
FINAL REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON ENGAGED LEARNING

FACILITATED BY: CAROLYN HAYNES, MARCIA BAXTER MAGOLDA, KARI TAYLOR, & TARAN CARDONE

April 10, 2009

PURPOSE:

The Community of Practice on Engaged Learning (COPEL) has served as a forum for Miami faculty and staff educators to intensively explore and discuss how to (re)design their learning environments to have a lasting and far-reaching impact on student learning at Miami.

Throughout the 2008-2009 academic year, COPEL participants engaged in personal reflection and joint readings, activities and discussions to: (1) generate ideas for promoting engaged learning within their own units and across the university; (2) develop partnerships with colleagues across campus who share similar interests; and (3) create a shared repertoire of resources for themselves and hopefully for the Miami community (e.g., body of knowledge, methods, stories, cases, tools, trouble-shooting strategies). The COPEL held eleven group meetings (90 minutes each); two of the COPEL facilitators met individually with core members of each participating department or program three times. Group meetings focused on topics including student development, discovery-based learning, educator roles, challenges of and resistances to engaged learning, and assessment.

The core members of COPEL also collaborated with colleagues within their own department, office or program to design or redesign their curriculum to support engaged learning and student development.

Our hope is that members of the COPEL will lead additional COPELs with new core members in the future—thus facilitating an ongoing development of a learning-centered culture and *a transformation toward a university-wide educational philosophy*.

PARTICIPATING UNITS AND INDIVIDUALS

Department or Program	Participants
Academic Advising Council	Kim Ernsting
American Studies Program	Peggy Shaffer
Architecture Department	John Weigand, Thomas Dutton
Bachelor of Integrative Studies (BIS)	Michael Hieber, Ellenmarie Wahlrab
Business Honors Program	Tim Greenlee
Geology Department	Michael Brudzinski, Janelle Sikorski
New Student & Second-Year Programs	Elizabeth (Buffy) Stoll, Michael O'Neal
Psychology Department	Carl Paternite and Len Mark
Residence Life Office	Gerald Olson, Patty Martinez
Rinella Learning Center	Linda Dixon, Kristy Drobney
Sociology & Gerontology	Rodney Coates, Margaret Jendrek
Student Affairs in Higher Education Program (SAHE)	Marcia Baxter Magolda, Taran Cardone, Joel Zylstra
University Libraries	Eric Resnis, Arianne Hartsell-Gundy
University Honors Program	Carolyn Haynes, Kari Taylor
Western Program	Hays Cummins, Ben Jacks, Kim Ernsting
Women's Studies Program	Madelyn Detloff, Ann Fuehrer
Student Representatives	Kellyn Moran, Jonathan Gair, Billy Stonecipher

OUTCOMES:

1) DEVELOP A SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF ENGAGED LEARNING.

Founded upon Miami's tradition of undergraduate excellence and student initiative, the vision for an Engaged University calls for not only an integrated learning environment where faculty, staff, and students work toward the same goal of self-authorship but also a sequenced one where students are steadily offered higher levels of intellectual and personal challenge and varying types of support.

It includes the following components:

- a) **PROMOTION OF SELF-AUTHORSHIP IN OUR STUDENTS:** Research has demonstrated that to master the rigorous outcomes necessary for future success, students must achieve "self-authorship," or the ability to critically evaluate information, form their own judgments, and collaborate with others to act humanely to construct new knowledge (Kegan 1994; Baxter Magolda 2004). Self-authorship emerges gradually as educators consistently foster students' holistic mental growth through frequent self-reflection and learning experiences that steadily increase in challenge and appropriate levels of support.
- b) **SEAMLESS LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND CLOSE PARTNERSHIPS ACROSS DIVISIONS:** Each encounter that a student has during his or her Miami experience promises a potential learning opportunity. We must leverage the talents and opportunities of all faculty, staff, and administrators and collaborate across all divisions along with our off-campus partners (parents, alumni, community members, employers) to enable students' full growth as thinkers and citizens.
- c) **SEQUENCED OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEARNING THAT STEADILY INCREASE IN COMPLEXITY:** Because the outcomes for a Miami graduate cannot be achieved quickly or by chance, learning opportunities must be purposefully sequenced inside and outside of the classroom—in the major, advising sessions, residence hall programming, or employment—so that students are steadily and consistently challenged to achieve maturity. As students' maturity develops, educators slowly relinquish some of their authority to allow students the opportunity to take greater agency over the process of discovery and meaning-making.
- d) **CULTIVATION OF ONGOING DEVELOPMENT OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE MIAMI COMMUNITY:** Faculty and staff must advance not only students' intellectual, personal and professional growth but also their own development in these three dimensions. Concerted efforts to break down structural, disciplinary and attitudinal barriers should be made, and each encounter among faculty, staff and students should be viewed as an opportunity to deepen one another's learning and growth.

2) CONSTRUCT PLANS FOR CURRICULAR DESIGN OR REDESIGN.

The core members of participating units generated plans for designing or redesigning their learning environments or curriculum to advance engaged learning. Proposed changes include:

1. Articulating student learning outcomes that are aligned with students' development in all learning opportunities (e.g., courses, residence hall environments, co-curricular programs, employment, advisement).

2. Infusing reflection more fully into advising sessions, degree completion plans, courses, Summer Orientation and other learning opportunities to better ensure that students are making decisions based on their own beliefs.
3. Developmentally sequencing the learning opportunities offered within departments or programs (e.g., courses in the major, Student Enhancement Program, advising in the major).
4. Incorporating active learning approaches, particularly in introductory learning experiences (e.g., foundation courses, library information sessions, living learning programs).
5. Embedding research and inquiry-based methods in intermediate and advanced learning opportunities.
6. Adjusting educator roles and responsibilities as students develop and gain more agency over their learning.
7. Creating direct and indirect assessment approaches to measure student development and learning.
8. Revising training or development opportunities for faculty, staff and student educators (e.g., faculty, professional staff, graduate students, student orientation leaders, student residence hall staff).

The attached reports from participating units offer specific details.

3) ORGANIZE FURTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO ADVANCE ENGAGED LEARNING.

To ensure that our efforts to advance the vision of the Engaged University will continue, we have taken the following steps:

A) DEVELOP A WEB-BASED CLEARINGHOUSE OF RESOURCES ON ENGAGED LEARNING.

The COPEL has created two web-based sites featuring resources and information on engaged learning: a Blackboard site for all COPEL members and a website on engaged learning: www.muohio.edu/engagedlearning. We plan to use the resources and materials posted on the Blackboard to enhance the website so that all members of the Miami community can learn more about this vision.

B) CONTINUE COPEL EFFORTS IN THE FUTURE.

