

Concurrent Session One

Thursday, June 16, 10:45 – 11:35 am

C1-1a

10:45 - 11:10 am

Room: Arts 102

Different Perspectives, Shared Priorities: Using various forms of student response in the redesign of a large introductory course

Mairi Cowan, Historical Studies, University of Toronto Mississauga; Tyler Evans-Tokaryk, Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, University of Toronto Mississauga; Cleo Boyd, Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, University of Toronto Mississauga.

C1-1b

11:10 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts102

Multiple-choice Questions on Classroom Tests: How Good Are They?

David DiBattista, Department of Psychology, Brock University

C1-2a

10:45 - 11:10 am

Room: Arts 208

Utilizing Community-Based Participatory Research in the Design Phase of a Service-Learning Research Program Assessing Learning Outcomes

Lori Hanson, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan; Laura Hopkins, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan; Marcel D'Eon, Educational Support and Development, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan; Linda Ferguson, College of Nursing, University of Saskatchewan

C1-2b

11:10 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 208

Enhancing Student Engagement Through Community Service-Learning Projects: Assessing the Impact

Jane Trakalo, Community Studies, Algonquin College; Lorie Hadley, Community Studies, Algonquin College

C1-3a

10:45 - 11:10 am

Room: Arts 211

Contingent Instructors' Engagement in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University;
Tony Ribera, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University; Amy K. Garver,
Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University

C1-3b

11:10 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 211

Investigating the Impact of SoTL Research on the Quality of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education or Completing the 2000-piece Jigsaw Puzzle

Gary Poole, Centre for Health Education Scholarship, University of British Columbia;
Nicola Simmons, Centre for Teaching Excellence (CTE), University of Waterloo

C1-4

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 101

Multidisciplinary Collaboration through Learning Communities: Overcoming the Anxiety

Erin DeLathouwer, University Learning Centre, University of Saskatchewan; Wendy Roy, , College of Arts and Science, University of Saskatchewan; Ann Martin, College of Arts and Science, University of Saskatchewan

C1-5

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 104

Five Dimensions of Learning as Valuing in the University Classroom: A Perspectival View of Diversity in Education

Robert Regnier, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Saskatchewan

C1-6

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 106

VACANT

C1-7

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 108

Learning by Doing: Reaching for the Active Learning Horizon

Colleen Sharen, Management and Organizational Studies, Brescia University
College, University of Western Ontario

C1-8

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 214

Developing an Educational Technology Group for Pre-Service Teachers

Jay Wilson, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Saskatchewan

C1-9

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 109

Create the right workplace environment for continuous learning by teaching faculty

Annemarieke Hoekstra, Department of Teaching and Academic Development,
Northern Alberta Institute of Technology

C1-10

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 105

The 'e-portfolio' - promoting professional development and reflective practice

Arlis McQuarrie, School of Physical Therapy, University of Saskatchewan; Peggy
Proctor, School of Physical Therapy, University of Saskatchewan

C1-11

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 217

**Teaching effective citation skills : a case of reducing plagiarism or increasing
critical academic engagement?**

Iris Vardi, Curtin Business School Learning and Teaching Centre, Curtin University

C1-12

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 212

Advanced Training Using Clickers

Cyril M. Coupal, ITS, University of Saskatchewan; Kalyani Premkumar, College of Medicine, University of Saskatchewan

C1-13

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 206

Cross-Cultural Learning Among Feminist Qualitative Research and English as Acquired Language Students

Marie Lovrod, Women's and Gender Studies, University of Saskatchewan; Gloria Forbes, Language Centre, University of Saskatchewan; Gina DiPaolo, Language Centre, University of Saskatchewan

C1-14

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 200

Engaging Students with Interactive Lectures using Case-Based Studies

Lovaye Kajiura, McMaster University; Colin J. Montpetit, University of Ottawa

C1-15

10:45 - 11:35 am

Room: Arts 213

Toward Deeper Understanding of the Diverse Undergraduate Experience of our Students: The Assessment Seminar at Mount Royal University

Jim Zimmer, Faculty of Teaching and Learning, Mount Royal University

Concurrent Session One

C1-1a
Room: Arts 102

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:10 am

Different Perspectives, Shared Priorities: Using various forms of student response in the redesign of a large introductory course

Mairi Cowan, Historical Studies, University of Toronto-Mississauga; Tyler Evans-Tokaryk, Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, University of Toronto-Mississauga; Cleo Boyd, Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, University of Toronto-Mississauga.

Research Track

Abstract:

How do we know what students should be learning in a first-year course? The needs of the department, the instructor's previous experiences, and the availability of resources all normally influence course design, but is there a way to incorporate the insights of students beyond the blunt instrument of standard course evaluations (Gravestock and Gregor-Greenleaf, 2008)? For several decades, scholars of teaching and learning have been championing the importance of assessing student learning, and several valuable strategies have emerged both for general postsecondary teaching (Angelo and Cross, 1993; Fink, 2003; Strachan, 2008; Bowman, 2010), and for more discipline-specific contexts (Adams et al., 2006; Agrawal and Khan, 2008). Not all disciplines are equally engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning, however, and little information is currently available to historians wishing to understand levels of understanding among first-year students and best practices for improving student learning (Pace, 2004).

