AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

TASK FORCE ON UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Annual Report

Academic Year 1999-2000

July 14, 2000

Table Contents: Page

Acknowledgements

Many of the activities described in this report would not have been possible without the generous support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; this is especially true of the visit that the members of the Task Force made to teaching centers at select US universities, and of the two workshops that were conducted here at the AUB and led by distinguished US scholars and professionals on teaching and learning.

As indeed have been true of all the activities of the Task Force during the past academic year, the preparation of this Report has been a truly cooperative, joint effort. I wish to acknowledge the remarkable dedication, efficiency, and professionalism that each of my 12 colleagues on the Task Force consistently manifested. Working with them has been a most valuable and educational experience; but what I cherish the most is the bond of friendship and sense of mission which we all shared and which grew stronger everyday. We are grateful for Miss Wadad El-Husseiny, our "supporting" Research Assistant, for all her hard work and for being there for us whenever help was needed.

Charges and Goals

The main charges of the AUB Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence are " to review current teaching and learning practice and to make recommendations to improve undergraduate teaching university wide." One of the goals of appointing this committee is to create a group of faculty committed to excellence in teaching whose efforts will focus the attention of the university community on this subject.

Composition

The members of the Task Force represent the various faculties of the university. One member represents the University Committee on Academic Development (which is one of the standing committees of the University Senate).

Members of the Task Force	Department
• Jamal Abed	Architecture and Design (Representing the Senate Academic Development Committee)
• Saouma BouJaoude	Department of Education
• Kevin Butcher	History and Archeology
• Theodore Christidis	Physics
• Nuhad	Nursing

Dumit

- Said El-Fakhani — Business
- Nesreen Ghaddar — Mechanical Engineering
- Nizar Hamzeh — Political Studies and Public Administration
- Fouad Mrad — Electrical & Computer Engineering
- Waddah Nasr — Philosophy (Associate Provost and Task Force Chairperson)
- Ahmad Nasri — Mathematics
- Iman Nuwayhid — Environmental Health
- Rami Zureik — Agriculture

Method of Operation

The Task Force held weekly meetings. We followed the Sub committee method: Each major task or activity was assigned to a sub-committee which met separately and reported back to the Task Force as a whole. A major part of this report consists of the reports of the various subcommittees on the activities they were charged with. One section reports on some of the 'self-education' activities that took place during our weekly meetings. The most important part is, perhaps, the section on " Conclusions and Recommendations".

Task Force Self-Education activities during Meetings:

Activity 1. Seminar by Profs. Mrad and Ghaddar(December 10, 2000):

Profs. Mrad and Ghaddar presented the work done by the FEA Total Quality Management Seminar on Teaching and Learning and Program Assessments. The Seminar Title was: Adopted Techniques Towards ABET EC2000 Accreditation at the American University of Beirut. The abstract of the presentation is as follows:

" The Faculty of Engineering and Architecture at the American University of Beirut recognized the need to institutionalize quality assurance, where on-going mechanisms for outcomes assessment and quality improvement would be built into the educational system. A committee of faculty members from the different departments was formed during the academic year of 1998-1999, to investigate how best to introduce quality assurance into the educational system that can lead to ABET EC2000 certification.

The vision and mission statements of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (FEA) were articulated and the educational objectives and outcomes were formulated for each of the four undergraduate programs offered in Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Computer and Communications Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering.

Teaching methodologies and the effectiveness of student learning were investigated in the light of techniques that address student learning styles and co-operative learning. The Index of Learning Styles by Felder/Silverman, still in beta version, was adopted on the basis that it is suitable for engineering students and no training is required to assess the results. The results of the questionnaire should lead to more adequate catering for student learning preferences.

A comprehensive list of possible assessing tools of program and courses educational outcomes was prepared based on the adopted techniques in already accredited programs in other universities. A typical course syllabus of multi-disciplinary nature was developed in light of EC 2000. The course objectives were tied to program objectives and while course outcomes were correlated to the course objectives while catering for program outcomes. A course articulation matrix was developed to assist in designing and formalizing the breakdown of learning objectives into detailed

contents correlated to in-class and out-of-class activities delivering certain desired levels of learning as defined in Bloom's Taxonomy. In addition, a course learning assessment matrix was developed to assess the achievement level of course learning outcomes correlated to the specific activities that contributed to the development of the competencies. The matrix could also be used as an end-of-term course appraisal for students to fill out.

Two multidisciplinary first year courses entitled "Introduction to Engineering I & II," were introduced which aim at exposing the students to the general nature of engineering, the engineering design process through reverse engineering and through design and build project, and teamwork. The necessary professional skills of leadership, innovation, and engineering ethics are highly stressed in those courses. Outlines of these courses, objectives, articulation matrix and learning assessment matrix were prepared. "

An extensive discussion followed the presentation.

Activity 2: Prof. BouJaoude, Seminar on Accreditation and Teaching and Learning Measures (December17,1999):

Dr. BouJaoude presented the major concepts of the "Framework for Outcomes Assessment" document, which is a publication of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The presentation included the following:

IMPORTANT USES OF ASSESSMENT

The Goal of Outcomes Assessment is to examine and enhance an institution's effectiveness:

Four objectives must be met to reach this goal. These are:

1. To improve teaching and learning
2. To contribute to the personal development of students
3. To ensure institutional improvement
4. To facilitate accountability

Two evaluation strategies can be used to measure the accomplishment of an institution's goals:

Formative evaluation (improvement oriented):

1. Takes place during the implementation of an activity
2. Facilitates mid-course adjustments

Summative evaluation (accountability oriented):

1. Takes place at the end of a particular sequence of events

2. Provides a macro view of teaching, learning, and institutional effectiveness
3. Provides data for larger scale improvement efforts
4. Helps determine a program's effectiveness for the purposes of expansion, reduction, and/or discontinuation.

Assessment for improvement

Assessment promotes self-reflection and evidence based thinking about teaching, learning and student growth.

To be effective assessment should be part of a cycle whose purpose is to improve teaching and learning

Note: Even though outcomes assessment has an academic focus, it does not mean that other goals and objectives should be neglected. Any factor that has a bearing on teaching needs to be assessed.

Assessment for institutional effectiveness

The greater the evidence of congruence between outcomes and the mission, goals and objectives, the more is effectiveness demonstrated.

However, this hinges on:

1. Well defined goals and objectives (and related plans)
2. Well designed assessment measures (quantitative and qualitative)

Assessment for accountability

Accountability is linked to quality and effectiveness. Thus assessing an institution's effectiveness may provide data to answer questions of accountability.

DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING AN ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Engaging faculty in assessment

1. **How do you enhance faculty involvement?**

Involvement of faculty is most likely if:

1. They are involved at the beginning of the process
2. They feel ownership of the assessment plan
3. They have administrative support for implementation
4. They recognize the role of assessment at the classroom and institutional level.
5. They appreciate the potential of assessment for self-renewal.

1. **At what level should faculty be involved?**

1. At all levels (but with appropriate support in terms of expertise and time)
2. Start at the classroom level where faculty may attempt to answer the following questions:

- What should students learn?
- How well are they learning it?
- How do we know?
- How can this information improve teaching and learning?

Guiding principles for college assessment

1. Assessment practices should be multidimensional and student cognitive development should be only one of several components

1. Cognitive tests
2. Student evaluations
3. Student satisfaction
4. Student personal and affective development
5. Student retention
6. Student involvement in academic and co-curricular activities

1. Faculty peer evaluations
2. Alumni achievements
3. Alumni work performance

1. Assessment programs should include research and analysis of the effects of assessment upon students, the institution, and the teaching learning process.

1. To find out whether or not assessment programs are making any difference

1. To find out differences between identifiable groups (males & females, students' of different socio-economic status, . . .)

1. Assessment programs should be launched with realistic expectations of fulfilling their stated goals

1. Need for clear goals and objectives for assessment programs
2. Need for institutional support

1. Assessment programs should maximize the use of existing data and information

- Begin by analyzing existing data (registration data, transcript data, opinion surveys, research projects, …)
- A simple inventory of activities may be useful

1. Assessment results should yield dividends that justify the institutions investment

- Clarity in purposes of assessment results in positive results

FOCUSING ON KEY PROGRAMS

Five major areas seem to encompass the majority of the activities of an educational institution:

1. General education
2. The Major
3. Basic skills
4. Social development
5. Graduate education

General Education includes four different areas (may be subsumed under *information literacy*):

1. Cognitive abilities and problem solving skills, …)
2. Content literacy
3. Competence in information management skills
4. Values awareness

Strategies that can be used to assess the above:

1. Standardized tests
2. Local comprehensive tests
3. Course embedded assessment
4. Self-reported measures
5. Portfolio assessment

The Major filed of study (single discipline and multidisciplinary courses of study)

1. Assessing outcomes is similar to assessment practices in general education (need for objectives and measures that are aligned with these objectives)
2. Need to assess learning environment since they impact majors directly and may be under faculty control. These include:

Input measures

- Quality of applicants
- Faculty credentials and reputation
- Enrollments, class size, faculty student ratios
- Facilities & equipment
- Funding

Process measures

- Requirements, attrition rates, graduation rates, time to degree
- Faculty teaching loads
- Research grants
- Publications
- Student ratings
- Facilities use data, library circulation, student se of learning resources
- Planning and efficient use of resources

1. Capstone courses involve students in real-world experiences where they apply the generic skills learned in general education in the context of the major filed of study.
2. Assessment in capstone courses is not limited to one test. Rather it is multidimensional and may involve outsiders.

Basic Skills Education

1. Helping students with correcting student deficiencies in basic skills and preparing them to reach advanced level skills such as:

- Writing skills
- Computational skills
- Study skills
- Skills in analysis of writing materials

2. Assessing basic skills should seek to provide information about the relationships between these skills- programs and subsequent student achievement.

Personal and social development

1. This is expected to take place in co-curricular activities
2. Goals of an institution cannot be accomplished only within the classroom
3. Co-curricular activities cannot be seen as supplement to the academic curriculum
4. If personal development is important, specific goals and objectives should be developed and assessed.

How are personal and social skills assessed?

1. Direct observation
2. Self-report measures
3. Questionnaires and survey
4. Personal and focus group interviews
5. Consensus development techniques
6. Inventories

The following concerns were raised by the TF members:
- Accountability towards students, institution or others
- Grading system and its effects on students' perception of the grade.

- Inconsistencies in grading practices at AUB.

The following suggestions were made by the TF members:
- A session/presentation on "grading methods and significance."
- Establishing a working plan to move forward with the tasks of the Committee.
- Considering the feedback of the reports of the external reviewers.

Activity 3:Invitation of Prof. Khojali (April 14, 2000):

Prof. Khojali was invited to discuss the Senate report on student evaluation of instructors and the work of the Senate Committee to evaluate teaching. Dr. Mustafa Khogali presented his experiences as Chair of the Senate Committee on Teaching Effectiveness (1995-1997). He highlighted the issues discussed in the report of the Committee, which included peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and student evaluations, among other topics.

Activity 4: Invitation of Dr. Nora Colton:

Dr. Nora Colton, Associate Professor of Economics at Drew University, who is currently visiting Professor at AUB and teaches a course at the Institute of Money and Banking presented her experiences at Drew University in connection with that university's efforts to improve the teaching effectiveness of its faculty.

Activity5: Evaluation of an educational video on cooperative and active learning practices.

The video is entitled" Making Large Classes Interactive" written by Dr. Barbara Walvoord and is available in Jafet Library. The videotape describes the work of five faculty members in a major research university from different disciplines in making their large classes more student-centered. All members of the Task Force viewed the video described above and discussed it.

American University of Beirut

AUB Task Force On Undergraduate Teaching Excellence

Report on Visits to

Teaching and Learning Centers at

Selected US Universities

(April 22-30, 2000)

Support

Office of the Provost

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Grant

Members of the Task Force	Department
• Jamal Abed	Architecture and Design (Representing the Senate Academic Development Committee)
• Saouma BouJaoude	Department of Education
• Kevin Butcher	History and Archeology
• Theodore Christidis	Physics
• Nuhad Dumit	Nursing
• Said El-Fakhani	Business
• Nesreen Ghaddar	Mechanical Engineering

- Nizar Hamzeh — Political Studies and Public Administration
- Fouad Mrad — Electrical & Computer Engineering
- Waddah Nasr — Philosophy (Associate Provost and Task Force Chairperson)
- Ahmad Nasri — Mathematics
- Iman Nuwayhid — Environmental Health
- Rami Zureik — Agriculture

Hosting Centers:

1. University of Minnesota, Center for Teaching and Learning Services.
2. Harvard University, The Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning.
3. University of Massachusetts Amherst, The Center For Teaching.
4. MIT, The Teaching and Learning Laboratory.

Acknowledgment

We thank the Mellon Foundation for covering the expenses incurred by the visits to US Teaching and Learning Centers. We also thank AUB Provost Dr. Peter Heath for the support and encouragement that he extended to the AUB Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence as we prepared for this trip.

Our special thanks go to the following:

- Dr. Jan Smith, Codirector of the Center for Teaching and Learning Services at the University of Minnesota, for her efforts in organizing the workshops on active learning and critical thinking, for the hospitality that she and her colleagues at the center extended to us, and for generously providing materials and resources.

