KU TEACHING SUMMIT 2011

Teaching & Learning as a Community Enterprise

August 18, 2011

Sponsored by the Provost’s Office, KU Medical Center, and the Center for Teaching Excellence

8:00–8:25 Registration
Northwest Budig entrance
Continental breakfast served in CTE, room 135, until 8:20 a.m.

8:30–8:50 Welcome
Budig 130
Barbara Atkinson, Executive Vice Chancellor
Bernadette Gray-Little, Chancellor

8:50–8:55 Teaching Development Award
Jeff Vitter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

8:55–9:00 Conference Framework
Dan Bernstein, CTE

9:00–9:40 Keynote
Marsha Lovett, Carnegie Mellon University
“The Power of i4 Instruction: Making Online Learning Interactive, Intelligent, Integrated, and Instrumented”

9:40–9:45 Door Prizes

9:45–10:00 Break
Refreshments are available on the 4th floor of Wescoe.

10:00–10:40 BREAKOUT SESSIONS I

A. Mitigating Problem Behavior through Engagement
Wescoe 4001
Patricia Hawley, Michael Vitevitch & Dan Bernstein, Psychology
Students can behave in the classroom in ways that are less than productive for instruction. In this session we will explore potential causes of such behavior and offer suggestions on how to address such behaviors, including novel pedagogical approaches that actively engage students in the education process and behavioral approaches for minimizing the impact of such behaviors. Please note: This session will be offered only one time.

B. Pilot Peer Mentoring Program and Resources for Lecturers
Wescoe 4040
Doug Crawford-Parker & Sonya Lancaster, English; Marian Hukle, Mathematics
This session will provide lecturers with an overview of pedagogical resources available to them. Participants will have a chance to ask questions and make suggestions about what additional resources would be useful for them as they teach at KU. Participants will also have a chance to be part of a pilot peer mentoring program, pairing novice lecturers with more experienced mentors. Please note: This session will be offered only one time.

C. The Making of a Hybrid Course
Wescoe 4043
Susan Williams, Chemical & Petroleum Engineering
What do you do when you need more time in class for activities and interactive learning? How do you fit it all in, and be assured that students still have a good learning experience? Participants in this session will discuss ways in which this can be accomplished.
D. Less Work for Mother: Effective Use of Blended Classes for Deeper Learning  
Paul Atchley, Psychology, & Doug Golick, Information Technology Services  
Technology is not supposed to be a burden; instead it should make our lives better and easier. But adding online activity to a class is frequently seen as "more work" for an instructor, without any clear payoff in student learning. In this session, Paul Atchley will present blended course models he uses in large classes that have been demonstrated to increase student learning and reduce instructor workload, and Doug Golick will show some of the best Blackboard technologies that can facilitate a better blended learning experience for your students.

E. Team Based Learning in a Large Classroom Setting to Improve Student Application of Knowledge  
Marty Eng, Pharmacy Practice  
Team based learning requires a paradigm shift in teaching that departs from traditional lecture only formatting. Team based learning allows students to be active in their learning, can allow a teacher to divide and conquer a large classroom environment, and can help students apply newly apprehended knowledge. Session participants will use personal smartphones, iTouch, etc. to take readiness assessment tests, and participants will do a team based application exercise. Session participants will also discuss the potential for using TBL in their teaching.

F. Unexpected Connections: Peer Collaborations Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries  
Reva Friedman-Nimz, Curriculum & Teaching; Lynette Hosek, Applied English Center; Kip Haakeham & Dena Register, School of Music  
When we were invited to explore a peer collaboration, we were a little hesitant, given that we teach in very different contexts (Lynette—Applied English Center; Kip—Music; Reva—Curriculum and Teaching). This potential concern evaporated within minutes of our first meeting. We found commonalities in the teaching challenges we wanted to address, as well as in our interests (instrumental performance). We will share ideas for uncovering connections as well as our specific experiences, with a focus on important collaboration moments.

