9-2019

# CeTEAL News, September/October 2019

CeTEAL, Coastal Carolina University

COASTAL CAROLINA UNIVERSITY®

# CeTEAL News

Center for Teaching Excellence to Advance Learning

Classroom Research Issue — September/October 2019



## Classroom Research: Reflections on a Signature Pedagogy Experience

*Rhonda Miller, assistant professor; foundations, curriculum and instruction; Spadoni College of Education*

As a new professor, you have all these grand ideas. You're going to do lots of research, you're going to change the world with your teaching, and you are going to serve on committees and go out to lunch with your colleagues! Then, as the first year begins, you realize that you cannot get it all done. That first year, you spend a lot of time learning how the college and the university works, and how you fit in. You also learn how to manage your teaching schedule as a full-time instructor. "That's OK," you say, "I can start that research agenda in my second year." But in that second year, you are given more responsibilities which occupy more chunks of your time. You may not start that research agenda in your second year, either. This has been my experience as an early career assistant professor in a teacher preparation program where the expectation for research is real, but the preparation of teachers is the focus. It is not easy to do research in a teaching-focused institution, but it is not impossible.

In the spring of 2019, I was given the opportunity to research my own teaching through the Signature Pedagogy grant offered through CeTEAL. I heard my colleagues talk about researching their own teaching, and writing and publishing the results. The advantage, they said, was efficiency. You are already doing the teaching, so why not look at how well that teaching works or test out a new instructional strategy and collect data on its effectiveness? Work smarter, not harder. So, I embraced this philosophy as I took on this research project, but efficiency was not the only advantage I discovered.

**Keeping current with the literature**

I don't know about you, but for me, keeping up with the research in my field is hard to do when you are focused on teaching. How can we teach responsibly without knowledge of the research about the content we teach? I have personally

*Continued on Page 11.*

CeTEAL
Center for Teaching Excellence to Advance Learning
COASTAL CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

# Professional Development Opportunities

Faculty/Staff Discussion Series

## Grassroots Governance: Understanding and Meeting Our Challenges Together

"The Completion Agenda" is a special introduction to what will be an ongoing discussion series for faculty. This new series, "Grassroots Governance: Understanding and Meeting Our Challenges Together," will give faculty and staff members an overview of issues, topics and challenges in higher education, with the goal of building knowledge so that faculty members can participate effectively in governance around these issues. Look for grassroots governance discussions as we progress through the academic year.

### The Completion Agenda

Discussions about retention, student persistence, graduation rates and student success are ubiquitous in higher education, comprising a significant portion of the agenda at conferences and in trade publications. In recent years, these issues have garnered widespread attention from major daily newspapers, news magazines, and politicians at the state and national levels. At the local level, campus conversations tend to center on retention in the narrowest sense, sometimes to the exclusion of the broader goal—successfully moving students toward degree completion. This session will focus our attention on student success and completion, with the goals of driving a meaningful conversation about student persistence and completion, and empowering faculty to action.

Topics covered during the session will include:

- Understanding local trends: How do we calculate retention and graduation statistics?
- National trends in student completion.
- The practical impact of student persistence.
- Best practices in student persistence and completion.
- What/how faculty members can contribute to the completion agenda.

The Completion Agenda is scheduled for:

- **The Completion Agenda for CCU Staff**
  Thursday, Sept. 19, noon to 5 p.m.
- **The Completion Agenda for CCU Staff**
  Thursday, Sept. 26, noon to 5 p.m.
- **The Completion Agenda for CCU Faculty**
  Saturday, Oct. 12, 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
- **The Completion Agenda for CCU Faculty**
  Monday, Nov. 25, 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Lunch will be provided. Watch your email for additional information on this new series.

**Register for sessions at coastal.edu/ceteal.**

# From The Director

*Jenn Shinaberger, M.S.Ed., MPIA*

*In 1990, Ernest Boyer published a report with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This foundational work—Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate—argued that we should consider the endeavors of faculty beyond the scholarship of discovery—research in one's discipline—to include the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of teaching. Boyer emphasized the need to go beyond the traditional notion of research to encompass the true work of the professoriate.*

*In this issue of CeTEAL News, several faculty consider their teaching from the point of view of a reflective practitioner or scholarly teacher. Reflective practitioners critically examine their own practice of teaching, and use what they learn to improve their teaching and their students' learning. Scholarly teachers consult with colleagues, engage in professional development, and research and apply literature from disciplinary sources.*

*Faculty members who engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) take the practice of scholarly teaching one step further. They add the rigor of a research process to the scholarly inquiry into their teaching, and then put the work out for community review and comment at conferences, in journals and through other outlets.*

*CeTEAL supports faculty participation in SOTL activities through our writing circles, individual consultations, and other opportunities to engage with faculty across campus. As Rhonda Miller mentions in her article "Classroom Research: Reflections on a Signature Pedagogy Experience," working with a group of diverse faculty in a professional learning community can provide beneficial feedback for SOTL research. If you are interested in engaging in classroom research in your own classes, please contact CeTEAL.*

*-Jenn*

*Boyer. E.L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.*

# Classroom Research

## Research in the Classroom: Revising Pedagogy

*Nicholas Schlereth, assistant professor, recreation and sport management*

In 2017, I published an article with CeTEAL focused on assessing group performance and conducting research on teaching practices. CeTEAL reached out requesting a follow-up on my previous article to expand on my thoughts surrounding classroom research. After spending two years in the classroom at Coastal Carolina University, I am continually challenged to ensure that I'm striving to be the best educator possible for my students. This article will elaborate on my previous article and provide innovative methods to enhance pedagogy and scholarship through our work in the classroom.

**Classroom Dynamics**

Coastal Carolina University is a vibrant university with an intriguing and challenging student population. The demographical make-up of the University consists of students from all walks of life, especially from multiple areas of the country. During the first week of class, I enjoy asking the question "Where are you from?" Usually, more students are from out-of-state as opposed to South Carolina. It forces me as a faculty member to understand cultural norms and expectations that may be different from what I'm used to from my personal education. As a sport management faculty member, it also means that I have to prepare my New England Patriots and Tom Brady one-liners to engage with my students.

The student population can be challenging for some of the same reasons I previously discussed, but one of the things that makes Coastal unique is the students who are the first from their family to attend college. While we as faculty at times may think "students just need to get with the system," we are often quick to forget that almost all of us spent at least five to six years in college. Most spent seven to 12 years in higher education, having been institutionalized to the cultural norms and expectations of college. The cultural difference can be a challenge, but it can also be the catalyst for innovation in our pedagogical practices.

**Classroom Research**

My prior article with CeTEAL explored my approach to better understand how to optimize groups in the classroom. Group work for students is like kryptonite for Superman, it appears to block their powers to be highly functional students. I wanted to explore how faculty could work to optimize groups so it was a great experience for students and faculty who have to address student concerns that arise from flawed groups. I sought to explore group optimization through various means, like letting students pick their groups vs. faculty organized groups, or choosing a group leader vs. students selecting their own group leader.

