

**Graduate Programs in College Teaching
Graduate School
University of New Hampshire**

GRAD 940: Foundations in College Teaching

Formal consideration of effective teaching approaches. Topics include course design and presentation and evaluation approaches. Introduction to multiple pedagogies and their application in higher education. 2 cr.

Instructor: Michael Lee, Ph.D., Co-Director
UNH Center for Teaching Excellence
(603) 862-4872; mjl@unh.edu

COURSE OBJECTIVES: At the completion of this course, the student will be able to:

- Identify issues and develop strategies related to effective college teaching;
- Evaluate different instructional techniques and approaches in terms of student learning;
- Present a reasoned assessment of his or her teaching approaches and philosophy;
- Demonstrate knowledge of current research on the scholarship of college teaching and learning.

Time Frame: GRAD 940 is an asynchronous course. You can access course materials and participate in the discussions at your convenience. However, it should be noted that the 5 course modules are timed and sequenced according to the dates noted below for each. Once a module has ended, you won't be able to go back and participate in the discussion for that module.

Required Resources:

You will need a computer and internet access. All readings, as well as other course documents, are available for download from the course's Blackboard© site.

****Please Note:** Changes and adjustments may be made to the syllabus at any time. I will notify you via e-mail and on the Announcements page of the course Blackboard site whenever I make any such changes.

COURSE OVERVIEW AND REQUIREMENTS:

This graduate course is designed for college level faculty, as well as for graduate students and career professionals preparing to teach. As such it offers an introduction to the formal scholarship in college teaching. It is structured to engage participants in a discussion of relevant issues related to effective teaching and enhanced learning in higher education, including widely recognized, evidence-based "best practices."

For the next twelve weeks, we will become a learning community -- a group of interested individuals who have come together to share, reflect upon, and consider critical issues related to college teaching. Our discussions will focus on a set of selected readings, but will also include reflections on our teaching experiences and our learning experiences as students in a myriad of educational settings.

This course uses **Lee Shulman's model** of college teaching. Shulman, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, posits that college teaching is a 5-part process involving: (1) the **vision** we hold for a particular course based upon a specific body of knowledge and field or discipline-specific traditions. Based upon this vision, faculty then (2) **design** the course with the primary artifact associated with this design being the course syllabus. The course design, according to Shulman, articulates the vision and is affected by multiple factors and issues, many of which we will examine in this course.

Based upon their design, faculty then enter into a period of (3) **intense interaction with students**. Interactions include, but are not necessarily limited to, formal classes and outside-of-class course projects. During this phase in the teaching process students interact directly with the professor, with one another, and with the course material. Learning occurs and students are evaluated. The next phase of this process involves the faculty member's assessment of the (4) **outcomes** associated with the course. Outcomes include intended learning outcomes, formal student evaluations of the course and professor, and a wide range of feelings and qualitative judgments about the course and its content. Based upon these outcomes, the faculty member undertakes a process of (5) **reflection and analysis** and may adjust or modify his or her vision and/or design of subsequent versions of the course, thereby creating a continuous cycle of development and improvement. Shulman's model serves as the foundation for this course.

In working with faculty and future faculty we have found that this model (**vision-design-interaction-outcome-reflection**) provides a robust context to examine many issues associated with college teaching. Whereas our examination of pedagogical issues may have little impact on your vision for the disciplinary content of a course, we expect this examination to provide you with insight into the **design** of courses, methods and

approaches to **interact with students**, and the development and use of **outcome information** to improve your courses.

GRAD 940 is offered using twelve weeks of asynchronous learning facilitated by Blackboard®, a web-based course management system designed to support instruction. Generally, but not exclusively, we use the lens provided by published works to consider specific questions as we search for practical strategies and explore best practices. The broad sample of published works included in this course has consistently provided us a common and appropriate platform as we collectively strive to define and address a range of issues we encounter in college teaching.

The course is organized around five modules, each having specific objectives and requirements, supported by assigned readings and asynchronous discussion. At the end of each module we pause for some reflection before moving along to the next module. When all the modules are completed, your course project is submitted.

Course Requirements and Grading

1. **Active participation** in each of the 5 modules in this course is required. Active participation means providing timely and relevant responses to each question posted on Blackboard, and interacting with your fellow students on the discussion board. Given the nature of this course, failure to participate actively in electronic discussions, as determined by the professor, will be sufficient grounds to award an administrative failure (AF) for the course. Students in jeopardy of receiving an ‘AF’ will be given a warning via email.

