UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

PRESENTED BY: John Kleefeld, Chair, Teaching and Learning Committee of Council

DATE OF MEETING: 20 June 2013

SUBJECT: **Teaching and Learning Committee Annual Report**

COUNCIL ACTION: For Discussion Only

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
2012-13

The Teaching and Learning Committee met eight times over the past year, including five joint meetings with the Academic Support Committee.

Terms of Reference and Membership

1) Recommending to Council policies, programs and activities related to the enhancement, effectiveness and evaluation of teaching and learning at the University of Saskatchewan.
2) Encouraging the adoption of new learning modes, strategies and technologies.
3) Encouraging the development of community-based learning opportunities including service learning and work experience.
4) Promoting the scholarship of teaching and learning.
5) Receiving and reviewing reports on matters related to teaching and learning.

Council members

Kathleen James-Caven	English	2015
Paul Jones	School of Environment & Sustainability	2014
Aaron Phoenix	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2015

General Academic Assembly Members

Bev Brenna	Curriculum Studies		2015
Tim Claypool (vice-chair)	Ed Psy & Special Education		2013
Hugo Cota-Sánchez	Biology		2014
Trisha Dowling	Vet Biomedical Sciences		2015
Lorraine Holtslander	Nursing		2015
John Kleefeld (Chair)	**Law**	**2013**	

Sessional Lecturer

Leslie Ehrlich	Sociology	2013

Other members
Ruvimbo Kanyemba/Jordan Sherbino, VP Academic, USSU
Dylan Beach, VP Academic, GSA
Rachel Sarjeant-Jenkins   [Dean of Libraries designate] Assistant Dean, Client
                                   Services
Dan Pennock/Patti McDougall   Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning
Dave Hannah   Associate Vice-President Student Affairs
Elizabeth Lulchak   Director, eMAP
Bob Cram   Executive Director, Centre for Continuing and Distance
                                   Education
Jim Greer   Director, University Learning Centre and Gwenna Moss
                                   Centre for Teaching Effectiveness
Marcel D'Eon   Director of the Centre for Discovery in Learning

The Committee also invites the following representatives to attend, to provide information
and advice to the committee discussions:
Keith Jeffrey   Manager, Educational and Research Technology Services
Brad Wuetherick   Program Director, GMCTE
Frank Bulk   University Learning Centre

Issues and discussions

Committee merger
The Committee held several joint meetings with the Academic Support Committee to
develop new terms of reference and membership for a new Teaching, Learning and
Academic Resources Committee. During these discussions, committee members agreed that
it is critical there be a strong voice for the academic side of the institution, and that spreading
pedagogical improvement over two committees undermines the strong voice that faculty
should have. Merging the committees will make it possible to deal with broader policy issues
affecting teaching and learning, as well as advising academic support units on how to align
what they do with the priorities of the institution. Regarding e-learning, the university has
not made the progress it might have made because there is not a unified voice in dealing with
this important area. Increasing distributed and experiential learning also poses challenges for
technology and support.

An important area not covered in existing committee terms of reference is the university
priority for improvements related to Aboriginal students, awareness and curriculum. The
proposed terms of reference for the merged committee explicitly recognize this priority.

At its April 2013 meeting, University Council approved the disestablishment of the Teaching
and Learning Committee and the Academic Support Committee and the establishment of the
Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee. The Terms of Reference and
membership of the new committee are attached.

Learning Charter
As the university works toward implementation of the University of Saskatchewan Learning
Charter (see attached summary), there are significant implications for improvement of
teaching and student assessment. This year the Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching

Effectiveness and committee member Bev Brenna developed a project to write and post online some of the excellent teaching innovations that faculty around campus are offering to students, so that other faculty can consider whether these ideas will work in their own classes. Write-ups are underway and GMCTE expects to have the webpage posted by August. A summary of the Learning Charter is attached.

