



# Teaching Notes

May/June 2004, Volume 1, Number 4

Editor: Bill Hill, CETL Director Copy Editor: Randolph A. Smith, Chair of Psychology

## Special Kudos

*Bill Hill, CETL Director*

Unfortunately, change is inevitable. After 2 years of outstanding work, three of the founding CETL Faculty Fellows have decided to return to their departmental homes. I wanted to take some space here to publicly thank them for their dedication, creativity, and leadership in developing outstanding programs and initiatives. I deeply appreciate the contributions of each of them to the enhancement of teaching and student learning at KSU.

### Mary Garner

#### **CETL Fellow for Scholarly Discourse Across Disciplines**

Mary is ending her 2-year term as a CETL Fellow. Mary did an outstanding job in developing innovative programs that brought together faculty to explore interdisciplinary topics to enhance teaching and learning. One notable program was the 2003 Summer Symposium for the Integration of the Humanities, Arts & Sciences, which was repeated in spring 2004. Mary also conducted the inaugural CETL Book Club and was an active collaborator with Kim Loomis in the development of several Teaching Circles.

### Army Lester

#### **CETL Fellow for Student Retention and Success**

Like Mary, Army is also ending his 2-year term and returning to full-time teaching. During his tenure Army initiated a series that addressed issues, strategies, and plans for fostering minority student success at KSU as well as a very successful day-long summit of educators and community members focused on increasing participation of minorities in post-secondary education. In addition, Army led numerous workshops on the reflective practice of teaching as espoused in the writings of Parker Palmer.

### Kimberly S. Loomis

#### **CETL Fellow for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

Although Kim had another year on her term, she decided to return to the department when she was offered the opportunity to develop and coordinate a new graduate program in the Bagwell College of Education. Kim was a tireless advocate of advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). She assisted with the new faculty programs through organizing SoTL sessions, was a consultant for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Research Teams, organized several teaching circles, and conducted a year-long series focusing on practical suggestions for starting and disseminating one's SoTL research.

## The State of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at KSU

*Kimberly S. Loomis, CETL Fellow for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*

We've started something on the KSU campus. When the first group of CETL Fellows was appointed two years ago, I'm not sure that any of us quite knew what our roles would be. Now, as some of us - myself included - are finishing our terms, it is a good time to reflect on what we started and where it may lead.

It was an honor to be named the first CETL Fellow for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). As a teacher educator, my discipline is characterized by activities that employ classroom research methodologies and scholarship that focuses on educational settings. In preparing to be an effective CETL Fellow, I had to learn about how SoTL fits into the context of KSU and into higher education in general, so that I could convince faculty that participating in SoTL-related activities was worth their time and effort. Then, I had to learn how I could best share what I know and do with others so that they could use SoTL to enhance their own teaching and contribute to their scholarship and creative activity.

So where *does* SoTL fit into the KSU community? The *2003-2004 KSU Faculty Handbook* states that the university considers "...the scholarship of pedagogy and learning both within and across disciplines" (page 5.6) as worthy of contributing to the review and evaluation of faculty performance. Still, there was concern expressed by some faculty members that tenure and promotion committees would not value their work in SoTL. Also, there was concern that even if KSU recognized SoTL as scholarly work, other institutions may not value such work, should a faculty member wish to transfer.

How can these concerns be addressed? Of course by helping more and more faculty - including those that serve on T & P committees - understand not only what SoTL is, but also how it contributes to student success, to higher education, and to the body of disciplinary research. This purpose was foremost in the design of a series of SoTL workshops offered and repeated during the past two years. These workshops have helped faculty to define the scholarship of teaching and learning and identify opportunities for SoTL that exist for them. We have introduced classroom research strategies, discussed the writing of SoTL for publication, and explored outlets for sharing SoTL for peer review in journals and at conferences. (By the way, it is good to know that among the conferences specifically devoted to SoTL, such as the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Colloquium that is held every spring in conjunction with the AAHE conference, Kennesaw State University is a recognized name in SoTL efforts.) Also, we have formed a Teaching Community, comprised of faculty who have expressed an interest in exploring issues related to teaching on our campus. The Teaching Community broke out into small groups called Teaching Circles, who began to explore topics

*(Continued on next page)*

Teaching Notes is a monthly publication during the academic year by the Kennesaw State University Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning.



