Scholarship, or just social media?
Creating an online community to support student engagement and development through group work
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The pros: great benefit for student engagement, in terms of the valuable interpersonal and organisational skills it develops, and the quality of collaborative work which it enables them to produce (Boud, Cohen, & Sampson, 1999)
Group work – the bad stuff

The cons: can be a cause of dissatisfaction for students (Davies, 2009), especially if skills required for successful group work are not taught, enabled and supported within the module or programme (McAllister, 1995; Vik, 2001).
The local situation
Group work – the bad stuff

PEOPLE YOU'RE IN A GROUP WITH:

DOES 90% OF WORK

DOESN'T EVEN KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON

DOESN'T HELP AT ALL, BUT CLAIMS HE DOES

DISAPPEARED UNTIL THE WORK IS DUE

SCHOLARSHIP OR SOCIAL MEDIA?
SCHOLARSHIP OR SOCIAL MEDIA?

http://groupwork.ning.com
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Test user • October 15, 2014 at 2:51pm

(Gilbert again) - blogs make group work visible, and this can include regular peer assessment - this works well on module delivery outside the UK this year. As a tutor, it's easy to pick up problems early on. Requiring explicit reflection point is that it's much better to monitor and manage group performance and sanctions than to rely solely on a formal
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Test user • October 15, 2014 at 2:41pm

(Posted by Gilbert Cockton) An alternative to ejecting students is reducing their marks via a tutor monitored peer assessment. Students are free to do this up to some threshold (e.g., up to 10% reduction), but above this agreement from the module tutor (or at milestones) in place, this provides a mechanism for groups and tutors to manage the process, with a clear audit trail. If students have problems addressed, but if there are no issues to address and problem students do not respond/appeal then they don't earn marks, perhaps to the point of failure. If they do fail, then referred work will need to be on an individual basis. There
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Richard Stockwell • October 15, 2014 at 1:43pm

It has taken me a long time to get back to your thought Stephanie. Sorry. I suppose we need to think through the possible implications of group work. But if the learning outcomes require them to work in groups of four or five then that gives you

Nov 4, 2014
Is this ‘scholarship of teaching and learning’?

http://biologyze.com/2012/07/03/photo-of-the-week-26/
Community of Scholars

- Boyer, in coining the term ‘scholarship of teaching’, looked towards a ‘community of scholars’ and “a campus-wide, collaborative effort around teaching” (1990).
Shulman saw teachers as “members of active communities: communities of conversation, communities of evaluation, communities in which we gather with others... to exchange our findings, our methods, and our excuses” (1993)
Trigwell et al commented that the aim of scholarly teaching was “to make transparent how we have made learning possible...university teachers must... be able to collect and present rigorous evidence of their effectiveness... as teachers.” (Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, & Prosser, 2000).
Weston & McAlpine saw the scholarship of teaching as “characterized by an intention to share expertise and develop scholarly knowledge about teaching that has a significant impact on the institution and the field” (2001)
The teaching commons

- Huber & Hutchings proposed “the teaching commons, an emergent conceptual space for exchange and community among faculty, students, administrators, and all others committed to learning” (2005)

http://bit.ly/1dVV7TY
Witman & Richlin (2007) remind us that ‘teaching tips’ are not the same as the scholarship of teaching (2007).

For Weston & McAlpine – it has to have impact outside the institution (2001)

Shulman reminds of the need for peer review: “We develop a scholarship of teaching when our work as teachers becomes public, peer-reviewed and critiqued”. (2001)

Healey is also explicit on the subject: “…if the scholarship of teaching is to match that of research there needs to be a comparability of rigour, standards and esteem” (2000)

Kanuka comments that publication must “make a significant contribution to knowledge... as theory allows you to make public the intellectual basis of findings” (Kanuka, 2011)
Peer review?
Or maybe not?

- Online moderation and discussion are genuine and potentially rigorous forms of peer review

http://bit.ly/1cn1m2b
How public is public?
Peer review?

• If scholarship requires ‘making public’ - a website could be more genuinely public than a conference paper or journal

The start of our conversations
How public is public?

- As Kreber comments: “…the scholarship of teaching... is represented not just in formal studies informed by the empirical analytical, interpretive or critical sciences, but also in the public dialogue that ensues from posing these questions in the first place... We might do better to think of research findings as the start of our conversations into teaching and learning rather than as the conclusion.” (2013)
Any questions?