- Dr. James Wilkinson, Director of the Harvard Derek Bok Center and the staff of the center, for giving us generously of their time and for the fruitful discussions on how best to get across the message that the University cares about teaching, and how to encourage faculty members to benefit from the activities of the Center.

- Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli, the Associate Provost and Director of the Center for Teaching at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, for organizing the workshop on integrating technology with teaching, for generously sharing with us their experiences in distance-learning, and for supplying us with video material on teaching practices and teaching excellence.

- Dr. Lori Breslow, Director of The Teaching and Learning Laboratory at MIT, and her staff for their hospitality and particularly for organizing the workshop on captivating classes: Meeting the Lecture Challenge. The presentations by MIT staff, and the ensuing discussion were very useful and instructive.

Report of AUB Task Force on Visits to Teaching and Learning Centers at Elite US Universities

Introduction

The AUB Task Force organized a trip to visit few Teaching and Learning Centers in the US during the Spring Term break of the academic year 1999-2000. The main purpose of the visit was to find out what other universities are doing in order to enhance teaching and learning on their campuses. The visited centers and the scheduled activities are listed in Table 1. A comparative overview of the visited centers is presented in Table 2. Appendix A provides information on contacts established during the visit. Detailed information is contained in Appendix B, including information on the trip log; attended workshops and their specific learning experiences, planned activities and discussions, information about the visited centers and their operational style, established contacts and acquired resources. Appendix C lists material obtained at the various center visited by the Task Force.

The visits to the various Teaching and Learning centers exposed the Task Force members to a variety of activities, strategies and methods for improving teaching effectiveness in undergraduate education. The attendance of various workshops and discussion sessions at these centers provided members of the task force with opportunities for training on critical thinking, cooperative learning, active learning, increasing teaching effectiveness in large classes, innovative teaching strategies, and integration of technology into the classroom. The role of mentoring student success, the use of innovative learning tools and innovative teaching tools and techniques were addressed in all four workshops with varying degrees of emphasis. These visits also provided us with opportunities to compare and contrast teaching practices at AUB with other leading US universities. We were struck by the fact that these universities face problems that are more or less the problems that we are facing here at AUB. These problems include excessive reliance on spoon feeding information to students, lack of students' interest, lack of motivation, students' absenteeism, diverse (and sometimes conflicting) values, lack of reward for class participation, the problem of amount to be covered in a semester (regardless of whether or not students understand all the material covered), and the need for faculty to be ready to face changes in the demographic constitution of students, and their willingness to take advantage of the recent advances in teaching methods and techniques. The administrations of the universities visited have charged their teaching centers with the task of helping faculty members improve their teaching. A major challenge to these centers is to allay the doubts of skeptical faculty members who are not convinced of the value or usefulness of the activities of the center, and, by allaying

their doubts, make them less reluctant to join in and take advantage of the services offered by the center. Most universities, wisely we believe, present their teaching enhancement services as an option that full time teaching faculty may or may not choose to take advantage of. Some universities require Teaching Assistants and newly hired Junior faculty to go through teaching orientation and teaching effectiveness programs. It is worth noting that the members of the staff in most of the teaching centers we visited did not necessarily hold Ph.Ds in Education, but were just good teachers and professors belonging to disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, sciences or engineering.

If at some point the university deems it desirable and feasible to establish a teaching center at AUB, we hope that this report and further feedback from the members of the Task Force who went on this trip may prove to be useful. As will become obvious in the section summarizing our learning experiences on this trip, we believe that the establishment of such a center is indeed desirable and may also be feasible. The trip has not included visits to teaching-oriented universities where the concept of teaching and learning centers is much more engrained within their teaching philosophy and practices.

Contacts were established with the learning and teaching centers visited and paved the way for future cooperation. Such cooperation may include organizing workshops or exchange of educational material (See Appendix A). We tried to find out how these centers were founded, what types of services they offer, what sorts of problems they faced and how they attempted to resolve them. We were particularly interested in the relative degrees of emphasis that these universities place on research and on teaching effectiveness.

Learning Experiences: Remarks, Views, and Impressions

1. The teaching centers visited have many common characteristics. However, in terms of size, resources, and services rendered, the centers at the University of Minnesota, and the University of Massachusetts were far more impressive than the centers at Harvard or MIT.

2. None of the centers' workshops offered discussions or presentations on curriculum designs and program assessments, despite the fact that the Derek Bok Center lists in its publications curriculum or syllabus designs and student assessments as two services provided by the center. Curriculum designs for courses and programs as well as program assessments are the two other strong outcomes that should have been obtained from this trip.

3. Additional contact with teaching-oriented universities should be established. This should shed light on concerns, practices, and strategies that these universities have developed through their own teaching and learning centers that may carry a deeper and longer experience in this field and/or be more commensurable in terms of size and mission with our own institution.

4. There is room for major improvements in teaching practices and learning at AUB.

5. The problems AUB faces are not unique. All four visited Centers reported similar problems: conviction of some faculty members that university professors need not to be "taught how to teach", and their reluctance to avail themselves of the services provided by teaching centers; perceived conflict between teaching and research; workload; use of teaching effectiveness in promotions; cooperation of students; and support of administration.

6. The Task Force has been exposed to several models of teaching centers, none of which can be implemented at AUB without modification. A teaching center at AUB should address our specific needs and take into consideration the size

of the university and the backgrounds of our students and faculty. AUB is a small university compared to all universities visited, and although AUB is research-oriented, it is not research-based nor research-funded as MIT or Harvard.

7. Workshops and seminars are one method of improving teaching effectiveness but not necessarily the most effective. Role models, mentoring, personal consultations, and group discussions may prove to be better methods.

8. Improving teaching effectiveness and learning within a university is a long-term commitment and investment with a somewhat delayed pay back.

9. The stronger Teaching Centers are those that extend to include faculty members from different disciplines teaching in their own Faculties. Faculty members who apply effective teaching practices in their own disciplines are better role models within their own disciplines.

10. Education specialists make significant contributions to the enhancement of teaching and learning but they are not necessarily the best to establish and operate Teaching centers. Knowledge of education principles is, however, essential.

11. Regarding classroom techniques - the workshops at Minnesota and MIT were useful, as were the comments made during the sessions at Harvard. Occasionally it was suggested that the techniques applying to very large classes might be difficult to apply at AUB because of student attitudes. But in conversation with some of our American colleagues, it was found that they face the same problems. Some Task Force members suggested that techniques to improve students' attitudes to learning should be looked into; this may prove to be a line worth pursuing. Core courses should be targeted for a change in attitudes because they might have some effect across the board.

12. The establishment of a center for teaching excellence at AUB may be the next step. The visit was useful in showing that it would be feasible to set up such a center. Faculty participation in a center (as mentors or in other forms) ought to be recognized by the University - there ought to be some sort of compensation for involvement, and the visit allowed us to see ways in which this could be done. If teaching portfolios were to become significant at AUB (e.g. for promotion), then no doubt a teaching center would be frequently used by faculty. The centers we visited are very keen on maintaining confidentiality, and are equally keen on not being involved in decisions pertaining to promotion, tenure, etc.

13. Academic advising of students is mostly done by full-time specialists rather than by hard-pressed faculty, who are then blamed for bad advising. Perhaps this matter too could come under the heading of teaching excellence.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Teaching and Learning Centers at US Universities have been established as a shift in pedagogy and teaching occurred from teacher- centered classroom to student-centered learning and with the infusion of technology into the culture of education. The emphasis that accrediting bodies now place on outcome-based programs, and the need to provide tools for assessing student performance as well as teacher performance, have driven universities to give more attention to the teaching-learning process and to the skills the students are expected to acquire. Quality assurance of undergraduate education and teaching at AUB is essential if the University is to attain, and maintain, accreditation. However, our commitment to such assurance is a matter of principle and professional pride, and not merely the result of "accreditation pressures".

We recommend to the administration of the university to establish a Teaching and Learning Center at AUB. The Center should help faculty members improve their teaching effectiveness on voluntary basis. The Center will offer centralized teaching development programs throughout campus and across different disciplines. **The center is perceived to have the following characteristics:**

- The center may be headed by a faculty from Education (or other discipline with the right qualifications and experience) but it should include associate members from each major school or program. The permanent staff of the Center will be hired as full timers who could also teach some courses in their respective academic disciplines. Members of the staff of the teaching center should have a clear sense of the mission of the Center as well as the commitment and ability to implement this mission. It may be necessary that some members of the staff of this center be sent to spend a semester at an appropriate teaching center in the US.

- Associate members of the center can be chosen from well-established teachers with exemplary teaching records from various schools and programs (e.g., teaching awards winners). These associate members would receive a fixed financial compensation for participation and / or reduction in their teaching loads.

- The charges of the Center will include:

- Seeking funding from appropriate US agencies and other donors.

- Offering a year-round set of workshops; some are repeated year after year for new faculty, and some are new depending on the specific needs of a group of faculty.

- Offering special counseling to individual faculty.

- Providing mid-career support, communication, and awareness activities, special needs and catering accordingly.

- Starting and maintaining a web site with a rich source of teaching services, tips, and pedagogy, including private web-based counseling.

- Offering sessions designed to help faculty in the preparation of their teaching portfolios.

- Visiting classes upon the request of individual faculty members and offering advice. Video taping lectures for the teachers' self-evaluation. These activities are held in utmost confidentiality and should not enter as evidence in any promotion or renewal procedures.

- Offering orientation classes of one to two days before the start of each semester to all new full time faculty, part timers, and graduate students who are involved in teaching activities.

- Using the services of associate members of the center to establish (informal) discussion groups within their respective disciplines to exchange ideas and teaching tips, and to share creative teaching experiences.

- Considering paying faculty a small token (e.g., $50-$100) for each session attended on improving teaching effectiveness.

- Exploring and suggesting ideas for enhancing the use of new technology in the classroom and lab.

- Designing a special evaluation form to get some feed back from students in the middle of the semester in order to try to improve the teaching environment before it is too late. The form can be administered by the Center itself or by the instructor herself /himself but with the anonymity of the students respected.

- Publishing the results of students' evaluation on annual basis in an orderly and controlled fashion. This exercise would provide additional incentives for faculty members to give teaching the attention it deserves.

1. A Teaching-Learning Center at AUB needs to build strong relationships with established ones in the US especially in the early years of its operation.

2. It should be mandatory for graduate assistants and newly hired part timers to attend designated workshops that the proposed teaching center may organize.

3. We also recommend mandatory orientation sessions for all newly hired junior faculty at the beginning of their appointments.

Table. 1

Task Force Activities and Schedule During the Trip

Date	Time	Location	Activity
	University of Minnesota, Center for Teaching and Learning Services (Minneapolis, MN)		
April, 24, 2000	8:30 – 9:45 a.m.	135 Fraser	Meeting with the Staff of the Center. Overview of the Center and its efforts to enhance teaching and learning at the University of Minnesota.
	10:00-12:00 noon	215 Donhowe	Workshop on Critical Thinking Skills.
	12:15-1:45 p.m.	215 Donhowe	Luncheon with U of M-Twin Cities faculty members and administrators.
	2:00-3:00p.m.	215 Donhowe	Workshop on Getting Students to be Partners in the Learning Process.
	Harvard University, The Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning (Cambridge, MA)		
April, 25, 2000	10:00 – 11:15 a.m.	Derek Bok Center	Meeting with Dr. Sue Lonoff; discussion of the functions of their center and its role at the university.

	11:15-12:00 noon	Derek Bok Center	Meeting with Dr. James Wilkinson as well as Dr. Lonoff; discussion of the programs of the center.
	12:15-1:45 p.m.	Faculty Dining Room	Meeting with Dr. Virginia Maurer; discussion of teaching methods and strategies.
	2:00-4:00p.m.	Derek Bok Center	Workshop by Dr. Maurer and Dr. Robin Gottlieb on Teaching and Learning Strategies and Styles.
	University of Massachusetts Amherst, The Center For Teaching **(Amherst, MA)**		
April, 27, 2000	10:30 – 11:30 a.m.	301 Goodwell	Meeting with Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli; discussion of the functions of their center and its role at the university.
	11:45-12:45 p.m	301 Goodwell	Presentation by Dr. F. Mues on TEACHnologyâ ; a video was also shown.
	1:00-1:30	Academic Computing Lab	A tour of the instructional multi-media Lab, where demos were observed of live distance learning classes.
	1:30-2:15 p.m.	Faculty Lounge	Lunch break
	2:15-3:15p.m.	Office for Information Technologies	Workshop by Dr. Elisa Campbel on critical thinking and the role of information technology in widening the use of resources among students and performing across campus workshops on use of Web-CT for on-line courses and Umail.
	3:15-5:00	Center for Computer-Based Instructional Technology	Demonstrations of the use of software tutors for many basic science and engineering courses. Task Force members access to the website where these software packages are developed.
	MIT, The Teaching and Learning Lab **(Cambridge, MA)**		
April, 28, 2000	12:00 – 1:30 a.m.	MIT Rm 9-151	Meeting with Dr.Lori Breslow; discussion of the functions of their center and its role at the university.
	1:30-4:15 noon	MIT Rm 9-151	Workshop on Captivating Classes: Meeting the Lecture Challenge.