At the April 9, 2009 COPEL meeting, we proposed a plan for starting a new COPEL for the 2009-2010 academic year. The members of the current COPEL shared that their participation to date had led them to see student learning and teaching differently, to reevaluate their assumptions about students and about themselves, and led them to the edge of reframing their practice. They reported feeling overwhelmed by the notion of moving into implementation without further COPEL support to guide their implementation, address issues with implementation, and assess the impact of new designs. The group agreed to continue through next year by sharing leadership among the COPEL members. Carolyn Haynes, Kari Taylor and Marcia Baxter Magolda will continue to participate because we now see that this effort must be sustained longer to bring it to fruition. Our participation is consistent with our own reform efforts in the coming year. The group is continuing without professional development funding because members have found the trusting community and the diversity of members so valuable to their own practice. The continuing COPEL will:

- Share unit designs for community critique and refinement
- Collaborate to address issues in implementing new designs (e.g., resistance by colleagues or students, concerns of administrators, role of evaluation of practice)
- Develop plans to assess student learning in the newly designed practices
- Build linkages across units (e.g., across advising, orientation, first and second year student units, residential curriculum; across departments and student affairs units – this was noted as one of the major strengths of this year's work).

We will also invite a few new members and interested units to join, particularly the incoming Director of CELT and the new director of the Liberal Education Council. Our hope is that the incoming Director of CELT will

participate in COPEL next year and spearhead efforts to promote the Engaged University vision beginning in 2010-2011 or earlier.

C) GENERATE ASSESSMENT METHODS.

COPEL members from units who are furthest along in design and plan to implement their designs as of Fall 2009 will collaborate to design instruments, analyze data, generate strategies for improving practice, and co-author articles. They will share their work at the COPEL meetings to collaborate with the larger group who will be pursuing assessment over the course of the year.

D) ORGANIZE A BICENTENNIAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE ENGAGED UNIVERSITY.

Interested COPEL members will collaborate with the Bicentennial Committee to further design and implement a two-day symposium on engaged learning for members of the Miami community and the general public. The symposium will take place on September 23-24, 2009 in the Shriver Center.

CONCLUSION & LESSONS LEARNED

At our final COPEL meeting, participants underscored the value of the COPEL experience and emphasized the following points to consider during future efforts:

- Participants reported that they understood learning partnerships as a result of the COPEL focusing on co-constructing the idea of engaged learning rather than having it imposed on the group
- Participants viewed interaction across academic and student affairs as a major strength of the COPEL, indicating greater understanding of a holistic student experience. Many vowed to continue to build these linkages and insisted that future groups retain this dynamic.
- Trust was an important dynamic of participants' willingness to take risks and explore new practices. They reported that this emerged from sustained interaction over time.

WORKS CITED

- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2004). Self-authorship as the common goal of 21st century education. In M. B. Baxter Magolda & P. M. King (Eds.), *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship* (pp. 1-35). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

REPORTS BY PARTICIPATING DEPARTMENTS AND PROGRAMS

ACADEMIC ADVISING

SUBMITTED BY: KIM M. ERNSTING

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

The COPEL experience has been profound in a number of ways. It has been stimulating to be part of a community learning experience with a range of faculty, staff, and students. It has been uncomfortable at times, causing me to stretch my thinking, to listen, learn, contemplate, reconsider, and try again. I have learned many new concepts, theories, application of theories, resistance to theories, and how to begin thinking through the challenges associated with change.

Personally, I am continuing to move forward in thinking about the many ways that engaged learning practices can be utilized in the multiple contexts in which I work. I have learned that the terms used when discussing development theory within the academic community (particularly with faculty) are very important and that it is best to frame the conversation based upon anticipated outcomes rather than using developmental “jargon.” This was a very important insight for me.

I recently had a powerful moment of personal insight regarding the Learning Partnership Model (LPM) and the self-authorship process while watching the movie Freedom Writers for the first time. In the film, the teacher’s use of the Learning Partnerships Model and journal writing (reflection) had a dramatic impact on the learning and in the lives of her multi-cultural students in an urban context.

Professionally, I am more aware of how I interact with students and colleagues. I am mindful of asking more inquiry-based questions and creating discovery-based processes. The three key concepts of the Learning Partnership Model (situating the learning in the student experience, validating the student’s capacity to know/learn, and co-constructing meaning with the learner) have revitalized my thinking about how I do my work.

DEPARTMENTAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

Since I have the privilege of working in two offices that are “in process,” I am mindful of keeping the LPM and the developmental stages of students throughout their college experience at the forefront of my thinking. Whenever possible, these concepts will be woven into program development and, hopefully, in the ways that I interact with students. I will be an advocate of including the LPM and inquiry-based approaches in the advising process as a member of both the Undergraduate Advising Council and of the Advisor Training subcommittee (charged with creating the campus-wide advisor training process). The LPM and student development theory have been part of the conversations among the new Western Program faculty during the discussions about designing the new curriculum.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENGAGED LEARNING

The COPEL process seems like it was quite effective. The readings, homework, intentional reflection, hands on activities and input from student guests provided effective building blocks for learning. Is there a way to create a learning community that is shorter in length (perhaps a semester) so that more people would have the chance to participate? Some of the most powerful teaching and learning moments for me occurred when there were examples of student engagement (ie—Len Mark’s students), so I hope that future COPEL experiences will include new and emerging examples of engaged learning practices throughout the campus.

CONCRETE PLANS FOR REDESIGNING MY DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM:

UNDECIDED/EXPLORATORY STUDENTS PROJECT

I am drafting a six-session workshop series for first-year Undecided/Exploratory students that will draw upon LPM and self-authorship concepts. I am working collaboratively with one of the First-Year Advisors (FYA), Shannon Foley, who will be working in the new *Explore Miami* Living Learning Community next year. Shannon and I have similar thoughts about creating more inquiry-based workshops for Undecided/Exploratory students and we met to brainstorm last week. It is expected that the *Explore Miami* Living Learning Community will house a fair number of Undecided/Exploratory students next fall, so Shannon is interested in “piloting” this next year with the students in her building.

I have spoken with Jerry Olson in the Office of Residence Life about this idea and he is very supportive and has some ideas about how this meshes with the ORL Residential Curriculum. Once the staff within the ORL structure are aware of this proposed “pilot” project, I will meet with both Marti Kyger and Claudia Scott-Pavloff to get their input and to ask if a divisional advisor from each of their areas could be designated as part of the “stakeholder team” for the *Explore Miami* LLC, along with someone from the Career Exploration and Testing Center (CETC). The intent is to invite the stakeholders to assist with planning the Spring 2010 events/workshops to be held in the residence hall; the proposed workshop series includes a workshop for preparing students to participate in the Exploring Majors Fair and a workshop to prepare students to meet with a faculty advisor/CDA in the spring. (This work with first-year students in the spring will represent an enhanced role for the FYA).

AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAM

SUBMITTED BY PEGGY SHAFFER

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

My experience in COPEL has been transformational in every aspect. As I noted in my application, for a number of years I have been working to better integrate my teaching and scholarship in American Studies with my commitment to promoting public agency and public culture. During the past eight years, I facilitated the revision of the American Studies major to focus on issues of public culture; I worked with the Wilks Leadership Institute to develop a prototype community/university partnership think tank called Acting Locally; and more recently I have been trying to embrace the learning partnership model in my teaching. My participation in COPEL has allowed me to see the intersections between these projects and to better connect my interest in public culture with the theories and practice of engaged learning. At its core COPEL has helped me reframe my work as a scholar-teacher and as an administrator at Miami. In many ways it is difficult to put this into words. I have learned about student development theory; I have learned a range of pedagogical strategies to promote engaged learning; I have thought about how to develop a curriculum for American Studies that fosters a more integrated and effective form of learning; and I have learned how to better support the work of my faculty. This list could go on, but it does not do justice to what I have actually come away with. Suffice it to say that I have made an epistemological shift in how I

define and conceptualize my work. I think about and understand my work in American Studies differently, and I feel a renewed sense of idealism about the possibilities of life in academe.

DEPARTMENTAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

As director of American Studies, I have already begun to work with my faculty to talk about what it means to promote engaged learning in American Studies. The program is well situated to begin this conversation, because we have already committed intellectually to a curriculum focused on issues of public culture and public agency. COPEL has provided a framework for linking this intellectual interest with a clearer understanding of how to support student development and engaged learning. Our stated goal in the program has been to educate students to think critically about and understand American culture and to develop skills that promote cultural agency. In other words, we want our students to understand how they are shaped by American culture, as well as how they can shape American culture. COPEL has provided a framework for articulating what this means. Faculty in AMS have begun to identify learning outcomes for our Miami Plan Foundation class and also for the AMS major. I have begun to use student development theory to examine our curricular sequencing and to better identify, define, and support interdisciplinary critical thinking as practiced in American Studies. Probably most important, I have come to understand the role and purpose of reflection in supporting not only student learning, but also faculty development and curricular assessment. As an administrator, I have come away from this experience with a shift in focus. Often we are encouraged to think of outcomes and end products; because of my experience in COPEL I am beginning to think more about the ongoing process. By that I mean that supporting AMS faculty, developing and offering an effective and innovative curriculum, and assessing the success of both faculty teaching and the student learning experience is a continual process—a give and take between action, implementation, and reflection. This makes sense to me. I came to academia because I loved the learning process—thinking, reading, discussing—COPEL has helped me to see what I do as an administrator as more of a continual learning process.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENHANCED LEARNING AT MIAMI

I think continuing the COPEL learning community for chairs and program directors, and even deans, and other administrators is crucial. But I also believe COPEL needs to be thoroughly integrated into faculty development. I would encourage the university to restructure and extend the new faculty orientation process using COPEL as a model.

I think student orientation programs should be restructured around COPEL, and the admissions office should begin to use criteria supported through COPEL to assess student applications and to promote the university.

In addition, I would encourage the new director of CELT to create a model for ongoing faculty development that institutionalizes and expands on the COPEL model.

Finally, I would suggest that the new director of Liberal Education work to clearly link the Miami Plan principles with the theory and practice of engaged learning.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING YOUR DEPARTMENTAL CURRICULUM

RESTRUCTURE MPF/AMS 205 AS A LEARNING PARTNERSHIP COURSE

For the past two semesters I have tried to teach MPF/AMS 205 Introduction to American Studies on the learning partnership model. I have been working to make engaged learning strategies and student centered learning integral to this course. Since one of the key learning objectives for this course is to begin to build the skills and competencies necessary for public agency, I feel that one way to begin teaching these skills is to partner with students, to imagine the class as a kind of temporary community, and to give them some responsibility for the

learning process and the knowledge generated. I have adopted a number of pedagogical strategies learned from COPEL to try to make this course work: situating learning in the student's experience, providing structured responsibility for making choices about course content, modeling cultural analysis, incorporating reflection into the learning process and the grading process, etc. I should note that this is an ongoing experiment. Ultimately, I am hoping to share this with other AMS faculty who teach this class, so that MPF/AMS 205 can be identified as a learning partnership course.

CLEARLY INCORPORATE THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ENGAGED LEARNING INTO THE NEW AMS CURRICULUM

The American Studies Program just revised its curriculum to focus on issues of public culture and public agency. We now require students to take 5 core courses in AMS and then select an area of concentration that allows students to choose courses that define their particular area of interest in the framework of the concentration. I would like to clearly link our curricular focus on public culture and public agency to the theory and practice of engaged learning; and I am hoping to facilitate the development of learning outcomes for the 5 AMS core courses that more clearly address issues of student development and support engaged learning. Specifically, I would like to work with faculty who teach the AMS capstone to think about what it means to support the student as scholar in the context of American Studies and in light of our focus on public culture and public agency. In addition, I would like to rethink the advising process for AMS. Currently, I serve as the academic advisor. I need to develop clearer advising outcomes that will support students in selecting an area of concentration and then choosing courses to complete their area of concentration. Finally, I would like to develop an assessment process for the program that incorporates reflection and that supports curriculum development and faculty development as an ongoing process.

BACHELOR OF INTEGRATIVE STUDIES (BIS) PROGRAM

SUBMITTED BY ELLENMARIE WAHLRAB & MICHAEL HIEBER

BENEFITS OF COPEL

We are so fortunate that, as regional campus representatives in the new Bachelor of Integrative Studies (BIS) degree, we were able to participate in the Community of Practice for Engaged Learning during the first year of the implementation of the BIS. The most obvious and direct impact that COPEL participation has had on both the BIS degree program and our own personal growth as faculty members has been in how it has informed our work with BIS seminar teaching and in our own and future BIS faculty member development. We were both active participants in the original task force that helped create and develop the BIS degree and we co-wrote the first of three required core integrative seminars. In this academic year, we have been the first faculty to offer the beginning seminar for the BIS degree, BIS 201 *Introduction to Integrative Studies*, and our participation in COPEL was a significant support to us in keeping the vision of engaged learning in the forefront of our teaching. We, along with Carolyn Haynes, have also been co-facilitators of the first 15-member BIS FLC that has run concurrently with the COPEL during the 2008-2009 academic year. The work of this FLC is to support faculty as they develop specific BIS seminars within the integrative, developmental framework of the BIS degree program.

Starting with a "clean slate," the new BIS degree was purposefully designed with student development and engaged learning as central elements within this multidisciplinary degree. This is most evident in the three required core seminars that have as a common trajectory thread of *self*, *other*, and *product*. Even with this clear initial vision of the program under construction, we continued to deepen our understanding of how this pedagogical model affects every aspect of how we think about teaching and learning. The collective and individual growth in understanding

that we shared with COPEL participants and leaders led to significant shifts in not only what we thought but how we designed components of the BIS program and the BIS faculty Learning community.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING OUR CURRICULUM

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

COPEL participation and working with Carolyn helped us to focus our BIS FLC emphasis on the integration of student development and engaged learning. This was evidenced early on by our mutually constructing with the BIS FLC participants our BIS learning outcomes from the degree goals based on student learning traits. Together we worked on framing the three seminar courses to encourage enhanced self-authorship through appropriate pedagogy. We formulated this work into a chart we called the Components of Practice (COP Chart – see attached).