In order to keep the board interactive I ask that you not wait until the last day or 2 of a given module before responding to the questions. You need not respond to all questions at the same time.

2. **End-of-module reflection papers.** At the end of each of the modules you are required to submit a paper in which you reflect on the readings and discussion activity for the module. From your perspective, what was the primary insight or most important idea that emerged from this module? What about this module makes it especially relevant to you and your understanding of effective college teaching? These papers should be *no longer than 500 words*. In total, **five reflection papers are required**. I will place all of these papers in folders on the Blackboard site for others to read, thereby allowing everyone to benefit from each other’s insights. Total: **60%**.

I use the following scale for grading reflection papers:

3 pts.—Paper is clearly focused on *your primary insight*—the most important thing you learned during the module, with reference to the pertinent reading and discussion activity from that module.

2 pts.—Less of an insight-based paper, more of a summary of the reading.

1 pt. --Ill-focused. A main point isn't made.

Of the 15 possible points, 13 points earn an **A**; 10 points a **B** for this portion of the course grade.

Note: Please see Addendum One of this syllabus for further instructions about the reflection papers.

3. *The Course Project* is worth **40%** of final grade. See description below.

Getting Started

On Jan. 28, 2008, log onto GRAD 940 on the UNH Blackboard Site. You can use any Internet Browser, but UNH Computing and Information Services reports that users experience fewest problems with Internet Explorer, Firefox, or Safari. Please note that some of the files you will have to download for course readings will take much more time with a dial-up modem than with a broadband or ethernet connection.

Downloading: Many of the readings for the course are in PDF format. In order to open these files you must have Adobe Reader installed on your computer. This free download can be accessed from the Blackboard home page. If you want to do the reading on your computer screen, note that you can use the “zoom” command to make the print appear larger on your screen (click on the magnifying glass icon on the toolbar, and then on the portion of the text you are reading).

Discussion Boards: Much of the work you will do in this course will involve the electronic discussion board. To participate, click on the “Discussion Board” button on the course’s main Blackboard page. To respond to a question, click on “open new thread.” After filling in the subject box, use the text box to type in your response to the question. When you reply to someone else’s comment, click on “reply” and then enter your response in the text box. If you want to compose a response offline, you can do so using your word processor, and then copying and pasting the text into the text box.

See **Addendum Two** of this syllabus for comments on the Discussion Board

NOTE: All discussion boards will remain available for the duration of the course. However, the time-frame for posting comments and responses is limited to the length of the particular Module for which the question is intended.

Submitting Written Work: When you save work that you will submit *via* Blackboard, always end the file name with .doc. For example, this file will be saved as: bboardinstructions.doc.

Please submit all written assignments using the “**Student drop box**” found under “Student Tools.” Be sure to save your work as follows: yourlastname.paper1.doc (for example: lee.paper1.doc).

To “Add File to Drop Box” locate the file you are sending by clicking the “Browse” button at “File to Upload.” Your file will be located somewhere on your desktop. After you upload the file, type in “Final Project” for “Name of link to file.” Then send the file to the instructor.

Module A. “Foundations” Jan. 28-Feb. 15

Instructor’s Statement:

During this module we will explore the implications of something we all know about teaching, but don’t always keep in mind, namely that the very point of teaching—the only reason to do it—is the advancement and enhancement of student learning. Each of the Module A readings addresses some aspect of this reality, and as a whole they serve as a useful reminder that we can and should be paying attention to the effect our teaching methods, behaviors, and approaches might or might not be having on our students.

Reading (All are in Course Documents):

Bass, Randy (1999), The scholarship of teaching: What’s the problem? This is an “external link” within the course documents file.

Barr, Robert and John Tagg (1995), From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. **Change** (November/December): 13-25.

Cross, K. Patricia (1998), What do we know about students’ learning and how do we know it? **Speech at AAHE** April 17, 1998.

Eble, Kenneth E. (1983) “Teaching’s highest aims.” **The Aims of Teaching** , San Francisco: Jossey Bass. 141-156.

Fisler, Jodi and John Foubert, “Teach Me But Don’t Disagree With Me.” **About Campus, Vol. 11 No. 5 (Nov./Dec. 2006)**.