Table 2.

A Comparative Table of the Visited Teaching Centers

Features	Teaching & Learning Centers			
	Center for Teaching and Learning Services **University of Minnesota** **April 23 and 24, 2000**	**The Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning** **Harvard University** **April 25, 2000**	**The Center for Teaching** **University of Massachusetts, Amherst** **April 27, 2000**	**The Teaching and Learning Lab** **Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)** **April 28, 2000**
Staff Size	1. Big Center with more than 20 staff people most of whom are not necessarily from the school of education. 2. Many associate members from different faculties and from the Academy of Distinguished Teachers	Mid-size Center with an experienced director and many faculty and volunteers	1. Six-year-old small center with 5 people (3 full time faculty who would teach one course per year, and 2 secretaries) 2. Associate members chosen from a list of good teachers with fair compensation	A very small fairly new center: established three years ago with only one Ph.D (professor of communication in the School of Business) and one staff who is a Ph.D candidate in education (but aided by a technology consultant upon request).
Program Clients	1.New Full Time Faculty 2.Tenured Existing Faculty 3. T.A's	1. New Full Time Faculty Orientation 2. 1,100 Graduate Students who are involved in teaching - 80-85% of undergraduate classes are taught by graduate assistants with major lectures offered by full time tenured faculty 3. Optional for full time tenured faculty	1. New Full-Time Faculty 2. Tenured Existing Faculty 3. Graduate Students Who Teach	1. Newly tenured Full Time Faculty 2. Graduate Students
Program Characteristics	1. Established for quite some time - Big School	1. Established following the 1969	1. 24,000 students of whom 18,000 are	1. Centralized but with very limited budget ($125,000/year)

	2. Centralized 3. Customized 4. Focus on learning enhancement (rather than provoking the issue of teaching effectiveness) 5. Involves distinguished teachers by associating them into helping 6. Confidentiality is guaranteed 7. Open discussion about best method to help individual teachers 8. Provides online help to all upon request, in order to attract "non-comers"	students= rise. Harvard has a total of 6,500 students. 2. Decentralized - the center we visited was within the School of Arts and Sciences; other schools were encouraged to establish their own centers. 3. Confidentiality is guaranteed.	undergraduates 2. Centralized with a dedicated Associate Provost for Faculty and Teaching Development 3. Customized 4. Focus on teaching effectiveness to enhance learning 5. Includes identified good teachers with one -year appointment and one class relief as associate members with financial compensation 6. Confidentiality is guaranteed	2. Focus on teaching and learning with open mind and no obligation 3. Confidentiality is guaranteed

Features	**Teaching & Learning Centers**			
	University of Minnesota	**Harvard University**	**Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst**	**Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)**
Types of Programs offered	1. Bush Program (to new faculty) 2. Mid-Career Program (to tenured existing	1. Year-round workshops relating to writing skills, course design, multi-section course coordination, equity in grading across multi-sections, lecturing styles, learning styles, etc.	1. Lilly Endowment Fund helped the establishment of the teaching center. 2. A regular	1. Lab-based teaching 2. Year-round workshops 3. Frequent survey of students = learning 4. Advanced distance-

	faculty) 3. Academy of Distinguished Teachers (Award Winning Teachers)		program that attracts about 50 tenured faculty every year, who meet every other week year-round in groups of 8-12 led by a fellow from the center to discuss teaching problems. All participants get some teaching relief bought by their departments (through special funds to hire part timers) 3. The TEACHnology Fellows Program that enlists around 10 faculty members each year to teach them the use of the state-of-art technology and computer-based classroom instruction. The program is funded by the Deans and the Provost and each participant receives a laptop 4. Year-round workshops 5. Advanced distance-learning center.	education center
Facilities Available	1. Dedicated Center with many staff to help individuals and groups 2. Provides video taping services to individual classes 3. Other educational resources	1. The Center is mostly concerned with graduate students who are teaching 2. Provides video taping services to individuals' classes - teachers evaluate themselves by watching their own videos 3. Other educational resources such as fliers and tips	1. Dedicated Center with staff and volunteers 2. Has a distance-learning studio connecting with many other Massachusetts universities and colleges 3. Has a specially equipped room	1. Provides video taping services to individuals classes 2. Provides other educational resources such as fliers and tips

	such as fliers and tips		using the Personal Response System (PRS) to enhance interactive learning 4. Offer Web-based training using CBT systems to provide interactive problem solving to more than 200 courses 5. Provides mid-term assessment of teaching and learning and compares students' performance before and after counseling teachers to change their teaching styles 6. Provides assistance in tenure cases by offering workshops	

Features	**Teaching & Learning Centers**			
	University of Minnesota	**Harvard University**	**Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst**	**Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)**
Motivations for Involved Faculty	1. Teaching awards at the University (10 of faculty members are chosen each year by a subcommittee on educational policy from the University Senate, each receives $5,000 financial prize) and	1. Teaching awards at the University (7 awards are granted each year) 2. Publishes students' evaluation results in a book every year 3. Good	1. Heburgh Award: Teaching awards at the University and School levels 2. Encourages consultation with peers as mentors 3. Encourages (but does not push) individual junior faculty to visit their peers' classes 4. Good teachers with	1. Good teaching is not a basic requirement for tenure and promotion 2. 85% of teaching is done by tenured faculty. Some tenured faculty are genuinely interested in improving their teaching styles

	many at the School levels (with financial prizes too) 2. Automatic 5-year membership in the Academy of Distinguished Teachers for University-Wide winners 3. Good teachers with good research productivity are awarded tenure 4. Students writing thanks cards (solicited by the learning center)	teaching is not a big deal when it comes to promotion and tenure; nevertheless, it is nowadays capturing the attention of the university under the pressure of parents and employers 4. Generally speaking, most faculty work for a term contract as they mostly know that they will not get tenure, and that they will have to be on the move in 7 years (only 12% of faculty are tenured)	good research productivity are awarded tenure	

Appendix A

Established Contacts

	Name	Position	Email Address
1	**Dr. Jan Smith**	**Co-director of the Center for Teaching and Learning Services at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.**	**smith004@maroon.tc.umn.edu**
2	**Dr. Lori Breslow**	**Director of the Teaching and Learning Laboratory at MIT,** **Rm. E53-411, 50 Memorial Dr. Cambridge MA02142.**	**lrb@mit.edu**
3	**Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli**	**Director of the Center for Teaching and Associate Provost at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.**	
4	**Dr. Fran Mues**	**University of Massachusetts Amherst.** **The Center for Teaching**	
5	**Dr. Beverly Park Woolf**	**Senior Research Scientist and Director of the Center for Knowledge Communication,** **Lederie Graduate research Center,** **University of Massachusetts Amherst.**	**bev@cs.umass.edu**
6	**Dr. James Wilkinson**	**Director of Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning,**	**jwilkins@fas.harvard.edu**

		Science Center, **Harvard University.**	
7	Dr. Sue Lonoff	Associate Director of Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Science Center, Harvard University.	
8	**Dr. Joyce Weinsheimer**	**Co-director of Center for Teaching and Learning Services at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.**	**teachirn@tc.umn.edu**
9	**Dr. Judith Puncochar**	**Director of Human Relations Program** **210e Burton Hall,** **University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.**	**puncocha@tc.umn.edu**
10	**Dr. Maurer**	**Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning,** **Science Center,** **Harvard University.**	**vmaurer@fas.harvard.edu**
11	**Dr. Robin Gottlieb**	**Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning,** **Science Center,** **Harvard University.**	
12	**Dr. Steve Simmons**	**University of Minnesota-Twin Cities,** **Agronomy and plant Genetics.**	**Ssimmons@tc.umn.edu**
13	**Dr. Connie D. Tzenis**	**Center of Teaching and Learning Services at the University**	**Tzeni001@tc.umn.edu**

		of Minnesota – Twin Cities: Human Resources, **Mpls MN55414-1546**	

Appendix B.

Details of Activities, Workshops, and Discussions During the Visit

Center for Teaching and Learning Services

University of Minnesota – Twin Cities

April 23 & 24, 2000

The AUB task force met the Center Codirector, Dr. Jan Smith, on Sunday April 23, 2000. Dr. Smith was able to identify closely our needs, learn more about AUB teaching practices and discuss with the Task Force the general activities of the center and the teaching enrichment series they offer to improve classroom teaching effectiveness and the efforts they direct to improving teaching among international faculty, teaching assistants, future faculty, tenure-track, and newly tenured faculty. The center also provides confidential consultations on general classroom concerns or specific teaching techniques to improve teaching and develop courses. The center has a large teaching and learning Resource Collection that contain books, articles, journals and video tapes on teaching and learning issues, and handbooks and guides for faculty, TA's, and TA supervisors.

On April 24, 2000, the AUB Task Force had the following schedule:

	Time	Location	Activity
1	8:30 – 9:45 a.m.	135 Fraster	Meeting with Staff of the Center for Teaching and Learning Services. Presentation and discussion on Teaching and Learning Development at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.
2	10:00-12:00 noon	215 Donhowe	Workshop on Critical Thinking Skills
3	12:15-1:45 p.m.	215 Donhowe	Luncheon with U of M-Twin Cities faculty and administrators.
4	2:00-3:00p.m.	215 Donhowe	Workshop on Getting Students to be Partners in the Learning Process.

Through activity (1) the following was learned:

1. The center has 22 full-time employees; 16 of whom hold PhDs; the others have Master degrees.

2. The center has a number of adjunct teachers from various faculties.

3. The center has 5 meeting rooms plus office space and working stations.

4. By law of the State of Minnesota, any teaching staff must have proficiency in English and familiarity with local accent and expressions. This initiated a program for international graduate students and faculty whose native language is not English.

5. A mid-career teaching program is offered by the center to experienced faculty as they continue to adapt their teaching styles to the demands of today's students.

6. The Bush Faculty development program on excellence and diversity in teaching matches tenure track faculty with experienced faculty through structured small group interactions.

7. The center conducts workshops on teaching large classes all over campus and provides consultation on one to one basis for individual faculty members.

8. Provision of teaching improvement incentives through creation of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers across the university. The Academy offers scholarships and awards for excellent teachers.

9. One third of the teaching at Minnesota is done by non-tenured faculty. Teaching is important but not a major part of the promotion process.

10. Success of the center programs is measured by: (1) participants' evaluation; (2) administration response; and (3) promotion and tenure is very high among faculty who participated in the program.

11. The idea of a centralized versus a decentralized teaching-learning center was discussed. Although the idea of multiple centers is more adaptable to faculty's needs (knowing that there are more than 34000 undergraduate students enrolled at the university in addition to around 10000 graduate students), a single center is easier to run and helps build momentum on campus.

12. Quotable remarks (Dr. Joyce Weinsheimer):

    "Perhaps the best way to make teaching more effective would

    be to put the emphasis on improving the student's ability to learn…"

    " Get faculty involved from the beginning…"

" For the most part, teaching at colleges and universities seems to be an isolated activity that goes on in the classroom between teacher and students. There is little talking about teaching, about what goes on in the classroom, identifying problems, sharing insights."

" Act as a facilitator. Let the faculty choose what format they are comfortable with. There are some faculty who would never go to a workshop, but would stay up beyond midnight in the privacy of their home or office joining in an on-line 'conversation' or exchange on teaching and learning."

13. AUB task force members were then divided into 6 groups, and each group met with one or two members of the center to discuss more specific problems related to teaching. Discussion and issues raised varied and encompassed many avenues. Some of the issues raised were on how to renew enthusiasm in faculty members towards their teaching and the students' role, win teachers' confidence in the learning center, build in students reflective learning (ask students to write papers about self-reflection or take a video and apply some pedagogical skills), and finally the importance of a built-in incentive to quality teaching. The issue of web-based courses was also raised. Discussion hovered around methods of training faculty members to get familiar with the technology as well as cautions about avoiding the outbreak of standardized soul-less courses. Examples on teaching of large classes were discussed with the use of cooperative learning, base groups or partner activities, and the use of teaching and grading rubrics.

<u>The following was learned from activity (2) that was carried by Dr. Judith Puncochar:</u>

1. Theory-based structured pedagogy for critical thinking.

2. Critical thinking pedagogical tools using structured learning groups and constructive controversy. In the session, members of the task force practiced both tools. We went through the process of critical thinking while analyzing the poem "the Bridge" by Khalil Hawi and evaluating each group's dynamics. We know how our students would feel through such an activity. It was a very informative and educational experience for us.

3. Advice for avoiding common problems.

4. Factors for high performance (Climate – Feedback – Input – Output).

5. The discussion included points such as how to provide incentives for group work through a rewarding assessment mean. Changing teaching style will require changing the ways courses are structured and taught as well as the way student work is assessed and graded.

<u>The following was learned through activity (3):</u>

Members of the Teaching-Learning Center Staff at U M-Twin Cities were all present at the luncheon and circulated among Task Force members to exchange experiences and answer questions. Faculty members from a variety of disciplines who are known to be effective teachers had been invited to the luncheon and shared in the informal, small group discussions.

<u>The following was learned through activity (4), which was conducted by Dr. Joyce Weinsheimer:</u>

1. The workshop concentrated on means for getting students to be partners in the learning process.

2. Setting the stage for shared responsibility through: (1) knowing what you want; (2) getting students to want something; (3) redefining roles and (4) once you define what you want, identify avenues (out of seven) to influence the behavior of students. These ideas were implemented directly with us.