Teaching-Research Relationship
In response to a question raised at Council's October meeting, President Busch-Vishniac undertook to provide the committee with an outline of her thoughts on the relationship between teaching and research. The committee held several discussions about this paper and also set up a Wiki page for posting of additional documents and discussions. President Busch-Vishniac's paper is attached to this report for the information of members of Council. Links and references were added by Professor Kleefeld.

Training for teaching
Faculty spend five to eight years preparing for their research roles; preparation for their teaching roles is also important. Teaching is a skill that can be learned, and better teaching is consistent with goals of the Learning Charter.

The Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness now offers a wide variety of teaching resources including the following teaching training courses for graduate students: GSR 982 Mentored Teaching, GSR 984 Thinking Critically: Professional Skills for Global Citizens, GSR 989 Philosophy and Practice of University Teaching, GSR 979 Introductory Instructional Skills. GMCTE also offers Introduction to Teaching Online and for new faculty, a one-term course called Transforming Teaching.

Evaluation of teaching and courses
The new committee intends to undertake a review of the university's course evaluation systems such as SEEQ, to determine areas for improvement in usability and credibility, and also to ensure that the course evaluations are measuring learning outcomes.

Reports received

Distributed Learning Strategy
At the Provost's request, the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning prepared a report on a strategy for implementing complete programs that can be delivered at multiple sites. The intention is to deliver programs through effective partnerships with other post-secondary institutions and by innovative and pedagogically sound applications of learning technologies. These initiatives will enable the university to increase the participation of Aboriginal and rural residents in our university, a priority of the Third Integrated Plan. The report can be obtained from Laura McNaughton (laura.mcnaughton@usask.ca).

Advising Charter
Following an external review of student advising, an Advising Council has been established (chaired by the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning), and an Advising Charter has been created for consideration and implementation. The Charter was discussed by members of the committee and initial feedback was provided. A small working group has been formed to

make final revisions to the Advising Charter before sending it for consideration by University Council in the fall of 2013.

Survey of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
The Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness has undertaken a study of the landscape at the University of Saskatchewan for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Findings from this research initiative have been shared with appropriate committees of University Council including TLCC and RSAW, presented at the Third Annual Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Symposium. The final report is available at the GMCTE website under 'reports': www.usask.ca/gmcte/resources/library

Experiential Learning White Paper
A subgroup of the committee, with the assistance of GMCTE staff, undertook the task of drafting a white paper on experiential learning. This document addresses definitional issues as well as providing a brief overview of research on the benefits of experiential learning. Consideration is given to activity and operational structure at U15 comparators as well as providing an overview of experiential learning opportunities at the U of S. The document concludes with a set of recommendations regarding our planning goal to increase experiential learning opportunities by 20% by 2016. Our primary source of data for U of S activity stems from the *Experiential Learning Inventory Project*, conducted this past spring by the University Learning Centre. Data collection and analysis for the project are ongoing and the final version of the white paper will be available to the university community by the fall of 2103.

Other activities

The committee also received updates on activities of the University Learning Centre and an update from Disability Services for Students on implementation of the revised policy on Academic Accommodation and Access for Students with Disabilities.

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the Committee, I wish to thank Tim Claypool who acted as Vice-Chair of the committee this year, Cathie Fornssler, who acted as Committee Coordinator, and all the members of the Committee for their thoughtful participation in the Committee's work.

Respectfully submitted,

John Kleefeld, Teaching & Learning Committee of Council

Attachments:
1. University of Saskatchewan Learning Charter
2. Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee—new terms of reference
3. President Busch-Vishniac's Teaching and Research Comments, with references

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Learning Charter

The University of Saskatchewan Learning Charter defines aspirations about the learning experience that the University aims to provide, and the roles to be played in realizing these aspirations by students, instructors and the institution.

Our Learning Vision

Our vision sees the University of Saskatchewan as a unique community of learning and discovery, where people can embark on a process of development through which they grow, create, and learn, in a context characterized by *diversity*— in academic programs, in ways of knowing and learning, and among its members. This diversity provides opportunities for learners to achieve their unique learning goals in ways most relevant to them, in a setting in which learning is seen as a multi-faceted process through which people can learn experientially; independently; in laboratory or clinical settings; through collaboration and teams; through research and inquiry; through debate and engagement with instructors, mentors, and other learners; and through community service.