This presentation will explore how a teaching team at the University of Toronto Mississauga is drawing on several forms of student response to order to inform the priorities of HIS101: Introduction to Historical Studies. Participants at this session will be introduced to the methods and results of a survey given to upper-year students to identify the gaps between high school preparation and university expectations; anonymous tests administered at various points throughout the first two semesters of HIS101 to measure student understanding; and ongoing, low-stakes assessments of student learning through online quizzes and clicker questions in lecture.

Theme: Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Audience: TA Developers Special Interest Group; Writing Centre Special Interest Group; Educational Developers; General

Keywords: discipline-specific scholarship of teaching and learning; teaching teams; skills instruction; research and writing; historical studies.

C1-1b
Room: Arts102

Thursday, 11:10 - 11:35 am

Multiple-Choice Questions on Classroom Tests: How Good Are They?

David DiBattista, Department of Psychology, Brock University

Research Track

Abstract:

Multiple-choice (MC) items are widely used on classroom tests in colleges and universities, and they often account for a substantial portion of students' course grades. Detailed guidelines for creating high-quality MC items are readily available (e.g., Haladyna, 2004), but we know surprisingly little about the quality of the MC items actually being used in university classrooms. To address this question, we examined undergraduates' responses to 1198 MC items on sixteen classroom tests in various disciplines.

A major determinant of the quality of a MC item is its discriminatory power, which reflects the extent to which higher-achieving students are more likely than lower-achieving students to answer the item correctly (Haladyna, 2004). Accordingly, for each item in our sample, we measured discriminatory power by computing the discrimination coefficient, which is the correlation between students' scores on the item (1 if answered correctly, and 0 otherwise) and their scores on the test. Discrimination coefficients, which can range from -1 to +1, should be positive, and the higher the value, the better. We evaluated the discrimination coefficients of MC items with reference to widely accepted benchmarks proposed by Ebel (Ebel, 1979).

Overall, 15% of items had discrimination coefficients greater than +0.40 and thus were strong discriminators. However, more than 30% of items were unsatisfactory discriminators, having coefficients below Ebel's minimal benchmark value of +0.20, and 4% of items actually had negative coefficients. The discriminatory power of items varied greatly across tests, with mean coefficients for tests ranging from a respectable +0.33 down to a rather dismal +0.20. On five tests, more than

80% of items had satisfactory coefficients, but on three tests, fewer than 60% of items had satisfactory coefficients. These findings suggest that there is room for substantial improvement in the quality of the MC items used on classroom tests.

An item's discrimination coefficient depends heavily on the effectiveness of its distractors (i.e., the incorrect options). There are two commonly accepted criteria for distractor effectiveness. First, the distractor must be selected by at least some examinees, with 5% being the commonly used cutoff. And second, the distractor must be selected more often by lower-scoring than by higher-scoring examinees. Of the 3819 distractors in our data set, more than one-third were flawed because they did not meet the first criterion, and about one-sixth were flawed because they did not meet the second criterion. Overall, 45% of distractors failed to meet at least one of these criteria, and thus only 55% of distractors actually functioned effectively.

A knowledgeable instructor with access to item-analysis information can readily identify which of the MC items used on a test have unsatisfactory discriminatory power and which distractors in those items are not functioning effectively. The instructor can then use this information to improve the quality of individual MC items before re-using them on subsequent tests. Because item-analysis information can be used to improve the quality of MC items, postsecondary institutions have a responsibility to provide this information to instructors in a user-friendly format following every MC test that they administer. In addition, institutions should provide their instructors with the training and support that they need to correctly interpret an item-analysis report and to improve their MC items for future use.

This research presentation will be moderately interactive. Participants will have the opportunity (a) to learn the basic elements of MC item analysis, (b) to learn about the quality of MC items that are being used on classroom tests, and (c) to understand the importance of using item analysis information to improve the quality of MC items.

Theme: Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Audience: General

Keywords: assessment, classroom testing, multiple choice, discrimination coefficient, distractor analysis

C1-2a
Room: Arts 208

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:10 am

Utilizing Community-Based Participatory Research in the Design Phase of a Service-Learning Research Program Assessing Learning Outcomes

Lori Hanson, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan; Laura Hopkins, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan; Marcel D'Eon, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan; Linda Ferguson, College of Nursing, University of Saskatchewan

Research Track

Abstract:

The purpose of this presentation is to describe and reflect on the use of community-based participatory research methods in the design phase of a service-learning research program initialized between the University of Saskatchewan and the Student Wellness Initiative Toward Community Health (SWITCH), a student-run initiative in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. The research team sought to consult with future participants regarding their perspectives on the practicality, feasibility and perceived effectiveness of our research design and data collection instruments. In this presentation, we report on our effort to maximize student collaboration in the design phase of the proposed research. We carried out an innovative scoping exercise that involved student consultation regarding both our proposed methodological approach and data collection tools. This activity proved quite useful, allowing the research team to gain numerous insights and adapt study design and instruments accordingly. The presentation reflects on the process of engaging participant stakeholders in the design process of a service-learning research study, and the importance of this activity in light of CBPR principles. Additionally, it demonstrates a unique approach to strengthening the ties between a community organization and an institute of higher learning through collaborative research.

