning is not easy" (Howard, 1998, p. 24). We agree here with Howard: "[A]cademic service learning is not for the meek" (p. 25). Our experiences exemplify that "reformatting classroom norms, roles, and outcomes so that both academic and experiential learning can be joined requires a very deliberate effort around a rather formidable challenge." (p. 25). Howard also described service-learning as a "counternormative pedagogy" and added that

"instructors who accept this challenge can expect…periodic self-doubt about their own teaching accomplishments" (p. 25). We concur with him, but we propose that the self-doubt appears earlier, much before any teaching is actually done, while learning about service-learning and designing a course that will allow the inclusion of service as an integral part of the students' learning.

Stage 3: Recommitment to Service-Learning

After conquering our doubts and fears we found that at the end of our participation in the seminar, our initial ideas had changed in ways that we had not anticipated. At the same time, we found a renewed commitment to service-learning pedagogy, not just with the purpose of integrating a service-learning component into our classes, but as a way of learning about the scholarship of teaching and belonging to an interdisciplinary collaborative entity. The following threads are taken from later reflections and journal entries.

We found a renewed commitment to service-learning pedagogy, not just with the purpose of integrating a service-learning component into our classes, but as a way of learning about the scholarship of teaching and belonging to an interdisciplinary collaborative entity.

JB pointed out that one outcome of the seminar was a clear sense that her teaching should continually evolve:

> *Another great thing about the seminar was that the teachers who came in discussed their own failures—that teaching isn't always smooth going, and that their courses required a lot of revisions before they really worked. They were invited to talk at the seminar because they have been successful; so even though some of their classes didn't work out as well as they had hoped, they were still regarded as competent by their peers.*

CCJ expressed gratitude for the seminar:

> *Through my participation in the seminar I have been able to overcome my first obvious fear: how a literature course could be conducive to integrating the kind of literacy work I wanted to do with the academic requirements of the course. Zlotkowski (2003) gave me the change of perspective I needed. He makes clear that the purpose of service-learning assignments is not just to improve the technical, discipline-specific effectiveness of student skills, but "to gain…a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (p. 222). I realize now that my students will be gaining "a broader appreciation" of their chosen discipline, Spanish, by putting their skills with Spanish to the service of the community.*

After reading Zlotkowski's article, CCJ began the process of relinquishing her initial ideas and opening her mind to other service-learning experiences for her students. For CCJ, giving up her own idea of what she had envisioned the community needed was very difficult, but by the end of the seminar she was able to somewhat let go of her own plans and had started to look at other possibilities:

> *Even though at the beginning of the seminar I was set on working only with children; my work with G… has made me realize that there is probably just as great of a need for literacy among the Spanish speaking adult community. I am thinking now, that if I cannot find a community need for literacy in Spanish, I might find a community need for sharing the Spanish language and its cultures among children who do not have the chance of learning a foreign language in their school. I feel that my students and I can*

provide the two sides of the same coin—language literacy in Spanish—for those that do not read or need to read more in their home language and for those that want to learn another language.

She finally seemed reconciled to the new avenues that might open up for her students, and expressed a renewed commitment to service-learning as a pedagogy that would benefit her students and where they might serve: "The service-learning component for my course might not be exactly what I first envisioned and what brought me to this seminar, but I know that ultimately it will be of value both to the community and to my students."

JB was still facing some issues with her own project at the end of the seminar; while others' individual projects had ended, hers was picking up, and she found that she did not have enough time to devote to it because of other academic commitments. However, she was hopeful that things would continue to progress slowly over the summer so that the agency wouldn't think she is shirking her duties. The following expressed some doubts, but ultimately reflected her optimism: "I think that if everything pans out with my work over the summer, my students will be prepared to take on a great project this fall. The project isn't as ambitious as I had originally envisioned; the students will have to learn most of the theory from their readings, which is really what is supposed to happen anyway."

The following from GY demonstrated faith in the pedagogy, even though she was still overwhelmed by the amount of work that service-learning required:

Now that I have found out what the community needs and what projects will be appropriate to my class, I encounter new challenges. It seems like there are many hills I need to climb. I also believe that once I succeed in conquering this mountain, I will find another hill on the other side. Although I feel frustrated sometimes, the benefits that my students will receive from the project keep me going.

She continued, bringing up the concept of self-realization:

The experience gained from the service-learning project will be unique but sort of similar in the big pool. In addition, through my own service-learning project, I have come to understand myself better. This experience combined with class knowledge will become real in the students life in a similar way to what service-learning has become to mine. Community will be part of their life regardless of where they are.

GY summarized well all of our feelings regarding the value of our service-learning experience:

Since I have received so much from my own experience with the service-learning project and seminar, I would love for my students to benefit from this and I want to apply a service-learning learning component in my classes. I totally believe that service-learning is a powerful teaching tool to teach more than class subject matter to students.

Our reflections in this stage showed that despite the unforeseen difficulties we encountered in the process of learning about service-learning pedagogy and integrating it into our courses and syllabi, we are definitely committed to the pedagogy. All three of us will be teaching our service-learning course in the coming semester, putting into practice what we learned during the seminar and our own service projects.

Conclusions

Service-learning is one way to actively involve faculty in the scholarship of teaching; seminars such as the one at USM in faculty development are valuable for faculty engagement and continued educational development and growth, and for engaging faculty in the scholarship of teaching toward transforming their pedagogies. As Zlotkowski (1999) pointed out, "regardless of the individual choices

individual faculty make with regard to the educational rationale, the kind of community service, and the course format, service learning requires instructors - no less than their students - to become 'reflective practitioners' (Schon, 1983, 1987)" (p.102).

It is important to realize that the process of integrating a service-learning component into a class is a very involved task that includes a lot of thinking and reflection, giving up ideas, and being flexible. For us, the process evolved from the initial ideal plan to a realistic look at what can be done, through three clear stages that evolve from the initial enthusiasm, through self-doubt and fears, to a realistic renewed commitment to the pedagogy.

It is important for universities to provide forums for faculty development outside of the narrowness of departmental boundaries.

It is important for universities to provide forums for faculty development outside of the narrowness of departmental boundaries. The involvement in this seminar has allowed faculty from different disciplines who normally would not work together to do so, and to feel connected to a campus-wide movement, bringing them out of the insularity of their own departments to a feeling of belonging to a community that transcends their chosen disciplines, personal objectives and goals. We feel that we truly have become part of a community of "reflective practitioners," actively engaged in the scholarship of teaching. This is a real example of the transformative power that service-learning has not only in student learning but also in faculty learning and teaching.

Limitations of the Study and Questions for Further Research

Even though this study is limited to the personal experiences of three faculty members, it shows that service-learning has a major effect on the faculty who decide to adopt this pedagogy. Further research involving more faculty is needed to expand on the ideas proposed in this article:

- Does the three-stage process of faculty transformation that emerged in this study occur in other seminars on course redesign?

Other possible topics for research on faculty in service-learning are the relationship that service-learning faculty have with their institution, and its effect on job satisfaction. Some specific questions we have are:

- Do faculty that engage in service-learning develop stronger cross-departmental relationships with other faculty than those that are not involved in it?
- Does institutional support for service-learning faculty improve the degree of satisfaction of the faculty with the institution?
- Does service-learning have an effect on junior faculty retention and tenure and/or promotion?

We welcome your questions or comments regarding service-learning in general or on this particular study.

---

[1] The hyphenated term "service-learning" will be used by the authors throughout this paper, except in direct quotes where the hyphen has not been used. See Eyler and Giles discussion on *Where is the Learning on Service-Learning* (pp. 2-5).

[2] The table is being used with permission of Trigwell *et al.* The authors of this paper added the level column for clarification.

[3] See Appendix A

[4] This comment is not meant as criticism. Since the main goal of service-learning is student learning, it is not surprising that most research has focused on student outcomes. The authors realize how important is all the research done in this area.

References

Braid, D. (1996, Winter). Personal narrative and experiential meaning. *The Journal of American Folklore*, *109*(431), 5-30.

Campus Compact. (2003). *Campus Compact's introduction to service-learning toolkit* (2nd ed.). Providence, RI: Brown University.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education. An introduction to the philosophy of education* (1966 ed.) New York: Free Press.

Eyler J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Eyler, J. S., Giles, D. E., Stenson, C. M., & Gray, C. J. (2003). At a glance: what we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-2000. In Campus Compact (Ed.), *Campus Compact's Introduction to Service-Learning Toolkit Readings and Resources for Faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 15-19). Providence, RI: Brown University.

Furco, A. (1996). Service-Learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Expanding Boundaries: Service and Learning* (pp. 2-6). Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

Howard, P. F. J. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 1998*(73), 21-29.

Schön, D. A. (1995, November/December). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change,* 27-34.

Shulman, L. S. (1993, November/December). Teaching as community property. *Change*, 6-7.

Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of teaching: A model. *Higher Education Research & Development, 19*(2), 157-168.

Zlotkowski, E. (1999). Pedagogy and engagement. In Bringle et al. (Ed.), *Colleges and Universities as Citizens,* (pp. 96-120). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Carmen Carracelas-Juncal obtained her Bachelor's and Master's degrees at Brigham Young University, and her PhD in Hispanic Linguistics and Literatures at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. She taught at Amherst College and the School for International Training Graduate Program before joining the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Jenny Bossaller graduated from the University of Missouri with a Master's degree (2002) and a PhD (2008) in Library Science. She teaches in the School of Library and Information Science at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Gallayanee Yaoyuneyong is originally from Bangkok, Thailand, where she earned her Bachelor degree. She graduated from Eastern Michigan with a Master's degree (2004) in Human, Environmental, Consumer Resources, emphasis in Apparel, Textiles, and Merchandising, and received a Ph.D. (2007) in Human Sciences, emphasis in Apparel/Textile Product Development from Florida State University. Currently, she teaches in the Department of Marketing and Fashion Merchandising, College of Business, at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Appendix A: Academic Service-Learning Faculty Fellow Application

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING
The University of Southern Mississippi
Division of Student Affairs
Box 10031
Hattiesburg, MS 39406
E-mail: david.brooking@usm.edu
www.usm.edu/ocsl
Phone: (601) 266-5074; Fax: (601) 266-5870

The Office of Community Service Learning will select 6 faculty members to participate in the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program for the spring 2009 semester. *Each of the 6 faculty selected will receive one course reassigned time for the semester in which they participate in the service-learning seminar. Departments will be reimbursed for a faculty member's time. This service-learning fellowship is made possible by the generosity of the Provost's Office and the Vice President for Student Affairs.*

Expectations:

- Attend a weekly (2 hour) seminar focusing on topics such as course design, social responsibilities of universities, liability, assessment, and reflection as they relate to service-learning courses.
- Modify an existing course to include academic service-learning.
- Commit to teach a service-learning course in the following academic year.

Selection Process:

Service-Learning Fellowships are open to full-time USM faculty members at the rank of instructor and above. We seek faculty representing a variety of disciplines and areas of expertise, and with varying degrees of familiarity and experience with service-learning. Preference will be given to those faculty members who articulate a clear vision of how service-learning fits into their professional development as teacher-scholars. Selections will be made by the Faculty Fellows Advisory Council and the Office of Community Service Learning.

Application:

Service-learning is a method of experiential education in which students learn and develop through active participation in and reflection on thoughtfully organized community service experiences tied to an academic course.

1. Have you used academic service-learning in the past? If you answer yes, please list some examples of your activities.
2. I am interested in adapting the following course(s) to include service-learning:
3. Please attach a current syllabus of the course you think you might revise for a service-learning component.
4. What is the potential of your discipline for application within the Hattiesburg community?
5. What is the possibility for publication or research as a result of your service-learning work?
6. How will this fellowship (a) complement your professional development plans and (b) contribute to your students' academic development?

Putting It All Together: Incorporating "SoTL Practices" for Teaching Interpersonal and Critical Thinking Skills in an Online Course

Randall E. Osborne, PhD
Professor, Department of Psychology
Texas State University-San Marcos

Paul Kriese, PhD
Associate Professor, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indiana University East

Heather Tobey & Emily Johnson
Students, Department of Psychology
Texas State University-San Marcos

Views of critical thinking were culled from the literature and developed into a scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) model that was implemented into the Internet course, "The Politics and Psychology of Hatred." Assessment of student course postings demonstrated a strong relationship between interpersonal skills (referred to in the curriculum as "course etiquette") and advancement on the levels of critical thinking. The implications of these findings are discussed.

Understanding Critical Thinking

Hutchings and Shulman (1999) define the scholarship of teaching as based in a process of critical questioning and answering. As such, it seems important to assess methods by which critical thinking skills can be developed and nurtured in students. Theories of critical thinking are numerous in the scholarship of teaching and learning literature but, in our experience, few efforts have been made to demonstrate how critical thinking can be taught in courses. Before outlining the critical thinking model that we developed and use in an Internet course on the Politics and Psychology of Hatred, let us quickly summarize a few of the models we drew from to create the version that we found well-suited for teaching interpersonal and critical thinking skills in an internet course (Osborne, Kriese, & Tobey, 2008). Kuhn (1999) presents a developmental model of critical thinking that begins with the question, "do we really know what critical thinking is?" Indeed, critical thinking may be a "buzz phrase" that many use without truly knowing what it is, how to foster it, or even how to measure it or recognize when students are (or are not) using it. This task of defining critical thinking must be addressed before any critical thinking framework can be integrated into a course.

Indeed, critical thinking may be a "buzz phrase" that many use without truly knowing what it is, how to foster it, or even how to measure it or recognize when students are (or are not) using it.

Before we can determine how to develop assignments that foster the elements of critical thinking, we must understand – really understand – those elements. Kuhn (1999) starts with the assumption that critical thinking involves cognitive competencies that are meta-knowing. These second-order, meta-knowing skills involve an awareness of how self and others "know." Kuhn expands this notion further by distinguishing three broad categories of meta-knowing: (1) metastrategic, (2) metacognitive, and (3) epistemological (1999). Let us quickly define each of these before connecting them to the critical thinking and interpersonal skills frameworks constructed for our course.

The *metastrategic* way of knowing involves an ability to select and monitor the thinking strategies that one uses. With this level, students are encouraged to

ask what they know and to consider how they know it. It is our experience that students are not typically encouraged to consider thinking strategies. In fact, there may be a general (unspoken) assumption in teaching that students already know "how" and "when" to think. We will revisit this point by articulating the critical and interpersonal skills we expect from students and, further, how we describe to students how such skills will be factored into the grading.

Metacognitive knowing, according to Kuhn (1999), operates at the level of declarative knowledge. What Kuhn appears to mean by this is "fact"-based information. In other words, it is important to provide students with the opportunity to "tell you what they know." Students should be able to describe their own thoughts and thought processes without necessarily understanding the significance or ramifications of that knowledge. Before one can worry about "how" one knows or the impact that knowledge has on others, one must first express "what" one knows. We refer to this expression of knowledge as *recitation*. The *recitation* process is described as a statement of known facts or opinions. A critical element of this step is to acknowledge what aspect(s) of what is being stated are factual (declarative) and what is based on opinion. It is not assumed that students will know to separate facts from opinions in their own thinking without being told to do so, shown how to do so, *and* being held accountable for doing so.

Students should be able to describe their own thoughts and thought processes without necessarily understanding the significance or ramifications of that knowledge.

Epistemological knowing involves understanding how one's knowledge (and what one knows) fits into the broader range of what people know. It involves an awareness of how people – in general – know something and how one – individually – knows it. Kuhn (1999) argues that meta-knowing is developmental in nature. By referring to meta-knowing steps as "developmental," Kuhn (1999) implies an interactive (nature *and* nurture) process. In other words, one's experiences will determine the extent to which one is able to progress from metastrategic to metacognitive and, eventually, to epistemological knowing. We build upon this notion by incorporating both individual and group assignments into our course that require students to practice with this progression of critical thinking. Critical thinking, in Kuhn's model (1999), does not happen by accident nor will it happen without experiences that require one to practice it.