McGonigal, Kelly (2005), Teaching for Transformation: From Learning Theory to Teaching Strategies. Stanford University, Speaking of Teaching, Spring 2005.

Steadman, Mimi and Marilla Svinicki (1998), CATS: A student’s gateway to better learning. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 75 (Fall): 13-20.

The Reflective Summary on this module is due by Feb. 22

Module B. “Students” Feb. 16-March 8

Instructor’s Statement:

If student learning is our objective, it is imperative that we consider issues and research related to two key prerequisites to learning: motivation and attention.

Student performance (i.e. learning) is influenced by at least two significant factors: **intelligence and diligence**. Intelligence means the intellectual capacity to learn and to demonstrate what has been learned. Diligence means the capacity to continue to work even in the face of difficulty. That said, let me add two thoughts:

Students study (and learn) using the skills and approaches that have previously led to their success. This can be a real issue, especially if you are teaching lower division courses to recent high school students. If your students have previously received positive feedback due to a capacity to memorize facts, and your course emphasizes learning objectives beyond just factual knowledge, they may have the requisite intelligence and diligence, yet fail because how they study and learn is not in tune with your course. These students may need a significant investment - class time - to develop a new or revised learning methodology and new study skills. Learning (any) new skill or approach takes time, positive experience, and well-directed feedback.

We think it is easy – they may not! We all tend to teach subjects that we find interesting and “easy.” If we didn’t we probably would not have selected the area as our professional interest and earned the needed graduate degree(s). Almost by definition, what we teach we find easy and interesting. Regrettably, this ease and excitement may not be shared by our students. As professors, we also lack personal experience as how to learn this “difficult and boring” subject; we ourselves have never been there. **Relevance** may tend to make learning easier for all students. Some research advocates starting every unit and every class with examples before introducing any new topic. Students learn (and remember) best via example. In other words, they may be better at deduction than induction. Others advocate short in-class writing exercises to anchor critical points, concepts, models or techniques. It might help to assume that your students are struggling to learn what is being taught; making it straight forward and ‘simple’ does not mean making it simplistic.

This last point should not be construed as advocating that you “dumb-down” your course. Instead, think of ladders and platforms. How can we help the students – given their capabilities and limitations – to get to a certain point (e.g. ladder). Now that they are at this point (e.g., a platform) – which we review frequently – how then can we help them up the next ladder?

At this point, we are also looking ahead to “course design” – that stage in the teaching process where we construct a course and plan the interactions with and between the students. We need to consider options and strategies. We also need to ponder specific questions, such as “What attributes of a course tend to maintain or enhance student motivation and attention?” What can we do to make the course—and the classroom experience—as conducive as possible for all students to learn? How can we work with students, even when they lack the inherent motivation or interest to learn a subject we have always found to be inherently interesting?

Readings (go to Course Documents):

Billson and Tiberius (1991), Effective social arrangements for teaching and learning. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 45 (Spring): 87-109.

Brookfield, Stephen D. (1990), Overcoming resistance to learning. **The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. 147-162.

Forsyth and McMillan (1991), Practical proposals for motivating students. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning** (Spring): 53-65.

McMillan and Forsyth (1991), What theories of motivation say about why learners learn. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 45 (Spring): 39-51.

Hirschy and Wilson (2002), The Sociology of the Classroom and Its Influence on Student Learning. **Peabody Journal of Education**. 77 (No. 3): 85-100.

Penner, J.G. (1984). **Why many college teachers cannot lecture: How to avoid communication breakdown in the classroom**. Charles C. Thomas Publishing: Springfield, IL. Chapter 6. Interest and attention in the classroom. pp 114- 133

Sorcinelli, Mary Dean (1991) Research on the seven principles. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 47 (Fall): 13-25.

The Reflective Summary on this module is due by March 16.

Module C. Teaching Methods and Approaches Mar. 9-26

Instructor’s Statement:

We will focus our attention on two topics: *the lecture and active learning* (and its multiple pedagogies). These are often seen as antithetical, but they need not be.

Each will have a dramatic impact on the actual design and conduct of a course and classes.