3. Reinforcing the partnership through: (1) modeling learning and encouraging reflection; (2) assessing learning and monitoring the process; (3) dealing with excuses; and (4) connecting students with campus resources.

The Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning

Harvard University

April 25, 2000

The AUB task force members met with the Director of the Derek Bok Center Dr. James Wilkinson and the Associate Director Dr. Sue Lonoff. The center is part of the faculty of Arts and Sciences. The following table lists the activities that went on that day.

On April 25, 2000, the AUB Task Force had the following schedule:

	Time	Location	Activity
1	10:00 – 11:15 a.m.	Derek Bok Center	Meeting with Dr. Sue Lonoff; discussion of the functions of their center and its role at the University.
2	11:15-12:00 noon	Derek Bok Center	Meeting with Dr. James Wilkinson as well as Dr. Lonoff; discussion of the programs of the center.

3	12:15-1:45 p.m.	Faculty Dining Room	Meeting with Dr. Virginia Maurer; Discussion about teaching methods and strategies.
4	2:00-4:00p.m.	Derek Bok Center	Workshop by Dr. Maurer and Dr. Robin Gottlieb about teaching and learning strategies and styles.

The following was learned through activity (1)

- The Derek Bok Center runs year-long workshops and provides confidential individual Faculty consultation as well as external consultations to other universities.

- There are other teaching-learning centers associated with related faculties or departments such as that of the Business School.

- All course evaluations are published annually and made accessible to everybody; evaluations are changed from get-at to friendly ones.

- A large percentage of the contact hours with students are covered by teaching fellows (graduate and/or teaching assistants).

- The center's strategies are built on videotaping and analyzing lectures and having the teacher review the session with a mentor assigned by the center for an assisted self-criticism and evaluation. The professor gives the lecture whereas teaching is run by graduate students.

- In addition to mentoring the faculty who consult with them, the center depends a lot on videotaping activities and analyzing taped-lectures and having the consultee critique himself/herself.

- The major role of the center is to help the professor improve his/her teaching. We should separate improvement of teaching from discussions on promotion. The University offers 7 awards per year (Harvard College Professorships) as incentives to motivate faculty members to improve their teaching effectiveness.

<u>The following was learned through activity (2):</u>

- The Center offers workshops and training on syllabus design, course coordination, lecturing styles, innovations in teaching, writing skills, lab teaching, grading equity in multi-section courses and student assessment. Examples of each were discussed.

- New Faculty Orientation; Practice teaching sessions; and teaching awards and certificates.

- Quotable remarks (Dr. James Wilkinson):

" There is an assumption that if you spend a lot of time on teaching, it is because you are bad at research. This assumption is now changing…. We used to look down upon 'emotional intelligence' and place sole emphasis on objectivity and analytical abilities. This too is now changing. The emotions of students are acknowledged; the student is seen as a whole, complex, being. We are now more aware of the need to give emotional support to students."

" Teaching centers at universities in US have come about as a result (at least in part) of an increased interest in pedagogy at the level of the university and the belief that teaching might be interesting and an appropriate subject of scholarship.
The university of Michigan developed one of the earliest (and more successful) teaching centers (1965).

" The marks of a successful teaching center:

1. Fit between the Center and the specific needs of the University.

2. Long term planning; not just short term remedies. Afternoon workshops may respond to political needs and pressures, but will not be of a permanent value without continuous follow ups on the progress of teachers and students and integration within a long term plan.

3. Good relations with faculty. A good deal of diplomacy may be needed. We need to be good listeners; we need to cultivate and exemplify collegiality.

4. Leadership. The central message being: ' our institution cares about teaching'.

5. Coordination between the Center and what is going on at the institution as a whole.

6. Identify and take full advantage of good teachers. Teachers who are exemplary at what they do. They can teach and be able to articulate what they are doing. Get them together; ask them what they need to improve teaching."

The following was learned through activity (3):

Lecturing styles, presentation styles such as theatrical presentations, and assessment of faculty's presentation through videotaping and observation.

The following was learned through activity (4):

- Students' feedback about their learning experiences; seen on video.

- Various teaching methods such as interactive classes; seen on video.

- Utilization of interactive classes in various courses such as Physics, Mathematics and Moral Reasoning.

- There is a consulting office for students that provides guidance and assistance to students in terms of counseling and teaching how to study and learn.

It has been felt that Harvard University had much harder time involving the faculty member in the center's activities and in convincing full-time faculty members to attend workshops on teaching and learning. This is because newly-appointed junior faculty rarely make it through the tenure system; the estimate is about 12%. There is little incentive for full-time, senior faculty (who usually come to Harvard from other universities) to attend these workshops. Also the University Administration is decentralized and the model of providing more than one center associated with each faculty may work better. We also obtained the evaluation forms of instructors and subjects and compared them to the assessment-based assessment matrix developed at FEA. The discussions with Dr. Virginia Muarer were fruitful. She mentioned the Harvard Assessment Seminars and gave us the first and second reports on these assessment seminars and on other written relevant material.

The Center for Teaching

University of Massachusetts Amherst

April 27, 2000

The AUB task force met the Director of the Center for Teaching, Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli, who introduced us to the activities of the Center, which was established 10 years ago. The following table lists the activities that went on that day.

On April 27, 2000, the AUB Task Force had the following schedule:

	Time	Location	Activity
1	10:30 – 11:30 a.m.	301 Goodwell Bldg	Meeting with Dr. Mary Deane Sorcinelli; Discussion about the functions of their center and its role at the university
2	11:45-12:45 p.m	301 Goodwell Bldg	Presentation by Dr. F. Mues on TEACHnology® A video was also shown.
3	1:00-1:30	Academic Computing Lab	A tour to the instructional multi-media Lab, where demos are shown of ongoing live distance learning classes and tools used in these labs.
4	1:30-2:15 p.m.	Faculty Lounge	Lunch break
5	2:15-3:15p.m.	Office for Information Technologies	Workshop by Dr. Elisa Campbel on critical thinking and role of information technology in widening the use of resources among students and performing across campus workshops on use of Web-CT for on-line courses and Umail.
6	3:15-5:00	Center for Computer-Based Instructional Technology	Demonstrations of the use of software tutors for many basic science and engineering courses. Access to the website where these software packages are developed is

			given to the task force members. Some sample CD's were distributed.

The following was learned through activity (1)

- University of Massachusetts Amherst has around 26,000 students and has gone recently through a re-accreditation process.

-. The center concentrates on using technology to improve the students learning with resources that include:

- The TEACHnology Fellows Program for tenured faculty, funded by the Deans and the Provost's Office. Fellows are awarded a state-of-the-art laptop computer (with the condition that these are used in classrooms) and opportunities for development through attending seminars and networking with other fellows.

- A multimedia resources room to provide opportunities for curriculum design and practice in implementing teaching technologies in the classroom.

- Campus-wide workshops and roundtables on using presentation tools, computer-based instruction, classroom communication system and distance learning tools.

- Individual consultation on issues of good practice in teaching and learning as related to instructional technology.

- The Center for Teaching cooperates with Academic Instructional Media Services, Center for Computer-based Instructional Technology, and with the office of Information Technologies which is the primary provider of computing, networking, telecommunication and information transfer services and support.

- The introduction of the Heburgh award to a faculty development program that is judged to have best met the three award criteria: significance of the program to higher education; appropriate program rationale; and successful results and impact on undergraduate teaching and student learning. The awards are based on the nomination of students and peers. Alumni were also involved.

- The introduction of mid-semester evaluation.

- Questions were raised as to whether technology really helped students learning and the answer was yes through feedback, comparison of students' performance and students' evaluations.

- References were given on Technology and Pedagogy.

- The infrastructure for the widespread use of technology is costly.

<u>The following was learned through activity (2)</u>

- The concept of TEACHnology was explained.

- The outcomes of implementing TEACHnology Fellow Program were illustrated.

- Campus wide workshops on building skills for preparing a teaching portfolio, designing Web sites, enhancing online learning, and creating online images were described.

- A handbook for Teaching Assistants was distributed.

The following was learned through activity (5 & 6):

- Online Information Technology has licensed Web-based training from CBT Systems and has 230 course titles available for use on Amherst Campus Community. CBT Systems delivers interactive education software and develops information technology training for business and education.

- The Center for Computer-Based Instructional Technology works in collaboration with faculty, students and staff to develop computer-based and Web-based instructional systems for use in meeting educational needs. An automated homework system is developed in the Departments of Physics, Chemistry, Entomology, Microbiology, Geology and Foreign Languages. Multimedia tutors are created for teaching in Mechanical Engineering.

The overall impression on the visit to University of Massachusetts Amherst Center for Teaching was that their use of technology is impressive, but unless technical support is provided, such a system is not feasible at AUB. The OIT Department and the number of support staff in all places are huge, while the impact on teaching effectiveness and improving students' learning may be disproportional with the university's huge investment in personnel and equipment.

The Teaching and Learning Lab at MIT

April 28, 2000

The AUB Task Force met with the Lab Director Prof. Lori Breslow who is also a professor at the School of Business, and with her graduate assistant.

On April 28, 2000, the AUB Task Force had the following schedule:

	Time	Location	Activity
1	12:00 – 1:30 a.m.	MIT Rm 9-151	Meeting with Dr.Lori Breslow; Discussion about the functions of their center and its role at the university
2	1:30-4:15 noon	MIT Rm 9-151	Workshop on Captivating Classes: Meeting the Lecture Challenge.

<u>The following was learned through activity (1):</u>

- The Teaching and Learning Lab (TLL) was initiated through a $2 Million donation to MIT and was founded three years ago.

- The TLL lab is run by Dr. Breslow and an assistant who is pursuing a PhD in education.

- The major difference between the TLL and other teaching centers that we had visited is that this center is more proactive in working with program definition and curricula improvement.

- The Lab function is to help faculty members improve their teaching, but does not impose the service.

- Most of the people who usually approach the Lab are newly tenured faculty members.

- The TLL Lab conducted several experiments in teaching methodologies for small and large classes.

- The center offers classes to graduate students and orientation for the teaching staff.

- Problem-based learning is encouraged and is very effective, but open-ended problems need to be addressed as well.

- The use of active learning may affect the amount of material that need to be covered as described by course syllabus, but the knowledge and skills will be retained more effectively by the student, after he/she is done with the course.

- Some reading material is provided on strategic teaching and on handling the muddiest points in a lecture when students have lost track of what is going on and are inattentive.

- The importance of periodic feedback through mini-surveys and the question box at the end of the lecture.

- Teaching is not important in the promotion process if one is good in research.

- There is absolutely no pressure on faculty members to seek the help of the Teaching and Learning Lab. But they do it out of interest, while confidentiality is maintained.

- Lecturers can observe their lecture on Video and can work with the Lab help on improving their styles.

- Enthusiasm about the material delivered plays an important role in students' interest in the subject.

- The TLL environment for conducting classes is very conducive to effective teaching. Lectures can be videotaped. The taping is supervised by a communication expert.

- Several live and distant learning classes are conducted in the TLL. One unique program on distant learning is conducted in cooperation with University of Singapore and seems to be working successfully.

- Common problems that the TLL addressed include the problem of inducing effective learning in large classes, and the problem of resolving the conflict between the drive of the teacher to cover all the material of a course and cooperative learning in classrooms (the issue of covering vs. un-covering the material).

The following was learned through activity (2):

- Learning is an active process.

- Posing problems motivates learning and forces the students to think.

- Both stimulation and reflection are necessary.

- The structure for understanding has been clarified through proper planning of lectures, working between levels of abstraction and using repetition, internal summaries, analogies and visual representation.

- A video of a lecturer in physics was shown. The AUB task force formed four groups and prepared a critique of the lecture and the teacher style.

- Sample students' surveys were provided for feedback on the lecture.

- Samples of active learning exercises were illustrated.

The discussion that followed after activity (2) was very interesting. Comparisons between AUB students and MIT students were drawn. At MIT, the atmosphere is very competitive for students, and they are attentive at lectures. Professors have several TA's for the course who help in grading and running tutorial sessions and discussion classes. Strong emphasis is placed on proper counseling and support for students.

Appendix C

List of References and Materials

From each of The Centers Visited

(MATERIAL IS AVAILABLE WITH TASK FORCE MEMBERS)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

• Compendium: Practical Pedagogy for Critical Thinking (CT)

CT curriculum for the classroom

Group work

Constructive controversy

CT discussion

One-minute paper

Reference list

• Handouts:

Working effectively in groups

Providing help for non-native English speaking students in a lecture class

Characteristics of a good grading system

Assessing course-related learning and study skills, strategies and behaviors.

Assessing skills in analysis and CT

Assessing skill in synthesis and creative thinking

Assessing skill in problem solving

Assessing course-related knowledge and skills.

Assessing learner attitudes, values, and self-awareness

Computer college degrees/constructive controversy

The teaching portfolio

I can't get the students to do the assigned reading

Designing effective library assignments

• Articles

The Dreaded Discussion: Ten ways to start

So Much Content, So Little Time

Faculty development bulletin

• Pamphlets:

Center for Teaching a learning services

Preparing future faculty

• Compendium: Getting students to be partners in the learning process

• Documenting your teaching

• The national teaching & learning forum

• Teaching & learning strategies: A collection of articles for new instructors.