G. Peer Review of Teaching: Implementing Department Models  
Bob Goldstein, Geology/CLAS, & Chris Haufler, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology/Provost's Office  
Representatives from two departments will discuss the peer review process they have used, providing examples and anecdotes and encouraging discussion.

H. Engaging Student Learning through Writing Assignments  
Angela Lumpkin, Health, Sport & Exercise Sciences  
Reflections on an initial redesign of an introductory course with the inclusion of four sequential writing assignments and additional revisions made in a subsequent semester will be shared. The emphasis will be on sharing reflections about what worked well, why changes were made in these writing assignments, how and why these writing assignments were engaging for students, and lessons learned that may help other teachers want to redesign large classes to use writing assignments to increase student engagement. Attendees will be invited to discuss their experiences with research and writing assignments, such as the use of specific task assignments, guidance in how to identify and use scholarly sources, frameworks for conceptualizing and writing a research paper, and structures of grading rubrics.

I. Team Teaching without Strangling Your Colleague  
Mary Klayder, English, & Tony Rosenthal, History  
What can faculty learn from team teaching? What opportunities does it offer? What are common obstacles to team teaching and how can they be dealt with? What do students get from a team-taught course that they are unlikely to get from other courses?

J. Problem Based Learning: What, Why, and How?  
Giulia Bonaminio, Medical Education, & Garold Minns, Internal Medicine  
Session participants will learn the fundamentals of what problem-based learning (PBL) is and where, when, and why they would choose to implement it. They will then participate as learners in a PBL group with an experienced faculty leader using a case applicable to any academic discipline.
K. Very Specific Undergraduate Curriculum Statements for Improved Recruitment, Advising, and Time-to-Degree

Brian Rock, Civil, Environmental & Architectural Engineering

Recruitment, retention, and effective time-to-degree are concerns that faculty, staff, and administration need to address together; we cannot rest on our laurels and expect to survive. This session is a discussion on whether development and posting of specific semester-by-semester model curricula would help address these concerns. The Architectural Engineering faculty, of a popular but historically resource-limited program, did so with very successful results.

L. The Clear, Understandable, and Engaging Instructor: Public Speaking Strategies for the Classroom

Kris Bruss, Communication Studies

Effective teaching requires the ability to communicate knowledge in a clear and engaging manner, but sometimes classroom lectures fall short of the mark, leaving students bored and confused rather than engaged and enlightened. In this session, participants will consider how to strengthen lectures by applying basic principles of public speaking. As part of the discussion, participants will learn about a design model for presentations, which can be adapted easily for classroom use.

10:50–11:30 BREAKOUT SESSIONS II

These sessions, first offered during Breakout I, will repeat at this time:

C. The Making of a Hybrid Course

D. Less Work for Mother: Effective Use of Blended Classes for Deeper Learning

E. Team Based Learning in a Large Classroom Setting

F. Unexpected Connections: Peer Collaborations Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries

G. Peer Review of Teaching: Implementing Department Models

Sessions M and N will be offered only once:

M. Teaming Up to Design Effective Instruction

Marsha Lovett, Carnegie Mellon University

Working in teams is common practice for many professionals. Group projects and collaboration are also becoming more common aspects of how we ask our students to learn. So, why is designing a course (or a piece of instruction) still mostly an individual's endeavor? This session will offer a few examples of faculty (and others) collaborating on instructional design and then launch a discussion of what can happen when we bring a collaborative spirit to instructional design.

N. Models for Teaching and Learning: Ideas from Development and Learning Sciences

Andrea Greenhoot, Psychology

An important goal of a university education is to help students learn how to complete tasks and solve disciplinary problems on their own. But accomplishing this goal can be very challenging. In this session we will discuss several models (both old and new) for teaching and learning that can help us undertake this challenge, drawing on ideas from the developmental and learning sciences.

