Team Learning ‘empowers’ both instructors and students by redefining their primary roles and responsibilities in the learning process. The instructor is redefined as a course designer and the manager of the overall instructional process. This is only possible because the performance evaluation system and instructional activities employed in Team Learning create conditions in which the vast majority of students willingly share in the responsibility to ensure that learning occurs.”

--Larry Michaelsen, Building Learning Teams: The Key to Harnessing the Power of Small Groups in Higher Education


“While instructors in a Web-based classroom can mediate and guide, they cannot entirely control the flow of communication. Thus, instructor and student roles and relations are less hierarchical and more overlapping and interactive. Increased opportunities for participation contribute to a greater diversity of student opinion and perspective. It is hard work to establish these social dynamics in a physical classroom constrained by a fixed space, a designated time block, and trained inhibitions. The virtual classroom, in contrast to the traditional classroom, has the potential to establish new patterns of instructor and student interaction and, accordingly, different teaching and learning roles and practices . . . .”


Team-Based learning and blended and online teaching and learning have been two major themes of this year’s CTL programming. At first blush, the two instructional approaches might seem worlds apart. One is an intensive classroom-based pedagogy; the other by nature explores what it means to challenge traditional classroom-based conceptions of education through the exploration of what web-based technologies can offer. However different the approaches are on the surface, both require instructors to think non-traditionally about teaching, learning, and designing courses, at the very least in the sense that they involve a shift from privileging the role of instructor as expert and presenter to highlighting the role of instructor as designer and facilitator. A corollary shift for students invites their investment and engagement in the role of active learners. The possibilities for enhanced student engagement, investment, and learning—given the precondition of thoughtful and responsive course design and delivery—are significant for both. In this issue of the CTL News, colleagues share some reflections on designing for active and engaged student learning.
Frank Brusca

I am an active and lifelong learner dedicated to the advancement of the appropriate and effective use of instructional technology systems. I hold a Master's degree in Instructional Technology and have received numerous industry awards for my professional work. Prior to coming to Otterbein, I worked as an instructional technologist at Westinghouse, NCR and Ariel. When I'm not at my desk, I can be found wandering along and writing about America's back roads, especially U.S. Route 40 (www.route40.net). In 2008, writer William Least Heat-Moon wrote about me and my odological studies in Roads to Quoz (Little, Brown and Company).

After eight and a half years, I am saying goodbye to the Otterbein community. During my tenure here I have witnessed firsthand the explosive growth of online learning technologies and feel honored to have been part of Otterbein’s transition to these new media. I have had the great pleasure of working with many skilled and dedicated people, many of whom I consider dear friends. I will continue in the field of instructional technology at Southern New Hampshire University’s College of Online Education in Manchester.
ePortfolios at Otterbein...

Faculty Associates:
Beth Rigel Daugherty, English and Sheri Birmingham, Equine Science

Thank you to the 50 people who took the (e)Portfolio use survey in fall quarter! You represented 17 academic departments and INST, SYE, ASC, CCE, Admissions, Investor Relations, and IT. One third of you said your departments use either print or electronic portfolios already, over half of you plan to use ePortfolios in courses in the new semester curriculum (a third weren’t sure), and 40% of you said your departments plan to use ePortfolios in the new curriculum (half weren’t sure). These results, a report on an ePortfolio pilot in two INST 105 courses, a presentation by peer mentors testing Epsilen and Digication, and a session on creating reflection prompts were all part of the December workshop, ePortfolios: Up Close and Personal.

In January, Sheri and I attended the AAC&U annual conference where we went to numerous sessions on ePortfolios and an all-day ePortfolio Forum. We have also been meeting with the ePortfolio Planning Committee, see list below.

The committee has created a timeline of next steps given that our rolling integration of ePortfolios will begin with Freshman Year Seminars, INST courses, and those faculty members and departments who want to use them in 2011-12. Because faculty development and training during this spring and summer will be important to successful implementation next year, a platform/design working group within the committee moved quickly to decide on a platform. Using feedback about the two platforms from faculty and administrators and a survey of peer mentors, it recommended Digication for the Otterbein platform. Negotiations are imminent. Another working group is developing a mission statement and title for our ePortfolio initiative – stay tuned!