From Kuhn's theoretical notion of critical thinking, we sought guidance on how to break critical thinking down into its component elements – elements that could be specifically integrated into a course and assignments within that course. In other words, we asked the question, "now that we know the theoretical foundations for critical thinking, what would examples of critical thinking look like?" We found answers to this question in the works of Paul and Elder (2002), and Smith (2002). Paul and Elder (2002) suggest that critical thinking involves integrating one's thoughts, feelings and desires. By understanding the relationships among thoughts, feelings and desires, Paul and Elder (2002) assert that we can become routinely aware of and able to evaluate our feelings. In this way, feelings can *inform* our thoughts rather than override them.

In the context of our project, this notion of integrating thoughts, feelings and desires provided us with the framework we needed to move from the theoretical foundation provided by Kuhn to a step-wise approach we could outline for students. What we sought was a method for outlining the progression of critical inquiry and thought that we expected from students. We wanted something "visible" that could be provided to students and to which their work could be held accountable. We turn to that framework in a moment, after briefly considering how we might approach measuring whether students have achieved the "critical thinkers."

To address this question, we turned to the work of Randolph Smith. Smith (2002) asserts that critical thinkers possess seven characteristics: (1) critical

thinkers are flexible – they can tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty, (2) critical thinkers identify inherent biases and assumptions, (3) critical thinkers maintain an air of skepticism, (4) critical thinkers separate facts from opinions, (5) critical thinkers don't oversimplify, (6) critical thinkers use logical inference processes, and (7) critical thinkers examine available evidence before drawing conclusions (Smith, 2002). We perceived Smith's (2002) characteristics as identifiable "markers" we could look for in assessing student work. Doherty, Hansen and Kaya (2007) remind us, however, that, after we employ these characteristics of critical learning, we need to return to them periodically to see if they have become a part of students' regular thought patterns. When students make these habits their own, they develop a vested interest to make sure that these habits continue. In short, when students ***own*** critical thinking habits they are more in control of not only when and what they think but also how they think (Doherty et al., 2007).

When students *own* critical thinking habits, they are more in control of not only when and what they think, but also how they think.

Clearly there are many more examples of, definitions for, and research about critical thinking. However, these four methods (Kuhn, 1999; Paul & Elder, 2002; Smith, 2002; and Doherty et al., 2007) allowed us to: (1) build a theoretical foundation for the kind of thinking we wanted to foster in our course, (2) delineate the elements that separate critical thinking from other forms of thinking, and (3) build an active framework that could be described to students, incorporated into assignments, and built into the assessment methods we use for those assignments. In other words, we utilized the four methods above to develop: (1) the course, (2) the assignments and, (3) the grading system we used such that critical thinking could be outlined, developed and demanded from our students. The framework we developed is summarized as follows:

1. Recitation – state known facts or opinions. A critical component of this step is to acknowledge what aspect(s) of what is being stated are factual and what are based on opinion.
2. Exploration – analyze the roots of those opinions or facts. This step requires digging below the surface of what is believed or known and working to discover the elements that have combined to result in that fact or that opinion. This involves analysis without an attempt to comprehend the impact of those facts or opinions.
3. Understanding – involves an awareness of other views and a comprehension of the difference(s) between one's own opinion (and the facts or other opinions upon which that opinion is based) and the opinions of others. To truly "understand" our own opinion in relationship to others, we must initiate an active dialogue with the other person about his or her opinions and the roots of those opinions. In other words, once we become aware of the roots of our own opinions, we must understand how to discover the roots of the opinions of others.
4. Appreciation – a full awareness of the differences between our views and opinions and those of others. To truly appreciate differences, we must be aware of the nature of those differences. The active dialogue undertaken in the third step (understanding) should lead to an analysis of the opinion as recited by the other. The result should be a complete awareness of the similarities and differences between our own opinions (and the roots of those opinions) and those of the "other." Although we may still be aware that our opinions differ, we are now in a position to truly appreciate and value those differences.

Understanding "Understanding"

In our view, it is important to acknowledge that "understanding" does not mean to "accept." The goal is not to get everyone to agree; the goal is to get people to truly explore and understand how and why opinions differ. To understand means to realize the circumstances and motivations that lead to differences and to realize that those differences are meaningful. It is our belief that discussing social issues (such as prejudice or racism) *without* requiring students to explore the roots of their views, understand the roots of other views, and appreciate the nature and importance of different views about those issues perpetuates ignorance. To raise the issue without using a critical thinking framework may simply reinforce prejudices by giving them voice without question. Among the various rubrics that can be used to undertake such an assessment of critical thinking, Coster and Ledovski's (2005) tool comes to mind. They assess students in three categories and rate them from high ability and low ability. These categories are: (1) contributes to the discussion, (2) presents one's own opinion on the issue and, (3) assesses the quality of support available (Coster & Ledovski, 2005).

To understand means to realize the circumstances and motivations that lead to differences and to realize that those differences are meaningful.

Enhancing Critical Thinking

The process of implementing critical thinking into our course began with the theoretical framework already outlined (Kuhn, 1999) and then proceeded to the design phase in which we used the work of Paul and Elder (2002), Smith (2002) and others to design a critical thinking framework that provided guidance for students on the elements of critical thinking and an understanding that these elements build upon each other. Finally, we progressed to a stage of course and assignment construction. In other words, knowing what critical thinking is, being able to break down critical thinking into its component elements, and demonstrating these elements to students to prepare students to engage in critical thinking. These skills must be practiced within the course and the assignments within that course. So, we set about the task of constructing assignments that would require all elements of critical thinking; that would foster student growth along this developmental continuum of critical thinking (Kuhn, 1999); and that would hold students accountable for demonstrating growth along that continuum.

Before ever teaching the course the first time, however, we knew we wanted to teach the course online. The reason for this, initially, was simple: our university wanted faculty to develop online courses with consistent content. Our early experiences in teaching the course online, however, taught us that the course is very well suited to an online format, primarily due to its exploration of sensitive and controversial topics (for more discussion of this issue see Osborne, Kriese, & Tobey, 2008). While constructing the course site and the assignments, we utilized the advice of MacKnight (2000) on how to teach critical thinking skills through online discussions. MacKnight (2000) spells out what students and faculty must be prepared to do in order to facilitate critical thinking with online discussions. In particular, students must have a clear understanding of the assignment and possess the social skills necessary to:

- ask the right questions,
- listen to each other,
- take turns and share work,
- help each other learn,
- respect each other's ideas,
- build on each other's ideas,
- construct their own understanding, and

- think in new ways. (MacKnight, 2000, p. 39)

Additionally, faculty must support disciplined discussions by:

- maintaining a focused discussion,
- keeping the discussion intellectually responsible,
- stimulating the discussion by asking probing questions that hold students accountable for their thinking,
- infusing these questions in the minds of students,
- encouraging full participation, and
- periodically summarizing what has or needs to be done (MacKnight, 2000, p. 39).

Potts (1994) outlined "best practice" methods for teaching critical thinking. Although many overlap with what we have already outlined, one suggestion stood out to us as we contemplated building a course and assignments that incorporated the best practices we had gleaned from other researchers and teachers. Potts (1994) suggests teaching students to build categories. In Potts' own terms, "students often are given (and asked to memorize) explicit rules for classifying information" (1994, p. 2). But students learn little about how to develop the rules themselves when they are provided. Instead, Potts (1994) suggests that students be expected to discover the rules needed to build the categories of thinking (and knowledge) required in the course. One of the keys to this approach is to assist students in this development process without "giving" them the rules.

Building Interpersonal Skills for Critical Thinking

Last, we encountered numerous references to interpersonal skills as an aspect of critical thinking (Halpern, 1996; Halpern, 1999; Klaczynski, Gordon, & Fauth, 1997; MacKnight, 2000; Hansburg & Silberman, 2005). In other words, critical thinking is not just a skill that one holds individually. As Gokhale (1995) outlined, critical thinking can best be fostered collaboratively. As such, we felt it was necessary to combine critical thinking and interpersonal skills training in our course. We outlined these skills in the form of course "etiquette" and held students accountable for demonstrating these skills so that a safe learning environment was maintained in our course.

In particular, we specifically outline the "interpersonal" expectations for our course with this statement: "This is an internet course. As such, the success of the course relies on active participation by each class member throughout the entire semester. Even though we are the professors for the course, it is designed as a seminar course, meaning that active participation from students is essential. Although face-to-face interactions will not occur because of our use of the internet, we do expect continual communication between members of the class and the course faculty. Even though this interaction will be over the Internet, we expect students to use the same etiquette that would be used in a classroom during face-to-face interactions. This etiquette includes:

Critical thinking is not just a skill that one holds individually; critical thinking can best be fostered collaboratively.

- respect for others (their viewpoints, their values, their beliefs),
- the right to disagree but requires sensitivity to the viewpoints of others,
- taking responsibility for being involved in developing the issues and topics relevant to this course,
- active participation in all elements of the course,
- continual feedback to the instructors about the course, course assignments, and individual viewpoints,
- a commitment to the mutual exchange of ideas. This means we will not isolate definitive 'answers' to the issues we raise, but we will actively explore and respect the multiple sides to those issues, and
- a responsibility to 'police' ourselves.

We are attempting to develop a community, and this requires trust. In order to develop trust, we must know that we can share our ideas and not be 'attacked.' This also requires that we allow other class members the same trust and freedom we expect."

Putting It All Together – Our Course

To summarize, here is the sequence we utilized to build our course (and the assignments for that course); this sequence reflects a scholarship of teaching inquiry model generalizable to other projects and disciplines. We

1. read much of the critical thinking literature,
2. delineated what we felt were "best practice" methods for developing a model of critical thinking (Paul & Elder, 2002; Smith, 2002),
3. molded those best practices into expectations for students (Gokhale, 1995; MacKnight, 2000),
4. developed methods we would use (as faculty) to encourage critical thinking (Gokhale, 1995; MacKnight, 2000),
5. used those best practices to create individual and collaborative assignments (Potts, 1994), and
6. developed a method for articulating the interpersonal skills necessary for critical thinking to our students (Halpern, 1996; Halpern, 1999; Klaczynski, Gordon, & Fauth, 1997; Hansburg & Silberman, 2005).

In structuring the course, we relied on the literature for guidance. We started with Gokhale's (1995) work illustrating the impact of collaborative learning on critical thinking. Gokhale found that students engaged in collaborative learning methods performed better on critical thinking test items than students completing the same assignments individually. Following Gokhale's (1995) guidance, we decided to develop collaborative assignments for our course. But collaborative assignments, while they allow for the assessment of interpersonal skills and critical thinking, are not always easy to assess for individual learning. For this reason, both individual and collaborative assignments were integrated into the course.

Our project rested on the idea that the interpersonal skills learned in our course would enhance critical thinking and these advancements in critical thinking would surely show how students would learn content in future courses. The focus of this article, however, is *not* on student performance (grades) in future courses. Our purpose here is to assess the logical but, heretofore, undocumented relationship between interpersonal skills and critical thinking discussed throughout the scholarship of teaching and learning literature, and to model a scholarship of teaching and learning inquiry framework for building a course.

Method

Two naïve raters went through the course postings from an entire semester of the internet-based, team-taught seminar course, "The Politics and Psychology of Hatred." Nineteen students participated in the course from the beginning to the end of the semester. Student posts were "graded" by faculty but not assessed as part of this project until after course grades were submitted. The raters were asked to assess the course postings for each student (at the end of the semester) using the instruments shown in Appendices A and B. The raters were trained to use the scoring systems until the correlation between their scores for a random sample of postings pulled from the course reached r=.90. From this point on, the ratings of the two raters were averaged for each of the participants in the study.

As a reminder, our interest was in assessing the relationship between interpersonal skills (what we called "course etiquette") and progress on the critical thinking model. For our purposes, a course posting that was assessed by raters as including "exploration" demonstrated a higher level of critical thinking than one that showed "recitation." Our guiding question was: Are higher levels of critical thinking

(moving upward through recitation, exploration, and understanding to appreciation) related to ratings of student use of the course etiquette (conceptualized by us as more effective demonstration of interpersonal skills)?

Students completed a weekly assignment (responding to a discussion forum "question of the week" that was linked to some current event dealing with prejudice, discrimination or hate), three individual assignments (larger scale assignments to be worked on and posted individually), three group assignments (larger scale assignments to be worked on and posted as part of a group – students stayed in the same groups all semester), and one course project that was completed with the same group as the group assignments.

Raters (and students at the beginning of the course) were given the following definitions to use in assessing course posts for levels of critical thinking: (1) *Recitation* – state known facts or opinions, (2) *Exploration* – analyze the roots of those opinions or facts, (3) *Understanding* – involves an awareness of other views and a comprehension of the difference(s) between one's own opinion (and the facts or other opinions upon which that opinion is based) and the opinions of others, and (4) *Appreciation* –a full awareness of the differences between our views and opinions and those of others. To truly appreciate differences, we must be aware of the nature of those differences.

Results

Average rater scores were entered into a linear regression analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5. The regression analysis was run for each level of the critical thinking model adding in each rating on use of course etiquette to determine which elements of course etiquette weighted most heavily for each level of critical thinking. As expected, none of the levels of course etiquette weighted on ***recitation*** of fact and opinion, $F(3,8) = 2.105$, $p = .292$.

For ***exploration***, several elements of course etiquette had significant beta weights and lead to an overall significance of $F(8,3) = 110.632$, $p = .001$. The course etiquette elements that weighted on exploration were respect, sensitivity, and mutual exchange of ideas. In terms of the third level of the critical thinking model, ***understanding*** views of others, again there was a significant overall effect of etiquette, $F(8,3) = 67.646$, $p = .003$, but the course etiquette item that weighted significantly was mutual exchange of ideas, $t = -3.667$, $p = .035$. Finally, there was a significant overall relationship between the highest level of critical thinking – ***appreciation*** of the views of others – and course etiquette, $F(8,3) = 908.845$, $p = .0001$ and the following individual elements of course etiquette weighted significantly with appreciation: (1) respect, (2) sensitivity, (3) active participation, (4) feedback to others, and (5) mutual exchange of ideas. Each of these were significant at the. 05 level.

Those students who were rated most highly on critical thinking also demonstrated the most use of interpersonal skills.

Discussion

These findings strongly support the notion spelled out in the literature that interpersonal skills are an important element of critical thinking. Indeed, those students who were rated most highly on critical thinking also demonstrated the most use of interpersonal skills. These findings do not, of course, allow us to determine if fostering interpersonal skills enhances critical thinking or if students with enhanced critical thinking skills are also more interpersonal. But these data demonstrate a clear relationship between the two. In order to determine the order of the relationship (which leads to the other), a pre-post design would need to be employed. Still, these findings are of value to faculty in terms of demonstrating that interpersonal skills are an important element of critical thinking.

It is important to describe to students how their work will be assessed for critical thinking. To make this clear, we included a clear statement about the critical thinking model in our course syllabus. This statement is included in Appendix C.

The information provided above strongly suggests that: (1) critical thinking can be taught in internet courses, (2) interpersonal skills are an important component of critical thinking, (3) faculty and students who have not taught or taken Internet courses have strong differences in perceptions of Internet courses, and (4) differences in perceptions between faculty and students about Internet courses do not completely go away when faculty have taught such courses and students have taken such courses.

We provide data that interpersonal skills are an important component of critical thinking and we outline methods faculty can use to demonstrate, facilitate, enhance and assess interpersonal and critical thinking skills in an Internet course. We believe faculty could incorporate both of these into virtually any Internet course. Indeed, it is very important that the reader understand this point very clearly: well-designed Internet courses can provide ***better*** opportunities to foster the kinds of critical thinking processes we have outlined than traditional face-to-face classes. Part of this is structural. Because an Internet course does NOT typically involve lecturing and presentation of material – material is posted ahead of time for all to see and process - the majority of "class time" is spent on reflection and analysis of material and student perceptions of that material.