The lecture remains a primary pedagogical approach used by many faculty in their classes. Nothing in this module should be construed as anti-lecture. The lecture is the most efficient class teaching approach we have to transmit large amounts of information to students. By definition, it is “passive” in that the professor lectures and students listen and take notes. The lecture was a 19th-century innovation in higher education by which scholars could present reasoned arguments and demonstrate research findings. In its earliest form and before textbooks, the lecture articulated primary research around a specific topic or question. Today, lecture remains a fixture in higher education. The issue is how to make the lecture (in the current environment) most effective.

Lecturing is frequently our pedagogy of choice. It was probably how many of us were taught. It is also the pedagogy we may feel most comfortable with as our classes increase in size. However, professors have choices – a primary choice being how to use class time: do we lecture or do something else? In this module we will consider alternatives to the lecture, as well as ways of making lectures interactive—even in larger classes.

As you consider the following readings, look for ideas and strategies to make lectures active and purposeful – not just done by default.

Readings

Bonwell, Charles G. and James A. Eison. (1991) Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C. pp 1-6, “What is Active Learning?” pp 1-6. “The Modified Lecture” pp 7-20 “Questioning and Discussion.” pp 21-32.

Cooper and Robinson (2000) 1- The argument for making large classes seem small. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 81. (Spring) 5-16.

Cooper and Robinson (2000) 2 - Getting Started: Informal small-group strategies in large classes. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 81. (Spring) 17-24.

Darlaston-Jones, D. (2003). Using a student centred learning approach in a large class context. In *Partners in Learning*. Proceedings of the 12th Annual Teaching Learning Forum, 11-12 February 2003.

Nelson, Craig E., (1996) Student diversity requires different approaches to college teaching, even in math and science. American Behavioral Scientist. 40:2 (November/December), 165-175.

Svinicki, Marilla (1991), Practical implications of cognitive theories. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 45 (Spring): 27-37.

View the following video:

Making Large Classes Work (Indiana University). This video can be accessed in the “External Links” section of the Blackboard site. Note that there are 3 segments, each approximately 15 minutes long.

The Reflective Summary on this module is due by April 3.

Module D (Mar. 27 – April 11) Course Design

Instructor's Statement:

Effectively designing a course is an art. Empirical research is available to help, but the outcome is an expression of a professor's vision for the course and how the professor has addressed and articulated his or her vision with a range of issues. As a colleague of mine likes to say, in many ways, teaching is more like playing with Legos than assembling a jigsaw puzzle.

This module is based upon specific premises:

- ❑ Active learning is more effective than just passive listening.
- ❑ The design of a course should motivate student excellence.
- ❑ The design of the course defines how **we will interact** with students and how students will interact with each other and the content – it is the script.
- ❑ The course syllabus CAN BE the most important document you will prepare.
- ❑ High grades reflect high learning and students *really* want high grades.
- ❑ Most learning occurs outside of the classroom. Course design should maximize out-of-class learning.
- ❑ Learning can be assessed using both graded and non-graded activities.

Common Design Questions and Issues include:

What are the specific objectives of this course? At the completion of this course a student should be able to _____. Remember that students must first possess the ability to **describe** before they can **analyze** and analyze before they can **evaluate**. They also may need assistance to know the difference between each.

“Understand” and “know” are too imprecise to use in stating course objectives. Be as specific as possible and limit the number of course objectives to no more than four.

What key topics in what order need to be covered in the course? What materials (books, articles, cases, problem-sets, etc) are available to help my students learn these topics?

How should I use class time? Do I cover assigned reading? Do I introduce new or other topics? Do we do problems or cases? Do we discuss major questions and issues? How do I avoid students generally believing that only what I “cover in class” is important (and going to be on exams)? Are classes organized around specific topics or questions? Are there exercises and/or case problems that could effectively substitute for “just lecturing”?

What about grading? Grades are “academic currency” for students. Grades are important to students and most want “good grades.” What students believe is essential to getting a ‘good grade’ may actually be the most important.

What about assessment and evaluation? How will I know whether students (individually and as a group) are making progress to realize the objectives of this course? How will I test and evaluate students? How can I use tests, testing, and other required graded work to help realize the course objectives?

As you begin this module, remember that a course design is effective only if it helps students to navigate the course experience and realize the stated learning objectives for the course. The design is presented to students in your **syllabus**; note that we advocate a user-friendly syllabus that explains the course and provides the instructor with the ability to have students refer back to the syllabus for answers to many questions. Your syllabus is the student’s roadmap; it must have sufficient detail -- not too much and not too little -- written for the students.