I did not conduct formal research, but have witnessed groups over the past two years in all my courses and used the valuable data to shape how I've adjusted my pedagogy to effectively integrate groups into the classroom. Each class presents a new sample from the CCU student population; it is difficult to do a formalized research study that has the generalizability to be published in peer-reviewed journals. As a tenure-track faculty member, publication is critical to my livelihood, and I'm often reluctant to engage in a project if it doesn't have publication potential. However, just because it doesn't have publication potential, I still highly crave the data to enhance my pedagogy.

The primary takeaway from my two years of qualitative data collection around student groups is students want structure to be provided, often lacking the ability to think abstractly and critically think about how to form a group. I have found students to be transactional in nature, reluctant to make mistakes, and want to be told how to get from point A to B. Essentially, they want a roadmap to success. I do not provide a roadmap, I provide guardrails.

In the event management course in the recreation and sport management (RSM) program, students are required to take an event and fully execute it from conceptualization to completion. The class is an upper-level course and is capstone in nature, requiring students to use the skills gained through the prior major courses, a point I reiterate to the students multiple times in the course. The students at the end of the course often tell me, "I wish I knew the things I know now at the beginning of the course." I respond, "That's why you take the course." They also say, "I wish you gave use a step-by-step guide to put on the event." My response to them is "You wouldn't have learned anything if I told you how to do everything." My goal in the course is to prepare them for the industry where often they must problem-solve to successfully execute an event or activity. I've had multiple students return to me and say, "Your class came in handy when I was responsible for doing an event with my organization. I had something happen, and I was able to fix it without anybody knowing."

**Groupwork 2.0**

After two years and vibrant discussions with my students, I've decided to implement a new system for dealing with groups. In my event management course, I'm adopting a collaborative approach with my students and their groups. I've laid out a new grading system to hold students accountable in their groups to minimize "social loafing." Half of the total points for the event are gained through their work leading up to the event in the class. The groups will be responsible for setting their own group timeline/schedule for the event, with gradable aspects that must be achieved leading up to the event. The group's timeline/schedule must be approved by me to ensure all elements are included to make them successful.

I'm also making them sign an "employment contract" with specific mutually agreeable duties between themselves and their group leader. The literature shows students do not want to let their peers down, so having them agree on work expectations among themselves has the potential to be successful. The act of signing a contract to their peers and myself also invokes a sense of responsibility beyond what is expected of a student in a classroom. I try to replicate the "real world" in my classroom for my students. I do not have the resources to compensate my students as I would if they were my employees, so I rely on the use of grades as a form of compensation to bring the class into the "real world." I'm excited to implement the new model in my course this semester as it has come from two years of data collection and feedback.

*Continued on Page 11.*

# Classroom Research

## A Year of Specifications Grading in Philosophy

*Dennis Earl, chair/professor, philosophy and religious studies, Edwards College of Humanities and Fine Arts*

Just over a year ago, I decided to change my grading scheme from a points-based scheme to a system called specifications grading. This article follows up on my item in this newsletter from last year (Earl, 2018), with the major difference being that I can now speak from some experience at using the system. I'll give the central features of the grading scheme, my reasons for making the change, some results from the year, how students perceive being graded this way, and my own lessons by way of advice to others.

Specifications grading has two central features:

1. Assignments (papers, tests) have specifications or detailed criteria for satisfactory performance, with the standard set fairly high (usually at the B-level or higher).
2. Students get a number of second chances to revise and resubmit work that falls short of the specifications.

For final course grades, different combinations of S's for individual assignments yield A, B+, B,… grades for the course. I didn't invent the system. I learned of it from reading Linda Nilson's "Specifications Grading" (2015), and I invite anyone interested in this system to seek out that text and the references listed for my article last year (2018).[1]

Why grade on specifications rather than points? First, and following Nilson, in setting the standard fairly high, the scheme helps eliminate the low road of sliding by with partial credit. Students and teachers alike know that C- or D+ work isn't really acceptable. When it gets treated as such, the larger consequence is that students can graduate without the skills and knowledge they need. Second, partial credit fails to motivate much improvement. If a paper's organization counts for 10 points of the overall grade, hammering a poorly organized paper with 5/10 points in that area gives the student little incentive to improve. Third, numerical grades don't reflect performance very well (an 81 really reflects something significantly better than a 79?), and yet I think I can specify in qualitative terms what a satisfactory paper, logic proof or reading response would be. Finally, most every student benefits from opportunities to revise work that fell short. With directed revising ("Your intro needs a thesis statement," "Find and correct all run-on sentences and sentence fragments"), work to correct mistakes helps students learn to avoid making them the next time. This especially helps at-risk students and those who stumble early in a course, provided they're motivated to improve, and so perhaps there is some connection with retention here as well.

How does my own version of specifications grading work? I used this course grading scheme for PHIL 101 (Introduction to Philosophy):

### Grading for PHIL 101

| | Quizzes /in-class assignments | Tests (4) | Writing assignments (10 available) | Final exam (2 parts) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | ≥70% S | 4 S | 8 S | 2 S |
| B | ≥60% S | 3 S | 7 S | 1 S |
| C | ≥50% S | 3 S | 6 S | 1 S |
| D | ≥40% S | 2 S | 5 S | |

To make an A, a student has to get a satisfactory grade on at least 70 percent of the quizzes, all four of the tests, eight writing assignments, and both parts of the exam. Missing even one of those conditions drops the grade. (There were two routes to a '+' grade like a B+: Meet the conditions for a B, and then have either 70 percent S on the quizzes or S's on both parts of the final.)

I used this scheme for PHIL 301 (Modern Philosophy):

### Grading for PHIL 301

| | Quizzes/ in-class assignments | Papers | | Tests | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Papers #1, #2, #3 | Paper #4 (2 drafts) | Tests #1 and #2 | Test #3/ Exam (2 parts) |
| A | ≥70% S | 3 S | 2 S | 2 S | 2 S |
| B | ≥60% S | 2 S | 2 S | 2 S | 1 S |
| C | ≥60% S | 2 S | 1 S | 2 S | |
| D | ≥50% S | 2 S | | 2 S | |

It might seem odd that there were fewer graded exercises than in PHIL 101. But students faced more difficult content, more challenging argumentative tasks for the papers, and a higher standard for an S on their work, too.

What about individual graded exercises? How did I grade those on an S/U scale? First, I lied earlier when I said I graded everything as satisfactory or not. I graded reading quizzes on points, and of six questions (typically), I counted 4/6 as an S. For multiple-choice tests, I somewhat arbitrarily set the threshold for an S at an 80. That maps onto a B grade, so that seems reasonable enough. So some graded exercises get points, but the grade got converted to an S or U.

