

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 7-8:30

### Breakfast in Exhibition Hall E

See page 17 for the ISSOTL Committees and Interest Groups meeting at this time.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 8:30-10:00

### Constructive Friction? Charting the Boundary Between Educational Research and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Torgny Roxå, Maria Larsson, Linda Price, Katarina Mårtensson

Glen 205

This panel adds to an ongoing mapping of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) through an interactive lens as it empirically explores voices heard at both sides of the border between SoTL and educational research (EdR). Even though EdR and SoTL are overlapping fields the literature reveals considerable friction between the two. Shulman, (2011, p. 5), recounts a situation when an EdR colleague accused him “of contributing to the bastardization of the field by encouraging faculty members who were never trained to conduct educational or social science research to engage in studies of teaching and learning in their fields.” Svinicki (2012, p. 1) poses the question “How can we expect a discipline-based expert to develop expertise virtually overnight in order to ‘do’ SoTL?” Boshier (2009, p. 13) goes as far as to claim that “SoTL is anti-intellectual and located in a narrow neoliberalism” and doubts whether SoTL is a worthwhile use of time and resources. Miller-Young & Yeo (2015) argue that defining SoTL as a field independent of education has created unnecessary tensions as there are more similarities than differences. However, they also maintain that SoTL scholars could benefit from a better understanding of EdR theories and methods. So what underpins these differences between the two fields and how might the friction be described and explained? This panel explores and contextualises this debate in the literature through the voices of 20 academics representing the two communities. Respondents were attendees at two conferences in 2015: Euro-SoTL and EARLI. Five experienced participants and five newcomers were interviewed at each conference. Interviews focused on EdR and SoTL respectively and on the perceived similarities and differences between the two. Aspects coming forward in the analysis concern: community membership, research rigour, purpose and focus of inquiry, and intended recipients of inquiry results. Some dimensions therefore stand out as crucial in identifying patterns within and between the two communities: what and who determines the value of the contribution to the field and why it is valuable. The panel explores these results step-wise through three different themes: 1) What do respondents say? 2) How can the two communities be conceptualised? 3) What are the implications in terms of ideology and power? The aim is to follow the direction offered by individual voices while exploring a perhaps more uncharted ideological wilderness. 1) Voices on both sides of the border express considerable overlap in terms of a concern for student learning, “we’re members of the same church” (Experienced EdR). But they also reveal differences “there’s a tendency for SoTL to hi, hide behind, eh, low, less, lower quality research” (Experienced EdR); “SoTL, I think is always to help my students learn more” (Experienced SoTL). These similarities and differences are not only visible at the border, they also reveal varying and sometimes conflicting perspectives inside each community, a fact that blurs the boundary and opens up for personal positioning and cross-border communication. 2) The interviews add nuances to the somewhat tougher language used in the literature. The two communities do not come across as homogenous; instead the voices listened to stretch the communities over a continuum where some EdR express more commonalities with SoTL than with other EdRs and vice versa. What emerges is a picture revealing two groupings with similar but also different purposes. “SoTL thing is perhaps yea, ehm, more connected to practice.” (Experienced SoTL), “you [EdRs] have to be well informed by the existing literature” (Experienced EdR). Furthermore, the interviews reveal issues about the inner structure of the two communities and point towards differences in terms of enterprise: adding to knowledge or improving teaching practice and student learning. Perhaps SoTL and EdR are two different breeds altogether? 3) There is also a matter of ideology and power in this. Clegg (2012) talks about higher education as an epistemic field in formation where

different groupings might be more or less adjoining. This calls for an analysis where the premises of EdR and SoTL are uncovered. Descriptions of EdR emphasise both what is known, that is, the literature and the necessity of rigour while adding to what is known, while descriptions of SoTL emphasise enhanced student learning in specific contexts and an overall aim of making teaching and learning count in the academic culture. These premises relate to power, as the two communities form alliances with other groupings in the field of higher education. The last part of the panel reflects on such ideological issues, and specifically the role of SoTL in the higher education landscape. In the context of ISSOTL such an investigation implies scrutinizing the organisation of SoTL, the daily life of SoTL, the internal hierarchies of the SoTL-community, and perhaps also the objectives of the movement. The lived experience of academic teachers and students, voiced inside the SoTL-tent constitutes the building blocks of an ideology signalled by the very existence of the big tent. This panel investigates further what that means and reflects upon this ideology. Throughout the panel, the audience is interactively invited to add to the material as participants in a SoTL-conference. The aim is to fuel an important debate but also to connect experiences voiced by individuals to deeper layers of power and discursive potential.

**A CASTL Cluster Retrospective: Looking Back at 10 Years of Building SoTL Communities** Glen 201  
**Teresa Johnson, Brian Smentkowski, Balbir Gurm, Mary Taylor Huber, Pat Hutchings**

The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) was launched in 1998 as a major initiative of the Carnegie Foundation. CASTL's aims were to support the development of a scholarship of teaching and learning community that would advance long-term student learning, bring effective teaching practices into a shared domain so that they could be built upon by others in the larger teaching community, and bring recognition and reward to faculty's scholarly work as teachers in ways typically afforded other types of scholarship. From 2006-2009, educational development leaders representing six universities in three different countries collaborated through the CASTL Campus Program Leadership Clusters, dedicated to "Building SoTL Communities". This program was created to "facilitate collaboration among institutions with demonstrated commitment to and capacity for action, inquiry, and innovation in the scholarship of teaching and learning" (CASTL Foundation Archive). Because our cluster encompassed a wide range of institutional contexts, we gained a wide range of experience in creating and maintaining scholarly communities. As a whole we are convinced that learning community models are excellent tools for SoTL support on many different kinds of campuses (e.g., Cox, 2001). The specific lessons learned in the first three years of this CASTL initiative ranged from strategies for building institutional buy-in, designing SoTL programs for sustainability, communication strategies for recruiting faculty, and functional models for scholarly communities (Transformative Dialogues, 2009). By 2009, our efforts to build SoTL culture through communities of practice over those first three years had resulted in tangible, incremental changes on all of our campuses. In the years since 2009, members of our cluster, and this panel, have continued to advance the scholarship of teaching and learning through original research, the editorship of journals, the authorship of books, and innovative programs that have scaled across institutional settings. As SoTL has flourished, we have discovered the value of "Never Standing Still" (Chick and Poole, 2016). We have discovered new challenges as well as new opportunities to grow SoTL, to democratize engagement among an increasingly diverse community of practitioners, and to extend its reach into other forms of scholarship, including engagement and educational development. This retrospective roundtable session reunites participants from that team along with two leading Carnegie voices from the CASTL experience to provide a 360-degree view of where we were in 2009, where we are now, and where we are heading in the scholarship of teaching and learning. This roundtable also provides an occasion to reflect more generally on the afterlife of reform initiatives---how the work and relationships formed in one set of activities continue to resonate, inform new efforts, and evolve. Through research, practice, and programs, each institution within our cluster has experienced and successfully navigated the peaks and valleys of SoTL, including its uncharted territories, its new and fertile grounds, and creative pathways to the many summits of SoTL. As SoTL continues to evolve, so too must our efforts to value, support, amplify, and drive innovation and transform institutional culture. This panel will share our experiences and the lessons we have learned about how to challenge and support teachers, scholars, and directors in their efforts to reach new heights. The session will also include opportunities for participants to share their own challenges and collaborate to devise strategies for success.

## **The Adventures of Engaging as Partners: Exploring the Literature to Discover Outcomes and Reveal Barriers**

**Glen 206**

**Sam Lucie Dvorakova, Kelly E. Matthews, Mick Healey, Anita Acai, Alison Cook-Sather, Peter Felten, Ruth Healey, Elizabeth Marquis, Lucy Mercer-Mapstone**

Since 2010 'Students as Partners' has become a 'hot topic' in higher education, in part to counter the predominant discourse of students as consumers (Millard et al. 2013; Marquis et al. 2016). SaP is a complex term to define (Harrison et al. 2003), in part reflecting the many different ways students and academics may work together to advance teaching and learning in higher education. Cook-Sather et al. (2014) define student-staff partnerships as "a collaborative, reciprocal process through which all participants have the opportunity to contribute equally, although not necessarily in the same ways, to curricular or pedagogical conceptualisation, decision making, implementation, investigation, or analysis" (p. 6-7). Healey et al. (2014) define SaP as a "process of student engagement, understood as [academics] and students learning and working together to foster engaged student learning and engaging learning and teaching enhancement" (p. 7). Given this rise in interest in the topic, it is timely to undertake a comprehensive review of the outcomes and barriers to partnership work. By doing so, we aim to provide a depth of coherent insight into the potential benefits and challenges of SaP for those who are grappling with the realities of translating theory and research into practice. This presentation will explore the outcomes and barriers to, initiating and sustaining students as partners initiatives as revealed by the analysis of 65 scholarly, peer-reviewed works published between 2010-2015. Students and faculty from 4 countries conducted a literature review with broad initial findings reported in (Authors, in press). A subset of us then worked together as co-researchers to analyse the results and report the findings specific to outcomes and barriers. We used the following research questions to guide this exploration: What outcomes, outputs, and barriers are reported by authors of 'students as partners' initiatives? How do these outcomes, outputs, and barriers differ or align for students and staff? How do these outcomes, outputs, and barriers vary between the different areas of partnership practice? Exploring the literature review findings using thematic analysis allowed for easy comparison of outcomes and barriers between students and staff. To classify differing forms of partnership, we adopted the Healey et al. (2014, 2016) four key areas of student engagement through partnership: learning, teaching and assessment (e.g. co-teaching), curriculum design and pedagogic consultancy (e.g. co-design, co-creating), subject-based research and inquiry (e.g. co-inquiry), and scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g. co-researchers). Each of the types of partnership is distinct though overlapping. The pattern of findings revealed quantitative variation in outcomes reported, for both students and staff, across the four areas of partnership practices. Differing patterns arose in outcomes and barriers between students and staff, although the tendency was for more outcomes to be reported for students and compared to barriers. Implications for these findings will be discussed in the presentation drawing on Matthews, Cook-Sather, and Healey's (in press) notion of partnership as egalitarian learning communities.

## **'Be My... Valentine's' Exhibition: Be My Partner': The Examination of Students and Staff Working in Partnership - Scaling the Peaks, Avoiding the Troughs**

**Glen 206**

**Kirsten Hardie**

Student and staff partnership, 'as a process of engagement' (Healey, Flint and Harrington, 2014. p. 7), can involve rich learning experiences that arise from, and can be a result of, both the highs and the lows of a collaborative project's journey. This session presents a case study: the 'Be My... Valentine' exhibition (2017) where students and staff worked in partnership and in collaboration with a museum in the co-creation and co-curatorship of a unique and creative public exhibition and number of related activities. It considers how museum and university staff developed a specific learning opportunity that resulted in students producing a number of creative outcomes that surpassed all expectations. It explores how the partnership scaled the peaks, evaded plateaus and dealt with the troughs during the project's journey. Importantly, it reviews and reflects upon the learning experiences and considers how students managed the challenges and opportunities of partnership. The presentation examines the creative cross discipline work (2016/2017) of undergraduate students and staff from four distinct and different specialist courses at the Arts University Bournemouth, UK, (a specialist art, design and media University) working in partnership with the Priest's House Museum, UK. Students and staff from Graphic Design, Costume and Performance Design, Creative Events Management, Interior Architecture and Design worked in partnership; the project built upon the expertise, specialist skills, and creativity of all. The project created a new community of

practice; its members had not previously worked together. As Healey, Flint and Harrington (2014:8) observe ‘Given that partnership is both a working and learning relationship, these new communities should acknowledge the dual role of staff and students as both scholars and colleagues engaged in a process of learning and inquiry’ and as this presentation evidences, the exhibition work did indeed see staff and students working as learners together. The presentation examines the process of partnership and how students’ ‘engagement through partnership’ (Healey et al 2014: 17) resulted in ‘a mature [student and staff] relationship based on mutual respect between students and staff’. (UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Quality Assurance Agency 2013, p. 3). It examines what Healey et al (2014:10) observe as the ‘the importance of re-distribution of power and openness to new ways of working and learning together’: how staff and students managed the challenges of large scale partnership; how risks were managed and how students took creative lead as the exhibition provided both curriculum assessment work for some students and extra-curricular design opportunities for others. Students’ evaluations and feedback evidence are examined. Delegates will be encouraged to reflect upon and discuss their own experiences of partnership and to develop potential ideas for future collaborative student and staff projects. Group activity will involve delegate’s creation of dynamic mindmaps/spider diagrams so that partnership ideas may be more fully considered and captured creatively.

**Identity, Positionality, and Inquiry in SoTL: How Does Who Seeks Shape What is Found?** Glen 206  
**Peter Felten, Stephen Bloch-Schulman, Susannah McGowan**

SoTL scholars have thought a lot about methodology, about how we inquire into learning and teaching. While many agree with Poole’s invocation that “we not simply tolerate differences but we give them enough respect for serious consideration” (2013, p. 149), debates continue about the merits and legitimacy of different approaches to SoTL inquiry (e.g., Bloch-Schulman, 2016). Questions also continue to emerge about who should be doing SoTL inquiry, with practitioners making the case for and collaborating with students as partners in SoTL. Advocates suggest that student inquirers will help SoTL view learning and teaching from new perspectives (Felten, 2013; Werder, Pope-Ruark, & Verwoord, 2016). In this paper we invite even more critical attention to the role of students-as-partners by focusing on the way who engages in the research and how that research is conducted shapes what we find in SoTL -- of how the identity and positionality of the inquirers shape not only what we learn, but what is possible for us to learn and what will remain ignored, hidden and unknown in our inquiries. We add to the conversation about students-as-partners by examining one SoTL project as a case study, and then use two theoretical models to illuminate aspects of identity and positionality in the case study. Our case is a SoTL project that involved undergraduate students conducting Decoding the Disciplines interviews with peers and with faculty (Rouse, Phillips, Mehaffey, McGowan, & Felten, 2017). The students’ analysis of the interviews uncovered insights about disciplinary teaching, and also raised questions about the identities of the student interviewers in relation to the people being interviewed. Building on those insights, our theoretical frameworks emphasize the primacy of standpoints (Mills, 1998) and the epistemologies of ignorance (Sullivan and Tuana, 2007; Tuana and Sullivan, 2008). These frameworks call on us to think carefully and critically about knowing as an activity that emerges from and impacts epistemic communities, and asks us to consider in counterintuitive ways how these epistemic communities are riven by forms of power and privilege. Our analysis challenges SoTL scholars to reconsider the ways that claims to knowledge and the relationship between knowledge and ignorance are shaped by power, positionality and identity. We conclude by asking questions about how SoTL practitioners and scholars might more critically attend to how our identities and positions influence the questions we ask, the methods we use, and the conclusions we reach.

**Connecting Conversations: Listening to Inform the Development of an Online Student Orientation Program** Telus 102  
**Carol Johnson, Jennifer Lock, Jane Hanson, Yang (Flora) Liu, Alicia Adlington**

Graduate programs are now able to access an array of programs offered online and at a distance. Graduate students appreciate having access to online programs that offers flexibility in terms of learning anytime and anywhere. Through such programs, students are able to continue their employment, family, and social commitments without having to travel to campus for attending class. Yet, as much as there are benefits of learning online, students need to be prepared for learning within this technology-enabled environment. Many students may

enroll in graduate programs after being away from formal post-secondary education for a number of years. They come from varied backgrounds and experiences as they enter graduate school. However, learning online requires them to be able to navigate the online environment, to be able to access materials and resources, and to collaborate with peers at a distance. Soft, or transferable, skills, such as collaboration, problem-solving, critical thinking, and self-regulated learning are required for a student to effectively engage in their online learning. Successful online learning experiences are supported when students are prepared, or oriented, for both the learning environment and the experience. Current research indicates there are positive benefits when students participate in a preparation program such as a virtual advisor (Brucato & Neimeyer, 2009), as well as teaching assistant preparation programs (Boman, 2013). As such, how are graduate programs providing opportunities for students to develop and implement practical skills and knowledge needed to be successful online learners? Given the importance of acclimating adult students to the culture of online graduate learning, through a two-year design-based study funded through a SoTL grant we have developed online student orientation program. Drawing on literature and a gap analysis, evidence-informed design of an online orientation environment was customized for our graduate program. The orientation program sought to provide students with low-stakes learning opportunities that familiarized them with the online learning environment (e.g., features within the learning management system). Designed similarly to other online courses using asynchronous and synchronous learning supports, the program focused on highlighting the necessary soft or transferable skills such as online communication skills, collaboration, self-regulation, and time management. Engaging in this program introduces students to best practices for online learning and prepares them to begin their graduate studies within our School. The purpose of the presentation is threefold. First, to provide an overview of our online orientation program. Second, to share the voices of students and faculty through the findings based on the first year's iteration of the design where they spoke of how challenges, expectations and factors that are influencing their confidence and competence of being online learners. Third, recommendations will be provided in terms of the design, institutional support, and faculty educational development for an online graduate student preparation program.

### **Investigating Student Learning in Online Discussion Forums through a Transactivity Framework**

**Telus 102**

**Kiruthika Ragupathi, Muthukumar Chandrasekaran, Min-Yen Kan, Bernard Tan**

New capabilities enabled by emerging learning technologies have created an educational ecosystem that not only provides rich educational resources but also promotes collaborative and self-directed learning. As educational institutions embrace Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), instructors are confronted with new pedagogical challenges that motivate inquiry into massive online learning. This paper addresses the challenges of the MOOC platform, with specific focus on MOOC discussion forums. Given the scale of MOOCs, there are numerous learners pursuing discursive and reflective activities (Laurillard, 2002) in MOOC discussion forums, including expressing their views, articulating their ideas, questioning or clarifying instructors' expert opinions, and reflecting on class discussion. Yet, it is hardly possible for instructors to respond effectively to the needs of all learners. However, the pedagogical benefits of MOOC discussion forums depend largely on how successfully these forums help to maintain the learning communities' productive dialogues. Student engagement and learning in MOOC discussion forum improves when appropriate instructor interventions create opportunities for inquiry, interaction, collaboration, knowledge building and acquisition. Therefore, we employ a typology of pedagogical interventions based on the transactivity framework (Berkowitz and Gibbs, 1983; Teasley, 1997), that will be fine-tuned by machine learning techniques to explore how instructor interventions may be augmented by technology. Past studies have yielded ambivalent results about the impact of instructor interventions in MOOC discussion forums. Some studies demonstrated improved learning while other showed contradicting outcomes (Murphy and Fortner, 2014). The effectiveness of instructor interventions may depend on finer-grained factors, such as having the right timing, frequency, or type of instructor interventions that can facilitate learner engagement and interaction. We refine the taxonomy of categories in the transactivity framework in analysing and annotating contributions in MOOC discussion forums. Our categories include feedback request, paraphrase, justification request, juxtaposition, clarification, refinement, reasoning critique, integration, extension, completion, generic answer, agreement, and disagreement. We use statistical natural language processing and supervised machine learning to analyse contributions in MOOC discussion forums (Chandrasekaran et al. 2015). This approach leverages on theoretically-grounded findings in pedagogy and complements the statistical model of instructor interventions by enhancing its

predictive power. In our work, human annotators (both on-site and crowd-sourced) annotated instructor intervened discussion threads. Next, we conduct a qualitative content analysis of the annotated threads to identify discourse markers in instructor-student or student-student dialogues to measure learning gains. Our study results confirm that instructors exhibit a bias towards intervening in the order of appearance of threads. However, our contention is that appropriate instructor interventions in discussion threads that require justification, extension, reasoning critique and/or integration would stimulate higher levels of learner interaction. Using the transactivity framework, we isolate threads that signal learning, and rank them using an automated triage to support strategic instructor intervention, encouraging maximal peer learning (Deslauriers, 2011) while saving instructors' time. We hope this will enable instructors' skillful facilitation to enhance academic discourse and encourage higher-level cognition, leading to fulfilment of learning outcomes (Dennen et al., 2008; Hou et al., 2015; Vygotsky, 1978; Winograd, 2003).

**Assessing the Effectiveness of Video Peer Feedback on Developing Emerging Writers**  
**Amanda Sturgill**

**Telus 102**

Nicol (2010) notes that written comments to give students feedback about writing are a one-way process. In addition, the written feedback can confuse students (MacDonald, 1991). Ware & Warschauer (2006) describe several ways that technology can be used to support feedback on writing ranging from compendia of peer comments to algorithmically generated feedback provided by a computer. Wood, Moskovitz & Valiga (2011) tested audio feedback for distance education nursing students, finding that student opinion was positive. Another type of feedback that has been tested is providing video feedback on student work. Thompson and Lee (2012) used screencasts of instructor feedback sessions in 5 sections of college composition and then surveyed student satisfaction and found that students were satisfied. Brick and Holmes (2008) used a similar methodology and found it similarly popular. Studies exist examining video feedback in student writing, but there is less concerning peer video feedback. This study considers following research questions 1. Does creating video feedback encourage metacognition about writing? 2. Does creating video feedback improve the writing for the critic? 3. Can students create effect peer feedback on video? 4. How emerging writers use video? This Study The current study reflects data from two sections of writing classes. In one section, students received both video and written feedback on 6 assignments throughout the semester as well as written and verbal peer reviews. In the other, students offered one peer review through creating a video similar to the models given by the professor prior to the assignment. Data include of analytics of use of the videos, student opinions about the process acquired through a questionnaire and student grades on required revisions of the papers following feedback.

**Mutually Beneficial Relationships between SoTL, Pedagogy, Program Development, and Assessment**  
**James DeVita, Colleen Reilly**

**Glen 204**

The NSEE Principles of Good Practice (1998) for the development of experiential learning programs constitute useful guidelines for development of experiential learning programs. While these principles (intention, preparedness and planning, authenticity, reflection, orientation and training, monitoring and continuous improvement, assessment and evaluation, and acknowledgement) function well as guiding concepts, through our analysis of instructors' reflections about their applied learning projects, we found that the principles in their current form do not provide a useable framework for the development and analysis of experiential learning programs. The principles function on different levels: some constitute inputs essential for successful experiential learning, some aid in creating an appropriate environment, and others comprise the outcomes sought from implementing applied learning. Our workshop will guide participants through revisioning the NSEE principles in terms of Alexander Austin's (1993) I-E-O model construct a framework useful in the development and assessment of experiential learning programs. This workshop demonstrates the mutually beneficial relationships between SoTL, pedagogy, program development, and assessment and, therefore, speaks to the Adventures and insights in SoTL thread of the conference. Learning goals and outcomes The workshop will enhance participants understanding and ability to apply the: Concepts associated with the NSEE 8 Principles and AAC&U HIPs; Proposed I-E-O Model of Applied Learning; Workshop pedagogies practiced during the session (Think-Pair-Share, Concept Maps, and Fishbowl) Plans for participant engagement. Part I: Overview of NSEE 8 Principles and Related Literature [20

minutes] Show relationship to AAC&U principles for HIPs [10 minutes] Interactive exercise: Think-Pair-Share about where participants see NSEE and AAC&U in practice in their teaching, at their institution. Do they apply? Anything missing? Other thoughts? [10 minutes] Part II: Research on Instructor Reflections [20 minutes] Brief overview of research activities [10 minutes] Summary of assessment process. Summary of instructor reflections. Summary of findings. Interactive exercise: Small group concept map about NSEE (and possibly AAC&U) concepts (possibly using quotes from instructor reflections). The concept map should show what they think that concept entails and how it can be applied to course development and instruction. [10 minutes] Part III: Introduce the I-E-O Model of Applied Learning [45 minutes] Brief overview of Astin's I-E-O [5 minutes] Presentation of I-E-O Model of Applied Learning [10 minutes] Interactive exercise: Use model to begin course design, present (or pitch) to small groups for feedback-model on a fishbowl [30 minutes] Wrap-Up [5 minutes]. Literatures and current SoTL conversations engaged. As exemplified by M. Jill Austin and Dianna Rust's (2015) article reporting and analyzing the successful experiential learning program developed at their institution, the NSSE principles of good practice are acknowledged as important in informing their activities. While their significance is mentioned, they are not used as an actionable framework to structure their program. To make the principles actionable for curricular development and assessment, scholars report crafting a separate model to apply the NSSE principles (see O'Bannon & McFaden, 2008). Our work participates in this conversation by reworking the principles through Austin's I-E-O model, aiding participants to further engage with and use them to guide their practice. Our approach is also in line with other recent interrogations of established theories surrounding experiential learning such as Bergsteiner and Avery's (2014) reconceptualization of Kolb's theory. Facilitators' relevant experience for this workshop; Facilitator 1 is a professor of English and the Applied Learning Faculty Associate for the Centers for Teaching Excellence and Faculty Leadership. She participated in the planning and development of her institution's Quality and Enhancement Plan related to Applied Learning from its inception, serving as a committee member, advisory board member, and faculty fellow. For the second year, she facilitates a group on her campus called the Applied Learning Research Cooperative. This cohort of 11 faculty from across her institution meet monthly to provide feedback to their colleagues about their SoTL projects focused around applied learning. She has also published SoTL scholarship related to service learning and assessment. Facilitator 2 is a professor of Educational Leadership and an Applied Learning and Teaching Community (ALTC) Senior Fellow. He has received grant funding for multiple applied learning projects, facilitated workshops on applied learning, and consulted faculty members about using applied learning techniques and strategies. He has presented at national and international conferences on his research projects related to applied learning, and has 7 peer reviewed publications (4 journal articles, 3 book chapters) that resulted from and/or examine topics that inform SoTL.

## **SoTL from the Start**

**Glen 204**

**Nancy Krusen, Anita Zijdemans Boudreau, Laura Dimmler**

Traditionally, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) tends to focus on retrospective outcomes within one assignment, module or course. Self-study curricular design offers unique opportunities to navigate unknowns through formative, systematic SoTL work. The purpose of the session is to propose scholarly teaching and learning intentionally integrated into program development. The session explores an intricate process incorporating SoTL during creation of an interprofessional PhD in Education and Leadership. The process includes comprehensive mapping of curriculum, deliberate collaborative inquiry across an interprofessional community of novice and expert scholars, and projected chronicling of impact. Participants will review a prospective SoTL process, followed by collaborative design of projects. Literature: There are elements of backwards design and curricular self-study contributing to SoTL from the start, however, literature discussing SoTL in design processes is limited. Nelson described five general groups of SoTL, none of which specifically address prospective development (2004). More recently, Nelson described an idealized seven-step model to design, present, and analyze SoTL projects (2014). The model hints at front-end design but only in reference to individual courses rather than entire curricula. Wilson-Doenges and Gurung (2013) proposed a continuum of SoTL and a series of benchmarks to serve as a basis for rigorous study. They suggested "SoTL should be held to a higher standard of deliberate, well-planned, programmatic, and designed research that should extend, if possible, beyond a semester and a single class" (p. 68). Salmon articulated overlapping scholarship of integration with scholarship of teaching and learning (2004). Salmon's work described implementation of educational practice beyond crossing disciplinary boundaries to embed Boyer's framework for informed curricular development. Presenters propose participants expand their scholarly teaching and

learning as intentionally integrated into program development. Objectives: The session will enable participants to facilitate analysis of curricular change by outlining SoTL topics suited to participant-proposed investigation; compare confirmatory and exploratory research across genres to guide SoTL process; design collaborative SoTL proposals, specific to participants' interests; identify resources for implementation of SoTL "from the start" projects.

**The Shared Canadian Curriculum in Family Medicine: Lessons Learned from Building a Collaborative Scholarship Program from Scratch** Glen 204  
**David Keegan, Ian Scott, Michael Sylvester, Amy Tan, Kathleen Horrey, Wayne Weston**

The Shared Canadian Curriculum in Family Medicine (SHARC-FM) is an open-access peer reviewed set of curricular and learning resources. Topics and objectives were developed through a series of modified DELPHI processes to achieve a national consensus on what medical students in family medicine should learn. In this paper presentation, we will describe our journey from initial concept to our current robust curriculum that is used across Canada. We will focus on the key lessons we learned, so that others can explore their own new horizons and under-explored territories in their fields. This has been a program of development involving different research projects and developing new scholarship models. The key lessons learned will centre on (1) establishing clear principles at the outset, (2) being alert for variations in tacit understandings among members, (3) developing the right structure to get the program off the ground, (4) focusing on meeting the needs of your program's stakeholders, and (5) adhering to best practices from the beginning. We will be sharing things that went well for us, and, more importantly, things that didn't, so that others can learn from our missteps. In conclusion, this eleven year journey has had its ups and downs, like any other project. As a project that did something that had never been done before in medicine (and family medicine in particular), the respective sizes of our ups and downs have been far greater than "normal" projects. We are thrilled to share our insights with colleagues so their ups will be as great as they hope, and their downs be minor.

**Developing Scholarship of Learning & Teaching: Perceived Needs of Health Faculty Academics** Telus 103  
**Marion Tower**

Background: Actualising scholarship of teaching is challenging for academics who often work in environments that reward traditional research (Glanville & Houd, 2001). Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that the relationship between research and teaching has become antagonistic in academic roles (Rolfe, 2007) and academics suffer overload around fulfilling the tripartite obligations of teaching, research and service within the time afforded (Clark, Alcalá-Van Houten; Perea-Ryan 2010). For academics who apply innovation to their learning and teaching practices there is often little recognition outside of formal award mechanisms (McDonald and Star 2008). Rolfe (2007) suggests that scholarship of teaching appears to have been forgotten in favour of practice research and theory generation (Rolfe 2007). Added to the difficulty in actualizing scholarship of teaching are institutional attitudes which treat research and teaching as separate entities, where academics are forced to choose a focus, with funded or competitive research scholarship often taking priority teaching scholarship (Butterworth et al. 2005). This is important as more commonly, accrediting organizations, both professional and government, are emphasizing the importance of demonstrating how students meet learning outcomes with a growing emphasis on teaching quality. This in turn dictates that academics are able to evidence the quality of their teaching by engaging with scholarship related to teaching practice (Smesny et al., 2007). Aim of the project: The project aimed to investigate the perceived needs of health faculty academics with regard to developing, evidencing and communicating scholarship associated with learning and teaching (SoTL). A survey was distributed to five academic Schools in one health faculty. The survey was adapted from Kreber (2001) and used a 5 point likert scale to ask academics about their needs around developing, evidencing and communicating scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). This included developing as a teacher, 'doing' the job of teacher, communicating scholarship, and evaluating teaching. Fifty-one academics took part in the survey. The results indicated there was a considerable need for support to develop scholarship around teaching in all areas surveyed. Questions were analysed using a one-way ANOVA. The Tukey post hoc test indicated that academics in Nursing, Midwifery, Social Work and Dentistry differed significantly from academics in Psychology and Health and Rehabilitation Sciences (Audiologists, Speech Pathologists, Occupational Therapists, Physiotherapists) ( $p < .05$ ) in their desire to receive more support to understand scholarship

and teaching practices. Conclusion It was clear from the findings that health faculty academics desired support to conceptualise and make meaning of SoTL, particularly in the disciplines of nursing, midwifery, social work and dentistry. Many health academics are experienced practitioners, however have limited experience in delivering formal education, and learn to teach by 'picking it up' or 'on the job' in a tertiary environment that offers limited support (McArthur-Rouse, 2008). This emphasises the importance of developing a culture of professionalism and meaningful SoTL agendas around linking teaching to research, innovation and inquiry (Andrew and Robb 2011, Ramsden 2008, Carr 2007).

**Key Questions for Supporting Teachers in Developing Their SoTL Skills Across the Career Span: Four Teacher Training Courses at One Asian University**  
**Josephine Csete, Barbara Tam, John Sager, Darren Harbutt**

**Telus 103**

"What SoTL is" can mean different things to different teachers and individual teacher's SoTL-related interests and needs can change over time as their careers progress. However, it can also be argued that there are core values and beliefs (such as those presented by Felten 2013) that are essential and deserve incorporation in all SoTL development initiatives. Therefore, it stands to reason that an institution wishing to support "good teaching" within its culture should offer a range of development opportunities that are both sensitive to the range of needs of its teachers as well as consistent with its core values. This paper reports on four teacher training short courses designed for teachers working at an Asian university with over 1000 full time academic staff members. Although the target participants of each course differs and some courses are required and others voluntary, all four courses offer skills development and collaborative experiences for teachers across a breadth of disciplines. Target participant groups vary widely from research students who are expected to fulfill duties as teaching assistants to recently hired faculty members who are new to teaching, as well as more experienced academics with particular interests such as becoming more effective at teaching online or conducting SoTL studies. This paper is an encapsulation of one higher education institution's (current) answers to key questions including: 1) What knowledge, skills and attitudes on teaching are important for teachers at various points in their teaching careers? 2) What are the values that should be consistently supported in teaching skills development initiatives? 3) What processes and approaches to providing continuing professional development for teachers are useful in nurturing a culture that promotes quality teaching that enhances student learning? All of these courses, in addition to other initiatives such as internal teaching and learning grants schemes, support teaching skills development for teachers in the institution. For each of the four courses information will be provided on: 1) The goals and context of each course and the resultant intended learning outcomes that accompany each; 2) Design and development rationales (particularly in terms of choices between individual and collaborative learning activities, feedback and assessment, and face-to-face and online learning modes); 3) How each course is being evaluated (and the resulting improvements); and, 4) Lessons learned for designing, implementing and continuously improving short courses for teachers. This paper is presented as an honest story of one university's experience in supporting its staff in developing teaching skills and building a culture that increasingly values SoTL. These courses did not emerge simultaneously as a result of a "grand plan." Rather each course has been developed to meet a perceived need and is continuously revised and updated in response to participant feedback, emerging global trends, and identification of effective practices. Over time, new courses have been added to address growing interest and needs (such as SoTL as a scholarly pursuit and teaching online). Yet there are also elements contributing to a consistent message across the courses.