Learning Objectives: Introducing the audience to the use of CBPR methods at a service-learning site; Providing the audience with a discussion of the value of CBPR principles in assessing learning outcomes; Identifying research methods and procedures that students prefer in educational research.

Session Description: Depending on the time allotted for our session, our presentation will include some combination of the following: Following a short descriptive presentation of the study and results, participants in the session will be

provided with time for discussion (in small groups if warranted), guided by questions and issues raised by the presentation.

Theme: Experiential Learning

Audience: College Educators Special Interest Group; Educational Developers; General

Keywords: service-learning, community-based participatory research, experiential learning, study design

C1-2b
Room: Arts 208

Thursday, 11:10 - 11:35 am

Enhancing Student Engagement Through Community Service-Learning Projects: Assessing the Impact

Jane Trakalo, Community Studies, Algonquin College; Lorie Hadley, Community Studies, Algonquin College

Research Track

Abstract:

When developing curriculum one aims to maximize student engagement and ignite learning that moves beyond the classroom environment. Over the last 10 years curricular Community Service-Learning (CSL) is gaining momentum in Canadian University and College classrooms. Supporters of CSL view it as a transformative educational strategy that enhances the quality of the student experience and assists in the development of engaged citizenship.

This session will describe an innovative research project conducted in the Child and Youth Worker Program at Algonquin College. The purpose of the project is to determine if developing a curricular CSL course enhances student engagement. As a means to measuring engagement students will participate in a focus group and complete a survey.

Students in the project are divided into six seminar classes that consist of 10 - 12 students. Two sections of the class are assigned to work with community partners, Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Ottawa, the Ottawa Boys and Girls Club, and T.E.M.B.O., (Tanzania Education and Micro-Business Opportunity), an international organization meeting the educational and economic business needs of girls and women in Tanzania. The students complete a needs assessment for

each agency followed by the development and implementation of a CSL project to support the identified agency need. The CSL follows a curricular model where the professor teaches concepts that support the project such as team work, professional deportment, problem-solving and conflict resolution. Each class includes a team meeting facilitated by a rotating student chair which allows the professor to observe skill development. Faculty participate in the CSL projects as well as an evening of celebration with the students and community agency representatives.

Session participants will gain an understanding of the methodologies incorporated to measure student engagement as well as a copy of the survey administered to students. The findings of the survey and focus groups will be summarized and the conclusions of the project will be presented.

Theme: Experiential Learning

Audience: College Educators Special Interest Group; Educational Developers; Administrators; General

Keywords: community service-learning, curricular, curriculum design, experiential learning, program design, student engagement, college education

C1-3a
Room: Arts 211

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:10 am

Contingent Instructors' Engagement in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University; Tony Ribera, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University; Amy K. Garver, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University

Research Track

Abstract:

At institutions of higher education across the U.S. and Canada, instructors ineligible for tenure teach many undergraduate courses (AFT, 2010; Lin, 2006). Some scholars have suggested that this may have a negative effect on student learning, since these contingent instructors interact less with students and are less likely to use active and collaborative learning techniques (Umbach, 2007). As the number of contingent instructors continues to increase, it is essential to know more about their practices and perceptions. In this research presentation, using data from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), we will discuss contingent

instructors' level of engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and the extent to which they perceive institutional encouragement of SoTL as well as explore the differences in practices and perceptions by tenure and employment status.

Huber and Hutchings' (2005) defining features of SoTL (questioning, gathering and exploring evidence, trying out and refining new insights, and going public) serve as the framework for our dependent measures in this study looking at institutional encouragement of SoTL and instructor engagement in SoTL. Instructors at 49 higher education institutions were invited to complete a set of items on SoTL added to the end of the FSSE questionnaire. FSSE measures instructor perceptions and expectations of undergraduate student engagement in educationally purposeful activities as well as the extent to which instructors promote student learning and development in their courses and interactions with students (Kuh, Nelson Laird & Umbach, 2004). The participating institutions represent a wide cross-section of baccalaureate-granting institutions. Slightly over half of the institutions were private (53%). Undergraduate enrollments ranged from just over 200 students to slightly over 20,000, with a mean of 5,800. After deleting cases for missing data, the sample for this study consisted of 4,229 faculty members. Various ranks and employment statuses were represented with 13% of the respondents being part-time lecturers, 11% full-time lecturers, 28% assistant professors, 25% associate professors, and 23% full professors.

Looking at the results from this study, holding perceptions of institutional support and other characteristics constant, tenure-track professors participate in SoTL more than non-tenure-track lecturers. Interestingly, the model on institutional encouragement suggests that, non-tenure-track lecturers actually perceive slightly greater encouragement than their tenure-track colleagues, though the differences are not significant. Are non-tenure-track faculty simply less likely to use effective educational practices in general (Umbach, 2007) and therefore SoTL in particular or are there barriers to engagement in SoTL that could be removed by institutions? This presentation will discuss findings and explore these questions further. By attending this session, participants will gain a better understanding of:

1. The defining features of SoTL,
2. FSSE,
3. Contingent instructor engagement in SoTL and perceived institutional encouragement of SoTL, and
4. Differences in engagement and perceived institutional encouragement by tenure and employment status.

