

Proceedings of the Roosevelt University Mini-Conference on Teaching

Volume Two
2005



ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

CHICAGO • SCHAUMBURG • ONLINE

www.roosevelt.edu

student learning. Some of these are based on faculty experience, others on college-level classroom research. On the whole, the literature I found supports my experience-based conclusions.

Measures that reduce test anxiety enhance student performance, particularly for students who are well-prepared for the test—where knowledge doesn't exist, it doesn't surface even under the most optimal test situations (Tests and stress, 2005). Humor (the candy bar “prize”) alleviates anxiety in test situations (Berk, 2000). Open-book exams do reduce pre-exam effort, and having an open book does not help under-prepared students perform better on exams (Boniface, 1985); this finding also extends to student notes, though these are not comparable to crib sheets prepared specifically for the exam and with clear restrictions.

There is conflicting information on the use of crib sheets and their effect on student achievement during tests. I have found three positive references on this practice (Davis, 1993; Janick, 1990; and Exams..., 1998) and one negative reference (Vessey & Woodbury, 1992). Vessey and Woodbury found that students using crib sheets focused too much on the content of their crib sheets, tended to copy directly from those sheets, and as a result often missed answering the question. This did not happen in my class because of the restrictions I put on the cheat sheet (no more than one page), and because answers to my exam questions were not likely to be found in the crib sheets themselves or the books or notes from which they were composed.

There are now many resources available to those who are interested in reviewing their own testing practices. Several books on college teaching include detailed sections on testing (Bain, 2004; Davis, 2001; Forsyth, 2003; Nilson, 2003) as well as references to diverse publications and research on testing in college courses. All of these books, of course, also address many other issues related to the effectiveness of instruction. They range from simple how-to books, to research, to thoughtful discussions of our discipline. They are useful in the career of any college professor—both for enhancing instruction and by suggesting useful topics for research on teaching and learning. In any case, students will be the ultimate beneficiaries of the knowledge now accumulating in our profession on good instruction.

REFERENCES

- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berk, R. A. (2000). Does humor in course tests reduce anxiety and improve performance? *College Teaching*, 48, 151-158.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Vol. I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: McKay.
- Boniface, D. (1985). Candidates' use of notes and textbooks during an open-book examination. *Educational Research*, 27, 201-209.
- Davis, B. G. (2001). *Tools for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Exams: Alternative ideas and approaches. (1989). *Teaching Professor*, 3(8), 3-4.
- Forsyth, D. R. (2003). *The professor's guide to teaching*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Janick, J. (1990). Crib sheets. *Teaching Professor*, 4(6), 2.

Nilson, L. B. (2003). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Tests and stress. (2005). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(27). Retrieved July 12, 2005 from <http://search.epnet.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&an=16484059>

Vessey, J. K., & Woodbury, W. (1992). Crib sheets: Use with caution. *Teaching Professor*, 6 (7), 6-7.

Webster's New Millennium Dictionary of English. (2005). Retrieved July 12, 2005 from <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?r=66&q=cheat%20sheet>

Service-Learning: A Guide to Course Implementation

Patrick M. Green

Office of Student Activities

Service-learning has emerged as an effective pedagogy at many institutions of higher education and increasingly at K to 12 schools. Service-learning is a pedagogy in which service work is integrally tied to the curriculum and course content. Sigmon (1996) explained the concept of service-learning which “assumes that colleges are living parts of communities, that the location of learning and serving is often beyond the classroom, and that communities have much to teach students and faculty” (p.10). The service-learning pedagogy addresses service and learning goals as equally important, and the hyphen represents the relationship between learning and the service experience.

The concept of reciprocity is a key element in the service-learning pedagogy. Jacoby (1996) explains this concept as addressing “needs that are defined by the community” (p. 5). Rhoads (1997) explains mutuality as “the relationship between the ‘doer’ and the ‘done-to’ ought to be reciprocal,” (p. 136) and the “collaboration and equality between community service workers and those in need of service” (p. 155). In essence, service-learning fosters a reciprocal relationship between the community partner and the student, which differentiates service-learning from community service and other forms of experiential learning.

Another essential element in service-learning is reflection. Jacoby (1996) notes that “the hyphen in *service-learning* is critical in that it symbolizes the symbiotic relationship between service and learning,” and the use of the term service-learning implies the “centrality of reflection” (pp. 5-6). Reflection, like reciprocity, is a defining feature of service-learning and establishes a link between the service experience and learning outcomes of a course.