ePortfolio Planning Committee Members
Theshin Angulugaha, Center for Student Success
Jennifer Bechtold, Student Affairs
Annette Boose, Health & Sport Sciences
Louise Captein, Art
Sue Constable, Education
Helen Cosner, Center for Continuing Studies
Joan Esson, Chemistry
Sarah Fatherly, Integrative Studies
Audra Fry, Center for Career Planning
Melissa Gilbert, Center for Community Engagement
Amy Jessen-Marshall, Academic Affairs
Dean Johnston, Chemistry
Regina Kengla, Academic Support Center
Mary McKelvey, Nursing
Jenny Merkowitz, Music
Katie Miller, student

Susan Millsap, Communication
Leslie Orquisto-Ahrens, CTL
Rares Piloiu, Library
Rachel Ripley, student
Barb Wharton, Academic Affairs
Tom Wilcox, CTL
Patti Wilson, Health & Sport Sciences

Platform subcommittee
Beth Daugherty, facilitator
Annette Boose, Sarah Fatherly, Melissa Gilbert,
Amy Jessen-Marshall, Katie Miller, Leslie Orquisto-Ahrens,
Barbara Wharton, and Tom Wilcox

Mission/Faculty Development subcommittee
Sheri Birmingham, facilitator
Theshin Angulugaha, Louise Captain, Sarah Fatherly, Dean Johnston, Regina Kengla, Mary McKelvey, Susan Millsap, Leslie Orquisto-Ahrens, and Patti Wilson
After Michael Sweet’s workshops last fall, I was excited about integrating Team-Based Learning into my teaching. I was intrigued by the accountability required of students taking a Readiness Assurance Test at the beginning of a unit of study. I was pleased at the wide variety of ways faculty in different disciplines have figured out how to use TBL. But I was puzzled about the Application Exercises that are integral to TBL.

As a teacher educator, I get it about application of theoretical learning in a real world context. I’ve always enjoyed assigning big projects that required students to solve a classroom problem … end-of-course assignments with names like: “Design Your Own Classroom,” “Create a Management Plan for This Challenging Student,” and “Develop an Instructional Unit for the Science Curriculum.” TBL’s Application Exercises are different: they offer the instructor a way to prepare students for these high-level, (often) open-ended assignments. The exercises involve the same teams that have taken the Readiness Assurance Tests. Like most good multiple choice test items, Readiness Assurance Tests have one right answer. Not so the Application Exercises! They too are in the form of multiple-choice, but each answer is plausible. The team must use critical thinking to come to consensus about the best way to solve the problem. Ensuing discussion after teams reveal their choices challenges them to defend and support.

For some reason, I was stymied about how to create these Application Exercises. My epiphany occurred during my recent sabbatical, part of which involved going “back to school” and teaching in an ESL (English as a Second Language) classroom in Whitehall. Those 30 first and second graders and their fabulous teachers, Stella Villalba and Michelle DePietro, reminded me of the complex problems encountered by all teachers….problems that may sound deceptively simple, regarding logistics, presentation, scheduling, pacing, grouping, etc., etc.

AHA! Write up scenarios that describe a vexing problem in the classroom. Embed in all of the plausible responses some of the concepts that my Otterbein Education students need to understand. Load it up with debates about best practice, practicality, and philosophical orientation about teaching and learning. I bought a video camera, filmed classroom events, and had more Application Exercise ideas than I deserved. Now I’m busy writing…..I’ll happily share what I have with anyone who’s interested.
Team-Based Learning Reflections

Dee Knoblauch, Education, Shelley Payne, Health & Sport Sciences
Sheri Birmingham, Equine Science, Miranda Hallett, Anthropology

Developed by Dr. Larry Michaelsen, Professor of Management at the University of Oklahoma, team-based learning is a comprehensive approach to collaborative learning built around four major components: 1) the establishment of permanent teams that are strategically formed; 2) the assurance of student preparation for class involvement, assessed through a specific approach to individual and group quizzes; 3) carefully crafted application exercises for teams; and 4) structured peer feedback and evaluations of the group experience. After Dr. Michael Sweet’s workshops in September and December, a number of faculty members tested team-based learning in their courses in both modest and extensive ways. Three of those who made significant use of the approach commented to me recently on their experiences.