The type of syllabus we advocate needs to be framed with some statements that allow for modification. For example, consider "The instructor may revise this syllabus based upon the learning needs of the class." This type of statement provides you the opportunity to adjust as needed once the course has begun. In other words, the syllabus is also your opportunity to empower yourself to make necessary adjustments during the term.

Consider, for example, this type of policy statement on a syllabus. While some may view it as overly harsh, even softer modifications **empower** the professor to act accordingly.

The instructor reserves the right to return any paper without grade if the paper includes more than three serious flaws in spelling, grammar or punctuation as judged by the instructor. If a paper is returned without a grade, the paper may be resubmitted within one week and can receive a grade no higher than a C.

Virtually all colleges and universities expect the professor to define his or her rules within the freedom granted by the college or university. For example, professors are expected to set and enforce attendance policies, policies concerning make-up work and grading. Use your syllabus to empower yourself (and course) in keeping with what you want to create.

At the UNH Center for Teaching Excellence, we have worked with faculty from virtually all fields and disciplines. Frequently, faculty seek our services when their teaching outcomes are not meeting their expectations. Almost every faculty member we have had the honor of working with presents the same profile – an incomplete or flawed course design, as manifest in their syllabus. The design just isn’t sufficient. In some instances their course enrollment has grown in size and their design hasn’t. In other instances, their “design” is sending confusing or wrong messages and expectations to students. In still

other instances, their design is not highly focused on the specific objectives associated with the specific course. Regardless of reason, however, our thesis is that **faculty tend to under design their courses**, which is usually evident in their syllabus.

Unlike other modules, this module also sends you on a journey to examine electronic resources. Use this as the opportunity to consider specific topics and issues you are interested in. For example, I urge everyone to consider the following guideline for a syllabus: <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/bgd/syllabus.html>

Readings:

Grading Systems

Anderson, Rebecca (1998) Why talk about different ways to grade? The shift from traditional assessment to alternative assessment. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 74 (Summer): 5-16.

Bean, John C. and Dean Paterson, (1998) Grading classroom participation. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 74 (Summer): 33-40.

Hammans, J.O. and J. R. Barnsley. (1992) Everything you need to know about developing a grading plan for your course (well almost). **Journal of Excellence in College Teaching**. 3: 51-68.

The Syllabus

Altman and Cashin (1992) The course syllabus. IDEA Paper Number 27, Kansas State University.

Felder and Brent. "Objectively Speaking."

McComas and Mihram (2005). Creating an objective-based and learner-centered syllabus.

TAKE A JOURNEY USING THE WWW

Below are some of the many Internet resources related to college teaching. Instead of assigning specific sections or readings *per se*, I ask that each of you examine all of these resources, reading those specifically related to the issues and interests that brought you to GRAD 940. Be prepared to suggest to others on the discussion board which of these resources are most valuable for what purpose. Most are presented in very practical format.

Tools for Teaching, Davis, B.G., Jossey-Bass; San Francisco, 1993.

A compendium of classroom-tested strategies and suggestions designed to improve the teaching practices of all college instructors, including beginning, mid-career, and senior

faculty members. The book describes 49 teaching tools that cover both traditional practical tasks--writing a course syllabus, delivering an effective lecture--as well as newer, broader concerns such as responding to diversity on campus and coping with budget constraints. See: <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/compendium/>

Active Learning: <http://www.ou.edu/idp/tips/ideas/model.html>

Course Design: <http://www.ou.edu/education/edpsy/iptwww/instdsgn/mainframeset.htm>

Teaching Tips: http://trc.virginia.edu/Publications/Teaching_Concerns/TC_Topic.htm

Teaching Excellence Sites

<http://president.scfte.nwu.edu/>

<http://www.unh.edu/teaching-excellence>

<http://www.ku.edu/~cte/resources.html>

<http://depts.washington.edu/cidrweb/tools.htm#Selected>

<http://www.clt.cornell.edu/resources/links.htm>

<http://trc.virginia.edu/tc/2000/Promoting.htm>

The Reflective Summary on this module is due by April 18.