References

Coster, J. & Ledovski, V. (2005). *Thinking outside the square: promoting critical thinking through online discussions*. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from http://www.englishaustralia.com.au/index.cgi?E=hcatfuncs

Doherty, J.J., Hansen, M.A., & Kaya, K.K. (1999*). Teaching Information Skills in the Information Age: The Need for Critical Thinking*. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/doherty.pdf

Gokhale, A.A (1995). Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, *7*, 22-30.

Halpern, D. (1996). *Thought and knowledge: An introduction to critical thinking* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Halpern, D. (1999). Teaching for critical thinking: Helping college students develop the skills and dispositions of a critical thinker. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (Winter), 69-74.

Hansburg, F. & Silberman, M.L. (2005). *Peoplesmart: Developing your interpersonal intelligence*. Indianapolis, Indiana: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hutchings, P. & Shulman, L.S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments*. Change, 31,* 10-15.

Klaczynski, P., Gordon, D.H., & Fauth, J. (1997). Goal-oriented critical reasoning and individual differences in critical reasoning biases. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *89*, 470-485.

Kuhn, D. (1999). A developmental model of critical thinking. *Educational Researcher*, *28*, 16-26, 46.

MacKnight, C.B. (2000). Teaching critical thinking through online discussions. *Educause Quarterly*, *4*, 38-41.

Osborne, R.E., Kriese, P., & Tobey, H.(2008). Reflections on a decade of using the scholarship of teaching and learning. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 3,* 37-46.

Paul, R.W. & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your professional and personal life.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education/FT Press.

Potts, B. (1994). Strategies for teaching critical thinking. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, *4*. Retrieved April 7, 2008 from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=4&n=3.

Smith, R. (2002). *Challenging your preconceptions: Thinking critically about psychology*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Randall E. Osborne has conducted scholarship of teaching projects illustrating how to: (1) maximize learning in online courses, (2) minimize the challenges of teaching in an internet format, (3) take advantage of the unique pedagogical features of online teaching, and (4) create online courses facilitating critical thinking and value exploration.

Paul Kriese' low socioeconomic upbringing near the waterfront of Buffalo, New York, and his years as a professor of political science have taught him that "we cannot reconstruct an environment of tolerance and inclusiveness unless we are teaching people to deconstruct the causes of hate in the first place."

Heather Tobey has just graduated with a B.S. degree in Psychology from Texas State University-San Marcos. She has taken a third of her classes online in order to obtain her Bachelors of Applied Science in Psychology. Without the use of the internet courses she would not have been able to pursue her educational goals as she is also a single mother of two and works fulltime.

Emily Johnson is a senior at Texas State University-San Marcos. Her broad interests include intercultural issues in psychology and helping students learn effectively in internet courses. She is now in the process of contemplating applications to graduate school.

Appendix A: Rating of Course Postings

Overall the posts from this student effectively demonstrates:

Recitation – state known facts or opinions.
The posts from this student clearly state known facts or opinions

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	somewhat agree	strongly agree

Exploration – analyze the roots of those opinions or facts.
The posts from this student effectively explore roots of opinions or facts

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	somewhat agree	strongly agree

Understanding – involves an awareness of other views and a comprehension of the difference(s) between one's own opinion (and the facts or other opinions upon which that opinion is based) and the opinions of others.
The posts from this student reflect an understanding of the roots of the opinions of others.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	somewhat agree	strongly agree

Appreciation – means a full awareness of the differences between our views and opinions and those of others. To truly appreciate differences, we must be aware of the nature of those differences.

The posts from this student reflect an appreciation for the diverse opinions of others.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	somewhat agree	strongly agree

Appendix B: Ratings of Course Etiquette

Track the number of times that the student named above, engages in each aspect of the course etiquette (put a hash mark for each occurrence of each aspect you encounter while reading the posts from this student):

1. respect for others (their viewpoints, their values, their beliefs),
2. the right to disagree but requires sensitivity to the viewpoints of others,
3. taking responsibility for being involved in developing the issues and topics relevant to this course,
4. active participation in all elements of the course,
5. continual feedback to the instructors about the course, course assignments, and individual viewpoints,
6. a commitment to the mutual exchange of ideas. This means we will not isolate definitive "answers" to the issues we raise but we will actively explore and respect the multiple sides to those issues, and
7. a responsibility to "police" ourselves. We are attempting to develop a community and this requires trust. In order to develop trust, we must know that we can share our ideas and not be "attacked." This also requires that we allow other class members the same trust and freedom we expect.

Appendix C: Important Notes about Critical Thinking and Course Contributions

All of your written work will be assessed on this model. In other words, all of your responses to questions must show all four levels: (1) recitation, (2) exploration, (3) understanding, and (4) appreciation. Higher grades will be given to those assignments that **clearly** demonstrate an effort to move upward on this continuum.

All course contributions (forum postings, exam answers, course papers) must be substantive contributions. *Substantive contributions are those that demonstrate*: (1) that a student has given thought to what he or she has posted, (2) that the student's comments have added positively to the discussion, (3) that the contributions adhere to the course etiquette principles outlined above, and (4) that the student has made progress along the four levels of the critical thinking model.

Assessing Assessment: Toward a Hermeneutic-Phenomenological Perspective

Michael Strawser, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Central Florida

Assessment is generally not a favorite subject for many teachers, and this is likely due to a perceived tension between the goals they wish to accomplish as educators and the methods of assessments prescribed by accrediting agencies. With even President Obama calling for improvements in assessing education, this paper seeks to develop an innovative phenomenological-hermeneutic model of assessment, one that focuses on the first-person interpretation of one's transformative educational experience. After the theoretical framework for developing this model is explained, I present an application of the model through the introduction of "mindful reading assignments."

Introduction

It would seem that, as a rule, philosophers are not particularly fond of assessment. Without wishing to incriminate my colleagues or myself, I take this as a general observation. Perhaps supporting evidence can be found in the following experience: At a recent divisional meeting of the American Philosophical Association with 1,008 members listed as participants, how many do you think attended a group session sponsored by the American Association of Philosophy Teachers devoted to the topic of assessment in Philosophy Courses?[1] As it turned out, I was *one of two* members of the audience, and awkwardly, the other member snuck out towards the end of the first presentation, while I remained. What's wrong with the topic of assessment? Why is there such a low level of engagement? Is it because any reflection on teaching and testing is at best secondary to the main pursuit of wisdom? True, Socrates disavowed being a teacher and had seemingly little interest in assessing his disciples. If anything, he reasoned, they should assess themselves. But despite maintaining that "the unexamined life is not worth living,"[2] it is safe to assume that Socrates certainly didn't have in mind that students should be subject to repeated standardized examinations.[3] Indeed, it is difficult to imagine Socrates fitting into our higher education system today, but perhaps this reasoning for the lack of interest in assessment is a bit too idealistic.

What's wrong with the topic of assessment? Why is there such a low level of engagement? Is it because any reflection on teaching and testing is at best secondary to the main pursuit of wisdom?

It is somewhat comforting to note that it is not only philosophy teachers who feel and think this way. As noted in a meeting I attended in the fall semester of 2008 at the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (FCTL) at the University of Central Florida, "work with assessment [is] most of the time [work with] a hostile audience," and "you're not supposed to be grumpy unless you're talking about assessment." I admit that these reflections generally fit with my own experiences in working on our General Education Program (GEP) assessment and trying to get others interested in the process. Why all the grumpiness? If it is not because that we are solely interested in the isolated pursuit of truth in itself, is it rather that we are quite suspicious that common assessment models involving standardized direct measures fail to account for the whole learning experience in all its complexity?[4]

Even our nation's President is concerned about assessment. From the campaign trail in New Hampshire in November 2007 to March 10th, 2009, when he unveiled his specific proposals for public education, President Obama has repeatedly called for "innovative assessments" (2007, p. 8).[5] Although focused primarily on K-

12 education and skill-based learning, Obama has clearly suggested that we need to develop alternative assessments that encourage our students "to become more than just good test-takers" and "that don't just test isolated bits of information" (p. 8). In his most recent speech, Obama called on education chiefs to develop "assessments that don't simply measure whether students can fill in a bubble on a test, but whether they possess 21st century skills like problem-solving and critical thinking, entrepreneurship, and creativity" (2009, para. 23).[6] Thus the time is ripe for thickening the discussion of assessment.

When we focus on higher education, however, where our goal is to educate and not merely train our students, we must be wary of the move to more standardized, "direct" measures of quantifiable "outcomes." Dean Adam Falk of Johns Hopkins University expressed his concern that assessment practices focused "on standardization and quantification will impel us to an impoverished vision of higher education that would do our nation a profound disservice" (2008, para. 5).[7] The reasoning behind this claim is based on a vision of the university that is centered on the goal of developing character and invigorating "the intellectual and moral forces," as well as Falk's discussions with alumni who only gain a clearer understanding of the significance of their education years after they have graduated. Thus Falk opposes the "new standardized testing regime" because it is clear that "a single test cannot uniformly evaluate the quality of the student experience, and the essential 'value added' of an education is not largely revealed by graduation" (para. 6). What is perhaps most important for this article is that Falk's comments emphasize the importance of focusing on the significance of the educational *experience* as a whole and not on particular bits of knowledge or skills.[8]

When we focus on higher education, however, where our goal is to educate and not merely train our students, we must be wary of the move to more standardized, "direct" measures of quantifiable "outcomes."

An even deeper worry is expressed by the holistic educators Sharon Solloway and Nancy Brooks (2004), who suggest that the "standardization and instrumental application of knowledge is akin to violence," (p. 43)[9] and they call, following Paul Ricoeur, "for the necessity of a constant watchfulness for the ways our own pre-conceived notions deform our understanding and reception of other texts, ideas, objects and/or persons" (p. 43). "We cannot," they note, "underestimate the subtle nature of this violence to deceive us into complacency" (p. 43). So, at the very least, we need to reflect on our assessment measures and be aware of the potential for violence (i.e., *forcing* students to think about a question in one particular way and to confine their answer, for example, to a limited number of multiple choice or rubric options).

In this article, I reflect on my current Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) project[10], aiming to extend the discussion initiated by Solloway and Brooks (2004) in their paper, "Philosophical Hermeneutics and Assessment." Here they offer a new model of assessment based on Hans-Georg Gadamer's (1989) work, in particular his understanding of experience as *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung*. I shall explain this model and attempt to add phenomenological support for it, and then consider how it might be applied in philosophy and humanities classes through the introduction of "mindful reading assignments." Finally, I shall briefly consider the potential benefits of this model of assessment, as well as the nature of "mindfulness."

Phenomenology and Education

The central subject matter of phenomenology is experience. "Phenomenology is concerned with attaining an *understanding* and proper *description* of the experiential structure of our mental/embodied life" (Gallagher & Zahavi, 2008, p. 9). A phenomenological assessment will thus focus on the experience of the learner, the "how" of the experience more than the "what."

Further, all experience involves perception, and phenomenologists appear to be agreed that all perception "involves an interpretation"; one does not simply receive information in perception (Gallagher & Zahavi, 2008, p. 9). Consequently, a "direct" measure of learning from a phenomenological perspective would involve an analysis of the first-person perspective, and a third-person, objective perspective would be considered derivative or indirect. This is a curious reversal of the common assessment practices promoted by accrediting agencies today that emphasize the use of so-called "direct" measures of learning designed to eliminate the perceptions of the learners.

Let me explain further and try to preempt a possible misunderstanding. Although phenomenologists promote the investigation of the first-person perspective associated with human subjectivity, it would be mistaken to consider this approach as either introspective or subjective. From phenomenology's beginning in the writings of the founder Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) there has been a consistent attempt to dissociate this method from introspective psychology[11] and to explain how it is not based on subjectivism.[12] Thus only by misunderstanding the phenomenological method could one think that any assessment derived from it would be a promotion of individualistic, subjective feelings.

It is also important to acknowledge that Husserl and later phenomenologists, such as Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002), clearly do not reject objective, scientific knowledge. Rather, they attempt to understand how such knowledge is constituted, and it is precisely the recognition that objective knowledge is a derivative phenomenon which shows the limitations of the objective, third-person perspective. In other words, that which is perceived (i.e., interpreted) as "objective" is done so *by* someone *for* someone *within* a larger framework of significance and purpose. In short, phenomenologists have sought to understand this larger framework, which is referred to as the "life-world" in Husserl, "being-in-the-world" in Heidegger, and the "hermeneutical situation" in Gadamer. Any assessment practice based on a phenomenological method—which would also embrace a hermeneutical approach[13]—would thus attempt to incorporate an appreciation of this larger framework and the "constitution"[14] of knowledge.

It seems to be more often the case than not that when assessing students we are looking for evidence of new facts, knowledge, and/or skills, rather than an experience of personal growth and transformation gained through engaging in a dialogue.

Hermeneutics and Assessment

The subtitle of Solloway and Brooks' (2004) paper on "Philosophical Hermeneutics and Assessment" is "Discussions of Assessment for the Sake of Wholeness," and in the introduction their aim is clearly stated: "We seek a healthier model, with greater possibilities for assessment that nourishes wholeness" (p. 43). In contrast, positivistic models based on "the traditional notion [that] the transmission of knowledge is evidence of learning" are less healthy and humane, because they are "designed to eliminate a student's particular history of being" and silence his or her voice (p. 44). While there are certainly exceptions in assessment practices which do allow for the student's understanding and history of being to be included (such as in portfolios), it does seem to be more often the case than not that when assessing students we are looking for evidence of new facts, knowledge, and/or skills, rather than an experience of personal growth and transformation gained through engaging in a dialogue. For Solloway and Brooks it is such an experience that allows for "the possibility of evolving wisdom and compassion" (p. 45). Without providing evidence for this profound claim at this point in their article (although I think some may possibly be found in an examination of the written student reflections they later cite), Solloway and Brooks turn their discussion to

Gadamer and the consideration of experience given in the German terms *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung*.

Before explaining this distinction, it is important to note the following points, which are not addressed by Solloway and Brooks. First, Gadamer's understanding of the hermeneutical process is grounded in Heidegger's analysis of understanding expressed in sections 31 and 32 of *Being and Time* (1927), which describes understanding as an existential mode of being that prefigures knowing and asserting. Second, in Gadamer's defining study *Truth and Method*, it is clear from the outset that he is not arguing for one conception of truth and one conception of method, and consequently he is not rejecting scientific "truth" and method, the extended development of which may lie behind the current positivistic tradition of assessment in what has been called "the Age of Accountability."[15] For there are learning processes characterized by the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and thus there may be assessment models suited for these processes. Gadamer (1989) would have us see, however, that "there is an experience of truth that transcends the domain of the scientific method" (p. xxi). This is the truth experienced in the phenomenon of understanding, the investigation of which is the central focus of Gadamer's entire study. For example, in the experience of understanding a work by Plato, Spinoza, or Hegel, "a truth is known that could not be attained in any other way, even if this contradicts the yardstick of research and progress by which science measures itself" (p. xxi).[16] In other words, "truth" in this sense is not a skill or craft (*technē*) or the correct conformity between the idea and the object (*adequatio*), but rather the unveiling (*alētheia*) of being in the self-understanding of the seeker. Heidegger, in particular, has emphasized this understanding of truth and its genuine association with education (*paideía*). This is summarized nicely in Shaun Gallagher's *Hermeneutics and Education*:

> …then knowledge, in Plato's sense, is not a matter of *adequatio* but of *alētheia*. *Adequatio* is taken as an inadequate kind of truth. It does not constitute the truth that must be sought in the educational process. For Plato, education means always going beyond truth as *adequatio*. *Adequatio* is a characteristic of purely technical or intellectual—logical, mathematical, formal—knowledge, a knowledge that lacks a moral dimension, a cleverness without *phronēsis* [practical wisdom]. Plato is not ambiguous about this. Education cannot be reduced to *technē* or *adequatio*. It involves more than a literacy with respect to correct opinions. It involves a self-knowledge that changes the learner. (p. 200)[17]

In light of this richer understanding of the nature of education, which is irreducible to *technē* or *adequatio*, it becomes evident that our assessment practices need to be enriched to account for the nature of truth as *alētheia*. Thus, we must realize that there are experiences of learning that transcend traditional assessment practices. Such experiences may be more obvious in the arts and humanities, which in turn would be the disciplines most in need of alternative models of assessment. But here it should be noted that in *Truth and Method* it was not Gadamer's (1989) concern to establish a new method or system of rules on how we should proceed. Rather, he states: "my real concern was and is philosophic: not what we do or what we ought to do but what happens to us over and above our wanting and doing" (p. xxv-xxvi).