*Continued on Page 5.*

# Classroom Research

## A Year of Specifications Grading in Philosophy

*Continued from Page 4.*

For papers in 300-level classes, I used my past grading rubrics to create a list of specifications for satisfactory performance. I then made a checklist where each of the following questions needs a 'yes' for the paper to receive an S:

Does the paper follow the general guidelines?

- ☐ Is the introduction effective, and does it include the right elements?
- ☐ (They say…) Is the exposition/summary material accurate?
- ☐ (I say…) Does the paper defend its thesis well?
- ☐ (One might object…/I reply…) Does the paper consider and reply to an objection effectively?
- ☐ Is the paper well-written and is the style clear?

These specify general criteria. Within each general criterion, I give 4-6 further questions to refine what a 'yes' answer means—i.e., what the more-refined specifications are for a good paper. For instance, the exposition category unpacks further like this:

- ☐ (They say…) Is the exposition/summary material accurate?
- ☐ Is all of the expository/summary material relevant to the paper's defense of its thesis?
- ☐ Is the thesis or theory being analyzed presented accurately and with enough detail?
- ☐ If an argument is being analyzed, is it presented accurately and with enough detail?
- ☐ Are definitions of relevant concepts given accurately and where appropriate?

Students get a copy of the complete checklist, and I use it to grade the papers and as part of the feedback. Writing assignments in PHIL 101 get evaluated with a shorter checklist and 100-level standards.

How then do the second chances work? For resubmissions, I set up some standards necessary for a satisfactory resubmission. For a test, 80 percent of the questions missed the first time have to be correct, and every missed question needs a commentary on why the original answer got selected and why the new answer is the right one. I also required a "metacommentary" on the student's study practices that led to the poor result, and what would get done to prepare better in the future. For a paper, the feedback would tell the student what to revise to get to an S. If the barrier to satisfactory performance was simply a matter of the writing quality, then I'd direct the student to revise simply for that. If it was a matter of the introduction lacking a thesis statement and there not being any documentation of sources, then I'd direct the revisions to just those two areas. Students could revise other things if they wanted. Usually, papers needed to address two to three areas, and very often one of those areas concerned significant argumentative content. Almost no one needed to make a complete start from scratch.

The other issue about second-chance opportunities concerns how many of them to allow. Nilson and others use the language of 'tokens.' Students get X number of tokens, each exchangeable for a resubmission (or for turning something in late—second-chances might be allowed for things other than revising and resubmitting). I had three tokens for the modern philosophy course and four for PHIL 101. I find the optimal number somewhat elusive. Too many risks students turning in lower-quality work ("I can always revise it"). Too few sets the overall course standard too high, and it fails to allow for enough improvement from past mistakes.

What of the results? How did the students do on this system? I'll comment from my side first, then report the students' perceptions. In PHIL 101, the written work struck me as far stronger. Students' first efforts tended to have better writing quality. They hit the assignment prompts better, and they had better arguments for what they had to say. In the upper-level courses, I was pleased with the final results too. However, one might not see it from a simple comparison of numerical and letter grades (from the past) with S/U grades (from this year). Numerical grades get skewed from the partial credit that grading on points entails. But on the whole, papers this year were written better, their summary material was more accurate and clear, and they showed a more earnest effort to defend their theses. This was especially true of resubmitted papers. Though one might offer revising opportunities on a points-based system, the kind of directed revising based on meeting specified criteria did make for many good papers in the end.

The students generally saw the specs grading system as better too. But in polling all of my classes this past year, I didn't put the question to them that directly. Instead, I asked two questions. On our specifications grading system,

- Do you think you wound up being motivated to work harder for the course or not (compared with a points-based system)?
- Do you think you learned more or not (compared with a points-based system)?

Students answered on a Likert scale of 'much more,' 'more,' 'about the same,' 'less,' and 'much less.' The results, with N=39 for PHIL 101 and N=33 for 300-level courses in aesthetics, symbolic logic, and modern philosophy:

| | **Motivation** | | **Perceived learning** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **101** | **300-level** | **101** | **300-level** |
| Much more | 21% | 21% | 23% | 9% |
| More | 41% | 33% | 33% | 39% |
| About the same | 33% | 30% | 33% | 39% |
| Less | 5% | 12% | 8% | 6% |
| Much less | 0% | 3% | 3% | 6% |
| | | | | |
| Much more or more | 62% | 55% | 56% | 48% |
| About the same | 33% | 30% | 33% | 39% |
| Less or much less | 5% | 15% | 10% | 12% |

I had hoped for a result like this. About a third of the students experienced no difference from a points-based system with respect to their motivation or their perceived learning. Some were less motivated and perceived they learned less. But far more students found themselves in the 'more' or 'much more' category for both

*Continued on Page 6.*

# Classroom Research

## A Year of Specifications Grading in Philosophy

*Continued from Page 5.*

motivation and perceived learning (about 50-60 percent). And if we combine some categories at the bottom of the table, we find that 85-95 percent of students thought they were at least as motivated and that they learned at least as much on a specs system as on a points-based one.

I also asked for written comments on specs vs. points-based grading. On the plus side, some students said they were motivated more because of the high standard: Making a C or less still doesn't "count" for anything, so you have to work harder, and in doing so, you learn more. Some said it was good to have the standard defined so precisely, for then they knew better what to strive for. Many said the resubmission tokens helped (who wouldn't?!) by letting them see what needed improvement and then, allowing them to revise to make it right. Some said the system took off some stress: The standard was high, but you didn't have to get everything exactly right, and with the resubmission option, it was ok to fail a few times.

On the minus side, some made remarks tied to there being no standard for an A on an individual assignment. Some said that motivated them less, for they only needed to produce "satisfactory" work instead of high-level excellence. And on the system I used, with an S set at the B or B+ level, piling up enough B's or B+'s entailed an A in the course. Other students said they were motivated less because they didn't feel they could get an S. If you figure you're getting a U anyway, there's less motivation and you wind up learning less. Some students expressed some confusion over the scheme as a whole, whether for the complexity of how many S's were needed for this or that grade, or for what might substitute for what, or for the extra deadlines for resubmissions after original papers got returned. Some wanted to be reminded more often about what's due when (especially for resubmissions). Finally, some students wanted a point-system's precision in telling them "how I'm doing" in the course. Some made a similar point for individual assignments. The coarseness of an S vs. U doesn't communicate the degree of goodness of one's work.

I can add a few negatives from my point of view, too. Specs grading can generate some complex logistics. This mirrors some student confusions above. Papers need deadlines. Resubmissions need deadlines. Resubmitted papers have to be compared to originals. It all has to be recorded and communicated to students. I always seemed to have grading on my to-do list, though the extent of it varied: Some assignments got a lot of resubmissions (like at the beginning), but others didn't (like near the end—students either learned how to get an S or they ran out of tokens). No matter how many there were, handling them added a layer of complexity for every resubmittable assignment. I couldn't linger on the grading either. Students need the feedback quickly, and the next deadline often would be right after a resubmission deadline. Was it "doable" from my end? Sure—despite having more individual grading tasks, grading with specifications and an S/U scale is far simpler than deciding about points and partial credit. But specs grading with resubmissions can be complex in other ways.