We originally looked at this chart as the template for the BIS seminar program that we could carry forward for future use in its entirety. In a COPEL session this spring, staff and faculty were sharing outcomes charts for their areas when we mutually came to the realization that the very principles we were attempting to enact in our respective areas with students were also crucial to enact with our colleagues. The case in point was how we needed to involve our colleagues in the mutual construction of these learning outcomes if we are to be effective in developing the “engaged university” across our campuses. As we are nearing completion of our first BIS FLC and planning for the next BIS seminar faculty cohort, COPEL participation helped us see that we needed to revisit the COP chart with every new contingent of BIS seminar faculty. Learning outcome development is not fixed entirely in particulars within any given degree or course but should be an ongoing process and should be the starting point for each new generation of BIS seminar faculty we are working with. By mutually working through the learning outcomes that emanate from the BIS degree and seminar design and goals, faculty development is situated in their own rich experience. In this way the learning outcomes, which they have constructed and embraced, are placed in the center of their course creation and development. COPEL participation helped to reinforce the need for this ongoing work with faculty.

STATEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES & SELF-ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING

Our deepening understanding of a learning partnerships model helped us make course modifications in BIS201 to build better bridges for students at that level, as we had originally overestimated the self-authorship of the incoming BIS students, especially the older, non-traditional students. Our COPEL work, and in particular our consultation sessions with Carolyn Haynes as part of COPEL, have helped us reframe and reconfigure both how we have BIS 201 students developing and presenting their educational plans (their Statement of Educational Objectives) to Regional Campus Curriculum and Coordinating Council (RC4), as well as the development of how students will reflect upon and assess their learning throughout the three BIS seminars through creating their Self-Assessment of Learning (SAL). It has also helped us in our work with future BIS 301 and 401 faculty members in the BIS FLC. We continue to learn from both our COPEL dialogues and the COPEL session structures how to assist faculty in making a transition from a faculty-centered pedagogy to a pedagogy anchored in the recognition and support of opportunities for more self-authored learning—for our students, our colleagues and ourselves.

With our direct involvement in BIS teaching and advising, RC4 membership, and BIS faculty development, we feel COPEL participation benefited us and our program in so many ways and has enhanced the development of the entire BIS degree program. We feel working within faculty learning communities within departments, who will place enough emphasis on engaged learning and the Learning Partnership Model as a core mission to revitalize teaching and learning within their given fields, will be the most effective way to break out of the traditional and increasingly outdated mode of operation in higher education. But to have faculty ready and equipped to lead such efforts within a department or discipline, entities like COPEL and our BIS FLC act are the catalyst for developing the attitudes, ideas, skills, and knowledge needed to facilitate a transformation toward an Engaged University. We are very grateful for the opportunity to work with such a dedicated, caring, and committed group of educators and

were particularly grateful to have the chance to work directly with Marcia Baxter Magolda, Carolyn Haynes and members of her staff. The breadth of inclusion of staff, faculty, students, and administrators from across the campus so enriched this opportunity and widened the context of dialogue and understanding, and expanded our idea of what integrative learning can be.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY

SUBMITTED BY JANELLE SIKORSKI AND MICHAEL BRUDZINSKI

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

JANELLE: The impact of my participation in COPEL on both a professional and personal level is profound. Professionally, I feel more encouraged and supported to take risks in my course methods that I might not have been willing to try on my own. The encouragement comes from exposure to the successes and failures of other faculty/staff who are also experimenting in their classroom. Failure of an assignment no longer feels so personal, but a building step toward a better classroom. Connected to this experience I feel better prepared to take on the challenges of designing an engaged classroom.

COPEL has provided a network of other professionals/services on campus that I can embed into my classroom. For example, in the Fall I plan on having staff from the Rinella Learning Center hold at least two workshops on study skills in my foundation course. These workshops will follow an exam day and target areas where I feel the students struggled. Within the classroom I also feel better prepared to anticipate and respond to the concerns of my students. I feel this will translate to a higher quality of education for my students and a more positive teaching experience for me.

Of course all of these benefits I see for my professional role feed into my personal self-confidence. I believe that this increased self-confidence will translate into better relationships with my working peers and students. Specifically, I can now see myself as a leader outside of my classroom and I'm not waiting (as much) for validation from people around me. For me the most profound benefit has been a renewed sense of purpose and excitement.

MIKE: The personal impact on me is a better awareness of the need to include the affective domain in my teaching goals and student learning outcomes. I went through a similar transformation in my work constructing student learning outcomes for the Top25 project, when reviewers pushed us to go beyond content focus to a process focus. I then realized that central outcomes I wanted were for students to better understand how the scientific method works. The second transformation in COPEL was that I don't just want students to understand science, but I want them to be confident in their understanding such that they would use science without me asking them to. Moreover, I now see how my courses fall within the broader university goals of developing students to be self authors. In fact, I have a much better understanding of the difference between critical thinking (an original Top25 goal) and self-authorship (a goal after COPEL).

The professional impact of being in COPEL will likely be realized in the coming years for me. As a young pre-tenure faculty, I feel my participation in COPEL has given me wisdom well beyond my years. I can easily see how I would have focused all of my efforts at helping students to become critical thinkers, and it would have been left to chance which students also would have the confidence in their skills to become independent thinkers. Now I can be much more purposeful in designing activities and opportunities in my classes for students to work on these aspects of development. Ultimately, I feel I will be more successful as a professor with this new understanding.

DEPARTMENTAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

JANELLE: The key benefit I see for our department coming out of COPEL is that we recognize the need to have a strategic approach to our foundational course redesign. This means that clear learning outcomes need to be further developed/rethought and agreed upon before any new material is created for our courses. I believe this planning process has also open dialogues about our department's strengths and weaknesses, but also verified that our whole department recognizes the redesign as necessary. I feel that COPEL has taught us that just redesigning one course is not enough. That overtime we will need to take what we learn from our redesign experience and translate this to other courses or aspects of our department. For example, I believe the next logical step will be to redesign the GLG115 Lab course that corresponds to the lecture course currently undergoing redesign. I would also like to start a learning community for the graduate students who are teaching the lab to better prepare them for the challenges they will face and include them in the redesign process.