Like Karen Robinson, her colleague in Education, Dee Knoblauch adopted team-based learning for the Educational Psychology course she teaches. She and her students loved the approach which represents a sustained example of collaborative learning—a pedagogical approach Dee espouses and which she and her students investigate in the course. “I’m always searching for a way to get kids to read the textbook,” Dee commented. And they do the reading, as students must arrive ready to first take a challenging 10-item quiz (which ensures individual accountability, a key element of effective collaborative learning) and then to retake the quiz—which involves a high enough level of ambiguity and challenge to warrant a second go round—in groups.

Similarly, Shelley Payne embraced a team-based learning approach for her Athletic Training course in Health and Sport Sciences. Not only did she find that students prepared more thoroughly for class than they had in the past, but, as a result, discussions of the material that ensued were deeper and richer. Furthermore, the group activities that require students to engage in a complex application problem are productive and entirely in line with the tradition of evidence-based medicine, a context in which students may go on to work, as nearly two-thirds of them are Allied Health majors.

In Equine Science, Sheri Birmingham wanted to find a way to decrease reliance on lectures to convey information in a content-heavy anatomy and physiology course. Team-based learning offered an approach that would ensure that students engage with and master the necessary content while also having opportunities to participate during class in active learning and application activities. Sheri was able to successfully decrease the time she spent on information transfer because students prepared differently and more thoroughly for class. In response to a survey about the approach, students responded quite positively, emphasizing that they were more likely to come to class prepared for the group work and readiness assessment quizzes, in part, because they didn’t want to disappoint their team members. They also agreed that the readiness assessment quizzes helped them determine what they needed to go back and study again as well as what specific questions they needed to ask when Sheri polled them for their questions.

These faculty members agree that, though it is not a silver bullet, team-based learning has provided them with a pedagogical strategy that has energized the classroom and encouraged students to engage more deeply with the material of the course. If you’re interested to learn more about team-based learning, contact one of these colleagues or the CTL (ctl@otterbein.edu).

History Professor Deborah Solomon participates in an Immigration Simulation with students for Prof. Miranda Hallett’s Anthropology 291, a course in which Miranda used team-based learning extensively.
In the fall of 2010, Eryn Kane, a recent graduate of Otterbein and the History department, approached Sarah Fatherly about creating an independent study for winter quarter that would help her prepare for the challenges of graduate study, something that might provide greater insight into the processes of college teaching. After some conversation about what this independent study might look like, we agreed to tackle a project Sarah had long wished to undertake--redesigning an introductory American history survey course. Eryn had taken this course during her time at Otterbein although with a different instructor. With our idea in mind, during the first week of winter quarter, we headed over to the Center for Teaching and Learning to meet with Leslie for guidance about how to begin our collaboration. What emerged from that discussion was a plan for the quarter to use the principles of backward design to reimagine and reinvigorate a course that had drifted into a focus on coverage and content, a “march through history” for its own sake.

Armed with copies of *Understanding By Design* by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe and the article “Power and Expertise,” by Peter Felten, Mihans, and Long, we started our project by discussing the goals that each of us had for our work. For Eryn, the goal was to understand the methods attached to course design. For Sarah, the main interest was to breathe new life into one of the courses she had prepped earliest in her teaching career and which had begun to feel stale. After discussing our investments in doing this collaboration, we began diving into conversations about key ideas from our shared readings and reviewing the existing course materials. In particular, Eryn started reviewing a set of textbooks and providing critiques of them from a student perspective, while Sarah used backward design principles to start examining what was truly “enduring” learning in the course. Posting notes, ideas, and reviews using GoogleDocs we were able to easily share and communicate as our project progressed. As the quarter flew by, we were able to finalize a set of learning goals and outcomes for the course which in turn enabled us to start identifying related possible teaching and learning activities and potential assessments.

As we reflect now on the experience, Eryn has gained an appreciation for the time and careful consideration that go into course construction. It also gave her the tools to successfully tackle the challenges of graduate work and a potential future career in the field. From Sarah’s perspective, the experience had the important consequence of helping her recognize and articulate course design and pedagogy decisions that she had previously made implicitly and intuitively. As a result, she finished the process with a much clearer way to prioritize what is truly at the core of learning in her courses. Overall, we both came out of our work together with an appreciation for how this sort of student-faculty collaboration places a spotlight on student learning and provides students with an important avenue to articulate their learning needs and have a voice in course design. And we gained a deeper insight into how this kind of work can strengthen and change student-faculty relationships in ways that recognize and validate the different kinds of expertise that each brings to the table.
Faculty Instructional Technology Lab

The Faculty Instructional Technology Lab is a workspace designed for faculty who wish to employ instructional technology media for traditional and online delivery. The lab consists of four workstations designed for processing intensive work such as audio and video editing. In this lab you can create and edit the following instructional media:

- Narrated and compressed PowerPoint presentations
- Podcasts and audio recordings
- DVDs and CDs
- Digital videos
- Screencasts
- Graphics and animations
- Desktop publishing documents
- Interactive maps
- Web pages

The lab is set up with both PC and Mac systems.