I knew I'd have logistics challenges. But what I found more important from the specs grading exercise involves student motivation. In my surveys, some students reported being less motivated or losing their motivation over time. I observed this in them too—that is, in at least some of them. It wasn't many students, as the surveys bear out. But I was hoping to reach more of that minority.

Two kinds of students fell into that group. One kind of student doesn't have the academic skills appropriate to the course (yet), but could develop them with the right work. The resubmission tokens help swimmingly here. If you're one of those students, you'll likely fall short the first time. But I'll tell you what to do to improve, and I'll target the feedback to your faults. Then you're supposed to go fix up your paper, and you'll improve as a result. But here's the negative: Some students in this category simply won't do it. They won't resubmit, even if they have tokens to use. True, a few students said in the surveys that they didn't think they could get an S, so that demotivated them. If we're talking about a resubmission needing significant revisions, that indeed might look like a lot to do. And admittedly, if a student also has personal issues, has to work 25 hours a week, gets sick, or has someone else's paper or test to do at the same time, then I can see not resubmitting something for my class. I also understand that if a student thinks he can't get an S from the start, he might indeed think it's futile to even try. This is a problem.

The other kind of student does have the academic skills appropriate to the course, but for whatever reason doesn't use them. Again, the resubmission tokens are supposed to help here. If you slack off, get ill, had to work, or had a soul-crushing midterm in someone else's class, resubmit my paper and you're good. The high standard of an S is supposed to help too. As some students said in the surveys, C-level work doesn't do you any good, so you have to make a good effort to get credit. But unfortunately, not every student did this. Some students I knew to have good writing skills, for instance, still didn't exercise them. This held a few times even for rewrites. The student had the skills, had the opportunity to revise and convert a paper to an S, and even when facing the course grade falling to a C or worse, still didn't resubmit. This is a problem.

I'll now give some lessons learned and some ways to meet some of the concerns. On the whole, grading on specifications is far better than grading on points. Yet no grading system is perfect. The trick is to minimize the negatives where possible. After my year's experiment, I see more clearly how to do that for a specs system.

On the "there's no real standard for an A" issue: On my system, piling up enough S's nets you an A, and for individual assignments like papers, it seems there's no A-level measure of excellence. This is really two concerns. First, it's true that on my system at present, it's the number of S's that matters to excellence, not how excellent the work is on each one. Nilson (2015, Ch. 3) distinguishes between schemes that reward jumping more hurdles as compared with schemes that reward jumping higher hurdles. My system is of the first kind. I think that's fine though, for consistently good performance is itself a sort of excellence. Also, and as Nilson cites as a general phenomenon, high-achieving students will still write excellent papers, even if the standard for an S might be at the B or B+ level. I found the same to be true, though admittedly at least one student behaved otherwise. If I wanted to go with a "higher hurdle" system for an A, I could just create an assignment where an S is at the A-level, and require that assignment for an A in the course.

For the second concern, it's true there's no 'A' assigned for any individual assignment. But one should remember that while simple letter grades communicate different degrees of goodness, there are other ways to do that. I use written feedback to do it. If I say, "Excellent paper—Your argument was compelling and the essay was

*Continued on Page 7.*

# Classroom Research

## A Year of Specifications Grading in Philosophy

*Continued from Page 6.*

exceptionally well written and well organized," that's different than "Good paper—You made a good case, but I think your argument might be improved by…" The lesson from the critique is to communicate that I'm giving this kind of feedback, and that's not much different than what students get on a points-based system where the instructor makes extensive comments too.

On the "I need more fine-grained feedback than an S or U" issue: I agree that an S or U seems pretty coarse-grained compared with letter grades and numbers. The former serve as code for 'excellent,' 'good,' 'average,' etc., and numbers seem precise. But here again, the written feedback explains more completely how good or bad a paper is. A letter grade just sums that up. I need to communicate better to everyone and give the finer-grained feedback the students rightly need.

On the "I like to know how I'm doing" issue: For worries about the overall course grade, it's true that my students can't look on Moodle and find a number reflecting "how they're doing" in some overall sense. That's indeed a disadvantage to specifications grading. Students need to get used to counting S's instead of looking for averages. If you're in my PHIL 101 and it's about halfway through the semester, and if you've made S's on the first two tests so far and on three of the five writing assignments, you're doing very well. But since you need eight S's on the writing assignments for an A, if you want an A, you'll need to do all of the remaining writing assignments. I mentioned above that one student thought I should remind students more often of the course grading scheme. I agree.

On the complexity issue: The lesson here is to simplify, simplify, simplify. If many students are going to wind up resubmitting tests and/or papers, I should have fewer of them. I like having lots of individual assignments, for that gives students more practice at the necessary skills. But I can still have that with fewer assignments, provided that students resubmit as needed. For in doing the second-chance revisions, they still practice the necessary skills for basic writing, summarizing, arguing, organizing a text, having something to say, and considering objections and replies. For revising a test, they still get to revisit the content in the sense of studying the material again. And for the grading workload on me, as a practical matter I have to keep that close to what I've organized my professional life around in the past. If you're an instructor teaching a lot of students or you have a lot of sections (lecturers, for instance), you must go with a simpler scheme if you convert to specifications grading.

Another 'simplification' lesson and recommendation: Where possible, simplify the grading for assignments. That means simplifying the papers checklist, simplifying what's needed for an S on homework, and simplifying what's needed for an S on other sundry assignments like what some instructors created for the hurricane closure. The simpler everything is, the easier it is for students to understand the grading, and the easier it is for me to manage that grading.

On the motivation issue: I'll likely find this the toughest problem to crack, though the general problem applies to points-based grading too. No matter what the grading system is, some students just won't do stuff, and that might happen for good reason or bad. But I learned two lessons unique to specifications grading. With the standard being higher, some students really will feel they can't get there, and they'll quit. I tried some "nudging" by email and in-person comments early in the semester, but I didn't follow up enough later in the semester. That's when some people quit. There's a category of student that's most at risk on a specs system, and that's the student at the C/D boundary. Maybe they're used to skating by with 68s and 72s all semester, when we all know that's far from satisfactory work, but on a points system they usually make their C. Without more effort to improve, those students all fail on a specifications system. I found, happily enough, that many students I was worried about rose to the occasion and got enough S's to get through. But not all of them did. The grading system on its own won't motivate everyone to work hard. The surveys bear that out, and that's a lesson anyone thinking of switching to a specs system needs to know. Fortunately, student motivation can be improved in other ways, and I need to revisit some of that literature. (Examples include Ch. 3 of Ambrose et al. 2010 and Ch. 7 of Barkley 2010.)