**Beyond the Conference: Singing Our SSONG**

**Corinne Green, Michelle Eady, Marian McCarthy, Jacinta McKeon, Ashley Akenson, Briony Supple, James Cronin**

**Telus 105**

The ISSOTL 2016 conference, "Telling the Story of Teaching and Learning", presented an exciting opportunity to meet with international colleagues from diverse backgrounds and situations to commune on our common interest with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). As with every ISSOTL conference, the enthusiasm for teaching and learning was palpable. Rich discussions took place, networks were formed, and promises to keep in touch were made. Unfortunately, previous conference experiences have taught us that these good intentions would be difficult to uphold once the perfect milieu of the 'conference bubble' was broken and the reality of 'real life' set in once more. Eight colleagues from across a number of continents therefore committed to

creating a SSONG - a Small Significant Online Network Group. This was inspired by a conference workshop with Gary Poole, Roselynn Verwoord and Isabeau Iqbal and builds on the notion of 'small significant networks' described by Verwoord and Poole (2016) and Roxå and Mårtensson (2009, 2012). We were interested in maintaining the relationships that had been built in Los Angeles in terms of tracking and investigating our development as agents of SoTL. Our self-study was framed by the following research question: How can a small significant online network group (SSONG) advance SoTL? We utilised reflective journaling as a way for each of us to document our experiences related to the ISSOTL conference and SoTL in general. To maintain momentum, we also connected every six weeks via video conference using Adobe Connect® to share those reflections with each other and consider how we could be implementing SoTL in our own contexts. This developed into what we affectionately called our orchestra, singing together our SSONG! Engaging in this venture has raised questions for us related to the complicated nature of connecting internationally in this way, including issues related to diverse time zones, competing work schedules, and technological difficulties. Nevertheless, we have committed to each other, spurring one another on to 'reach new heights' in our exploration and implementation of SoTL. As our journey unfolds, we are seeing the emergence of the power of our SSONG in creating a small significant network of scholars who share similar interests in SoTL. We have continued to build on the in-person relationships that we had created at ISSOTL 2016, and the SSONG is empowering us to confidently share and contribute to our discussions about SoTL. Our initial findings suggest that combining technological tools with the human side of teaching and learning is enhancing our exploration and implementation of SoTL through our global connections. This reflective self-study looks at the process involved, challenges faced, and benefits that have arisen from creating our own international choir, singing SSONGs about SoTL. It highlights the perspectives of each member to reveal what the SSONG means to them. This study will suit the "Adventures and Insights in SoTL" thread of the ISSOTL 2017 conference, "Reaching New Heights".

**Joining Forces to Climb the Mountain: A Chronicle of A 7-Investigator, Multi-Site, Multi-Institution SoTL Project**  
**Katherine Kipp**

**Telus 105**

We created a neuropsychology learning exercise in which teams of students raced to put together a difficult 31-piece 3-dimensional brain model. After the race, each group was assigned a brain region. They were to disassemble the brain to demonstrate to the class what the region looked like, where it was located, and its function. Previous anecdotal evidence suggested that students enjoyed the "Great Brain Race" and felt they learned from the experience. To investigate whether this full-class period learning exercise actually resulted in learning, we conducted a SoTL project comparing learning in students who participated in the brain race with students from a control class who listened to lecture on the brain and neuropsychology. We compared the treatment and control groups on an end-of-class knowledge quiz and a satisfaction survey. To fully explore the generalizability of this project, 6 instructors tested treatment vs. control classes; 2 institutions participated; 4 campuses (3 of one institution; 1 of the other institution) participated; and 3 courses were tested (Introductory, Cognitive Psychology, and Neuroscience). Our presentation will highlight the results of the SoTL project and also provide insights into the experience of creating such a wide reaching SoTL collaboration.

**Peak to Peak: Insights from An International Linked Learning Activity**  
**Lauren Styles, Piera Jung**

**Telus 105**

This proposal addresses the "adventures and insights in SoTL" thread, building on the idea of linked learning as an active pedagogy. We focused our inquiry on the question of "how do we create opportunities for increasing international awareness that enhance students' learning of global issues in new ways?" To help us 'reach new heights', we invite participants to join us as we unpack our gear, practices and assumptions. The scholarship of teaching and learning focuses on purposeful inquiry into teaching and learning, with an intention for insights and new understanding that can contribute back to improvements in teaching and learning (Huber & Hutchings, 2005; Hutchings, 2010; Paulsen & Feldman, 2006). Developing an international awareness amongst students is no longer a privilege, it is a necessity for global citizenship and the professional practice of nurses (Garneau, Pepin & Gendron, 2017). The impetus for an innovative learning activity was to increase student engagement through active and collaborative learning to pick up benefits of international exchanges without real time travel thus promoting

access to such learning. As a result, a technology mediated International exchange for 87 nursing students in two countries was piloted. Two nursing educators, continents apart, implemented a linked learning activity (Smith & Garteig, 2003) involving first year nursing students from a west-coast university in Canada and fourth year nursing students from a university in Qatar. Although this linked learning activity spanned only a month's time, over three interaction cycles, students were engaged throughout the process not because it was a required class activity or assignment but because they wanted to hear from and connect to their linked partners. The international exchange created social learning between the two student groups that addressed the affective domain in globalization of professional nursing identity. Through authentic and experiential interactions, the linked learning activity promoted deeper student engagement in two main areas: (a) active and collaborative learning, and (b) conceptual learning. The collegial connections between the two faculty members, though worlds apart, provided many pedagogical and intellectual advantages for students (Letterman & Dugan, 2004; Wadkins, Miller & Wozniak, 2006; Wentworth & Davis, 2002). It also created the common bond of shared scholarly inquiry that challenged and inspired each other to take risks, explore unasked questions with the intent to examine instructional strategies, revise course designs and improve student learning.

**Reflexive Photography: Revisiting How Students Reflect, Process and Communicate About Transformative Learning Experiences**  
**Brent Oliver, Mary Goitom, Darlene Chalmers**

**Glen 208**

Reflexive photography assignments are a novel tool being used in professional education to assist students to record, reflect and communicate their learning. Consistent with transformative approaches that view new knowledge as evolving through the processing of experience; reflexive photography affords students the opportunity to articulate the meaning of their experiences in a format that allows for increased feel, physicality, and emotion. Reflexive photography provides an experiential learning strategy that assists students to document social realities and reflect on their impact in the world. Additionally, it provides an opportunity to engage students to think critically and develop skills in reflexivity by integrating their learning with critical analysis through the use of visual methods. This paper will identify and discuss results from a recent scholarship of teaching and learning project on reflexive photography. The purpose of this collaborative research was to explore student's experiences with reflexive photography within three distinct and diverse programs offering social work education in Canada. The study utilized grounded theory methodology to better understand the processes students experienced as they strived to make meaning of, and reflect on their emerging professional practice. Purposive and theoretical sampling methods were used to recruit 17 undergraduate and graduate social work students registered in field practicum at three Canadian universities. Data collection included two qualitative sources including key informant interviews with participating students and their associated reflexive photography project submissions (photographs and text captions). Qualitative data analysis was conducted utilizing grounded theory coding methods and constant comparative analysis of the interview data and student assignments. The analysis identified themes related to students' experiences with the reflexive photography project, the meaning and insight they drew from participating in the project, their perspective on the strengths and challenges experienced as part of the process, and their ideas on alternatives to enhance their learning. This paper will explore study findings and situate them within Mezirow's (2009) transformative learning theory (TLT). This theory posits a ten-step educational process to assist learners in revisiting taken for granted frames of reference such as stereotypical attitudes and practices. Transformative learning processes are integral to adult learning and enable students to recognize, reassess, and modify the structures of assumptions and expectations that frame and influence their thinking, beliefs, and actions. Study findings suggest that reflexive photography is a form of transformative learning that can help inform the discourse on reflexivity within social work education and within other professional disciplines.

**Assessing Intercultural Competence in Short-Term Study Abroad Programs: Are Mixed Methods the Way Forward?**  
**Andrea Paras, Jodi Malmgren, Michael Carignan**

**Glen 208**

As institutions continue to prize measurable outcomes for study abroad programs, educators are striving for clear, identifiable goals as well as reliable methods and techniques for assessment. This paper blends analysis of coded student writing with numerical data from the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to better understand

the impacts of several variables on intercultural competence development during short-term study abroad programs. We propose that this mixed-method approach can provide much-needed nuance to understanding what and how students learn in their programs. The research team includes faculty members and study abroad administrators from six institutions; data was collected from six different study abroad programs (one from each institution). This multi-institutional approach creates a unique opportunity for extensive data collection and comparisons between different program models. Our exploration and discoveries in this relatively new methodology places this proposal in the “New Horizons, Emerging Landscapes, and Underexplored Territories” conference theme. The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a psychometric assessment instrument used to assess and teach intercultural competence in a variety of professional and educational setting, including study abroad (Bennett, 2009; Deardorff, 2006; Jackson, 2009; Vande Berg, 2009). While it is common for study abroad programs to employ the IDI to measure intercultural competence in their students, a limitation of the IDI is that it only provides quantitative data. In other words, it indicates whether there has been a change in intercultural competence, but it does not explain why that change has occurred or how to understand the student learning process. In order to address this gap, we combined IDI data with qualitative analysis of student reflections to gain a rich empirical understanding of why growth in intercultural competence did or did not occur. Specifically, our study uses a mixed-methods approach to analyse the role of pre-departure cultural orientation and training exercises on students’ intercultural competence. We analyze both qualitative and quantitative data collected from students participating in a variety of pre-departure orientation programs. Students enrolled in all six programs took the IDI survey twice: prior to their departure to and upon their return from their program abroad. The IDI survey indicated whether there were any changes in intercultural competence as a result of student participation in the program. We triangulated IDI survey results with qualitative data, which included 257 written student reflections that were collected at four different points before, during, and after the program. The writing prompts were designed to have students describe intercultural experiences and we coded the writing for a wide variety of factors, including several pertaining to intercultural competence. We regard the IDI data as suggestive rather than conclusive, but when we supplement it with our analysis of coded student reflection-writing before, during, and after the programs, we have deeper insights into the types of growth suggested by the IDI, and get closer to explanations for how certain program features may have contributed to the growth. Our findings yielded a number of insights suggesting not only that some intercultural competence growth is possible in short-term programs, but that more interventions and deliberate intercultural training seems to make a positive impact on many post-return IDI scores. We conclude that a mixed-methods approach is able to capture a more nuanced understanding of how students’ development of intercultural competence during study abroad programs.

**Defining and Assessing the Impact of Culture Shock and Group Dynamics on Student Learning in Short Term Travel Study Programs** Glen 208  
**Lisa Stowe**

Short term travel study programs (STTSPs) are unique learning environments where students travel, live and study with other students and their instructors for a compressed period of time, often from 3 to 6 weeks. To date there has been significant research on STTSPs, but often researchers have assessed these programs based on student outcomes related to intercultural awareness and global citizenry (Donnelly-Smith, 2009; Long, Akande, Purdy, & Nakano, 2010) or the studies conducted are large scale classification and assessment studies (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2009; Engle and Engle, 2003). Some scholars have moved beyond outcomes assessment research to try and define and understand the type of learning that is present in these programs (Perry et al., 2012; Tarrant and Lyon, 2012). Research is underway to show the benefits of these programs, but as Perry et al. (2012) suggest, more empirical studies on short-term travel-study programs as a phenomenon are needed. There has been very little research on the type of learning that takes place in these programs or on defining the unique learning environments that are created by group travel. The emotional conditions that are created by group dynamics are a form of culture shock reminiscent of the culture shock that Pedersen (1995) discusses. Culture shock is normally thought of as “primarily a set of emotional reactions to the loss of perceptual reinforcements from one’s own culture” (Adler, 1975, p. 13 ). Culture shock is often exhibited as feelings of “helplessness, irritability, and fears of being cheated, contaminated, injured or disregarded” (p. 13). But Pedersen defines culture shock as any situation that is unfamiliar and “where an individual is forced to adjust to an unfamiliar social system where previous learning no longer applies” (p. 1). How one copes with these intense feelings either increases the culture shock or helps overcome

those feelings. For Pedersen, critical incidents, which are defined as unexpected events that students may encounter while abroad, play an essential role in revealing culture shock. I posit in my research that group travel, with its compression of time often creates culture shock and intense group dynamics reminiscent of Pederson's (1995) definition and which ultimately can lead to enriched learning environments. This paper presentation will explore the initial findings from a qualitative research project that aims to define culture shock and group dynamics across a wide range of STTSPs at the University of Calgary. It will also determine if those elements are currently being used to encourage deep learning in STTSPs. Final results from this project can potentially be used to create an assessment tool that could be adopted by instructors to understand how culture and group dynamics are useful for effective learning opportunities in their STTSPs. This research into how culture shock can foster deep learning environments is one that is newly emerging and one that is underexplored in both study abroad learning environments and on campus classrooms.

**The Collegial Project Course: Building A Collegial Scholarly Culture Scholarly  
Roy Andersson, Arild Raaheim**

**Telus 104**

Background: bioCEED – Centre of Excellence in Biology Education, is a Norwegian joint venture between University of Bergen, the University Centre in Svalbard and the Institute of Marine Research. The two most central strategies for bioCEED is to improve education by moving away from the teacher-centered tradition toward a learner-centered education, and to change and grow a knowledge-based teaching and learning culture. For this work, bioCEED was inspired by Graham Gibbs' framework and the collegial educational development culture at the Faculty of Engineering at Lund University (LTH). Gibbs' framework presents a whole set of activities that need to be addressed and integrated in an institutional strategy to develop the university's whole teaching and learning (Gibbs, 2009), which LTH is as a successful example of (Andersson and Warfvinge, 2012). A key activity in bioCEED's work to promote a collegial teaching culture has been an academic development Collegial Project Course based on the course developed at LTH (Andersson and Roxå, 2014).

The Collegial Project Course (CPC): Simply adopting an activity or a program from another institution will not guarantee success. To make it successful you need to adapt and make use of it in a new and different setting - or in an Extended Abstract way to reference the SOLO taxonomy (Biggs and Collis, 1982). When Lund introduced the CPC it was as a new and more sophisticated tool to reach further into collegial contexts and thereby involve new categories of academic teachers previously not engaged in SoTL. At bioCEED the need was different. Here the focus was to start building a collegial SoTL culture. But even if starting on a lower level of scholarly requirement the development curve have been very steep (upwards). This is i.e seen in the change of the teachers' conceptions of teaching (Andersson et al, 2013; Prosser et al, 1994) and in the final CPC reports, which have been compared with CPC reports from Lund. By stressing the similarities with the fully accepted research culture and their research knowledge this have been possible. The key outcome for us from this project is that the level of scholarly requirement to start with can be moderated and still very effective.

More results: The participants appreciate the collegial approach. It has changed their conceptions of teaching and maybe most of all it have provided them with a common language when discussing teaching and learning locally. Education, teaching and learning is now a topic for discussion in both strategy seminars as during lunch breaks and in the university quality assurance system's course reports you can see shifted patterns of collegial behavior by including peer teaching, better written accounts about teaching situations and even peer reviewed. One important factor is the CPC participants are now change agents and informal norm carriers which acknowledges the fact that the identity of academic teachers and their social positioning in hierarchies is formed during day-to-day collegial interaction (Roxå and Olsson, 2008; Trowler, 2008).

**The Emerging Landscape of Mentorship to Support Teaching, Learning, and Research  
in Nursing Academia  
Lorelli Nowell, Deborah White, Karen Benzies, Patricia Rosenau**

**Telus 104**

Background: As the numbers of nurses in the workforce continues to decrease, so do the numbers of nursing faculty required to implement effective teaching and learning methodologies to support the development of new nurses. Nursing education institutions globally have called for mentorship to help address the nursing faculty

shortage. Mentorship is perceived as vital to maintaining high-quality education programs. While there is emerging evidence to support the value of mentorship in other disciplines, the extant state of evidence for mentorship in nursing academia is not well established. Little is known about the current state of mentorship or the barriers and facilitators for implementing mentorship programs in Canadian nursing schools. Objectives: 1) To document and assess the global evidence for mentorship in nursing academia. 2) To identify the current state of mentorship in Canadian nursing academia. 3) To explore factors that impact implementation of mentorship programs. Methods: A three phase mixed methods approach was used: 1) a mixed studies systematic review was conducted to identify and evaluate the nature, strength, and quality of the evidence for mentorship in nursing academia; 2) nursing faculty members (n=935) were recruited from English speaking Canadian schools of nursing to complete a web-based survey to identify the current state of mentorship and explore facilitators and barriers to implementing mentorship programs; and, 3) survey participants (n=48) were purposively sampled for maximum variation to participate in interviews to explore their experiences with mentorship. Descriptive statistics and thematic analysis were used to analyze the data. The results of all three phases were integrated to develop a more robust and meaningful picture of mentorship. Findings: In general, mentorship positively impacts behavioural, career, attitudinal, relational, and motivational outcomes; however, the methodological quality of mentorship studies is weak. The majority of Canadian nursing schools lack formal mentorship programs and those that exist are largely informal, vary in scope and components, and lack common definitions or goals. Factors influencing mentorship program implementation include: training and guidelines; quality of relationships; choice and availability of mentors; organizational support; time and competing priorities; culture of the institution; and evaluation of mentorship outcomes. Dyad, peer, group, constellation, and distance mentorship models are present and components include guidelines, training, professional development workshops, purposeful linking of mentors and mentees, and mentorship coordinators. Evaluation of mentorship, where it exists, remains mostly descriptive, anecdotal, and lacks common evaluative metrics. Conclusion: Current literature suggests largely positive outcomes exist for mentorship in nursing academia with numerous benefits for mentees, mentors, and organizations; however, there is a distinct lack of methodologically rigorous evidence. Our results confirm lack of formalized mentorship programs in Canadian schools of nursing. To ensure success in developing mentorship programs, academic leaders need to consider multiple barriers, facilitators, models, and components to meet their specific needs. Further rigorous evaluation of mentorship programs and components is needed to identify if mentorship programs are achieving specified goals. Audience engagement: Attendees will be stimulated to reflect on individual mentoring experiences and critically respond to study findings.

**Amongst a Sea of Data: Telling Meaningful Stories About Our Programming**  
**Marie Vander Kloet, Michal Kasprzak, Alli Diskin, Kathleen Ogden**

**Telus 104**

The Teaching Assistant Training Program at the University of Toronto is a peer-led teaching assistant and graduate students teaching development program that provides both mandatory, paid training sessions and professional development initiatives (including special events, certificate programs, workshop series, practicums and other specialized initiatives). Next year, the TATP will be in its 20th year and it has been collecting substantive data on its programming for more than 10 years. This data, including feedback from participants and facilitators for all events, trainings and workshops and detailed information related to certificate administration and participation including information about participants' program, department and campus, reflections from participants who complete certificates and attrition and completion rates. While this data is used routinely to inform decision making in the program, there remains, amongst TATP staff, a desire to use this data to tell meaningful stories to and with our scholarly peers about teaching assistant and graduate student programming. In this paper, we begin by exploring two central questions: What are meaningful stories in teaching assistant and graduate student teaching development? And what challenges exist in collecting and analyzing program evaluation data? To answer these questions, we look at a specific section of our data in order to identify and explore stories frequently told about teaching assistants and graduate students who are novice teachers. Through coded participant feedback from mandatory, department-specific, paid training sessions led by the TATP peer trainers for the past three years (n=1206), we highlight four areas of training: most beneficial training topic; least beneficial training topic; teaching strategies to adopt; and future topics to include in training. This data tells familiar stories to educational developers working with teaching assistants and graduate students such as concerns about grading, answering student questions, dealing with imposter syndrome and classroom management. We happily tell these anticipatable stories

but also hope to interrupt and complicate them with some unexpected narratives including the impact of specific peer trainers' language and facilitation on feedback responses as well as how various situational factors inform how these stories are constructed and reconstructed. To further examination the critical reflective work of the trainers and the trainees, we discuss another, not fully explored data set: certificate participant reflection responses. Our early analysis reveals the emergence of a critically reflective teaching assistant subject - one who is well practiced in expressing oneself through particular teaching and learning tropes. Our paper is tied together through a focus on using program data to tell stories and a rich consideration of what can and cannot be told through certain data sets, evaluation practices, and research methods. Our intention is to open up dialogue about the challenges of telling meaningful stories with evaluation data and to offer reflective considerations of possible ways forward.

### **Critical Theory at the Intersection of Assessment and SoTL** **Daniel Anderson**

**Telus 106**

Patricia Cranton (2011) has argued that critical theory offers useful theoretical tools for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) as a practice, but her insight has remained a yet-underexplored topic in SoTL circles. This paper develops Cranton's insight further, mobilizing critical theory to conceptualize institutional assessment of student learning outcomes as a SoTL practice, where SoTL is understood as self-reflexive inquiry into teaching and learning experiences that opens onto evidence-informed practice (Hutchins, 2000)--or, in the patois of academic assessment, continuous improvement (NILOA). In their means and ends, SoTL and assessment discourses converge because they describe parallel practices each promising a transformational potential. Critical theory specifies the content of "transformation" in the context of research in social institutions (Horkheimer, 1937) such as colleges and universities, and offers a means to conceptualize the intersection of SoTL and assessment methods, aspirations, and (perhaps) practices. Three relevant contributions critical theory can make in this conjuncture are summarized: First, because critical theory describes the intervention of a thinker into a historical moment that is both acted upon by the researcher and active upon him or her, the dialectical modes of thought mobilized in critical theory are of value in articulating, strategizing, and implementing recursive processes such as SoTL and assessment in institutions that are changing at all times. Dialectical thought can account for the complex reciprocations of the researcher and the institutional context, and empower the persistent researcher to take an ever-more adequate or "higher" viewpoint (Standpunkt) from which meaningful interventions can be made. Second, the imperative of critical social theory to not only understand the world as is done in the disciplines, but to transform it accounts for the imperative of assessment professionals and organizations such as NILOA to use assessment tools and evidence not only to satisfy the demands of external auditors and accreditors, but most importantly to inform the practice of teaching and concomitantly the re-visioning of the institutional structures in which teaching and learning happen in order to promote effective learning experiences. In this context, SoTL and assessment may be usefully conceptualized in Antonio Gramsci's terms as a "philosophy of praxis." Its purpose is to intervene in the regular routines of work on campuses to remake learning anew as informed by analysis of historical artifacts such as the previous semester's outcomes. From here, critical theory can contribute in a unique way to assessment work understood as SoTL by specifying and embedding specific objectives into assessment projects. Critical theory can draw out the implicit social justice agenda of assessment work through the concept of totality--in this case, the totality of stakeholders in the college or university, inclusive of those who are structurally disempowered. For example, critical theory's attention to the reproduction of disempowerment (through categories such as class, race, and gender) within institutions can instruct those designing assessment measures to find out if learning is made available equitably, or if some students are systematically excluded or marginalized, and if so, how (perhaps even by the means of assessment itself). Corrective actions may be envisioned on the basis of the evidence produced to ensure a just learning environment for the totality of students and faculty.

### **SoTL-Curriculum: Challenges, Potential, and Future Directions** **Patti Djur, Frances Kalu**

**Telus 106**

An "underexplored territory" in SoTL is the Scholarship of Curriculum Practice, or SoTL-Curriculum. While there is increasing interest in SoTL, it might be argued that many of these inquiries are at the course level. SoTL-Curriculum, which can be defined as "the ongoing learning and dissemination of practice-driven curricula research in peer review contexts" (Hubball and Gold, 2007, p. 10) takes a broader view to examine teaching and learning at

a program level, offering the possibility of better understanding programs and pedagogical approaches within a program of study as opposed to within a single course. Learning Goals and Outcomes: Participants in the workshop will have the opportunity to: Discuss what SoTL-Curriculum is, what sorts of studies it might encompass, explore an aspect of SoTL-Curriculum in depth, and gather ideas for SoTL-Curriculum studies that relate to their own practice. Participant Engagement: We will provide a brief overview of SoTL-Curriculum, including a definition, examples of different types of inquiry questions related to curriculum, benefits of such studies, and challenges in conducting them. We will then talk about potential future directions for SoTL-Curriculum. The last 10 minutes of the session will be reserved for participants to discuss their experiences with SoTL-Curriculum and for question and answer. Participants will come away from the session with a deeper understanding of SoTL-Curriculum, some references and resources, and a few contacts from other institutions who are also interested in this topic. Relevant Literature and Current SoTL Conversations: There are many potential benefits to program-level inquiry into teaching and learning. For example, SoTL-Curriculum studies can provide an evidence-based way to examine a program, result in recommendations to improve it, and increase discourse and collaboration between instructors (Uchiyama & Radin, 2009; Sumsion & Goodfellow, 2004). Examining the learning experience at a program level allows us to look at trends across the program, strengths, and gaps as students progress through a series of courses. In spite of the potential, SoTL-Curriculum studies are currently underexplored (Hubball, Pearson & Clarke, 2013). Hubball, Pearson and Clarke (2013) offered a conceptual framework for SoTL-Curriculum studies, with four categories of inquiry: Context inquiry: The examination of the context of a program, such as strategic plans, innovations and challenges. Development inquiry: Examines the development of a program, such as program-level learning outcomes, student learning activities, or pedagogical approaches, for example. Implementation inquiry: Implementation studies examine how a program is enacted and can focus on a particular perspective or initiative. Evaluation inquiry: To evaluate aspects of a program in order to make it more effective for learners (Hubball, Pearson & Clarke, 2013). Thus, SoTL-Curriculum includes a broad range of studies aimed at better understanding learning experiences at the program level. Facilitators' Relevant Experience: This concurrent workshop will have two facilitators, both of whom work in the field of curriculum development, present and publish within the Scholarship of Curriculum Practice. The facilitators regularly conduct workshops and retreats that provide a balance between presentation, discussion, and participant activity. Most Relevant Conference Thread: New horizons, emerging landscapes, and underexplored territories in SoTL

**Embracing the Inherent Vagueness of Learning: Aspiration Over Anxiety**  
**John Draeger**

**Telus 106**

If SoTL is dedicated to learning about student learning, then this paper explores a tension at the heart of learning itself. On the one hand, learning is rooted in a particular context (e.g., lab, case study, literature). On the other hand, learning seeks to transcend particular contexts to make connections to new circumstances. This tension plays out for SoTL scholars in our various visions of the future. On the one hand, we decode the disciplines (Pace and Middendorf 2004), engage in signature pedagogies (Gurung, Chick, and Haynie 2009), and take disciplinary approaches to SoTL (Healey 2000) because we recognize that learning needs to be grounded in disciplinary frames of reference. On the other hand, we debate over the role of theory in SoTL (Clegg 2012; Hutchings and Huber 2008; Roxå, Olsson, and Mårtensson 2008) because we recognize the need to transcend particular disciplinary contexts. If SoTL is to reach new heights, our community must explore the ways learning is simultaneously deeply particular and aspirationally transcendent.

In an attempt to frame the dialogue over the nature of learning, I appeal to a parallel tension at the heart of legal philosophy. Courts, for example, must apply general principles to particular cases and the legitimacy of those decisions depends upon coherence across cases. Legal decisions are simultaneously particular and transcendent. Waldron (1994) argues that important legal concepts (e.g., liberty, equality, fairness) are inherently vague. It is their vagueness that allows them to be adapted to a wide variety of cases, while still being faithful to particular conditions. Embracing vagueness is not a glorification of sloppy thinking, but a recognition that many powerful concepts can fall along continua (e.g., conditions can be more or less conducive to free expression) and can be understood in terms of overlapping features (e.g., freedom to make personal choices in private/public, freedom from intrusion government in private/public). According to Waldron, vagueness in legal concepts is desirable insofar as it encourages discussion over their meaning and application.

Drawing on tools from legal theory, I argue that a careful understanding of vagueness can help the SoTL community navigate the tension at the heart of learning. A discussion of vagueness allows us to identify important overlapping features and to acknowledge that learning occurs along various continua. I illustrate with reference to debates over the role of theory in SoTL and the importance of disciplinary understandings, especially as pertains to critical thinking. In short, I argue that SoTL should aspire to embrace vagueness because it will propel us to new heights by facilitating conversations about when, where, how, and why learning takes place.

### **Global Service Learning: Structuring Curriculum to Enhance Humility**

**Glen 202**

**Victoria Calvert, David Peacock, Margot Underwood, Judy Gleeson, Andrea Kennedy, Scharie Tavcer**

Cultural humility is critically important for students to be open to the deep understanding and transformational experiences that occur through Global Service Learning (GSL). Too often well-intentioned faculty structure international field schools that essentially become international tourism which reinforce a colonialist sense of privilege for their students. GSL exists when there is a meaningful experience carefully constructed with host communities through long-term relationships, marked by reciprocity, where students have been encouraged to critically examine the affordances and limitations of their own privileges, and coached to develop respectful and culturally accepting values. Our interdisciplinary panel will explore ways to cultivate this cultural and epistemological humility, within the context of partnership with host countries, to better enable critically reflexive GSL. The panel will be comprised of six faculty from Nursing, Business, Arts, and Justice Studies disciplines from two universities. We will start by providing the context for successful GSL experiences, then describe the need for a humble and vulnerable approach to GSL. Panelists will describe their teaching philosophy, and the evolution of the curriculum strategies they have developed for embedding cultural humility as a key component of GSL learning. Structures that may be employed to promote humility using pre-trip, concurrent, and post-trip reflection and activities will be outlined through examples of GSL field schools in Rankin Inlet, Hawaii, The Dominican Republic, and the Cook Islands. We would then open the dialogue to attendees to discuss their approaches to the development of GSL experiences, and encourage reflection through questioning. Background: As educators who have facilitated Global Service Learning (GSL) we are familiar with its impact, and sometimes a transformational effect, upon students. However, we have concerns regarding the nature of GSL pertaining to the level of interaction between students and the community partner, and in particular the ability of students to become conscious of unexamined assumptions, values and cultural expectations to facilitate deep understanding and acceptance of the host country. We sense that many interactions with global partners remain merely transactional and superficial that fail to stretch students beyond familiar patterns of giving to the 'less fortunate'. The limited scope of these interactions with the hosts does not optimize transformative learning potential for students possible through GSL across the personal, professional and cognitive domains. At best, such experiences contribute to a sense of global citizenship, at worst they contribute to the reinforcement of the perceptions of cultural superiority (Crabtree, 2008, 2013; Prins & Webster, 2010). GSL builds upon the body of research and experience generated through International service-learning, study abroad, and international education with an overriding moral imperative to structure the relationship between the community and the learning experience to ensure reciprocal benefit and critical learning experiences. Emergent practice recognizes the following criteria for GSL practices: students develop an awareness and understanding of culture, power, privilege, and hegemonic assumptions, are immersed within the global volunteer space, and engage stakeholders in a critical global civic and moral vision (Hartman & Kiely 2014). Projects based in culturally isolated communities, such as those of the First Nations in Canada and the federally-recognized Indigenous nations of the United States, would be construed as GSL (Hartman & Kiely, 2014). Clayton, Bringle and Hatcher (2013) identify that the characteristics of cultural humility support best practice of reciprocity, cooperation and openness and greater understanding between host and visitors. The panelists will outline several elements that contribute to cultural humility, including: the mutual design of the project with community partners, the knowledge and mental readiness of students so that they can successfully engage with local partners, and the resolution of logistic and operational considerations including language barriers. They will discuss management of the learning experience through the construction of reflection exercises and assessment methodologies that build upon the experience and provide feedback loops for layered consideration. Cultural humility and respect are noted to be vital in all phases of GSL. An important part of this is participants' willingness to engage in self-reflection and self-critique (Tervalon and Murrey-Garcia, 1998). Panelists will discuss how preparation for GSL could be conceived from a

holistic perspective, whereby students would be not only aware of the community partner's environment from a political, economic, historical, environmental, but more crucially that students undertake a process of self-examination to develop cultural awareness and humility through which their view of community engagement shifts from the 'with' rather than 'for' perspective, and from an "I" and to a "we" engagement that is integral for the development of a shared sense of community and transformational partnerships (Janke, 2009). Panelists will highlight the development of the cultural and boundary crossing (Hora & Miller, 2011) capabilities by students so that they can culturally identify with and begin to understand and appreciate people from radically different cultural milieus. A review of GSL literature indicates significant gaps pertaining to the structuring of cultural preparation, particularly with regards to methods and outcomes (Bringle, Hatcher, & Jones, 2011). While some professional disciplines such as Medicine and Nursing have a body of work investigating the necessity for intercultural capacities including cultural humility, inter-disciplinary processes to develop student capacity for cultural humility for GSL practice have not been widely shared. Models of intercultural competencies provide frameworks for building the attitudinal and knowledge awareness and skills from which students can build positive and open experiences (Deardorff, 2012). An analysis of the structure for cultural training should address the following variables: the timing (conducted pre-departure, or in country), the process (the models and exercises employed to build awareness and humility), and the inclusion of assessment regarding awareness and skills for intercultural encounter (included or not, self-reflective or not, academic applications, on-site or pre-trip, and the impact upon the community). This panel will contribute to SoTL practices relative to GSL by sharing the varied and productive ways in which faculty have structured their curricula to prepare and cultivate students for learning cultural humility.

**Leading the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to New Heights: Engaging, Connecting, Collaborating, and Advocating** **Glen 203**  
**Nicola Simmons, K. Lynn Taylor**

As the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) matures as a field of inquiry, the imperative to build institutional infrastructure to develop, support, integrate and recognize SoTL at an institutional level has emerged (Hutchings, Huber & Ciccone, 2011). To achieve this systemic integration, institutions must cultivate leadership roles at multiple levels to build robust "networks of practice" (Wasko & Faraj, 2005) and adjust resource allocation, policies and practices to enable and reward SoTL (Hutchings, Huber & Ciccone, 2011). This challenge is all at once an "aspiration and anxiety" and a huge opportunity for SoTL. As part of this second wave of evolution in SoTL, people in diverse roles facilitate faculty and staff in promoting, supporting, and providing leadership for the SoTL. To better understand the nature of this work, we conducted an international survey to discover how educational developers, faculty members, and administrators enact their SoTL roles, and the supports and obstacles they encounter. In this workshop, we invite you to join us in exploring the multiple ways survey respondents construed their SoTL leadership roles and how they help create thriving SoTL networks (Martensson, Roxa, & Olsson, 2012; Williams et al., 2013). Together, we will examine survey participants' perceptions and your own experiences with respect to four different dimensions of SoTL integration: Engagement (involvement in creating SoTL) Connections (identifying and connecting clusters of strong local teaching and learning scholarship, Collaborations (building on connections to share and build practice, leadership, and knowledge), and Advocacy (promoting the valuing, support, and recognition of SoTL) We will consider how we can learn from the experiences of survey respondents to build capacity in intersecting "trading zones" (Galison, 1997) at micro (individual), meso (departmental), macro (institutional), and mega (cross-institutional/disciplinary) levels (Poole & Simmons, 2013). Creating infrastructure to support the SoTL at each of these levels requires leadership to intentionally cultivate the complex intellectual and social networks that support knowledge creation, dissemination, and application. Through reflective activities and in large and small group discussions, participants will discuss similarities and differences among ED, faculty, and administrator perspectives on supporting the SoTL; consider formal and informal roles that support SoTL integration in institutions and within and across disciplines; explore the factors that enable or impede the development of institutional infrastructure to develop, support, and recognize SoTL; create action plans for supporting the SoTL at your own institution. The workshop leaders are experienced facilitators and have deep experience in building institutional and national infrastructure to support the development of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 10:00-10:30

Refreshment break outside of the Telus rooms, the Glen rooms, and the Exhibition Halls.