Among the learning outcomes we visualize are intellectual growth, clarified values, independence, social responsibility, and the recognition of diversity as an overarching concept that reflects a philosophy of equitable participation and an appreciation of the contributions of all people.

Core Learning Goals

The University of Saskatchewan offers a diversity of academic and professional programs that is matched by few other institutions of learning. Our students undertake programs of many different types and durations, and students in different programs will differ in the specific learning outcomes they achieve. However, while specific learning outcomes will vary, there is a set of core learning goals to which we aspire for all graduates, to the extent feasible and appropriate within each program of studies.

All graduates of the University of Saskatchewan will:

Discovery Goals	• Apply critical and creative thinking to problems, including analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. • Be adept at learning in various ways, including independently, experientially, and in teams. • Possess intellectual flexibility, ability to manage change, and a zest for life-long learning.
Knowledge Goals	• Have a comprehensive knowledge of their subject area, discipline, or profession. • Understand how their subject area may intersect with related disciplines. • Utilize and apply their knowledge with judgement and prudence.
Integrity Goals	• Exercise intellectual integrity and ethical behaviour. • Recognize and think through moral and ethical issues in a variety of contexts. • Recognize the limits to their knowledge and act accordingly.
Skills Goals	• Communicate clearly, substantively, and persuasively. • Be able to locate and use information effectively, ethically, and legally. • Be technologically literate, and able to apply appropriate skills of research and inquiry.
Citizenship Goals	• Value diversity and the positive contributions this brings to society. • Share their knowledge and exercise leadership. • Contribute to society, locally, nationally, or globally.

Commitments and Responsibilities

Achieving the learning vision and goals to which we aspire requires the active commitment of students, instructors, and the institution, and depends on each party fulfilling its role in the learning partnership embodied by the University of Saskatchewan.

Student Commitments

While all three roles are important, the role of the learner is most fundamental to the learning partnership. No learning can take place without active engagement by the learner in the learning process.

Learn Actively.
Actively engage in the learning process.

Think Broadly.
Thoughtfully consider, on the basis of evidence, a diversity of theories, ideas, beliefs, and approaches to problems and solutions.

Act Ethically.
Undertake all university work in accordance with principles of academic integrity.

Engage Respectfully.
Engage in a respectful way with members of the university community and its partners.

Instructor Commitments

While commitment by the learner is fundamental to the learning process, the active commitment of those members of the university community responsible for providing learning opportunities is crucial to optimizing the student learning experience.

Exemplify Learning.
Embody learning behaviours expected of students.
Maintain an appropriate instructor-student relationship.

Teach Effectively.
Ensure content proficiency.
Ensure pedagogical effectiveness.

Assess Fairly.
Communicate and uphold clear academic expectations and standards.
Perform fair and relevant assessment of student learning.

Solicit Feedback.
Provide opportunities for student feedback.
Solicit other feedback on their teaching effectiveness.

Institution Commitments

The University as an institution serves as a catalyst and context for learning and scholarship. It brings together learners and other members of the educational community in an environment conducive to learning and discovery.

Provide Opportunities.
Offer high quality programs for learning and discovery.
Foster learning partnerships.

Ensure Quality.
Ensure qualified instructors and effective instruction.
Promote research-enhanced learning.

Build Environment.
Provide a safe, secure, and inclusive environment.
Provide appropriate learning resources, facilities, and technology.

Support Learning.
Support students.
Support instructors.