> "Specifications grading offers higher standards, clearer standards, simplicity in some respects, and second chances to revise work to improve."
>
> —Dennis Earl

To close, I doubt I'll ever go back to a points system. The good of specs grading far outweighs the negatives. Specifications grading offers higher standards, clearer standards, simplicity in some respects, and second chances to revise work to improve. On the whole, students say they're motivated more and that they learn more. The negatives are very real, but one can minimize them by simplifying the scheme where possible, communicating well with students about their performance (though perhaps in a different way than they're familiar with), and by paying close attention to students at risk of losing their motivation. Specifications grading might not fit with every instructor's taste. But I call on readers to be open-minded with respect to the case I've made here. Open-mindedness is a virtue, after all.

### Notes

[1]In characterizing the nature of specifications grading, Nilson also includes "bundling" of assignments to match up with course learning outcomes. I made some efforts in that direction, but I don't describe those here. As for further resources on specifications grading, since last year I can add Palmer (2018).

### References

Ambrose, S., Bridges, M., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M., & Norman, M. 2010. How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching. Jossey-Bass.

Barkley, E. 2010. Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty. Jossey-Bass.

Earl, D. 2018. To my students: I've failed you in the past, but I might fail you better in the future. CeTEAL Newsletter July/August 2018, pp. 5–7. Retrieved from https://www.coastal.edu/media/2015ccuwebsite/contentassets/documents/ceteal/cetealnewsletters/CeTEAL_Newsletter_July-August_2018-smaller.pdf

Nilson, L. 2015. Specifications grading: Restoring rigor, motivating students, and saving faculty time. Stylus.

Palmer, M. 2018. What happened to the E's? Conference presentation at Innovative Strategies to Advance Learning. Lilly Conference, Asheville, NC. Handout and Powerpoint slides retrieved from https://www.lillyconferences-nc.com/handouts.

# Tips, Tools and Resources to Support Student Success

## Tips for Effective Student Participation in Office Hours

Office hours give students the opportunity to ask questions about the course materials, seek extra help and/or follow up on the topics that are confusing or interesting to them. If you are looking for ways to encourage your students to come to your office hours and to use that time effectively, consider these tips:

1. Many students are nervous about talking to a professor or being an inconvenience. Consider sending a personal email invitation and/or using class time to invite students and talk about how they can benefit from office hours.
2. Consider requiring students to meet with you individually or as a group early in the semester, especially if you have a small class.
3. Include office hours on your syllabus, post your office hours on your door, post them on the course website and announce them in class.
4. Encourage students to make appointments with you if office hours are conflicting with students' other responsibilities such as other classes or employment.
5. Consider selecting times that might work for most of your students. It is best to consult with your students before deciding when you'll hold office hours and then schedule times that are convenient for them. At least two different weekdays would be ideal to hold your office hours. (Try the "Choice" tool in Moodle to conduct a brief one-question survey to find out the days/times that work best for most of your students.)
6. Move away everything that will interfere with dedicating this time to students. Have a chair ready. Turn away from your computer or phone if you don't need it. Put candies in a bowl on your desk. Keep your office door open during your office hours.
7. Post welcoming messages or funny cartoons on your office door. Humor can be an effective ice-breaker for students who feel anxious.
8. You might hold your office hours in a public place. Tell your students to bring their drink and/or lunch! Invite them for a walk and talk on campus!
9. For students whose time on campus is limited because of out-of-class responsibilities (e.g., family, work), consider arranging virtual office hours via Skype for Business. (CeTEAL offers a session on how to use Skype with your students.)
10. Finally, consider being an active listener during your meetings with students. Some active-listening techniques you can use are writing down notes, questions and important points of the discussion, and mapping the keywords. Referring to those in your next meeting can be impressive.

*Contributed by Elif Gokbel, instructional designer, CeTEAL.*

## Simplify and Clarify Your Online Courses

One way to retain students in your online classes is to remove barriers to student success. Online classes can be more challenging than on-campus classes for many students, especially those who are new to online learning or who are less skilled at self-management.

Here are some ideas for helping your students succeed:

1. **Let students know up front about any additional tools, technology and costs your course may require.** If students will need to purchase additional publisher programs or use specific technology tools outside of Moodle, let them know up front. Students may lack the resources needed for add-ons after the semester has started. A few dollars may not seem like much, but for students it may make the difference in being able to remain in class.
2. **Simplify your course navigation.** Make it easy for students to find course content and activities. Consider using Moodle books to organize information (assisted by an automatic table of contents). Consider keeping the current week/unit/module at the top of the course, and try to keep clicks and scrolling to a minimum. The better organized the course, the more likely students can find everything they need to succeed.
3. **Set up a simple, understandable gradebook at the beginning of the semester.** Students should know what their grades are throughout the course. By setting up your gradebook early, you can offer students a current/running course total grade based on everything that has been graded so far. If the grades in your course are unclear, students may decide to drop out rather than risk failure.
4. **Provide clear instructions.** Instructions should be easy to understand, and may bear repeating. Consider providing general instructions for course activities in the syllabus and then repeating or expanding them for individual activities as they occur in the course. For example: Have you provided general instructions for class discussions in your syllabus? Try posting those same general instructions at the top of each discussion prompt to remind students of your expectations.
5. **Respond to student emails or calls in a timely manner.** Even if the questions seem unnecessary—the answer is in the syllabus or the answer should be common sense—respond to the question. If you are receiving too many emails from students about your class, you may need to clarify the information or instructions you are providing. Most online students will look for the information in the course before contacting you.
6. **Provide grades and feedback as quickly as you reasonably can.** Make sure students know what your grading turnaround time will be generally, and give them a deadline for grading and feedback on larger projects. Do your best to meet these deadlines. Feedback is most helpful when it closely follows the work, and students don't mind waiting quite as much when they know your timeline.

*Contributed by CeTEAL staff.*

# Tips, Tools and Resources to Support Student Success

## Improve Your Students' Experiences through Universal Design in Education

*CeTEAL Staff*

The idea of universal design is not new. We have seen the growth of universal design in the physical space—wheelchair accessible restrooms, easy-to-open doors, sidewalk curb cuts, etc.—and we are currently having the conversation about making our digital resources accessible to users who require accommodations. In recent years, universal design has been thought of as a way to make the world more accessible to people with disabilities. But universal design in education (UDE) could be and should be so much more.

In the past, the world has been designed for the "average" person. But who actually fits that identity? "Average" does not take into account the wide diversity of human physicality, intelligence, emotionality, skill or ability. So how do we look beyond the average and work toward a more universal design? How do we make the learning environment—on campus and online—accessible to the greatest number of people?

First, we must stop seeing universal design as a chore. As teachers, we should want our students to have the best chance to learn the information we're offering. Will it take time? Yes. Will it be inconvenient sometimes? Yes. Should we do it anyway? Yes. Besides, we do not have to do it alone. CCU has resources to help. The Office of Accessibility and Disability Services will assist faculty with immediate student needs each semester; CeTEAL can help with longer term universal design of accessible classes; and the COOL office offers services such as closed captioning videos, designing Moodle course modules and learning how to use the Ally tool into Moodle to help make online content more accessible through multiple formats.