MIKE: The key benefit I see is making sure we redesign our Top25 course in a way that will help our students develop at the same time they learn specific scientific skills and geologic concepts. Faculty members are often surprised at how students have a hard time rising to challenges that we present them in our classes. I now see that part of this issue is that even though students may have learned a concept or method well enough to explain it well on an exam when asked about it, they still have trouble making judgments when to apply it in new situations and the confidence to act on their own decisions when they are faced with uncertainty. Incorporating new student learning outcomes that include aspects of student development will help guide us as instructors to create assignments and course experiences that build these other student abilities as well. Honestly, making sound judgments is not an easy skill to teach, but if we can at least make conscious efforts to help students work on this skill in our courses, we will be better of than ignoring these issues and hoping for the best.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

JANELLE: The transition from a visiting instructor to lecturer position here at Miami has been difficult for me. The central problem I see is that the University has an infrastructure to support the needs of the tenure-track faculty, but lacks programs/systems to support the needs of visiting instructors and lecturers. On my part this still leads to immense uncertainty and mistrust of "authority" on Miami's campus despite all the positive gains made in COPEL. I feel this is important because lecturers on campus often teach four classes a semester, most Miami Plan foundation courses. The lecturers of these courses will be carrying the weight of course redesigns. I feel that many are too wary to take risks in fear of their contracts not being renewed. This fear might come from the expectation of lower course evaluations that often happen while adjustments are made to a course. They might not be willing to take risks because they feel no loyalty to the university based on years of perceived mistreatment or neglect. One positive impact however is that many lecturers become more dedicated to their students because that is the only outlet the university has given them. This would be a real opportunity for the administration to gain real support and model a "real" engaged university where all voices are validated.

As part of building an engaged university it will be necessary for faculty/staff/administrators to be exposed to models and practices of engaged learning. I think it is unrealistic to believe that "everyone" knows this stuff, that it's self-explanatory or straightforward. In other words, major training opportunities need to be made available. Above that a rational or defense of active teaching methods needs to be provided to everyone on campus, including both incoming and present students, to make it clear that the university is really trying something different and why it is critical we make this change. Perhaps the redesigns to CELT will help with some of this transition and might include university incentives to those who are making serious attempts to redesign their courses. Some universities, such as the University of Cincinnati, have started a webpage/blog for faculty trying active teaching strategies to connect with each other and work through problems together. The link is <http://profpost.uc.edu/>. It would be great for Miami to adopt a similar practice. I know Miami has an informational website at <http://www.units.muohio.edu/EngagedLearning/> but as far as I could tell there was no way to directly connect with people off of this site.

MIKE: This could be somewhat tricky because I think currently the term “engaged learning” has different meanings to different faculty and staff. Coming into COPEL, I thought our efforts towards inquiry-based learning in our Top25 project were by themselves engaged learning. Now I see engaged learning as a broader definition, including two other key aspects: guiding students to develop their own belief system (developing self-authorship) and creating a vibrant campus learning community (connecting learning through both in-class and out-of-class experiences). So the first goal would be to better communicate that definition to the faculty and staff at large. To me, the next goal would be to demonstrate that engaged learning by this definition is both feasible and more successful compared to current practices. I believe this will require assessment of new and current engaged learning endeavors that show evidence for feasibility and success to help convince faculty and staff personally make the decision to set this broader definition of engaged learning as their personal goal. Once people have made that decision, then it would be great if resources, tutorials, contacts, and workshops were available to them to guide their efforts. I’m afraid that institutions often jump to this last step without first addressing the other two preliminary steps (clarify the definition, demonstrating the evidence for it). This approach embodies what engaged learning is in the classroom: instead of telling people what to do (passive lecture), you describe an issue and then provide data and methods that help them to make personal decisions on how to proceed.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM IN OUR DEPARTMENT

JANELLE & MIKE: The plans for redesign as a result of COPEL mesh extremely well with our Top25 project that will redesign our foundational course GLG111 (The Dynamic Earth). We have been developing and piloting new inquiry-based approaches and assessment techniques over the first year of our project (2008-09 academic year). Over the past semester, we have also begun implementing what we learned from COPEL by utilizing knowledge surveys to facilitate student perceptions of their own learning, and we are working to adjust assignments and exams to incorporate aspects of student development. Janelle and I have funding from the Top25 project to complete a full redesign to lectures, assignments, and assessment this summer. In the Fall of the 2009-10 academic year a few sections will implement the full changes, and we will monitor the progress of these courses in detail to identify aspects of our redesign that are either successful or unsuccessful through assessment. After we incorporate the needed adjustments, we plan to have all Spring 2010 sections of GLG111 taught following the inquiry-based and engaged learning methods and guidelines. Initially, we expect that faculty-to-faculty mentoring and the availability of a broad range of instructional resources for the new teaching style will be critical to the success of this effort as it spreads to all sections of the course.

LIBRARIES

SUBMITTED BY ERIC RESNIS AND ARIANNE HARTSELL-GUNDY

For the Libraries, COPEL has not only helped us to further refine our thinking about developmentally appropriate learning, but has definitely provided us with ideas on how we can better embrace this in teaching. The rich conversations from multiple units and disciplines have helped us to think further about instructing in general. We are a bit unique in that we instruct for all disciplines, so it is important for us to see faculty perspective from these disciplines. COPEL was an excellent way to familiarize ourselves with pedagogy that we don’t frequent enough as librarians.

While information literacy instruction and learning are two of the most important missions of the library, our forms of instruction are, for the most part, different from the typical academic department. As we often play the role of “supplemental instruction”, our instruction is usually short (50-75 minutes for one session). However, we feel that the knowledge we have gained from COPEL can help us to make better use of that time while still incorporating and fostering engaged learning. Furthermore, we can serve in a support role to faculty members who

are utilizing those methods in those classes to create information literacy instruction that is both engaging and integrated seamlessly into classroom curricula.

For truly integrating engaged learning across campus, it will be helpful to have more than small pockets of those who practice engaged learning. To fully work and to benefit students, a great deal of the university should be participating in these efforts. Furthermore, it is important for assessment methods to reflect the value of engaged learning.

PLAN FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM

The Libraries' plan includes two components. First, we will continue to foster and expand our efforts for engaging learning opportunities. The second component is to create an assessment plan that will provide the opportunities for librarians to see the effectiveness of engaged and developmentally appropriate learning objectives. We have already established information literacy learning "benchmarks" at each developmental level. Now we plan to take those to the next step and develop overarching learning outcomes and a system to effectively assess them. Activities for both components include:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR LIBRARIANS ON ENGAGED LEARNING

The plan is to use our internal professional development sessions to begin discussions about engaged learning and integrating into information literacy instruction. This will undoubtedly involve several sessions with individual instructor consultations.

CREATE LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR THE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

We will create 3-4 learning outcomes (from our current list of developmentally-appropriate outcomes) for the entire instruction program. To do this successfully, we will need to define information literacy for Miami (adapting the national definition as necessary). All librarians will need to be involved in this process.

DEFINE CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT

We will need to define how we will determine if we are actually meeting the learning outcomes we decided upon. Once criteria are set, we will determine upon methods for actually assessing our learning outcomes.