We must realize that there are experiences of learning that transcend traditional assessment practices.

Let us now consider the complex distinction between *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung,* which for Solloway and Brooks (2004) lies at the heart of their new holistic thinking on assessment. They begin their discussion as follows:

> While traditional notions of learning and assessment [consider/as] a replication and/or application as evidence of having mastered a pre-given body of knowledge, *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung* may be associated with a philosophical hermeneutical notion of

> assessment as an aesthetic experience – one in which the individual encounters him/herself and engages in a play across horizons. (p. 45)

I would offer that it is rather rare that we consider assessment as an aesthetic experience, and I would like us to keep this idea in mind, while taking both "aesthetic" and "experience" in the broadest senses.[18] For Gadamer, it seems, the aesthetic experience *par excellence* is an engagement with a literary text,[19] and surely any course offered at the university, whether science or humanities, is going to include this experience. It will also include the aesthetic experience of engaging the oral tradition given through the language of the instructor, so "aesthetic assessment" may be applicable to all disciplines.

Although "Gadamer typically uses the term *Erlebnis* with a critical overtone, and the term *Erfahrung* with a positive one" (1989, p. xiii), Solloway and Brooks (2004) argue for an interpretation that brings together both notions of experience. They take *Erlebnis* to define an immediate, particular experience that jolts one "out of the ordinary" and "awakens us to ourselves in a way that we haven't been awakened before" (p. 46). In contrast, *Erfahrung* "is a way of being, a stance or orientation to experience in general" (p. 46). In other words, we might say that *Erlebnis* is a subjective event, "it is all about ME; it happens TO me" (p. 46). *Erfahrung* moves beyond subjectivity to an understanding that is radically undogmatic, one in which I understand my experiences not as "isolated moments, but an ongoing integrative process in which what we encounter widens our horizon" (Gadamer, 1989, p. xiii). For Gadamer, "the dialectic of experience has its proper fulfillment not in a definitive knowledge but in the openness to experience that is made possible by experience itself" (p. 355). It would seem, then, that this openness to ever-widening horizons allows for the possibility of transformation, in which one transcends one's isolated subjectivity—but one does not eliminate it—to become an integrated part of the whole.

Theory in Practice: Mindful Reading Assignments

"What assessment practices might be invented by teachers who are interested in drawing students toward their own hermeneutic imagination?...toward their own growth in appreciation of the wholeness and integrity of the world?" (Solloway & Brooks, 2004, p. 50). This is the question posed by Solloway and Brooks, and answered by the different model of assessment they propose, one that does not eliminate "the idiosyncrasies of personal relevance, cultural context, and historical context," but rather allows "students to bring their personal histories to the table" (p. 51). The assessment designed by Solloway is a "self-evaluation" assessment of learning, which is claimed to have "demonstrated a texture of 'mindfulness'" (p. 58).

> The merit of this initiative lies in its innovative use of philosophical hermeneutics as a model of assessment. It opens assessment to the possibilities of a holistic notion of mindfulness – observing the mind in its processes. Perhaps, this accounts for the responses that describe learning as if it is a new experience. Mindfulness practitioners often describe ordinary experience as having a keenness – a sense of vibrancy not noticed without mindfulness. (p. 58)

Following this initiative, I have designed what I call "Mindful Reading Assignments" for my Introduction to Philosophy classes, and have just begun asking my students to complete them during the 2008-2009 academic year. A short description of the Mindful Reading Assignment (MRA) is this:

> Throughout the course students will be required to submit four MRAs in which they (1) *identify a passage* from an assigned reading that has affected (deepened, qualified, confirmed, raised new questions, etc.) the way they think and (2) *explain the*

> *significance of the passage* (e.g., its difficulty, originality, insight, truthfulness, etc.) and how their thinking has been affected (deepened, qualified, confirmed, raised new questions, etc.). The assignments should include the passage and reference (singled-spaced, use ellipses if more than 50 words) and the explanation (double-spaced, 250 to 500 words).

The focus of this assignment is not on demonstrating knowledge about the content or argument found in a particular text (although this inevitably happens along the way), but rather in demonstrating that one has been open to letting the other (in this case the text) engage oneself, and has been transformed through an interpretation of both oneself and the text. In Gadamerian terms this would exhibit a "kind of play, a back and forth or to and fro movement" (Solloway & Brooks, 2004, p. 45) that is the unveiling or truth of being, which is not entirely objective (since the focus is not on getting the text right) or entirely subjective (since the focus is not solely on what the student thinks alone). Rather the focus is on the encounter in which the object and subject become merged, and both are transcended in the process, that is, in the experience. How exactly this happens through the activity of reading might be considered in some sense "miraculous,"[20] and yet Gadamer's ontological explanation of the work of art goes a long way in clarifying this "miracle." As Gadamer understands it, the concept of play is the clue to the ontological explanation. This means that the mode of being of play helps us to understand the mode of being of the work of art, which "is not an object that stands over and against a subject for itself" (p. 103). Instead,

The focus of this assignment is not on demonstrating knowledge about the content or argument found in a particular text, but rather in demonstrating that one has been open to letting the text engage oneself, and has been transformed through an interpretation of both oneself and the text.

> the work of art has its true being in the fact that it becomes an experience that changes the person who experiences it. The "subject" of the experience of art, that which remains and endures, is not the subjectivity of the person who experiences it but the work itself. (p. 103)

From this line of thought one may understand that when we attempt to assess the student's experience of the work of art by focusing on the changes undergone, we are also assessing the work of art itself understood as experience. For perhaps the most significant part of Gadamer's work in understanding the process of understanding and interpretation—at least if one considers that it is the part most often anthologized—readers should turn to the first section of "Elements of a Theory of Hermeneutic Experience" in which the hermeneutic circle and the conception of prejudices are explained. Relevant to the current discussion is this description of the hermeneutical circle:

> The circle, then, is not formal in nature. It is neither subjective nor objective, but describes understanding as the interplay of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter. The anticipation of meaning that governs our understanding of a text is not an act of subjectivity, but proceeds from the commonality that binds us to the tradition. (p. 293)[21]

In an attempt to apply these theoretical concerns to the assessment process, the plan for my SoTL project is to compare classes which are asked to complete MRAs with those that are not, and to see what, if any, significant differences emerge. My expectation would naturally be that the use of MRAs would lead to an enhanced learning experience that would also result in improved results on other more traditional assessments, such as multiple choice and short answer tests. I am also interested in surveying students to find out which method of assessment they find most valuable, but here I am not sure what to expect. Students who are used to traditional assessment measures may not think that the

MRAs reflect significant learning. This, of course, is yet to be determined, since I am only at the beginning of my study using the intervention of MRAs as an alternative assessment model. Whether the results will provide "an opening for transformation" as presented by Solloway and Brooks (2004) remains to be seen, as also whether it will be possible to categorize the student responses by the following six themes: "new energy/excitement for learning, new visions of how they want to enact teaching and learning, new ways of being in the world, new wisdom about themselves, new experience of learning, [and] concrete horizons" (p. 52).[22]

Conclusion: *In Media Res*

The major goals of this paper have been to provide a theoretical background for my SoTL project and a description of the new application of MRAs. Thus my study is "in the middle of things," as all data has not yet been collected, and the data that has been collected does not represent two comparable courses which would yield statistically significant results. Initially, due to my class schedule, the study focused on two different sections of PHI 2010, Introduction to Philosophy. Group 1 consisted of 18 honors students in the fall semester of 2008, and Group 2 consisted of 75 general students in the spring semester of 2009. Both groups had the same reading material from Plato, Spinoza, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche, while Group 1 was asked to complete four "mindful reading assignments" throughout the course and Group 2 was not. Both groups also took the same three tests containing multiple choice, true/false, and essay questions.[23]

Initially, it appeared that students in Group 1 were more comfortable writing expository or reflective pieces, rather than being able to describe their reading experiences and how their thinking was changed in the process. This is reflected in 56% of the class earning full credit for the first two MRAs compared to 67% earning full credit in the last two MRAs. As suggested above, the goal of these assignments is neither a straightforward exposition of the text (this would be the predominantly objective focus) nor a personal explanation why a student liked a particular passage (this would be the predominantly subjective focus), but rather a careful description of how a student's consciousness has been changed in the experience of reading the text. Helping students understand *this focus on the experience*, which is not simply objective or subjective, showed itself to be the greatest challenge in implementing this assessment. Students needed to be reminded to attempt to express directly how they thought about a particular issue prior to reading the text and how they then thought about it after reading the text. In doing this students were being asked to come to self-knowledge about their own being-in-the-world, and the greatest aid to students in this regard was to read to the class those MRAs that succeeded best in achieving the goals of the assignment.

Helping students understand *this focus on the experience*, which is not simply objective or subjective, showed itself to be the greatest challenge in implementing this assessment.

It does seem that students in Group 1 were satisfied with the MRAs as a method of assessment. In the free response section of the student perception of instruction forms, 11 of 14 students (79%) responded favorably to the question: "What is your reaction to the method of evaluating your mastery of the course?"[24] Although the majority of comments received were rather general (such as "grading was fair") and this question refers to all assessment measures including tests (which was interestingly the only measure receiving negative comments, while there were no negative comments regarding the MRAs), three students (21%) commented positively and without any prompting regarding the MRAs in particular. One student even put down "MRAs" for "The thing(s) I like the MOST about this course," and another student wrote: "I enjoyed the required reading and believe the assignments in the class helped me to better understand the material." Further, the following

unsolicited message from a student in Group 1 was received about a third of the way through the course. This message speaks for itself:

> *Professor Strawser,*
> *I am participating in the 40 day challenge "Yes, I Believe in God." Today's daily "challenge" is to write a letter of appreciation to someone with general authority over us. I just wanted to thank you for being so open minded with our Intro to Philosophy class and for actually caring about what we think. Many teachers only expect you to read the information and complete the assignment. By giving us the "Mindful Reading Assignments" you are proving to the class that you actually* do care *about how the course is affecting us. That is more than just working for your paycheck. While, to you, these mindful reading assignments seem like trivial pieces of work that every class should instate, the truth is that many professors don't care about their students as individuals. Thank you again.*

Whatever the outcome of a statistical survey of the data, this study has been significant because I have become more mindful of my own assessment practices as a teacher and more open to letting myself be transformed by the students' observations. The MRAs have already provided a pedagogical benefit in that they allow students to determine which passages they find significant rather than the ones I (and the tradition I am following) find significant, and when these passages become the focus of our discussion and analysis, or when the students' reflections provide new questions for their own research papers (which I suspect will happen), it broadens the horizons of us all. Thus I am already starting to realize that using a phenomenological-hermeneutic model of assessment may also provide the opportunity for transformation that *Erfahrung* offers for the teacher.

Notes

[1] The actual topic title was "Non-traditional Assessment in Philosophy Courses," but I do not think that the demonstrated lack of interest was due to the "non-traditional" aspect of the topic, but rather to the topic "assessment" itself. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 81.3 (January 2008): 71. I have since been assured by colleagues in other disciplines that the general lack of interest in assessment is not unique to philosophy and philosophers.

[2] *Apology* 38a. See Plato, *The Last Days of Socrates*, edited by Harold Tarrant and translated by Hugh Tredennick (New York: Penguin Classics, 2003).

[3] While Socratic teaching methodology has been much discussed throughout the ages, little, if any, attention has been given to the question of what might be involved in a Socratic approach to assessment. What would appear to be the popular Socratic form of assessment would be oral interviews subject to cross-examination or critical scrutiny (*elenchus*), but although a consistent method, this would hardly be akin to the kind of standardized practices we have today. It is interesting to note that this kind of assessment prioritizes speech over reading and writing, and that in the *Phaedrus* Socrates actually argues "that reading and writing are dangerous to learning and thinking," a view which few, if any, educators would agree with today. See David Kallack, "The Speakerly Teacher: Socrates and Writing," *Metaphilosophy* 20.3 & 4 (July/October 1989): 341.

[4] This is much more than a suspicion for philosophy professor Ken Buckman, who argues quite strongly that "standardized testing is among the worst things one can inflict on education," and that "when we view education merely as an outcome, the real, transformative character of education as process toward intellectual independence is lost." Ken Buckman, "What Counts as Assessment in the 21st Century?" *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal* (Fall 2007): 29-31. Accessed at http://www2.nea.org/he/heta07/images/2007pg29.pdf, May 29, 2009.

[5] Barack Obama, Speech on "Our Kids, Our Future," delivered in Manchester, New Hampshire, on November 20, 2007. Accessed at http://www.usatoday.com/news/pdf/obama-on-education-nov-20-2007.pdf, March 13, 2009.

[6] Barack Obama, "Remarks by the President to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce on a Complete and Competitive American Education," Washington, D.C., March 10, 2009. Accessed at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-of-the-President-to-the-United-States-Hispanic-Chamber-of-Commerce/, May 29, 2009.

[7] Adam Falk, "Assessing Assessment," *Johns Hopkins University Arts & Sciences Magazine Online* 6.1 (Fall 2008), Accessed at http://krieger2.jhu.edu/magazine/f08/view.html, March 13, 2009. The title of my article, a version of which was presented under the same title at the Engagement in Undergraduate Research: Florida Statewide Symposium, University of Central Florida, September 26, 2008, was formulated prior to my knowledge of Falk's article.

[8] This should not be taken as denying an imperative of knowledge and the importance of developing particular skills, just that this does not encapsulate the entire mission of university educators.

[9] Sharon G. Solloway and Nancy J. Brooks, "Philosophical Hermeneutics and Assessment: Discussions of Assessment for the Sake of Wholeness," *Journal of Thought* 39.2 (Summer 2004): 43. Although not explicitly developed or analyzed, the background for this seemingly extreme view is to be found in Paul Ricouer's essay, "Violence and Language," in *Political and Social Essays*, edited by David Stewart and Joseph Bien (Athens: Ohio University Press), 88-101. In this text, Ricouer seeks "to take the largest view of the realm of violence" that moves beyond "a very limited and very reassuring idea of violence" (murder and natural destruction) and considers the problem of violence in relation to language (88-89). In considering various manifestations of violence, Ricouer writes:

> There is finally the violence of the always premature conclusion: philosophy exists only in books which are always a finite work of the mind. Books are always brought to a close too quickly, intercepting the process of totalization in an arbitrary termination. This is why all philosophies are particular even though everything is to be found in any great philosophy. And as I am myself one of the violent particularities, it is from my particular point of view that I perceive all these total particularities that are also particular totalities. The hard road of the "loving struggle" is the only road possible (96-97).

Here one may begin to understand how adopting any one particular modality of discourse—such as one implicit in any single, standardized test—will have a totalizing effect on the meaning of the discourse, such that only that discursive practice which fits within the context of the test is meaningful, and all other practices are excluded. Although what may be involved in the "loving struggle" that Ricouer identifies is somewhat vague, it would surely involve "respect for the plurality and diversity of languages," which is what it means "to be non-violent in discourse" (101). As we shall see below, the particular assessment that I have developed seeks to respect the plurality and diversity of the hermeneutical experiences of students in engaging with the philosophical tradition .