Second, we should realize that universal design is not something we should do only for students who specifically ask for accommodations. Not all students who need accommodation are comfortable asking. According to Sheryl Burstahler (2019) with the University of Washington, "UDE is proactive and benefits all students, including those who are not receiving disability-related accommodations…." UDE is not just for the physical characteristics of the classroom or for accessibility of online content. It can be applied to all the physical spaces and services students use on campus as well.

Finally, we need to educate ourselves about our students. We have a great diversity of students at this University, and we should get to know them and how best to help them learn. In one class, you might have 19-year-olds, senior citizens, parents, veterans, international students, non-gender conforming students, students with disabilities, students from different races, students of different sizes and shapes, students with different learning preferences, students with full-time jobs…and list goes on. Learning about your students may be as simple as asking a few survey questions about how they learn best, whether they have prior understanding of the subject matter you will cover, how/when/where they plan to study or work on class activities, other responsibilities, etc. Once you know more about your students, you can create a class that is more accommodating to a greater number of them. That is "more accommodating," not "easier." We want to remove barriers, not learning opportunities.

To learn more about how UDE can help your students, read Burrstahler's article, "Universal Design in Education: Principles and Applications." A link to the full article can be found in CeTEAL's Effective Teaching Resources guide: libguides.coastal.edu/ceteal/effectiveteaching on the "Links" tab of the "Universal Design" section.

*Burgstahler, S. (2019). Universal design in education: Principles and applications. Retrieved, August 26, 2019, from washington.edu/doit/programs/center-universal-design-education/resources-and-training.*

## Break the Ice and Get to Know Your Students

*Dianne Mark, professor; foundations, literacy and technology; Spadoni College of Education*

It is a good feeling for students to be recognized and known by teachers, whether they are in first grade, 12th grade or their second year in college. It is important to familiarize yourself with your students, either by knowing their names, their involvement in school clubs or their membership on an athletic team. At the beginning of each semester, besides taking time to go over the syllabus and assignments, I purposely find ways to get to know my students. I actually begin this process before the first day of class.

Once I get the list of students enrolled in my classes, I develop a spreadsheet with the following information: name, hometown, adviser, major, gender, status, phone number and email. I also practice pronouncing unfamiliar names. By the first day of class, I already know a lot about my students. This spreadsheet is something that benefits me, plus it makes for a great reference throughout the semester. I also may use this information for placing students in interactive groups.

During the first class, I use my initial icebreaker, "Commonalities and Uniqueness." In this activity, I begin by having students complete an index card asking the following questions: high school (city/state); favorite music; favorite television show; recent movie watched at the theater; purpose for taking my course; and three things that make them unique. Then, I divide the class into four to five groups of five to six students per group. Again, they identify three unique characteristics, but they cannot be the same characteristics as anyone in their group. This allows for a lot of conversation within the groups and a chance for them to become acquainted.

The second part of the icebreaker is for the group to identify three things that they have in common. Finally, they come up with a group name based on those commonalities. The entire activity takes about 45 minutes, which includes introducing each group by highlighting some of the group members' unique characteristics. I also take time to tell them about me and allow them to ask me questions.

A second icebreaker, which is given on the second day of class, builds upon the information from the first icebreaker. The icebreakers are one way to encourage team building and student interaction. Throughout the semester, I engage students in many group activities, and they are expected to address each other by name. As we all become more familiar and comfortable around each other, students tend to speak up more in class, ask questions, and come to class better prepared.

*This article was originally published in the July/August 2015 issue of CeTEAL News.*

# Faculty/Staff Wellness

## New Faculty Get Acquainted with CCU

*CeTEAL staff*

In August, CeTEAL hosted orientations for new full-time and part-time faculty joining our CCU community. New faculty had the opportunity to meet with representatives and offices from around campus, and to get to know their new colleagues.

If you see any of these smiling faces around campus in the upcoming weeks, be sure to welcome them!

*New faculty orientation group pictured above. Teaching associate orientation group pictured on the left.*

# Faculty/Staff Wellness

### Classroom Research: Reflections on a Signature Pedagogy Experience

*Continued from Page 1.*

struggled with making time to read peer-reviewed research and with deciding what literature to focus on. Should I read all the articles in a certain journal or two? Should I focus on a certain research topic across different publications? How many articles should I read a week? A semester? When planning a research study, you have to delve into the literature, and the topic that you choose to research leads you on a focused path through the literature. During my study, I gained additional background knowledge on a new teaching method that has the potential to be used across the different classes that I teach.

**Thinking about your pedagogy**

The study of one's own teaching practices provides insight into the way students learn which, in turn, leads to changes in instructional practices to maximize learning. My participation in the signature pedagogy project compelled me to examine teaching methods that are "signature pedagogies" in my specific discipline, special education. I was able to focus on very specific teaching methods and collect data on their effectiveness in real time. I was able to analyze the data and reflect on what was working and what aspects needed to be tweaked. The study participants also provided me with feedback on their perceptions of the strategy's effectiveness and ease of use. Without the research project, this probably would not have occurred.

**Collaborating across disciplines**

As a participant in the signature pedagogy project, I was part of a professional learning community (PLC). Each PLC was composed of instructors from other disciplines and even other colleges within the University. We met periodically to discuss our ideas and processes about our individual studies (e.g. study designs, research questions). Working with a multidisciplinary group of colleagues provided me with valuable feedback from diverse viewpoints which was very beneficial. Ideas from colleagues in other disciplines sparked questions and ideas about similar topics, but in different ways. Also, as you work with scholars in other disciplines, you cannot hide behind the jargon. You are forced to think, speak, and write in a way that is comprehensible for scholars in other disciplines to be able to understand.

**Researching to inform your teaching**

Another advantage of studying your own teaching is learning how your research informs your practice. Through the signature pedagogy project, I focused on a specific type of information delivery system (i.e. a multimedia presentation) paired with classroom observation, instructional coaching and feedback. By analyzing my data, observing preservice teachers practice in real time in the field, and reflecting on participant feedback, I was able to determine improvements that should be made to the delivery system for future use. I discovered that participants had misconceptions about what they had learned. As a result of this study, my department is discussing how the multimedia presentation strategy I employed can be improved and used as a "regular instructional tool" in classes for different topics in teacher education.

In summary, scholarship is an important part of a professor's job. It is time-consuming and made more challenging when one works in a teaching-focused institution. Classroom research can provide important insights into the way students learn and the effectiveness of one's own teaching practices. Researching classroom practices can be an efficient way to meet your college's requirements of teaching, scholarship, and learning while keeping you current in the literature and refining your instructional practices.