DETERMINE THE ROLE OF STANDARDIZED IL TESTING

Project SAILS (or a similar standardized IL skills test) will be a piece of the assessment plan, but it is suggested that we begin implementing the test on a regular basis in order to gain a better perspective on the IL skills of our students, and to see progress through their Miami education (i.e. students taking the test in their freshman year and again in the junior/senior year).

IMPLEMENT PILOT

Once our plan is created, we will implement the plan with a high-profile and high enrollment course. A pilot will help us to tweak the plan and determine what to expect once the plan is fully being implemented.

CREATE AN OPERATIONAL FEEDBACK LOOP

Acting and changing the instruction program based upon assessment will be an important feature of the assessment plan. Results from the previous years assessments will be discussed with all librarians yearly. This meeting will provide time not only to discuss results, but to determine action steps for improving the instruction program as a whole.

THE MIAMI STUDENT

SUBMITTED BY KELLYN MORAN

BENEFITS OF COPEL

- 1) The COPEL has impacted me professionally by forcing me to ask the question: how can I better serve students—(whether it is in the realm of a student organization or my fellow students in class)? COPEL asks members to think beyond basic curricula and to throw out some of what they may have learned so far in their teaching careers. The readings and meetings are a great opportunity to bounce ideas.
- 2) I wasn't expecting COPEL to benefit my program (The Student). I wanted to get involved because I questioned how the conversation about an engaged model could happen without engaging students in it. But after writing learning outcomes and having individual meetings with Kari, I realized how well the engaged learning model fit with The Student. Generally, as students begin to develop more in their writing and are less likely to be in that first "externally driven" stage, they are promoted to a higher post, be it beat reporter or editor. I think taking some of what I've learned at COPEL back to The Student will help improve the process and product in that office.

PLANS FOR CHANGE

- 3) Getting everyone on the same page is one challenge with promoting engaged learning. One colleague was talking about having a rough time with another department who just didn't understand why it was important to allow a student time for tutoring. The other department didn't understand the model of the engaged learner and didn't seem very willing to spend time learning about it, according to what one of the COPEL members was talking about during a meeting. This kind of clash shows the need to get everyone on board if this is the model the university would like to follow going forward.
- 4) At this point, there are no concrete plans for redesigning The Student, but I am passing along Learning Outcomes to the new editor in chief for him and sections editors to implement should they choose. Austin understands the importance of the project and will likely put some of what I'm passing along to use. It is not a quick process though, and, especially with the rate of turnover in my program specifically, it is going to be hard to keep the momentum going. But I hope future editors realize the value of integrating the engaged learning model into some aspects of the newsroom, because I really believe it could improve the product of the paper.

NEW STUDENT PROGRAMS

SUBMITTED BY BUFFY STOLL

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

The COPEL has had a far greater impact on my professional and personal development than I anticipated. When I first applied for the COPEL, I was very excited, and certain that it would be beneficial for my work in New Student Programs. But I never imagined the extent to which the COPEL would influence specific, visible, measurable change in orientation.

One thing that's challenging about working with orientation programs is that it looks easy. New students are generally receptive to direction, and they'll follow the instructions we give them. So the population doesn't demand a great deal in terms of student development knowledge – in my experience, they're most concerned that programs are organized and that staff are good "customer service" representatives. Before participating in the

COPEL, I had recognized the importance of outcomes for orientation & new student programs, but I didn't know enough about student development and student learning to effectively implement developmentally appropriate change.

The term "developmentally appropriate" is very significant to me now. In designing outcomes and expectations for the programs and students I work with, I now start by considering what they know. Often, the outcomes I was designing before the COPEL were unrealistic, because I didn't know enough about students' developmental stages in order to calibrate my goals with the opportunity for development within the time and space limits of my program. Now, the changes we've made in orientation really do situate learning in the student (and parent/family) experience, so the new information is relevant and has a context within their perspective. Specifically, we'll ask new students and their guests to engage in written reflection after several orientation sessions throughout the day. Students will then utilize their reflections in conversations with orientation leaders (SOULs). We'll ask parents and family members to utilize their reflections to start discussions with their new students during/after orientation. New students will then develop one academic and one co-curricular goal by the end of the first day of Orientation that they can use to guide advising conversations the following morning.

The COPEL also inspired our use of a framework to define and contextualize student outcomes and expectations in their orientation experience. We developed four key words: Confident, Comfortable, Connected, and Curious. These "Four Cs" are elements of student development to which we'd like our programs to contribute. And we'll communicate The Four Cs to students and family members at orientation so they will understand our program's aims more clearly, and take initiative to reach toward these competencies as well.

In addition to these new developments, the COPEL has also prompted us to consider existing elements of orientation in order to increase impact and meaning to new students and their families. We've considered our messages to new students in terms of their operation from an external formulas stage. For example, we know that students come to orientation with the expectation of getting registered for fall classes – so we've constructed our reflection and goal-setting exercises into the message that these exercises will contribute to a more successful advising experience. We're using their external formulas as carrots to engage them in experiences that we hope will also generate growth toward self-authorship.

I can also say that the COPEL has had a significant impact on my career personally. As a result of my participation, theory has developed an increasing importance in my practice, and I've felt energized and excited about my work. The COPEL has also a great deal to do with my decision to pursue further studies at the doctoral level. I know that I want to continue learning about student development in order to increase the impact I have on new students and their transitions.

I'd like to note that the one-on-one meetings with COPEL facilitators were infinitely valuable to me, and I felt this was a major strength of the program. Also, I value that the membership of COPEL spanned academic and student affairs, and I appreciate that opportunity for connection and dialogue.

DEPARTMENTAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

The COPEL has infused a greater sense of purpose and reliance on theory in the work that my office is doing. We're even designing our student leader training based on the Learning Partnerships Model, and beginning each SOUL training (we've had three so far) with written reflection. This purpose is also evident in our new website, which was developed during my time in the COPEL. Our new website communicates a stronger sense of purpose in our programs, and helps new students and parents better understand the aims and goals of our program, and our expectations of new students.

I think the COPEL will continue to benefit New Student Programs as we continue to carefully consider and expand services and programming to support new student transitions throughout their first year, and build the bridge between the first and second year experience.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

Maybe consider a presentation for the Miami Community as a peer education opportunity to share our progress. I'm also curious about what other COPEL members are developing, and I'd certainly attend a symposium on engaged learning that featured updates on COPEL projects.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM IN MY OFFICE

I think I may have already answered this question in part 1. Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification on my answers.