[10] This project was sponsored by The Karen L. Smith Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Central Florida, and I would like to thank the interim director, Dr. Tace Crouse, and the staff of FCTL for their support for this project.

[11] "Indeed, all the major figures in the phenomenological tradition have openly and unequivocally denied that they are engaged in some kind of introspective psychology and that the method they employ is a method of introspection." This

clear statement is supported by significant evidence in Gallagher and Zahavi, *The Phenomenological Mind* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 21.

[12] Husserl remarks that "mere subjectivity should not be confused (as it is so frequently) with an experiential subjectivity, as though the perceived things in their perceptual qualities were themselves experiences…." Edmund Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, translated by W. Boyce Gidson (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1962), 158.

[13] Readers should keep in mind that phenomenology and hermeneutics are inextricably linked, and I have often thought that it would be useful to come up with a term that refers to both approaches, but somehow "phermeneutics" or "phenomenuetics" seem unsatisfactory. One of the best discussions of the relationship between phenomenology and hermeneutics can be found in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* by Paul Ricouer, who attempts to make explicit the "mutual belonging" between phenomenology and hermeneutics. According to Ricour, "*phenomenology remains the unsurpassable presupposition of hermeneutics*. On the other hand, phenomenology cannot constitute itself without a *hermeneutical presupposition*." Paul Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, edited and translated by John B. Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 101-102.

[14] The notion of "constitution" is very important in Husserl's writings and "expresses the manner in which objects of consciousness come to have the kinds of 'sense and being' that they do, the manner in which subjectivity carries out its function of giving sense." Dermot Moran, *Introduction to Phenomenology* (London: Routledge, 2000), 164-165.

[15] I don't pretend to know fully the historical reasons behind assessment having become "a national movement with a reform agenda" and what is driving the accrediting agencies that are driving the accredited institutions. (Although I might speculate that the focus on direct measures and positivistic approaches would be connected to "the methodical spirit of science" that "permeates everywhere" today [see Gadamer's *Truth and Method*, xxvi].) According to Barbara E. Walvoord and Virginia Johnson Anderson, "Faculty are going to have to make peace with this [new] paradigm [of assessment] and with the need to communicate to outsiders in new ways about student learning." *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1998), 3.

[16] Gadamer, *Truth and Method,* xxi. This experience is surely not limited to philosophical texts, but is to be found in all works of art.

[17] Shaun Gallagher, *Hermeneutics and Education* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1992), 200. Although the topic of assessment is not directly addressed, Gallagher's far-reaching work presents a detailed consideration of a moderate hermeneutical theory of education.

[18] I am also reminded of the meeting I attended on "Non-traditional Assessment in Philosophy Courses," where one presentation by Debby Hutchins entitled "Learning as Constructing: Logic Art as Pedagogy" exhibited students' works of art containing logical proofs. See note 1 above.

[19] Gadamer's work clearly prioritizes the notion of text as written, as evidenced in this passage which explains the profound uniqueness of the engagement with a written text.

> At any rate, it is not by chance that literature is the place where art and science merge. The mode of being of a text has something unique and incomparable about it. It presents a specific problem of translation to the understanding. Nothing is so strange, and at the same time so demanding as the written word. …Nothing is so purely the trace of the mind as writing, but nothing is so dependent on the understanding mind either. In deciphering and interpreting it, a miracle takes place: the transformation of something alien and dead into total contemporaneity and

> familiarity. This is like nothing else that comes down to us from the past. The remnants of past life—what is left of buildings, tools, the contents of graves—are weather-beaten by the storms of time that have swept over them, whereas the written tradition, once deciphered and read, is to such an extent pure mind that it speaks to us as if in the present. That is why the capacity to read, to understand what is written, is like a secret art, even a magic that frees and binds us. In it time and space seem to be superseded. People who can read what has been handed down in writing produce and achieve the sheer presence of the past (*Truth and Method*, 156).

[20] See the passage in the previous note where Gadamer refers to the act of reading as involving a miracle.

[21] Readers familiar with Louise Rosenblatt's transactional theory of the literary work may notice an affinity between Rosenblatt's perspective and Gadamer's, for both writers focus their theories on the experience of the work of art as an event, rather than on the author or the text itself. In *Literature as Exploration* (1938) Rosenblatt analyzes "The Literary Experience" (Chapter 2) and argues that "the teacher's task is to foster fruitful interpretations—or, more precisely transactions—between individual readers and literary works." I think it is fair to say that both authors are concerned with what Rosenblatt refers to as "the uniqueness of the transaction between reader and text" (which may be related to Gadamer's notion the historicity of the understanding), and that this concern, as Rosenblatt puts it, "is not inconsistent with he fact that both elements in this relationship [reader and text] have social origins and social effects" (which would be captured by Gadamer's understanding of everything that belongs to "tradition"). See Louise M. Rosenblatt, *Literature as Exploration*, 4th ed. (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1978), 26-27. Further agreement may be found in understanding the reader as "productive" or "creative" in the interpretative process, and of particular interest in this context is Rosenblatt's focus on experience. She explains the value of literature "as a means of enlarging [students'] knowledge of the world, because through literature [students] acquire not so much additional *information* as additional *experience*. New understanding is conveyed to them dynamically and personally. Literature provides a *living-through*, not simply *knowledge about*" (*Literature as Exploration*, 38, author's italics).

It is rather surprising that there has been little if any discussion of the relationship between these theories and neither Gadamer nor Rosenblatt, as far as I can tell, acknowledges the other's work in their texts. Rosenblatt, however, admits that she was not interested in the phenomenologists (she only mentions Husserl by name and seems to consider all of phenomenology as tainted by idealism, which is surely an unfair criticism of Heidegger, Gadamer, Ricouer, and several other major phenomenologists), perhaps because she had been so taken by the pragmatists, in particular the work of John Dewey. See Louise M. Rosenblatt, *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work* (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978), xiv. The first chapter of this later work deals with "The Poem as Event," and offers the following key passage which fits nicely with Gadamer's understanding: "The poem, then, must be thought of as an event in time. It is not an object or an ideal entity. It happens during a coming-together, a compenetration, of a reader and a text" (*The Reader, the Text, the Poem*, 12).

[22] Solloway and Brooks studied students taking an undergraduate teacher education required course, and while all significant, I find Solloway and Brooks explanation of the first category—"New Energy/Excitement for Learning"—to be particularly exciting as it parallels some of the responses that I expect to emerge from my study. They explain:

> At the beginning of the semester, many of the students expressed anxiety at being in charge of selecting what would count as learning for them from the assigned readings. (…) It was hard for these students to "think" about their learning, to think about how the text had affected their thinking. They were habituated to playing the game of school where it is the student's task to guess what in the reading would be important to the teacher, not what in the reading was important to them.
>
> Once they began to give themselves permission to hear their own voices, it was cause for new excitement about learning. This was best expressed in these phrases from one student's responses "Another thing I'm learning is how to be excited about my own thinking…I feel myself watching for how the words are going to affect me as I read them…" (p. 53).

[23] Here are the test results. Students in Group 1 who completed four MRAs throughout the course averaged 90% on Test # 1, 91% on Test # 2, and 92% on Test # 3. Students in Group 2 averaged 76% on Test # 1, 77% on Test # 2, and 78% on Test # 3. Obviously, since Group 1 consisted of a small section of honors students and Group 2 consisted of a large section of general students, we cannot attribute the significance in higher test scores to the implementation of the MRAs alone. Thus, I am looking forward to teaching two similar sections on Introduction to Philosophy in order to gather more reliable data.

[24] Two students offered no response.

References

Buckman, K. (2007, Fall). What counts as assessment in the 21st century? *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal* 23. Retrieved May 29, 2009 from http://www2.nea.org/he/heta07/images/2007pg29.pdf.

Falk, A. (2008). Assessing assessment. *Johns Hopkins University Arts & Sciences Magazine Online,* 6 (1). Retreived March 13, 2009 from http://krieger2.jhu.edu/magazine/f08/view.html.

Gadamer, H. (1989). *Truth and method*. (J. Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, Trans.). London: Continuum. (Original work published 1960.)

Gallagher, S. (1992). *Hermeneutics and education*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Gallagher, S., and Zahavi, D. (2008). *The phenomenological mind: An introduction to philosophy of mind and cognitive science*. New York: Routledge.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. (J. Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row Publishers. (Original work published 1927.)

Husserl, E. (1962). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. (W. B. Gidson, Trans.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company. (Original work published 1931.)

Husserl, E. (2001). *Logical investigations.* Volume 2. (J. N. Findlay, Trans.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1901.)

Kallack, D. (1989, July/October). The speakerly teacher: Socrates and writing. *Metaphilosophy* 20 (3 & 4): 341-346.

Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

Obama, B. (2009). Our kids, our future. Retreived March 13, 2009 from http://www.usatoday.com/news/pdf/obama-on-education-nov-20-2007.pdf.

Obama, B. (2009). Remarks by the President to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce on a Complete and Competitive American Education. Retreived March 10, 2009 from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-of-the-President-to-the-United-States-Hispanic-Chamber-of-Commerce/.

Plato. (2003). *The last days of Socrates*. (H. Tarrant, Ed. and H. Tredennick, Trans.). New York: Penguin Classics. (Original work written ca. 395 BC.)

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. (J. B. Thompson, Ed. and Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1970-1979.)

Ricouer, P. (1974). *Political and social essays*. (D. Stewart and J. Bien, Eds.). Athens: Ohio University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *Literature as exploration* (4th ed.). New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Schrader, D. (Ed.) (2008, January). *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 81(3).

Solloway, S. G. & Brooks, N. J. (2004, Summer). Philosophical hermeneutics and assessment: Discussions of assessment for the sake of wholeness. *Journal of Thought* 39 (2): 43-60.

Walvoord, B. E. & Anderson, V.J. (1998). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Michael Strawser is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the University of Central Florida, where he was awarded the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award (2007) and Teaching Incentive Program Award (2007). He received his Ph.D. in philosophy in 1993 from the Florida State University. His published works focus on collaborative learning, Kierkegaard, and Continental Philosophy (both modern and contemporary), and the Philosophy of Religion. He is co-editor of the online journal Florida Philosophical Review.

Implementing Problem-Based Learning in an Undergraduate Psychology Course

H. Russell Searight, PhD
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology
Lake Superior State University

Barbara K. Searight, PhD
Adjunct Professor, Department of Communication
Lake Superior State University

Problem-based learning (PBL) is a small-group pedagogical technique widely used in fields such as business, medicine, engineering, and architecture. In PBL, pre-written cases are used to teach core course content. PBL advocates state that course material is more likely to be retained and applied when presented as cases reflecting "real life" applications of class material. However, rather than traditional lecture-discussion, PBL encourages student autonomy in analyzing cases, with the instructor serving initially as a structuring facilitator before gradually becoming less active as students take more responsibility for their learning. As students proceed through each case, they address four dimensions: What they know, what they want to know, possible causal hypotheses, and questions that can be answered through library research. The PBL cases referred to herein were developed and employed for an undergraduate psychology course, "Psychology of the Exceptional Child." Students completing this course included psychology, special education, and human service majors and have positively evaluated this technique as a teaching tool.

Introduction to Problem-Based Learning

Problem-based learning (PBL) is a small-group educational technique in which students apply course material to practical problems or clinical cases. Cases may be taken or adapted from published sources, or the instructor may develop vignettes specifically for a particular course. The cases focus on core course content and include sufficient ambiguity to reflect realistic clinical or applied practice.

Problem-based learning proponents emphasize that course content is more likely to be implemented and retained when it is embedded in "real world" situations.

PBL assumes that students are more likely to acquire and retain information when they are challenged to apply course content to applied dilemmas (Barrows, 1996). In addition, PBL attempts to simulate the types of reasoning and critical thinking characteristic of practitioners and investigators in the discipline of interest. Finally, since PBL is typically conducted in small groups with a faculty facilitator, students are challenged not only to work cooperatively but also to reflect on their own and their fellow students' problem-solving styles.

Background of Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

PBL was originally developed for medical education and its origins are often traced back to McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, where PBL was implemented approximately 30 years ago. This approach has since been applied to disciplines such as public policy, pharmacy, and special education, as well as psychology. PBL proponents emphasize that course content is more likely to be implemented and retained when it is embedded in "real world" situations (Dolmans & Schmidt, 1996). Many medical schools have implemented PBL as the principal approach to instruction in courses such as genetics, psychiatry, and family medicine.

Relevant Research on PBL

Research on PBL has focused on two issues: Educational processes and knowledge outcomes. Research conducted in medical settings suggests that there are four essential characteristics of effective PBL facilitators: Collaboration, directing, integration, and interaction/accountability. Collaboration consists of stimulating brainstorming by asking questions and follow-up clarifications. Directing the learning process includes helping students generate learning issues and indirectly drawing attention to students' gaps in knowledge. Stimulating integration of knowledge encourages students to examine their information in the context of previous cases or course material. Finally, stimulating interaction and individual accountability encourage students to make an inventory of learning resources (DeGrave, Dolmans, & van derVleuten, 1999).

There are four essential characteristics of effective problem-based learning facilitators: collaboration, directing, integration, and interaction/accountability.

Results of research on student learning have been mixed. An early review of PBL in medical education suggested that when compared with a traditional curriculum, PBL was associated with greater long-term retention of content, better self directed learning skills and improved critical thinking skills (Norman & Schmidt, 1992). In examining PBL's effects in a graduate clinical psychology training program, interactive skills such as working within a team, responsiveness to supervision and collective efficacy appeared to improve over time (Stedman, Wood, Curle, & Haslam, 2005; Wood, 2004).

Construction of PBL Cases

Cases are selected or written to address specific course objectives. In this respect, PBL, at least conceptually, differs little from objective-driven guides to curriculum development. For example, if schizophrenia is a topic to be addressed in an abnormal psychology class, the case would include common symptoms of the condition as well as demographic features associated with schizophrenia. The patient's behavior may include features of schizophrenia subtypes (e.g., paranoid, undifferentiated), as well as both positive and negative symptoms. Historical and family information about the patient may suggest a genetic diathesis possibly exacerbated by a domestic environment high in expressed emotion. The case study narratives should include enough ambiguity to reflect realistic diagnostic and etiological dilemmas, while also encouraging critical analytic reasoning. Additionally, by having the case appear on sequential pages, the format reflects clinical reasoning and problem-solving: As new information is compared and/or integrated with previous clinical data, new hypotheses are developed.

While there are a growing number of published PBL cases written by professionals in areas such as medicine, psychology, counseling, and social work, instructors may prefer to write their own cases. In this way, the cases can be more directly tailored to specific course curricula. Additionally, many departments now have specific objectives attached to their core courses. This is particularly true for disciplines such as education and nursing in which there are state guidelines for course content. It is helpful to frequently refer to these objectives as the written case is developed. In this process, having a clear set of objectives will help maintain focus while adding realistic details and sufficient ambiguity to engage student interest.

A Step-wise Approach to Developing PBL Cases

PBL cases can be systematically developed through the following steps:

1. List the specific educational objectives as criteria that the case should illustrate.
2. Write the case in narrative form, using the criteria as a rough checklist.
3. If there are multiple objectives that build upon one another, develop a list that organizes the objectives into those that should be addressed early in the course of the case and those addressed as the case later unfolds.
4. In writing the case, include a specific and limited number of pieces of information -- typically no more than three points -- in each paragraph. This organizational plan facilitates discussion of the impact that specific new content has on students' evolving understanding of the case.
5. Paragraphs should be brief (three sentences) and each page should have no more than two paragraphs.
6. Cases should include demographic information as well as content reflecting cultural and gender diversity issues. For example, one of the cases used early in the semester in an abnormal psychology class involves an adolescent female who is having a lesbian relationship. She is brought to the office by her parent with the request that the counselor change the young woman's sexual orientation.
7. Each of the cases should include "clues" in the form of pieces of information that raise hypotheses, particularly in the context of other facts about the case. For example, a reference to facial features such as a smooth philtrum and a thin upper lip might mean little outside the context of accompanying details—for example, previously presented evidence of cognitive deficits. Taken together, these details can suggest the possibility of fetal alcohol syndrome.
8. Typically, the cases should place the students/readers in a particular role. Roles may include mental health counselor, special education teacher, or preschool director who needs to make a specific decision about the case. These roles set the information in an applied context and also encourage students to consider how different professionals might prioritize information and approach problems.