(Based on the University of Saskatchewan Learning Charter as approved by University Council June 2010)

TEACHING, LEARNING AND ACADEMIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Membership (voting)

Five members of the University Council
Six members of the General Academic Assembly
One sessional lecturer
One undergraduate student appointed by the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union
One graduate student appointed by the Graduate Students' Union
Vice-provost, Teaching and Learning

Resource Personnel (non-voting)

Associate Vice-President, ICT
Associate Vice-President, Student Affairs
Dean, University Library
Director, University Learning Centre/GMCTE
Executive Director, CCDE

Administrative Support

The Office of the University Secretary

The Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources committee is responsible for:

1)   Commissioning, receiving and reviewing scholarship and reports related to teaching, learning and academic resources, with a view to supporting the delivery of academic programs and services at the University of Saskatchewan.

2)   Making recommendations to Council and the Planning and Priorities committee on policies, activities and priorities to enhance the effectiveness, evaluation and scholarship of teaching, learning and academic resources at the University of Saskatchewan.

3)   Promoting student, instructor and institutional commitments and responsibilities, as set out in the University of Saskatchewan Learning Charter and as reflected in the priority areas of the University of Saskatchewan Integrated Plans.

4)   Designating individuals to act as representatives of the committee on any other bodies where such representation is deemed by the committee to be beneficial.

5)   Carrying out all the above in the spirit of a philosophy of equitable participation and an appreciation of the contributions of all people, with particular attention to rigorous and supportive programs for Aboriginal student success, engagement with Aboriginal communities, inclusion of Indigenous knowledge and experience in curricular offerings, and intercultural engagement among faculty, staff and students.

Teaching and Research Comments, with References

Ilene Busch-Vishniac
December 6, 2012

At the October meeting of University Council, I made comments about teaching and research as well as comments about the scholarship of teaching and learning. I received a question about references, but forgot having received this question until it was raised again at the November meeting of University Council. At the November meeting, it was suggested that I provide the Teaching and Learning Committee with material to document my comments and support them with references. This brief is intended to serve in that capacity. I've limited references to a manageable few rather than the thousands that are available on any particular topic.

There are three main comments I have made repeatedly since arriving, all of which relate to the interactions of teaching and research:

Teaching and research are not independent – they are flip sides of the same coin.

This comment stems from a personal observation. Research requires crafting a hypothesis, studying a matter to determine whether that hypothesis is correct, and then communicating the results in some form (book, paper or talk). At universities, the bulk of this work normally is carried out by graduate students and postdoctoral fellows working in partnership with an academic advisor. In essence, the process of doing research is a means of teaching graduate students and postdoctoral fellows how one conducts research of the highest caliber. It is, in my opinion, teaching that is dissimilar to undergraduate or classroom teaching only in that it has a stronger one-to-one relationship. Further, describing the work and its conclusions, an imperative for universities in order to share results with a community of scholars, is a form of teaching as well. It differs from classroom teaching, but the intention is to provide information to anyone interested in the field so that they may learn from the work and build upon it. Thus, research contains many aspects of teaching. Similarly, I note that research is able to inform and influence teaching. Through research on the scholarship of teaching and learning we learn what pedagogical methods are best suited to produce desired learning outcomes. Also, the introduction of new discoveries into classroom material can add a sense of relevance and excitement that engages students.

There is a rich body of literature on the role of engagement in producing desirable student learning outcomes. Indeed, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is predicated on the hypothesis that student engagement is a proxy for student learning. A few key papers are the following:

1. R. M. Carini, G. D. Kuh and S. P. Klein, *Student Engagement and Student Learning: Testing the Linkages*, Research in Higher Education 47(1), 1 (2006).[1]

2. G. D. Kuh, *What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE,* Change 35(2), 24 (2003).[2]

3. L. S. Shulman, *Making differences: A table of learning,* Change 34(6), 36 (2002).[3]

There are also many centers that focus on student learning and engagement, including the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and the Centre for Student Engagement and Learning Innovation at Thompson Rivers University.

Research methods are related to best teaching practices.

In 1998 the Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University produced a report entitled *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities.*[4] This report contains a full review of the literature available and makes the case for changing undergraduate teaching methods to take advantage of research approaches.