### Research in the Classroom: Revision

*Continued from Page 3.*

**Tips for Research in the Classroom**

As I noted earlier, I'm a tenure-track faculty member, and working on projects that lead to publication is a prerequisite for me when conducting research. While I know all scholarship has merit and value, if it isn't published then it has lower value to me. After I earn tenure, then I will be open to taking greater risk with my scholarship projects. I'm speaking from direct experience where research I conducted on my courses and pedagogy took a significant amount of time but was rejected from two journals for "narrow scope." I cannot afford to spend six months on a project without published artifacts.

As the son of two educators, I've seen the value of data driven educational practices to lead our students along their educational journey. Each university presents its own unique paradigm that must be individually explored to best educate our students. Established best practices from peer-reviewed journals are good theoretical starting points for examination, but we must develop our own insight specific to Coastal.

As faculty, we can play a vital role in the development of solutions to advance the student educational experience at Coastal. A culture can be established that rewards institutional research on pedagogical techniques that may not result in a peer-reviewed publication. As faculty, we can work in a collaborative manner advancing our pedagogy to better educate our students.

## Kimbel Library and CeTEAL Support Faculty Research

*CeTEAL Staff*

Kimbel Library has joined with CeTEAL to expand professional development opportunities for faculty engaged in research and scholarship activities. This fall, librarians will visit CeTEAL's Writing Circle to provide participants with information on how to select a journal and avoid predatory journals.

In addition, the librarians are developing the following new sessions to offer through CeTEAL:

**Fall 2019** (now available for registration)

- Citation Management Tools: Mendeley and Zotero
- Researcher Identification: Developing Your Online Persona
- Where (and Where Not) to Publish

**Spring 2020**

- Authors' Rights
- Building Your Scholarly Presence

**Fall 2020**

- Copyright

As part of the expanding scholarship and research options, CeTEAL is increasing its research technology-based offerings with the following sessions beginning this semester:

- Introduction to SPSS: The Basics
- An Overview of Popular SPSS Tests
- Bring Your Own Data for Cleaning
- Microsoft OneNote to Boost Scholarly Productivity and Research Organization

**Register for sessions at coastal.edu/ceteal.**

# Resources & Tips

*In each newsletter, CeTEAL includes a page of resources and tips. If you have teaching tips, technologies or ideas you would like to share with fellow faculty, please email them to cetealnews@coastal.edu.*

## Peak Hurricane Season is Here

Peak hurricane season falls in September and October, and CeTEAL encourages you to create a contingency instruction plan for your classes before it's too late. To learn more about how to prepare your class to weather a storm, register for a session through CeTEAL or visit our contingency instruction resources site: **libguides.coastal.edu/contingency.** The site includes a contingency instruction checklist and an alternate activity reporting form.

## Using Adobe Acrobat for Accessibility

Is Ally displaying the dreaded red meter showing low accessibility ratings for your PDF documents in Moodle? Adobe Acrobat has a built in accessibility report generator that can help you ensure your PDFs are accessible before you upload them into your classes. The accessibility checker can be accessed via the "Tools" tab in Adobe Acrobat.

To use the "Accessibility" tool:

1. Open a document in Adobe Acrobat.
2. Click the "Tools" tab at the top of the screen.
3. Locate the "Accessibility" tool under "Protect & Standardize."
4. To run a check on your document, click the "Full Check" option in the menu to the right of your document. The program will generate an HTML report that includes a full check of your document and highlights areas that need improvement.

You can correct problems such as missing alt text/tags, adjust other accessibility concerns and tie the report to the PDF to validate its level of accessibility.

If you have questions regarding the accessibility checker in Adobe Acrobat, contact:

**George Warriner**, ghwarrin@coastal.edu, 843-349-2383 or
**Jean Bennett**, jbennet1@coastal.edu, 843-349-2481

## ITS Announces the Availability of Microsoft Teams

Do you want to use a great project management application that allows you to have live web conferencing, document collaboration, cloud storage, and chat functions all at the same time, in the same program? If you do, Microsoft Teams is the program for you. You can set up a class team and use that setup to:

- Provide students with collaborative space for group work via a OneNote Class Notebook.
- Monitor student progress through the planner tool for organizing tasks.
- Manage a shared class file repository.

Teams can also be used to manage research projects and other scholarly activities by collecting and managing related documents, engaging in chats and web conferences with colleagues, and tracking research tasks through a shared planner.

ITS recently released Microsoft Teams for use by CCU faculty and staff, and CeTEAL is ready to help you use it. If you would like to learn more about Microsoft Teams, register for a session through CeTEAL or contact:

**Matthew Tyler**, mctyler@coastal.edu, 843-349-2951 or

**George Warriner**, ghwarrin@coastal.edu, 843-349-2383

## Sharing Information with Colleagues

CeTEAL News was designed to help faculty share information with colleagues. We encourage faculty to write articles about current research, teaching or service activities, and we welcome tips, tricks and strategies for success. If you have information you would like to share with your colleagues, please contact Tracy Gaskin at tgaskin@coastal.edu.

We accept articles or resources at any time, and generally publish them in the next available issue. We welcome your input!

## Looking for Effective Teaching Ideas?

Visit CeTEAL's effective teaching resource site: libguides.coastal.edu/ceteal/effectiveteaching.

## CeTEAL Guides for Faculty

**New Faculty**
The New Faculty Resources guide is designed to help faculty get to know CCU and review basic information on getting started teaching at the University. To access the guide, go to libguides.coastal.edu/newfaculty.

**Effective Teaching**
The Effective Teaching Resources guide contains a collection of faculty/staff articles, and links to useful books, articles and websites related to effective teaching practices. To access the guide, go to libguides.coastal.edu/

**Contingency Instruction**
The Contingency Instruction Resources guide can help faculty develop a plan for continuity of instruction for times when classes cannot meet on campus. To access the guide, go to libguides.coastal.edu/contingency.

**Contributing Information**
We are always looking for information to share with faculty, and you are our best resource. If you would like to contribute to any of CeTEAL's guides for faculty, please contact Tracy Gaskin at 843-349-2790 or tgaskin@coastal.edu.


# CeTEAL Faculty Development Schedule

**To see our complete schedule, visit coastal.edu/ceteal.**

## Special Topics

The Completion Agenda for Staff (5-hour)
Sept. 26, noon to 5 p.m.

The Completion Agenda for Faculty (5-hour)
Oct. 12, 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Nov. 25, 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

## Scholarship/Research

An Overview of Popular SPSS Tests - **NEW!**
Sept 26, 12:15 p.m.
Oct. 10, 12:15 p.m.
Oct. 22, 12:15 p.m.

Bring Your Own Data for Cleaning: SPSS - **NEW!**
Sept. 27, 10 a.m.
Oct. 15, 12:15 p.m.

Microsoft OneNote to Boost Scholarly Productivity and Research Organization
Sept. 30, 10 a.m.
Oct. 22, 10:50 a.m.

Introduction to SPSS: The Basics
Oct. 7, 11 a.m.
Oct. 21, 11 a.m.