Four-Part Category System for Organizing PBL Cases

In order to provide some structure for the case discussion, as well as to provide some specific parameters for critical analysis, the small group discussion should be organized around four categories:

1. What do we know? -- available facts about the case;
2. What we would like to know? -- what additional information would help answer important open questions about the case;
3. Hypothetical causal relationships --- a form of "mind mapping." This is a visual technique of developing a schematic diagram of key concepts in an area of study. One or a limited number of central characteristics are the nexus of the diagram with related material branching off of this center (Budd, 2004). For example, the concept of schizophrenia may have central lines emanating from it indicating biological and psychosocial factors. The biological branch might have "genetics" as a central "trunk" with specific brain abnormalities (e.g., enlarged ventricles) and neurotransmitters (e.g., dopamine) as branches.
4. Learning issues -- questions arising during the discussion that can be answered by focused library research.

These dimensions are listed at the top of four blank columns that are filled in during the course of the discussion with relevant information. Ideally, a student-participant rotates through the role of "scribe" and writes material on an easel, chalkboard, or whiteboard throughout the session.

Initial PBL Session

The first session with a new group of students should begin with an orientation to PBL. Since some students may have been exposed to PBL in previous undergraduate classes, it is useful to ask for brief accounts of previous experiences so that similarities and differences between the current use of PBL and any previous courses may be highlighted. Students' opinions about PBL may also be elicited.

The rationale for PBL should be explained. The principle of learning through real-world cases is generally well-received by students. The facilitator can enhance students' self-efficacy by emphasizing students' roles as self-directed learners and establishing a "brainstorming" norm. By writing students' contributions on the four column chart, the facilitator underscores the value of students' ideas. The four categories that organize the discussion should be briefly described next. Since PBL categories, in particular the last category, involve activity outside the classroom, some time should be devoted to explaining learning issues. Specifically, questions will arise for which a ready answer is unavailable without library research. In the latter part of each session, students will select (a) learning issue(s) to investigate and present at the next meeting. It may be necessary for the instructor to present basic ground rules for sources (for instance, peer-reviewed articles and or textbooks as sources; no Wikipedia selections) and presentations (for instance, a five minute presentation accompanied by a brief handout; brief description of sources; and evaluation of sources' credibility) of learning issues for the PBL group.

The facilitator can enhance students' self-efficacy by emphasizing students' roles as self-directed learners and establishing a "brainstorming" norm.

Students should take turns reading segments. All students as well as the facilitator have a copy of the case and follow along while the material is being read. The instructor should have a preset place in the text at which each student should stop reading and discussion should ensue. These stopping points are usually based upon the number and/or significance of new pieces of information about the case. After completion of the segment, the group should organize the new data and accompanying hypotheses and questions into the four categories.

To encourage discussion and establish a norm of group responsibility, the facilitator, in early sessions may need to "prime the pump." In particular, students in these early sessions may underestimate the significance of available information such as age and gender and how it may impact the likelihood of various hypotheses. For example, males are 4 to 8 times more likely than females to be diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (AD/HD) (Searight, Gafford, & Evans, 2008). The facilitator may need to ask meta-cognitive questions focusing on the types of additional information that would be helpful to have and/or hypotheses that could be generated at a particular stage of the case. After several contributions of framing questions and information in the context of the four-part framework, students will typically take over these tasks and the facilitator can begin a process of fading to a less central role.

Learning issues should be the focus of the meeting's final 10-15 minutes. The list of topics should be presented on the board and students invited to select a topic to investigate and report on at the next meeting. If a large number of learning issues are generated, students may be invited to collapse or condense topics. As noted above, students unfamiliar with PBL may benefit from guidance about how to investigate and present their topic. In some groups, the facilitator may take a learning issue to model in a presentation to the group, demonstrating proper

citation of sources. Finally, students should be asked to consider how the newly-obtained information would bear on the case at hand.

Second and Subsequent PBL Sessions

Ideally, the chart from session 1 will be available at subsequent sessions. If the chart is not available, the instructor should maintain a copy including learning issue assignments.

The subsequent session typically opens with students individually presenting their learning issues. There are several process dimensions that the facilitator should monitor during these presentations. Setting a norm for group interaction around learning issues is important. The rest of the group should be encouraged to give feedback and ask questions of the presenter. Particularly if students are reserved, the facilitator may initially model how to question and provide respectful feedback to the presenter.

Time is often an issue. The presentations and subsequent discussion will often take more than the three to five minutes allotted for each presentation. The facilitator should attempt to structure the discussion but avoid doing so in a way that cuts off the presenter or group discussion. The facilitator will often need to decide which is more worthwhile--discussing learning issues or covering more case material. Providing students with feedback about the quality of their learning issue presentations and the appropriateness of their background research becomes a delicate issue. Students may not have any framework for researching and presenting learning issues prior to the PBL experience. If several students' presentations are less than optimal, the facilitator could have a relevant learning issue presentation pre-prepared and present it. If evaluation anxiety within the group is at manageable levels, the group can be invited to discuss each of the presentations and their informational value. Finally, an outline describing how to investigate and present learning issues can be developed by the facilitator and made available to the group. Again, a balance between facilitator-imposed structure and group initiative is desirable.

Students often have to be prompted as a group to apply the new information from the learning issues to the case. Several questions are useful for promoting group reflection such as: "Does this new information make a difference in your understanding of the case?" and "Does this new information lead you to a next step?"

After all learning issues have been presented, the session should follow in the same vein as the previous session. After the learning issues have been discussed and integrated with the available information about the case, the group returns to the point in the case narrative at which they previously left off.

Interpersonal Aspects of PBL

Periodically, it may be helpful for the group to examine its own process, including the role of the facilitator. This reflection can be prompted by asking group members to consider their own learning processes and outcomes with questions such as, "How has this process been for the group?" and "Do you feel that your learning goals are being met?" These inquiries serve several functions. First, they emphasize the responsibility of group members for their own learning. Second, if asked in early meetings, the facilitator can make any necessary adjustments such as the difficulty of the cases. Finally, if the format is confusing to students, the facilitator can further explain the rationale for PBL and provide additional structure during class discussions and student presentations of learning issue research.

In forming PBL groups, an optimal size is approximately five to eight students. Barrows (1985) suggested a group size of five during the preclinical medical school years. Larger groups have been conducted when necessary because of a limited number of faculty facilitators. In similar situations, it may be useful to consider dividing the larger number of students into two smaller groups with a

"roving" facilitator dividing time between the two groups. This approach will be more workable if students have had previous PBL exposure and/or are more self-directed with good leadership skills. Smaller groups can be very productive if all students are active.

Group composition varies. Students may be at the same year level in their respective disciplines or at consecutive year levels (e.g., first and second-year students combined). A greater disparity in educational level could contribute to more advanced group members having disproportionate input and younger students being intimidated.

The Facilitator's Role

The faculty facilitator sets the tone and plays a major role in setting group norms conducive to learning. In early work on PBL, the role of the facilitator was primarily to ask meta-cognitive questions such as "Why?," "How do we know that?," and "Is there anything else?". The facilitator was not advised to provide information or to directly evaluate student contributions (Savery & Duffy, 1995). However, it is important for the facilitator to model reasoning with questions such as "Do you know what that means?" and "What are the implications of that?". By modeling this metacognitive approach, it is assumed that students will soon begin critically examining information in the same way (Barrows, 1985).

By having material up on a whiteboard or chalkboard, the facilitator can gently direct students to the case if the discussion becomes tangential. Again, over time, students will do this re-orienting, themselves. Also, by raising group process questions like those noted above, the facilitator reiterates that it is the students' responsibility to use the experience for their own learning.

Well-developed group process skills and metacognitive questioning are seen as more important than the facilitator's content knowledge.

Many PBL trainers have argued that it is not necessary for the facilitator to have content knowledge of the discipline for which the cases were developed. In theory, someone knowledgeable about PBL facilitation, with no academic background in medicine, could serve as an effective facilitator for a PBL group on obstetrics. Well-developed group process skills and metacognitive questioning are seen as far more important than the facilitator's content knowledge. However, it is important to note that basic knowledge in the field is helpful for formulating appropriate questions as well as for appreciating learning issues.

Evaluation of PBL in an Undergraduate Psychology Class

Originally trained in PBL in a medical school setting, the first author has been applying the technique in an undergraduate course "Psychology of the Exceptional Child and Adolescent," writing the PBL cases specifically for this class. Cases include scenarios as varied as an adolescent forced by her family to see a counselor because of her sexual orientation; a four-year-old boy presenting for admission to a preschool with a history of disruptive behavior and probable fetal alcohol syndrome; a 12-year-old with evidence of a mood disorder; and a bilingual child with possible evidence of a learning disability. To date, PBL has been used with two sections of students—one section with nine students and the other section (a summer course) with three students. Students represented an array of majors including psychology, human services, early childhood education, exercise science, and special education. While this application has not been evaluated quantitatively, end-of-the semester course evaluations indicated that students found the cases to be particularly helpful for learning common mental health conditions. Representative qualitative comments included:

- *"Case studies are brilliant"*

- *"The case studies really helped the material soak in and going through them was a great way to memorize symptoms of the disorders as well as diagnosis/classification."*
- *"Loved the case studies; it makes it easy to apply what you've learned to real-life situations."*

Informal observation suggested that students were more engaged and demonstrated more active critical thinking in PBL sessions than in traditional lecture-discussion. For example, without the facilitator's prompting, students became fairly adept at engaging in differential diagnosis using behavioral descriptions, history, and demographic information. In addition, as the sessions progressed, students exhibited improved skills in using available information to generate hypotheses and using subsequently-presented information to refute or support these tentative models.

Further evaluations should include both qualitative and quantitative approaches. A quantitative measure which has been used in somewhat similar settings to assess PBL's impact is the California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (Facione, Facione, & Sanchez, 1994). This instrument could be used as a pre and post-test measure administered at the beginning and end of the semester. Examination of qualitative and quantitative information could be obtained through audio and/or video taping PBL sessions. Video taping has been suggested by Woods (2004) and would provide useful group process information as well as quantitative data such as the average participation by group members and number of hypotheses generated.

References

Barrows, H.S. (1985). *How to design a problem-based curriculum for the pre-clinical years*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas Publishers.

Barrows, H.S. (1996). Problem-based learning in medicine and beyond: A brief overview. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 68, 3-12.

Budd, J.W. (2004). Mind maps as classroom exercises. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 35, 35-41.

Facione, N.C., Facione, P.A. & Sanchez, C.A. (1994). Critical thinking disposition as a measure of competent clinical judgment: The development of the California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 33, 345-350.

Norman, G.R. & Schmidt, H.G. (1992). The psychological basis of problem-based learning: A review of the evidence. *Academic Medicine,* 67, 557-565.

Savery, J.R. & Duffy, T.M. (1995). Problem-based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *Educational Technology,* 35, 31-38.

Searight, H.R., Gafford, J., & Evans, S. (2008). Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. In M. Mengel & P. Schwiebert (Eds.). Ambulatory Care and Prevention (Fifth Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stedman, J., Wood, J., Curle, C. & Haslam, C. (2005). Development of PBL in the training of clinical psychologists. *Psychology Learning and Teaching,* 5, 52-60.

Tiwari, A. ,Lai, P. So, M., Yuen, K. (2006). A comparison of the effects of problem-based learning and lecturing on the development of students'critical thinking. *Medical Education, 40,* 547-554.

Wood, J. (2004). Report of PBL Implementation in D. Clin. Psych. Programme. Exeter, School of Psychology: University of Exeter.

Note

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology, St. Petersburgh, FL, January 4, 2009.

Russell Searight received his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from Saint Louis University in 1984. In 2003, he received his master's in public health from Saint Louis University School of Public Health. He has been on the faculty of Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, St. Louis University, and St.Louis University School of Medicine. He is currently Associate Professor of Psychology at Lake Superior State University in Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan.

Barbara K. Searight received her Bachelor of Science degree in Special Education from Wayne State University, a master's degree in counselor education from St. Louis University and her Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration from St. Louis University. From 1995-2007, she was Executive Director of the St. Louis Office for Developmental Disabilities in St.Louis, Missouri. Currently, she is an adjunct professor at Lake Superior State Univeristy in Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan and Algoma University in Sault Sainte Marie, Ontario as well as Executive Director of Habitat for Humanity for Michigan's Eastern Upper Peninsula.

The Intersection of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning with Online Course Design in Teacher Education

Kathryn S. Lee, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum & Instruction
Texas State University - San Marcos

This study employed a web-based survey investigating graduate students' perceptions of effectiveness of various learning activities in an online teacher education course designed to teach instructional strategies. Learner-centered evaluation allows for insights into the teaching and learning process, and learner satisfaction is particularly critical in determining quality in distance education. The findings would inform a redesign of the course with the goal to enhance learning, using students as evaluators. The students' ratings and comments of course activities are discussed, and implications related to course redesign are examined.

Nearly 4 million students were enrolled in an online course in higher education in the United States during the Fall 2007 semester (Allen & Seaman, 2008). With the burgeoning growth and demand for collegiate online courses, it is imperative that we respond to the needs of online learners to ensure academic success (Moore, Sener, & Fetzner, 2006). Studies that investigate and confirm that individual distance education courses support rigorous learning outcomes, effectively use available technology to improve pedagogy, and provide student satisfaction are essential to the scholarship of teaching and learning. This article recounts one such study focused on student learning and, in doing so, documents learning effectiveness in order to make the teaching and learning process public and to advance the practice of teaching (Hutchings, Babb, & Bjork, 2002).

Studies that investigate and confirm that individual distance education courses support rigorous learning outcomes, effectively use available technology to improve pedagogy, and provide student satisfaction are essential to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The purpose of the study reported herein was to replicate and substantiate the results of a previous study conducted by the researcher (Lee, 2009) to inform a redesign of a course. The intent was to investigate graduate students' perceptions of the effectiveness of various learning activities in an online teacher education course designed to teach instructional strategies for improving secondary teaching. The findings informed a redesign of the course with the goal of enhancing learning, using students as evaluators (Calloway, 2008; Cuthrell & Lyon, 2007). We know that learner-centered evaluation allows for insights into the teaching and learning process (Cerbin, 1995), and that learner satisfaction is particularly critical in determining quality in distance education (Belfer, 2000). This study additionally addressed Shulman's three rationales for the scholarship of teaching and learning: professionalism, pragmatism, and policy (2000). As a teacher educator, I have the professional responsibility to ensure that an online course designed to teach and model effective instructional strategies does what it purports to do. Online courses in teacher education have the added responsibility of modeling "best practices" in online design and online facilitation due to a substantial increase of online courses offered in K-12 schools. Some of these teachers will likely become online facilitators themselves, as experts predict that online learning in K-12 schools will accelerate (Picciano & Seaman, 2009). Furthermore, engaging in such inquiry and documenting the journey facilitates the sharing of our craft, resulting in a body of work that "becomes public, peer-reviewed and critiqued, and exchanged with other members of our professional communities so they, in turn, can build on our work" (Shulman, 2000, 49). Surveying the graduate students themselves to investigate their perceptions of the effectiveness of

the online learning activities was a pragmatic approach designed to inform "efforts in the design and adaptation of teaching in the interests of student learning" (Shulman, 2000, 49). Also, this research provides a "policy" rationale, responding to standards of quality assurance in teacher education (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008) and distance education (Wang, 2006).