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SUBMITTED BY LEONARD S. MARK, PSYCHOLOGY

PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL IMPACT OF COPEL

For health reasons I was unable to participate in COPEL during the fall semester. However, I can honestly say that COPEL meetings have been the highlight of my spring semester. **First**, the meetings address important issues that need to be examined by the diverse constituencies of the university—faculty, residence life staff, administrative staff and students. Outside of seminars that I teach (and I suspect Marcia Baxter Magolda teaches), this is the only forum on campus that addresses questions regarding the types of experience that promote the sought-after intellectual, ethical and personal development sought-after by educators who focus on the college experience. **Second**, the multiple constituencies that participate in COPEL we are able to construe student engagement in the broader context of college life as opposed to classroom activities. Engagement applies equally to the co-curriculum as well as the curriculum. **Third**, COPEL has been invaluable in providing me with guidance and support for my own activities in the Psychology Department's TOP 25 project. This semester I have been overseeing two groups of undergraduate discussion leaders for our redesigned Introduction to Psychology (PSY 111) course. (See below for more information about this project.) The preparation and supervision of these engaged undergraduates has occupied considerable time. The discussions have helped me focus my efforts toward meaningful goals. At a recent COPEL meeting a panel of five current discussion leaders spoke with the participating faculty. This discussion offered me a candid perspective about the impact of this program on the discussion leaders as well as the students enrolled in introductory psychology. More importantly, it encouraged me to reach out to the Howe Writing Center which also has undergraduates serving in the capacity of writing consultants. Today (4-1-09) we arranged a joint meeting of the two groups of undergraduates to talk about their experiences in guiding the development of the undergraduates with whom they work. From these experiences, I am now convinced that this undergraduate leadership program can become a Miami brand that distinguishes what we have to offer. We are beginning to work with other departments to explore how they might adopt such a undergraduate leadership program.

KEY BENEFITS OF COPEL FOR MY DEPARTMENT

The third point (above) is having a significant impact on conversations in our department about the psychology major and how activities at key points in the curriculum might be coordinated and integrated to produce better

outcomes for the psychology majors. With the encouragement of Carl Paternite (Chair), the faculty members have become more willing to talk about some of the important developments in the field of learning, cognitive science and development as they bear on pedagogy throughout the curriculum. In an important sense, the discussions we have had as part of COPEL have provided useful background for interpreting the efforts of faculty within the department to promote engaged learning in their own classes.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

1. It is simply false to believe that faculty cannot excel in the classroom as well as in their research. We have many outstanding and innovative instructors in the classroom who have internationally recognized research programs and are able to engage undergraduate and graduate students in their research. To achieve this faculty need a course load that permits them to pursue the types of interactions with students that encourage student engagement.
2. The university should sponsor a conference in which faculty from each department examines how each discipline uses evidence, and regards the nature of knowledge. The purpose of the discussion is to identify the similarities (and differences) among disciplines so that instructors can assist students in appreciating these relationships. Currently, the foundation course structure does a stellar job at obfuscating the similarities and differences, which is why so many students see the foundation courses as silos.
3. The university should provide a discussion of engaged learning and pedagogy as part of the orientation for new faculty. The new faculty should understand something about the intellectual and ethical development that occurs during the college years (and beyond).

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM IN DEPARTMENT

The Psychology Department has participated in the TOP 25 Project to redesign our introductory psychology course. A key component of the redesigned course involves the training of engaged undergraduates to lead discussion sections for one-hour each week. To support the training and ongoing supervision of the undergraduate discussion leaders, the Psychology Department has created three courses (PSY 211, 212, 313). The key idea is that these students are being trained to be leaders, not only in the discussion group, but in their daily activities that comprise the co-curriculum of the college experience. They have an appreciation of the intellectual and ethical development of beginning college students as well as the ability to reflect on their own development and views about the nature of knowledge and learning.

The original report, written in 2008, examines the inquiry-based efforts from the perspective of student development in Perry's progression of positions. Several updates to that report are identified below.

Beth Uhler (Middletown campus) has developed a web-based introductory psychology course that is available to Ohio residents. This course, as well as her face-to-face course, focuses on the same principles regarding how psychologists use evidence that is the cornerstone of the redesigned PSY 111 course that is part of the TOP 25 project.

The Psychology Department is also supporting the efforts of Joseph Johnson to redesign the statistics and research method sequence which is an essential component of the psychology major. This effort involves not only a new curriculum, but new pedagogy based on the "inverted classroom." The intention is to improve quantitative literacy among psychology students in order to better prepare them for advanced courses in the major. Dr. Johnson's efforts are supported Robin Thomas' work in the area of mathematical modeling. Dr. Thomas is using a new pedagogy to transfer considerable responsibility to each student in designing their own syllabus. The rationale

behind her work reflects many of the ideas underlying David Hodge's student as scholar model and works toward the emergence of self-authorship.

Amanda Diekman is taking responsibility for creating a curriculum for honors students (including students intending to pursue departmental honors) in the department. There is now a multicourse sequence that builds on the foundation provided by the introductory course, statistics and research methods courses to facilitate a meaningful experience in which students engage in research leading to a thesis project.

The department discussions of how we can better engage students in learning have encouraged a number of faculty to use pedagogies designed to give students more responsibilities for their own learning. There are a number of courses that have engaged students in research action projects that are intended to have some effect in addressing a problem at the university.

The department (faculty and graduate students) are devoting one Friday each semester for a colloquium and discussion of learning and pedagogy.

RESIDENCE LIFE

SUBMITTED BY JERRY OLSON & PATTY MARTINEZ

The context of this reflection on our participation in COPEL is important to understand. The Office of Residence Life spent approximately 15 months preparing for the implementation of a paradigm shift in the way our work occurs: via a residential curriculum, a learning-outcome based approach that has, as one of its philosophical foundations, the learning partnerships model. During these 15 months, many meetings were held with the advisory and central staffs of the department, which included all staff and subsets of these groups. Outside consultants (e.g. Marcia Baxter Magolda, Kari Taylor, Peter Magolda) met with us on multiple occasions, the two Associate Directors attended a Residential Curriculum Conference held at the University of Delaware, and staff training sessions occurred with both the full advisory staff and the RA staff for the implementation of the residential curriculum, which occurred in July, 2008.

Thus, the focus of our participation in COPEL was to examine the components of our residential curriculum, to gain a perspective from others about this work, and to further discern what changes/next steps should occur. The discussions via COPEL have been instructive in this regard. The interactions with others in the group and listening to the students who have been on the panels have affirmed our belief that our paradigm shift has been a good one. A significant key benefit has been the examination of our current training programs and the way they are administered. We are changing the committee structure of the office in terms of the administrative oversight for the training programs, a shift that we anticipate will have a bump or two along with the way, just as the implementation of the residential curriculum had - and will continue to have - some bumps along the way. Other concrete changes that will occur are revisions to the language of the curriculum [i.e. to make it more "user friendly" for RAs and other students to understand], the continuation of a practicum student each semester whose focus will be the residential curriculum, the creation of an academic year assessment calendar for the curriculum, the development of a marketing piece - for use with ORL stakeholders, candidates, other institutions making inquiries of our work, and other campus constituents - that will help us "tell our story" when it comes to the work we do with our students. The most recent session - on assessment - was very valuable to us as this issue is one of the more challenging ones for us.