*Loomis, continued from Page 1*

such as interdisciplinary teaching, course and teaching portfolio development, inquiry teaching methods, and peer evaluation and review.

The process of exploring outlets for presentation and publication naturally included a Web search. Results showed that CETL counterparts at other universities, such as the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) at Illinois State University, the University Center for Excellence in Teaching (UCET) at Indiana University South Bend, and Portland State University's Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) among many, many others, are conducting the same types of workshops and have faculty pursuing the same types of SoTL activities as we do here at Kennesaw State. Such finds are validating for me as the CETL SoTL Fellow as well as those participating in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

So, as far as SoTL is concerned, we've started something here at KSU and we are obviously on the right track. As members of the KSU teaching community, we can expect more of the same as well as bigger and better opportunities for SoTL in the future. I know that I won't be the lead dog now that I'm leaving my Fellowship, but I certainly plan on being involved. The Fellowship has been an incredible experience for me, not only helping me learn and grow as a professional, but also giving me the opportunity to meet and interact with faculty from across campus. I hope that your review of the information above has sparked or fanned the flame of your interest in SoTL and you'll join the new SoTL Fellow and me in the coming year for some exciting and rewarding opportunities.

---

## **Team Teaching: Dynamics and Realities**

*Harry J. Lasher, Department of Management & Entrepreneurship*

We continue to see the use of "convenient traditional" classroom settings augmented in some instances with technology. Individual teachers continue to "control" the classroom and relish total autonomy with little exploitation of innovative possibilities to involve adult learners in defining and implementing a learning environment. Change is seldom sought on an incremental and/or system-wide basis and implemented using organization design frameworks. Experimentation in enhancing learning using team teaching as an innovative organization design is rare and, when used, has had limited long-lasting success in academic settings.

Questions surface such as: Is team teaching in adult learning environments a reasonable alternative to traditional education delivery? What is team teaching and does it enhance student learning? What causes experiments in team teaching to not have sustained success? How do you define "adult learning" students? Who determines what adult students need and want? Lastly, what causes a "lack of fit," from an organizational design framework, when viewing team teaching as an approach that often results in change resistance in academic settings?

When considering organizational change, whether incremental or system-wide, one must look at the "fit" between organizational elements of strategy, structure, systems and processes, staffing, skills, leadership styles, and rewards. Clearly the dynamic interaction of these elements does not occur independent of current organizational culture as well as external

environmental opportunities, threats, and possibilities. The following will highlight "selected" issues and opportunities, using an organizational design framework, when considering team teaching as a change within an adult academic learning setting.

Pursuing team teaching is not an "either-or" decision and does not have to be made at the institutional level. Therefore, we do not have to look toward system-wide change as providing permission to develop a strategic change by a group of faculty. Typically, the decision to engage in team teaching is made when committed and passionate faculty decide a new approach is appropriate to enhance student learning. Team teaching can reflect a desire to move beyond the knowledge and understanding levels to facilitating student learning at the applications, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation levels (Hornyak & Wenger, 1999). Once the decision is made to design and implement team teaching, all members of the learning community must assume accountability for measuring success and engage in continuous improvement. I realize there are numerous additional strategy opportunities and issues to be considered before the question of structure surfaces.