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 10:30-NOON

**Rewarding Excellence in University Teaching-Discovering New Horizons, Exploring Emerging Landscapes, and Promoting Underexplored Territories in SoTL** Glen 201  
**Thomas Olsson, Torgny Roxå, Vigdis Vandvik, Oddfrid Førland, Christine Winberg, Diane Grayson**

In this panel, we will discuss how systems for rewarding excellence in teaching promotes institutional development and how SoTL underpins such a development (Gunn & Fisk 2013; Kezar 2014). A reward system alone is not enough to drive the development (Mårtensson, Roxå & Olsson 2011; Olsson & Roxå 2013), but as part of an integrated strategy for educational development it plays a very important role. Informed (SoTL!) collegial conversations, both written and oral, about teaching and learning are central in this development (Mårtensson 2014). The panel as a whole will debate important aspects of reward systems for teaching excellence from three different perspectives: experienced institutional, informed institutional, and national. Lund University, with more than 15 years of experience, will provide important examples and results of institutional development. The University of Bergen is in the process of implementing a reward system at faculty level (informed by the Lund model). In South Africa, the discussions focus on the possibilities of introducing a national assessment and/or accreditation system (Council on Higher Education). The three countries participating in the panel will provide important but different experiences, and their various stages and priorities in the development of reward systems will provide a background for the discussions during the session. The topic of rewarding excellent teaching engages numerous SoTL conversations, but also debates that occasionally are more based on emotions than SoTL – even in academia! Lund University has a long experience of assessing and rewarding teaching excellence, within the university, but also as advisors and assessors for more than 15 other universities, and we have performed numerous research projects since the beginning of the century. Consequently, we have acquired knowledge about how the process influences institutional development. We know that rewarded teachers are responsible for courses that support good student learning and a deep approach to learning (Olsson & Roxå 2008; Borell & Andersson 2014). We also know, through examination results and course evaluations that teaching has developed positively over time. We know that the quality of teaching portfolios has increased significantly in relation to the complexity of the narratives (what is taught, how is the subject taught), the scholarly approach, effects of teaching on student learning, and sharing/dissemination of expertise and best practice (Larsson, Anderberg and Olsson 2015). The assessment process was researched through portfolios and video recordings of assessment interviews. This has resulted in better criteria and assessment procedures, and new models for defining teaching quality and excellence (Olsson & Roxå 2013). A very important indicator of institutional development in relation to teaching excellence is that (after 15 years) rewarded teachers are significantly overrepresented at important positions within the university (Olsson 2017, to be published). This includes groups like programme leaders, research boards, postgraduate education board, and teacher appointment committees, as well as heads of departments, dean's office, and faculty board. The fact that excellent teachers engaged in SoTL are heavily involved in policy and decision-making is of course of profound importance for the institutional development of teaching and student learning. In Lund, we know that a system for rewarding excellent teaching can promote institutional development. The criteria are very important since they indicate how the institution define excellence in teaching. An excellent teacher must be able to show that he or she can incorporate deep subject knowledge in a teaching and student learning context (Shulman 1986). The teacher must also show that he or she has systematically developed teaching in relation to student learning. Finally, the teacher must be engaged in various kinds of collegial discussions – at different levels, and always with a scholarly approach– about teaching and learning. A majority of Swedish universities has introduced different forms of reward systems. They differ mainly in the focus of the criteria, if they have more than one level of excellence, and also how the assessment is performed. The national student union organisations are heavily supporting the demand that reward systems should be introduced at all Swedish universities. This is now happening in Sweden's neighbour country, Norway. The University of Bergen (Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences) has developed and is implementing (spring 2017) a system for rewarding teaching excellence. Many of the experiences from Lund

University have been taken into account and we will have exciting experiences to include in the panel discussions in Calgary later this year. The process has not been without backlashes and the Faculty of Science has decided to go forward and introduce their system as the first in Norway. The support at national level is noteworthy. A white book was written and presented within the Norwegian parliament earlier this year (Det Kongelige Kunnskapsdepartement, Meld. St. 16, 2017) about teaching quality and how to support and reward it. The work at Lund University was also discussed and referenced in this report. The white book and the development in Bergen have created a lively national debate in Norway about rewarding teaching excellence. The Department of Higher Education and Training in South Africa has introduced a new funding instrument, the University Development Grant, which will support the improvement of university teaching. Related, there is an ongoing dialogue, driven by the Council on Higher Education, which focus on whether a national policy on assessment and accreditation of university teachers is needed and desirable. This dialogue is drawing on experiences from partners in the European Union (including Lund University) focusing on assessment, accreditation, and professional development of university teachers. Another relevant South African/Swedish initiative is a three-year research project (the four universities in Western Cape and Lund University, 2017-19) investigating and developing teaching quality in STEM educations, including fair and supportive assessment practices, and recognition and rewards for teaching excellence. The panel agenda will, after short introductions about main experiences and results from Sweden, Norway and South Africa, focus on interactive discussions involving all participants of the session. We will cover the importance of SoTL in areas such as criteria for excellent teaching, teaching portfolios, assessment and assessors, and pedagogical leadership. After this session, participants should have reached an improved understanding of how reward systems can promote institutional development, and gained new insights into SoTL horizons, landscapes and territories promoted by rewarding excellence in university teaching.

**Unconditional Welcome: Derrida's Law of Hospitality as a Framework for Inclusive Pedagogic Practice**  
**Joan McLatchie, Laurie Campbell**

**Glen 206**

The transformative expansion of UK Higher Education over the last twenty years has resulted in a highly diverse student body, creating new challenges for pedagogic practice as Universities seek to maintain a high-quality learning experience within an inclusive learning environment. This paper uses Derrida's law of hospitality as a lens to explore the concept of hospitable education, and how it can inform inclusive pedagogic practice. Derrida (2000) describes the law of hospitality in terms of unconditional, unlimited and absolute welcome; this requires trust between student and teacher (Hung, 2013). However, this concept is not without its questions. What views or behaviours, for example, can be tolerated in the hospitable classroom? Where should the line of tolerance be drawn, and how does this reflect prevailing hegemonies (Langmann, 2010)? Is it possible to move beyond tolerance towards the unconditional welcome of diversity? The authors argue here that to create a truly welcoming space, teachers must offer the student a space to be 'other', without expectation to conform. The hospitable teacher recognises that the student's arrival may change the space, rather than expecting that the student will conform to fit. (Ruitenbergh, 2011). These themes are explored through a small scale mixed methods pilot study supported by the Higher Education Academy and conducted in a Scottish Higher Education (HE) Institution. Eight HE practitioners, representing a range of academic programmes, were interviewed to explore their perceptions of what constituted an inclusive learning environment. The research team then used the data to design six self-reflective 'conversations', building on the methods used in the U.S.-based National SEED Project. These were held over a six-month period and were attended by 8-12 participants; each session focused on a different issue relating to equality and diversity in HE. Further data were gathered through participant observation and pre- /post-session qualitative questionnaires. A final evaluation meeting was held for the research team and participants to reflect on the learning generated by the sessions. The reflective conversations were received positively by participants, who reported increased self-awareness and knowledge around the issues raised. They believed that the sessions had offered a place to be reflexive about their practice, and they intended to transfer this knowledge to their learning spaces. The findings of the study revealed the difficulties of achieving a truly hospitable classroom. Participants highlighted the issue of tolerance, and the need to meet the requirements of the curriculum, as restricting factors in providing an unconditional welcome, as well as the desire to meet the needs of all inhabitants of the learning space. Derrida argues that a true application of the law of hospitality is unachievable, and the outcome of this study suggests that this also holds true for hospitable education. The research team recognise that this is a small-scale pilot study with

limited student input, and further research is required to explore these themes from the student viewpoint. However, preliminary conclusions indicate that the Derridian framework offers an intriguing additional dimension to the scholarship of inclusive teaching and learning.

### **Decolonizing the Syllabus** **Rachel La Touche**

**Glen 206**

In this paper, I review literature and present strategies for decolonizing the syllabus. In doing so, I approach the syllabus as an orienting project and pedagogical tool – engaging the ideological and practical considerations of challenging power and voice in scholarship, course policies, and assignments. Drawing from the critical pedagogy of bell hooks, Pierre Bourdieu, and Paulo Freire, I locate and question ideas in their historical, geographical and empirical traditions. I present strategies to create syllabi that give voice to marginalized narratives, including the identities and perspectives of students. While this paper details techniques for creating and adapting syllabi in undergraduate courses and for Social Science disciplines, strategies will be easily adaptable to the Humanities and graduate-level courses. As a complement, this paper also details classroom strategies that pair well with the decolonized syllabus – e.g. the *flipped classroom*. This paper concludes with suggestions for future empirical work to test the utility, effectiveness, and student learning outcomes of classrooms designed around the decolonized syllabus.

### **On Belonging: Discourse and Narratives on Race and Racialization in Higher Education** **Yael Harlap, Hanne Riese, Olympia Ahenkorah**

**Glen 206**

“Even when you are included, it is always complicated by how you are included” Puwar, 2006

In this presentation we place the narratives of 15 racialized minority students, academic staff and administrative staff from two Norwegian universities alongside analyses of classroom discourse where (mostly) white students and educators talk about race and ethnicity. These two studies-narrative interviews and classroom discourse-together illuminate processes of exclusion and inclusion, and the contested belonging of racialized minorities in Norwegian higher education and society. Research on race and racialization in Norway in particular, and continental Europe in general, suggests that these are unspeakables, as they are associated with a belief in race as biological reality (Essed & Trienekens 2008; Gullestad 2004). The prevailing ideology is the neoliberal approach of not recognizing or acknowledging race, though a growing literature on the experiences of people of color demonstrates both race-thinking and race-based discrimination (Andersson 2007; McIntosh 2015; Wekker 2016). Interview participants were recruited through self-identification as having experienced being perceived as ‘different’ on the basis of their skin color, facial features, race, ethnicity, or religion. Their narratives were analyzed using a combination of concept-driven coding and data driven coding (Kvale and Brinkman 2009). In the classroom discourse study, four university courses at the same two universities were audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using conceptual tools from membership categorization analysis (Schegloff 2007a, 2007b; Stokoe 2012; Whitehead 2009) and conversation analysis (Heritage 2005; Pomerantz 2000; Schegloff 2016). Analyses of both narratives and classroom discourse suggest that the positioning of racialized minorities is marked by ambivalence and uncertainty. White students and teachers in classroom discussion struggle to locate visibly marked ‘others’ as either belonging or not-belonging in Norwegian classrooms and society. The presence of these “bodies out of place” generates feelings of disorientation in spaces traditionally reserved for the invisible, centered, somatic norm of white bodies, as described by Nirmal Puwar in *Space Invaders* (2004) and Sara Ahmed’s *On Being Included* (2012). People of color in Norwegian academia, though they often report more acceptance at the university than in society at large, experience processes of exclusion such as: stereotypical conceptions of foreigners, discrimination on the basis of skin color, social marginalization, and lack of approval. In our discussion, we explore the narratives of our participants through the lens of Nirmal Puwar’s (2004, 2007) analysis of “bodies out of place,” and the exclusionary social dynamics she identifies in her study of academia and national institutions. We look at the narratives and classroom discourse together in light of postcolonial theory and empirical literature on race, difference, the nation, and institutions. This research maps underexplored territories in SoTL by looking at the experiences of actors in different institutional positions in universities, by using multiple methods of discourse analysis to unearth social dynamics and processes, and by elucidating findings that can inform how we think critically about inclusivity in teaching, learning and institutional relationships and structures.

**Evaluating the Impact of an International Faculty Development Program**  
**Julia Evanovitch, Alyson Brown, Jennifer Blaney**

**Telus 102**

Faculty development programs are designed to foster the professional development of faculty within an institution through the implementation of a variety of strategies including workshops, communities of practice, fellowships, and/or consults to a list a few. The uniqueness of the presenters' program is that it is structured around a 5-year collaborative international partnership. In considering the program's development, it was important to take into account the long-term impact and the metrics that would allow for the evaluation of the program's success. Kamel (2016) explains that in any faculty development program it is important to ensure that there exist opportunities for instructional, professional, organizational, career, and personal development. These different characteristics were important considerations in the development of our impact framework. In this presentation, we will be mapping and chronicling the inception of an international faculty development program, through the implementation of a Theory of Change (ToC) framework, which values a participative team-based approach (Hart et al. 2009; Graystone et al. in press). The aim of this paper is to highlight how the use of a ToC approach guides the development and evaluation of an international faculty development program. During the session, we will explore some of the initial challenges, insights, and milestones of the development process so far. The ToC framework helped to align the program goals and processes with those of the stakeholders. Hart et al., (2009) acknowledges that an impact evaluation approach "is both to inform improvement and provide accountability for an initiative" (p.292). This helped to guide early conversations regarding the program goals. Implementing a ToC facilitated both a participatory and theory based approach that helped to shape the program and build the processes within the framework (Hart et al., 2009). The impact guide that was developed by Graystone et al. (in press) shaped and inspired the understanding of what impact meant within this specific context. The program's evaluation metrics were influenced by the design of Dawson et al. (2014), and helped to understand how ISWs are implemented in an international context. Some of these metrics included a pre and post measure of an 'Approaches to Teaching Inventory-Revised' (Dawson et al., 2014). Graystone et al. (in press) argue that when conducting impact investigations, it is difficult to measure all impacts of a program, and instead it is useful to focus on a particular area of the program. This recommendation was useful in narrowing the scoping of this broader international partnership to focus specifically at the faculty development level of the partnership. The ToC framework helped conceptualize two components of the program: training and leadership. These two components shaped the understanding of how capacity could be developed in an international faculty development program. Participants will be invited to discuss how they incorporate evaluation approaches at their institutions, and to share their experiences of how impact is conceptualized and what metrics have been used in this capacity. Keywords: theory of change, impact study, faculty development.

**Using Educational Design Research to Develop an SoTL Online Learning Experience**  
**Josephine Csete, Carmel McNaught**

**Telus 102**

This paper describes the evidence-based design process carried out to develop a Small Private Online Course (SPOC) on the topic of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) for tertiary teachers in Hong Kong. This project stood to benefit from the educational design research (EDR) approach of cycling through phases of analysis, design and evaluation as described by Van den Akker et al (2006) and McKenney & Reeves (2013). The EDR approach was found to be useful in addressing three main challenges of the project. First, SoTL concepts and approaches are relatively new in the context. It was therefore important to understand what knowledge and skills teachers already possessed and what their educational context valued and expected regarding the topic of SoTL. Needs-assessment activities included surveys of SoTL experts internationally and of local SoTL stakeholders, identification of extant high-quality resources, and culminated in a list of key principles that would inform the content, activities and other design decisions for the course. Second, there was no existing set of SoTL resources that had been developed for the region and refined over repeated use in face-to-face mode. Accurate high-quality materials suited to the participants and context needed to be developed "from scratch". Therefore, following the needs assessment, a prototype face-to-face workshop series was conducted with thirty academics across a four-week period. Participant information collected before, during and after the workshop series provided valuable insights and suggestions for changes and enhancements. Forms of feedback collected included; a) a pre-workshop

series survey; b) weekly post-workshop evaluations; c) in-class exercises; d) end-of-course reflection reports; and e) follow-up interviews four months after completing the series. The third factor was that the project funder required these SoTL resources to be available to all teachers “regardless of their mode of employment” (including both part-time and evening teachers as well as full-time staff); which in turn necessitated that the resources be placed online and made available “anytime-anywhere”. Insights gained from the EDR approach informed the online delivery choice and design of the course that was ultimately developed. This paper will: provide an overview of the key elements of educational design research as described in the literature; explain (including the above mentioned challenges) how educational design research was useful in the given context and constraints; describe how EDR elements have been applied in the given project, going into detail on activities across a 24-month timeline for the cycles of analysis, design and evaluation; report on the SoTL online resource that was developed through this approach (including decisions as to content, activities and assessment); and share “lessons learned” with others wishing to carry out educational design research projects.

**Signature Pedagogies-A New Direction for SoTL in Nursing?**  
**Patrick Crookes, Kay Crookes**

**Telus 102**

The preparation of nurses for professional practice has always been a primary concern for nursing scholars involved in SoTL (author, 2013), as well as a concern among practicing nurses (author, 2016). One pathway to further enhancing professional nursing education in the future may lie within the concept of ‘signature pedagogies’. Signature pedagogies are the fundamental way in which students are educated in their future profession and through which they are instructed in the ‘three fundamental dimensions of professional work-to think, to perform, and to act with integrity’ (Shulman, 2005b, 52). The authors first came across the concept of signature pedagogies at the ISSOTL Conference in Melbourne in 2015, when Felten and Chick posited the idea that SoTL may be the signature pedagogy for Academic Developers (2015). This led the authors to an examination of the signature pedagogies literature (Falk, 2006; Shulman, 2005a, 2005b) and further conversations with colleagues in the disciplines of Nursing, Midwifery and Paramedicine as well as various Allied Health disciplines; regarding what signature pedagogy(ies) exist in those disciplines. Thus this paper will speak briefly about the literature on signature pedagogies generally and in health professions education more specifically, then compare and contrast data collected from interviews focused on identifying signature pedagogies in relation to health professional preparation in several disciplines. This work will provide greater insight into the area of signature pedagogies and how they can be applied to previously unexplored professions, therefore fitting well within the conference theme of ‘SoTL newcomers, fellow climbers and guides’. This work will assist and guide others in applying the signature pedagogies concept to their own disciplines. At the end of the session, the author will present the audience with the opportunity to reflect on the potential of signature pedagogies for their own SoTL practices and will challenge them to identify or debate the existence of signature pedagogies within their own disciplines.

**Strengthening Academic Pathways from Orientation to Graduation and Beyond for Masters Coursework Students**  
**Josephine Hook, Vicki Peel**

**Glen 204**

The Faculty of Arts, Monash University, Australia, offers ten masters coursework programs across disciplines including communications and media studies, tourism, international relations and bioethics. Monash is valued by masters coursework students as a leading Australian research institution with opportunities for career development through industry engagement and international experience. With more than 1000 students currently enrolled from more than twenty countries, numbers are forecast to rise. Dovetailing with the increasing scale and diversity of this cohort is the University’s strategy to transform education across the institution. The Monash University ‘Better Teaching, Better Learning’ agenda aims to disrupt traditional approaches to education through innovative curricula, multi-faceted modes of delivery and purposeful learning spaces. There are two key challenges in meeting the needs of this student cohort: the cultivation of an innovative education culture responsive to increasing scale; and the orientation of these predominantly international students to a western education system and enhanced graduate employability (Oliver, 2013). This paper reports on a holistic approach to meeting these challenges through the application of a ‘third generation’ partnership between faculty and professional staff (Kift et al., 2010; Whitchurch, 2008). The model was developed by faculty and library staff in the Monash Business School in 2012 (presented at

ISSOTL 2015), and extended in the Faculty of Arts to include the educational designers embedded in the faculty. The paper discusses the three key outcomes of this 'third generation' collaboration. Firstly, we have implemented a flipped classroom approach to address the challenge of growing scale. In strategic units, the didactic lecture is replaced with pre-class learning delivered in online lessons in preparation for group-based face-to-face learning and authentic, diversified assessment (Abeysekera & Dawson, 2015; Salmon, 2011; Boud 2000 & 2007). Secondly, we orient students from diverse learning backgrounds to active engagement where students take greater responsibility for their learning (Michael, 2006) via a skills development program, comprising a three-day orientation workshop, a modular online course, and in-curricular workshops and resources. The multi-modal delivery of this program models the blended nature of the curriculum, and ensures that students have access to crucial support for their learning and assessment at strategic points along the program pathway. Finally, we underpin change with a program-mapping strategy used to gain necessary buy-in from teaching faculty. By determining the pathway that students navigate through their degree program, we prioritise the points at which students should develop, practice and be assessed on the application of knowledge and skills necessary for their disciplinary profession. As part of this strategy we also identify the 'teaching moments' where innovation will reap the most rewards. In this paper, we evaluate case studies of change and innovation to demonstrate the impact on student expectations, behaviour and engagement with learning. We share some of the ways in which we have responded to student feedback on new approaches - both positive and negative. We contend that this multi-faceted approach to the challenges of scale and diversity has both enhanced student capacity to engage with disciplinary learning and enriched their experience as graduate coursework students.

**How a Graduate Teaching and Learning Program Can Enhance the Employability of Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Fellows**  
**Renee Polziehn, Deanna Davis, Suzanne Kresta, John Nychka, Heather Zwicker**

**Glen 204**

The University of Alberta has had formal campus-wide teaching development programs for graduate students since 1998. The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research took on an active role in the re-design and delivery of the Graduate Teaching and Learning (GTL) program in 2010 and more recently has undertaken a review of the program. The innovative and revised multi-tiered program leads to transcript notation, and participation at each level is independent of other levels with the exception of Level 4. The levels are: Level 1: Introduction to teaching and learning: classroom basics Level 2: Developing practical teaching skills with feedback and reflection Level 3: Pedagogy and course design: deepening understanding Level 4: At the heart of the program is an opportunity for graduate students to learn the pedagogy and practice of teaching; however, given today's challenging academic job market (Jaschik, 2016), universities have a responsibility to better prepare graduate students and postdoctoral fellows for a wider scope of job prospects (Edge and Munro, 2015). Session attendance, classroom instruction, and peer observations can be found as fundamental parts of many teaching development programs. While tracking hours provides an easy way to assess participation and completion of a program, it fails to capture participants' learning outcomes. The new University of Alberta GTL program prepares graduate students and postdoctoral fellows to develop their scholarship in teaching through practices of meta-cognition, skills reporting, peer feedback, and research. Layered on top is a pragmatic career preparation lens that requires participants to articulate their abilities and prepare materials for the job interview. Early indicators suggest participants are more prepared for transitioning into their careers. This paper will focus on lessons learned in revising a graduate program, the usefulness of a learning management system in tracking student progress, and the impact of designing a teaching and learning program that also attends to the future career needs of graduate students.

**Navigating New Territory: Development of a Conceptual Framework for Identifying and Comparing Invisible Graduate Attributes Across Disciplines**  
**Barbara Kensington-Miller**

**Glen 204**

Although an academic transcript represents a student's learning, it gives only a grade to indicate that they have acquired certain content and skills. It records only what can be measured, what is visible. It ignores their approach to learning, self-efficacy, professional readiness, disciplinary awareness and so on, so these aspects of learning remain largely invisible to an employer-and to the student themselves. Supported by a national government grant, our team from two research universities have been working to develop a conceptual framework that explores

new territory in teaching and learning. The framework will identify and describe the emerging landscape of visible and also invisible (not yet visible) learning attributes, and activities associated with their development. The framework will be used in curriculum to identify effective university teaching, evaluate innovative course delivery, and enable quality teaching practice to be compared within and across disciplines. Our team are developing the framework across undergraduate courses in English, Psychology, Dance, Law, Music, and Chemistry. We will present our findings on applying the framework to unexplored territory with three invisible graduate attributes: creativity, professionalism, and diversity awareness. We will describe in detail the SEEN framework we have been developing, which can be used for mapping existing curricula, supporting design of curricula, and as a reflective guide for students as they develop these attributes. We will contextualize our findings in the literature of graduate attributes and the 'soft' skills agenda prominent in higher education today. Although the attributes occur in all the disciplines, they appear, are defined and are taught differently across the disciplines. This led us to question how attributes can be visible in one discipline and not in another, and whether they are transferable across disciplines. We have collected quantitative and qualitative data from students, lecturers and employers of graduates of our six disciplines, including surveys with about 1000 students and interviews with about 20 academics and employers, and analysed the data using Qualtrics and NVivo. Our presentation will provide evidence for the efficacy of our framework based on data from a representative sample of the three graduate attributes listed previously across the six disciplines by identifying alternative profiles of the attributes, and explore how the attributes can be enhanced by particular modes of delivery. This work is relevant to the conference sub-theme 'New horizons, emerging landscapes, and underexplored territories in SoTL' because it makes visible much student learning that is currently invisible, it applies to all disciplines in higher education, and it provides a framework for unexplored attributes that conventionally go 'under the radar' in teaching and learning.

### **The Cartography and Contours of Research Informed Teaching** **Tansy Jessop**

**Telus 103**

Research Informed Teaching (RIT) can be traced to the birth of the modern university at Humboldt University in Berlin in 1810. Research is the defining feature of modern higher education, setting it apart from schools and training institutions. Modern universities are in the business of generating and advancing knowledge through research. Yet the links between teaching and research are often tenuous. Similarly the practice of research informed teaching remains patchy and elusive, with students being kept at arm's length from research processes (Brew 2006) and professors retreating to their ivory towers to conduct research (Boyer Commission 1998).

The literature provides strong evidence of the benefits to students of research rich curricula, particularly when students themselves engage in research. These gains include growth in complex reasoning, intellectual stimulation, confidence and even achievement (Levy 2011; Healey and Jenkins 2009). Teachers who embrace inquiry based approaches to learning have student-centred philosophies of teaching and learning (Spronken-Smith et al. 2012).

This paper explores three common myths about research informed teaching which prevent academics and students from fully engaging in it. These include the prevalence of a 'facts first' approach in university teaching; the belief that only a select band of students are capable of doing research; and that it is best practised in research-intensive universities with research-active staff (Author and Wu 2017). We will go on to define research informed teaching drawing on and extending Healey and Jenkins' model (2009), and using illustrative case studies. Finally, the session will highlight strategies for embedding an institutional culture of research informed teaching.

Participants will leave understanding how RIT maps onto the history of higher education, its significance in an increasingly corporatized higher education sector (Berg and Seeber 2016; Collini 2012), and with practical strategies and tools for implementing RIT. The paper will trace the contours of RIT as espoused and practised, and participants will gain a deeper grasp of its significance.

### **It's Not All Rainbows and Unicorns: A Mental Health Informed Approach to Contemplative and Other Self-Reflective Pedagogies in Higher Education** **Rachael Crowder**

**Telus 103**

Mental health-related issues and incidents among students are on the rise and receiving much attention in institutions of higher education. At the same time, contemplative pedagogies that focus on mindfulness meditation

and other present-moment, first-person approaches are gaining in popularity. Self-reflexive and contemplative approaches have been used in professional programs like education, social work, nursing, and other helping professions for some time, valued for the transformative learning they facilitate. But as contemplative pedagogies continue to grow in popularity and cross over into other disciplines it is important to pause and reflect on what is required for ethical practice in contemplative pedagogy. Many instructors may not be aware that some students have mixed or adverse reactions to contemplative experiences, and instructors may not have the tools and training to proactively prepare students for, as well as respond skillfully to, difficult mind and emotional states that may arise during and after class. The author draws on the scholarship of contemplative teaching and learning and her experiences as a mental health and trauma therapist, mindfulness meditation teacher, and a social work professor with more than a decade of experience using contemplative approaches in the classroom, to propose a theoretical and practical framework for cultivating a mental health-informed teaching practice, especially when using contemplative pedagogies.

### **Learning to Teach in the Academic Workplace: A SoTL Study** **Cynthia Korpan**

**Telus 103**

Research in the field of workplace learning has shown that if the learning process for each role in the workplace is not understood, too many factors can undermine the process (Cosnefroy & Buhot, 2013; Eraut, 2007). Eraut (2007) states that in order to enhance learning in the workplace, it is essential that there is clear understanding of the range of ways that people learn in the job. Once this is determined, it is then possible to identify the learning needs in the context and attend to the “factors which enhance or hinder individual or group learning” (Eraut, 2007, p. 420). This session will share results from my PhD SoTL research that investigated the learning process that teaching assistants (TAs) underwent as they first began teaching (as the lead instructor in the classroom) in the academic workplace. Piccinin, Farquharson, and Mihi (1993) brought attention to the important link between preparing TAs to teach and quality education over 20 years ago. A significant number of TAs provide classroom instruction for first- and second-year courses (Piccinin, Farquharson, & Mihi, 1993) with approximately one-third of first- and second-year courses having a tutorial, discussion, or lab component with TAs as the lead instructor. Therefore, it is necessary to determine how to best prepare graduate students for teaching from the very beginning. My research results highlight the factors that enhance and hinder graduate students’ learning to teach in four distinct areas: disposition, subject position, affordances, and reflective abilities. In this session, I will discuss each of these factors, show the significance of attending to them, and suggest strategies, such as transformative learning that can be used in programming for graduate students’ professional development.

### **Creating Meaningful Surveys to Measure Student Learning in SoTL Projects** **Trent Maurer**

**Telus 105**

Experienced SoTL scholars frequently bemoan reviewing SoTL manuscripts where the evidence of student learning presented is little more than student satisfaction or perceptions of learning; direct evidence of student learning is often missing. Although there is room under the “big tent” of SoTL (Huber & Hutchings, 2005) for scholarship on student satisfaction and perceptions of learning, and such scholarship can have particular value when those data are triangulated with direct measures of student learning, generally direct measures of student learning tend to provide more direct answers to SoTL questions. Moving beyond the “I tried Method X and the students liked it!” approach to SoTL can be facilitated by an understanding of how to create meaningful survey designs and appropriate questionnaires to authentically assess student thinking and learning. This session will present an overview of best practices in designing surveys and creating questionnaires to measure student learning in SoTL projects. It will address the SoTL newcomers, fellow climbers, and guides conference thread through providing guidance and advice on the selection and construction of questionnaire items to reveal student thinking and learning. Topics to be addressed include quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods designs, researcher-administered vs. self-administered questionnaires, assessment of student proficiency vs. student growth, question wording and response scales, and statistical issues and considerations for quantitative data (Artino, La Rochelle, Dezee, & Gehlbach, 2014; DeVellis, 2016; Fowler, 2013; Hull, 2007; Johnson & Morgan, 2016; McCoach, Gable, & Madura, 2013). Rather than discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each method and technique, the focus of the presentation will be on which methods and techniques most appropriately and effectively answer different

types of SoTL questions (e.g., Hutchings' Typology, 2000) or address specific issues in data collection (e.g., small class sizes). The audience will be invited to contribute specific examples for advice and discussion, and to offer critiques of the guidance provided during the presentation.

**Adventures and Insights of a "Failed" SoTL Project**  
**Chris Ostrowski, Nancy Chick, Galicia Blackman**

**Telus 105**

Engaging in SoTL can be a fickle experience with ups, downs, and unexpected twists. Researchers can spend considerable time and effort in designing and undertaking studies to improve teaching and learning, and often the process is complex and unpredictable. But what happens when SoTL projects "fail?" Are insights or data from incomplete or marred projects useful? Are there ways to salvage projects that seem hopeless? In this presentation we respond to these questions and share our experiences of a "failed" SoTL project, the insights gained, and how researchers can still find value in such work. Over the past year, we (a faculty member with extensive SoTL experience and several graduate students) embarked on a study of how learning spaces influence teaching and learning. As is common, we started with a conceptual framework to underpin the research and to guide data analysis. We carefully designed our study around considerations for "good practice in SoTL" (Felten, 2013) and drew on the principal investigator's experiences in SoTL (Author). Unfortunately, from the day we applied for research ethics approval, we encountered institutional and logistical barriers. After multiple rejections, modifications, resubmissions, and discussions with various stakeholders we wondered if we were even doing SoTL anymore. Given the hours, effort, and people involved to yield a small sample of data, was the project even worth pursuing? Was a year's worth of time and effort trying to do SoTL wasted? We think not. In retrospect, we realized many indirect benefits beyond data, not only to us, but all levels of expertise in SoTL practice. For example, our team now understands the complexity of doing SoTL ethically and stakeholder concerns, more deeply. Also, the timing of inviting participants and collecting data within courses taught by another instructor is critical for success. In conversations with newcomers to SoTL, we were reminded considerations for research with human participants were not typically part of some disciplines and researchers may need support (e.g., ethics applications). Consequently, new resource documents and a specialized position were created to support SoTL project design. As well, the graduate students gained a wealth of experience and knowledge about being co-inquirers, doing SoTL, and research skills (Authors, 2017). Lastly, rather than let our conceptual framework die on the vine, we repurposed it for a smaller scale study of educational development with fewer institutional barriers (in-progress). We may have "failed" at SoTL, but the experience has substantial value to the research team and has immediate implications for how to approach future SoTL projects--our own and other SoTL researchers--that are responsive and sensitive to contextual factors. We believe these types of insights are often overlooked by SoTL researchers and there is meaningful and informative value in persisting, despite the challenges. As we strap on our boots, dawn rain jackets, and pack bandages for inevitable blisters, we look forward to new adventures in SoTL and sharing with the broader community.

**Padlet as a Means of Mapping and Chronicling Student Learning and the SoTL Practitioner Journey**  
**Briony Supple**

**Telus 105**

Much of what we do in our teaching takes place behind 'closed doors'. Part of the scholarship of teaching and learning is about making teaching 'community property' - making our findings and practices public (Boyer, 1990; Schulman, 1993). Mapping and chronicling what is happening in the classroom is an important part of knowledge creation, knowledge sharing and knowledge deepening. This is more than a map showing 'what we did' or 'where we went', but a meaningful artefact of the journey which informs 'where we might go'. As Bernstein and Wert (n.d.) state:

When all the careful, difficult, intentional, and scholarly work of planning and teaching a course is undocumented, it is lost for further use. Not only is it unavailable for the teacher's own reflection, but it is not there for aspiring teachers and colleagues to learn from. (Bernstein & Wert, n.d., para. 3).

Part of the challenge in documenting teaching however, can also be tied up in documenting the learning taking place. In that regard, the author was interested in exploring the following research question: How do we make learning visible, in a way which serves as both a teaching tool, and a learning tool for both educators as SoTL

practitioners, as well as students? Padlet is a free, web-based platform which allows users to populate a page with images, documents, videos and so on in both synchronous and asynchronous environments. It is available via <https://padlet.com/> or as a free phone application for Apple and Android devices. As well as a learning resource for students, it doubles as a neat yet powerful tool for SoTL practitioners in documenting their collaborative, interactive and engaging teaching in an easily-shared format, which can be used as part of an overall teaching portfolio. Built on over time, the final ‘product’ in itself can be copied and edited to suit other contexts. The author is a lecturer in Learning and Teaching Enhancement in a European university. Each year, a number of visiting scholars from China come to our university to attend intensive programs of study which involves development in SoTL practice, integrated with an English Language programme. The author and her colleagues have experimented with the use of Padlet while facilitating these visiting scholar programmes since July 2016. They found Padlet to be an invaluable tool for resource sharing, facilitating collaborative work both in and outside the classroom and a way of capturing learning in a visual way – giving the students a tangible, highly visual and easily portable portfolio which reflected both a teaching and learning journey – capturing and chronicling their experiences via images, documents, videos and various learning resources. The work captured on Padlet became both a memory of their journey in Europe and through SoTL, as both scholars and learners. Reflections on the use of Padlet were sought from Lectures in Teaching and Learning around the pros and cons of Padlet. This paper reports on these reflections and combines with relevant SoTL literature which articulates creating meaningful and visible learning and teaching resources and relevant applications of technology.