• Teaching at the University of Minnesota: A handbook for faculty & instructional staff

• Univ. of Minnesota Summer Session 2000 catalogue

• Univ. of Minnesota Fall Session 2000 class schedule

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

• **Pamphlets**:

Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning: Fall Teaching Orientation

The Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning: Winter Teaching Orientation

Bureau of Study Counsel: Faculty of Arts & Sciences

Bureau of Study Counsel: Groups & Workshops

Harvard Teaching Series: Videotapes from the Derek Bok Center and Order Form

• **Booklets**:

Derek Bok Center for Teaching & Learning

Peer Counseling at Harvard College

• **Mid-Semester Evaluations**

- **Ten Strategies for Effective Discussion Leading**

- **Tips for Teachers: Twenty Ways to Make Lectures, More Participatory**

- **Teaching Fellows Handbook**

- **Harvard Assessment Seminars**: First Report 1990

  Second Report 1992

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST

- **Handbook**:

  Preparing a teaching portfolio

Hesburgh 2000: For faculty development to enhance undergraduate teaching and learning – Award winners 2000

Handbook for teaching assistants

- **1998 – 1999 Annual Report-Center for Teaching**

- **Newsletters of the Office of Information Technologies**

  Fall 1999 / Vol. 5 # 1

  Spring 2000 / Vol. 5 # 2

• **Handouts**:

Web CT at UMass

Reading recommendations on:

a) Communication, teaching, & learning in the foreign language classroom

b) Community service-learning: Linking classroom education and community service

c) Teachers' choices: The ten best on teaching and learning

d) Preparing for promotion and tenure: A selected bibliography

Two thumbs up: A selection of teaching and learning videos

Faculty technology support sessions-spring þ2000þ

Academic computing workshops June 2000

Center for teaching: Programs and resources

• **Compendium: Technology fellows program**:

• **Pamphlets:**

Center for teaching: A mind once stretched by a new idea, never regains its original dimensions.

Teaching technologies

Academic computing

• **University catalogue**:

Undergraduate

Graduate

M I T

• **The teaching and learning laboratory folder includes**:

Presentation compendium on captivating classes: Meeting the lecture challenge. A presentation for the AUB Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching – April 28, 2000.

• **Booklet:**

The Torch or the Firehose: A guide to section teaching

• **Pamphlets**: MIT the teaching learning laboratory

• **Handouts on**:

Department based teaching and learning workshops

The electronic forum on educational innovation

Class videotaping and consulting program

Schedule of series of workshops presented for " On the culture edge: Innovations in Science and Engineering Education".

• **Syllabus on**:

Teaching College – Level Chemistry.

Report on Cooperative Learning Workshop

Members

Saouma Boujaoude, Chairperson

Theodore Christidis

Nesreen Ghaddar

Ahmad Nasri

Nuhad Yazbeck-Dumit

The Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence organized a workshop on Cooperative Learning in the College Classroom that was presented by Dr. Roger Johnson and Dr. David Johnson, two international authorities on the topic. Dr. David Johnson is a Professor of Educational Psychology and holds the Emma M. Birkmaier Professorship in Educational Leadership. He is Co-Director of the Cooperative Learning Center at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Roger Johnson is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Science Education and Co-Director of the Cooperative Learning Center at the same university. The workshop was presented once on each of the following dates in the College Hall Auditorium, Basement of College Hall.

1. Tuesday, May 9, 2000 (9:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.)

1. Wednesday, May 10, 2000 (9:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.).

The workshop provided a basic background for implementing cooperative learning into the college classroom. It emphasized informal cooperative learning for use in large or small group lectures and formal cooperative learning for use in problem solving, case study, and project oriented assignments. Specifically, the purpose of the workshop was to:

1. Provide an opportunity for faculty members to explore ways for involving and training students in cooperative learning in and out of the classroom.

2. Provide a stimulating forum for faculty to develop a greater understanding and appreciation of cooperative learning
3. Provide a framework and practical strategies for applying critical thinking, cooperative learning, and discovery learning in the classroom.

4. Enable the participants to appreciate what the learner experiences in a cooperative learning environment.

   The topics covered in the workshop included, but were not limited to:

1. What is cooperative learning?
2. What makes cooperative groups work?

3. Essential elements of cooperation

4. Structuring groups for effective cooperation
5. In and out-of-class cooperative activities

   A total of 97 faculty members form a variety of disciplines attended the workshops (See Appendix 1). Each of the participants received a certificate of attendance (Appendix 2).

   Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop. The following are examples of the comments they provided:

-

-

Souad Araj

Thank you very much for organizing the workshop on Cooperative learning. I think it was well organized. The idea itself was not new ,but it was presented in a nice new way. I think the presenters handled themselves very well. They could have presented the material in less time. I look forward to more workshops of this kind.

Thank you.

Nadia Maria El-Cheikh

I attended the Workshop on Cooperative Learning . The following are some of my impressions ...

The workshop was very useful, in a general way, for getting us to think more aggressively about ways to involve the students in the classroom. In a more specific way, the workshop was also very helpful in suggesting techniques to implement group learning. Although some of the methods and techniques used cannot be applied universally to any class, the combination of techniques that were suggested allow variable approaches that would fit the variety of class set-ups that we deal with. As we were going through the exercises, I was already thinking whether a

particular technique can be applied in my freshman history class, or whether it would be much more appropriate and successful in a Junior/Senior class.

I am planning to use the cooperative approach starting next Fall. This will necessitate a somewhat different approach to the material of the courses. It will involve a different type of preparation. For my Freshman class I intend to provide them with a number of handouts concerning a variety of topics and get them to discuss the quotation, reference, analysis , in class , among themselves. For my upper class, I am already thinking about changes to be made in the substance of the syllabus in ways that will enhance group-learning.

Although I have always tried to get the students to actively participate in class discussion, I have mostly been disappointed because out of a class of 25 only three to four students would be genuinely interested in doing the required reading or assignment. I am hoping that by getting them to do the work together, I will get many more people involved in class discussion and in the material of the course.

The workshop was, on the whole, very useful. At times, though, I thought that we were going a bit too slowly losing precious time that was badly needed towards the end. I wish we had more time to ask specific questions and to share some of our experiences with the Johnsons. I enjoyed the workshop very much. It was educational. I strongly believe that methods such as cooperative and interactive learning should be encouraged at the AUB. As a matter of fact, I have already applied cooperative learning techniques in one of my lectures and the majority of the students enjoyed it. Thank you again.

Efat Abou-Fakhr Hammad

I would like to indicate that the Cooperative Learning Workshop was

very interesting. I have previously participated in a similar seminar that

explained the ways to provoke students to interact more and more with

specialized material in the field of Entomology.

This workshop allowed us to practice suggested methods at hand and I am

sure I will incorporate some new ideas in my methodology of interactive

cooperative learning during my teaching sessions, lectures and labs.

Thank you.

Steve Harakeh

I enjoyed the workshop very much. It was educational. I strongly believe

that methods such as cooperative and interactive learning should be

encouraged at the AUB. As a matter of fact, I have already applied

cooperative learning techniques in one of my lectures and the majority of

the students enjoyed it. Thank you again.

Hind Rizkallah

I am pleased to inform you that the workshop on cooperative learning given by the Johnson's brothers was extremely useful. As a matter of fact, I personally started applying them in my recitation session in the Biology 210 course. It was a success but I had few obstacles such as:

1. The armchairs in the classroom were fixed which impeded the proper arrangement of the groupings.
2. The students enjoyed this new teaching method but wondered why it started towards the end of the semester.

However this experience proved to be more successful while conducting laboratory sessions in Biology 260, it helped conducting more homogenous groups.

Finally, I believe from my little experience that cooperative learning must be used extensively in teaching as a whole and especially in recitation sessions.

Muhammad Ali Khalidi

The following is a brief response to the request for feedback on the Cooperative Learning Workshop.

I thought the workshop was effective in sensitizing me to the possibility

of incorporating more cooperative learning in my courses, and I have indeed

already begun to experiment with one such exercise in my Freshman

Philosophy course.

However, it seems to me that the workshop had a few drawbacks to which I'd

like to draw your attention:

1. The method of instructing us in cooperative learning was itself a cooperative one. While this has its advantages in terms of giving us an experiential or phenomenological "feel" of cooperative learning exercises, it may have been more effective given the time constraints and the artificiality of the setting (not a real classroom environment), to impart these techniques in a more classical way.
2. There was a shortage of concrete ideas on how to implement cooperative learning in specific classes and disciplines. While it would not be possible to feature an example from each discipline, we might have been more inspired

had we been exposed to a few such exercises drawn from actual classes. In this regard, a videotape or two may have been especially useful in helping us to visualize the implementation of cooperative learning in specific classroom situations.

3. The graphics and audiovisual aids were quite crude, especially given the fact that the workshop was about conveying pedagogical techniques. The auxiliary pedagogical tools they used themselves could have been more effective.
4. Problems involved in experimenting with cooperative learning were insufficiently addressed. For example, the "free rider" problem, or the problem of lost class time, or the problem of students who adamantly insist that they work better on their own than they do in groups (as one student insisted to me today).
5. The jokey tone adopted was sometimes a little alienating and seemed to be aimed at a less savvy and sophisticated audience.

Finally, I'd like to end these brief remarks on a positive note.

Interestingly enough, one of the most useful aspects of the whole workshop for me was a diagram which was projected on the overhead projector at one point (but not included in the booklet). It was a suggested breakup of the time in a 50 minute class into the following segments: 3 minutes speculation and calling for students' intuitive responses, 10-15 minutes lecture, 3-4 minutes review (cooperative), 10-15 minutes lecture, and so on. This was a concrete practical tip that each of us could implement (and I've even begun to follow it informally in some class sessions).

Thanks for the opportunity to give you my feedback and for all your efforts in organizing the workshop.

Khadijah Lakkis

I'd like first to thank you for the new trend you initiated i.e. the series of workshops you've already started to update the teaching level for AUB faculty members. As for the 'Cooperative Learning' workshop in particular, I'd like to comment as follows:

1. It was a good opportunity for AUB faculty from all departments to meet and interact academically.
2. For us , teachers of education,it was a refreshing activity as the concept itself is very basic for all the courses we had at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
3. Finally, Drs. Johnson's lecture was a bit repetitive and they didn't come up with any new trend or theory in cooperative learning.

All in all, it was a fruitful experience and similar ones are recommended for future activities.

Hala Mohtaseb

The workshop was quite informative and enlightening. I am afraid though that some of the ideas the Johnson's presented cannot be implemented in our classes and particularly with our students (premedical) whose only concern is to compete with others. I believe that our students are not at a level to accept cooperative learning

procedures. For example, in one of my classes I tried to implement some of what was presented (stop lecture every 10 mins and initiate discussions among groups) and felt that things were getting somehow out of hand and students were not so appreciative of the idea. The cooperative learning method could perhaps work better in a lab setting (smaller classes) or in problem solving kinds of classes (such as Math, Physics, Chemistry), but not as much for fields like Biology (or for large classes). It is good though to be exposed to such ideas and perhaps introduce them slowly to the class and with time hope that our students be at a level of maturity to accept them. As always, change is not easy and has to come slowly but surely.

Thank you for organizing this workshop. We do need to be informed of teaching tools that are applied elsewhere and, in turn, use some of what we learn to fit our needs.

Rima Shadid

The Cooperative Learning Workshop experience was a good one. We instructors in the English Dept. have a good background on this subject as we have attended such workshops in the past.. however this one was a good refresher, especially that the presenters are well known figures in the field - they were able to make the workshop an enjoyable one. One other important point to mention is the general atmosphere in the workshop - ie. we were able to meet with other professors in various departments and exchange views on teaching which was informative as well as enjoyable... this type of interaction should be encouraged .... rather than the constant 'unequal' treatment between MA's and Phd's!

Thank you for an interesting and enjoyable workshop.

Samar Sadek

Concerning the cooperative learning workshop, I was very glad to participate in, I think I have now some new ideas about cooperative learning, and I can apply them in some of my classes.

It was a successful activity, and we need more and more of this type of activities.

Thank you.

Bassem Saab.

The workshop was useful. I can apply what I've learned in medical teaching. The speakers were outstanding with good sense of humor.

Keep the good work

Ahmad Smaili

Cooperative Learning is a wonderful idea that draws on the benefits of teamwork, which is a badly needed approach to problem solving, especially in developing societies. However, Cooperative Learning is just one tool of many that facilitate Process Education.

Just like anything else, learning is a process, and if is approached as such, it will leverage the outcome of the University's mission beyond anybody's dreams. Process Education is an "educational philosophy focusing on improving students' performance skills and creating "self growers"." It is the whole of which Cooperative Learning is just a tool. The focus of Process Education is not just the course in the class room, but rather on the whole body the educational experience, from administration to curricula to class-room environment, and so on.