Module E (April 11-20) Improving YOUR Teaching

Instructor's Statement:

Every course is an active uncontrolled social experiment. Some things work and others don't. Sometimes the best-intended design of a course is flawed; other times student reaction to our well-designed course and/or how we interact with students is idiosyncratic. Sometimes things work well.

To improve a course -- either during the semester or over the longer term -- we need to solicit and collect data and then use this data as we reconsider the design of the course and/or how we interact with students.

This module emphasizes student reactions to teaching data as one primary source of insight related to course design and redesign. In addition, I have included two readings to help us look back over some of the key points of the course.

Readings:

Angelo, T.A. (1993) A Teacher's Dozen: Fourteen general, research-based principles for improving higher learning in our classrooms. *AAHE Bulletin* 45(8): 3 -7, 13.

Eble, Kenneth E. (1983) "Seven deadly sins of teaching." *The Aims of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 103-119

Keig, Larry W. and Michael D. Waggoner. (1995) Peer review of teaching: Improving college instruction through formative assessment. **Journal of Excellence in College Teaching**. 6:3, 51-83.

Seldin, P. (1989). Using student feedback to improve teaching. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**. 37: 89-97.

Teaching and Learning Issues - Student Ratings and the Evaluation of Teaching: A White Paper. See: <http://president.scfte.nwu.edu/White.htm> (Also available in Module E folder of Course Documents)

The Reflective Summary on this module is due by April 28

Course Project: DUE May 10

Choose one of the following options. Option A is more suited to those who have teaching experience; but you are free to choose either option.

Papers should be double-spaced with 12-point font. Any standard academic format is acceptable (MLA, APA, etc.).

Option A. Anthony Grasha (1996) argues that the central element of highly effective teaching is not the application of a specific technique or approach *per se*. Just because you are incorporating (more) directed writing assignments, power point slides or an electronic blackboard does not mean that students are necessarily learning more. Effective teaching is not some trick or technique. Instead, Grasha argues that teaching is highly individual and that effective teachers know what works for them – an approach that is based upon their specific style, preference, and goals...as well as their content expertise and experience.

I add to Grasha my realization that whenever you teach a new course, it's beneficial to give yourself three times to get it right – the first time you are still getting comfortable with the material; the second time you are making heavy investment in pedagogical adaptation; and by the third time it should be close to being a well designed course able to be polished as needed, but not requiring extensive investment.

Read these chapters and complete the exercises in Grasha, Anthony F. (1996) Teaching With Style (Alliance Publishers, Pittsburgh, PA): Chapter 3, Developing a Conceptual Base for Our Teaching Styles; and Chapter 4, An Integrated Model of Teaching and Learning Styles. (See Course Documents)

Present a paper no longer than 12 pages that reflects upon GRAD 940 and your assessment of lessons learned from examining your teaching “style” using the Grasha model:

1. What do you identify as 3-5 primary “lessons learned” from this course?
2. What lessons did you learn about your teaching style from by Grasha?
3. Describe and present a rationale for your strategy to enhance your continued development as an effective teacher, with reference to pertinent readings from GRAD 940.

Option B. Below are two lists of books on college teaching. List A contains works that are philosophical and theoretical in their approach, while the books on the B list are more practical in orientation. All the books are available at www.Amazon.com, www.barnesandnoble.com and/or www.powells.com. Choose one book from each list. Present a paper, not to exceed 12 pages, in which you report the critical contributions of each of the 2 works, your assessment of the value of each, and an analysis of the ways in which the practical suggestions of one book do or do not fit in with the theoretical/philosophical outlook of the other.

List A

Brookfield, Stephen D. (1995) **Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher**. Jossey-Bass.

Dressel, Paul L. (1982) **On Teaching and Learning in College: Reemphasizing the Role of Learners and the Disciplines**. Jossey-Bass.

Eble, Kenneth E. (1988) **The Craft of Teaching: A Guide to Mastering the Professor's Art**. Jossey-Bass.

Menges, Robert J., Weimer, Maryellen, and Associates (1996) **Teaching on Solid Ground: Using Scholarship to Improve Practice**. Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, Parker J. (1997) **The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life**. Jossey-Bass

List B

Davis, James R. (1993) **Better Teaching, More Learning: Strategies for Success in Postsecondary Settings**. American Council on Education/Orxy

Lowman, Joseph (1995) **Mastering the Techniques of Teaching**. Jossey-Bass.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. (2002) **Teaching Tips, 11th Edition**. Houghton Mifflin.