There are teams and there are teams. Faculty must explore dimensions of teams when engaging in the design and implementation of teaching teams. Course design and delivery varies from low to high levels of faculty collaboration (Benjamin, 2000). It is clear that varying levels of faculty commitment, in terms of time, egos, risk-taking, sharing of control and power, giving up classroom autonomy, colleague-student interaction, and so forth are heavily influenced by degrees of collaboration (Watkins, 1996). For example: Does everyone on the faculty teaching team plan all content and attend all classes? Is there a willingness to be challenged by other faculty as well as students? Do faculty engage in theoretical dialogue and try to "position" themselves, vis-à-vis each other, leaving students to assume a passive role? Do faculty desire to appear periodically and "air-drop" into learning environments and quickly retreat leaving integration and higher levels of learning to chance? Lastly, is it important that students be aware of the levels of collaboration that faculty used in conducting courses; particularly in the planning and assessment aspects of the courses (Davis, 1995).

Perhaps the most important process to consider is what the adult learners want. Jointly the faculty team can engage in dialogue with adult learners, solicit learner wants, and present their ideas as to what faculty feels they need. This information, combined with a "real" knowledge of what professional settings are looking for from graduates, in terms of knowledge and skills (technical, team, and interpersonal), provides an approach for a mutual understanding of all within the learning community. It should be noted, in most professional schools, especially at the graduate level, the "key" customer is the recipient of the graduate and that students are best viewed as the "intermediate customer."

It is imperative that team staffing be voluntary. Faculty need to demonstrate accountability to themselves, other team members, and everyone in the adult learning community. At a minimum faculty team members have to have an understanding of their strengths and developmental needs when working as a team leader and member. Emotional intelligence understanding is critical for faculty to interact effectively in a team-learning environment (Farnham, 1996; Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis,

*(Continued on next page)*

Lasher, continued from Page 2

2002; Shinn, 2003). Competence, cooperation, coordination, commitment, trust and accountability are skill areas all team members should possess. Proactive use of technology to create a learning community and encourage information and experience sharing are important. In addition, listening, soliciting and providing feedback (George & Davis-Wiley, 2000), involving others, and engaging in continuous professional development are among other "key" behaviors to ensure faculty team success.

It is important that faculty be willing to assume leadership roles as well as follower roles during the design and implementation phases of a team-taught course. The issue is not style; rather it is substance. Faculty need to be able to influence and inspire everyone in the learning community to learn and enhance effectiveness in professional pursuits.

Research indicates team faculty report personal growth from the process of collaboration while finding the process professionally challenging and rewarding. In addition, team faculty may acquire new subject matter knowledge and integrative understandings, enhanced pedagogical effectiveness, and enriched social interactions. However, those faculties preoccupied with extrinsic rewards may be quick to point out that that additional time burdens of team teaching detracts from scholarly pursuits, service, and other responsibilities and more money is the solution. Another view of sub-roles suggests that no one person can perform the many roles and skills being required of "stand-alone" teaching and that it would be beneficial for professors and students to engage in collaborative efforts (Bess, 2000).

The dynamics associated with a change, such as team teaching, suggest that one needs to consider all organizational design components when moving forward. I have identified selected "possibilities," "opportunities," and "issues." The reality is that academia will continue to operate in a competitive resource environment. If team (collaborative) teaching is to be a successful change in professional colleges and higher education in general, it will be because a few dedicated and committed teachers see the benefits to adult learners and themselves and are "inner-driven" to make personal and professional sacrifices.

#### References

- Bess, J. L. (2000). *Teaching alone/teaching together: Transforming the structure of teams for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Benjamin, J. (2000). The scholarship of teaching in teams: What does it look like in practice? *Higher Education Research & Development, 19*, 191-204.
- Davis, J. R. (1995). *Interdisciplinary courses and team teaching*. Phoenix: Oryz Press.
- Farnham, A. (1996, January 15). Are you smart enough to keep your job? *Fortune, 35-48*
- George, M. A., & Davis-Wiley, P. (2000). Team teaching a graduate course. *College Teaching, 48*, 75-80.
- Goleman, D., McKee, A., & Boyatzis, R. E. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hornyak, M., & Wenger, M. (1999). Team teaching for higher-level learning: A framework of professional collaboration. *Journal of Management Education, 23*, 311-328.
- Shinn, S. (2003, September/October). *BizEd, 19-23*.
- Watkins, T. (1996). Stage I: Creating a new MBA core with team teaching. *Journal of Management Education, 20*, 411-421.