Theme: Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Audience: General

Keywords: scholarship of teaching and learning, contingent instructors, institutional encouragement

C1-3b
Room: Arts 211

Thursday, 11:10 - 11:35 am

Investigating the Impact of SoTL Research on the Quality of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education or Completing the 2000-piece Jigsaw Puzzle

Gary Poole, Centre for Health Education Scholarship, University of British Columbia; Nicola Simmons, Centre for Teaching Excellence (CTE), University of Waterloo

Research Track

Abstract:

As a movement, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning holds considerable promise for higher education's horizon (Poole, 2009). The burning question is: To what extent is this promise being realized? For answers, we can look at publication records, the emergence of societies, conferences, and institutional units, and narratives describing career impact. While all of these indicators are meaningful, none is more meaningful than the potential impact SoTL research can have on the quality of teaching and learning in our higher education institutions.

Higher education sectors the world over have grappled with definitions and measures of 'quality' (e.g., Ramsden, 1991; Saarinen, 2010). Nevertheless, this has not stopped governments and others from establishing major initiatives to assess this quality. In this assessment, student learning has always proven challenging in terms of determining cause-effect relationships (Finnie & Usher, 2005). This is especially true when learning is assessed on more macroscopic levels, such as at institutional or system-wide levels. Thus, we must begin with more microscopic analyses of the impact of specific SoTL projects on the learning of targeted students and then combine these narratives to get a broader picture of impact.

Objectives:

In this session, participants will:

1. Develop a greater understanding of the challenges of determining cause-effect relationships between SoTL research and the quality of teaching and learning;

2. Work with specific examples of SoTL research to improve our ability to draw links between the research and teaching and learning quality, writ large;
3. Bring examples of their own to begin developing the bigger picture regarding the cumulative effects of SoTL on teaching and learning quality.

Session Plan:

We will provide a general overview of the forms that 'quality assessment' has taken in the UK, Australia, and Canada. We will describe research we are undertaking as part of an edited international publication on quality in higher education. Working in small groups, participants will consider the extent to which a collection of actual SoTL projects allow for an assessment of the impact of the project on student learning. Participants will be asked to consider the following questions:

1. Is student learning a research endpoint in the study?
2. If so, how is learning operationalized? If not, what is the endpoint?
3. To what extent can these results be generalized to other learning environments?
4. How might the results of this study be combined with other SoTL research to develop a more general understanding of the impact of SoTL on quality in higher education?

Participants will then bring in examples of their own to add to those used to consider the questions in part 3. We will conclude with an open discussion of:

5. What can we learn from the exercises featured in parts 3 and 4?
6. If you were to investigate the relationship between SoTL research and quality in higher education how would you go about it?

Theme: Program Level Outcomes and Quality

Audience: General

Keywords: scholarship of teaching and learning, quality in higher education, impact on student learning

C1-4
Room: Arts 101

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

**Multidisciplinary Collaboration through Learning Communities:
Overcoming the Anxiety**

**Erin DeLathouwer, University Learning Centre, University of Saskatchewan;
Wendy Roy, Department of English, University of Saskatchewan; Ann Martin,
Department of English, University of Saskatchewan**

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

The Learning Communities programme at the University of Saskatchewan is an initiative that provides support for students as they enter the first year of university. Students enrolled in a Learning Community (LC) are registered in a set of 2-3 common courses and meet weekly with two upper-year peer mentors. Students are encouraged to participate in activities that extend their learning outside the classroom environment. The main goal of the LC programme is to foster connections between the people who make up First Year LCs by fostering connections between the concepts, issues, and ideas taught in the different courses students take.

Surveys of students who have participated in Learning Communities have indicated a high level of satisfaction with their experiences. Nevertheless, feedback also suggests that students remain challenged by recognizing the connections between different disciplines. The challenge we face is thus two-fold: how to encourage students to make connections between apparently disparate fields and how to encourage faculty to enable students to see those points of intersection.

This presentation will ask participants to experience the U of S Learning Communities programme from the perspective of both students and faculty members faced with the challenge of multidisciplinary collaboration. Following an introduction, the first exercise, a small-group activity, will replicate a first-year student's experience of making connections between material from different courses. The three short readings that participants will encounter will be derived from the course cluster that included a first-year English course. Participants will be asked to find common issues that link the readings from English, History, and Native Studies. Those common concerns will then become the basis of the next activity. The second exercise will ask all participants to replicate the experience of a faculty member who has been approached to participate in a multidisciplinary discussion with a First Year LC. The topic of the discussion is one of the issues derived from the first exercise, and the task of all participants will be to consider a way in which his/her own field of knowledge intersects with that subject. In concluding the session, 2 or 3 participants will be encouraged to share their ideas with the larger group, spurring discussion that spills outside of the session's classroom walls, just as it does when successfully enacted by First-Year Learning Communities.

There are three main session objectives/ learning outcomes for this presentation:

1. Participants will be able to list the challenges that face students and faculty members who participate in First Year LCs.