Pregent, Richard (1994) **Charting Your Course: How to Prepare to Teach More Effectively**. Magna Publications.

Seldin, Peter and Associates (1995) **Improving College Teaching**. Anker Publishing.

Weimer, Maryellen (2002) **Learning-centered teaching: Five Key Changes in Practice**. Jossey-Bass.

Addendum One: Reflection Papers

The last time I taught this class, I received the following e-mail from a student. It contains some questions that I thought might well be answered to the whole class.

I just had a question about the reflection papers. Is this a reflection of my thoughts on the readings or a summary of the readings or both. How professional should it be? Can I use statements such as; I think? Do you want a cover page, abstract and reference page? Also, how do I send this to you? I know you want it via Blackboard. Do I post it the same way we are posting our responses to the module questions? If not, could you please explain how I do this?

First of all, here's the assignment as described in the syllabus:

End-of-module reflection papers. At the end of each module submit a paper in which you reflect on the readings and discussion activity for the module. From your perspective, what were the primary insights that emerged from this module? Why are these points especially relevant to you and your understanding of effective college teaching? These papers should be no longer than 500 words.

In response to the above questions:

1. ***Is this a reflection of my thoughts on the readings or a summary of the readings or both.*** Definitely NOT a summary of the readings. What I would like to hear are the primary insights you derived from the module (readings and discussion). In sharing your insights, you should refer to the particular reading(s) associated with the insight, but you should do so without attempting to summarize readings. Bring in your own perspective—your own understanding of “effective teaching.” And you need not mention all the readings—in fact, please be selective. Focus on a primary insight or main point, and refer to the reading(s) that relate to that point or insight.
2. ***How professional should it be? Can I use statements such as; I think?*** You can—and should—write from your point of view. Therefore, the word ***I*** is appropriate. Since you are connecting your insights with published readings as well as your own experience, you can maintain a professional tone and still present your perspective on the articles.
3. ***Do you want a cover page, abstract and reference page?*** None of the above. Your name and date and the Module on the top of the page will do for identification. As far as references are concerned, when you quote from or refer

to an article that is on our reading list, simply identify the author's name in a way that refers unambiguously to the specific reading ("*As Cross says, ...*"). If you bring in an outside reading (there is no need to do so), provide an endnote with citation in an appropriate format (e.g., *APA* or *MLA*).

4. ***Also, how do I send this to you? I know you want it via blackboard. Do I post it the same way we are posting our responses to the module questions? If not, could you please explain how I do this?***

Submitting Written Work: When you save work that you will submit *via* Blackboard, always end the file name with .doc. For example, this file will be saved as: bboardinstructions.doc.

Please submit all written assignments *via* the "**Student drop box,**" found under "Student Tools." Be sure to save your work as follows: yourlastname.ModuleA.doc.

To "Add File to Drop Box" locate the file you are sending by clicking the "Browse" button at "File to Upload." Your file will be located somewhere on your desktop. After you upload the file, type in .doc for "Name of link to file." Then send the file to the instructor.

If you find the drop box confusing, you can always send a paper to me as an attached file with an e-mail message. The drop box is more convenient for archiving work, but the important thing is to get the work to me.

Addendum Two: The Discussion Board

The core of each module consists of a set of questions for discussion. Please don't see these discussion questions as having specific, fixed answers. Rather, consider them more as a direction for you to take as you reflect on and respond to the readings and to comments made by other participants.

To make a response to the original question, click on the "add new thread" option. To reply to someone else's response, click on the "reply" button that follows that response. I certainly don't expect everyone to reply to everyone else's postings, but I would like to see the discussion board become truly interactive, so please respond when a classmate makes a comment that you feel needs clarification, elucidation, further questioning, or polite disagreement. Please don't reply with simple agreement ("Good point" or "I think so too"). Rather, state your agreement or disagreement, and follow it up with a salient reason why.

As to the *form* of your replies and comments: I see a discussion board as a form of writing, not quite as formal as a paper, but not as informal as conversation, instant messaging, or texting. When you post a response, aim for clarity, conciseness, and correctness of grammar and usage (without having to obsess about every sentence).

And, of course, be polite and respectful to one another.