These sessions are new during Breakout II:

O. Creating and Assessing Learning Outcomes for a Program Based on the Values of Those in a Discipline

Sonya Lancaster & Erin Williams, English

We will begin by describing how the First- and Second-year English program created learning outcomes for our three-course sequence, and how we are assessing these outcomes. Then participants will be divided into groups according to disciplines for a workshop that will serve as an example of how a program could discover what teachers value and use what they discover to create outcomes and assess them. The workshop will ask participants what members of their disciplines value about written communication as an example of a learning outcome. Then, the session will end with a discussion of how the information generated in the groups could be used to create assignments and activities that support learning outcomes. (Note: 80 minute session)
P. Course Redesign: Involving KU Partners

Jeff Hall, Communication Studies; Jennifer Church-Duran & Julie Petr, KU Libraries; Terese Thonus, KU Writing Center

Course design is never really finished, if you believe that education is a process of getting a larger percent of your students to learn a larger percent of the course material every semester you teach. Hall begins the workshop by explaining his redesign of COMS 356, an upper-division research methods class, over three years. Church-Duran and Thonus describe the roles of KU Libraries and the KU Writing Center in this process. Participants then imagine a course they want to revise, brainstorm ideas, and consider how to best involve Libraries and Writing Center staff in course redesign and implementation.

Q. Closing the Loop 2: An Update on Measuring Graduate Student Learning

Debby Daniels, Holly Storkel & Jane Wegner, Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders

At the 2008 Teaching Summit, we presented steps that the MA speech-language pathology program had taken to identify measurable program goals, assess learner outcomes, and re-examine practices. In this session, we provide an update based on our implementation of this system of accountability with a full class of 30 MA students from program start to finish. We will share our portfolio guidelines, formative and summative evaluation materials and procedures, and outcome data from this first class of students.

R. What Being an Ombudsman Has Taught Me About Teaching

Maria Orive, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology/Faculty Ombuds, & Kellie Harmon, University Ombuds

The University Ombuds Office receives hundreds of visitors each year from across the campus community, many of whom come to us from both sides of the classroom—students and instructors. This session will use case studies (modified to preserve the anonymity of our visitors) to explore some of the main themes we see in these instructional conflicts. After a brief discussion of the role of the University Ombuds Office, we will discuss the case studies with the goal of coming up with ideas on how to prevent them in the first place, and also with some possible steps to resolve these conflicts once they arise. Themes for case studies will include: classroom expectations and communication, academic misconduct, and graduate student/advisor interactions.

S. Bridging Resources to Create the Art Minute Assignment

Celka Straughn, Spencer Museum of Art; Tami Albin, KU Libraries; Howard Graham, KU Athletics

Through Art Minute Assignments, students learn about resources available at the Spencer Museum of Art; build research, critical thinking, and communication skills; and acquire new tools for interpreting different cultural expressions through object-based teaching and learning. This session features a group activity that includes listening to an existing art minute, selecting an object from the SMA online collection, and creating an Art Minute Assignment for your course.

11:40–12:20 BREAKOUT SESSIONS III

Sessions T, U, and V will be offered only once:

T. Analyzing Student Learning to Improve Instruction

Marsha Lovett, Carnegie Mellon University

There is much to be gained from analyzing how students learn in our courses: we can identify difficult concepts, reflect on where students need more (or less) support and/or practice, and refine how we evaluate student work. This session will include a technology-enhanced example in which student-learning data were analyzed to improve instruction. Then we will discuss what kinds of analyses can help improve instruction regardless of whether technology is involved.

U. Faculty Collaborate and Design Online and Hybrid Courses Using Quality Indicators; Early Student Surveys Indicate Success!

Kathy Tally, Teaching & Learning Technologies

Learn about the eight over-arching standards and 17 specific review standards developed by Quality Matters, an online quality assurance organization, that guided KU School of Nursing lead faculty to collaborate and ultimately make hard decisions about what is best in online and hybrid course delivery to promote student satisfaction and success. This session will provide an opportunity to explore your own course design to determine if quality indicators are present. We will dis-
cuss the challenges of design collaboration and look at early student survey results from initial design changes implemented in the spring semester of 2011.