At Roosevelt University, the work of a faculty-driven committee and task force has adopted the following definition for service-learning: Service-learning is an educational philosophy and pedagogical method of experiential learning that embraces ethical and socially responsible participation in structured service activities. Specifically, these activities:

- Integrate service experiences with learning objectives of course content.

- Offer structured service activities designed to meet community needs.
- Provide reflective opportunities for students to make meaning of this experience.
- Promote service and learning as equal goals marked by reciprocity between the student and person/group being served.
- Develop relationships through multiple service experiences

To frame service-learning course implementation, an overview of six methods for implementing the service-learning pedagogy in the curriculum is presented, as discussed by Heffernan and Cone (2003). Each model places service as the central aspect of the course but approaches the curricular goals and learning outcomes differently. For example, Heffernan and Cone identify some courses as:

1. **“Pure” Service-Learning.** These are courses that send students out into the community to serve. These courses have as their intellectual core the idea of service to communities by students, volunteers, or engaged citizens. They are not typically lodged in any one discipline. An example of such courses may be entitled Community Service, and ultimately have the academic goal of service and engagement.

Another model is discipline-based, which places the service experience within a specific field of study.

2. **Discipline-Based Service-Learning.** In this model, students are expected to have a presence in the community throughout the semester and reflect on their experiences on a regular basis throughout the semester using course content as a basis for their analysis and understanding (Heffernan & Cone, 2003). A core educational course, such as a world history course or citizenship course, provide an example of discipline-based service-learning.

Other models require more advanced skills and a more sophisticated knowledge base, such as problem-based service learning.

3. **Problem-Based Service-Learning (PBSL).** According to this model, students or teams of students relate to the community much as “consultants” working for a “client.” Students work with community members to understand a particular community problem or need. This model presumes that the students will have some knowledge they can draw upon to make recommendations to the community or develop a solution to the problem (Heffernan & Cone, 2003). The service experience is placed within the context of a problem and solution, relying on knowledge from a specific academic field of study.

Other advanced forms of service-learning courses include capstone courses, service-learning internships, and community-based action research (Heffernan & Cone 2003). The description for each of these models of service-learning target students who have upper-class standing or are further along in their academic development.

4. **Capstone Courses.** Capstone courses ask students to draw on the knowledge they have obtained throughout their coursework and combine it with relevant service work in the community (Heffernan & Cone, 2003). Often capstone courses are offered in the junior or senior year, as are service internships.

5. **Service Internships.** Like traditional internships, these experiences are more intense than typical service-learning courses, with students working as many as 10 to 20 hours a week in a community setting (Heffernan & Cone, 2003).

6. **Undergraduate Community-Based Action Research.** The final model of service-learning combines research methods with service experiences. Community-based action research can also be effective with small classes or groups of students. In this model, students work closely with faculty members to learn research methodology while serving as advocates for communities (Heffernan & Cone, 2003). This model focuses on the research work as the service for the community, and is usually utilized with highly-motivated students, graduate students, or as an independent study.

It is essential for faculty to identify which model best fits the new or existing course that will be transformed into a service-learning course. These six models demonstrate the varied forms that service-learning may take in a course-based model, although reciprocity and reflection are consistent elements in all six models. The implementation of service-learning, though, is defined by the course goals, and dependent on the faculty instructor and teaching style. To implement service-learning into a course ultimately requires a new paradigm for teaching and learning.

The process-based teaching that characterizes service-learning involves a shift in roles for faculty and students. Bringle, Phillips, and Hudson (2004) describe this as a paradigm shift in higher education “because it heightens the role that students can assume as constructors of knowledge... service learning shifts the role of the instructor from the center of instruction to the facilitator of learning that occurs outside the classroom” (p. 7). The experience of the student is placed at the center of a service-learning course, and this is counter-cultural to the content-based teaching style found in many academic fields of higher education.

As the student’s experience is the central focus of the service-learning course, reflection is the essential tool of service-learning, which differentiates it from other forms of experiential learning. Bringle and Hatcher (2003) explain: “Reflection is the ‘intentional consideration of an experience in light of particular learning objectives’... Reflection activities direct the student’s attention to new interpretations of events and provides a means through which the community service can be studied and interpreted, much as a text is read and studied for deeper understanding (p.84).” The reflection activities (journals, small papers, final projects, class discussions, group work) shape the learning that occurs within a service-learning course.