With commitment, hard work, patience, administrative support, and willingness to experience a paradigm shift in the way we view our role as educators, Process Education can be implemented in a way that would make AUB regain its stature as the premiere institution of higher education in the region. The Workshop on Cooperative Learning was well organized and beneficial. I am sure many of us have been using teamwork approach to learning for many years and we can see the promise it holds. But for Cooperative Learning to be effective, it has to be a part of an overall educational strategy that views education as a process. This is the way of the future and Workshops such as the one on Cooperative Learning will definitely help promote this vision.

Salwa Makarem

My sincere thanks for giving the School of Nursing the opportunity to attend the workshop on Cooperative Learning and for requesting feedback from Faculty.

The emphasis on learning and outcomes continues to receive increased attention in the nursing literature. Hence, the workshop on Cooperative Learning was timely in that it provided several insights into learning which I believe need to be incorporated into nursing education. Insights gained include active learning, personalization, contextual learning and learning to learn.

I fully agree with the Directors of the Cooperative Leaning Center that education ought to focus on life long learning and not just on academic degrees. Their various approaches to developing skills associated with success in academia i.e. initiative, effective communication, critical and creative thinking and teamwork were interesting and practical.

The Johnson’s presentation detailing the basic elements of cooperative learning and the three types of cooperating learning groups were indeed enriching. I believe the workshop was successful in that the three stated objectives of cooperative learning were met. Structuring interactions, understanding group process in maintaining working relationship among team members are important objectives to learning goals. I believe, as nurse educators we do use the cooperative learning approach especially, in our post conferences conducted after an eight hour of practicum. No doubt, the details about the use of the cooperative learning was timely and beneficial.

Appendix 1

Participants in the Cooperative Learning Workshop

Tuesday, May 9, 2000

Total number = 45

Name	Faculty	Department
Reem Rashash Shaaban	University Orientation Program	Director
Amal Bou Zeineddine	Division of Education	Education
Hussein Yaghi	Division of Education	Education
Lina Karkanawi	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Rabab Kodeih	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Hassan Zreik	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Elie Barbour	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Animal Science
Faraj El-Awar	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Soil, Irrigation and Mechanization
Efat Hammad	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Crop Production Protection
Helen Sader	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Nadia El-Cheikh	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Amal Kassiss	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Hind Rizkallah	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Theodory Christidis	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Physics
Conolly Oliver	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Philosophy
Hanin	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Business School

Abdallah		
Evagellos Dedoussis	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	GSBM [Business]
Hala Mohtasseb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Malakeh Khoury	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Zane Sinno	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Mina Khoury-Shalhoub	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Rima Shedid	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Nada Sinno Saoud	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Said El-Fakhani	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Business Administration
John Meloy	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Farid El-Khazen	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	PSPA
Samar Sadek	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Hana Deeb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Bashar Haydar	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Philosophy
Soha Saffieddine	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	English Department
Assad Khairallah	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Arabic & Near Eastern Languages
Kevin Butcher	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Ahmad Nasri	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics & Computer Sciences
Fouad Mrad	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Electrical & Computer Engineering
Ramsey Hamade	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Mechanical Engineering
Ali El-Hajj	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Electrical & Computer
Samer Jabbour	Faculty of Health Sciences	Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Steve Harakeh	Faculty of Health Sciences	Environmental Health
Mona Kambris	Faculty of Health Sciences	Environmental Health

Arabia Mohamad Ali	Faculty of Health Sciences	Health Services Administration Department
Nuha Nuwayri Salti	Faculty of Medicine	
Sossy Balian	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Mirna Doumit	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Nuhad Doumit	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
May Khoury	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Salwa Makarem	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing

Candidates for Cooperative Learning Workshop

Wednesday, May 10, 2000

Total number = 42

Name	Faculty	Department
Bashshur, Munir	Division of Education	Director
Henningsen, Merge	Division of Education	
Abu Saba, Mary	Division of Education	Counseling
Araj, Suad	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Baalbaki, Rula	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Sidahmed, Moatasim	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Soil, Irrigation and Mechanization
Haidar, Mustapha	Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences	Crop Production Protection
Zurayk, Rami	Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences	Soil, Irrigation and Mechanization
Toufeili, Imad	Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences	Food Technology and Nutrition
Seeden, Helga	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology

Tabbal, Malek	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Physics
Fadda, Nada	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Deeb, Rima	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Iskandarani, Rima	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Maktabi, Sawsan	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Behmardi, Vahid	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Arabic & Near Eastern Language
Aga, Saleh Said	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Arabic & Near Eastern Language
Kreyddieh, Sawsan	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Baalbaki, Imad	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Business Administration
Seeden, Helga	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Lakkis, Khadija	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	University Orientation Program
Khalidid, Mohamad Ali	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Philosophy
Mansour, Rania	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Nasr, Waddah	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Philosophy
Hamzeh, Nizar	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	PSPA
Ghaddar, Nesreen	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Mechanical Engineering
Smaili, Ahmad	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Mechanical Engineering
Sadek, Salah	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Civil & Environmental
Karaki, Sami	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Electrical & Computer
Kanj, Mayada	Faculty of Health Sciences	Health Behavior & Education
Khatib, Rola	Faculty of Health Sciences	Medical Laboratory Technology
Ramia, Sami	Faculty of Health Sciences	Medical Lab. Technology

Melhem, Nada	Faculty of Health Sciences	Medical Lab. Technology
Kodeih, Amal	Faculty of Health Sciences	Population Studies
Nuwayhid, Iman	Faculty of Health Sciences	Environmental Health
Saab, Bassem	Faculty of Medicine	Family Medicine
Adra, Marina	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Arevian, Mary	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Arnaout, Irene	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Azoury, Nuhad	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Yaktine, Umayma	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Marini, Sana	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Shehab, Dina	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Ghazu Ghaith	Division of Education Programs	Education
Salma Talhouk	Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences	Crop production & protection
Rania Al-Jadira	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics Department

Report of the Sub Committee on the Enhancing of

Teaching Effectiveness Workshop

Members

Saouma BouJaoude

Theodore Christidis

Nisreen Ghaddar, Chairperson

Ahmad Nasri

Nuhad Yazbeck-Dumit

The Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence organized a workshop on Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness (with emphasis on assessment and evaluation) by Dr. Yezdi K. Bhada. Dr. Bhada is Associate Provost for Academic Services and Professor of Accounting at Georgia State University. He holds an MBA from Bowling Green State University, a Ph.D. from the University of Florida, and is a certified Management Accountant. His professional experiences include a two year visiting professorship in business administration at IMD (IMEDE), Lausanne, Switzerland; presentations and seminars in the U.S., Europe, Africa, Middle-East, South and Central America; consulting and program activities with IBM, Nestle, NationsBank, Central Bank of Ecuador and other organizations. Dr. Bhada has conducted numerous programs on teaching improvement in the United States and around the world. He is a frequent contributor to professional literature and his experiences include work on Boards of business and non-profit organizations. The workshop covered four modules on effective teacher attributes, student evaluations, learning objectives, and testing and grading respectively.

The workshop was presented once on each of Tuesday, June 6; Wednesday, June 7; and Thursday, June 8, 2000 in the College Hall Auditorium, Basement of College Hall. A total of 110 faculty members from a variety of disciplines attended the workshops (See Appendix 1).

Appendix 1

Tuesday June 6, 2000

Name	Faculty	Department

Said El-Fakhani	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Graduate School of Business Management
Salma Talhouk	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Crop Production & Protection
Jamal Abed	Faculty of Engineering and Architecture	Architecture
Abdo R. Jurjus	Faculty of Medicine	Human Morphology
Reem Shaaban	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Rima Slim	Faculty of Medicine	Biochemistry
Amal Kassiss	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Mandana Hajj	Faculty of Health Sciences	Environmental Health
Myrna A. A. Doumit	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Sana Dayeh Marini	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Evangellos Dedoussis	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Graduate School of Business & Management
May Khoury	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Hassan Diab	Faculty of Engineering and Architecture	Electrical & Computer
Salwa Makarem	Faculty of Medicine	Nursing
M. Arevian	Faculty of Medicine	Nursing
Umayma Yaktine	Faculty of Medicine	Nursing
Sossy Balian	Faculty of Medicine	Nursing
S. Isber	Faculty of Arts &	Physics

	Sciences	
Theodore Christidis	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Physics
Mary Abu Saba	Division of Education	Education
May Awaida	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Social & Behavioral Sciences
Yasmine Nassif	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Psychology
Waddah Nasr	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Philosophy
Tarek Kazzaz	Faculty of Engineering and Architecture	Architecture & Graphic Design
U. Kortz	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Malek Tabbal	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Physics
Samar Sadek	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Randa Abi Rafi’	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Hana Deeb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry
Bared Safieh	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Sui-Kwong Yau	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Crop Production & Protection
Maha Hatab	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
Nada Melhem	Faculty of Health Sciences	Medical Laboratory Technology
Rola Khatib	Faculty of Health Sciences	Medical Laboratory Technology
Jack Nikiel	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
Rabab	Faculty of Arts &	University

Kodeih	Sciences	Orientation Program
Afaf Tabsh	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
Ibrahim Osman	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Graduate School of Business Management

Wednesday June 7, 2000

Name	**Faculty**	**Department**
Efat Hammad	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Crop Production & Protection
Assad Taha	Faculty of Medicine	Surgery
Nuhad Yazbek Dumit	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Samer Jabbour	Faculty of Medicine	Physiology
A. Abdel Rahman	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Geology
Khadija Lakkis	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Arabia Moh'd Ali Osseiran	Faculty of Health Sciences	Health Services Administration
Basim Saab	Faculty of Medicine	Family Medicine
Ghazi Ghaith	Division of Education	Education
Hussein Yaghi	Division of Education	Education
Rania Mansour	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Chemistry

Maha Al-Assad	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Andrzej Kulczycki	Faculty of Health Sciences	Population Studies
Iman Nuwayhid	Faculty of Health Sciences	Environmental Health
Prem C. Saxena	Faculty of Health Sciences	Population Studies
Nuhad Bu Raad Azoury	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Dina Madi Shehab	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Marina Adra	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Abla Sibai	Faculty of Health Sciences	Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Monique Chaaya	Faculty of Health Sciences	Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Steve Harakeh	Faculty of Medicine	Obstetrics and Gynecology
Elie Barbour	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Animal Science
Hala Mouhtaseb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Helga Seeden	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Marwan Ghandour	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Architecture
Leila Farhoud	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing
Assad Khairallah	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Arabic
Sawsan Kreyddieh	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Irene Arnaout	Faculty of Medicine	School of Nursing

Ahmad Nassri	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
John Meloy	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Nadia El-Cheick	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Helen Sader	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Hala Tamim	Faculty Health Sciences	Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Hazar Abu-Khuzam	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
Abdallah Lyzzaik	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
Fuad Mrad	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Electrical & Computer
Shadi Hamadeh	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Animal Science
Hanin Abdallah	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Graduate School of Business Management
Kevin Butcher	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	History & Archeology
Ramy Zurayk	Faculty of Agricultural & Food Sciences	Soil Irrigation and Mechanization

Thursday June 8, 2000

Name	**Faculty**	**Department**
Ghassan Hamadeh	Faculty of Medicine	Family Medicine
Nina Shabb	Faculty of Medicine	Pathology & Laboratory Medicine
Hanaa Kobeissi	Faculty of Health Sciences	Health Services Administration

Hind Rizkallah	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Peter Shebaya	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Civilization Sequence Program
Malakeh Khoury	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Hala Mohtasseb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Antoine Hannoun	Faculty of Medicine	Obstetrics & Gynecology
Ahmad Awdeh	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Nesreen Ghaddar	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Mechanical Engineering
Suha Safiyiddeen	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Zane Sinno	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Rima Shadid	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Sawsan Maktabi	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Adel Ismail	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Reema Iskandarani	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Nadine Darwiche	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Nada Sinno Saoud	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Biology
Amal Dibo	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Civilization Sequence Program
Rima Deeb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Mona Kambris	Faculty of Health Sciences	Environmental Health

Hassan Zreik	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	University Orientation Program
Lina Karkanawi	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	University Orientation Program
Saouma Bou Jaoude	Division of Education	Education
Shibl Shibl	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Rola Baalbaki	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Suad Araj	Division of Education	University Orientation Program
Ramsey Hamade	Faculty of Engineering & Architecture	Mechanical Engineering
Hayat Shayto	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	English
Monique Chaaya	Faculty of Health Sciences	Epidemiology / Biostatistics
Aida Arasoghli	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Civilization Program
Mona Amyuni	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	Civilization Program
Helen Nuwayhid	Visitor	

Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence

Report of the Sub-Committee on the Survey of Teaching Practices at AUB.

Members:

Jamal Abed

Kevin Butcher, Chairperson

Said El-Fakhani

Iman Nuwayhid

The Sub-Committee for the Survey of Teaching Practices at AUB was formed at a meeting of the Task Force on January 28 2000, following the discussion of a draft survey composed by Dr. Karma El-Hassan on January 21. The Task Force agreed that the purpose of the survey was to map current teaching practices at AUB in relation to contemporary theories and practices that are believed to lead to teaching effectiveness. The data from the survey would also be used to help determine what sort of workshops AUB requires.