2. Participants will find common ground between diverse disciplines by generating new topics for multidisciplinary collaboration and debate.
3. Participants will leave with tools they can apply to their own institution's effort to introduce multidisciplinary to first-year students.

Implicit in these outcomes is our main goal, which is to refine the concept of Learning Communities through consultation in order to generate a stronger sense of connection between people, disciplines, the university, and the global communities to which they belong.

Theme: Communities of Practice, Learning Communities

Audience: College Educators Special Interest Group; Educational Developers; General

Keywords: learning community, multidisciplinary, collaboration

C1-5
Room: Arts 104

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Five Dimensions of Learning as Valuing in the University Classroom: A Perspectival View of Diversity in Education

Robert Regnier, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Saskatchewan

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

The basic objective of this session is to introduce audience members to the five dimensions of learning as valuing. Members will be able to: a. conceptually and practically comprehend the notion of learning as valuing particularly as differentiated from learning as knowing; b. appreciate the theoretical framework in process philosophy from which it is advanced; and c. differentiate the five dimensions of learning in theory and practice. The core of objective is to have the audience recognize how learning can be appreciated not as knowledge nor as values but rather as an insistent process of 'valuing' through which the learner is created and recreated as value.

This session will show how the notion of learning as valuing locates learning within a framework that not only appreciates each learner's perspective as central to method but as the central purpose for learning. It will present learners not only as

having perspectives on the universe but more fundamentally as 'being' a perspective of the universe where the ultimate purpose of education is to have learners project themselves as 'superjects,' not just subjects, into greater harmony and purpose. Within this perspective, what is significant for university instructors to appreciate is how to support the freedom of learners by accommodating the lure of what is interesting and important from their situatedness that leads to the commitment of self-disciplined and focused investigation which produces new practical freedom through the utilization of wisdom.

More specifically, the session will have audience members appreciate the basic meaning of learning as valuing through its five dimensions so that each member can potentially redesign their own teaching practice. Through a power point assisted lecture presentation on core concepts in relation to my own teaching practice and through application of a participatory handout, group discussion and feedback, the audience will be guided into considering how useful the idea of learning as valuing might be to their own teaching practice and theorizing.

The five dimensions of learning as valuing are based on: a. learner ecstasy of continuous selective self-emergence into the insistent present; b. pre-conceptual selection of worth and purpose in one's subjective aim; c. transmuted contrasting and adjustment of experienced qualities and categories; d. lures that differentiate what could possibly be from of what is; and e. conscious perception and judgment of what is and ought to be. These five dimensions are contrasted with 'inert' teaching practices that a. ignore or objectify learner self-emergence; b. impose categories that deny or pre-empt learner pre-conceptual unity of experience; c. impose contrasts of qualities and categories that lack lived meaning; d. recommend proposals or propositions with little lived resonance for possibility in learner experience; and e. foster or impose events that constrain or delimit perception and judgment of what should be. The presentation will be twenty-five minutes and the audience participation will be twenty-five minutes.

Theme: Diversity and Inclusive Practice in Higher Education

Audience: General

Keywords: learning, valuing, philosophy of education, perspective, a.n. whitehead

C1-6
Room: Arts 106

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

VACANT

C1-7
Room: Arts 108

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Learning by Doing: Reaching for the Active Learning Horizon

**Colleen Sharen, Management and Organizational Studies, Brescia University
College at the University of Western Ontario**

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

Despite significant evidence that active learning pedagogies improve student performance (Hake, 1998), many professors are reluctant to use active learning as a primary instruction method in their classrooms. This session will use a case study to illustrate the benefits and drawbacks of moving to an entirely active learning based course design.

Our discussion will include the fears that professors face when letting go of the lecturn, the lessons that were learned in the process of developing and delivering such a course, and the outcomes, good and bad, of this approach.

Learning Objectives:

At the end of this session, participants will:

- 1) Understand the implications of active learning on course assessment.
- 2) Demonstrate knowledge of the implications of active learning methods on the instructor's personal identity.
- 3) Identify the fears that many instructors have about moving to a 100% active learning instruction methodology.
- 4) Discuss the benefits and pitfalls of exclusively using an active learning approach.

Participants will be engaged in active learning using pair and share techniques; large group discussion; and by participating in a sample class learning exercise. Group exercises will be used to discuss instructors' fears about changing pedagogies, and about the lessons learned from the case study. There will be limited use of powerpoint in this presentation.

Theme: Creative Practices: Teaching, Assessment, and Evaluation

Audience: General

Keywords: active learning, experiential learning,

C1-8
Room: Arts 214

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Developing an Educational Technology Group for Pre-Service Teachers