Using Depose for Analyzing Quantitative and Mixed Methods Data: The Basics
Oct. 17, 1:40 p.m.
Oct. 31, 10:10 a.m.

Researcher Identification: Developing Your Online Persona - **NEW!**
Oct. 25, 11 a.m.

Where (and Where Not) to Publish - **NEW!**
Nov. 11, 11 a.m.

## Leadership/Service

Leading Students Abroad: Developing a Faculty-led Program Proposal (Session 1 of 2-part series)
Sept. 30, noon

Leading Students Abroad: Developing a Faculty-led Program Proposal (Session 2 of 2-part series)
Oct. 2, noon

## Accessibility

Integration of Accessible Assignments and Activities into Your Online, Hybrid and Flex Classes
Oct. 9, 12:30 p.m.
Nov. 13, 11 a.m.
Nov. 26, 12:30 p.m.

Integration of Open Educational Resources (OERs) into Your Online, Hybrid and Traditional Classes
Sept. 26, 10 a.m.
Oct. 16, 11 a.m.
Nov. 14, 9:25 a.m.

## Technology

Office365: Introduction to Microsoft Teams
Sept. 20, 2 p.m.
Sept. 23, 10 a.m.

3-in-30 Infographics
Sept. 25, noon

Getting Started with Moodle - Tier 1
Oct. 10, 2 p.m.
Oct. 24, 11 a.m.
Nov. 7, 2:30 p.m.

Advanced Moodle Training - Tier 2
Sept. 26, 1:40 p.m.
Oct. 15, 9:25 a.m.
Oct. 31, 1:40 p.m.
Nov. 12, 10 a.m.

Ally Digital Accessibility Tool - Let's Get Started!
Oct. 17, 10 a.m.
Nov. 18, 11 a.m.

Echo360 Basics
Oct. 23, 11 a.m.
Nov. 15, 11 a.m.

Podcasting: Creating Audio learning Object for Your Course
Sept. 20, 1 p.m.

3-in-30 Formative Assessment Tools
Sept. 24, 12:15 p.m.

Adobe CC: Premiere Pro Basics - **NEW!**
Sept. 27, noon

## Webinars

Strategies for Reducing Cheating and Plagiarism (Live Webinar)
Oct. 25, 2 p.m.

Managing Your References: Mendeley (Live Webinar)
Oct. 30, 11 a.m.

## Effective Teaching

Using the SIFT Method to Evaluate Online Information
Sept. 20, 11 a.m.

Large Classes: Challenges and Opportunities)
Sept. 20, noon

Teaching Students to Reflect
Sept. 23, 11 a.m.

Strategies for Increasing Student Engagement in STEM Classrooms
Sept. 23, noon
Oct. 9, 11 a.m.
Oct. 28, 11 a.m.

Creating Effective Mini-Lectures to Promote Active Learning
Sept. 23, 1 p.m.

Active Learning Strategies to Use in < 10 Minutes
Sept. 24, 9:25 a.m.

Designing a Three-Part Lesson for Problem-Based Learning
Sept. 20, noon

## Assessment Institute

Assessment Institute: Overview of Assessment
Oct. 16, 1 p.m.

Assessment Institute: Course Map and Assessment Audit
Oct. 23, 1 p.m.

Assessment Institute: Designing an Assessment Plan
Oct. 30, 1 p.m.

Assessment Institute: Connecting Courses to Program Goals through a Curriculum Map
Nov. 13, 1 p.m.

Assessment Institute: Analyzing and Reporting Assessment Results
Nov. 20, 1 p.m.

## Individual Consultations

CeTEAL offers individual consultations for faculty and staff. If you have questions about teaching, instructional design, research, scholarship, instructional technology, classroom observations, etc., contact ceteal@coastal.edu.

# CeTEAL Services and Resources

## Professional Development Sessions

CeTEAL offers professional development sessions in the following areas: effective teaching; assessment and evaluation; scholarship and research; leadership and service; and instructional technology. In addition to the sessions offered by CeTEAL staff, we host sessions led by individuals and offices across campus on topics such as student advising, study abroad, course and program development, online learning, and more. For more information, contact Tracy Gaskin.

## Classroom Observations

CeTEAL trains and coordinates a cadre of instructional coaches who are available to provide classroom observations and recommendations for faculty who request them. The process is confidential and strength-based. To request an observation, contact Jenn Shinaberger.

## Professional Development and Consults for Departments

CeTEAL is available to work with individual departments to arrange professional development opportunities tailored to the department's needs. In addition, we can assist with assessment planning, curriculum mapping, scholarship of teaching and learning, and training for departmental classroom observation processes. To request any of these services, contact Jenn Shinaberger or Tracy Gaskin.

## Individual Consultations

CeTEAL staff are available for individual consultations on a variety of topics, including instructional design for in-class and online courses, using technology for teaching, effective teaching techniques, promotion and tenure activities, research and scholarship activities, and more. For more information, contact Tracy Gaskin.

## Certificate Programs

CeTEAL offers several certificate programs. For more information on these programs, visit coastal.edu/ceteal.

- Teaching Effectiveness Institute.
- Assessment Institute.
- Blended/Hybrid Institute.
- Instructional Coaching Certificate.
- Instructional Technology Certificate.

## Faculty Orientations

CeTEAL plans and hosts orientations for new full-time and part-time faculty. Full-time faculty orientation is held prior to the fall semester. Orientations for part-time faculty are held prior to both fall and spring semesters.

## CeTEAL Online Resources

- **CeTEAL website:** coastal.edu/ceteal
- **New faculty resources**: libguides.coastal.edu/newfaculty
- **Effective teaching resources**: libguides.coastal.edu/effectiveteaching
- **Contingency instruction resources**: libguides.coastal.edu/contingency

## CeTEAL Newsletter

CeTEAL News was created to share information with faculty and to highlight faculty accomplishments, activities and research. If you are interested in contributing to the newsletter or have news you would like to share, please contact Tracy Gaskin at cetealnews@coastal.edu.

## Contact CeTEAL Staff

**Jennifer M. Shinaberger**
**Director of CeTEAL**
843.349.2737 KRNS 215E
jshinabe@coastal.edu

**Gail M. Sneyers**
**Administrative Assistant**
843.349.2353 KRNS 215
gsneyers@coastal.edu

**Jean K. Bennett**
**Assistant Director**
843.349.2481 KRNS 215D
jbennet1@coastal.edu

**Matthew C. Tyler**
**Instructional Designer and Technologist**
843.349.2951 KRNS 215A
mctyler@coastal.edu

**Elif Gokbel**
**Instructional Designer and Technologist**
843-349-2351 KRNS 215B
egokbel@coastal.edu

**George H. Warriner**
**Instructional Technology Trainer**
843.349.2383 KRNS 211C
ghwarrin@coastal.edu

**Tracy J. Gaskin**
**Faculty Development Program Coordinator**
843.349.2790 KRNS 211H
tgaskin@coastal.edu

## CeTEAL Advisory Board