**Finding the “Ah-ha” Moment: Using Digital Spaces to Scaffold Inquiry-Based Learning** Glen 208  
**Across Disciplines**  
**Kelly Schrum, Amy Swan**

Over the past few decades, pedagogy in higher education has increasingly focused on inquiry-based learning (IBL). Indeed, inquiry has become a central theme anchoring best practices across disciplines within postsecondary education (American Historical Association, 2016; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2017). At the same time, the concept of scaffolding has garnered considerable attention within educational research (van de Pol, Volman, & Beishuizen, 2010). Building on these trends, scholars have sought ways to make the student thought process more visible as they engage in inquiry-based learning (Manarin, 2016; Rouse, Phillips, Mehaffey, McGowan, & Felten, 2017). As institutions expand their hybrid course offerings, instructors face the challenge of scaffolding inquiry-based learning in fully or partially online environments. While researchers in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) have focused on strategies for conveying ways of knowing and habits of mind to students (Calder, Cutler, & Kelly, 2002; Goldschmidt, 2014), implementation of inquiry-based projects in hybrid classes is underexplored. Further, use of digital spaces to scaffold inquiry-based learning is an emerging landscape, as new technologies make it possible for instructors to monitor and check students’ understanding outside of face-to-face environments (van de Pol et al., 2010).

Using a hybrid, graduate, history course as a model, this presentation explores strategies for utilizing digital tools to facilitate inquiry, scaffold student learning, and capture student thinking as they engage in inquiry. Presenters will share their experiences developing this hybrid history course, including lessons learned, sample student work, and student reflections on their learning experiences. Session participants will be invited to consider how digital spaces could be used to scaffold inquiry-based learning in their own disciplines.

**Evaluating Immersive and Experiential Learning** Glen 208  
**Phillip Motley, Rebecca Pope-Ruark, Joel Hollingsworth, William Moner**

This presentation will describe research conducted on the pilot semester of the Design Thinking Studio in Social Innovation, a service-learning oriented program offered at a mid-sized, private, liberal arts university in the southeastern United States. The goal of this research has been to determine how students benefitted from the unique aspects of this program including the following: 1) A sustained, non-fragmented, focus on learning, 2) The use of human-centered design thinking methodologies to help students discover, define, and attempt to solve challenging problems in the local community, and 3) A learning environment that differed in many significant ways from typical course environments and structures.

The Design Thinking Studio in Social Innovation program was offered to all undergraduate students regardless of academic major or minor, and was a 15-week immersive and interdisciplinary experience focused on achieving social change through human-centered design methods. Enrolled students committed their entire course load to participating in the program (through a block registration process) and worked in partnership with two county-wide consortia in the local community surrounding the university. The two organizations are made up of representatives from local government, educational institutions, public health agencies, nonprofit organizations, and for-profit businesses working together on community-based food, health, and wellness initiatives.

We established multiple learning objectives for students enrolled in the immersive semester program: To learn about the spectrum of what social innovation entails including how it overlaps with—and differs from—social entrepreneurship, changemaking, and service-learning; To understand how human-centered design thinking can be applied toward solving systemic social problems faced by communities locally, regionally, nationally, and even globally; To collaborate in an interdisciplinary academic setting with other students and in partnership with representatives from the community in ways that allow everyone involved to take advantage of the distributed expertise of the group; To provide students with opportunities to work in environments that closely approximate professional work scenarios and that often differ significantly from normal university settings; and, To appreciate that solving authentic, real-world problems first requires those problems to be articulated and defined before solving them can take place.

Although students who registered for the program received 16 semester hours of credit—the equivalent of four 4-credit courses—their learning experience was not broken down into four individual components. Instead, students met for three hours Monday through Friday of every week followed by additional hours of work in the community. Time spent in class was not disrupted by the specific objectives of individual courses, but was focused on continuous activities targeted at learning human-centered design processes, reading and discussing social innovation and changemaking content, and working collaboratively to define and solve social problems located in the surrounding community.

In addition to focusing on achieving social change through design thinking, we had the additional goal of escaping many observed challenges of routine classroom-based learning. We attempted to do this by borrowing from pedagogies found in various experiential learning programs and courses. From study abroad, we wanted to leverage the value of cognitive dissonance that often accompanies the immersive nature of situated learning that is removed from the “bubble” of the typical university campus. From service-learning, we wanted to incorporate opportunities to work in authentic settings with real-world partners. From internships and coops, we wanted to take advantage of working in collaborative professional environments, ones that often feature mentor-novice pairings, and to make use of professional assessment strategies such as performance reviews rather than grades.

This presentation will describe the unique aspects of the Design Thinking Studio in Social Innovation program from the perspective of those involved: the students, the community partners, and the instructors. We will present collected observations and gathered data in several key areas. In the area of instruction, we will discuss findings related to pedagogical components of the program: human-centered design thinking methods, collaborative learning, and the potential value of immersion in the local community. Relative to assessment of student learning, we will share what we learned from unconventional approaches to evaluation. We will also present the perspectives of our community partners giving special attention to addressing the question of whether or not the immersive and extended nature of the program presented any perceived advantages over more conventional single course-based service-learning interventions.

**Audio Visual Narrative; Making the Manikin Real**  
**Amanda Fox, Sandra Johnston, Christina Parker**

**Glen 208**

The use of high fidelity simulation is popular in health education, and is an integral component of most curricula (Foronda et al, 2013). Anecdotal evidence suggests that students have difficulty engaging with simulation manikins due to the unrealistic appearance and inauthentic context in which simulation is undertaken. This research evaluated the implementation of a learning and teaching strategy, an audio-visual (AV) narrative depicting a patient's journey, to increase realism and student engagement with simulation. Engagement with learning activities is thought to improve retention of knowledge and provide a deeper contextual understanding (Wolff et al, 2015). Replicating an authentic learning context will improve student engagement and optimise learning (Walsh and van Soeren, 2012). However, high fidelity manikins used in simulation are often unrealistic (Barry et al, 2012) and impact on

students' ability to engage with the inanimate object in a manner conducive to learning. AV narratives are frequently used in health education and are considered a highly effective teaching strategy (Al-Shaer et al, 2011) that supports contextual understanding and assist in the transfer of knowledge to subsequent situations (Ironsides, 2006). Use of AV vignettes in simulation was examined in a qualitative study that reported; increased student interaction and empathy for the manikin and improved personal reflection on values and prejudices (Power et al, 2016). Aim: The study aimed to determine if viewing an AV narrative in a simulation pre-brief altered undergraduate nursing student perceptions of the learning experience. A quasi-experimental post-test design was used to compare student perceptions of transferability, value and realism of the simulation experience between two groups; those who viewed the AV narrative and those who participated in a standard verbal pre-brief. The principles of Narrative Pedagogy (Walsh, 2011) guided the development of a five minute narrative where actors portraying the patient, patient's wife and nursing staff highlighted the patient and family perspectives. A convenience sample of final year baccalaureate nursing students at a large metropolitan university completed a modified version of the Student Satisfaction with Simulation Experiences Survey (Abdo and Ravert, 2006). This 12-item instrument contained questions related to transfer of knowledge to practice, realism and overall value of the learning experience. A total of 418 students attended the simulation with 385 (92%) completing the survey. The students reported high levels of value, realism and transferability related to the addition of an AV narrative in simulation pre-brief. Statistically significant results ( $t = 2.38, p < 0.02$ ) were evident in the sub-scale of transferability of learning to clinical practice. The subgroups of age and gender indicated some interesting, although not significant, results. Conclusions: High satisfaction with simulation was indicated by students of both groups in relation to value and realism. A significant outcome was noted between the groups related to transferability which is a continuing challenge in nursing education. This is a significant finding that will influence curriculum design. Further research on this teaching and learning strategy is recommended to evaluate the subgroups and other variables noted by this research.

**Research Ethics and the Ethics of Global Health Research: Is the Learning Gain Worth Undergraduate Students' Pain? Telus 104**  
**Julie Wintrup**

Research-engaged education is associated with high quality learning and improvements in standards, when implemented across the institution (QAA, 2012) and when disciplinary priorities inform practice (Healey, 2011). Undergraduate, empirical research epitomises research-engaged learning. Skill and perseverance is needed to appraise others' work, form ideas, innovate, negotiate, persuade, work in partnership, as well as design and manage the project, collect and analyse data, and draw conclusions - all for assessment purposes. Schleicher (2015) calls such skills 'transversal', asserting their centrality not only to high quality, effective and measurable learning improvement (or learning gain), but also ultimately to societal regeneration. Learning gain has been defined by HEFCE (2016) as 'the attempt to measure the improvement in knowledge, skills, work-readiness and personal development made by students during their time spent in higher education'. For most students and institutions, however, it is grades and classifications that constitute evidence of achievement, and signify a successful curriculum. Undergraduate research invites novices to embrace uncertainty, to learn through doing, and to 'answer questions posed by the problems we face' (Benton and Craib, 2001:3), at a point when they may not yet know quite what those problems are. This presents a dilemma to learners and educators alike: an excellently conducted piece of research may reflect high personal learning gain, yet while grades rely on the summatively assessed report of that research, an inexpertly presented thesis may mean a low grade. The instrumental, strategic learner might well be tempted to minimise workload and subsequent stress, by focussing on the final output rather than process. The more ambitious the research, the more risk and uncertainty need to be factored in to the project. In this paper, the experiences of UK undergraduate students researching health topics in different countries are discussed. New ethical questions are raised, including issues of access, language, respect and equality, ways of communicating rights and responsibilities, and practical issues such as remuneration and technological access and costs. Negotiating contested ethical and methodological concepts, as a novice, requires deep intellectual engagement, which takes time and support. Finally, when differing cultural norms and practices are intrinsic to ethical review processes, dominant beliefs are illuminated by the review process and in responses to the students' research questions. Gatekeepers, whether ethics committees and reviewers, or supervisors, often want to seek to 'protect' people, communities and places from student researchers. Yet those same students may be part of those communities, know places (and risks) very well, and have existing relationships with people. So in summary, inviting

undergraduate students to become researchers requires academics to examine carefully and reflexively questions of power and control, types of knowledge, and the amount of additional burden placed on student researchers when balanced with potential educational benefits, and learning gain. In this paper we examine issues through using students' own submissions (volunteered, anonymised and minimally adapted where appropriate) using the mechanism of ethical review. We ask: is the learning gain worth the undergraduates' pain? The paper introduces a Faculty-wide approach to undergraduate research education in health professions, now coming to the end of its second year of implementation. We invite participants to engage with and debate one of its most contentious and fraught aspects: gaining ethical approval to collect primary data from others, whether fellow students, or what are often called 'healthy subjects', or contacts including family members in other parts of the world. The workshop will draw on case vignettes, ethical review resources and processes, and students' stories, experiences and research findings to explore not just questions of 'research ethics', but the ethics of research, when students generate research questions and conduct the research.

### **Understanding Undergraduate Students' Learning: What Makes Learning Transformative?** **Gemma Puntì**

**Telus 104**

Transformative learning is defined as "a deep, structural shift in basic premises of thought, feelings, and actions" (Transformative Learning Centre, 2004). It is a learning process that leads participants to experience significant change in the ways they understand their identity, culture, and behavior (Mezirow, 1978; 1991). Mezirow found that the process is typically initiated by a disorienting dilemma; a critical incident or event that makes the student reassess or change previously taken-for-granted assumptions, values, beliefs, and lifestyle habits. Under these premises, this paper focuses on a case study to explore what type of courses and activities foster undergraduate students' transformative learning and whether this shift affects their perceptions of others and/or themselves. In particular, this study aims to answer: how and through what activities do students' experience transformative learning during their undergraduate educational experience? Students' transformative learning is examined through a required course called Capstone Reflection that takes place during the last semester of their undergraduate degree. In particular, the study focuses on 23 students who graduated in the Fall of 2016 in a small health science university. All 23 students were enrolled in the critical reflective course that demands students to analyze, reflect, and illustrate, through a final presentation, the learning acquired during their years at University and in particular during their last year--the Capstone. The capstone is a semester or yearlong self-designed academic project in which the students choose what to explore and where based on their interests and career goals. Capstones can have credit and non-credit based activities and can take an array of coursework, study abroad or away experiences, internships, shadowing, volunteering opportunities, and research projects. This qualitative case study analyzes the undergraduate students' writing and speech in their capstone course reflections and final presentation--as they reveal critical incidents that led to reframe their perspectives. Initial findings illustrate that all students indicated in their writing they had experienced critical incidents and new perspectives on themselves and/or others while in college. This transformation rarely was perceived to occur while at the university or while taking courses, but during internships, while volunteering, or studying away or abroad. All students expressed the power of interactions with others in affecting their shifts in perceptions. But also ten of them referred to spending time alone in discovering new values or identities-- thus these students showed awareness of the importance of self-reflection in transformative learning (Kiely, 2005; Springfield, Gwozdek, & Smiler, 2015). Overall, while transformative learning is a rare learning experience (Dirkx, 1998), all undergraduate students described experiencing changes in their perceptions during their years at the health science university. Furthermore, this shift was largely connected to situations of experiential learning when students interacted with individuals in the community who challenged students' assumptions. Many of these experiences occurred while developing one-on-one relationships with patients, health professionals, and researchers. The power of the interactions was particularly evident when the students were able to get know closely individuals whose physical or mental abilities or backgrounds (socio-economic, ethnic, religious, generational) differed from theirs.

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) has many forms and can take on many meanings. Regardless of how SoTL is defined, the systematic evidence-based study of teaching to improve student learning is the constant element of any SoTL endeavor (Fanghanel, et al., 2016; McKinney, 2004; University of Central Florida, 2016). Investigating and contributing to evidence-based practices for teaching are foundational components of SoTL projects (Fanghanel et al., 2016). With this in mind, it is important that researchers continue to push the boundaries of thinking around methods for conducting SoTL to go beyond traditional practices and allow us to reach new heights in developing the evidence-base from which we investigate and improve our teaching practices. Applying scoping review methods to SoTL projects allows researchers to do just that. Traditionally used in health care settings, scoping review methods enable researchers to systematically study and map evidence-based interventions within a particular topic area that in turn promote positive patient outcomes (Pham, et al., 2014). Unlike other forms of systematic review, scoping methods permit the inclusion of studies containing multiple research designs, heterogeneous samples, and a variety of outcome measures drawn from both the grey and scientific literature. These allowances make scoping review methods particularly applicable to SoTL projects in which systematically studying and mapping evidence-based practices are of paramount importance. In this study, the question “what teaching methods are best-suited to facilitate the successful completion of post-secondary education (PSE) for Indigenous students in Canada?” was utilized to determine whether scoping review methods can be effectively used to generate an evidence-base within a SoTL paradigm. Levac, Colquhoun, and O’Brien’s (2010) advancement of Arksey and O’Malley’s (2005) methodological framework for scoping reviews was implemented through six iterative stages to address the research question. Of the N=700 articles reviewed, n=250 addressed pedagogical practices in relation to Indigenous PSE. Narrative analysis (Popay et al., 2006) was used to extract evidence-based recommendations for teaching practice during the charting process. The six stages as applied through this study will be used to guide audience members through the successful application of a scoping review framework for identifying and mapping evidence-based practices within a SoTL project. Outcomes from this project include a series of evidence-based recommendations for the teaching practices best-suited for Indigenous students within PSE. As suspected, the scoping review provided a solid methodological framework for this SoTL project. Scoping methods can be widely adapted to inform any SoTL project design (before and after, reflections on changes in practice, and so on). Critical reflections on the use of scoping review methods for SoTL revealed that not only are scoping methods applicable to building a foundation for SoTL projects, but scoping reviews themselves can be considered SoTL projects. Furthermore, scoping review results can be easily disseminated to inform educators and researchers as they implement investigations into teaching and learning.

Preparing a student for a successful career in secondary urban teaching is far more than cultivation of content knowledge and pedagogical skill. It requires dispositional characteristics such as the ability to establish and maintain relationships with students (Stotko, Ingram & Beaty-O’Ferrall, 2007), use mature judgment in a highly challenging context, and to both maintain and display respect for authority. While dispositional attributes are arguably among the most important aspects of an urban teacher’s efficacy, they are the most difficult to assess (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013) especially those interpersonal attributes that are displayed not only behaviorally but attitudinally. In The Detroit Teacher Project, a clinically-based urban teacher preparation program, we created a process for assessing dispositions that ventures into interpersonal terrain not addressed in traditional teacher preparation. Utilizing a comprehensive rubric with three domains completed from three perspectives, it is a method for addressing areas of advancement and concern that would not otherwise be assessable. At key points during their teacher preparation program, the teacher candidate completes the rubric as a self-assessment of performance in both fieldwork and seminar. The coaching teacher completes the rubric based upon direct observation of the candidate’s fieldwork. Faculty members teaching coursework during the semester complete the rubric for each candidate independently of one another and then meet to ensure inter-rater reliability and determine a singularly

scored rubric. During a one hour structured meeting with each teacher candidate, the teacher candidate and faculty discuss indicators, strengths, and areas of improvement. The process for discussing dispositional performance in these meetings allows faculty to naturally extend beyond the rubric indicators to open up conversation venturing into topics that provide compelling insights for the teacher candidate. It is, as our six years of experience informs us, a method that becomes increasingly complex as it traverses psychological terrain that runs deep. For example, a teacher candidate who displays a disdainful stance toward authority figures in his program is helped to realize it is his own struggle in his relationship with authority that undermines his ability to serve as an effective, necessary authority figure to his students. Another teacher candidate, streetwise and charismatic, attempts to rely upon his sense of humor and charm for success yet his academic work falls short of his intellectual capabilities. The dispositional process provided a rich venue for addressing not only his strengths as a natural leader but to discuss how his streetwise ways could be successfully adapted and applied to making impressive academic gains. This paper will provide a detailed view of the process coupled with specific case study examples to vivify how this process ventures into complex domains of urban teacher preparation and will conclude with steps taken to ameliorate particularly problematic dispositional traits.

**Fostering Confidence and Competence in Nursing Instructors through Simulation**  
**Sandra Goldsworthy, Carla Ferreira, Tracey Clancy**

**Telus 106**

Simulation has become a signature pedagogy in undergraduate nursing education. Simulation-based experiences (SBE) with the help of high tech simulators to mimic real life clinical practice have improved the way learners engage in the teaching and learning process. Nursing students' learning preference is through experiential learning. Providing students with experiences grounded in Kolb's theory such as SBEs aim to improve competency and confidence in a safe learning environment. Undergraduate nursing students must be prepared to practice in a milieu driven by well-informed patients requiring health care services that are convenient and relevant. However, increasing student enrollment in nursing programs, lack of appropriate clinical placements, increasing number of retiring Registered Nurses (RNs) in clinical practice, and faculty shortages prove as challenging. For educators, SBEs offer an alternative instructional method to the traditional didactic approach where learners are actively engaged in their learning. SBEs allows for repetition of skills, aimed at mastery of competencies and building confidence, while also promoting reflective practice. SBEs foster students' competency in various areas such as technical/procedural skills, clinical reasoning/judgment skills, interpersonal skills, reflection, and self-directed learning skills, all of which are foundational to nursing practice. In a recent systematic review that examined SBEs in nursing education, knowledge/skill, critical thinking, and confidence among nurses improved with the use of simulation. The research also demonstrated that simulation may be advantageous over other teaching methods, depending on the context, method, and whether or not simulation best practices were followed. The objective for this study is to explore the impact of a simulation intervention that includes booster training on development and maintenance of self-efficacy and competence in maternal child nursing practice. This five-phased quasi-experimental, longitudinal research project includes two cross sectional descriptive surveys to provide insight into the preparation of undergraduate nursing students for practice in maternal/child settings, a four-hour SBE intervention among undergraduate students in their second year of the program, a two-hour booster SBE delivered in the students' third year of the program, an assessment of performance based on a mock National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN) provided during their final year in the program, and lastly, a comparison of NCLEX-RN performance results between students who received the SBEs and those in the control group. This research project demonstrates an emerging landscape of undergraduate nursing education. Preliminary results of this study along with the implications of using simulation education to create an effective experiential teaching and learning environment to enhance student learning outcomes will be presented.

**Being in a New World: Ontology and Higher Education**  
**Miriam Carey, Scott Hughes, Paul Jessop**

**Telus 106**

Miriam Carey found herself confronted by a new horizon: the lacuna of ontology in theories informing higher education. How she scrambled to this particular viewpoint is the story of her engagement with, and ultimately delivery of, an ontological /phenomenological course aimed at leaving participants in the being of leadership, rather than knowing a whole lot about leaders and leadership (Being A Leader and The Effective Exercise

of Leadership: an ontological / phenomenological model – see [beingaleader.net](http://beingaleader.net) for more information). Carey's commitment to empowering students, by giving them access to their individual capacities for leadership, had led her here. She looked for useful maps with which to navigate this new terrain and found many that seem to hint at the valleys and peaks of this new territory, but none quite fit: Mezirow's transformative learning, approaches to experiential learning in general, the critical pedagogy of Brookfield and Friere, Chickering's identity development theory, Palmer's work on the being of a teacher, literatures on professional identity development, and the objectives of positive psychology. All of these maps were developed in the well-travelled world of epistemology – the landscape in which the objectives of education are the expansion and consolidation of ways of knowing and skill sets necessary to particular practices. But Carey had, unknowingly, entered the world of ontology, where the study and knowledge of being was the landscape she confronted. She needed help! She presented the initial results of her SoTL study on the impact of this leadership course in January of 2017 and asked for help from colleagues interested in exploring and navigating this emerging landscape with her. Two experts in different fields answered her call, and this panel is their first foray in to the description of this underexplored territory, and the opening up of a conversation about the implications of their journey for SoTL. We will address the following topics emerging from our conversations and explorations in this new terrain of ontology. What are the implications of the lacuna in educational theories – the almost complete absence of the concern for, and development of, ontology (being) in our educational endeavors? What does this say about the current educational landscape – the dominant epistemological paradigm of education? What other emerging landscapes and underexplored territories are being revealed by SoTL research? How can we liberate ourselves from received epistemological theories in order to fully appreciate these new contributions and liberate ourselves to explore these emerging landscapes? Why is the leadership strand of interest in SoTL communities predominantly concerned with academic (largely administrative) leadership? Where is our concern for developing empowered and agentic students in leadership education? Could we open up the territory of the being of leaders to our students as well? Miriam Carey is a political scientist who has spent time seconded to faculty development and has been engaged with this ontological / phenomenological leadership course for the last three years. She is an advocate for the empowerment of students, colleagues, and staff in her university and is standing for greater access to this leadership course in her university. She is also deeply worried for the future of the traditional university if it remains stuck in the dominant epistemological paradigm of higher education, given the technological revolution which has democratized the availability of information, potentially making academic expertise less relevant than earlier. She wonders what other kinds of value we might offer our students, and she sees the horizon of ontology as a potentially fruitful territory to explore in her quest. Scott Hughes is an Assistant Professor of Education specializing in Curriculum Studies. He is deeply interested in questions of being and becoming at all stages of life. His research explores happiness as a fundamental aim of education. Specifically, he examines characteristics of happy early childhood classrooms, explores positive experiences and emotions in learning, and seeks to understand lived experience as meaningful curriculum. His research and university teaching is informed by over twenty years of experience as an early primary classroom teacher and student support worker in which his greatest pleasure was to be with children in art, music, story-telling, and the outdoors. Paul Jessop has a Master's of Education in Leadership Studies in which he developed curriculum for outdoor-based, experiential education programs. He has completed the Instructor course at the National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS), and has taught at the school since 2009. He specializes in teaching, at a post-secondary level, outdoor leadership, environmental studies, and outdoor skills. He has led 30-day backpacking expeditions in Alaska, Yukon, Washington, and Wyoming, as well as 12-day ski tours in the Absorokas. Join us as we share our initial mapping of this new terrain: the world of ontology in higher education. We seek other interested adventurers to join us in our exploratory journey.

**Crossing Metaphorical Thresholds: Exploring the Humanities and Its Disciplinary Contributions to SoTL**  
**Jessica Riddell, Lisa Dickson, Shannon Murray**

**Glen 202**

Exciting though experiential learning or learning outcomes can be, Literature and other Humanities departments can find themselves left out, pushing back against new pedagogies, or contorting themselves awkwardly to fit spaces designed for other disciplines. Attention to learning thresholds (also called threshold concepts), though, has the potential to appeal even to the most “edu-speak” averse of literature professors. Its metaphorical language, its emphasis on transforming ways of thinking and seeing the world, and its recognition that

students cross these thresholds at varying speeds fit more congenially with the kind of material we deal with; at the same time, it can encourage continuing conversations about the importance and ordering of concepts within a program. Drawing on the work of Jan Meyer, Ray Land, and others-cf. *Threshold Concepts Within the Disciplines* (2008) and *Overcoming Barriers to Student Understanding: Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge* (2012)-panelists will explore the particular contribution that the humanities can make to SoTL. Unlike the psychology-method-case-study model of much SoTL, the humanities interpose irresolvable contradictions, free-floating anxiety, not as a problem to be solved but as a “means of production,” a necessary condition; in other words, a threshold concept of disciplinary inquiry that can intervene in our understanding of how SoTL can and may be done. How do our attempts to help students to navigate their cognitive dissonance help or obscure our own? What are the differences that govern those two domains, teaching and research? How does our experience illuminate those? What does the teaching space tell us about how we produce research in the humanities? There is a great deal written about using research in teaching, but so little about using teaching as a means of analysing research. This panel seeks to explore thresholds in the humanities classroom in order to explore what we believe is the greatest potential for strengthening a shared focus on teaching and learning in these disciplines: that is, the discussions that must happen before departments agree on what threshold concepts ought to be taught and when. These conversations about disciplinary threshold concepts as a way of focussing a department’s attention on teaching and learning is applicable to many disciplines; it may be particularly fruitful across disciplinary boundaries in the Humanities, where there are arguably more shared than separate concepts.

**Measuring Impact: From the Ground Up**  
**Arshad Ahmad, Anita Acai, Leah Graystone, Nancy Fenton**

**Glen 203**

Chalmers & Gardiner (2015) summarize the universal problem of planning, doing, and disseminating impact studies succinctly by stating that there is a “general reluctance to confront the challenge of determining indicators of effectiveness, identifying what aspects to measure, how to measure them, and how to interpret and respond to the results” (p. 81). Measuring impact is a key element in SoTL work and invokes the conference theme of mapping and chronicling SoTL. This interactive workshop is designed for anyone interested in developing a plan to evaluate the value of a program, process, or activity in which they are engaged. In other words, it is where you can take away a framework, a model, and exemplars to help you begin your impact study. “Where do I start?” is a common refrain voiced by faculty and educational developers engaged in the business of generating evidence of the work they do. The stakes are high when programs are being scrutinized, for example when senior management is reviewing the impact of a teaching and learning centre that has become vulnerable to traditional input-oriented measures. When we turned to the literature, we discovered several frameworks for investigating impact; however, the impact and outcomes of larger-scale teaching and learning programs were largely under researched (Delvin, 2008). Moreover, resources to investigate the impact of programs at the institutional and national levels were few and far between, and rarely focused on higher education. Our attempt is to respond to the need for a practical “how-to” document that examines the impact of an institutional program of students as partners in Australia and the impact of a national awards program in Canada, which resulted in a HERDSA green guide (in press). We will begin the workshop by briefly discussing the importance of evidence-based impact investigations and share some lessons learned from writing a guidebook during the past three years. Participants will engage in small group discussions to explore the use of frameworks and application of models to plan their own impact study. Whether you are beginning a study, midway, or looking back retrospectively, we suspect you will find valuable takeaways to help you move forward in your own impact investigations. Facilitators will include a range of individuals (Director of Teaching and Learning Centre, Educational Developer, Student Partners) who have participated in the writing the Impact Guidebook. This Guidebook consists of two case studies that one of the facilitators has first hand knowledge. The Educational Developer brings theoretical background; experience applying foundational concepts and models to programs in a teaching and learning context while keeping the needs of developers and leaders at the forefront. Student partners are both graduate students who played a key “critical view” to the work-pushing for clarity and interrogating assumptions to ensure content was accessible.

Over the past several decades, teaching and learning approaches have moved from content centered to learning centered. The influential “How People Learn” book recommends that instruction be Learner-Centered, Assessment-Centered and Knowledge-Centered. Learner centered means that students are supposed to be doing things and thinking about what they are doing, paraphrasing the many definitions of active learning. Learner centered lessons are structured so that students are given tasks challenging enough to sustain their interest but not too hard to prevent discouragement. Assessment centered implies monitoring student progress in order to be able to adjust the assignments to match the student status. Knowledge centered has to do with faculty expertise. Traditionally we expect faculty to have expertise in their discipline. The learner-centered paradigm requires additional expertise in pedagogical content. The latter includes information about typical difficulties that students encounter as they attempt to learn about a set of topics; typical paths students must traverse in order to achieve understanding; and sets of potential strategies for helping students overcome the difficulties that they encounter. Pedagogical content knowledge is not equivalent to knowledge of a content domain plus a generic set of teaching strategies; instead, teaching strategies differ across disciplines and even across different types of lessons. To prepare a lesson that takes into account all of the above one would start with an analysis of the proposed content of the lesson, decide on the desired outcome, explore the challenges students are expected to face and examine the rich assortments of pedagogical tools that education research is constantly expanding. With this background one would proceed to construct a pre-class assignment, prepare an outline of the in-class activity, always subject to substantial revision when in front of an actual class, and finally outline a post-class assessment, again subject to revision in light of the in-class experience.

In this workshop we will describe research-based procedures to accomplish the above. We start with a procedure co-developed by David Pace, called Decoding the Disciplines, which uncovers typical bottlenecks the student might encounter. The strategy of dealing with the expected obstacles to learning is essential if the lesson is to produce lasting learning outcomes. We then proceed with a review of pedagogical strategies and choose what appears appropriate for the content of the current lesson. Instructional design theories offer many approaches, e.g. objectivism vs constructivism vs a blend of these4, not all of them appropriate for all types of lessons. After deciding on the appropriate instructional design we then choose a suitable activity approach for this type of lesson, e.g. Just-in-Time Teaching. This gives us the structure of the lesson. We now choose or create the resources for the lesson. Obviously, this is harder and more time consuming than preparing power point slide for a passive lecture. But in the long run it is more honest and more rewarding.

The workshop will conclude with a hands-on period whose goal it is to enable each participant to develop a template for a specific lesson and submit it to the group, participants and presenters for critique. The workshop leaders strongly believe that being able to take away an actual lesson template is essential for a lasting outcome of attending the workshop. The workshop website with more information and a set of resources is at [https://jittdl.science.iupui.edu/ISSOTL17\\_LESSON\\_DESIGN/](https://jittdl.science.iupui.edu/ISSOTL17_LESSON_DESIGN/).

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 12:00-2:00**

**ISSOTL Members Meeting (Exhibition Hall D)**

You are invited to get your lunch in Exhibition Hall E, and bring it with you to attend the ISSOTL membership meeting, where you'll hear about what's happening in various world regions and on ISSOTL's different committees. You'll get a chance to meet ISSOTL's officers, hear about new opportunities in the Society, and ask questions.

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2:00-3:30**

**Beyond Decoding the Disciplines 1.0: Opening up the Swiss Army Knife of Decoding?** **Glen 205**  
**David Pace, Janice Miller-Young, Peter Felten, Jolanta Mickute, Sarah Drake Brown**

Decoding the Disciplines began in the late 1990s as a strategy to help instructors respond to specific difficulties their students encountered in their course. Developed by Joan Middendorf and David Pace as part of the Indiana University Freshman Learning Project, it blossomed into a seven-step process, designed to identify specific bottlenecks to learning, to make explicit the mental operations that must be mastered to overcome those obstacles, and to help students master these skills. This work led in 2004 to the publication of *Decoding the Disciplines: Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking*, a series of essays by Pace, Middendorf, and the faculty fellows of the FLP—a volume that, in retrospect, may be seen as *Decoding 1.0*. In the subsequent thirteen years *Decoding* has spread to at least a dozen countries and has generated a considerable SoTL literature. In the process the approach has been transformed. Joan Middendorf and Leah Shopkow have explored the use of *Decoding* in understanding emotional bottlenecks and the disciplinary nature of student difficulties in learning, respectively. It has served as the basis for the formulation of faculty learning communities, for a variety of SoTL projects, for the preparation of future high school teachers, and for curricular and institutional development. At Mount Royal University, a faculty learning community on assessment began to explore *Decoding* by conducting *Decoding* interviews with each other and analyzing the resulting dialogues. This group's work and influence gradually expanded as *Decoding* began to be used by other groups of colleagues for inquiry projects about a range of topics such as teaching with community service learning pedagogy, and a curriculum redesign (Miller-Young and Boman 2017). One common theme amongst all of these projects was the role of the *Decoding* interview in developing the community and trust necessary for successful collaborative projects. In this session a panel of scholars of teaching and learning will briefly share their experiences with *Decoding*: David Pace will present an overview of the development of the paradigm since 2004. Janice Miller-Young will discuss the use of *Decoding* as a basis for the creation of faculty learning communities. Peter Felten will describe the use of the approach in a SoTL project involving undergraduate co-investigators. Sarah Drake Brown will consider the use of *Decoding* in the preparation of future social studies teachers. Jolanta Mickute will describe how *Decoding* was used in a course on cultural awareness taught to an ethnically diverse group of students in Lithuania. After these presentations, the attendees will break up into small groups to discuss how the *Decoding* approach might be used to respond to a variety of different SoTL challenges. Participants will return to the large group at the end of the session to synthesize the small group discussions into a collection of future directions, important challenges, etc., for *Decoding 2.0*.