In addition to the hardware and software resources, the lab is staffed to provide hands-on guidance.

The lab is conveniently located in the Center for Teaching and Learning on the third floor of the Library. Simply follow the signs at the top of the stairs.

---

Hours of Operation

The Faculty Instructional Technology Lab is open from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday.
**Workstations**

The Faculty Instructional Technology Lab workstations all contain:

- 1.5 TB external hard drives
- Universal memory card readers
- USB and Firewire connectivity
- Flatbed scanners with transparency adapters
- Microphones, mixers and headsets
- MS Office
- Adobe Creative Suite 5 Master Collection:
  - Acrobat Professional
  - Premiere Pro, After Effects, OnLocation, Encore (video)
  - Audition (audio)
  - Contribute and Dreamweaver (web pages)
  - Photoshop, Illustrator, Fireworks (graphics)

**PC Workstation**

In addition to the standard items (above), these workstations also contain:

- AVS Suite (audio and video)
- Windows Movie Maker
- PhotoStory

**Mac Workstation**

In addition to the standard items (above), these workstations also contain:

- iWork
  - Keynote (slides)
  - Numbers (spreadsheet)
  - Pages (word processing app)
- iLife
  - Garage Band (audio)
  - iMovie and iDVD (video)
  - iPhoto and Photobooth (graphics)
  - iWeb (web page development)
- FinalCut Express (video)

**Laptops**

The Faculty Instructional Technology Lab has two laptops (one PC and one Mac) available for in-lab use as well as short term loan. These laptops are equipped with the same software as the desktop workstations.

To reserve a laptop contact ctl-tech@otterbein.edu
Teaching Inquiry Group
Facilitators:
Carrie Scheckelhoff, Education, Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, Center for Teaching and Learning

Exploring teaching questions . . . and possible tech solutions

The Center for Teaching and Learning sponsored a faculty teaching inquiry group during winter and spring quarters 2011. This professional development activity encouraged us to ask questions about and explore teaching technologies for web-enhanced, blended, and online approaches to teaching. We chose and read portions of three books on blended and online learning; we practiced interacting in discussion boards and wikis on our own Blackboard site; we demonstrated, taught one another, and recounted how we are using technologies in innovative ways in Education, Math, Equine Science, and Communication courses; and some of us designed courses that are intended for blended or fully online delivery. We've completed the experience by exploring recommendations for good practice, each of us taking one to investigate and connect to concrete practices. Participants have recommended that a similar group—or an extension of this group—continue on into next year, so if your interest is piqued, keep an eye out for calls for participation.

Members:
Niki Fayne, Graduate School
Grace McDaniel, Education
Nancy Paul, Communication
Michael Schor, Student Tutor, BAE
Kate Carey, Cont. Studies,
Diane Ross, Education
Margie Vogt, Nursing

Richard Gilbert, English
Mary McKelvey, Nursing
Kristin Reninger, Education
Bruce Mandeville, Equine Science
Marlene Deringer, Education
Jeff Smith, Mathematical Sciences
Chris Reynolds, Communication

Course Design Workshop
Wednesday, June 15, 8:30 am-1:00 pm
Quest Conference Center
8405 Pulsar Place, Columbus, OH

If you plan to design a new course over the summer or revise an existing one for semesters, you are encouraged to attend this half-day course design workshop that has been developed to help you craft courses to foster the kind of deep and lasting learning you want for your students. You will learn some of the key principles involved in good course design; you will have time to work on a specific course of your own; and you will have a chance to interact with colleagues as they work on their courses. The workshop will take place at the Quest Conference Center on Polaris Parkway. Morning refreshments and lunch provided. Seating limited to 25.

To Register: go to—https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/367XS9V
Sponsored by McGregor Grant, The Center for Teaching and Learning, Integrative Studies Program