Jay Wilson, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Saskatchewan

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

The College of Education Technology Group is a second year pilot that supports Teacher Candidate's understanding and integration of technology. The volunteer students meet weekly as a group and also spend a minimum of one half day in Saskatoon schools. Teacher Candidates who choose to participate are required to commit for the entire school year. Partner schools are chosen based on potential benefit to their students. To date participants include the English as an Additional Language program at Walter Murray and the general student body at Oskayak High School (Saskatoon's only First Nations High School). Teacher Candidates work with the students in technology-based projects that support their learning and their engagement with school. Projects include science fair displays, music videos, personal narratives and cultural multimedia presentations. The TCs develop their skills in EAL as well as improve their understanding of different cultural aspects related to teaching. This innovative program is based on the major goals of the College and the University. The pilot has improved the student experience by facilitating the creation of deeper meaning around theory and allowing for reflection in a supportive collaborative manner. It is also important to provide place-based instruction to our TCs. Through engaging Teacher Candidates with local schools the program is enhancing technology-based learning in the classroom for in-service teachers and their students, especially those from First Nations and

other Cultural backgrounds. The group works across boundaries with students in various teaching and learning settings to assist in developing valuable skills the TCs will apply as future classroom teachers. The program has an emphasis on increasing the social and cultural awareness of our TCs. This is especially important with the current need for teachers sensitive to the needs of First Nations students and with the rapid growth of new ethnic groups in the province. The presentation will share the outcomes of the pilot and how they might assist in our understanding of the application of technology and how best to provide an optimal learning experience for our teacher candidates.

Theme: Innovation with Technology

Audience: General; Educational Developers; College Educators Special Interest Group

Keywords: pre-service learning, authentic learning, technology, teacher training, education

C1-9
Room: Arts 109

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Create the right workplace environment for continuous learning by teaching faculty

Annemarieke Hoekstra, Department of Teaching and Academic Development, Northern Alberta Institute of Technology

Organizational Change Track

Abstract:

Continuous learning and development by teaching faculty is a necessity in educational institutions that aim to be responsive to societal, educational, and industry changes. It is therefore important to create a workplace environment that supports and fosters continuous learning and development by faculty. In this interactive session, you will explore the cultural and structural organizational factors that might foster or hinder learning by teaching faculty. You will obtain an overview of workplace conditions to consider in assessing your own workplace, engage in group discussion, and generate ideas to further improve the workplace as a learning environment.

As a background for exploring the diversity of cultural and structural factors in your own organization that might foster or hinder formal and informal learning by

teaching faculty, this session draws on research on workplace learning (Coetzer, 2007; Ellinger & Cseh, 2007), as well as research on teacher learning (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009), and faculty development (Camblin & Steger, 2000; Cottrell & Jones, 2003). Informal workplace learning occurs through activities such as receiving feedback, collaborating with colleagues, researching new teaching methods, and reflecting on one's own teaching practice (Lohman, 2006). Conditions in the learning environment that foster such activities include managerial support for learning (Bryson, Pajo, Ward, & Mallon, 2006), physical proximity to colleagues, and relationships with colleagues (Berg & Chyung, 2008). The presenter will also draw on her own experience as a facilitator of a learning community for department chairs that has the goal to foster faculty learning in the workplace.

Intended audience: Faculty, administrators and educational developers who work at institutions where teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty, such as colleges, university colleges, Collège d'enseignement general et professional, and polytechnic institutions.

Theme: Communities of Practice, Learning Communities

Audience: Educational Developers; Administrators; General

Keywords: faculty development, workplace conditions, professional learning communities

C1-10
Room: Arts 105

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

The 'e-portfolio' - promoting professional development and reflective practice

Arlis McQuarrie, School of Physical Therapy, University of Saskatchewan; Peggy Proctor, School of Physical Therapy, University of Saskatchewan

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

A clinical electronic portfolio (e-portfolio) is an individualized self-portrait of one's clinical competence development maintained in electronic format. The School of Physical Therapy, College of Medicine, University of Saskatchewan, implemented a clinical portfolio with the initiation of a new program, a Master of Physical Therapy, (MPT) in August, 2007. This clinical e-portfolio is collated and maintained

throughout the whole of the MPT program, primarily associated with the five clinical practice courses (~ one thousand and two hundred hours of experiential learning).

Health sciences professions' licensing boards increasingly require the maintenance of an annual professional, or clinical, portfolio, which shows evidence of continuing professional development, in order to be licensed and renew licensure. The implementation of a clinical e-portfolio prepares the students for the expectation of demonstrating evidence of continuing professional development in practice. It is also an approach to teaching, learning and tracking clinical and professional development in MPT clinical practice courses.

The new clinical e-portfolio implemented in August, 2008, was the result of almost two years of development funded by a Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) project. In phase two of the TEL project, we designed, customized and implemented a clinical practice e-portfolio system using the open source software Mahara. It is a collection of evidence which demonstrates the continuing acquisition of skills, knowledge, attitudes, understanding and achievements in clinical practice courses. This approach to teaching the student the importance of reflecting on, monitoring and planning for one's professional development as a life-long skill is an emerging new component of clinical courses in physical therapy programs in the Canadian environment.

The implementation of the clinical e-portfolio required carefully designed orientation sessions. The orientation sessions are conducted in computer labs and include live application of the primary activities expected in the use of the e-portfolio while in the MPT. The orientation sessions are further integrated with the theory courses occurring at the same time: Professional Practice I and Case Integration II. The presentation will include detail of all components of the e-portfolio, the method of orientation integration with other courses and the evaluation to date.