## Applying the Research and Theory of Cognitive Psychology to Teaching and Learning: The Least You Need to Know

Diane F. Halpern, Claremont McKenna College  
President, American Psychological Association

Like many other members of the Society for Teaching of Psychology, I am often asked to provide "expert" advice for faculty and administrators who a) really care about providing quality learning experiences for their students; b) are embroiled in some controversy (usually involving money and tenure) about teaching; and c) some mix of the two in the same room. I usually have 50 minutes to address this incredibly complex topic, allowing time for questions, audience participation, and the inevitable late start. Given this state of affairs, I often begin my planning with the deep question, "What is the least that faculty need to know about how people think, learn, and remember?"

Unfortunately, the least that new faculty need to know about teaching and learning is that most of higher education is dishonest about this topic. Virtually every document on retention, promotion, and tenure extols the virtues of good teaching and importance of enhancing student learning. College catalogues sell their institutions to prospective students and to the general public by touting the value they place on high quality instruction. Prospective and new students and the general public believe that teaching is the main job of faculty. In fact, what most colleges and universities value is what I have labeled "good enough" teaching. Almost everywhere really awful teachers will find themselves in trouble as they undergo the review process, especially if students complain about poor teaching. Complaining students demand the attention of harried department chairs, who tend to view student complaints about professors as yet another interruption in a workday that is composed entirely of interruptions. When in class, faculty need to do something that "looks like" teaching--they can talk about the subject matter, write something on the board, show some topic-related form of media, bring in a guest lecture who should know something about the topic, have students discuss their own opinions, etc. Of course, none of these activities requires that anyone actually learns anything, nor do they necessarily relate to practices that are known to promote learning--they only have to look like our commonly held beliefs about what teaching looks like. Thus, another contender for the least that faculty need to know about teaching and learning is that face validity--that is the appearance of teaching--is, for most purposes, good enough. Although I do not have any data to support this, I would bet that more professors fall from the rungs of the tenure and promotion ladder because they have too few publications than the number who are not promoted because of poor teaching. There are very few attempts to determine if long lasting learning has occurred. Disgruntled faculty have often complained to me that they are very good teachers, but the students just don't learn--leaving me with a great metaphysical question (whatever that means): If I taught something and no one learned it, what happened?

One reason why high quality teaching is not rewarded is that it is difficult to operationalize and to assess. It is easier to order 100 faculty according to the number of publications that

(Continued on next page)

Halpern, continued from Page 3

they each have than it is to make qualitative distinctions among them regarding how well they teach. But, it is possible to assess learning outcomes and such assessment has been the focus of several STP and APA Board of Educational Affairs books and projects. The Assessment CyberGuide for Learning Goals and Outcomes including an annotated bibliography can be found at [www.apa.org/ed/guide\\_outline.html](http://www.apa.org/ed/guide_outline.html). The problem with the status quo is that teaching that is "good enough" to get faculty through the retention, promotion, and tenure process is not "good enough" for many of our students. It has always been true that our best students will learn well no matter what we do, as long as we inflict no more than minimal harm. But, there are new students on college campuses who need better learning environments, and the workforce they are entering requires more complex skills and abilities than ever before. The number of jobs available in manufacturing is shrinking; those workers with low levels of education can expect more competition for fewer jobs that pay poorly, while at the same time, there is increased demand for a new type of worker--this new job category has been dubbed the "knowledge worker" or the "symbol analyst" (a term that is used by the United States Secretary of Labor), to describe someone who can carry out multi-step operations, manipulate abstract and complex symbols and ideas, acquire new information efficiently, and remain flexible enough to recognize the need for continuing change and for new paradigms for life long learning.