**The Cat's Out of the Bag: Learning Analytics, Student Success and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning** **Glen 201**  
**George Rehrey, Linda Shepard, Caroline Benett, Carol Hostetter**

Learning analytics and the use of big data to further student success are emerging as some of the latest advances among post-secondary institutions in the U.S. (Treaster, 2017). Big data about students, their backgrounds and the choices they make on the path toward graduation already exists, with new tools becoming available each day to make better sense of it, all in the pursuit of improving the student college experience. And so, when we say that the “cat is out of the bag” we are not only referring to the fact that learning analytics is here to stay, but that its use will become more widespread and common in the future. Like the invention of the first personal computers, laptops or smartphones, learning analytics is here to stay, whether we care to embrace it or not. The availability of such large scale robust data sets offers the possibility for conducting SoTL research from a completely new perspective (Rehrey et. al., 2018). How will the ISSOTL community respond to this new and practically unexplored territory? How will learning analytics reshape what is considered as evidence of student learning in SoTL? In what ways can SoTL practitioners bring their experienced voices to this emerging research field, as it continues to expand and influence important institutional decisions, resource allocations, and programing. What are the ethical and moral issues surrounding the use of analytical data to improve, teaching, learning and student success? In this panel discussion participants will explore how learning analytics can play an active and collaborative role not only in SoTL research, but also in support of key initiatives at their institutions, ones that can foster collaborations with programs that might not be considered typical partnerships for their teaching centers and SoTL programs. Specifically, we will

share our Learning Analytics Fellows programs, a multi-institutional effort to empower faculty to engage with analytical data, while at the same time building a Community of Transformation that includes faculty participants from different programs, disciplines and institutions. Influenced by past efforts to integrate the core principals of SoTL research within our institutions (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone 2011) (Felten, 2015) (Rehrey, Hostetter & Siering, 2015), our Learning Analytics Fellows programs acknowledges that the academic department is the most likely place to change a teaching culture (Austin, 2011) and further student success. Although faculty remain in the best position for the grass-roots adoption of new approaches, we recognize that collaborative work within a Community of Transformation (Kezar and Gehrke, 2015) has proven to be an effective method to promote implementation of new models and sustained cultural change (Fairweather, 2008) (Henderson & Finkelstein, 2011). Panelists will share different aspects of their Fellows programs and their involvement in our international network of research institutions that received external funds to transform teaching and learning cultures at the departmental level. This will include sharing their experience in a Community of Transformation, taking different approaches to creating a Fellows program, gaining access to student institutional data, and sharing the results from a case study. The case study includes an analysis of the Fellows final reports and survey responses from faculty and administrators engaged in the program. The panelists will be asked to share the lessons learned thus far with the different Fellows programs. The discussion will be framed by asking panelists to respond to the following prompt questions: 1) How can learning analytics and big data inform and enhance the SoTL? 2) What effects will faculty using learning analytics have upon, the SoTL, student success, and teaching cultures at your institution? 3) What are the primary challenges of creating a Learning Analytics Fellows program? Conference participants will be provided the opportunity to work in small groups throughout the panel discussion, reflecting on how various aspects of our Learning Analytics Program and the use of big data might be adapted to the context of their institution. Panelists come from large research institutions. The panel chair is the director of a 20-year SoTL program and oversees the original Learning Analytics Fellows program. Other panelists are 1) a professor of social work and author of over 12 SoTL publications, 2) an associate professor of civil, environmental and architectural engineering and leader of the School of Engineering Engaged Learning Initiative, 3) an Assistant Vice Provost for an office of institutional assessment and research.

**Wagging Tails and Happy Faces: Partnering with Students in a Dog Therapy Initiative** Glen 206  
**Rebecca Johnke**

The initiative (topic) Interaction with companion animals induces relaxation and provides positive distraction from stresses and so therapy dogs are being introduced to some university campuses. Accordingly, academic and professional staff will partner with students from Arts and Social Sciences to introduce them to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) research design and methods in a project that introduces dog therapy into student support events at an Australian university at key points in 2017. Existing evidence suggests dog therapy is an effective way to reduce stress and increase wellbeing. Drawing from academic literature, it has been used successfully in hospitals, classrooms, rehabilitation centers, psychiatric units, prisons, nursing homes, colleges, universities and workplaces (Churchill et al., 1999; Chandler 2012, Folse 1994; Marcus 2011). Moreover, SoTL literature underscores the value of staff-student partnerships and research led experiential teaching and learning (Ratsoy, 2016; Sangster 2016). This study aims to test the hypothesis that students can act as effective change agents in the university by creating student-led initiatives supporting peer health and wellbeing. The study has five aims: 1. To contribute to creating a healthy learning environment for students by reducing stress through dog therapy. 2. To facilitate peer-to-peer messages about student support and connect students with information about support services and initiatives such as counselling and psychological services, disability services, peer mentoring, student representation and more. 3. To increase student engagement with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and contribute to creating a sense of identity and community (students as 'fellow climbers'). 4. To create opportunities for students to act as change agents ('guides') in the university and gain self-confidence, skills and experience relevant to their personal, professional and academic futures. 5. To introduce students ('newcomers') to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). Evidence of outcomes and opportunity for discussion Over 500 students attended the pilot in 2016, and feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Subsequently, ethics approval has been secured to extend the initiative and obtain qualitative and quantitative data via online and written surveys and focus groups. By October 2017 the project will be complete and the outcomes and effectiveness of the project will be shared at the conference and discussion will centre on elements of successful student-staff SoTL partnerships.

**Exploring the Relationship between Significant Networks and Faculty-Student Partnerships** Glen 206  
**Cherie Woolmer, Elizabeth Marquis, Catherine Bovill**

Understanding how and where faculty discuss and develop their understanding of teaching and learning is a central concern to scholars engaged in research on higher education. A social-cultural perspective on this issue emphasises the importance of understanding the micro-level interactions, often between individuals, and the context in which they operate (Trowler, 2008; Bamber et al, 2009; Roxå and Mårtensson, 2015). More recently, there is a growing body of literature which explores how conversations about teaching and learning can be enhanced through meaningful dialogue with students (Ashgar, 2016; Bovill et al, 2016; Cook-Sather et al, 2014; Healey et al, 2014; Werder and Otis, 2010; Woolmer, 2016). Roxå and Mårtensson's (2009) research explored the nature and context of discussions about individuals' teaching experiences. Their findings showed that significant conversations about teaching usually occur with very few colleagues and that these conversations often have particular characteristics: 'they are permeated by trust, they have an intellectual component of problem solving or idea testing, and they are private and involve only a few distinct individuals' (p. 554). They found that these conversations took place in small networks, across organisational and physical boundaries, referred to as Significant Networks. In parallel to this, the emergent field of research on faculty-student partnerships reveals there are noticeable similarities with conversations that occur within faculty-student collaborations. Cook-Sather et al (2014) note the importance of trust and reciprocity in partnerships. Healey et al (2014, p 25) describe the underpinning principles that support partnership activity, including honesty, authenticity, respect, plurality, responsibility, courage, empowerment and inclusivity. Furthermore, Werder et al (2010, p 18-19) advocate more opportunities for conversational scholarship that includes students, in an effort to create a 'pedagogy of dialogue'. However, the interchange between the networks that emerge through faculty-student partnerships and those that already exist for faculty have not previously been explored. This presentation explores the topic of significant conversations between faculty about teaching and learning and the extent to which these are influenced when faculty engage in pedagogical partnerships with students. It presents interim findings from data gathered in two Universities and, in doing so, draws together for the first time two fields of literature; Significant Networks (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009) and faculty-student partnerships in teaching and learning (Cook-Sather et al, 2014; Healey et al, 2014). Our study extends Roxå and Mårtensson's research on Significant Networks to explore with faculty their existing networks for discussing teaching and learning and how their work with student partners has or has not influenced them. The research methodology included semi-structured interviews with faculty who have engaged in partnerships with students. Participants were asked who they discussed their teaching with, what characterised these conversations, and to what extent these conversations overlapped or differed with their student partners. This presentation will provide an opportunity for fellow researchers and practitioners to discuss the methodological approach and emerging data as well as to discuss the implications of this under-explored territory of pedagogical research.

**Students' Perceptions of ISSOTL: Insights, Challenges, and Aspirations** Glen 206  
**Roselynn Verwoord, Aaron Long, Trent Maurer**

There is a growing movement within higher education that recognizes the importance of involving students as contributors to all aspects of teaching and learning including research and activities within SoTL. Many scholars (for example, see Cook-Sather, Bovill, & Felten, 2014; Healey, Flint, & Harrington, 2014; & Werder & Otis, 2009) have provided theoretical arguments for the involvement of students. ISSOTL has been at the forefront of this growing movement and has a well-established history of acknowledging the importance of involving students as contributors to all aspects of teaching and learning. For example, there are three student-facing ISSOTL special interest groups (SIGs): the Students as Co-Inquirers SIG, the Student Engagement SIG, and the Advancing Undergraduate Research SIG, which engage in discussions about students and SoTL. Further indications of this clear interest include several activities that ISSOTL sponsors including awards for students (Best Conference Presentation, Best Poster Presentation), two student representatives on the board, and a student welcome event at the annual conference. But what do current and former ISSOTL student members think about their engagement with the society? How do they perceive ISSOTL and its annual conference? To answer these questions, and with the endorsement of the ISSOTL Board, we conducted an online survey of current and former ISSOTL student members to understand their needs, concerns, and priorities; and to gather their suggestions on how ISSOTL can best support them. Our research questions include: (1) What attitudes and perceptions do current and former ISSOTL student members have about

ISSOTL and its annual conference? (2) In what ways can this information be used to best support ISSOTL student members? Using a general inductive approach and guidelines on analyzing qualitative data by Saldana (2009) and Braun and Clarke (2006), we analyzed respondents' answers to the open-ended survey questions by generating codes and themes. The closed-ended survey questions were analyzed using descriptive analysis. Our findings helped us to identify specific benefits, incentives, and opportunities for student members and will be useful for shaping future directions including targeted initiatives and resources. In this paper, which contributes to the conference theme of Aspirations and Anxieties for SoTL, we provide a description of our research study including context, survey design, and data analysis; present our findings; and provide suggestions for ways to encourage and support student representation and involvement across all areas of ISSOTL's activities. This study contributes to current research in the field of student engagement. By the end of the session, participants will have an increased awareness of some of the priorities and opportunities as articulated by student members and they will have a set of ideas for how they can support ISSOTL student members.

**Impact of Team Formation Method on Student Performance, Attitudes, and Behaviors** Telus 102  
**Martiqua Post, Anthony Barrett, Marlyse Williams, Lauren Scharff**

Understanding the impact of different methods to team formation may lead to better functioning teams, increased student learning, and greater student satisfaction. This SoTL project investigated to team formation methods for a core-required, first-year engineering course: student self-selection and instructor formed based on predicted academic performance. Although teamwork can have its advantages for education (e.g. Feichtner and Davis, 1984; Hernandez Nanclares, 2012), these benefits are not automatic. Communication and conflict resolution, as well as time management are also required for high functioning teamwork. Team experiences and team dynamics can be a result of team composition. Team composition can include member academic experiences, expertise and abilities, cultural background, gender, and life experiences. Some students do not like working in teams; thus, an important question is to what extent the process of team formation may contribute to this dissatisfaction (Connerley and Mael, 2004). Overall, team members' positive attitudes, values, enjoyment, and effectiveness of the team experience are indicators of a well-functioning team (Chapman, et al., 2006).

This investigation included 845 students and 18 instructors across two semesters. Teams were formed within the first three lessons and maintained for the entire semester. Self-selected teams were formed through student choice. Instructors formed the predicted-performance teams using academic composite scores (scores based on incoming GPA and other test scores) to create teams of like-performing individuals, i.e. like scoring students were placed together rather than forming teams with an even mix of scores. This grouping was used to prevent lower-performing students from not contributing as much as higher-performing students if they were in the same team. Student performance was measured using average grades for mid-semester and end-of-the-semester, and average grades for team assignments for the first half of the semester, the second half of the semester, and the semester overall. Mid and post self-reported behavioral attitude responses were gathered using a 24-item questionnaire. Questions asked about enthusiasm, team communication, work session dynamics, overall attitudes, perceived fairness of team formation method, value, and effectiveness of the team experience.

Results indicated that for four of the student performance measures (all except the average for the team assignments for the first half of the semester), the predicted performance teams significantly out-performed the self-selected teams ( $p < .01$ ). The questionnaire results showed no significant effects for the majority of the questions. However, both team formation groups showed a decrease in the level of worry across the semester and an increase in comfort to meet outside of class. Not surprisingly, the self-selected teams reported having more friends on their teams overall, but there was a greater increase in new friends among predicted-performance teams. Finally, the predicted-performance teams reported increases in the level of communication, while self-selected teams reported a decrease. These results suggest that the method of team formation is worthy of study. Our presentation will discuss not only the implications of these team formation methods but also other methods not tested (e.g. random selection). This presentation falls within the conference theme of "New horizons, emerging landscapes, and underexplored territories in SoTL."

**Disaggregating the Effects of Cooperative Learning: Team Functioning and Student Learning Gains**  
**Andrea Greenhoot, Marsha McCartney**

**Telus 102**

There is considerable evidence documenting the benefits of collaborative learning (see Johnson et al., 2002 or Davidson, Major, & Michaelsen, 2014). Compared to students learning in more traditional class contexts, students in classes that incorporate group learning activities have deeper understanding and longer-term retention of the course material as well as improved overall course performance. Yet even within the same course, not all collaborative learning experiences are the same; some student learning groups function more effectively than others, and these differences may have implications for students' learning. In this session we explore how variations in the functioning of student learning teams are related to individual student learning, in the context of a large undergraduate course in which students are assigned to learning teams for in-class work. We compare measures of learning and learning gains in students who belong to high functioning learning teams to those in lower functioning teams. We also examine whether the differences are particularly acute for different subgroups of students (e.g., students from underserved groups, low-performing students). The analyses presented in this session are part of a larger project designed to transform a high-enrollment (200+), upper-division psychology course (Child Development) into a highly active and collaborative format. We shifted almost all of the "information delivery" to out-of-class time and used weekly pre-class assignments to ensure student preparation for in-class work. Using an online tool for managing student teamwork (<http://catme.org/>), we assigned students to fixed learning teams for in-class work, and organized class time around team learning exercises designed to deepen their understanding and application of the material. Several times each semester, students completed peer reviews of their team members' contributions (also using the catme system) along with several measures of team functioning such as interdependence, psychological safety and satisfaction. Preliminary analyses of the first semester's data indicated that most students were highly satisfied with their teams, even if they disliked group work. The strongest predictor of students' average team contribution rating was their performance on the pre-class work ( $r_s > .36$ ,  $ps < .0001$ ), suggesting that students who were more prepared were more valuable to their teams. The measures of Team Functioning predicted larger average improvements in individual test scores over time,  $r_s > .27$ ,  $ps < .05$ , suggesting that belonging to a higher functioning team may have produced greater student learning gains. A second (further improved) offering of the transformed course is currently underway and additional analyses will include data from this second offering. Further analyses will examine changes in team functioning over time, and the relation between team functioning and student learning for different subgroups of students. Discussion will focus on how instructors can create conditions to promote group attributes and behaviors that are most conducive to learning.

**Developing Effective Academic Reading in the Electronic Environment**  
**Mark Jensen, Lauren Scharff**

**Telus 102**

E-readers have advanced tools for search, bookmarking, highlighting, and annotation. Even so, many researchers have claimed that students prefer paper and that students perform better with paper when compared to e-books (Baron, et al. 2016, Daniel & Woody 2013). However, we believe that most of these studies are limited and only scratch the surface of what is a complex topic that should take into account student prior experience and instructor course design. Based on our research, we believe that students must be trained in the effective use of e-reader technology in order for them to realize the potential benefits over reading on paper. In our two-semester SoTL project, we compared student preferences and performance between five sections of a core-required, upper-level ethics course using electronic texts (total N = 76), and seven control sections of the same course using paper texts (total N = 98). In the e-reader sections students were required to read and annotate primary texts using the Kindle app. These students received instruction on how to best make use of the electronic tools available to enhance critical reading, the instructor modeled critical reading in the electronic environment during class, students' annotations were collected for analysis, and students regularly submitted journal entries describing their academic e-reader experiences. Students in both sets of sections (all section sizes ranged from 10-15 students) read the same texts and had the same reading and discussion expectations for the lessons. A pre- and post-semester questionnaire captured student attitudes regarding print versus paper texts and self-reported behaviors and annotation habits. Attitude results showed that, while the Kindle and the Control groups were not different to start (~ 2/3 reported a preference for printed texts), by the end of the semester, there was a significant shift with ~2/3 of the Kindle group

reporting a preference for electronic texts and no change in the Control group. Students in the Kindle group were also significantly more likely to report “some” or “significant” change in their annotation habits, while students in the Control group reported “no change” or “it got worse.” There were no significant differences in academic performance between e-reader sections and control sections on common final exam questions. These results suggest that, at the very least, e-readers do not automatically lead to lower academic performance. Rather, with training, modeling, and accountability, student performance with electronic texts matches performance using paper texts, student annotation skills improve, and student attitudes change dramatically in favor of e-texts. In our presentation, we will describe our study and its results as well as entertain a discussion of our training methodology and the ways that it might be improved in order to better achieve the promise of electronic tools for critical reading.

**Assessing Institutional Teaching Culture: Understanding the Enablers and Challenges to Integrating the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Academic Work** Glen 204  
**Ken N. Meadows, Lynn Taylor, Erika Kustra, Donna Ellis, Peter Wolf**

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) defies academic convention. It emerged across disciplines and without the institutional infrastructure that supports most forms of inquiry because it made sense: Understanding and improving students’ learning experiences is essential to the future of our disciplines (Shulman, 2000). The work of individual faculty members still runs ahead of institutional strategies to support, recognize, and leverage SoTL (Hutchings, Huber & Ciccone, 2011). If as Peter Drucker claims, “culture eats strategy for breakfast,” then institutional culture underlying these strategies remains an underexplored territory. Research on organizational culture suggests that improvements in culture predict positive outcomes such as increased commitment, productivity, and satisfaction (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Lok & Crawford, 2004). In post-secondary education, cultivating these positive outcomes among faculty and students has substantive financial, professional, and personal benefits (Cox, McIntosh, Reason, & Terenzini, 2011; Grayson & Grayson, 2003). To assess institutional teaching culture, a team of researchers from eight Canadian universities developed the Teaching Culture Perception Surveys (TCPS). The surveys, based on the framework of Henard and Roseveare (2012), examine six indicators of institutional teaching culture: Institutional, strategic initiatives and practices prioritize effective teaching; Assessment of teaching is constructive and flexible; Effective teaching is implemented; Infrastructure exists to support teaching; Broad engagement occurs around teaching; and Effective teaching is recognized and rewarded. Faculty members and students at two research intensive universities in Canada completed online surveys to determine the relationship between their perceptions of the actual and ideal teaching culture at their institutions and teaching satisfaction (faculty members) and emotional engagement in learning (students). The indicators of actual and ideal teaching cultures differentially predicted teaching satisfaction dependent upon the faculty members’ rank (sessional, tenure track, or tenured) and emotional engagement in relation to the students’ enrollment in an undergraduate or graduate program. These results will be discussed in the context of how institutions might reduce the discrepancy between their actual and ideal teaching cultures, thereby enhancing those cultures to reach new heights in integrating SoTL.

**Self-Assessment on Teaching Culture in Postsecondary Environments: SoTL Contribution** Glen 204  
**Fanny Macé**

Canadian universities in general and Alberta’s postsecondary institutions in particular increasingly attract students from diverse cultural backgrounds as UNESCO (2016) ranks Canada 8th for inbound international students in formal tertiary education. More than ever, globalization-because of the rapidity and the complexity of its cross-cultural exchanges-has forced postsecondary institutions to reflect on ways to improve educators’ and students’ cross-cultural experiences and practices. As a result, higher education has shown a growing interest in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in relation to cross-cultural issues (D. Palfreyman et al. (eds.), 2007). Encouraging and engaging educators, students and communities to become more aware of cultural diversity today requires integrating cross-cultural perspectives in classrooms through assessment, curriculum planning, learning strategies, online learning, teaching approaches, and (educator and student) research. Developing cross-cultural communication competencies appears as a possible strategy, since it does not entail a simple exchange of cultural facts or experiences but rather a stance of awareness of the other’s culture when in a communicative or interactive setting. In this perspective, how can scholarly instructors of second/additional languages at the postsecondary level develop cross-cultural awareness in order to better include it in their teaching? Lázár (2003) suggests that

successful cross-cultural communication can only occur when the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes have been detected, discussed, and somehow experienced. Since, according to McKinney (2006, p. 41), “the heart of SoTL is its applied nature and potential to improve teaching and enhance learning”, this presentation, drawing on a transcultural (communication) competencies development framework (Lussier 2013; Lussier, Golubina, Ivanus et al., 2007; Piccardo, 2014; Slimbach, 2005, Wulf, 2010) and using an interpretive methodology will allow me to share a self-reflection on the inclusion of cross-cultural perspectives in second/additional language courses in Higher Education. Utilizing my autobiography, or to put it differently, “a story of one’s experiences provid[ing] a temporal frame that captures the dynamic actions and reactions stemming from critical narrative events” (Mathias & Smith, 2016, p. 205-206), will enable me to present the educator’s perspective as a prelude to future investigations around students’ perspectives on learning and assessment. Indeed, McKinney (2012) reminds us that one of SoTL main objectives is to “increas[e] student voices in SoTL” (p. 4); subsequently, how can educators include their students in their teaching and learning practices in order for them to develop their transcultural (communication) competencies and become more open to otherness and flourish in more culturally inclusive, diverse settings? This further questioning can only occur once the instructor’s classroom practices have been enriched by students’ input in an ongoing interrelated process, reminiscent of Vygotsky’s perspective on the social and interactive nature of learning.

**The Unexpected Impact of SoTL on University Teaching Culture**  
**David Hinger, Harold Jansen, Victoria Holec**

**Glen 204**

In 1967, Marshall McLuhan emphasized the bewilderment that students experience when walking into a classroom environment that signals one-directional learning (Wesch, 2007). Can we change teaching culture in a learning environment that has changed little since its inception 50 years ago? Does the physical classroom space have a direct impact on student engagement? If so, how do we design optimal teaching environments to have a positive impact on student learning? In 2012, the Teaching Centre at the University of Lethbridge initiated a multi-year Learning Environment Evaluation Project, to evaluate our existing classroom spaces and inform future classroom designs to support student learning. The early results of this research quickly caught the attention of senior administration at our institution which resulted in the design and implementation of 3 new active learning spaces, including our first SCALE-UP-type (Beichner et al., 2000) classroom. These new learning environments gave us an opportunity to expand our research into the impact of active learning spaces on student engagement. This interactive presentation will report on our research findings as well as some of the challenges we encountered during this process, many of which were related to institutional culture. Ultimately, however, our experience highlights the support we received from our faculty pioneers engaging in advocacy. This advocacy emerged organically through the newly created culture of active learning initiated by sharing new classroom spaces and thus creating a cohort of pioneers. This new culture and passion for effective teaching spaces had an unanticipated effect in creating an institutional buzz that rippled through all layers of the institutional and administrative culture. We hope to share some of this experience and discuss with participants some of the following questions: How we can leverage teaching research to grow a culture of teaching excellence? How does asking hard questions about learning environments affect organizational culture?

**'Frontier Taxonomies': Exploring How the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning can Further Illuminate the Nexus of Writing, Research, Learning and Teaching**  
**Marina Ventura**

**Telus 103**

This paper addresses the challenge of creating synergy among the increasingly more specialised and centralised supports for four key higher education activities - research, writing, teaching and learning - which frequently fail to capitalise on their shared territories and common ground. The paper is based on a European project, which is currently made up of representatives from 28 European countries. The project draws on the scholarship of teaching and learning for its theoretical foundation and aims, as part of its goals, to react to what we perceive as the dearth of professional conversations and research around the shared territory of support for, and development of, these four areas. We believe that an increase in such dialogue and research, across units and institutions, will illuminate intersections and contribute to institutional transformation based on complementary, coherent and integrated provision. Specifically, our project aims to address the challenge we perceive in two ways: 1. by classifying, as ‘frontier taxonomies’, the common ground in terms of shared purposes, processes, knowledge,

values and skills among centralized institutional supports for research, writing, teaching and learning in order to capitalise on their synergies 2. by offering the most advantageous models and practices for supporting these four areas that are mindful of the availability of new technologies and assessments and that prompt a reworking of current institutional supports which will be valuable and far-reaching. In our project we wish to achieve five distinct outcomes, namely: the co-ordinated identification of existing centralised models which aim to support teaching, learning, research and writing in higher education; the mapping of the purposes, processes, knowledge/scholarship basis, skills development and values of the existing aforementioned centralised models of support; the deconstruction of each of the four areas of teaching, learning, research and writing with key informants in order to classify the elements that have typically led them to success, effectiveness and productivity; the identification of the common ground that exists, in terms of positive development and performance through purposes, processes, knowledge/scholarship, skills development and values, across the four areas of teaching, learning, research and writing; the proposal of alternative centrally provided models and practices might best support the effective, successful and productive development of learning, teaching, research and writing. In this paper we will report on our progress to date with regards the achievement of the project's objectives.

**Forty Years On: Have We Made Improvements in Teaching Practices?  
Heather Kanuka, Erika Smith, Robert Luth**

**Telus 103**

Rationale: In 1976, a study was commissioned in a university that in most respects is “a thoroughly typical university--drawing its faculty from the traditions of academe, but now experiencing hard pressures for change” (Cross, 1977, p. 8). The rationale for the Cross study was to gain insights on how to improve teaching practices. Based on the findings, it was concluded that “when more than 90% of faculty members rate themselves as above-average teachers, and two-thirds rate themselves among the top quarter, the outlook for much improvement in teaching seems less than promising” (p. 1). Cross (1977) also concluded that it will likely take a new generation of faculty to begin to see the implementation of new approaches to teaching, predicting we will not see changes until 2001 when a new wave of faculty will replace the current faculty hired in the 1960s. In this study we ask, was Cross's prediction accurate? Methods: This study used a replication study design with the Cross (1976) survey. Consistent with the original study, the survey was sent to randomly selected faculty at a research-focused university similar to the Cross survey-in addition to a teaching-focused university. Descriptive analysis was conducted to analyze closed responses, and open-ended responses were analyzed using generic qualitative coding techniques (Merriam, 2009). Analysis focused on differences in participant views between the two institutions, as well as the original Cross survey (1976). Outcomes: The Cross (1976) survey findings stated the following reasons for why it would be unlikely teaching practices will change with current faculty: There is a prevailing perception teaching is already quite good. Institutional commitments do not exist with teaching to the same extent as with research. Most faculty do not know how to improve instruction except through spending more time on preparation, updating course content, interacting with students through smaller classes, and/or improving instructional materials through better equipment. Our survey findings illustrate changes in faculty perception over the last 40 years, as well as offering insights for future changes that may help to support changes to teaching practices in the next 40 years. Reflective Critique: While Cross (1977) asserted that it will take a new generation of faculty members to begin to see the implementation of new approaches to teaching, such future predictions tend to be fraught with inaccuracies. Looking back to the origins of the academy, formed by Plato in 387 B. C., his method of teaching was to talk and tell stories. More than two thousand years later, the mainstream method of teaching in the academy continues to be through talking. With this in mind, aspects of our survey results should perhaps not be unexpected. Audience: We will engage the audience through visual illustrations and discussion of the research, including the use of a digital response system to anonymously poll participants on what has changed, and what has not. We will also engage the audience with an exploration on the differences of teaching practices and perceptions between research- and teaching-focused institutions.

**Measuring Perceptions of Teaching and Learning: A Longitudinal Study on the Impact of a Teaching and Learning Centre Initiative (TLCI) on an Institutional Culture**  
**Jessica Riddell**

**Telus 103**

In fall 2014, in order to study the impact the our newly introduced Teaching and Learning Centre Initiative would have on our institutional culture, we designed a needs and beliefs assessment to address the following questions: 1) What needs and beliefs do full-time and contract faculty, and academic librarians at X University have regarding teaching and learning? 2) What is the existing institutional culture around supports for teaching and learning at X University? 3) What pedagogical development activities and resources are valued within this culture? Two and a half years later we are a recognized committee of Senate, have secured a physical space in our future Learning Commons, and have expanded our mission to support not only pedagogical development but also research on scholarly teaching and educational leadership. This presentation will discuss the results of our two-year follow-up of our initial survey and will outline our progress and next steps. Session Description: As a small, primarily undergraduate university, quality teaching and student success are at the core of our institutional mission. However, we have been informal in our approach to pedagogical development. In fall 2012, individuals from across the university became founding members of the Teaching and Learning Centre Initiative (TLCI), an initiative to enhance a culture of teaching and learning at the university. In fall 2014, in order to study the impact that our newly introduced TLCI would have on the institutional culture, we designed a needs and beliefs assessment to address the following questions: 1) What needs and beliefs do full-time and contract faculty, and academic librarians at the university have regarding teaching and learning? 2) What is the existing institutional culture around supports for teaching and learning at the university? 3) What pedagogical development activities and resources are valued within this culture? The results of this initial study were presented at STLHE 2016. Two and a half years later we are a recognized committee of Senate, have secured a physical space in our future Learning Commons, and have expanded our mission to support not only pedagogical development but also research on scholarly teaching and educational leadership. This presentation will discuss the results of our two-year follow-up of our initial survey. According to Roxå & Mårtensson, there is “an established link between teachers’ conceptions about teaching and learning, and the quality outcome of student learning” (2009, p. 547). If a faculty member feels supported by their institution and has a strong network of colleagues with whom to share ideas, they will likely be more engaged in the teaching and learning process. The more engaged professors are, the more likely students are to be engaged as well: “A culture of inquiry and the exploratory nature of reflective practices increase the probability of successful teaching and learning” (Brüssow & Wilkinson, 2009, p.166). Furthermore, there is a strong relationship between pedagogical training and development for university teachers and students’ learning outcomes (e.g., Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Roxå & Mårtensson, 2012). This research presentation will make direct links to this year’s theme (Reaching New Heights), as the goal of this study was to better understand the change in institutional culture around supports for teaching and learning in order to better support our transition to engaging more formally with pedagogical development, research on scholarly teaching, and educational leadership. Elements of Engagement: While this session will present the relevant background literature on the topic of our study, along with our specific research questions, methodology, results, and conclusions, we will make every effort to ensure that participants are actively engaged with the topic. The session will include time for personal reflection and small group discussion on the institutional culture around teaching and learning at the participants’ home institutions and will also include ample time for questions and discussion related to our specific study.

**Undergraduate TAs with Teaching Responsibilities: Who is Driving the Bus?**  
**Betsy Keating**

**Telus 105**

Teaching responsibilities that were once the milieu of full-time faculty members have increasingly devolved-from faculty members, to sessional or contingent faculty, and to graduate students (Brownlee, 2015; Field, et al., 2014). More recently, teaching responsibilities have further devolved to undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs). While there is a long history of UTAs assisting instructors with peer-guidance activities, a more recent phenomenon involves UTAs taking greater responsibility for higher-level teaching-related tasks. This research involved a program in which UTAs were responsible for teaching tasks such as: assessing student work, offering feedback, facilitating discussions, facilitating peer editing between their students, holding weekly office hours, answering students’ questions, and generally acting as the single frontline point of contact for as many as 80, mostly first-year,

undergraduate students. Post-secondary institutions find relief from financial pressures by hiring less expensive labour, but they are increasingly accountable to their stakeholders for supporting teaching excellence. As a result, teaching development programs for faculty and graduate students have proliferated (Kenny, et al., 2014; Korpan, 2011). Participants in these professional development programs are aware of their engagement with teaching and learning and the necessity for pedagogical development and instructional skills. By contrast, UTAs employed to assist in post-secondary courses may, or may not, be aware that their assigned tasks include the active practice of teaching and learning. Therefore, they may be unaware of any need for knowledge and/or instructional skills development when it comes to teaching. The Problem: What might ensue if teaching responsibilities are left to inexperienced and untrained undergraduates? Connections have been established between teachers' beliefs about teaching, their approaches to teaching, their students' approaches to learning, and learning outcomes (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Kember & Kwan, 2000; Trigwell, et al., 1999). Teaching approaches, whether teacher-focused or learning-focused, will affect students' approaches to learning. When UTAs are undertaking teaching responsibilities, their beliefs and approaches will ultimately affect student learning. The Study: Untrained UTAs hold beliefs about teaching based on their experiences as students; however, they are unlikely to have developed purposeful approaches to teaching. This study was designed as a preliminary look at UTAs' conceptions of teaching and changes to those conceptions over a 13-week semester. The integrated, mixed-methods study utilized pre-and post-semester surveys and interviews with participants from a large-scale program at a Canadian university. Survey data informed the interview guides and the data were further integrated during analyses. From Likert-type scales, a non-parametric, conditional relative change score method was employed to analyze mean scores and change over time (Hennig et al., 2010). Interview data were analysed using Framework Analysis (Ritchie & Spencer, 2002) and interpreted in terms of developmental stages, (Fuller, 1969), dimensions of teaching (Feldman, 1989), and teacher-oriented or learning-oriented focus (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Discussion After a short presentation of research results, there will be time for questions and discussion. For decades, SoTL researchers have been investigating effective pedagogy and the meaning of development in higher education. This research raises some important questions about pedagogical knowledge, approaches to teaching, and institutional responsibilities.

**Partnering Research with Practice in Undergraduate Research and Inquiry**  
**Huyen Dam, Nancy Fenton, Lynn Martin, Andrew Perrella**

**Telus 105**

In spirit of the conference theme "Reaching New Heights" in our individual and collective work, the aim of this research presentation is to share our findings of an Undergraduate Research and Inquiry (URI) study recently undertaken, and to highlight the experience of working with undergraduate and graduate student partners from the Student Scholars Program, alumni, staff and faculty team members. In addition, we explore the experience of engagement with a URI student group in partnering research with practice. As part of developing future research directions, and building upon the University's vision, the University's Teaching and Learning Centre identified Undergraduate Research and Inquiry as one of six research target areas. What we undertake in this research is to explore the Institution's perspective along with student experiences of URI, and focus on the meanings across the University. This qualitative study illustrates the diverse nature of URI experiences through in-depth interviews with faculty members (n=12), and focus groups with students (n=19) to gather perceptions of, and experiences with URI. This study employed Healey and Jenkin's (2009) framework to organize the collection of data to help illustrate the diverse nature of URI activities and to build an important foundation for developing future empirical research ideas. Student engagement was central to the development of this research and it, in turn, directed the research process itself. Student scholars and undergraduate alumni played a key role in shaping the research tool, data collection process, data analysis and report writing. The focus on undergraduate research and inquiry fostered links to students on campus with the goal of improving student access to URI opportunities. As a result, our research findings overlapped with the implementation of recommendations by students concurrently. The process of student engagement cultivated mutual support and mobilized efforts between the URI research team and the URI student group to bridge the gap between informing practice through engagement and partnership.