V. An Electronic Tutor for Improved Language Learning

Wescoe 4001

Nina Vyatkina, Germanic Languages & Literature

Session participants will learn about the German E-Tutor, an Intelligent Language Tutoring System (ILTS) for learners of German as a foreign language developed by Trude Heift at Simon Fraser University. You'll learn how KU students reacted to using E-Tutor instead of a traditional workbook, as well as some encouraging research results about learning outcomes achieved by using the program. You'll see how E-Tutor is a viable alternative to traditional “drill-and-kill” grammar exercises in a language classroom.

These sessions will repeat during this time:

P. Course Redesign: Involving KU Partners

Wescoe 4045

Q. Closing the Loop 2: An Update on Measuring Graduate Student Learning

Wescoe 4034

R. What Being an Ombudsman Has Taught Me About Teaching

Wescoe 4076

S. Bridging Resources to Create the Art Minute Assignment

Wescoe 4008

In addition, the following sessions, first offered in Breakout I, will repeat at this time:

H. Engaging Student Learning through Writing Assignments

Wescoe 4044

I. Team Teaching without Strangling Your Colleague

Wescoe 4035

J. Problem Based Learning: What, Why, and How?

Wescoe 4002

K. Very Specific Undergraduate Curriculum Statements

Wescoe 4025

L. The Clear, Understandable, and Engaging Instructor

Wescoe 4007

12:30–1:00 LUNCH

4th floor Wescoe hallway

Pick up a box lunch from tables at the west end of the 4th floor, then join an informal discussion:

Team Course Design—Jennifer Church-Duran, Jeff Hall, Julie Petr

Wescoe 4040

How to Blend Online & In-Class Learning—Paul Atchley, Doug Golick, Jean Yoo

Wescoe 4041

Quality Indicators of Learning—Debby Daniels, Sonya Lancaster, Holly Storkel, Jane Wegner & Erin Williams

Wescoe 4043

Renewing General Education at KU: What Have We Achieved and What Remains to be Accomplished?—Chris Haufler

Wescoe 4044

Teaching Potpourri: Bring Your Own Topic to Discuss—Dan Bernstein

Wescoe 4045

Special thanks to the following offices for participating in the Info Fair during Summit breaks:

Information Technology Services

KU Libraries

KU Writing Center

Privacy Office

Spencer Museum of Art

Thanks to Impromptu Café, UnderGround Lab and Massage Envy for providing conference door prizes.
## BREAKOUTS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Breakout I: 10:00–10:40</th>
<th>Breakout II: 10:50–11:30</th>
<th>Breakout III: 11:40–12:20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>A. Mitigating Problem Behavior</td>
<td>V. Electronic Tutor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4002</td>
<td>J. Problem Based Learning</td>
<td>J. Problem Based Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4007</td>
<td>L. The Clear Instructor</td>
<td>L. The Clear Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4008</td>
<td>S. Art Minute Assignment</td>
<td>S. Art Minute Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4012</td>
<td>E. TBL in a Large Classroom</td>
<td>E. TBL in a Large Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4023</td>
<td>N. Ideas from Learning Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4025</td>
<td>K. Curriculum Statements</td>
<td>K. Curriculum Statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4033</td>
<td></td>
<td>U. Using Quality Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4034</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Closing the Loop 2</td>
<td>Q. Closing the Loop 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4035</td>
<td>I. Team Teaching</td>
<td>I. Team Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040</td>
<td>B. Resources for Lecturers</td>
<td>O. Learning Outcomes for a Program (80 min. session)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4041</td>
<td>D. Less Work for Mother</td>
<td>D. Less Work for Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4043</td>
<td>C. Making of a Hybrid Course</td>
<td>C. Making of a Hybrid Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4044</td>
<td>H. Learning through Writing</td>
<td>H. Learning through Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4045</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Redesign with Partners</td>
<td>P. Redesign with Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4051</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Teaming Up</td>
<td>T. Analyzing Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4067</td>
<td>F. Unexpected Connections</td>
<td>F. Unexpected Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4071</td>
<td>G. Department Models</td>
<td>G. Department Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4076</td>
<td>R. Being an Ombudsman</td>
<td>R. Being an Ombudsman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>