The e-portfolio is used to monitor clinical experiences, (the required mix of diagnostic, assessment and treatment experiences while in the program). In addition it is expected that the e-portfolio will: show professional development, develop reflective practice skills, allow assessment of one's learning and promote interpretive inquiry. The content of the Mahara, MPT e-portfolio includes sections for: an individual profile, learning styles, clinical practice course assignments, experience tracking in the form of checklists, continuing education, journaling, personal artifacts and career and learning path goals.

The primary objective for the presentation is to show the broad application of an electronic portfolio in development and tracking of professional skills, attitudes and behaviors, as well as recommended software application and components of a

clinical portfolio. Participants will see a live demonstration of components of the School of Physical Therapy e-portfolio.

Theme: Innovation with Technology

Audience: General

Keywords: portfolio, professional development, reflective practice, technology

C1-11
Room: Arts 217

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Teaching effective citation skills : a case of reducing plagiarism or increasing critical academic engagement?

Iris Vardi, Curtin Business School Learning and Teaching Centre, Curtin University

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

Concerns about plagiarism and students' abilities to cite are as strong today as they have ever been with exhortations for students to be taught directly about the need for academic integrity. This session explores the differences between expert and student citation, the skills underlying effective use of citation, and the problems students have in citing effectively. It compares the messages that beginning students receive about citation when the focus is on academic integrity, plagiarism and punishment with approaches that focus on critical engagement with subject matter. It reports on the prevalence of plagiarism and the development of citation skills in student writing in a unit which in one semester adopted an academic integrity approach and in another semester adopted a critical engagement approach.

Theme: Creative Practices: Teaching, Assessment, and Evaluation

Audience: General; Educational Developers; Writing Centre Special Interest Group; College Educators Special Interest Group

Keywords: plagiarism, citation and referencing, student writing

C1-12
Room: Arts 212

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Advanced Training Using Clickers

**Cyril M. Coupal, Information Technology Services, University of Saskatchewan;
Kalyani Premkumar, College of Medicine, University of Saskatchewan**

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

Clickers are well known for engaging students in the presentation of course content, through polls where a question is posed and students submit their responses using the handheld clicker device. Instant feedback of the results can be used to gather attention, produce a sense of community, assess initial understanding before beginning a topic to guide discussion, for contingent teaching, and formative assessment to determine understanding after a topic has been presented. When a session is distributed over multiple remote sites, different clicker technology must be used to gain similar advantages.

Newer clickers have feedback windows that allow more sophisticated interaction. Clickers can also be used for paper-based self-paced assessments. In addition, using clickers, responses from multiple versions of an exam can be collected synchronously by a single computer/receiver combination.

In this interactive session participants will discuss various scenarios where advanced features and capabilities of the clicker system can be used to facilitate teaching and learning.

Theme: Innovation with Technology

**Audience: College Educators Special Interest Group; Educational Developers;
General**

Keywords: clicker, clickers, assessment, engagement, distributed learning, remote site, self-paced exam

C1-13
Room: Arts 206

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Cross-Cultural Learning Among Feminist Qualitative Research and English-as-Acquired Language Students

Marie Lovrod, Women's and Gender Studies, University of Saskatchewan; Gloria Forbes, Language Centre, University of Saskatchewan; Gina DiPaolo, Language Centre, University of Saskatchewan

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

The University of Saskatchewan Women's and Gender Studies program and Language Centre have piloted a collaborative project, linking international language learners and advanced academic students in an innovative knowledge building venture. Students of feminist qualitative research must become fluent in theories and practices that address local/global knowledge politics, to develop research questions, instruments and reporting methods that respect diverse knowledge frames.

An important hurdle facing international students attending post secondary institutions in Canada is the level of language acquisition required for program entry. These students “. . . need to learn in their L2 not only the ‘information’ of content areas but how to gather, synthesize, and evaluate information, and organize ideas on their own. . .” (Pally, 2000). They face the added challenge of social integration in an academic setting with peers who may have different educational experiences. Shared learning opportunities enable international students to interact in meaningful ways with local peers in processes that support integration. “Beyond grammatical and discourse elements in communication, we are probing the nature of social, cultural, and pragmatic features of language” (Brown, 1994:78), “making the world in which we live intelligible to [one another].” (Alexander, 2005).

Students share both classroom learning and a small “field project,” using participant observer methods. Faculty members from both classes prepare students with concepts and vocabulary relevant to each learning task. All students complete individual evaluations and discuss shared experiences as part of class assignments. Students in both groups learn to ask more open-ended questions and to navigate shifting world views with greater ease. All confirm that considerable cross-cultural learning takes place; desire for access to the project is high on both sides.

Working in a structured and supported social environment to explore feminist research methods has proven to be a valuable authentic language and experiential learning opportunity for both groups. All are exposed to concepts and materials that lead to inclusive understandings of the educational environment as social sphere. As such, the project provides a “positive opportunity structure” for “institutional advocacy” (Masson and Dufour, 2010). Feminist research methods, which attend to diverse situational variables, permit international students to approach the educational environment from a critical research perspective, to articulate their social understandings, and to cultivate success and integration toward future educational endeavors. Learning opportunities that nurture inclusion benefit not only international students, but help to educate and sensitize domestic students to the diversity of knowledges, traditions and perspectives they will encounter in international arenas of education, business, and culture.