**Promoting Disruptive Opportunities to Enhance Learning**  
**Pauline Kneale, Jennifer Hill, Helen Walkington**

**Telus 105**

This paper considers the impact of disruption on students' learning and the consequent development of self-authorship. We highlight the disadvantages of an otherwise 'safe' curriculum where content, pedagogy and assessment are tightly specified. Self-authorship is defined by Baxter Magolda (2004) as the ability to know oneself, to know what one knows, to be able to reflect on that knowledge and to base judgements on it. There are three dimensions to this concept: the epistemological, concerning the nature and certainty of knowledge; the intra-personal, concerning an individual's sense of who they are and what they believe; and inter-personal, concerning the construction of relationships. Self-authorship necessitates skills of critical analysis and evaluation, development of mature working relationships, embracing and valuing of diversity and consideration of multiple perspectives. These are all characteristics of the effective academic. However, students are unlikely to develop self-authorship if faculty (academic staff) do not offer sufficiently novel spaces and encounters that compel students to reconsider and subsequently begin to fashion new conceptions of self and personally-referenced ways of knowing. This argues for creating learning spaces where students are challenged to become 'border crossers', moving beyond the familiar pedagogic contexts to situate themselves in new and unknown spaces. These physical and/or virtual borderland spaces can occur at the heart of the curriculum, or in the less formal and co-curricular spaces. Self-authorship opportunities will be exemplified through three brief borderland examples of disruption: immersive teaching, inter-disciplinary conference presentations and working outside the academy. The aim is to prompt consideration of 'other' disruptive borderland spaces that promote deeper learning.

**Digital Storytelling as Autoethnographic Composing: A Multimodal Trek through the Messy Terrains of Participatory Research**  
**Hoa Truong-White**

**Glen 208**

Through the use of photographs, personal narratives and digital stories, this presentation offers insights into the use of digital storytelling as autoethnographic composing in a doctoral research project. The digital stories provide snapshots of the adventures and insights gained from co-designing and implementing a virtual exchange project with students and teachers in an Indigenous community in Canada and an urban community in Viet Nam. Using a participatory visual and digital methodology, the project examined students' evolving ideas about what it means to be a citizen in a global digital world. As a way of inserting myself into this participatory research landscape, I engaged in autoethnographic composing (Ellis & Bochner, 2000) to reflect on my own shifting views and identities. From compiling photographs, to collecting written and audio-recorded notes, to writing scripts and blending multimedia, the aesthetic and reflexive process of creating a digital story (Brushwood Rose & Low, 2014) served as a form of locating myself-of examining my motives, implicit, and roles-throughout the research process and reflecting on how my own experiences influence and filter my interpretations (Kovach, 2009). While digital storytelling as an autoethnographic method is gaining popularity in teacher education courses, it remains an under-explored territory in the learning journey of doctoral researchers. Guided by an anti-colonial framework for learning across difference (Andreotti, 2011), I will share how digital storytelling was an integral part of my journey towards decolonizing my own research and teaching practices in the context of learning, teaching, researching and collaborating with middle school students and their teachers. This presentation offers a dialogue about the possibilities and limitations of using digital storytelling to engage doctoral researchers in learning to unlearn, listen, learn, and reach out in the complex, and sometimes uncomfortable, intercultural spaces where identities, power and ideas are negotiated (Andreotti, 2011).

**International, Cross-Institution Undergraduate Student Videochat Diversity Assignment**  
**Silvia Bartolic, Dan Perlman**

**Glen 208**

This presentation will report our 'adventures and insights' in developing an assignment on the new horizons and emerging landscapes of SoTL. Students from a Canadian and U.S. university prepared a brochure on healthy relationships in their culture and then interacted via videochat technology to discuss ideas about healthy relationships and explore diversity in attitudes, behaviors and beliefs between the two groups. Learning Goals: An overarching goal of the assignment was to have an experience that would be informative, engaging for students

and broaden their perspectives about relationships. More specific goals included having students: identify and articulate their own culture's values, beliefs, norms and practices regarding close relationships; similarly explore close relationships in a different culture; compare the similarities and differences in close relationship in the two cultures; and develop active listening and empathy skills. In terms of Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956), we hoped the assignment would foster understanding and analysis via comparing and contrasting cultures and would generate more favorable attitudes toward and understanding of practices of peers in a culture other than their own.

**Pedagogical Underpinnings:** This project was rooted in a constructivist position on learning. It drew on Piaget's notion of disequilibrium, collaborative learning literature and social psychological theory and evidence regarding the benefits of intergroup contact. A central tenet of the constructivist philosophy is that "learners arrive at meaning by actively selecting, and cumulatively constructing, their own knowledge, through both individual and social activity" (Biggs, 1996, p. 348). Collaborative learning has shown group activities provide a variety of benefits to students such as academic achievement, "meta-cognitive thought, willingness to take on difficult tasks, persistence in working toward goal accomplishment, intrinsic motivation, transfer of learning from one situation to another, and greater time on task" (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998, p. 31). Intergroup contact literature shows that under the right conditions, interaction between group members fosters positive attitudes toward outgroups (White, Harvey, & Abu-Rayya, 2015).

**The Universities and Students Involved:** This assignment involved students from the University of British Columbia (UBC) and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). Both universities have ethnically mixed student populations, with 65% of UBC students being visible minorities, especially of Asian descent (Todd, 2015), and 45% of UNCG students being non-Caucasian especially of African American and Hispanic descent (<http://csc.uncg.edu/employers/statistics/>). Students were taking a course on close relationships. The UBC offering was a third year lecture course, open to non-majors, with 85 students. The UNCG course was a fourth year seminar with 31 students.

**Evaluation:** Based primarily on students' answers to closed and open-ended survey questions and secondarily on their written reflections, overall, the results indicated that students evaluated this assignment positively and that it fostered students' sensitivity to cultural aspects of relationships as well as interest in the practices of a culture different than their own.

**Final Reflections:** Final reflections will focus on challenges in conducting the assignment (e.g., privacy rules), lessons learned, and the extent to which the assignment can be generalized to other courses.

### **Teaching and Learning Culturally Sensitive and Controversial Issues Through Visual Culture** Glen 208 **Mousumi De**

This paper describes research from a SoTL study that examined the effectiveness of using visual methods for teaching and learning in an undergraduate general education course in the Arts and Humanities. The theme of the course was peace and conflict transformation, which also required students to understand concepts of violence, conflict, racism, social justice and so on. These topics are often considered culturally sensitive and controversial topics that deeply divide societies (Malikow, 2006; Stradling, 1984) and require alternate teaching approaches, which provide a psychologically safe learning environment as well as foster critical thinking about such issues. Several studies show 'discussion' as the most appropriate pedagogical approach for exploring controversial issues in the classroom (e.g. Dewhurst, 1992; Levinson, 2006). However, studies also show, students often accept opinions of their parents and close relatives as their own, when dealing with socio-political issues, without giving substantial thought to the issues at hand (e.g. Flinders, 2005; Russell 2004). Thus, teaching controversial issues effectively also requires promoting critical thinking skills among students. In this context, the paper describes a curricular approach that used cultural images and artifacts (visual culture) as pedagogical sites of learning and used art-critiquing methods for promoting critical thinking to enable students to think deeply about such issues, deliberate with others in class, develop their own opinions as well as accept diverse perspectives. This approach draws its insight from media scholar Ellsworth's (1997; 2005) notion of pedagogy and 'anomalous' places of learning such as museums, visual and media arts that provoke us to think and imagine in new ways - beyond the conventions of using traditional text and discussion based approaches. In this approach, students were shown visual culture images such as street art, public art, contemporary art, sculpture, photography and multimedia that were used for teaching as well as learning disciplinary content such as violence, conflict, racism and so on, that are complex as well as and controversial topics. The study examined the (i) effectiveness of using visual methods for teaching and learning such content and (ii) effectiveness of using visual methods for promoting critical thinking skills in relation to such controversial issues. The study was an action research project that also utilized reflective practice (Schon, 1991;

Eraut 1994). The research data included students' analyses of images, reflections and questionnaires and instructor's reflective logs. These were coded using open, axial and selective coding that were further analysed based on the research questions and diverse issues that students addressed. Findings reveal that although art in general is subject to different interpretations, a visual culture pedagogic approach provided a deeper understanding of such complex and controversial content, as well as enhanced their analytical, interpretive and critical thinking skills. While this study seeks to make a small contribution by extending SoTL scholarship on the potential of using visual methods for enhancing teaching and learning in the general education classroom (e.g. Cornell et al, 2007) and promoting critical thinking skills in higher education (e.g. Bahr, 2010; Mae, Cortez & Preiss, 2013), it seeks to highlight the potential of using visual based approaches to teaching controversial issues and extend SoTL discussions in this domain (e.g. Van Jaarsveldt & Joubert, 2015; Abrahamson & D'Sena 2015).

### **Expanding the SoTL Landscape: Using a Study on Mentoring for Teaching to Mobilize New Research and Practices**

**Telus 104**

**Carol Rolheiser, Megan Burnett, Gregory Hum, Andrea Graham, Cora McCloy**

How SoTL research is intentionally disseminated, exchanged, co-created, and applied in diverse settings is a key emergent issue in the SoTL landscape. Like many universities worldwide, "Canada's universities and Tri-Council Agencies are placing more emphasis on knowledge mobilization in order to generate research with a high social utility and to get research into the hands of decision-makers, policy-makers, and practitioners" (McKean, 2016, p.2). Definitions of knowledge mobilization or Kmb vary (Qi & Levin, 2011), but a simple definition is: how generated knowledge will be put to use, inform practice, or advance research (SHRCC, 2016). We outline how our Teaching and Learning Centre in a large, research-intensive university came to more fully understand the ways in which faculty experience both informal and formal mentoring in their teaching. We began with a scholarly study (Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation, 2016) that identified promising practices, gaps, challenges and recommendations related to mentoring for teaching. This included a comprehensive literature review, capturing seminal faculty mentoring research (Boice, 2000; Dawson, 2014), and research specific to mentoring for teaching (Roxå & Mårtensson, 2009; Carbone 2014). Drawing from our earlier study, the current paper outlines our subsequent Kmb strategy, including examples of Kmb with varied stakeholders (e.g., educational leaders, practitioners), and the array of methods (e.g. resources, products, and activities) facilitating this. One key facet and example of our Kmb strategy is a pilot peer mentoring program (completion May 2017) that includes knowledge exchange (e.g., workshops, skill training of mentor-coaches) and knowledge dissemination (e.g., tools, tip sheets, webinars, guides). This pilot draws on research that describes the important role mentoring plays in faculty development, as well as the shift from a more traditional hierarchical mentoring relationship to one that focuses on meeting the needs of faculty across a range of career stages (Ponce et al., 2005; Carbone, 2014; Dawson, 2014; Boyle & Boyce, 1998). Our program employs a dyadic, reciprocal peer-assisted teaching partnership model, combined with cohort/network models. A key goal of the pilot is to develop further insights into how mentorship of faculty can support university teaching. That goal, in turn, informs the current SoTL research we are undertaking on this pilot, so that we have an ongoing cycle of Kmb. This paper provides an overview of our qualitative methodology and analysis (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) as well as descriptive quantitative survey data, drawing upon analysis of a subset of the data collected from: 1) Pre-Pilot registration forms including faculty members' goals for participating in the pilot program and other artifacts from the workshops (e.g., reflections); 2) Post-pilot focus groups; and, 3) Post-pilot participant surveys. We will engage participants in considering the range of Kmb strategies that can be used to not only distribute knowledge, but to also help ensure such knowledge is accessible, relevant, and used. Discussion will also include evaluating the success of Kmb strategies. This paper will contribute to scholarly literature on faculty-based mentorship for teaching and faculty development, as well as the emerging landscape of literature on Kmb for SoTL.

### **Expanding the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning on the Global Stage: An International Professional Teaching Certificate Initiative**

**Telus 104**

**Keith Foggett, Carol Miles**

Many Australian universities offer degree programs through offshore campuses in Asia. These programs have the same teaching activities and assessments as the courses offered at their Australian campuses. This presents a particular challenge as instructors in the Asian locations tend to teach (believing that students prefer to learn) in a

traditional, didactic style (Kember, 2000). As an increasing number of Australian university courses are being flipped and blended to offer more engaged activities, offshore instructors are finding themselves ill-equipped to teach in this mode. Also, students can transfer from Asian campuses to Australian universities but find the teaching styles markedly different, with more emphasis on students constructing their own learning—a practice with which they are largely unfamiliar (Tham & Tham, 2011). For a large Australian University, delivery of engaged teaching in Singapore has presented a particular challenge due to this strong tradition of didactic teaching (Hedberg & Lefoe, 2005). As we offer more engaged and blended learning opportunities rich with online content and in-class activities for local students, the challenge has been to replicate these opportunities for students completing these courses at our Singapore campus. To address this, The Certificate in University Teaching has been developed to provide both new and experienced university instructors with a basis for establishment or expansion of their repertoire of innovative teaching strategies and skills. The inclusion of reflective practices that introduces participants to the scholarship of teaching and learning allows them to consider their own practice in light of current research. Delivered to teaching staff at our Singapore campus, the program offers a broad range of tools for providing students with the best possible learning experience, as well as thoughtful reflection on teaching practices. Approaching teaching from the three basic aspects of preparing to teach, active teaching in face-to-face and blended environments, and assessment of learning, the program has been customised to incorporate time for addressing individual concerns for all participants. This innovative approach addresses the improvement of the student experience from the delivery perspective. Addressing the improvement of course delivery will have a greater impact on student experience than many other measures that have been targeted at individual students. Many university teachers participating reported that this was their first opportunity for professional development in the area of teaching and learning. Certificate participants are introduced to the concept of evaluating and improving teaching through reflective practice, empirical study and are encouraged to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning. They are encouraged to continue their teaching exploration through the establishment of active communities of interest at their respective institutions. Rich opportunities for international SoTL research collaborations are presented through this initiative. This paper will provide detail of this nationally recognised program and offer insights from the facilitators, feedback from course graduates, as well as initial findings relating to improvement of student outcomes. Paper session attendees will consider how intensive teaching certificate programs and the resulting teaching communities that are established may be beneficial to their own teaching faculty either at home or abroad.

### **SoTL Explorer: A Visualization Tool for Exploring the Space of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning** Telus 104

**Sarah Perez, Ido Roll, Adriana Briseno-Garzon, Letitia Englund, Andrea Han, Rama Flarsheim**

The landscape of SoTL is wide and diverse. Thus, there is a need for an effective and low-barrier way to share successes and lessons learned [1]. SoTL knowledge is often mobilized through publication and presentations, as well as through less formal venues such as blog posts [2], online repositories [3], and hallway conversations. These informal channels support dissemination within a context (e.g., institution) and across disciplinary boundaries. Specifically, for SoTL practitioners to be active participants in their SoTL communities, they need to be able to make their work public and identify related efforts, best practices and resources [1]. Similarly, SoTL administrators who support SoTL initiatives face several challenges including identifying trends or gaps in areas of study. While online repositories typically provide data on published SoTL projects [3], making sense of lists that do not use common vocabulary is a challenging task. a framework for viewing, interpreting and connecting SoTL projects and practitioners would thus strengthen the field of SoTL. In this presentation we introduce "SoTL Explorer", an online, open-source, and interactive visualization developed at the University of British Columbia (<http://sotl-explorer.sites.olt.ubc.ca/>). SoTL Explorer includes two components. The first is a thorough shared taxonomy that can be used to describe most common teaching practices, areas of impact, and evaluation approaches. The second component is a visualization of the SoTL landscape across institutions. We designed three different views that support comparisons of multiple projects, pattern extraction, and access to project details. Learners are invited to query this landscape by filtering projects according to their focus and context. SoTL Explorer supports practitioners by providing answers to questions such as: (1) What teaching and learning practices are used in a specific context at my institution? (e.g. What practices are used to impact student motivation in first year classes?), (2) How can I evaluate my project given my goals? (e.g. How do other project evaluate the use of clickers to impact student knowledge?), (3) What are the projects similar to mine that I could share resources with? (e.g. What other project

use similar practices or evaluation methods?). In particular, SoTL Explorer supports practitioners in the planning stage of their projects. Similarly, the taxonomy and visualization support high-level administrators as they seek to (1) oversee the diversity of SoTL work at their institution by enabling them to identify trends and gaps and (2) ensure that the research design of SoTL initiatives they support is sound and coherent by enabling them to view the alignment of project's practices, goals and evaluation methods. Finally, SoTL Explorer enables users to answer their own queries about past and ongoing SoTL work in their institution and connect to other SoTL practitioners. The tool is available under the GNU license at <https://github.com/sperez8/sotl-explorer>. We look forward to sharing our framework and tool for exploring and connecting SoTL efforts in the "Mapping and chronicling SoTL" thread of the ISSOTL conference.

**College Reading: What Digital Natives Say About the Digital Terrain**  
**Kimberly Creech**

**Telus 106**

Historically, post-secondary teaching has been viewed as ritualistic and symbolic with very little value or reward attached to instructional quality (Sacken, 2005; Fairweather, 2005). I'm not certain that everyone would agree with this statement, but most agree that instructors are reflective by nature and intrinsically motivated to improve instructional quality and student learning. That said, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) has not always been viewed as rigorous and reliable when compared to conventional methods (Bishop-Clark & Dietz-Huhler, 2012). However, if we are to address instructional quality, we must rise to the challenge of teaching in an environment of rapid technological change and economic distress by engaging in applied research. As a college developmental reading and writing instructor, I acknowledge three major undergraduate challenges facing higher education in the coming decade, technology, affordability, and retention. Although trends in technology present solutions to affordability and retention, it remains unclear whether these applications will indeed serve at-risk populations and the cognitive and non-cognitive challenges these students possess. Several questions come to mind such as, how will we continue to respond to technology issues, such as digital textbooks, as well as student and teacher competencies and preferences. Although we continue to confront and wrestle with variations and competencies, this study specifically examines how students respond to the use of an e-textbook compared to traditional textbooks for gains in student achievement and student perceptions of motivation and learning. This university funded and IRB approved SoTL project provided many adventures and insights including, planning and implementation, teaching and reflecting, and analysis of data pertaining to student achievement and perceptions of learning. The study compared the use of a traditional textbook and an e-textbook among college freshman placed in developmental reading courses. Student achievement and perceptions of motivation and learning are analyzed for experimental and control groups. Two-sample t-tests reveal there is no significant difference in course grades, no significant difference in textbook quiz grades; however there is a significant difference in control group Nelson Denney gain compared to experimental group negative gain, p-value < .05. Student post survey results indicate 31% or < of students have favorable perceptions of learning and engagement. Most students report unfavorable or neutral perceptions. This study was informed by current literature associated with digital textbooks and student motivation and cannot be generalized due to the small sample size; however, the results offer a contribution to the literature base that has not evaluated student outcomes and perceptions in developmental reading courses. Furthermore, this study allowed me to make more informed decisions about the instructional design of my courses and assess potential quality of teaching. It challenged me to venture into the unknown largely because of my preference for traditional texts, and the tactile properties I favor; however, I've considered students' preoccupation with cell phones/reading and extrapolated this to the potential of digital textbooks/tablets and hope to share my challenges, insights, and outcomes with professionals that are engaged in scholarship of teaching and learning.

**An International Adventure-Co-Curricular Design for Physiotherapy Students in Finland and the United Kingdom**  
**Claire Hamshire, Deborah O'Connor, Rachel Forsyth, Esa Barlund, Ursula Hyrkkänen**

**Telus 106**

Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom (UK) and Turku University of Applied Sciences, Finland are both members of the CARPE network - the Consortium on Applied Research and Professional Education-the first strategic alliance of a number of European Universities of Applied sciences. The partners within this alliance aim to encourage cooperation in European research programmes and jointly develop educational programmes. Enthusiasm

for joint provision to improve the quality of student learning has been expressed across the CARPE partnership, with the aim of promoting international collaboration and developing graduates for a more globalised economy. Physiotherapy is an international profession and the goal of undergraduate programmes is to prepare students to be competent to practice throughout their career. Embedding internationalization to facilitate students' multicultural awareness and skills so as to be responsible global citizens is essential. Respect and empathy for other people, their culture, values and way of life; are integral to intercultural competence (Nilsson, 2003) and enhancing collaboration between European Institutes and physiotherapy educational institutions in the European region is encouraged (ENPHE, 2017). Internationalising curricula requires both staff and students to make paradigm shifts and understanding the perspectives of different racial, culture and gender groups (Banks 1999). Across the CARPE network internationalisation is viewed as essential to enhance students' learning experiences and programme quality. Our students need to have global perspectives, intercultural communication and be able to analyse situations with sensitivity to the perspective of others, but whilst some staff and students are able to gain international experience through exchanges, it is not an opportunity available to all. Curricula therefore need to be redesigned to embed opportunities for international collaboration throughout programme activities. However, the constraints of different academic, regulatory and funding systems can make the process unwieldy and unattractive. This paper reports on the INSTEP project (INternationalising STudent Education in Physiotherapy) that developed shared learning resources and teaching activities to develop students' understanding of and ability to critique practice across the two universities in the UK and Finland. The purpose of the study was to gain a greater insight into students' perceptions and experiences and explore some of the advantages to and pitfalls in establishing such programmes for both staff and students. The study was evaluated using one-to-one interviews with students who were invited to tell the stories of their experiences, using narrative interviews. Focus groups were conducted with the staff teams at each institution. All data were digitally recorded; transcribed verbatim and analysed using a thematic approach to identify staff and students' perceptions. Common themes and subthemes were extracted and subsequently analysed in relation to the a priori themes. We will present a summary of the findings as well as reflections on future developments and potential wider implications, detailing issues around internationalisation that were identified by the students and staff; using narrative fragments. Our study emphasises the importance of international collaboration to gain understanding of both differences and similarities in designing a collaborative Physiotherapy curriculum.

**Developing Bonds in The Learning Journey To Enhance Student Learning: Hands-On Experience** Telus 106  
**Nguyen Anh Thu**

Social bonds and their impacts on student learning deserve greater attention. As students are special customers of a teaching service, social bonds can be operated to enhance learning outcomes in a more collaborative learning atmosphere. The assertion that learning is a journey (Harris and Walling, 2017) grounds this reflection of learning and teaching. The term bonding process, applied to higher education, broadly describes how students move from initially considering a class to enrolling in it and then engaging and bonding with the class throughout the learning journey. More narrowly, the term refers to a sequence of interactions in which students are guided and inspired to actively engage during the learning process as they want to achieve certain learning outcomes. Bonding is widely applied in services marketing as a crucial strategy to develop committed customers (Dash et al., 2009). Based on the literature of relationship marketing, bonds are defined as economic, psychological and physical attachments in a relationship that are built through interactions and that tie involved stakeholders together in a relational exchange to achieve mutual outcomes (Liang and Wang, 2005). This presentation will draw from personal experiences of an academic's reflections on developing bonds as psychological attachments in the learning journey to enhance student learning. A bonding process is built in my business teaching based on the social bonds theory (Rook, 1985), the Kolb experiential learning model (Kolb, 1984) and the collaborative learning communities (Curran and Millan, 2016). To elaborate, it is an extended application of the Kolb experiential learning model (Kolb, 1984), using assessments and marking rubrics (Hafner and Hafner, 2014; Griffin et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2017), providing and receiving feedback (Dunworth and Sanchez, 2016; Pereira et al., 2016; Sambell, 2016) and developing collaborative learning communities (Barkley, Cross and Major, 2014; Curran and Millard, 2016; De Hei et al., 2015; Zheng, Niiya and Warschauer, 2015). In my teaching, I redesign curriculum, including assessments and feedback to support integrated learning journeys and to leverage student touchpoints for building and developing

engagement levels through four steps (Engage & Observe, Engage & Do, Engage & Collaborate, Engage & Bond) to ultimately gain the desired social bonds for student learning. I design and refine learning journeys to attract students and keep them, creating customized experiences so finely tuned that once students get on the path, they are actively engaged in the learning journey to actually learn. From my own observations, once students are socially bonded, they will live the learning experience in a collaborative community and achieve better learning outcomes. As teachers around the world aim to develop bonds of difference (Sharma and Bali, 2014) in appreciating similarities in differences (as we teach different subjects in different contexts), this reflection on bonding in teaching hopes to bring a fresh look at the learning journey through a bonding process as one of the underexplored territories in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

**Exploring Anxiety in SoTL: An International Perspective**  
**Anne Tierney, Graham Scott, Andrea Webb**

**Glen 202**

In this panel, we explore the issues of anxiety experienced by practitioners of SoTL. Based on studies conducted in the UK and Canada, we first explore the origins of anxiety experienced by faculty, and why, despite the challenges, we continue to engage with SoTL (Boyer, 1990). We then look in more depth at two empirical studies: one, conducted in the UK, involves teaching-focused Life Science faculty (AUTHOR, 2016b). The second, conducted in Canada, involves mid-career faculty in a SoTL Leadership postgraduate certificate course (AUTHOR, 2016). Perspective 1: Drawing upon my personal experiences of the slow transition from disciplinary researcher to SoTL practitioner over some 20 years, those of my peers over the same time scale, and the experiences of new to SoTL colleagues that I have mentored more recently (Hubbard, Gretton, Jones & Tallents, 2015) I consider from an 'insiders' perspective experiences of a sense of being a lesser professional, loss of disciplinary identity and imposter syndrome. But don't worry it's not all gloomy and there can be happy endings (AUTHOR, 2015). Perspective 2: Following on from the previous perspective, I offer evidence gathered from my study on Life Science academics in the UK, and their experiences of engaging with SoTL as practitioners. Using Engeström's Activity Theory (Engeström, Miettinen, & Punamäki, 1999) I explore the environment of teaching-focused academics in a life science setting, and what that means in a research-oriented culture (AUTHOR, 2016a). While this group, without exception, is enthusiastic and dedicated to including SoTL in their professional practice, this is not without a price. I explore the epistemological and ontological challenges that this group faces in coming to terms with new knowledge and a shift in identity. I also explore the anxieties associated with being a teaching-focused academic in a culture which is focused on high impact disciplinary research. Perspective 3: Novice SoTL leaders face many challenges within the research-intensive university. They perceive that traditional academic cultures confine them to disciplinary silos, while promotion and tenure requirements conspire against time for SoTL Leadership (Boyer, 1990; Dobbins, 2008; AUTHOR, Wong, & Hubball, 2013). This section of the panel presentation shares some of the findings from a recent study that aimed to explore Threshold Concepts (Meyer & Land, 2003; 2005; 2006) in SoTL and what constrained educational leaders' understanding of SoTL while enrolled in a SoTL Leadership program at a Canadian research-intensive university. Using phenomenological research methodology (van Manen, 1997), the SoTL leaders identified five key constraints; ingrained disciplinary cultures (Bunnell & Bernstein, 2012), difference between scholarly teaching and SoTL, the discourse and conventions of SoTL, an unfamiliar field, 'studentness' (Cousin, 2012) and not seeing themselves as educational leaders. Understanding and considering these constraints is important to instructional teams facilitating professional development programs in SoTL and SoTL Leadership. Reducing anxiety around involvement in SoTL will not only develop better programs for the students at our institutions, but also better SoTL research. We welcome discussion on this topic, and are particularly interested in sharing perspectives from different contexts. This panel is of particular interest to faculty who are teaching-focused, those who have an interest in developing their SoTL practice within their discipline, and educational developers who support them.

**Love and/or Hate: Intro to the Basics, Limitations & Use of Statistics in SoTL**  
**Carolyn Hoessler**

**Glen 203**

Statistics, also known as quantitative analysis, the cornerstone of randomized control trials and data analytics, or "that course I once took", is a frequently utilized approach to scholarship of teaching and learning. Whether one is a causal reader of such studies, an enthusiast of the approach with limited training, or someone who just wants to know what the fuss is all about, this workshop is for you. Facilitated by someone who coaches in

SoTL design and leads SoTL support at a university, has taught graduate level statistics, survey design and qualitative research, and has led workshops nationally and internationally on statistics, this workshop is intended to answer three questions: 1) what makes a good quantitative study? 2) What can statistics tell us, and what can they not? 3) Of the many tests, how to decide which to use? With the learning goals of increased confidence in reading and evaluating quantitative SoTL designs, increased awareness of the range of statistical analysis, increased ability in selecting relevant approaches to statistical analysis for SoTL. What will happen in the 90 minutes: Introduction to a 4-part framework and then small groups identifying the parts in a real SoTL article. An attendee (maybe you!) suggests a research topic: together, we workshop it into a study design, working through the topic as a group decision-making process about statistical design using provide decision trees and templates throughout, identifying the appropriate uses and limitations of statistical research and the questions it can and cannot answer. Why important: Statistical analysis appears in about half of the research studies published in most non-special call issues of SoTL journals, including comparison of student grades, survey results, predictive modeling, and more. SoTL researchers may be part of research teams considering statistical analysis, or pick up an article on student engagement in their discipline and find themselves reading a statistical analysis. McGrath (2016) in her Teaching and Learning Inquiry article advocates for increased awareness of statistical significant testing and the factors influencing significance and clarity of reporting. Other non-special call articles in the same TLI volume included one article with statistics, one using mixed methods including statistics, and two qualitative studies, including one in chemistry (which the authors note is typically quantitative). Similar ratios occur across SoTL journals. Because statistical literacy is quite unfamiliar in many disciplines or is associated with fears of math or statistics, even well-informed scholars may avoid reading relevant articles, or too quickly assume the conclusions are proven. This workshop aims to create an epistemologically-open space where questions can be asked and discussed, practical big picture of statistics can be seen and applied, and statistics can become as critically considered by the SoTL community. Thus, this workshop focuses on one of the anxieties of reading and engaging in SoTL and provides a space to grow in confidence to be the informed reader and engaged collaborator who asks good questions about the chosen analysis and considers the strengths and limitations of statistics in research. In this way, this workshop focuses on the first conference thread: Aspirations and anxieties for SoTL, while also helping attendees to better understand our fellow climbers whose tools are statistics.

**Locating Reflexivity and The Scholarship of Supervision as Teaching**  
**Marlon Simmons, Brenda Spencer**

**Glen 209**

Definitions of SoTL have converged and diverged (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999, Kreber, 2002a; Potter & Kustra, 2011) to take shape within particular terrains and, while conceptual diversity is accepted (Trigwell 2013, p. 96), the purposes of SoTL have been clearly articulated (Kreber, 2002b; Trigwell, 2013). Thus, entering the discourse by way of the conference theme “emerging landscapes”, we work at the intersection of SoTL and scholarship of “supervision as teaching” (e.g., Amundsen & McAlpine, 2009; McAlpine & McKinnon, 2013) and, following Trigwell and Shale (2004), present our paper by: 1) sharing what we have learned, through reflexive processes, about our own and students’ experiences of our supervision as teaching, and 2) opening to critical scrutiny our insights about this “scholarship as activity” (p. 529). We draw on our experiences of a monthly Thesis Group meeting that we have set up for all of the graduate students we supervise in the area of Education Leadership. We began with the idea that students benefit from being a part of a community of learners, wherein cross-year contributions that also represent a range of graduate experiences can present important teaching and learning opportunities for all participants, including supervisors. Situating the SoTL as a reflexive process (Kreber, 2002b; Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, & Prosser, 2000) rooted in the activity of teaching and learning (Trigwell & Shale, 2013) of the Thesis Group, we see ourselves involved in a kind of autoethnographic reflection-in-action (Schon, 1995) with the aim of developing a better understanding of teaching and learning through both engagement with the literature (research) and deliberate consideration of our actual practices of supervision (experience) (Kreber, 2002a). In addition, we attempt to put into practice Trigwell and Shale’s (2004) assertions that, to improve student engagement and learning, SoTL ought to be transparent, and, we argue, especially to the students with whom we work. Thus, we have been explicit about our focus on student needs, student voice, and student-led practice. We not only strive to model but, subsequently, have witnessed and learned from the respectful awareness of group dynamics and differences, the careful listening, the considered and considerate questioning, the thoughtful and informed contributions, and the critically constructive feedback from which many key insights have emerged. We also realize

that this collective teaching and learning is indeed scholarship that involves the kind of critical reflexivity that Andresen (2000) characterizes by values such as “honesty, integrity, open-mindedness, breadth combined with depth, scepticism, fairness, generosity, and intellectual humility” (p. 142). The Thesis Group, then, promotes a kind of scholarship that students engage in about their own scholarship, and we engage in about our own scholarship about their scholarship. And, to add another dimension to this critical reflexivity, by making public our ideas at the ISSOTL Conference, our paper invites scrutiny by peers (Andresen, 2000; Trigwell & Shale, 2013), and we hope to generate discussion by asking the following: How can critical reflexivity about the practice of supervision as teaching enhance student learning and enrich the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning?

**On the Horizon: Re-valuing ‘Wisdom in Practice’ Perspectives within the Scholarship of Glen 209  
Teaching and Learning  
Suzanne Le-May Sheffield, Anne Marie Ryan**

“...academic culture ... distrusts personal truth. Though the academy claims to value multiple modes of knowing, it honours only one – an ‘objective’ way of knowing that takes us into the ‘real’ world by taking us ‘out of ourselves’.” (Parker Palmer, *Courage to Teach*, 1998, pp.17-18) There have been calls over the last decade to honour the range of approaches and ways of knowing drawn from the disciplines, in our scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). (Potter and Kustra, 2011, and Potter and Wuetherick, 2015) However, our own forays into this field have led us to question what counts as evidence for research in teaching and learning. In the move to legitimize our evidence, and driven by such expanding fields as data analytics, we question whether we might be in danger of losing the humanity of the teaching and learning environment, in an effort to force “measurable”, or quantifiable data as a priori acceptable evidence. In this movement, we wonder whether we are in effect marginalizing faculty and student lived experience in the research? Are we in danger of losing the humanity of the teaching and learning environment and marginalizing faculty and student lived experience if we do not include a range of approaches as ‘evidence’ in our SoTL practice, as we do in our teaching practice? Are we overlooking this key aspect in our rush to produce “evidence” for our scholarship in an increasingly data-driven world? If we accept reflective, scholarly teaching that is grounded both upon a knowledge-base rooted in the literature, and most critically, involves development of a “wisdom in practice” (Allen and Field, 2005), can these approaches be included as evidence for SoTL? Our own experiences of participating in the scholarship of teaching and learning, and in particular our scholarly inquiry into the value of informal teaching and learning conversations for faculty support, encouragement, and the generation of creative risk-taking in the classroom (ISSOTL Poster 2015: A Framework for Creativity Through Dialogue in Higher Education), has led us to consider how we can and should frame such experiences in the context of the scholarship of teaching and learning. This session aims to explore questions around what counts as evidence. We contend that the scholarship of teaching and learning can be further enriched by the incorporation of these more nebulous and affective aspects of our teaching practices that resonate deeply with reflective teachers and with our students too. Participants will be asked to share reflections on their own SoTL practice, to consider what they believe ‘counts’ as scholarship, what has led to these beliefs and how they have impacted the directions chosen in their research. We will engage participants in a conversation to consider when such experiential approaches should be utilized, and how such research can be more frequently valued, and more readily published.