For faculty interested in constructing a service-learning course, the following principles will guide course implementation:

Community partnership. With which community partner (organization) are you collaborating? How have you involved the community partner in the course goals and course development? How will you engage the community partner throughout the course and in the assessment of the course?

Reciprocity. How is the service work meeting a community-defined need? How is the service work contributing to the learning objectives of the course?

Reflection. What reflection activities have you built into the course as assignments? How are the reflection activities integrated into the learning objectives and course goals?

After addressing these principles, faculty will be able to clearly define the service-learning aspect of their course in the syllabus. It is essential to present service as an integral part of the course in the syllabus, not an add-on or sidebar to the course. Varlotta (2000) suggests “one of the most constructive ways to conceptualize service-learning is to refine the pedagogically purposeful metaphor ‘service as text’” (p. 76). Approaching the service component of the course as “text” honors the lived experience of students, as they reflect and make meaning of their service experiences and the course content. In effect, service-learning allows students to construct knowledge, connect to the community, and create meaning of their experiences. As Paulo Freire (1993) noted: “To exist, humanly, is to name the world, to change it. Once named, the world in its turn reappears to the namers as a problem and requires of them a new naming. Human beings are not built in silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection” (p. 69).

REFERENCES

- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2003). Reflection in service-learning: Making meaning of experience. In Campus Compact (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (pp. 83-89). Providence, RI, Campus Compact.
- Bringle, R. G., Phillips, M. A., et al. (2004). *The measure of service learning: Research scales to assess student experiences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cooper, D. (2003). Reading, writing and reflection. In Campus Compact (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (pp. 91-96). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Heffernan, K., & Cone, R. (2003). Course organization. In Campus Compact (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (pp. 105-110). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Jacoby, B., & Associates. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Sigmon, R. L. (1996). Introduction to service-learning. In S. G. Pelletier (Ed.), *Journey to service-learning: Experiences from independent liberal arts colleges and universities* (pp. 1-41). Washington, DC: The Council of Independent Colleges.
- Strait, J. (2005). *Levels of reflection for assessing service-learning assignments*. Paper presented at the National Service Learning Conference, Long Beach, CA.
- Varlotta, L. (2000, Fall). Service as text: Making the metaphor meaningful. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 76-84.

“Survey Says:” Personal Response Systems Enhance Active Learning in the Classroom

Vicky McKinley, Cornelius Watson, and Jennifer Vlk
Department of Biological, Chemical, and Physical Sciences

Personal Response Systems (PRS) are a relatively new application of technology to education. These systems (also known as audience response systems, group response systems, classroom performance systems, electronic voting systems or the “Who Wants to be a Millionaire” system) allow instructors to receive immediate feedback from all members of a class on questions posed during lecture or discussion. They can also be used to administer quizzes, tests, class polls or course evaluations, and to take attendance. In this article, we present a brief overview of the available systems designed for classroom use, discuss our personal experiences with them as instructors and student, and present feedback from classes on the ability of the system to promote active learning and critical thinking.

CLASSROOM APPLICATIONS OF PRS

Questions presented to the class can be framed as multiple choice, true/false, matching or (in some systems) numerical response. The questions can be presented verbally, through stand-alone software provided with the system or via PowerPoint. The PRS activity can be integrated into the class in a variety of ways. During a typical lecture, PRS questions can be posed to the class as a means of previewing material that will be presented next (“priming the pump”), stimulating active learning while new material is being presented, reviewing material just covered, fostering critical thinking by leading students to apply and extend learned material to new situations, improving quantitative analysis and graph and map reading through regular practice with material relevant to the lecture, and reviewing material assigned for reading but not covered during lecture.

The system can also be used to evaluate the effectiveness of group work during lecture or discussion by posing questions before and after the group session to assess the group process. PRS can be used to review for upcoming examinations by posing integrative questions that require synthesis of material, challenging questions that prompt students to study the material, and questions that are similar to exam questions that familiarize students with the instructor’s exam style. Some instructors even sprinkle in a few verbatim exam questions during lectures or exam review sessions to enhance attendance and attentiveness. This also helps students to focus their studying and is a good way for them to check their understanding before the first exam.