The members of the Sub-Committee felt that the survey should focus on outcomes and development of objectives and student learning skills, rather than simply surveying current teaching practices. By filling in the survey, Faculty would become more aware of the variety of contemporary educational approaches, if they were not already aware. Members of the Sub-Committee examined examples of existing teaching surveys from universities in the USA, but it was felt that none of these provided a suitable format or questions for our purposes. An original format and questionnaire had to be developed.

The Sub-Committee also felt that anonymity should be guaranteed, and to ensure anonymity it would not be possible to analyze the data collected by department. Therefore the questions in the survey had to reflect general practices, and could not be tailored to meet the needs of individual departments or faculties. Initially it was proposed that the survey cover lecture type courses only, but at the Task Force meeting of February 18, 2000, it was decided that laboratories also be covered, by creating an additional questionnaire for laboratories only. In both cases the responses on the questionnaire would be divided into two categories, depending on whether the class was large or small (approximately 30 students being the watershed between the two categories).

Rather than having questions, the main part of the survey was designed as a series of statements about teaching practice, to which Faculty could respond that they either employed this practice or they did not. A five point grading system of responses, from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’, was entertained, but it was decided to classify the responses into three categories: ‘yes’; ‘no’; and ‘not applicable’. The latter enabled the Sub-Committee to include questions that might not be appropriate to every sort of lecture course.

The format of the survey, discussed and approved by the Task Force members in the meeting of February 18, 2000, was as follows:

Part 1: Knowledge of contemporary educational theories and practices.

This part was divided into three sections:

a. Questions related to designing a course (i.e. setting course objectives and designing and distributing a syllabus)

b. Questions related to techniques used in the classroom or laboratory

c. Questions related to evaluation (i.e. tailoring the evaluations to give feedback about whether the course meets its objectives)

The main purpose of this structure was to see to what degree Faculty are organizing courses with clearly stated objectives and how they measure whether the courses meet those objectives.

Part 2: Obstacles to effective teaching.

This part listed some types of obstacles, but also left room for open-ended responses.

Part 3: Faculty needs.

This part enabled faculty to express an opinion about what they needed to make their teaching more effective. The feedback from this could prove very useful in determining the type of workshops AUB requires.

The lecture course and laboratory surveys were presented to the Task Force for further consideration at a meeting on March 3, 2000. A number of Task Force members suggested editorial changes to some of the statements. A pilot survey was then conducted. Task Force members were asked to fill in the survey, and request a colleague in their departments to fill it in as well. This pilot allowed the Task Force to give an average estimate of how long it took to fill in the survey and to invite comments from colleagues. These comments were reviewed at the Task Force meeting of April 14. As a result of this, some minor corrections were made. The

survey was then submitted by the Chair of the Task Force to the Board of Deans for approval. A method for distributing the survey to Faculty was approved at the Task Force meeting of May 12, 2000.

1. Survey of Undergraduate Teaching Practices at AUB.

2. Survey of Undergraduate Science Laboratory-Based Teaching Practices at AUB.

A total of 247 responded, 45 of whom filled in the second form (Lab-Based Teaching). All data has been entered, and the comments typed and categorized. We are thankful for Miss Lamia El- Husseini for entering the data at short notice. The data is currently being studied and analyzed under the supervision of Dr. Fuad Abdel-Khalek of the Department of Education at AUB. We are very grateful to Dr. Abdel-Khalek for his valuable assistance and advice. Once the study and analysis of the data is completed the results will be included in a final report on the survey.

Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence

Report of the Sub-committee on the Survey of graduating Students

Members

Jamal Abed,

Nisreen Ghaddar,

Fouad Mrad, (Chairperson)

Nuhad Yazbek-Dumit,

Rami Zurayk.

The following material was provided by the sub-committee to the Task Force in preparation for the discussion of the questionnaire.

I. Proposed AUB Student Survey Objectives:

The survey is a part of a summative evaluation effort at AUB that should provide a macro view for the purpose of improving teaching, learning, and institutional effectiveness.

1. Assessment of teaching effectiveness in today's AUB practices and identification of desired teaching techniques for effective learning as perceived by students in order to be able to:

make comparisons between teacher survey and student survey;

understand what is being practiced, effective and desired from the students' point of view.

2. Measurement of students' awareness of, and satisfaction with their undergraduate program

objectives.

3. Assessment of outcomes as part of the deployment of TQM higher education.

II. Background:

Background Questions [4,5]:

Assessment of learning outcomes:

How does this survey data improve teaching and ultimately learning?

Congruence of evidence of teaching outcomes with stated purposes and Objectives.

How does the survey make faculty members recognize the connection between the survey and their interests.

The Teaching-Improvement Loop:

"Teaching, learning, outcomes assessment, and improvement may be defined as elements of a feedback loop in which teaching influences learning, and the assessment of learning outcomes is used to improve teaching and, ultimately, learning. If this loop is followed, institutions will achieve effective teaching and curriculum development."

"Student outcomes' assessment is the act of assembling, analyzing, and using both qualitative and quantitative evidence of teaching and learning outcomes, in order to examine their congruence with stated purposes and educational objectives and to provide meaningful feedback that will stimulate self-renewal."

"Student interviews, faculty evaluations, periodic program reviews, opinion surveys, alumni studies, and student test performance, measured over time, all constitute complementary ways of obtaining useful feedback."

"When faculty are assured that assessment will facilitate the improvement of teaching and learning, they can recognize it as connected to their interests, and they are more likely to participate fully."

"Assessment practices should maximize the use of existing data and information."

"The impact that assessment practices have on students?..; on changes that students introduce to their academic and career plans; on decisions about curriculum content and instructional methods; and on academic and public policy."

"Perceptions of student experiences and the impact of those experiences, and reports of current status, activities, and accomplishments."

"

What should students learn?

How well are they learning it?

How do we know?

How can this information improve teaching and learning?"

"

Student evaluations of course and instructional quality;

Measures of student satisfaction with the quality of the curriculum;

Measures of student personal and affective development;

Measures of student retention, and students' interest in their educational programs;

Measures of students' involvement in academic and co-curricular activities;"

"Skillfully designed survey instruments can accommodate the assessment of a wide range of affective outcomes, including students' personal qualities (interpersonal skills, leadership skills, and self understanding), attitudes (social responsibility, motivation for learning, and understanding diversity), career paths (occupational choice, educational objectives, and the quality of the educational environment)"

III Student Questionnaire

LEARNING EXPERIENCES AT AUB

SURVEY OF GRADUATING STUDENTS

Dear graduating AUB student:

The purpose of this survey is to improve the educational experience of AUB students. As graduating students you are now in a position to look back at your overall educational experiences at AUB. The University values your opinion and advice. Kindly take the time to share your views with us by answering the questions in this survey.

FACULTY: ……

MAJOR:…….

KINDLY RETURN TO THE SECRETARY OF YOUR DEPARTMENT BY FRIDAY <u>JUNE 9, 2000</u>

In answering the following questions about your learning experiences, consider all of the courses you have taken. Answer according to the following key:

Strongly Agree = SA = 4

Agree = A =3

Disagree = D =2

Strongly Disagree = SD =1

	SA	A	D	SD
1.The objectives of the program I am enrolled in were clear to me.	4	3	2	1
2. The objectives of the courses that I have taken were clearly stated.	4	3	2	1

3. Course syllabi are usually distributed early on in the semester.	4	3	2	1
4. The syllabi usually included course outcomes i.e. the skills that the students ought to acquire by the end of the course.	4	3	2	1
5. The material covered in class was relevant to stated course objectives	4	3	2	1
6. Teachers were usually available to students during office hours.	4	3	2	1
• Recent developments in the field were <u>not</u> discussed in class.	4	3	2	1
• Classroom sessions were often structured to enable student involvment.	4	3	2	1
• Teachers often encouraged problem- solving in class.	4	3	2	1
• *Course activities often included group* *work both in and out of class.*	4	3	2	1
11. Teachers usually invited students to relate outside events/activities to subjects covered in the courses.	4	3	2	1

• Term papers and other take-home work were designed to encourage students to do independent research.	4	3	2	1
• Teachers clearly explained their grading policy to students at the beginning of courses.	4	3	2	1
• Teachers usually evaluated student performance periodically.	4	3	2	1
• Teachers usually discussed performance and progress with students.	4	3	2	1
• Teachers often used the following types of performance evaluations:				
Objective test	4	3	2	1
Subjective test	4	3	2	1

	SA	**A**	**D**	**SD**
Oral test	4	3	2	1
Drop quiz	4	3	2	1
Take-home test	4	3	2	1
Homework assignment	4	3	2	1
Individual report	4	3	2	1
Group project report	4	3	2	1
	4	3	2	1

• The overall quality of instruction in my program was not good.				
• The content of required courses in my major were adequate.	4	3	2	1
• I found large classes beneficial.	4	3	2	1
• There was no time to cover all of the course topics.	4	3	2	1
• I was motivated to do as well as I could in my classes.	4	3	2	1
• The classes I was enrolled in contributed to my personal growth.	4	3	2	1
• I have heard faculty refer to their research.	4	3	2	1
• I have attended special talks, lectures, or panel discussions held on campus.	4	3	2	1
• I have talked with faculty members about my career plans.	4	3	2	1
• The overall quality of academic advising provided to me was not adequate.	4	3	2	1

• I have worked with a faculty member on research projects.	4	3	2	1
• I have taken a course that required accessing information through the internet.	4	3	2	1
• I had access to computers in my department.	4	3	2	1
• I have seen students cheat on a test at AUB.	4	3	2	1
• I knew AUB students who handed in someone else's work as their own.	4	3	2	1
• The program I am enrolled in prepared me to apply my knowledge in my field to solve relevant problems.	4	3	2	1
• I am able to reinforce and support ideas from team members.	4	3	2	1
• I am able to plan work and set goals.	4	3	2	1

	SA	**A**	**D**	**SD**

35. I am able to stay on task toward a timely completion of goals.				
• I am able to communicate effectively with persons from other disciplines.	4	3	2	1
• My educational experience at AUB enhanced my ability to convince others with my ideas and solutions by effective presentations.	4	3	2	1
• My educational experience at AUB enhanced my ability to convince others with my ideas or solutions to problems by effective written reports.	4	3	2	1
• My educational experience at AUB prepared me to make ethical decisions in my field.	4	3	2	1

Kindly Respond to the following:

1. Suggest important changes to teaching practices at AUB.

2. Recommend topics, skills, or concepts that were not covered during your study at AUB that you feel strongly should have been covered.

3. Describe your best learning experience and your worst as well. If necessary use the back of this page.

IV. References

1. The University of Minnesota "1999 Student Experiences Survey."

2. The University of Minnesota "Graduate Survey: assessing the impact of the university on its graduates."

3. Clemson University Employer telephone Survey.

4. Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) Engineering

Criteria 2000.

5. "Framework for Outcomes Assessment", Middle States Commission on

Higher Education, 1996.

We wanted to make sure that the graduating students will speak out their minds freely and without fear of 'retaliation'. We decided to get their responses after the final grades were reported. One disadvantage of this delay is that we got fewer responses than we might have received had the graduating students been surveyed while they were still going to classes. Although the responses are still being studied, it is already obvious that important conclusions pertaining to teaching and learning at AUB could be drawn on the basis of what the graduating students are telling us. We ought to listen and consider. A final report on this survey, including recommendations, will be issued later.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

Subcommittee Report on

The Teaching Excellence Web Page

Members

Theodore Christidis

Said Elfakhani

Ahmad Nasri (Chairperson)

Rami Zurayk

INTRODUCTION:

The Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence formed a subcommittee charged with the development of a web site on Teaching Excellence. The site will be used as repository for hosting, exchanging and posting information about teaching excellence at AUB and around the world. The members of the subcommittee are:

Theodore Christidis

Said Elfakhani

Ahmad Nasri (Chair of the Subcommittee)

Rami Zurayk

The objectives of this web page will be:

- To give a brief overview and background for the current teaching excellence initiative at AUB. This includes an introduction to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant, the AUB Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence, and the various activities carried out by the Task Force during the first year of the grant. In particular, the visit to the teaching centers at select universities in the US. The results of the survey on current teaching practices at AUB and the survey of graduating students will be posted on the web site as well.

- To provide news on future activities related to teaching excellence, such as workshops, seminars, and tutorials.

- To post the final report of the Task Force and make it accessible to faculty and students.

- To outline the current resources related to teaching excellence available at AUB. These are in the forms of books, video tapes, and other material received from the centers visited by the Task Force.

- To provide links to international teaching excellence resources for faculty to explore and learn more about related issues.

- To provide a platform for discussing teaching excellence issues.

THE WEB PAGE STRUCTURE

The diagram provided in Appendix A illustrates the various sections and sub sections of the web page. Basically, three main sections will be available at the main page. These are:

1. Background. This section will contain sub sections related to the following:

- Overview of the Grant
- The Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence
- Members of the Task Force
- Final Report
- Activities: The teaching-learning surveys and the trip to US teaching centers

2. Teaching Resources. This section will include two main sub sections:

- Teaching and learning resources at AUB: this includes:

- Books
- Tapes
- Faculty educational workshops: Cooperative Learning workshop and Enhancement of Teaching Effectiveness workshop

- International: Includes links to international resources on teaching and learning.

3. News:

Will include reports on recent and current activities and will announce various future activities related to teaching excellence.