**Reinterpreting the Idea of ‘Making Public’  
Carolyn Kreber**

Glen 209

Reflective critique, or reflectivity, is one of several features we recognize as essential to developing the scholarship of teaching (e.g., Andresen, 2000; Glassick et al, 1997). Other features include that our work as teachers becomes public and peer-reviewed (e.g., Shulman, 2000). In this presentation my main aim is to offer a reinterpretation of what *making public* could look like with regards to SoTL, drawing selectively on transformative learning theory (Mezirow, 1991), Habermas’s (1971, 1984) validity claims and Arendt’s (1958) notion of ‘action’. In previous work I portrayed SoTL as a practice that takes place in contexts that are often unpredictable, complex and situation-specific. In such ‘non-laboratory type’ contexts, definitive rules in the form of ‘If I do A then B will happen’ rarely apply. Nonetheless, perhaps with the goal of making SoTL more legitimate within the academy, there is a tendency within the SoTL community to equate SoTL with ‘research’, or systematic formal inquiry into teaching and learning. Additionally the notion of evidence-based practice enjoys superior status in SoTL discourse. A widely

shared assumption is that what we need foremost in SoTL is more research, ideally based in the empirical analytical sciences, to help us identify 'what works'. The validity claim against which such instrumental studies of 'what works' are judged is that of 'objective truth' (Habermas, 1984). While knowing which approaches to teaching and learning are 'effective' is certainly valuable, the danger of a narrowly construed notion of evidence-based practice lies in the risk of us emphasising questions of 'what works' at the expense of questions that would address the desirability of our practices. SoTL would be enriched by explorations (formal and informal) that are informed also by the interpretive and critical sciences, adhering to the validity claims of 'rightness' and 'truthfulness' (Habermas, 1984), respectively. The question then shifts from 'does it work?' to 'what should it work for?', or 'What purpose should the practice serve?' I furthermore propose that SoTL understood as *action* (Arendt, 1958), is not limited to formal studies we undertake into student learning, that we then disseminate through journal articles or conference presentations; it includes any enquiry-oriented public dialogue among diverse stakeholders (including other teachers, students, policy-makers, etc.) in which diverse points of view on educational processes and purposes are disclosed and openly debated. Interpreted through the lens of *action*, SoTL would also take on a deeper community connection, and the idea of 'going public' would be linked to the intention of creating a better world (Arendt, 1958) *in and through* higher education, or (alternatively put) better contexts and conditions in which to learn, teach and live. SoTL would involve taking up broader issues that are a concern for society as a whole, as in asking: who has access to certain types of higher education and who does not; what is participating in higher education like for different people, who gains, who loses, and why; what qualities and dispositions do we hope students participating in higher education will graduate with, and to what purpose do we hope they will employ these, etc. I will use the presentation to elaborate on some of these ideas locating the discussion in the notion of professionalism and professional practices.

#### **FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 3:30-4:00**

Refreshment break outside of the Telus rooms, the Glen rooms, and the Exhibition Halls.

#### **FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 4:00-5:30**

##### **Ain't No Mountain High Enough: Journeys through the SoTL Landscape**

**Glen 205**

**Nicola Simmons, Earle Abrahamson, Barbara Kensington-Miller, Karen Manarin, Sue Moran-Garcia, Carolyn Oliver**

Every journey has a beginning that influences individual and collective destinations. For us, the Collaborative Writing Group (CWG)(see Healey, Marquis, & Vajoczki, 2013; Marquis, Healey, & Vine 2014/2016) at ISSOTL in Hamilton, Canada five years ago was the starting point towards exploring the SoTL landscape through scholarship, collaboration, friendship, memories, and mutual support within the group. Our adventurous exploration has seen us discover new ideas, revisit old ones, forge new identities, and confront fears and challenges. Our mountaineering thus far has taught us about the value of a community and shared language and has given us opportunity to write jointly (authors, 2013) and also in smaller partnerships (for example, authors, 2016; authors, 2015). As we continue to venture into the relatively unknown, we wonder about a number of questions: Who are the most useful co-travellers? What skills and attributes do they contribute? Need, they, for example, be in our own institutions? Who are our guides? Where do we find them? Do we ask them for help often enough? Is travelling the SoTL journey about reaching new heights or about recognizing and appreciating the heights we have reached? What is the peak? What is our ideal(ized) SoTL destination? What views open once we get there? In this panel, we begin by sharing narratives in which we reflect upon the distance travelled, the mile markers to measure our achievements, and the newly attained views from the peaks that show us where we have been as well as uncharted terrains. Our narratives illustrate the difficult spaces that SoTL inhabits, the challenges to overcoming adversity, and where we gain the strength to continue the journey to discover the impact and value of SoTL practice. They also illustrate that we take different paths to the peak: some want to live on the mountain, while others are less frequent climbers. As individuals, however, we are very aware that we have climbed higher with the group than we would have on our own. Using these narratives as a 'base camp,' we invite you to consider the above questions and your own SoTL journey. Our collective and individual journeys have also caused us to

consider the similarities between our mountaineering and SoTL/ISSOTL's own developmental path. We see SoTL's identity development having similar stages and phases, along with challenges and supports to what we have experienced ourselves. We will finish the session by inviting participants to draw the mountain journey of what comes next for SoTL/ISSOTL. We offer this panel in honour of our departed colleague and co-traveller Joanna Renc-Roe.

**Teaching From (Personal) Archives: Feminist Pedagogy Transforming the SoTL Horizon** Glen 201  
**Krista Grensavitch, Ariel Beaujot, Casey O'Brien**

Feminist pedagogy maintains that power in the classroom should be strategically balanced between teacher and students to inform both curriculum and classroom practices and to encourage critical thinking and reflection. Growing from critical pedagogy and looking toward contributions from queer theory, feminist pedagogy embraces unknowability and welcomes spontaneity and emphasizes methods that seek to emancipate: to identify, destabilize, and/or transform oppression and its manifestations (Friere, 2000; Shrewsbury, 1987; Weems, 1992; Kenway and Modra, 1992; hooks, 1994; Hassel and Nelson, 2012). A growing body of scholarship, recognized by the presenters in this panel, explores the intersections of critical, feminist, and queer pedagogies and its impact and potential for SoTL (Levstik, 2009). While each presenter has roots in Women's and Gender Studies, we teach within the disciplines of English and History, thereby illustrating the interdisciplinary potential of our pedagogical approach. Our collective rationale for grounding our work in SoTL responds not only to gaps and silences in the historical record, but also to oppressive hegemonic discourses that often frame teaching, learning, and knowledge production regarding marginalized voices and history. Each of the three panelists facilitated student research projects that engaged with primary source materials, including local archives and personal archives. In asking students to generate new possibilities for interpreting these materials, we explicitly shifted assumptions about who shapes academic discourse. This interdisciplinary panel will examine multiple feminist pedagogical practices, including strategies for project and knowledge presentation, critical reflection, and student evaluation. Following feminist teacher-scholar bell hooks' notion that "the classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy" (1994), we share SoTL strategies for regularly integrating activities that call for reflection so that teacher and students may situate themselves within course content and reflect on the ways in which lived experiences are shaped by social processes and structures. In truly decentering the classroom, we each found that traditional modes of evaluation were insufficient, and therefore, we will present approaches to measuring student learning outcomes when evaluating projects that are both personal and creative. Our collective perspectives, along with examples of student work, provide a compelling illustration of how incorporating critical, feminist, and queer pedagogies shapes new - and necessary - directions for SoTL, effectively transforming its horizon. "The Impact of the Unknowable: Objects and Archives in a Women's History Classroom" Krista Grensavitch discusses creating, facilitating, and presenting this final project, which required students to use primary sources to reconceptualize the variable forms that knowledge takes, assess the relative value often ascribed to these forms, and transmit created knowledge through both written narratives and physical objects. In addition to facilitated museum and archives visits, students also engaged with local makers, friends, and family members to develop the skills necessary for completing several facets of this project. These interactions juxtaposed academic knowledge and knowledge from home and local resources. In this course, the teaching and learning process had several surprising outcomes, both for the students and for the instructor, emphasizing the role of unknowability and what benefit recognizing that the unknowable exists brings. Framed with theory, the presenter will discuss several outcomes, illustrating that pedagogy must be flexible in relation to that which is unknowable in the classroom-because teacher and learner identities are fractured, intersecting, and multiple; that queer theory can be used to unsettle what knowledge is, how we teach, how we learn, how we know the unintelligible; and that in working through crisis, that significant liberatory education occurs (Llewellyn and Llewellyn, 2015; Luhmann, 1998; Kumashiro, 2002). "[art]ifact: flipping the power dynamics of a traditional classroom" Ariel Beaujot will introduce her object-centered [art]ifact course in which students performed material culture analysis and traditional research in archives and libraries based on several objects made locally. Once research was completed the class flipped the traditional classroom power dynamics so that students became in charge of the outcome and the final product which would ultimately be an exhibit at the Regional Art Gallery, along with K-12 and community programming. Another important aspect of the student-planned and student run exhibit was that they created a Call to Artists that asked local artists to create art in response to the objects chosen and their research, thereby allowing history and art to speak in their own ways to the same object.

In the process, students also sought to query the display mechanisms of art galleries and historical societies in order to question the power dynamics inherent in both. Flipping the traditional classroom dynamics meant students were in charge of outcomes and they wrote Gantt Charts, weekly reports reviewed by the class as a whole, and did peer review as a way of determining the final grades of the class. In this way, the instructor stepped back from the process and the students came to develop their own education in a less-oppressive, less-power ridden classroom environment. "Collaborative Rubrics: Student-Led Assessments of Learning through Personal Archives" Casey O'Brien examines how writing a collaborative rubrics when engaging with personal archives in a Women's Graphic Memoirs course cultivates a culture of critical reflexivity and, by extension, helps an instructor ethically assess learning outcomes when students' projects are both creative and personal. Building from an assignment sequence, which guides students through a series of low-stakes writing-drawing assignments that correlate with the assigned graphic memoirs and the course learning objectives, the activities are designed to encourage the interrogation and analysis of visual texts with the aim of students learning to apply those skills when creating their own visual texts in the form of a personal graphic memoir. At each stage, students are asked to incorporate personal archives as primary sources, such as photographs, letters, journals, and mementos. Addressing the role of Imagination-Intellect in feminist research writing, Susan Iverson posits, "feminist pedagogy demands that we become personal with the material studied" (2015). Given the creative and personal nature of these final projects, and in line with her identity as a feminist pedagogue, this instructor, with her students, designed a "collaborative rubric," for assessing the graphic memoirs. Collectively, the students negotiated the criteria and point system for grading their graphic memoirs, a process which measurably deepened critical reflection and learning.

**Newcomers to Conducting SoTL Research: Graduate Students Reaching New Heights by Glen 206  
Designing, Researching, and Analyzing SoTL  
Cynthia Korpan**

Providing graduate students with Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) instruction through various means in higher education institutions has been highly recommended (Gale & Golde, 2004), and as Schram and Allendoerfer (2012) point out, learning and teaching centers are essential for providing that valuable support. An example of this support is the University of Victoria's (UVic), Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (LATHE) Graduate Certificate Program offered by the Learning and Teaching Centre (LTC). One of the requirements of the two-year six-credit degree program (that graduate students convocate with) is that students develop a SoTL proposal. Some LATHE students submit these proposals for funding (up to \$7500.00) through LTC grants. The many benefits associated with providing instruction about SoTL to graduate students does exist (Chick & Baume, 2015; Gale & Golde, 2004; Hannon & Taraban-Gordon, 2010) but lacking is investigation as to what impact conducting SoTL research has on graduate students. The opportunity to conduct SoTL research is not always supported at institutions but LATHE graduates are highly encouraged to conduct the research that they have designed. This session will share data from a research project that had several LATHE graduate students reflect on questions about the SoTL research that they designed, researched, and analyzed. The questions developed were guided by the last two steps (out of four) of Gale and Golde's (2004) SoTL instruction for graduate students, engagement and extension; the first two steps, exposure and encounter, are incorporated into the LATHE program. The questions asked were: What impact did your SoTL research have on your teaching and learning? Specifically, what were the benefits, challenges, and issues encountered that affected your SoTL research, your teaching, and/or your disciplinary research? How did your learning about SoTL by conducting research differ from being exposed to and encountering other SoTL research? What was it like to be concurrently conducting your doctoral research and SoTL research? Did one inform the other? Who provided guidance during the research phase? What collaborations resulted from conducting SoTL research? How did or will you disseminate your SoTL research? How have you mentored others, either graduate students or faculty, about SoTL?

**Research Associates (RAs) as Student Partners in Teaching and Learning: Reflections Glen 206  
Using Healey, Flint, and Harrington's Conceptual Model  
Rachel Braun, Galicia Blackman, Judy Tran, Calvin Ng**

The Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning (TI) Research Associate (RA) Program was launched in spring 2016 with the vision of providing part-time student staff (RAs) opportunities to gain professional experience in

teaching and learning in higher education, to build upon their academic studies, and to contribute to the evaluation, enhancement, and development of the TI's programs and activities. Students are invited into these roles *as partners* with TI faculty and staff. In recognition of RAs' diverse roles and contexts within and across the TI, each RA has an official, specific job title (e.g., *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning [SoTL] Research Assistant* or *Learning Technologies Coach*), but as a group are collectively referred to as Research Associates (RAs). RAs are hired in real-time to meet TI needs, and are provided ongoing professional development through the Program's self-study initiative, the Research Associate Professional Identity Development (RAPID) Badge Program. In this 30-minute paper presentation chaired by the Program Coordinator (a graduate student), four RAs (two undergraduate and two graduate students) discuss the Program's pilot year using Healey, Flint, and Harrington's (2014) conceptual model of students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education. This model provides a detailed lens for each presenter to explore: 1) professional and personal assessment of their development within and beyond their role; 2) curriculum development in the RAPID Badge Program; 3) growth as a learning community; and 4) RAs as a subject of SoTL inquiry. This discussion situates the RA Program's practices to date, presenters' personal and professional experiences and growth, and areas of further development within the larger question of students as partners both in SoTL research and professional contexts.

This paper engages with SoTL literature on students as partners, as conceptualized by Healey et al (2014 and 2016). From its inception, the Program was cognizant of students-as-partners as a best practice in SoTL (see Felten, 2013). We have enacted this principle in the research and design of our activities, initiatives, and reflection prompts. Whereas much of the current students-as-partners literature writes to faculty (see Cook-Sather, Bovill, & Felten, 2014), our paper considers the Program from a student and SoTL newcomer perspective. Healey et al.'s (2014 and 2016) model provides a common framework with which to conceptualize these perspectives through a scholarly lens. This paper engages the conference theme, "SoTL Newcomers, Fellow Climbers, and Guides" from four directions. First, as all presenters are students, we are newcomers and emerging practitioners in SoTL and our academic disciplines. In participating in the Program and its initiatives, we are building a strong scholarly foundation upon which to inquire into our current (and future) teaching and learning *as students*. Second, this paper shares the hopes and aspirations for the Program before, during, and after its pilot year. These components provide insight into our third direction, where we consider RA and RA Supervisor relationships as a topic of future inquiry. Fourth, the paper reflects on the Program's opportunities to provoke new thinking about students' as partners, and how these roles impact RAs' emerging professional identities.

**Nurturing Novice SoTL Scholars: Examination of the Impact of Participation in a Teaching and Learning Grants Program on the Learning and Growth of Graduate Student Research Assistants**

**Glen 206**

**Laura D'Amico, Irina Presnyakova, Cheryl Amundsen**

Most investigations of the development of graduate students as researchers have focused on development of their disciplinary scholarship through the conduct of their thesis research. However, empirical studies focusing on how students learn to combine knowledge of teaching and research to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) are now also emerging (e.g., Manor, Block-Schulman, Flannery, & Felten, 2010; Werder, Pope-Ruark, & Verwoord, 2016). It is to this growing literature of students learning in partnership with faculty that we seek to contribute with a study that explores student research assistants' (RAs) development of SoTL knowledge and proficiencies through participation in a grants program. The grants program has been in existence for 10 years and provides faculty with small grants (up to \$6K) to investigate questions about teaching and student learning. Eighty to ninety percent of all grant funds are allocated to hiring student RAs. By August 2016, 149 student RAs (including 116 graduate students) had been employed by 136 completed projects. In addition, seven graduate students had been employed by the grants program itself to provide support to the grant teams. Data was collected from a subset of these students to explore their learning and experiences. These data include: 58 surveys completed by project RAs; 10 interviews with project RAs from completed projects; 4 interviews with program RAs. 100% of the RAs describe the work as a valuable experience. They outline gains in knowledge and proficiency related to teaching, teaching and learning research, research in general, and personal and professional growth. SoTL understandings and proficiencies gained ranged from general insights (such as becoming aware that such research exists and its power to inform teaching and learning) to specific skills (such as designing surveys). Teaching benefits ranged from gaining a deeper understanding of the purposes underlying a course and its design to improved knowledge of students and

how they learn to the development of specific teaching techniques. Some of the key factors leading to these benefits include: (1) close, collegial working relationships with faculty members, (2) a more explicit level of conversation around teaching and learning goals and course designs than students typically experience, (3) shifts in perspective generated by the unusual role of “observing” and “researching” in a teaching setting, and (4) exposure to research methods and problems from other disciplines. Participation in grants programs such as this one clearly offer graduate students an entre to the world of SoTL and an environment for developing knowledge and skills related to teaching, research and their intersection. The paper presented will provide further detailed data from survey and interviews related to the benefits outlined above.

### **Course Redesign to Shift Student Mindset and Increase Identification of Effective Learning Strategies** Telus 102

**Julie Tetley, Kerry McCaig**

Recent research findings from cognitive psychology and neuroscience have revealed that many of the long-held beliefs about how best to study and learn are, in fact, not effective and the most common learning strategies college students employ (e.g., highlighting, rereading, cramming for exams) may be counterproductive (Brown, Roedinger, McDaniel, 2014; Dunlosky, Rawson, Marsh, Nathan, & Willingham, 2013). Research also indicates that changes in one’s mindset can lead to changes in a person’s perspective about ability and future success (Blackwell, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2007). Sriram (2013) found that high-risk college students who were taught to view intelligence as malleable reported significantly higher levels of academic effort and employed study skills significantly more than students who were only taught study skills alone. This presentation addresses the adventures and insights in SoTL track by providing a course re-design model that deliberately integrates concepts and strategies from two books, *Mindset* (Dweck, 2006) and *Make it Stick: The Science of Successful Learning* (Brown, Roedinger, McDaniel, 2014) as well as other research findings from the cognitive sciences. Four research questions have guided our ongoing study: 1) Do students who participate in the intervention sections of Learning Strategies 101 show greater gains in Mindset scores compared to control sections? 2) Do intervention students show greater increases in awareness of the most effective of learning strategies as measured by a Learning Strategies Questionnaire? 3) Is there a relationship between mindset and awareness of the most effective college learning strategies? 4) How do total scores on the Mindset and Learning Strategies Questionnaire relate to end-of-semester GPA? During Phase 1 of the study (Fall 2015), students in the intervention group showed significant gains in their mindset scores over a one-semester period when compared to the control sections. This suggests that an intentional approach to changing Mindset can be achieved over the course of a semester, and given the previous research related to a growth mindset and higher academic achievement (Yeager & Dweck, 2012), the effort is worthwhile to improving one’s academic success. Results from the Learning Strategies Questionnaire analysis showed a strong trend suggesting that students in the intervention sections achieve greater increases in awareness of the most effective learning strategies when compared to the control group. There was a medium, positive, correlation ( $r = .46$ ) between Post Mindset Scores and Post Learning Strategies scores for the intervention group. This relationship did not exist for the non-intervention group ( $r = -0.11$ ). The positive correlation for the intervention group is consistent with Sriram’s (2013) findings—students who were taught that intelligence is malleable employed study skills more often. Phase 2 of the study (Fall 2016) expanded the intervention to all sections of the course; this additional research will allow us to replicate the study with a larger sample size. Data analyses are currently underway and will be available at the time of the presentation.

### **Using Behaviour Analytics to Access Meaningful Learning Opportunities; “To be Self-Aware is to be Brilliant; To be Self-Aware and Brilliant is to be the Best”**

Telus 102

**Juliette Gaunt, Mark O’Hara, Adam Crizzle, Angela Zvesper**

Scholarly activity is sparse surrounding the notion of successful academic collaboration with external agencies in working with high-achieving undergraduate students to support the development of their self-awareness. We know from anecdote and common sense that increasing confidence, resilience, self-awareness and ambition in students who are already high-achieving will position them to achieve their best outcomes both at university level and into their first graduate employment positions. This research sets out to test these assumptions. The presenters will discuss a successful collaboration between the High Achievers Recognition Scheme (HARS) at BCU and an

externally sourced business company, Hillcroft House, and the positive benefit this partnership has had on supporting healthcare and education students to develop their own self-awareness, using a behaviour analytics tool. In turn, the presenters will offer comment on how an increased understanding by students of both their own behaviour, and that of others, has helped them to refine and develop their own core skills. It has further enabled them to more effectively access learning and teaching opportunities and grow to become high quality practitioners, capable of forging strong, secure relationships with employers through refined self-awareness skills and reflection. Colleagues attending the workshop will have a chance to hear and debate student's stories of success and to understand at a deep level how a clearly structured knowledge of self can foster brilliance and success in the field of teaching and learning. Presenters will also share aspects of the behaviour analytics tool to enable delegates to understand other aspects of themselves as teachers. They will also describe how this contributes significantly to successful classroom interactions and develops further the dynamic of classroom teaching. They also offer an insight into why online learning may be more effective for some students than others. As scholars of teaching and learning, we have a responsibility to use reflection reflexively to refine and develop our own teaching whilst nurturing the brilliance of those whom we teach. It was a risk to use the Hillcroft House Behaviour Analytics tool, in conjunction with an elite group of high-performing students and staff, to define our sense of selves as teachers and students. There have been smaller peaks to climb along the way, prior to reaching the summit. In trusting our own qualities and strengthening our limitations, we have explored new and diverse opportunities and expanded the horizons of our capabilities, bringing things which were once out of reach firmly into the grasp of our student population.

**Engaging with First-Year Students**  
**Shelly Wismath**

**Telus 102**

Developing an open and trusting relationship between students and professors is important in enhancing student learning, as is understanding students' lives and their goals and intentions for their education. For many professors, the "millennial" generation is vastly different from their own generation, and it can take effort to reach and inspire this generation. This session will describe a number of methods used for getting to know students in classes, from in-class show-of-hands demographics to on-line self-introductory postings to letters of introduction, and discuss their impact. Many of these methods have helped connect students and professors, but have been only minimally successful in provoking any deep connections between students and academic life. But a recent study using liberal education courses as a framework for introductory writing exercises, based on Bruffee's vision of acculturating students into "the community of liberally educated people" (Bruffee, 1995, p. 18) presents encouraging results in this direction. Our study consisted of two parts. First, asking first-year students to reflect on their own educational goals, their recent and current academic work and their career goals, as well as who they are now and who they want to become, has provided a richer introduction of students to the professor and helped build a trusting classroom atmosphere. It has also fostered a metacognitive awareness in students, which enhances student success (Sternberg, 1998; Kuh et al, 2005) and produces a transition beyond concern with grades to deep learning (Biggs, 1987) as an end goal. Secondly, an exercise in which we asked students to describe their first-year experiences, and to explain what they think they need to succeed, provides vivid insight into the experience of our "millennial" first-year students, allowing (older) professors to see the world through student eyes.

**Instructors' Conversations About Teaching: Using Social Network Theory to Reach Beyond** **Glen 204**  
**Our Existing Networks**  
**Gary Poole, Roselynn Verwoord, Isabeau Iqbal**

Conversations about teaching, as a type of informal learning, contribute in meaningful and important ways to post-secondary instructors' professional growth (Patariaia, Falconer, Margarysan, Littlejohn & Fincher, 2014; Roxå & Mårtensson, 2009; Thomson, 2013; Thomson & Trigwell, 2016; Van Waes, Moolenaar, Daly, Heldens, Donche, Van Petegem & Bossche, 2016). Instructors participate in conversations for a variety of reasons which include evolving their teaching practice, accessing new teaching ideas and diverse resources, and growing their disciplinary knowledge. Irrespective of the reasons, conversations can enable instructors to 'reach new heights' in their teaching practices.

We examine academics' conversations about teaching through the lens of personal networks and social network theory, which is the study of how people, organizations or groups interact with others inside their network (Claywell, 2016). A network consists of a set of relationships (Kadushin, 2004) and, according to this theory, networks are made up of the actors (referred to as "nodes") and the relationships (or "ties") between those actors (Patarai, Falconer, Margaryan, Littlejohn, & Fincher, 2014). Within the broad framework of social network theory, we draw from the concept of significant networks and significant conversations (Roxå & Mårtensson, 2009) to examine how academics use conversations to grow as teachers. Significant networks describe the (typically) small number of trusted individuals with whom post-secondary instructors discuss teaching.

This paper builds on our previous SoTL research and ISSOTL presentations (Poole, Verwoord, & Iqbal, 2016a; Poole, Verwoord, & Iqbal, 2016b) by presenting findings from a mixed-methods study that explored the nature of post-secondary instructors' small significant networks. Specifically, we asked: (1) How are educators using networks to expand, refute or build their stories of teaching and learning and of SoTL? (2) What are the relationships among (a) perceived similarity among network members, (b) value of interactions, and (c) impact of network on teaching? (3) What strategies can be employed to enhance a network's value? To answer these questions, we collected and analyzed instructors' social networks maps (visual representations of the relationships between individuals within a network). We found that instructors tend to form networks with people they perceive as sharing similar beliefs and that they perceive these relationships as more valuable than relationships with people who don't share similar beliefs.

In this paper, which contributes to the conference theme of Adventures and Insights in SoTL, we provide a description of our research study including context, methods, and data analysis; present our findings; and provide strategies for instructors to enhance their existing networks. By the end of the session, participants will: 1) have an increased awareness of the extent to which instructors value conversations more when these conversations happen with others who share similar beliefs; 2) be able to describe the implications on teaching and learning; and 3) have a set of ideas for how they can 'reach beyond' their existing networks.

**Around the Pacific Rim: Establishing and Sustaining a Global Learning Community** **Glen 204**  
**Alberto Corrias, Zahiruddin Fitri, Karen Freisem, Erin Hill, Xiuhua Huang, Adrian Lee, Sean McMinn, Yusuke Morita, Wei Zuo**

Conferences such as ISSOTL provide opportunities for faculty and staff who are practicing Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) around the world to meet, collaborate, and discuss their work and its effect on student learning. How can these collaborations and conversations be extended and deepened beyond what can be achieved during a conference? An online synchronous/asynchronous global learning community offers a way for colleagues to share ideas and learn from one another, support each other's work, and collaborate on projects. This session provides the opportunity for participants to learn about one such global learning community, reflect on its effectiveness, and consider how they might design a global learning community to achieve their own SoTL goals. The speakers have participated for nearly two years in a global learning community formed as a part of an Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU) collaboration. Learning community participants represent APRU institutions in six countries and regions (China, Hong Kong, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, and the United States), and together participants co-created a learning community focused broadly around evidence-based teaching and flipping the classroom. Participants have learned from and questioned each other, reflected on the process and effectiveness of the learning community, adjusted practice to improve engagement in and benefit from the learning community, and formed strong collegial ties. Although the community is primarily online, part of the group's scholarship and community building has been to meet face-to-face, so far through presenting at conferences like ISSOTL. These projects have provided additional focus as participants prepare for the conference and reflect on their shared work. In addition, some participants have initiated learning communities in their own institutions building on the work of the global learning community. In this session, speakers will first present learning community (Cox, 2004) and communities of practice (Wenger & Snyder, 2000) frameworks to engage participants in discussion of characteristics and practice of effective faculty/professional learning communities. Participants will then be asked to extend these frameworks to a global online context where learning community participants collaborate as digital residents (White & Le Cornu, 2011). Participants will learn about the structural, logistical and conceptual opportunities and challenges a global learning community presents. Participants will then reflect on their own scholarship goals and discuss with the group how they might apply this global learning community model to meet

these goals. The session will end with Q&A among facilitators and participants. Woven through the session will be description and explanation of the global learning community that the facilitators have participated in and reflection on how its practice exemplifies learning community, communities of practice, and digital residents frameworks. By the end of the session, participants will be able to identify characteristics of an effective global learning community, analyze opportunities presented and challenges faced in establishing and sustaining a global learning community, and consider how they might create and sustain their own global learning community to meet their own goals. This session fits well into the conference themes in that it explores the adventures and unknowns in establishing a global learning community as well as the reflection and communication necessary to sustain the community.

**Evaluating the Impact of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) at a University of Technology in South Africa**  
**'Mabokang Monnapula-Mapesela**

**Glen 204**

The aim of this paper is to present an evaluation of the impact of SoTL at a university of technology in South Africa (SA). In 2014 Central University of Technology, Free State established a unit for scholarship of teaching and learning with the main aim of promoting the quality of teaching and learning at the institution through reflective practice of academic staff on teaching and learning, scholarly research, dissemination and sharing of research findings with peers. SoTL at CUT is a product of a generous financial support by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) which made it possible for the Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching to employ the services of a retired research professor to establish a vibrant SoTL unit. The model followed is that of a mentor-mentee project between seasoned and novice academics. The project encourages the participants to reflect on their day-to-day practice within their disciplines. It acknowledges the fact that academics at CUT and at other universities in the country are at different stages of the teaching continuum as well as different levels of engagement with researching their teaching and learning. The project avails opportunities for the participants to reflect on their practice and to ask relevant questions about what they teach (curriculum), how they teach (pedagogy), why they teach (assessment), and what espoused theories underpin their practice. All these are undertaken with an ultimate aim of improving teaching and learning. Whilst we can already boast several achievements in terms of research outputs that participants produce and share with their peers through presentations at institutional, national and international teaching and learning conferences, as well as through publications in peer reviewed journals, we are still grappling with how to measure the impact of SoTL on teaching and learning. Archer's social realist theory and framework of structure, culture and agency is used as an organising frame of reference in this paper as it permits exploration of causal links between the different strata of the social world. It also provides an opportunity for application at the different levels to analyse the various 'enablements' and 'constraints', as well as their impact on the overall success of the SoTL project. A qualitative approach will also be employed where focus group discussions will be held with all 59 SoTL participants to establish whether among other things, the SoTL project outcomes were achieved and how well they were achieved? How SoTL transformed individual lecturer's teaching and learning practice and what should be done differently to improve SoTL. Content analysis will be employed to identify trends and patterns in the participants' responses. Preliminary findings are that the majority of participants in the SoTL project are now arguably not only good teachers and scholarly teachers who continuously investigate their teaching and students' learning, but they are able to engage with SoTL including reflecting on their practice. Furthermore there is evidence of sustained and increased research outputs by the participants, something that has contributed to the overall institutional outputs.

**Hosting a SoTL Event**

**Beth Marquis, Katarina Mårtensson, Bettie Higgs, Jessie Moore, Huang Hoon Chng, Nancy Chick**

**Telus 103**

This interactive session, offered by members of ISSOTL's Conferences and Convenings Committee, will provide attendees with an opportunity to discuss what's involved in hosting a successful SoTL event. Panel members will offer some preliminary advice, drawing from their experiences hosting institutional, regional, national, and international SoTL conferences and symposia, and will engage attendees in dialogue about other features and factors that impinge on conference/event success.

## **How to Get Your Collaborative Scholarship Initiative Off the Ground: From Concept to Reality** **Telus 105** **David Keegan, Susan Bannister**

Bringing together a collaborative scholarship initiative is not easy. While such an idea may make intuitive sense, there are many steps to be taken and challenges that need to be surmounted to make it a reality. While education leaders may have excellent curriculum development skills, there are a host of leadership/strategic skills needed for the project to reach success. By the end of this workshop, participants will: 1. be able to identify and answer critical strategic questions that will influence the design of their planned collaborations, 2. be able to develop a plan for next steps to bring their collaborations closer to success. This 30 minute event will be a quick and interactive exploration of key strategic issues that are important to the successful implementation of a collaborative scholarship project. Participants will use provided materials to reflect on these issues in the contexts of their own collaborations, and develop a plan for further action. The two facilitators have extensive experience in this domain. They have both led major scholarship projects from concept to reality in their respective academic fields, which are being used by all universities in their country that have such a training program. Together, they play major roles in a total of seven national and international scholarship projects. They have extensive training and experience in designing and delivering education leadership development programs.