This panel invites audience members to: participate in examining the project of integrating acquired English language students in a Canadian academic environment; explore how shared advanced academic projects can enhance learning for all participants; and develop “first thoughts” on applications in other contexts. “Guided activities and projects that gradually lead students to successful cross-cultural encounters, rather than misunderstandings, give students confidence for future cross-cultural interactions” (Rivers, 1987). The importance of providing Canadian and international students with meaningful, academically focused, cross-cultural interactions is explored and confirmed through participatory approaches.

Theme: Diversity and Inclusive Practice in Higher Education

Audience: General

Keywords: cross-cultural learning, language acquisition, qualitative research, learning conversations, social integration, inclusive/innovative practice

C1-14
Room: Arts 200

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Engaging Students with Interactive Lectures using Case-Based Studies

Lovaye Kajiura, Department of Biology, McMaster University; Colin J. Montpetit, Department of Biology, University of Ottawa

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

The utilization of case based studies has been shown to enhance student engagement and improve learning outcomes (Dunne and Brooks, 2004; Schiller and Herreid, 2010). Case based studies effectively expose students to the process of science and encourages students to apply the fundamental concepts taught in lectures. During the process of using case based studies, students to work through facts, analyze data, formulate solutions, draw conclusions, and predict consequences. In this interactive presentation, we will explore the value of using case based studies in lectures to promote interdisciplinary learning and reveal “real world” integrated linkages amongst lecture concepts. We will discuss the benefits and concerns of using case based studies in several diverse academic settings. We will guide participants through activities to facilitate the formulation of case based studies including selecting your topic, searching for references, prioritizing key concepts, formulating your case study, editing, and refining your study. We will also review and demonstrate different methods of delivery of case studies. In addition, we will display how classroom response systems (iClickers) may be used to promote active learning in lectures that employ case studies. The primary objective of this presentation is to provide practical strategies to assist educators in the preparation, implementation, evaluation, and refinement of collaborative interactive case based activities.

Theme: Creative Practices: Teaching, Assessment, and Evaluation

Audience: General

Keywords: case based studies, learning outcomes, classroom response systems

C1-15
Room: Arts 213

Thursday, 10:45 - 11:35 am

Toward Deeper Understanding of the Diverse Undergraduate Experience of our Students: The Assessment Seminar at Mount Royal University

Jim Zimmer, Faculty of Teaching and Learning, Mount Royal University

Innovative Practice Track

Abstract:

The Mount Royal Assessment Seminar is an ongoing research project in which rich, qualitative data about aspects of the undergraduate experience is gathered from Mount Royal students through structured one-on-one interviews. The approach is

grounded in hearing first-hand from students, in depth and in their own words, about issues of importance to them. The project is modeled on the Assessment Seminar initiative at Harvard University, described in Richard Light's (2001) "Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds."

In its first year (2009-10), and in the context of institutional transition to university status, the focus of the Assessment Seminar was the early undergraduate experience (broadly-defined) of students enrolled in Mount Royal's recently-launched baccalaureate programs. Members of the Assessment Seminar - close to 50 students, faculty, staff and administrators from across the institution - designed and tested a protocol for use in student interviews through a mix of small group and large group discussion. Questions included in the protocol arose from discussions concerning the characteristics of excellence in undergraduate education, predictors of student success, and aspects of the undergraduate experience that members wished to interrogate. The interview instrument contained 23 open-ended questions addressing areas such as motivation for attending Mount Royal, readiness for post-secondary study, advising, orientation, teaching and learning, campus environment, engagement in student life, and barriers/enablers to success.

Data was collected through one-on-one interviews with approximately 100 degree-seeking students in March 2010. Interviewees were recruited from a randomly generated pool of baccalaureate students, weighted by program size. Interviews were approximately 60 minutes in length and were conducted by trained student interviewers. All interviews were audio-captured and transcribed. Analysis of the data is being led by a team of faculty researchers (members of the Assessment Seminar) and has yielded a number of interesting preliminary findings. Further analysis of the data is in process, and is expected to be complete by May 2011.

In concert with other student data sources such as NSSE, the Assessment Seminar at MRU fosters an evidence-based approach to the ongoing enhancement of students' undergraduate experience. Future rounds of interviews will explore other areas of strategic importance to Mount Royal, and may focus on at-risk populations such as aboriginal and first-generation students.

This presentation reports on the Assessment Seminar's first year of work - how it was undertaken, findings, responses, lessons learned and next steps. Participants in this interactive session will:

- gain an understanding of how the Assessment Seminar brings together students, faculty and staff committed to enhancement of the undergraduate experience through evidence-based means
- develop an appreciation of how qualitative (interview) data can be used to enrich and extend other student data sources such as NSSE
- review and discuss the methods, tools and resources utilized at Mount Royal to

undertake the work of the Assessment Seminar

- discuss the findings of the Assessment Seminar's first round of student interviews, and possible responses to those findings
- consider the replicability of the Assessment Seminar project on their own campuses

Theme: Creative Practices: Teaching, Assessment, and Evaluation

Audience: General

Keywords: assessment, evaluation, qualitative, interview, undergraduate, experience