Method

Participants

At the end of the semester and after course grades had been calculated, I recruited participants who had been enrolled as students in the online graduate course, using the class roster with university e-mail addresses. An e-mailed invitation to 26 individuals yielded 24 participants. The invitation included the purpose of the research survey, the estimated time to complete it, explanations related to informed consent and confidentiality, the Institutional Review Board approval number, and a two-week deadline for completion. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=24)

Characteristic	N	%
Age at time of survey (years)		
23-27	7	29.2
28-33	11	45.8
45-47	2	8.3
50-55	4	16.7
Gender		
Female	16	67
Male	8	33
Ethnicity		
White	18	75
Hispanic	4	16.7
Asian	2	8.3

Measures

A survey was employed as the research tool to examine the students' perceptions of the effectiveness of the online activities, affording a process of examination and reflection, "viewing teaching and research as fundamentally dialogical activities" (Ritchie & Goodburn, 1996, p. 76). The online course survey was created using SPSS mrInterview (4.0), a browser-based authoring tool. This sophisticated tool afforded respondent data to be exported directly into SPSS, a data analysis software program. The survey was designed to gather basic demographic data on the participants and determine the graduate students' perceptions of the effectiveness of the online instructional activities. A categoric grid allowed respondents to quickly and easily rate a comprehensive list of the course activities. Several open-ended questions allowed respondents to personally comment on various aspects of the course activities.

Results

Participants rated each of the weekly activities in response to the question, "How effective were these learning activities in facilitating your learning of instructional strategies?" Point values for the responses were assigned as follows:

excellent (1), good (2), fair (3), and poor (4). Means and standard deviations were calculated for each activity. Table 2 presents the graduate students' perceived effectiveness of the online activities from most effective to least effective, as demonstrated by the mean and standard deviation scores.

Table 2: Rating of Online Activities by Number, Mean and Standard Deviation, N=24

Activity	M	SD
Field Experience Portfolio: Construct lesson plan for video teach	1.38	.65
Field Experience Portfolio: Construct portfolio notebook of field practicum	1.38	.58
Performance Assessment: Construct extended-type performance task and assessment rubric in your content area	1.50	.98
Field Experience Portfolio: Reflect on video teach, write reflection, and upload to Live Text	1.50	.78
Field Experience Portfolio: Record video teach and burn onto CD	1.50	.78
Field Experience Portfolio: Conduct teacher interview	1.54	.88
Field Experience Portfolio: Analyze classroom observations	1.54	.88
Mental Models About Teaching: View "First Day of Class" video and categorize teaching behaviors	1.62	.77
Active Learning: Watch "Jerry Seinfeld" and "The Mirror Has Two Faces." Discuss effective and ineffective practices in forum	1.63	1.14
Questioning Styles and Strategies: Discuss "Common questioning errors"	1.63	.77
Building a Learning Community: Introduce self in "All About Me." Include photo and welcome to classmates.	1.67	.70
Cooperative Learning: Read, map, and summarize the 5 essential elements of cooperative learning	1.67	.92
Mental Models About Teaching: Discuss "Seven Myths of Learning"	1.71	.75
Motivation: Motivation Factors: Discuss influence of race, SES, linguistic ability, religion, etc.	1.71	1.12
Learning Styles: Complete Index of Learning Styles Questionnaire and analyze results	1.75	.74
Motivation: Cognitive Interactions: Post thought-provoking questions and responses to "Concepts of Ability and Motivation"	1.75	.85
Assessment: Instruction: Massaging the TEKS	1.79	.78
Learning Styles: Claim research article and post responses to the multicultural perspective discussion forum	1.83	.92
Mental Models About Teaching: Create a broadcast letter	1.87	.80
Engaging Students: Create magazine cover as summary for "Making Learning Real: Engaging Students in Content"	1.87	.85
Engaging Students: Watch Newscast video clip and discuss advantages and disadvantages of strategy	1.88	.99
Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: Create ppt. presentation on Ch. 12 "Addressing the Academic Needs of Immigrant Students"	1.92	.93
Cooperative Learning: View "Working Together" clips on Teaching Alive CD and answer guided reading	1.96	.96
Quiz: Ch. 3: Lesson Planning and Assessment Objectives	1.96	.81
Building a Learning Community: Post personal goals using SMART criteria	1.96	.91
Building a Learning Community: Post and discuss "Online Student Readiness Survey" results	2.00	.72
Field Experience Portfolio: Analyze a textbook	2.00	.89
Personalizing Culture: Discuss personalization of culture.	2.00	1.22
Student-Centered Instruction: Watch "Good Morning Miss Tolliver"	2.04	1.12

video clip and discuss in forum		
Assessment: Students: Read "Lessons at the Kitchen Table" and discuss deficit thinking and funds of knowledge	2.04	1.33
Personalizing Culture: Complete jigsaw of "Personalizing Culture through Anthropological and Educational Perspectives."	2.08	1.10
Questioning Styles and Strategies: Observe questioning strategies in "Teaching Alive" CD	2.08	1.14
Student-Centered Instruction: Choose graphic organizer to summarize Ch. 7 "Reflective Teaching and Learning: Students as Stakeholders"	2.08	1.21
Quiz: Ch. 5: Assessment During Instruction	2.12	.99
Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: Complete guided reading questions to Ch. 10 "Effective Multicultural Teaching Practices"	2.12	.85
Assessment: Students: Take quiz on Assessment text Chapters 1 and 2: Breadth of Assessment and Learning About Pupils Early	2.17	.96
Learning Styles: Compare results of 2 different online LS inventories	2.17	1.31
Student-Centered Instruction: Complete graphic organizer Ch. 5 "Interactive Practice for Learning: Beyond Drill"	2.21	1.38
Active Learning: Identify the ABCCD components of an objective	2.29	1.27
Performance Assessment: Take quiz over Ch. 8 "Performance Assessment"	2.29	.91
Cooperative Learning: Jigsaw Group Debriefing: How effective?	2.29	1.23
Building a Learning Community: Take "Course Information & Syllabus" quiz	2.42	.93
Personalizing Culture: View "Teaching Alive" video clip on contextualization and describe a unit in content area that exemplifies "meaning making"	2.46	1.62
Cooperative Learning: Just for Fun: Watch "Emperor's New Groove" video clip and discuss the tenets of cooperative learning	2.58	1.59
Cooperative Learning: Just for Fun: What would Johnson and Johnson say?	2.67	1.47

Discussion

Context of Online Instructional Activities

This teacher education course, *Strategies for Improving Secondary Teaching*, is required for a Master's degree in education and/or post-baccalaureate teacher certification, and the course is also a prerequisite for student teaching. The course utilizes a 30-hour field experience model, allowing graduate students the opportunity to bridge theory and practice (Brandsford, Pellegrino, & Donovan, 1999). Units of instruction are organized into weekly learning modules (e.g., building a learning community, mental models of teaching, cooperative learning, etc.); to scaffold the learning, all the week's activities are bound in one location. The findings of this follow-up study were congruent with the findings of the previous study. Data from both surveys supported similar general categories of most effective and least effective activities.

Most Effective Activities

In response to the open-ended survey question asking the students to identify the most effective learning activity, the field experience activities were rated among the highest. As two students reported:

- *"The portfolio process—I really enjoyed all the aspects of the classroom and my observation. The experience really showed me that I want to be in a classroom and I thought it was*

important to see other subjects beyond your content area. I wish I could have gone the whole semester; I did not want to leave."

- *"I had a wonderful time with my field experience. I honestly wish it were longer than 30 hours. I wish it were more of an every week thing. It allowed me to look into the lives of teachers and see what their day-to-day activities were actually like. They allowed me to interject whenever I wanted and made me feel very comfortable. It also led to a possible job. The district wants to hire me on in a new school they are opening. Thanks to my field experience, I was given a wonderful opportunity!"*

The students' field experience portfolio, submitted at the end of the semester, included a log documenting 30 hours in the field, a teacher interview, textbook analysis, classroom observations in three different content areas, a lesson plan (created in concert with the cooperating teacher), a "video teach" (videotaped teaching of the lesson plan), and video teach reflection. Other comments related to the value of the field experience included:

- *"I think that the video teach process was the best because you get to think about integrating learned methods and reflect on it. The reflection piece is vital because the camera does not lie."*
- *"The video teach was my favorite because it got me out of the house and into my field that I enjoy. I learned the most from the teacher interview; getting information from experienced teachers is priceless."*
- *"I really enjoyed the field experience. I worked with a great P. E. teacher, and was actually able to get in the classroom and work with the kids. I learn better by hands on activities, so this was very helpful to me."*

Least Effective Activities

In response to the open-ended survey question asking the students to identify the least effective learning activity, assignments and quizzes related to the weekly readings were among those most commonly identified. Several participants commented on their perceptions of the ineffectiveness of these learning activities:

- *"I have never been a strong reader, so the articles, review questions, and quizzes took a lot of time."*
- *"Questions from chapters; I just don't like those kinds of assignments."*
- *"I did not like reading text and taking quizzes or answering guided reading questions. I was not motivated; I had to work hard to remain focused. But I do understand that reading and Q&A is required."*

Regarding the online multiple choice quizzes over the reading content, the following responses were noted:

- *"The chapter assessments, although usually straightforward, I am not a fan of the multiple-choice tests. I would much rather respond to questions in a written format."*
- *"I did not like the quizzes."*
- *"I didn't like the quizzes online. I took notes as I was reading and knew the info, but still didn't do very well on the quizzes. Assignments are a better way to test understanding."*

Suggestions for Improvement

Several respondents offered suggestions for improving the course via an open comment section of the survey:

- *"Delete about 1/3 of the weekly assignments. I felt overwhelmed with the quantity of work."*
- *"Have less work in the week and more meaningful projects."*
- *"Instead of assigning readings, have the students find their own valid articles to summarize and discuss. Have them present their own vision of teaching, pedagogy, and strategy."*
- *"I would love to have an actual chat session, like an active conversation but with time constraints and people's schedules, it's probably impossible."*

Utilizing the student feedback collected from this survey and the previous one (Lee, 2009) provided valuable information on ways to improve the design of the course and the online learning experience for future students.

Considerations for Redesign

Although the overall high student ratings of the perceived effectiveness of the learning activities incorporated in *Strategies for Improving Secondary Teaching* indicate a strong original design, it is critical to examine, analyze, and improve upon the learning activities identified as needing improvement. Originally the course was co-created by a subject matter expert and an instructional designer, neither of whom had taught an online course. The logical "next step" was to investigate the course effectiveness through the lens of students who had completed the course and the faculty member who had taught it.

Build on Strengths

The field experience was perceived as the most valuable component of the course. In conjunction with students' suggestions for having fewer and more meaningful activities, decreasing the number of activities and integrating the course activities more closely with the field experience is warranted. Further study of the most "effective online strategies for integrating coursework and field experiences" (Knapczyk & Hew, 2007) will improve the value of several course activities. Dykman and Davis (2008) caution that --

> it is difficult for an instructor to judge workload levels in an online course. There is a real tendency to overload the student with work to make sure that an online course, which is potentially visible to other faculty and administrators, has a level of content and rigor equivalent to a comparable conventional course (159).

As the online facilitator of this course for several semesters and having graded the large quantity of course assignments, I agree that there are too many assignments. In his recommendation to "analyze and balance interactions" Hirumi warns that too many interactions can frustrate online learners, resulting in cognitive overload and an overwhelmed instructor (2003, p. 79).

Integration & Effective Use and Modeling of Technology Tools

Although this online course was offered through the university's open source course groupware, which offers built-in technologies such as a discussion board, digital drop box, and wiki space, integrating the use of the prolific and easy-to-use Web 2.0 tools is essential to model and practice the use of these innovative and 21st Century technologies to enhance learning. For example, one of the suggestions for course improvement was to offer a chat, an activity resembling

"more of an active conversation." One way to address this issue of personalization would be to utilize Tokbox (http://www.tokbox.com), a free video chat and video email provider. Students and the instructor would be able to video chat in "real time" if schedules allowed, and/or video emails could be recorded and sent asynchronously. Griffiths & Graham (2009) recently found that using asynchronous video in an online course facilitated a sense of personal connection and immediacy between instructor and students. Using asynchronous video as a vehicle through which students could articulate and demonstrate their understanding of course readings would be a viable option to replace the quizzes and/or chapter questions. Furthermore, allowing the students a choice of formats would support different learning styles and the motivational aspect of andragogy (Pew, 2007).

Sound Pedagogical Design

The overall high ratings the students assigned to the various learning activities may be attributed to the course designers' commitment to sound pedagogical practice, as they followed Newlin & Wang's (2002) recommendation that faculty in all disciplines apply American Association of Higher Education's Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education (1987) when designing online courses. The seven principles are:

1. Encourage contact between students and faculty
2. Develop reciprocity and cooperation among students
3. Use active learning techniques
4. Give prompt feedback
5. Emphasize time-on-task
6. Communicate high expectations
7. Respect diverse talents and ways of learning

These principles of "best practice" were incorporated into the design of the course. For example, contact between students and faculty was facilitated by the creation of weekly discussion board forums for dialogue among students and the instructor focusing on the concepts being explored. An "Assignment Clarification" forum was created as a central location for students to pose questions or concerns about assignments, field experience requirements, and other course-related concerns. Numerous interactive activities and media were incorporated into the design of the course to meet the diverse learning preferences of the students enrolled in the course. For example, video clips modeling the use of various instructional strategies in the classroom were employed; routine weekly activities included student-created learning artifacts as demonstration of their learning. I communicated high expectations by providing performance assessment rubrics outlining specific assignment criteria and provided weekly feedback to the students regarding their progress.

Incorporating student survey data as formative feedback to improve a course design supports a student-centered learning paradigm.

Incorporating student survey data as formative feedback to improve a course design supports a student-centered learning paradigm. Additionally, integrating Web 2.0 technologies as powerful learning tools facilitates the evolution of effective online instruction and learning. The venue of scholarship of teaching and learning offers those who are dedicated to the advancement of teaching and learning a vehicle to document and share their research efforts and scholarly work. "Scholarship of teaching and learning supports our individual and professional roles, our practical responsibilities to our students and institution, and our social and political obligations to those that support and take responsibility for higher education" (Shulman, 2000, p. 52).

References

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2008). *Staying the course: Online education in the United States*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from www.sloanc.org/publications/survey/pdf/staying_the_course.pdf

American Association of Higher Education. (1987). *Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education*. Winona, MN: Seven Principles Resource Center, Winona State University.

Belfer, K. (2000). A learner-centered assessment of quality for online education: Course climate. *World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications, 1,1265*-1267.

Brandsford, J. D., Pellegrino, J. W., & Donovan, S. (1999). *How people learn: Bridging research and practice.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Calloway, C. A. (2008). *Let students be your guide—as lesson evaluators.* Retrieved July 3, 2008, from http://www.techlearning.com/showArticle.php?articleID=196605246

Cerbin, W. (1995). Connecting assessment of learning to improvement of teaching through the course portfolio. *Assessment Update*, *7*(1), 4-6.

Cuthrell, K., & Lyon, A. (2007). Instructional strategies: What do online students prefer? *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching , 3*(4), 357-362.

Dykman, C. A., & Davis, C. K. (2008). Online education forum - Part two- Teaching online versus teaching conventionally. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *19*(*2*), 157-164. Retrieved March 27, 2009, from the Ebsco database.

Griffiths, M., & Graham, C. (2009). Using asynchronous video to achieve instructor immediacy and closeness in online classes: Experiences from three cases. In C. Crawford et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference 2009.* Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Hirumi, A. (2003). Get a life: Six tactics for optimizing time spent online. *Computers in the Schools, 20*(3), 73-101.