While the Boyer Commission report sparked a great deal of conversation about research methods adapted for teaching, the use of pedagogies based on research methods predates this report. The impact of research on undergraduate learning has been studied by Healey and Jenkins (in the UK) more than any other team to date. A key study is M. Healey and A. Jenkins, *Developing Undergraduate Research and Inquiry,* HE Academy, York, 2009.[5]

In particular, Problem-Based Learning (PBL) was developed at a medical school (which one is a matter of some debate) and has become recognized as a best practice in teaching so that students learn. There are thousands of publications on PBL. A few that are useful summaries are the following:

---

[1] http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-005-8150-9.

[2] http://www.jstor.org/stable/40177261.

[3] http://www.jstor.org/stable/40177381.

[4] http://sundog.usask.ca/record=b2261322~S3.

[5] http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/491372795.

1. M. A. Albanese and S. Mitchell, *Problem-based learning: A review of literature on its outcomes and implementation issues,* Academic Medicine, 68(1), 52 1993.[6]

2. C. E. Hmelo-Silver, *Problem-Based Learning: What and how do students learn?,* Educational Psychology Review, 16(3), 235, 2004.[7]

3. K. Hoffman, M. Hosokawa, R. Blake, Jr., *Problem-based learning outcomes: ten years of experience at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Medicine,* Academic Medicine, 81(7), 617 (2006).[8]

4. B. J. Duch, S. E. Groh and D. E. Allen (eds), *The Power of Problem-Based Learning,* Stylus Pub., Sterling, VA, 2001.[9]

In addition to PBL, inquiry approaches and experiential learning are recognized widely as best practices. Again, there are many, many papers on the value of such approaches. A personal favorite summarizing various approaches as they relate to engineering education is the following book: S. D. Sheppard, K. Macatangay, A. Colby, W. M. Sullivan, L. S. Schulman, *Educating Engineers: Designing for the Future of the Field,* Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 2008.[10]

Spending time on research does not compromise teaching quality.

The intersection between teaching and research is a topic of considerable interest. There are certainly people, myself included, who would like to have evidence that research and teaching are positively correlated. Others argue that teaching and research must be negatively correlated – that time spent on research necessarily means that there is less time available for a focus on high quality teaching. The reality, according to the literature, is that neither view is supported.

There are a very large number of articles on the relationship between teaching and research. Indeed, there are several meta-analyses of the literature on this topic. Among these meta-analyses, one of the best regarded is J. Hattie

---

[6] http://preview.tinyurl.com/ad5e8gr (this will show the original long URL and redirect you to the OvidSP legacy database; once there, give the document time to load, as it is a scanned version of the original article).

[7] http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3.

[8] http://preview.tinyurl.com/brjyd9d (this will show the original long URL and redirect you to the OvidSP database).

[9] http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/45394360.

[10] http://sundog.usask.ca/record=b3109156~S8

and H. W. Marsh, *The Relationship Between Research and Teaching: A Meta-Analysis*, Review of Educational Research 66(4), 507, 1996.[11]

This analysis showed that there is, at the individual level, neither a positive nor a negative correlation between traditional measures of research excellence and teaching excellence.

A meta-analysis of the many meta-analyses on the teaching and learning can be found in J. Halliwell, *The Nexus of Teaching and Research: Evidence and Insights from the Literature,* HEQCO, Toronto, 2008. This much more recent publication supports the earlier report by Hattie and Marsh.[12]

There are also a number of studies of student interactions with research and how it changes learning perceptions. The work in this area suggests that students who engage with research perceive an increase in their learning outcomes. However, it is not clear how this relates to the specific question of teaching quality and research quality combining in an individual.

The bottom line at this date seems to be that there is no support for a suggestion that research excellence leads to teaching excellence in an individual; nor that research excellence precludes teaching excellence in a person. From the perspective of U of S, this means that we should not anticipate that our teaching will change for the worse as we push for greater research intensity; it may well change for the better.

---

[11] http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170652.

[12] http://sundog.usask.ca/record=b3206675~S8.