## **The Relationship between Educational Research and SoTL: Metaphors and Tensions** **Telus 105** **Kimberley Grant**

Although definitions of SoTL continue to be refined and re-envisioned, the central concepts of teaching and learning inevitably provoke questions about its relationship to educational research. As a graduate student in education, it initially seemed to me that since educational research is all about teaching and learning that there would be a natural affinity between SoTL research and educational research. Upon exploration, however, I have discovered that this relationship, like all relationships, is far more complex than I had originally thought. There are those, and I include myself among them, who focus on the possibilities of SoTL and educational research developing a mutually beneficial, almost synergistic, relationship: Indeed these communities ... enrich one another. The scholarship of teaching and learning may open up new questions that, over time, prompt major new lines of educational research. Educational research may suggest models and strategies that can be explored in the scholarship of teaching and learning and in scholarly teaching practice. (Hutchings, 2000, p. 9) However, in educational institutions characterized by "a culture of scholarly individualism and intellectual mastery" (Berg & Seeber, 2016, p. 2), such interactions between communities for mutual enrichment, built "over time," can seem idealistic and even naive. Instead, SoTL's relationship to educational research is sometimes seen as a barrier to academics who may want to inquire into student learning but simply do not have the time, or perhaps the inclination, to "become experts in the discipline of education" (Geertsema, 2016, p. 126). Such objections, however, are based on assumptions about the relationship between SoTL and educational research. For example, if academics must "develop a parallel expertise in education" (Geertsema, 2016, p. 127) prior to engaging with SoTL, this implies that SoTL is simply a sub-category or an offshoot of educational research. Such assumptions are rarely explicit in the literature; they are more likely to be implied or to appear as metaphors. Sometimes educational research is positioned as a parent or ancestor that can provide theoretical grounding (see, for example, Miller-Young & Yeo, 2015) but from which SoTL must break away in order to establish its independence. Other metaphors place SoTL and educational research on a continuum in which SoTL is the gateway to the real work of educational research (Streveler, Borrego, & Smith, 2007). A familiar metaphor in SoTL is the image of the big tent, but it is not always clear whether educational research is under the SoTL tent (see, for example, Huber in Hutchings, 2000, p. 8) or if it is the other way around. More recently, the language of fields has become prominent, particularly in conversations about the relationship between education, SoTL, and academic development (Clegg, 2012; Geertsema, 2016). Questions arise, therefore, as to where and how to build the fences between these academic communities. This paper aims to explore how these metaphors both reflect and influence perceptions of the relationship between SoTL and educational research in the hope of opening more opportunities for these "communities [to] enrich one another" (Hutchings, 2000, p. 9).

**An Emerging Framework to Enhance Coursework Units**  
**Angela Carbone, Jing Ye, Robert Nelson**

**Telus 105**

There is an increasing amount of attention on the quality of teaching and student satisfaction of units across universities globally. This presents itself as a challenge facing how university coursework units are transformed to meet the expectations of quality standards, and has led to a spread of global initiatives in implementing strategies and policy changes aimed at improving the quality of education. The paper provides insights into how the Unit Enhancement framework was strategically adopted for institutional-wide transformation of coursework unit in one of Australia's largest universities. The framework reported elsewhere (Carbone, Camm-Evans, Ye, 2016) was constructed from research undertaken as part of an Australian Government National Senior Teaching Fellowship which trialled new professional development model called the Peer Assisted Teaching Scheme (PATS). PATS applies the principles of Vygotsky's social cultural theory (1978) and Lave's situated learning theory (1988). It embeds Brookfield's (1995) four lenses to engage teachers in a process of critical reflection to improve their practice and strongly features elements of mentoring (Dawson, 2014) by a colleague and peer learning to develop and enhance learning. The framework outlines the facets, underlying foundations, minimum and aspirational standards, barriers and evaluation lenses that guide unit development, assessments, teaching and evaluation. In this paper, we report on how academics from a variety of disciplines at a large Australian university transformed their units by engaging in a continuing education excellence development (CEED) module entitled 'Enhancing your unit'. This CEED module introduces academics to the 'Unit Enhancement Framework', which enables them to transform their coursework units. A lived experience of the application of the framework is reported and justified. The module was piloted with 24 academics in 2015 and 63 academics in 2016. Participants are required to set goals around each facets, develop and implement an improvement strategy and have their progress reviewed. A combination of lenses presented in the framework has provided highly valued insight on participants' reflective evaluation and its impact on their teaching quality and practices. Overall, participant's opinion of the module and framework was positive in helping colleagues across the university to transform their coursework unit. This paper addresses the conference thread: new horizons, emerging landscapes in SoTL. The framework provides academics with a systematic approach for transforming units from a minimum standard to a better standard that meets the challenge facing university coursework units.

**Investigating Best Practices for Formative Assessment for ELL Students in Higher Ed**  
**Lorelei Anselmo, Sarah Eaton**

**Glen 208**

Often, when ELL (English language learning) teachers give formative feedback they see themselves as "error hunters" (Lee, Mak & Burns, 2016, p. 249). Teachers are prone to focusing almost exclusively on linguistic features, rather than on content (Furneax, Paran & Fairfax, 2007). While teachers want feedback to be a positive experience for students, that is not always the case, the result can be a sense of frustration or disempowerment among teachers (Grunette, 2012). The purpose of this qualitative study was to investigate how teachers can improve their best practices regarding providing formative assessment for ELLs. Seventeen international post-secondary ELLs in Canada completed a survey and were interviewed regarding their perceptions and experiences with receiving feedback both in Canada and their home countries. Results from the participant interviews and completed surveys support the literature and reveal three common themes regarding formative feedback. The feedback must be (1) clear, (2) related to goals, and finally, (3) the type of feedback should reflect the learners' preferences (Nicol, 2009; Price, Handley, Millar, & Donovan, 2010, Rae & Cochrane, 2008; Sadler, 2010, Zhou, 2009). In addition, it was found that the participants did not prefer feedback that included a re-write of their essays, nor did they feel that they benefitted from peer feedback. This evidence highlights the need for teachers to provide students with feedback that is supportive and conducive to learning. Knowing what kind of feedback students prefer and how they prefer to receive it can help teachers become more effective and efficient when designing formative assessments. This study has implications for teaching and learning in a variety of contexts, as formative feedback is a key to learner progress.

**Designing Authentic Assessments: Is the Academic Essay a Valid Measure of Student Achievement?** **Glen 208**  
**Keith Foggett, Carol Miles**

A significant body of teaching and learning research focuses on academic assessments, often seeking to determine the most psychometrically valid and reliable way to determine our students' achievement of the learning outcomes that are established for them (Brown, 2017). For universities, the traditional academic essay has long been the mainstay of these assessment items. However, there are very real issues with what this format actually allows us to measure (Brown, 2010). Globally, it appears that a disproportionate number of university assessments insist on a formally constructed and referenced academic essay. This restrictive format forces students (especially in their first year or two of study) to focus more on convention and format than on demonstrating their learning. Many of these essay assignments have limited word counts, substantially restricting a student's ability to express the knowledge they have gained, or to express their achievement of course learning outcomes. Re-designing these assessments as more authentic tasks can provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their achievement of course requirements in realistic ways. An initial analysis of assignment types across a large Australian university revealed that the traditional academic essay format had been overlain on what otherwise could have been authentic and engaging tasks. Many university teachers had created these essay-style assignments believing that students needed to learn to write academically, whether or not this was a learning outcome of the course (or whether it was a requirement of their chosen career). There was also a prevailing belief that the academic essay format enables students to demonstrate critical analysis skills. A major finding was that, often, the primary focus for those staff marking these assignments was adherence to referencing formats and citation monitoring-not achievement of course learning outcomes. It was also reported that students were more likely to plagiarise assignments of this type for a number of practical and motivational reasons. A recent case study exemplifying these academic integrity issues surrounding the essay format will be presented for consideration. Participants will be asked to consider the results of current research indicating that the formal academic essay may not be effective in measuring global learning outcomes, especially those of problem solving or critical analysis (often used as justification for asking students to present work using this restrictive format). The workshop will demonstrate how we can apply Krathwohl's modification (2002) of Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) to scaffold authentic assignments throughout a student's entire period of university study, with an aim to develop the necessary knowledge and skills required for their chosen field. It will be argued that students will embrace these activities as relevant to their chosen careers, while teaching staff will recognise the benefit of reduced marking time, reduced potential for plagiarism, and the importance of this area as an emerging landscape that will make a significant contribution to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Participants will be challenged to rethink the value of the academic essay in the context of the Taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002) and consider three real academic essay examples to determine the validity and reliability of the assessments for the targeted student groups. This work will be done both in small groups followed by discussion of redesign by the group as a whole. Engaged workshop activities will demonstrate the transformation of sample assignments from a variety of disciplines into authentic assessments (McCann & Taylor, 2016), and examples of over 100 different types of authentic assessments will be provided for participants.

**IFCAT: An Immediate Feedback Collaborative Assessment Tool** **Glen 208**  
**Neeilan Selvalingam, Michael Dennis, Brian Harrington, Sohee Kang**

Despite mounting educational research showing the benefits of collaborative learning, many educators still revert to traditional methods of evaluation. This is particularly true in STEM subjects, where assessment is predominantly in the form of individually written tests, with distinct correct solutions, and binary marking schemes. This not only removes an opportunity for collaborative learning, but the binary classification and resulting cascading effects of small mistakes may also be contributing to student frustration and poor retention rates in these subjects, particularly among already underrepresented groups. Think-Pair-Share is a collaborative learning strategy in which students' first attempt to answer a question by themselves (Think stage). Then students form or are formed into teams (Pair stage). The teams then discuss their answers, and collaboratively form and submit a consensus answers (Share stage). This technique has been shown to improve retention and engagement in a number of classroom setting. Immediate Feedback Assessment Techniques provide formative feedback during testing to allow students to

identify and correct mistakes before moving to subsequent questions. This not only encourages students to fix their errors early on, but also prevents small errors from causing cascading problems through later stages of questions; a common problem in fields that rely on scaffolded questions such as mathematics and computer science. In the winter term of 2016, students in [2nd year statistics class, details removed for anonymity] were asked to write weekly quizzes in a Think-Pair-Share manner, with IF-AT testing. Students were given a series of 5 multiple choice questions each week. They were first given 10 minutes to come up with answers on their own. Then they were randomly placed into groups of 2-3, and given an additional 5 minutes to come up with consensus answers. In the group answering stage, IF-AT scratch cards were provided where students scratched off answers in order to reveal a small star indicating the correct answer. Marks were awarded based on the number of answers scratched. This Think-Pair-Share + IF-AT model was well received by students, and had a positive impact on engagement and retention. However, there were several problems: the scratch cards themselves are difficult to manage and cost-prohibitive; randomized grouping results in significant administrative overhead; and the quizzes were necessarily limited to multiple choice. In order to combat these limitations, we developed IFCAT: a web-based Think-Pair-Share + IF-AT testing app. IFCAT allows an instructor to easily write and send questions to students. Students can then either be assigned to groups randomly (each student's screen displays a group number) or students can form their own groups. IF-AT feedback (of multiple question types) can then be given, and results can be recorded and monitored. Students can also award points to helpful group members that can be integrated with the TrAcademic classroom gamification system. This presentation will share students' comments on IFCAT along with course performance metrics and quantitative measures of learning-improvement.

**High Quality Teaching Philosophy Statements: A Study on (and for) New Teachers**  
**Arshad Ahmad, Kathleen Kinsella**

**Telus 104**

A teaching philosophy statement (TPS) is a rite of passage for new teachers—a declaration of their identity as an educator. A well articulated TPS is a common requirement when applying for an academic position (Kearns & Sullivan, 2001; Schönwetter, Sokal, Friesen & Taylor, 2002; Kaplan, Meizlish, O'Neal & Wright, 2008), and carries a good deal of weight within the hiring process (Alexander et al., 2012; Meizlish & Kaplan, 2008; Benson & Buskist, 2005). A TPS is also an integral part of the teaching dossier required for tenure and promotion and for many new teachers writing such a statement can be daunting (Schönwetter et al., 2002). This paper presents the results of a three-year study to identify high quality TPS from graduate students. Our research goals were to: a) develop an empirically driven framework for identifying a TPS aimed at improving student learning; b) explore variation in TPS across disciplinary contexts and other variables; and c) consider possible implications of our findings for professional development. A mixed method design was employed that proceeded in three phases: development of the TPS coding scheme; deductive coding and statistical analysis; and inductive coding and grounded theory analysis. Our theoretical framework for evaluating a TPS was agreed upon after much discussion on the research team and with reference to the literature and our research goals. A diverse group of researchers then coded statements from 80 graduate students according to practical interpretations of three theoretical constructs: learner centeredness (Weimer, 2013), deep learning (Trigwell & Prosser, 2004; Biggs, Kember, & Leung, 2001), and discipline specific approaches to teaching (Shulman, 1986). Results were explored through quantitative analysis for shared agreements which predicted unconstrained, overall ratings of quality. The top ten ranked TPS were then qualitatively assessed for meaning and produced a set of themes that translated our theoretical constructs into language that new teachers can apply in writing a TPS. Extracts from exemplary TPS were selected to illustrate each theme and disciplinary perspective. These extracts provide much-needed examples of how views and practices specific to teaching and learning can be articulated in a TPS. Our main conclusion is that graduate students looking for an academic teaching position would benefit from awareness of research on student learning in order to write a high quality TPS. How will they make content personally meaningful to students, consider learning outcomes beyond their courses, and empower students to think and solve problems on their own? How positive about learning and passionate about teaching? By focusing attention on learning, we hope to deepen the conversation about teaching philosophy statements in today's competitive higher education context.

**Longitudinal Mapping of Course Evaluations for Reflection on Action in Professional Development**  
**Nancy Krusen**

**Telus 104**

The purpose of the presentation is to make explicit the value of longitudinal mapping of course evaluations for reflection on action. Longitudinal mapping supports careful examination of professional growth over time. In 1993, Shulman's classic article described the need to make teaching scholarship public (1993). Faculty members routinely include course evaluations in tenure and promotion dossiers but may not use the long view to reveal their evolution of teaching and learning. Shulman's seminal work about learning, reflection, and change prompted reflection in and on action without specific strategy (1983). A longitudinal reflective mapping project falls in the SoTL genre of Group 2 inquiry, Reflections on years of teaching experience implicitly or explicitly informed by other SoTL (Nelson, 2004). The literature addresses mapping for assessment of learning outcomes with a few authors address mapping for assessment of teaching outcomes. For example, Smith (2008) described a model integrating longitudinal reporting system including student evaluation for the purpose of structured professional development as part of a comprehensive evaluation. The presentation proposes dialog about a nuts and bolts process of longitudinal mapping to reveal the art and science of teaching through inquiry, useful for professional development, designing teaching and research agendas, and justifying tenure and promotion.

**Supporting New Faculty to Develop 'Scholarly Habits' through a Relational and Holistic Faculty Development Program**  
**Kathryn Sutherland**

**Telus 104**

The traditional trinity of teaching, research, and service is arguably shifting in twenty first century universities to include variations and additions such as citizenship, entrepreneurship, engagement, leadership, and, of course, scholarship of teaching and learning. These roles do not happen in isolation, nor are they always complementary or easy to hold in balance, especially when the research role is privileged in awards and promotions systems and the main criterion for success continues to be research output (Leisyte & Dee 2012; Sutherland 2017). Often, faculty/academic development opportunities focus on just one of these roles-teaching and learning workshops, for example, or a mentoring program focused on researcher development, or writing retreats on SoTL projects. Rarely are newcomers offered holistic faculty development, covering all aspects of the academic role. This presentation describes a year-long, cohort-based, faculty development program for early career faculty that has run successfully since 2011. The program is based on Charles Glassick's and colleagues (1997) six standards of scholarly practice: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, effective presentation, significant results, and reflective critique. Taking a relational and holistic approach to faculty development, participants attend an off-site retreat, complete monthly tasks, attend monthly group meetings, and engage in peer mentoring. They observe each other's teaching, collaborate on disciplinary and inter-disciplinary research and SoTL projects, and develop ongoing supportive communities that last well beyond the end of the year-long program. Pre- and post-program questionnaires have been collected each year, offering rich evaluative data, alongside interviews during and after the program. Findings indicate that participating faculty see improvements across the following measures: research and teaching confidence, workplace satisfaction, research output, teaching and research collaborations, and work-life balance. They also develop an increased sense of agency, and feel more in control of their time and priorities. The university benefits from improved retention, increased expressions of loyalty from early career faculty, and more active academic citizenship and leadership from participants. This presentation targets the conference theme of 'SoTL newcomers, fellow climbers, and guides'. During the session, we will discuss the 'Scholarly Habits' program at one university in particular, but participants will also be asked to share their own experiences of and with holistic faculty development programs. We will discuss how best to encourage new faculty to incorporate SoTL into their academic lives, and what support they need to do that alongside all their other academic duties and passions.

**Reaching New Heights through Writing to Learn: An Experiment in First-Year Anthropology Tutorials**  
**Andrea L Williams**

**Telus 106**

As SoTL matures and as universities struggle to teach increasingly diverse students with fewer resources and pedagogical strategies are coming under increased scrutiny. Expensive smaller classes and tutorial groups in

particular, need to justify their value. This paper reports on a study in a large first-year anthropology course examining the effectiveness of short writing-to-learn activities in discussion-based tutorials, a teaching and learning context that has yet to be fully explored. Writing-to-learn activities are intended to help students learn in a wide range of disciplines (Ambron, 1987; Elbow, 1997; Johnson, Holcombe, Simms, & Wilson, 1993) based on the finding that student engagement is correlated with the amount writing students do (Light, 2001). However, less is known about the effectiveness of writing-to-learn activities in tutorials since only recently have tutorial instructional methods been studied (Spike & Finkelstein, 2012). Although anecdotal feedback from students and TAs suggests that these writing activities may be beneficial, the efficacy of writing-to-learn instructional methods remain ambiguous (Bangert-Drowns, Hurley, & Wilkinson, 2004). Moreover, there is scant evidence about whether writing activities, as compared to more conventional discussion-based methods, help students learn course content. To assess the effectiveness of writing-to-learn activities in a large (with approximately 1000 students and 20 TAs) first-year anthropology course, we introduced short writing activities in half of the approximately 40 tutorials while the other half used discussion-based instructional methods. The writing and discussion activities involved responding to a review question drawn from lecture and course readings that addressed threshold concepts (Meyer and Land, 2005). We analyzed survey data to learn about student and TA perceptions of the writing and discussion activities and examined student grades for correlations between student performance and tutorial instruction method. Students found that the writing-to-learn activities enhanced their learning by enabling them to participate more in the class and to apply their knowledge. Although there was no statistical difference in overall student performance between the writing-to-learn and the discussion-based tutorials, students at the low end of the grade spectrum did better in the writing-to-learn tutorials than in the discussion-only tutorials. This study therefore suggests the potential of writing-to-learn activities to help lower-achieving students. Our study contributes insights to SoTL by suggesting how writing-to-learn activities in tutorials provide an important means for helping all students, particularly lower-performing ones, engage with course content more effectively. In addition to presenting the findings of our study, we will invite the audience to consider how they have already or might use writing as a tool to engage students and help them learn key course concepts and methods.

**Adventures in a Flexible Writing Classroom: An Ethnographic Study of Instructor Experience and Critical Reflection**  
**Dana C. Gierdowski**

**Telus 106**

When we think of classrooms on college campuses, large lecture halls with fixed seats or rooms with desks arranged in neat rows often come to mind. These traditional classrooms reflect a design that lags behind 21st century pedagogical practices that value learning as social and active, and that support inquiry and project-based learning. For writing-intensive courses in particular, outdated learning space design is a relic of outmoded hierarchical, sage-on-the-stage pedagogy, while modern Composition best practices value writing-to-learn and a collaborative, studio-based approach to teaching writing. Collaborative learning in the composition classroom is often practiced in the form of writing workshops, where students discuss and review the work of their peers in small groups. Bruffee (1999) argued that the conversations taking place in these environments allow students to construct knowledge, and this “is why writing lies at the center of collaborative learning as one of the most important elements in the craft of interdependence” (p. 53). Active learning and “flexible” classroom designs are particularly supportive of writing and the pedagogies commonly practiced in Composition/Writing Studies. This presentation discusses the findings of an ethnographic study of eleven instructors teaching the first-year writing course in a newly designed flexible classroom at a large southeastern university in the U.S. The flexible room was outfitted with a variety of modular and mobile tables and chairs, multiple LCD display screens, and mobile whiteboards. Students were required to use their own laptop computers in the space. The goal of the study was to shed light on how the flexible space impacted the pedagogical choices instructors made and examine the “rhetorical and ideological assumptions” (Spear, 1997, p.327) that influence their teaching, which may be shaped by individual differences such as gender, age, and culture (Melhuish, 2010). The presenter, who conducted the study, will discuss the results of the instructor interviews, which suggest that teaching in this student-centered space encouraged critical pedagogical reflection. Instructors reported an increased awareness in how the space influenced and guided the decisions they made when planning lessons and engaging with their students. The data also suggest that instructors perceived greater student and teacher agency within the flexible classroom, which challenged their assumptions of traditional instructor hierarchies and roles. Drawing on the voices of participants, the presenter will also discuss the

anxieties and insights they shared about their subject positions and privileges based on their gender, teaching experience, and self-perceived “creativity.” Instructors noted their experience in the flexible room helped them examine their own professional practice and incorporate more active learning strategies into their courses, as well as transfer student-centered teaching ideas to more traditionally-designed classrooms. The panel will be framed by reflection activities that encourage attendees to engage in discussion and share their own experiences, insights, and assumptions they may have about teaching and learning in particular kinds of classroom spaces.

**Wobbling Up the Mountain: The Journey of a Well-Intentioned White Woman**  
**Miriam Horne**

**Telus 106**

Sometimes long and treacherous, the greatest journeys are those upward climbs that faculty and students take together. Often this journey comes in the form of faculty mentoring undergraduate students. Research in mentoring shows that the teaching that happens in one on one faculty to student work can help students to develop both their beliefs and their personal concepts of identity (Magolda, 2002). Furthermore, mentors help students develop non-academic skills that are necessary for college success (Gullan et.al. 2016). And yet, work in SoTL has done little to explore this teaching and learning relationship. While a few SoTL scholars have begun to fill the gap around mentoring in general (McKinsey, 2016) a more specific examination of cross-racial mentoring for undergraduate students remains largely unexplored. While some (Barker 2007) suggest that race is not, in fact, an issue in interracial mentoring situations, others argue that white faculty have an inherent racial bias that prevents them from having the same positive impact on students of color that faculty of color can have (McGrady & Reynolds, 2013). As McKinsey (2016) points out in her SoTL study, there is a significant difference between classroom teaching and mentoring, and informal mentoring can be critical for student growth and learning. The absence of research in cross-racial mentoring is particularly problematic given increasing numbers of students of color at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) and given the relatively low number of faculty of color in comparison to white faculty (Barker, 2007; Harper 2015). Examining cross-racial mentoring through a SoTL lens is particularly vital as it has the potential to provide a unique perspective into what has been classified by others as a successful or high impact practice outside the classroom (Kuh, 2003). Unlike other methodologies SoTL highlights the role of both faculty and student to examine the relationship and the learning that takes place (Chick & Poole, 2013). This paper presents research done on cross-racial mentoring at a small PWI using SoTL methodology. The presenter describes her work with student participants to examine the white mentor role with at risk students of color. The study specifically seeks to address and explore a concern in the literature that this kind of work does a disservice to the students (Anderson & Shore, 2008; Cole, 2012; McCoy, Wagner & Luedke, 2015; McGrady & Reynolds, 2017). By focusing on racial concerns and academic achievement and by drawing on surveys, interviews and in-depth observations, this presentation interrogates and weighs the value of increased academic support for student of color against racial tensions between white faculty and students of color. In other words, the presenter will examine how teaching and learning in a mentoring relationship may be impacted by race.

**How SoTL Became Part of Our Identities: Scientists Reflect on Inhibitors & Catalysts**  
**Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, LeighAnn Tomaswick, Glenn Dolphin, Hovig Kouyoumdjian**

**Glen 202**

Scientists value evidence in their disciplinary research, but often fail to apply that same scholarly lens to their teaching. In addition, STEM faculty are slow to adopt best teaching practices identified through scholarly research in teaching and learning (Austin, 2011; Anderson et al., 2011; Brownell & Tanner, 2012). There are many institutional and individual barriers (anxieties) that inhibit scientists from adopting SoTL as part of their professional identities or professional practice. (Austin, 2011; Anderson et al., 2011; Henderson et al., 2011; Brownell & Tanner, 2012). Some of these barriers include lack of: resources, training, mentors, recognition and reward. Elevating scholarly research on teaching and learning in the sciences is an important goal associated with the specific aspirations of increasing the numbers of scientists valuing SoTL, using evidence-based practices in their teaching, and conducting SoTL research.

This interactive panel session features four scientists reaching new heights in their practice and support of scholarly research in teaching and learning. Panel members include male and female biologists, chemists, and geologists working as faculty and professional development staff at universities in the U.S. and Canada. Panelists' educational backgrounds are also diverse, with studies in the U.S. and abroad, at small liberal arts colleges and

large, research-intensive universities. The panel represents individuals with varying years of experience as scientists (11-30 years) and with SoTL (4-10 years). Each panel member has come to SoTL research at different points in their career (some as early as graduate school and others as late as 15 years after tenure). These diverse backgrounds and experiences have contributed to each panel member's unique understanding of their own professional identities.

Professional identity, as any kind of identity, includes recognizing ourselves and others as "the kind of person" we are within our professional context (Gee, 2001). As Henkel (2000) indicates, there are three key concepts of academic identity: a distinct individual with a unique history, located within a chosen moral and conceptual framework, who is identified within their community or institution by the goods that they achieve. Kogan (2000), Henkel (2005) and Clarke et al. (2013) further emphasize the concept of identity as one in which the distinct individual is *embedded* within a social system of their departments, communities and institutions. Individual and social aspects of professional identity, such as the personal and community concepts of what scientists should do and be, can influence professional choices quite profoundly. Academic identity is subject to change with shifts in circumstances, individual values and embedded social systems (Whitchurch, 2013). Recent research highlights the inherent tensions in managing competing research and teaching identities (Brownell & Tanner, 2012; Lief et al, 2012) and how these tensions may influence professional choices, such as scientists deciding to engage in research on teaching and learning.

In this interactive panel session, the four scientists will reflect on their climb, identifying the "inhibitors" that had to be overcome and the catalysts that aided them in reaching new heights in SoTL. Through shared reflection, the panelists and audience will identify recommendations to achieve the aspirations of scientists valuing SoTL, using evidence-based practices in their teaching and conducting SoTL research within their individual institutional contexts.

Panelists will share briefly their career pathways, using personal timelines to identify career transitions and focus on teaching/learning research. The audience will construct similar personal timelines related to their careers, with interactive share-out of important milestones (e.g. years engaged in any kind of research, years involved with teaching/learning research). Panelists will share personal examples of catalysts (aids) and inhibitors (barriers) to their inclusion of teaching/learning research as part of their professional identities. The audience will reflect on and report their own catalysts and inhibitors as part of their developing identities. Together, the panelists and participants will engage in thoughtful discussion (through think-pair-share activities) to make recommendations for what we can do to achieve our aspirations. The action plans will focus on what individuals can do, what departments can do and what institutions can do to support scaling these aspirational peaks.

### **Staying flexible in SoTL Research: Participatory Action Research (PAR) Yoga Poses** Glen 203 **Lorraine Venturato, Heather Moquin**

While some research approaches are shaped by control and consistency, others, like participatory action research (PAR) approaches, are shaped by flexibility and responsiveness. Projects subscribing to a participatory action research (PAR) methodology-where inquiry is collective and shaped by the experience of participants- hold collaboration at the heart of the process. The cyclical and developmental nature of PAR inevitably means involvement in a diverse and shifting range of relationships, conversations and directions. Novice researchers, in particular, often struggle with the need to be flexible in response to change. This workshop will address some of these struggles and offer strategies for maintaining flexibility in the face of research that just doesn't go to plan. Based on a project utilizing a PAR methodology to develop a positive placement experience in residential aged care for undergraduate nursing students, this workshop considers the various pressure points for change within the project and our responses to them using yoga poses as metaphors for the flexibility that is often required in various types of research. Like yoga, research may be considered a practice and, with intention not to minimize serious yoga disciplines, we will link various yoga poses to research issues in order to play with the concept of flexibility and adaptability in research. No actual yoga poses will be harmed in the undertaking of this workshop (yoga pants not required). Linking various poses to research issues, this session will first outline our research and some of the issues and challenges we have encountered in our SoTL exploration. With a research focus alongside the primary priority of scholarship of teaching and learning within a non-traditional academic setting, complex flexibility has been required within the collaborative endeavour. We will consider how the researcher must be prepared to release control and trust the process while remaining open to diverse and shifting priorities and engaging collaboratively to

rejig and refocus as the research moves forward. We will use different yoga poses for discussion of research touchpoints that triggered the need to be flexible and responsive. Participants will be invited to engage in contemplations of their own research as yoga practice and to explore strategies for being responsive in their research practice. Learning outcomes from this workshop include greater comfort and acceptance of research in real world SoTL contexts, and an appreciation of strategies for managing change and flexibility in research practice. Your facilitators for this workshop are both highly experienced researchers, with a wealth of experience in research that doesn't quite go to plan. Our yoga experience is somewhat more limited, although on a good day we can both manage to touch our toes.

**Critical Reflection on Organisational Practice at a UK University through Scholarship of Glen 209  
Teaching and Learning  
Rafe Hallett, Aysha Divan, Paul Taylor, Andrea Jackson**

This panel will provide an institutional portrait of the scholarship of learning and teaching (SoTL) in a research-intensive UK university. Drawing on Russ Vince's framework for 'Organising Reflective Practice' (2010), we will explore how SoTL can provide a language for critical reflection at institutional level, including 'Organising Reflection', 'Public Reflection' and 'Productive Reflection'. The panel members will share and discuss strategies undertaken at institutional level to promote SoTL, nurture and grow teaching and scholarship activity, both internally and externally and to evidence its impact. We will reflect on the lessons learnt, and the ongoing challenges, our aspirations and anxieties as we map the trajectory and future of the institution.

In 2015, the University of Leeds established the Leeds Institute for Teaching Excellence (LITE). This was a significant point of transition for the institution, signalling its commitment to support innovative and evidence-based pedagogical practice and nurture scholarship in student education. This initiative is set against a backdrop of rapid changes in the UK Higher Education sector; reduced resourcing leading to the consolidation of academic Centres for Excellence of Teaching and Learning (CETLs), reconfiguration of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF, Department for Education, 2017). The latter a UK government policy to drive up standards in teaching is controversial, the metrics are still being defined and the scheme is under pilot. Under the glare of TEF, we probe how SoTL can provide a common vocabulary across the institution as we reflect critically on our practice and evidence the impact of our work. As part of our session, we will invite other institutions to reveal their own models of institutional teaching scholarship practice, and open ourselves to possible project partnerships and affiliations.

'Organising Reflection: the Leeds Institute for Teaching Excellence (LITE) - Rafe Hallett will showcase and interrogate the structure of support offered by the University, presenting a 'taxonomy' of the scholarship groups, projects and fellowships supported by LITE and other units within the institution. In particular, we will explain the network of teaching innovation centres that exist under the umbrella of LITE, explaining the model of 'affiliation' that allows this, and describe our investment in secondments of staff to allow time as well as funding, for scholarship. This will be presented critically, examining the challenges of maintaining these communities internally and exploring the added - and crucial - dimension of creating external-facing links with other national and international centres.

'Public Reflection: the role of writing groups in collaborative SoTL activity' - Aysha Divan will reflect on how LITE is acting as a vehicle for bringing together individuals across the institution to promote dialogue and foster collaboration, thus supporting public reflection. Current structures include interdisciplinary thematic groups focusing on topics of pedagogical interest such as research methods, employability, student support and assessment and feedback as well as groups formed around discipline-based learning and teaching. The panel will discuss how such groups can be cultivated to form reading and writing groups akin to the International Collaborative Writing Groups (ICWG) that crystallise around ISSOTL conferences (Marquis et al., 2016). A number of dimensions will be explored to include; mobilising communities of practice (Wenger et al., 2002), promoting public discourse and developing collaborative reading and writing models at institutional level.

'Productive Reflection: the impact of undergraduate research' by Paul Taylor: Productive reflection in our context encourages us to see all the participants in our University as potentially productive agents and to seek to understand their impact on the world beyond their institution. In the UK research staff (faculty) are now well versed in the importance of demonstrating the 'impact' of their work, through the Research Excellence Framework (REF). Leeds has been at the forefront of the move to position undergraduates as productive researchers, through the introduction of the Final Year Project for *all* students and engagement with opportunities to disseminate

undergraduate research, such as the British and International Conferences of Undergraduate Research (BCUR & ICUR). While existing research demonstrates the educational benefits of these initiatives, we need, not least in the context of TEF, to understand how undergraduate research and researchers have impact on others. We will share ideas on tools for achieving this impact analysis for debate at the Panel.

'Supporting individuals in a reflective organisation' - Andrea Jackson will reflect on the successes and challenges of developing the LITE Mentoring Scheme, a bespoke student-education focused mentoring programme. It provides support in areas including (i) mentoring for those who want to pursue more formal teaching scholarship and pedagogy, moving beyond practice-sharing and report writing to more rigorous research, dissemination and publication routes, (ii) mentoring for those who are seeking career development through student education at Leeds, including how to explore external, national and international scholarship networks and (iii) mentoring for those who are progressing with curriculum design and student education project delivery including significant and innovative developments. The scheme draws upon the Institute's community of National Teaching Fellows (NTFs), University Student Education Fellows (USEFs) and project leaders to provide a valuable resource in supporting the growing Leeds student education community.

### **5:30pm End of Friday programming**

See page 17 for the ISSOTL Committees and Interest Groups meeting at this time.

### **Enjoy dinner on your own!**

See the "Dining within Walking Distance of the Telus Convention Centre" handout at the Registration Desk and in the Conference Commons.

## **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14**

### **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 6:45-8:00**

#### **Breakfast in Exhibition Hall E**

### **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 8:00-9:30**

#### **Reaching for the Scholarly Heights: Publishing Special Issues of SoTL Journals** **Milt Cox, Gregg Wentzell**

**Glen 205**

This panel will explore and involve participants in aspects surrounding the special issue of a SoTL journal. The editor-in-chief and managing editor of two SoTL journals will lead a discussion to learn what other journals are doing, are contemplating, and have experienced with respect to special issues. The presenting editors will provide their processes and outcomes. Here is a list of topics that the panelists will discuss, and they will provide examples from their experiences:1) What types of special issues can occur?2) What special issue topics have been published by each of the journals represented on this panel and by others in the session?3) How and by whom are the topics proposed?4) Do topics of a special issue arise from the topics of articles already selected for publication in a regular issue, or do they come from "outside" requests for a special issue topic.5) Is there a call for special issues, and if so, how is that framed?6) Does the proposer of a special issue become the guest editor?7) How are editorial boards involved (or others) in special issues?8) In the case of multiple topics suggested for a special issue, what decision process is used to select the topic or multiple topics?9) Have some special topics involved two issues and why?10) Are guest editors selected for special issues? If so, what is their role?11) What challenges can arise when a guest editor is involved, and how does the regular editor resolve these?12) How are reviewers selected for a special