WEB PAGE DEVELOPMENT

The structure of the web page given in Appendix A was implemented and the main infrastructure was constructed. In appendix B we give a list HTML files indicating the various sections and links. It is expected that the web page will continue to be updated in the future, hence flexibility and simplicity were taken into account during the implementation phase. Some of the sections have not been filled yet as the web page focuses currently on the background and the development of teaching excellence at AUB starting from the Mellon's Grant and the activities of the Task Force. In the future, more links and pages can be added.

APPENDIX A. WEB PAGE STRUCTURE

The following gives a picture of how the web page will look like.

APPENDIX B: WEB PAGE LINKS AND LAYOUT

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These conclusions and recommendations are based on the cumulative experience of the members of the Task Force on Undergraduate Teaching Excellence after an academic year of intensive and systematic efforts to assess our current teaching and learning practices at AUB, to identify problems, and to suggest solutions to these problems. The activities that the Task Force organized are described in this report. We also benefited from feedback generously provided by colleagues who participated in the workshops that were organized by the Task Force. We benefited, as well, from advice and feedback given to us by the presenters of these workshops (Drs David Johnson and Roger Johnson who gave a workshop on Cooperative Leaning, and Dr. Yezdi Bhada, who gave a workshop on Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness). The results of the two surveys that were developed and administered by the Task Force (Survey of Undergraduate Teaching Practices at AUB and a Survey of Graduating Students) are still being studied. However, the data already obtained from these surveys (and the written comments in particular) provide us with useful information on how teaching and learning (and problems associated with teaching and learning) are **perceived** by the faculty and by the graduating students who participated in the surveys.

Study Groups and Shared Experiences

We strongly believe that AUB faculty can learn a lot from one another; external resources should be used judiciously. **The formation of teaching circles or study groups ought to be encouraged and facilitated**. Such informal meetings provide ideal contexts for sharing teaching experiences and learning from one another's successes and failures. We also recommend **the organization of faculty retreats at which teaching, learning, and academic matters related to them are discussed.**

Workshops

We recommend that more workshops on teaching effectiveness and practices be organized. Most of these workshops can be developed and given by faculty members from within AUB (from the Department of Education, for example) and few by experts from abroad. Workshops and seminars need to be hands-on, more relevant to the needs of different departments, and address (in addition to practices) concepts of outcome assessment.

Efforts should be made to involve the greatest number of faculty members in workshops on new innovative teaching and learning tools as well as curriculum designs and program assessments. We should also organize **workshops to introduce faculty members to new theories in pedagogy and illustrate how it is possible to integrate active learning, critical thinking, and cooperative learning in the classroom. Priority should be given to workshops on the use**

of technology in and out of the classroom. Whether to use technology in the classroom; and, if used, what type(s) of technology should be used are matters that are material / subject dependent and should be left to the discretion of the instructor. **It is essential, however, to develop and maintain a teaching-learning environment which encourages and facilitates the integration of technology into the classroom.** For example, faculty should be encouraged to design a web site for each course they offer. The web site will include all the information pertaining to a course (syllabus, lecture notes, samples of various exams, links to similar courses at US universities, etc.)

Classrooms:

The designs of most of our classrooms make them suitable for lecturing but not for other methods or styles of teaching. Many rooms have no projection facilities, and cannot be darkened adequately. Some rooms let in too much noise from outside. **We recommend that more rooms be modified and properly equipped to accommodate different styles of teaching, and as demand increases more of these modified and properly equipped rooms become available.**

Accreditation

The university is now in the process of seeking accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. This is a step in the right direction. Seeking accreditation, and maintaining accreditation after it is granted, contribute to improvement of teaching through the continuous process of self-study, documentation, and assessment. **We recommend that academic units within the university be encouraged to seek accreditation from the appropriate (specialized), accrediting agencies.** This requires identifying the conditions that should be met in order for accreditation to be granted, and making sure (prior to seeking accreditation) that these conditions are met.

Syllabi and Course Objectives

There is a need to stress the importance of clearly stating program and course objectives as well as measurable outcomes for the purposes of evaluation and assessment. Chairpersons of departments should see to it that syllabi for courses offered in their respective departments are properly prepared prior to the offering of the course. **It should be possible for interested faculty members to get help and advice on the preparation of course syllabi**. This is often one of the services that a teaching center provides. However, we need not await the establishment of a full-fledged teaching center in order to obtain the help and information needed to enhance teaching effectiveness. We should tap the close, and perhaps most valuable, source of information, advice and shared experiences–our own colleagues. Faculty should be encouraged (and helped) to have access to on-line basic teaching resources. This sort of help could be provided by **hiring a part-time research**

assistant who would obtain, and update, on-line information and help faculty members access it. An increasing number of faculty members are able at this point, to do this on their own; those who need help, will need it only in the initial stages.

Incentives of the Enhancement of Teaching Effectiveness

There is a general belief amongst the faculty that effective teaching will not be recognized by the administration. Consequently, there is little incentive to invest considerable time or effort for the enhancement of teaching effectiveness. This perception is born out by the comments made by a fair number of respondents to the survey of the faculty. It is born out, as well, by the views expressed by members of the faculty at the meetings that the Associate Provost held with the various academic departments at the University during the months of May and June 2000.

Dr. Yezdi Bahada, the Associate Provost for Academic Services at Georgia State University, who conducted workshops on Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness here at AUB (June 6 through June 9, 2000), provided us with some written observations based on his " encounters" with AUB faculty. The following is one of his observations: " There is a general concern that the reward system is not congruent with the goal of quality teaching."

The traditional commitment of AUB to excellence in teaching should never be in doubt. While emphasis upon research and upon creating the conditions conducive to the increase in the scholarly output of members of the faculty is essential and ought to be strengthened and continued, yet such emphasis should not be at the expense of excellence in teaching. The administration of the university ought to reaffirm its commitment to both teaching and research.

The administration of the university could show its commitment to teaching by: (1) **using teaching effectiveness as one of the criteria for promotion, (2) generously budgeting for its support, and (3) making the establishment of a teaching center one of its priorities.** The development of teaching portfolios may insure that effective teaching will not be marginalized. I quote another of Dr. Bahada's observations: " There seemed to be a strong consensus that Teaching Portfolios should be encouraged as a means for documenting effective teaching." A teaching center at the University would contribute significantly to the explanation of the concept of a teaching portfolio, and would help faculty members develop their teaching portfolios. These portfolios could then be used as important components of the means used for evaluating teaching performance. Demonstrated **interest** in improving one's teaching and **evidence** of having done so should be acknowledged and rewarded. Preparing a teaching portfolio, keeping up-to-date on teaching techniques and philosophies, seeking assistance and making efforts at self-improvement are positive **indicators** useful for file documentation purposes.

Awards

We recommend the establishment of awards for excellence in teaching with the criteria and procedures for granting these awards clearly stated. On the whole, competition is a good thing. Excellent teachers deserve recognition. Moreover, the recognition and rewards that excellent teachers receive are likely to encourage other teachers to strive for the same goals.

Mid-Term Evaluation of Courses

We recommend the use of mid-term student rating feedback in addition to the end-of-term student evaluation. Mid-term evaluations will help faculty to do some fine-tuning, or perhaps consider major changes in their teaching for the remainder of the term, if that proves necessary. The faculty should be advised (perhaps by the chair of the department and / or the dean of the faculty) of the usefulness of this type of evaluation. The mid-term evaluation form could be prepared by the faculty member, or developed around forms used at US universities for similar purposes.

Mid-Career Training for Faculty Members

We also recommend mid-career training for faculty members, particularly in the use of multimedia. We urge the University to start the nucleus of a team that could help the faculty receive this kind of training. Depending on the field and department, we recommend the establishment of one fully equipped multimedia room, i.e. Computer, Video, TV, DDP (Digital Document Projector, etc.) These need to be properly installed and made accessible to specific teachers. In some fields such as computer science, two or more such rooms may be needed. Choice of specific equipment should be done by the users.

Student Evaluation of course and Instructor

Most faculty seem to agree that student evaluations of course and instructor (if properly conducted) should be included as one measure of teaching effectiveness. But while the principle is in general accepted, dissatisfaction with some of the instruments used for student evaluations of course and instructor is considerable. This dissatisfaction became evident during the meetings that the Associate Provost had with academic departments. It is also born out by Dr. Bahada's observation on this matter: " Many issues were raised by participants regarding evaluations of teaching in the different faculties. Significant criticisms were directed at instruments used for student evaluations of instruction."

We recommend that efforts be made to improve our 'survey skills' at the University and that pending the establishment of a teaching center, the Office of Tests and Measurements be involved in these efforts.

STUDENTS

A common complaint of faculty about students:

"Students prefer the lecture format; they resist the use of alternative methods of teaching, such as cooperative or collaborative learning, or student-centered teaching. They are used to being spoon fed, and they expect to be spoon fed."

To a large extent this is true. The teaching and learning experience at AUB should not be an extension of the approach to education and the teaching methods that prevail at most secondary schools in Lebanon and the region. On the other hand, there is a growing minority of students who come to AUB from secondary schools whose approach to teaching is less traditional and more student-centered. These students find themselves (at least in some of the courses they take at the University) having to make an 'adjustment in reverse'!

Workshops and Orientation Programs for Students.

On our part, we should reaffirm our commitment to the ideal of liberal arts education and to the inculcation and strengthening of critical and analytical skills in our students; we should also endorse and implement a student-centered approach to teaching and learning. **We recommend that workshops on student-centered learning and on time management be developed and offered to our students**. Alternatively, our conception of effective teaching could be incorporated into **a well-developed Orientation Program for entering students.** Such a program should help to communicate faculty expectations and students' responsibility for their teaching. Students should know what are the objectives we wish to achieve and how we hope to achieve them; what our role as teachers will be and what we expect of them as learners.

The first few class sessions of a course are crucial. During these sessions the rules are set and the tone is established for the rest of the semester. Students should know what is expected from them at the very beginning of the term. The syllabus should be clear with goals clearly set, amount of work required and evaluation means clearly indicated.

Complaint about the Academic Quality of Students

Some faculty members believe that the academic quality of the students we now have at AUB has gone down. Criteria of admission are often indicated as the reason for the presumed inferior quality of students currently enrolled at AUB in contrast with earlier generations of AUB students. The level of proficiency in English is deemed to be too low. Secondary schools have not provided their graduates with adequate education which will prepare them to pursue their studies at the University level; or so, at least, some faculty members believe.

These are serious claims that should be looked into very carefully. Admittedly, some very good students in Lebanon, and perhaps also in the region, do not apply for admission to AUB because they cannot afford our tuition (even if granted financial aid to cover a portion of the tuition). But **the students whom we do admit are still amongst the very best students in Lebanon and the region** in terms of their aptitude (as measured by their SAT 1 scores) and in terms of their level of academic achievement (as determined by their secondary school grades and academic record). Students who are inferior in both of these respects who continue their education at other universities (including good universities in the United States) seem to perform extremely well!

We recommend that the sources of 'discontent' be identified and carefully studied. This matter should be looked at in an objective, open, and professional manner. The possibility that we may be at fault should not be excluded. It may very well be the case that many of our students need our help in varying degrees and in a variety of areas. It is our obligation to identify how we could help such students, **and to help them.**

Students' Perceptions of their Teachers

It is very interesting and instructive to see how students perceive their teachers and how they perceive the whole teaching and learning process at AUB. Based on the preliminary results of the survey of graduating students (especially the written remarks) the following types of student perceptions emerge: students felt that there is a need to render classes more interactive. They named teaching methods which rely on discussion, or small group cooperative learning as desirable. They felt that too much emphasis is placed on memorization and passive reception of information; little emphasis on critical thinking. There were complaints about teachers who repeatedly use the same test again and again.

Looking at the two surveys, we are stuck by another contrast. Teachers and students complain about each other's **attitude**. Some members of the faculty complain about disrespectful attitudes of students and about their lack of concern for others. Some students, on the other hand, perceive faculty members as unfriendly, close minded, and unfair.

Cheating

There is some concern amongst the faculty over the increasing number of cases where students cheat and/or plagiarize. The responses that graduating students gave to items 30 and 31 on the questionnaire clearly illustrate that the concern of the faculty is well founded. **We recommend that a clear policy on cheating and plagiarism be developed, given wide circulation, and implemented**.

Grading

There is widespread dissatisfaction (amongst both teachers and students) with our grading policies and practices. For the last fifteen years the " Problem of Grading" has been studied and discussed by Faculty Committees, Senate Committees, ad hoc committees, but we are not closer now than we were fifteen years ago to agreeing on how grading related problems should be resolved. We recommend that we consider two basic questions: (1) How we actually grade and (2) How we ought to grade. We should make use of earlier studies (particularly those conducted by Senate Committees) including statistics and recommendations. The most recent study-report of grading policies and issues was produced by the Provost of the University aided by the University Statistician. **We recommend that this document be used as a framework for the development of a clear understanding of how we grade our students at AUB, and how we could improve and reform our grading practices in the light of a shared philosophy on how we ought to grade.**

We recommend that the University began to plan for the establishment of a teaching center at AUB. For the full text of this recommendation, please see the section on " Conclusions and recommendations" in the " Report on Visits to Teaching and Learning Centers at selected US Universities" included in this report