We already have powerful models of human learning that we can use as a guide for the redesign of education for thinking. Cognitive psychology is the empirical branch of psychology that deals with questions about how people think, learn, and remember--how people acquire, utilize, organize, and retrieve information. We study topics like memory, decision making, problem identification and solving, and reasoning. It is clear that a successful pedagogy that can serve as a basis for the enhancement of learning will have to incorporate ideas about the way in which learners organize knowledge and internally represent it, and the way these representations change and resist change when new information is encountered. As faculty concerned with student learning, we need to be teaching so that our students will be able to recall and use the information and skills they are learning now in our classes at some time in the future. In planning learning activities for a class, it helps me to imagine what the students will need to know and be able to do after graduation and the settings they will be in that will be very different from our classroom. In other words, faculty need to think more about teaching for long-term retention and transfer across time and contexts and less about doing something in class that looks like teaching and prepares students for the test we are planning to give in class next week.

In a recent article in *Change*, Milt Hakel and I listed some cognitive principles that promote crossdomain transfer and durable learning, which I summarize here (Halpern & Hakel, 2003): 1) practicing at retrieval: the likelihood of retrieving a response increases as a function of the number of times learners generate the response; 2) varying the conditions at learning: the learning may be more effortful and have more errors, but later performance will be enhanced; 3) re-representing information: transfer can also be enhanced and learning made more durable by having learners re-represent the information in a problem--for example, having them draw a visuospatial display of a word problem or respond in sentences to a visuospatial display;

4) using prior knowledge: an assessment of prior knowledge can be used to correct misunderstanding or reinforce existing domain knowledge; 5) actively engaging attention: these are important determinants of what gets learned and transferred in any setting; 6) recognizing that the learner's activity determines what is learned and transferred: the emphasis should be on the learner and how the teacher directs learning activities. Faculty need to teach for transfer if they want it to occur.

As faculty and administrators in higher education, we are entrusted with the job of designing and delivering the education that students will need when they face novel problems, when the nature of the workplace changes repeatedly, when familiar responses no longer work, when they work at jobs that we can only imagine today. We must do a better job of educating our country's most precious commodity--smart, educated adults who can cope with and chart the direction of the change. I'm glad that I have so many wonderful colleagues in STP to help me meet this challenge.

#### Reference

Halpern, D. F., & Hakel, M. D. (2003). Applying the science of learning to the university and beyond: Teaching for long-term retention and transfer. *Change*, 35(4), 37-41.

NOTE: This article originally appeared in the Spring 2004 Newsletter of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology and is reproduced with the author's permission.

---

## 10 Tips for the First Day of Class

Bill Hill, CETL Director

1. Remember, first impressions are lasting impressions. What are the impressions you want to make?
2. Introductions are important, both for you and for them.
3. Be prepared.
4. Be enthusiastic.
5. Know your students in advance as much as possible. This includes common fears, anxieties, and concerns.
6. Do your "housekeeping chores" (e.g., syllabus), but do not get bogged down in policies and procedures.
7. Give students a chance to speak.
8. Motivate students.
9. Include course content.
10. Arrive early and stay late.

#### Some Online "First Day" Resources

Lieberg, C. (undated). *Ten unspoken questions from new college students during the first days of class*. Retrieved May 14, 2004 from the University of Iowa Center for Teaching Web site: <http://www.uiowa.edu/~centeach/resources/ideas/greatbegin.html>

Lunde, J. P. (undated). *101 things you can do the first three weeks of class*. Retrieved May 14, 2004 from the University of Nebraska, Lincoln Graduate Student Academic & Professional Development Web site: <http://www.unl.edu/gradstud/GSAP/101things.html>

Honolulu Community College. (undated). *Teaching tips index. The first day*. Retrieved May 14, 2004 from Honolulu Community College, Faculty Development Teaching Tips Index Web site: <http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/committees/FacDevCom/guidebk/teachtip/teachtip.htm>