Hutchings, P., Babb, M., & Bjork, C. (2002). *CASTL resources: An annotated bibliography of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in higher education*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from www.carnegiefoundation.org

Knapczyk, D. R., & Hew, K. F. (2007). An analysis and evaluation of online instructional activities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 30*(3), 167-182.

Lee, K. S. (2009). Listening to students: Investigating the effectiveness of an online graduate teaching strategies course. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching , 5*(1), 72-87.

Moore, J. C., Sener, J., & Fetzner, M. (2006). Getting better: ALN and student success. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *10*(3), 55-84.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from http://ncate.org

Newlin, M. H., & Wang, A. Y. (2002). Integrating technology and pedagogy: Web instruction and seven principles of undergraduate education. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*(4), 325-330.

Pew, S. (2007). Andragogy and pedagogy as foundational theory for student motivation in higher education. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 2*, 14-25. Retrieved March 27, 2009, from http://www.insightjournal.net

Picciano, A. G., & Seaman, J. (2009). *K–12 online learning: A 2008 follow-up of the survey of U.S. school district administrators*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/survey/index.asp

Ritchie, J., & Goodburn, A. (1996). Collaborative inquiry in the teaching of writing theory and practice at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. In Hutchings, *Making teaching community property*, 73-76. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Shulman, L. (2000). From Minsk to Pinsk: Why a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning? *The Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*(1), 48-52. Retrieved March 27, 2009, from http://www.iupui.edu/~josotl/VOL_1/NO_1/shulman_vol_1_no_1.htm

Wang, Q. (2006). Quality assurance -- Best practices for assessing online programs. *International Journal on E-Learning, 5*(2), 265-274.

Kathryn S. Lee is a teacher educator at Texas State University-San Marcos in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction. She is committed to promoting a culture of diversity in education and responding to the unique needs of individual students within face-to-face and online learning environments.

"The great aim of education is not knowledge, but action."
~Albert Einstein

Call for Papers

Volume 5: *Scholarly Teaching and Learning*

InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching is a scholarly publication designed to highlight the work of postsecondary faculty at colleges and universities across the United States. It is a refereed scholarly journal published annually by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) at Park University that features theoretical and empirically-based research articles, critical reflection pieces, case studies and classroom innovations relevant to teaching, learning and assessment.

InSight articles focus broadly on the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL)*. Faculty are encouraged to submit original manuscripts that showcase SoTL processes or critically discuss SoTL as a scholarship paradigm. While reports of SoTL projects are welcome, *InSight* is also committed to continuing broader conversations about SoTL's value as a tool for advancing student learning and demonstrating faculty commitment to teaching.

Faculty are encouraged to submit manuscripts related to:

- Challenges/Responses to the SoTL paradigm
- Developing institution or discipline-specific understandings/definitions of SoTL
- Status reports of SoTL's role in a particular discipline
- Guidance to faculty new to SoTL (on developing inquiry questions, determining methodologies, making SoTL work public, etc.)
- Examples of SoTL projects at the course or discipline-level
- Intersections of SoTL and service-learning, eLearning, learning communities, and other learning initiatives
- Future directions in SoTL
- Cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional collaborations for promoting SoTL

Submission Requirements

- *STYLE* - All manuscripts must be formatted in APA style.
- *LENGTH* - Manuscripts should be no more than 10 pages (not including abstract, references or appendices). Authors are encouraged to include appendices that promote application and integration of materials (i.e., assignments, rubrics, examples, etc.).
- *ABSTRACT* - Each manuscript must be summarized in an abstract of 50 to 100 words.
- *AUTHOR* - Each author should provide his/her full name, title and departmental affiliation, campus address, telephone number, and email address. Each author must also include a brief biography (no more than 100 words per author).
- *FORMAT* - All manuscripts must be submitted via email as attachments in Microsoft Word or Rich Text Format. Do not include personal identifiers within the manuscript. Include contact information only on a separate cover sheet. Each manuscript will be assigned a unique identifier for blind review processes. Send submissions to cetl@park.edu.
- *DEADLINE* - All submissions must be received by **4:00pm on March 12, 2010 (CST)** to be considered for inclusion in Volume 5.

Review Procedures

Submissions will be subject to a double blind peer-review. A manuscript is evaluated based on relevance, practical utility, originality, generalizability, clarity, significance and the extent to which the subject matter contributes to the ongoing development of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Review process and

publication decisions will require approximately 12 weeks. Referees' feedback and editorial comments will be provided to the author when revisions are requested. If accepted, final versions of manuscripts will be due June 30, 2009. CETL retains the final authority to accept or reject all submitted manuscripts. The publication will be distributed both in print and online in August 2010.

Copyright

Manuscript submissions are accepted with the assumption that they neither have been nor will be published elsewhere. Authors and CETL will hold joint copyright to all published manuscripts.

Contact

All inquiries should be directed to:

B. Jean Mandernach, PhD
Editor, InSight
Research Associate, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Park University
cetl@park.edu or jean.mandernach@park.edu

For more information, visit the CETL website at www.park.edu/cetl.

QUICK TIPS: PREPARING MANUSCRIPTS FOR *INSIGHT*

The following "Quick Tips" provide suggestions and guidance for preparing manuscripts for potential publication in *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*. *InSight* is a peer-reviewed publication highlighting the scholarly contributions of postsecondary faculty. As is the nature of refereed journals, acceptance and publication of original manuscripts is a competitive process. The goal of the following information is to assist faculty in preparing manuscripts in a manner that maximizes the chances of publication.

Preparing the Manuscript

The organization and style of your manuscript will be largely dictated by the type of submission (e.g., theoretical, empirical, critical reflection, case study, classroom innovation, etc.). Thus, while guidelines will follow to assist you in preparing your manuscript, the key to successful submission is clear, effective communication that highlights the significance and implications of your work to post-secondary teaching and learning in relation to the target topic. To prepare and effectively communicate your scholarly work, the American Psychological Association (2001) provides the following general guidelines:

- Present the problem, question or issue early in the manuscript.
- Show how the issue is grounded, shaped, and directed by theory.
- Connect the issue to previous work in a literature review that is pertinent and informative but not exhaustive.
- State explicitly the hypotheses under investigation or the target of the theoretical review.
- Keep the conclusions within the boundaries of the findings and/or scope of the theory.
- Demonstrate how the study or scholarly approach has helped to address the original issue.
- Identify and discuss what theoretical or practical implications can be drawn from this work.

There is no mandatory format for *InSight* articles; rather authors should organize and present information in a manner that promotes communication and understanding of key points. As you write your manuscript, keep the following points in mind:

- Title - Generally speaking, titles should not exceed 15 words and should provide a clear introduction to your article. While it is okay to incorporate "catchy" titles to pique interest, be sure that your title effectively captures the point of your manuscript.
- Abstract - Do not underestimate the importance of your abstract. While the abstract is simply a short summary (50-100 words) of your work, it is often the only aspect of your article that individuals read. The abstract provides the basis from which individuals will decide whether or not to read your article, so be certain that your abstract is "accurate, self-contained, nonevaluative, coherent, and readable" (Calfee & Valencia, 2001).
- Body - Within the body of a manuscript, information should be organized and sub-headed in a structure that facilitates understanding of key issues. There is not a mandatory format for *InSight* articles, rather authors should use professional guidelines within their discipline to present information in a manner that is easily communicated to readers. For example:
  - *Empirical investigations* should be organized according to the traditional format that includes introduction (purpose, literature review, hypothesis), method (participants, materials, procedures),

results, and discussion (implications). The following links provide general examples of this type of article:
    - http://www.thejeo.com/MandernachFinal.pdf
    - http://www.athletic*InSight*.com/Vol7Iss4/Selfesteem.htm
- *Theoretical articles and literature reviews* should include an introduction (purpose), subheadings for the relevant perspectives and themes, and a detailed section(s) on conclusions (applications, recommendations, implications, etc.). The following links provide general examples of this type of article:
    - http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/winter84/royal84.htm
    - http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/winter84/mclean84.htm
- *Classroom innovation and critical reflections* should be organized via an introduction (purpose, problem, or challenge), relevant background literature, project description, evaluation of effectiveness (may include student feedback, self-reflections, peer-insight, etc.), and conclusions (applications, implications, recommendations, etc.). If describing classroom-based work, please include copies of relevant assignments, handouts, rubrics, etc. as appendices. The following link provides a general example of a critical reflections article:
    - http://www.compositionstudies.tcu.edu/coursedesigns/online/33-2/ritter.html

The limited length of *InSight* articles (manuscripts should be no more than 10 pages, not including abstract, references or appendices) requires authors to focus on the most significant, relevant factors and implications.

- References - Select your references carefully to ensure that your citations include the most current and relevant sources. As you select your references, give preference to published sources that have proven pertinent and valuable to the relevant investigations. The goal is not to incorporate ALL relevant references, but rather to include the most important ones.
- Tables, Figures, Appendices & Graphics - Authors are encouraged to include supporting documents to illustrate the findings, relevance or utilization of materials. Particularly relevant are documents that promote easy, efficient integration of suggestions, findings or techniques into the classroom (such as rubrics, assignments, etc.). Supplemental information should enhance, rather than duplicate, information in the text.

The importance of clear, effective communication cannot be highlighted enough. Many manuscripts with relevant, original, applicable ideas will be rejected because authors do not communicate the information in a manner that facilitates easy understanding and application of key points. The value of a manuscript is lost if readers are unable to overcome written communication barriers that prevent use of the knowledge. With this in mind, authors are strongly advised to seek informal feedback from peers and colleagues on manuscripts prior to submission to *InSight*. Requesting informal reviews from relevant professionals can highlight and correct many concerns prior to formal submission, thus improving chances of publication.

References

American Psychological Association. (2001). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Calfee, R. & Valencia, R. (2001). APA Guide to preparing manuscripts for journal publication. Washington, DC: APA.

QUICK TIPS: SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR *INSIGHT*

The following "Quick Tips" provide suggestions and guidance for submitting manuscripts to *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*. *InSight* is a peer-reviewed publication highlighting the scholarly contributions of postsecondary faculty. The following information provides an overview of the purpose, scope and functioning of *InSight* so that faculty may better understand the *InSight* publication process.

Scope & Focus

InSight features theoretical and empirically-based research articles, critical reflection pieces, case studies, and classroom innovations relevant to teaching, learning and assessment. While there are a broad range of acceptable topics, all manuscripts should be supported with theoretical justification, evidence, and/or research (all methods and approaches relevant to qualitative and quantitative research are welcome); all manuscripts should be appropriately grounded in a review of existing literature.

Audience

InSight emphasizes the enhancement of post-secondary education through the professional exchange of scholarly approaches and perspectives applicable to the enrichment of teaching and learning. Relevant to this mission, manuscripts should be geared toward post-secondary faculty and administrators; included in this audience are full-time and adjunct faculty; face-to-face, hybrid and online faculty; tenure and non-tenure track instructors; trainers in corporate, military, and professional fields; adult educators; researchers; and other specialists in education, training, and communications. Recognizing the cross-disciplinary readership of *InSight*, manuscripts should present material generalizable enough to have relevance to post-secondary instructors from a range of disciplines.

Review Process

All submissions are evaluated by a double-blind, peer-review process. The masked nature of the reviews helps ensure impartial evaluation, feedback and decisions concerning your manuscript.

This review process utilized by *InSight* mandates that you should keep the following points in mind when preparing your manuscript:

- Your name and other identifying information should only appear on the title page; the remainder of the manuscript should be written in a more generalized fashion that does not directly divulge authorship.
- All information needs to be explained and supported to the extent that an individual not familiar with a particular institution's mission, vision or structure can still clearly understand the relevance, significance and implications of the article.

Focus of the Review

Prior to dissemination to the reviewers, the *InSight* Editor will conduct a preliminary appraisal for content, substance, and appropriateness to the journal. If the manuscript is clearly inappropriate, the author will be informed and the manuscript returned. Appropriate manuscripts will be electronically sent to a minimum of two reviewers for blind evaluation. Although there is an attempt to match manuscripts and reviewers according to content, interests, and topical relevance, the broad focus of the journal dictates that papers be written for

applicability to a wide audience. As such, reviewers may not be content experts in a relevant, matching academic discipline.

The manuscript will be reviewed and evaluated according to the following dimensions:

- Relevance - The most important feature of your manuscript is its relevance; the decision to accept or reject a manuscript is typically based on the substantive core of the paper. As such, manuscripts should introduce the substance of the theoretical or research question as quickly as possible and follow the main theme throughout the article in a coherent and explicit manner.
- Significance - Related to relevance, significance refers to the value of your manuscript for substantially impacting the enhancement of post-secondary education relevant to the target topic. Significant manuscripts will clearly highlight the value, importance and worth of a relevant topic within a meaningful context.
- Practical Utility - As highlighted previously, the goal of *InSight* is to enhance teaching and learning through the exchange of scholarly ideas. With this purpose in mind, all manuscripts should emphasize the practical value, relevance or applicability of information. Manuscripts should go beyond the simple reporting of information to provide *InSight* into the implications of findings and the application of information into meaningful contexts.
- Originality - The most effective articles are those that inspire other faculty through innovative practices, approaches and techniques or via the thoughtful self-reflection of the purpose, value and function of educational strategies. Thus, manuscripts that highlight original approaches or perspectives will be given priority. Per the nature of published work, all contributions must be the original work of the author or provide explicit credit for citations.
- Scholarship of Teaching - Contributions to the enrichment of teaching and learning should be grounded in relevant theoretical concepts and empirical evidence. As such, articles should be free from flaws in research substance/methodology and theoretical interpretation. All conclusions and recommendations must be substantiated with theoretical or empirical support; personal classroom experiences and critical reflections should be framed within a structure of existing literature.
- Generalizability - The broad goals and varied audience of *InSight* mandate that manuscripts be written for consumption across a range of disciplines that allows generalizability of findings and implications. Thus, while classroom techniques may be developed, tested and reported for a specific discipline or student population, the manuscript should go on to highlight the implications for other populations.
- Clarity - All manuscripts must be written in a clear, professional manner free from grammatical flaws and errors in writing style. The purpose of the manuscript should be clearly defined, relevant and supported by the evidence provided. All manuscripts should be structured in a manner that promotes a clear, cohesive understanding of the information presented. Be sure that your manuscript is free from organizational, stylistic or “sloppiness” barriers that would prevent effective communication of your work.
- Contribution to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning - All manuscripts must be clearly relevant and advance our understanding or application of the scholarship of teaching and learning within an educational context. Despite the quality of a manuscript, articles that do not directly align with scholarly teaching will not be published.

Review Outcomes

Based upon the feedback and recommendations of the anonymous reviewer panel, the Editor will make a final publication decision. Decisions fall into the following categories:

- Reject - Rejected manuscripts will not be published and authors will not have the opportunity to resubmit a revised version of the manuscript to *InSight*. All rejections will be handled in a courteous manner that includes specific reasons for rejection.
- Accept Pending Revisions - A manuscript accepted-pending-revisions meets all the major requirements for publication but may need improvements in substantive, mechanical or methodological issues. Once these issues are adjusted for, the manuscript must be reviewed and approved by the Editor prior to publication. Very rarely is an article accepted with no changes required; as such, most manuscripts are accepted in this category.
- Accept - Accepted manuscripts will be published "as-is" with no further modifications required.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching could not have been created without the contributions of many individuals; the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning is deeply indebted to each of them for their support and expertise.

For sharing freely their ideas about good teaching: The faculty and students featured in this volume; we thank the featured educators for their willingness not only to invest their time and effort to improve teaching and learning in their classrooms, but also for their willingness to share their experiences to facilitate improved teaching for all of us.

For providing support and funding: The executive staff of Park University; their leadership and support in providing faculty resources makes this publication possible.

For administrative assistance throughout the process of creating InSight: Megan Holder.

For reviewing and commenting on draft material at various stages: The InSight Peer Review Board.

For graphic design assistance: Fred Rohrer, Graphic Designer.