Other challenges for us to stay-the-course include the sophomore residency requirement being implemented in the fall, the expansion of our living learning community initiatives, the examination of the university-wide academic advising system underway, the current budget crisis within the University, and aging residence halls needing

renovation/reconstruction – with a learning-environment focus. We see these challenges as opportunities to influence the culture of the campus to evolve into a learning-centered university, from both a curricular and co-curricular point of view.

COPEL provided participants to get on the same page when it comes to what constitutes an engaged learning environment. Its legacy will endure only if current participants carry out their projects and discussions occur outside their own departments/offices. The continuation of support from the Provost and President's offices will be integral to the success of creating a culture where engaged student learning is the goal. CELT may be able to play a role in this legacy as well. Just as the implementation of our residential curriculum is a culture change that takes time, so too is the culture change of the university as a whole. ORL hopes to be a contributor in this regard in the years ahead.

RINELLA LEARNING CENTER

SUBMITTED BY KRISTY DROBNEY AND LINDA DIXON

PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

Kristy: Professionally COPEL has given me the opportunity to systematically analyze/design practice around the engaged learning principles. As a graduate of the CSP program I am familiar with developmentally based practices and strive to weave them into my work. However, COPEL formally introduced me to the Learning Partnerships Model and the process to ensure engaged learning principles are at the core of what I do. In the past I would start with the product, task or practical need that had to be accomplished (i.e., topic of class, helping student with time management, discussing choice of major, etc.) and attach student-centered practices to those scenarios. COPEL made me realize that I was approaching things backwards. Our COPEL project has taught me to identify the learning objectives I want to achieve first and think about how those objectives can be facilitated (i.e., what approaches will be developmentally effective and student-centered). Then the practical needs of our office can be incorporated into the theoretical framework that we crafted. This approach will certainly lead to more effective, consistent and assessable implementation of engaged learning.

Linda: Being involved in COPEL has been intellectually stimulating at a point in my career when I thought opportunities like this one for me to grow and learn were limited.

Kristy & Linda: Another benefit of COPEL was the opportunity to professionally connect with faculty and staff from across the university. The mix of student affairs and academic affairs was refreshing and productive. We were able to build relationships with a broad range of university professionals. In addition, we identified ways to collaborate with a number of offices/departments in the university that we had never worked with before. We were also able to share perspectives and gain a better understanding of one another's work. Overall, COPEL broke down some barriers that have existed between our office and other offices in the past.

Finally, it was refreshing to have this professional development opportunity during the workday and at the university. We all engage in professional development (i.e., research, classes, conferences, keeping current with best practices, etc.) outside of the office. It was nice to know the President and Provost value professional development enough to facilitate and fund COPEL.

DEPARTMENTAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

Kristy & Linda: The framework for the academic support we provide students will be more consistent and coherent across the functional areas in our office and our various programs. We will use our engaged learning plan to rethink and revamp all aspects of our work. We will be able to create structures that are grounded in engaged learning and promote student development. Ultimately we will help students become more developmentally sophisticated and internally defined. Since similar efforts will be taking place across the university this is an opportunity for a significant cultural shift at Miami. This is the type of change needed to revitalize our campus and foster an engaged intellectual climate.

Linda: What drew me to apply for COPEL was an opportunity to work with faculty who are interested in changing how they teach. I thought my involvement would advantage my unit because as instruction of students change so will the kind of academic support. So I came into this with the notion that the information I gain would help me to assess if my unit is providing the right kind of support or be able to determine if we need to change and how. What I learned during the process is that everything we do is not hinged to classroom instruction. My unit can incorporate the tenets of engaged learning on multiple levels.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

Kristy & Linda: Build on the work COPEL has begun. The COPEL participants could serve as facilitators or consultants for other departments working to build engaged learning into their areas. Some participants might feel comfortable facilitating a second COPEL. Others might be able to facilitate stand-alone workshops or work sessions to provide guidance and feedback to those crafting engaged learning plans.

Kristy: Faculty and staff educators would benefit from taking a semester long course on student development theory. COPEL did a fantastic job covering the basics but more depth would have been beneficial. Those new to student development did not have enough time to really explore the concepts and create meaning around them.

Kristy & Linda: Future efforts should have significant student input. A format that pairs faculty/staff with students to create plans and work on projects would be true examples of co-constructing knowledge and situating learning in learners' experiences. Our learning outcomes and plans may not include the primary concerns of students.

Linda: The effort needs to be bigger. The CELT office should be positioned to provide some leadership for initiative. The senior administration needs to go through an abbreviated process. A web site rich with information and resources should be developed so that self-learners can have access to the model. Lastly, there needs to be more examples of how the model can be applied to the four year experience.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM IN OUR PROGRAM

Kristy & Linda: We are creating learning outcomes and engaged learning practices for our regular meetings with students (those students who we meet with during an entire semester, year or over several semesters). We currently have our learning outcomes. We have started the process of aligning the tasks we complete in our meetings with the outcomes. The final step will be to identify practices/strategies/instruments to facilitate the outcomes and task completion. Below is our learning outcomes chart.

Engaged Learning Plan: RLC Student Appointments: Long-term connection, regular meetings

Student Learning Outcomes	Where Students Start	Introductory: recognize what is going on behind the scenes	Intermediate: actively investigate & pursue things that are meaningful to them	Advanced: monitor and assess the impact of their pursuits; make adjustments as necessary
Decision Making	<p>Look to authorities</p> <p>Right/Wrong answers</p> <p>Do what is expected</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to identify and articulate how their decisions are made • Identify times when what others wanted did not reflect what they wanted and why there was a mismatch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify options and how each aligns or does not align with one's values. • Identify the problems/negatives of making decisions that meet others' needs and the benefits of making decisions that meet their own needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an evaluation process to make decisions • Ability to mediate external agents in order to make best decision for themselves
Goal Setting/Planning	<p>Single-minded</p> <p>Product focus (not process)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to recognize how current endeavors can lead to realizations and enhancement of long-term goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create action plan to explore potential goals • Create benchmarks or mini-goals that lead to long-term goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess progress, maintain, refine and evaluate goals based on new experiences and changes in perspective
Self-Assessment/Self-Awareness	<p>Low self-assessment/awareness</p> <p>Look to others to know strengths</p> <p>Values/priorities externally based</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to articulate strengths & weaknesses; identify how they came up with those perceptions • Able to see help when necessary & appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and explore identities, abilities, values and beliefs • Identify ways to evaluate strengths, values and beliefs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconcile previous perspectives with current perspectives • Identify ways to play to strengths
Engaged in Education	<p>Passive</p> <p>Receive knowledge</p> <p>Go through the motions</p> <p>Approach school as a check-list</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to identify & articulate why they came to college, as well as, articulate what they hope to gain/outcomes they want to achieve by going to college 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take classes & engage in activities that promote what students want out of college; recognize how they contribute to experience & desired outcomes; and identify behaviors, activities and choices that are detrimental to desired outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create plans for education; systematic approach to promote desired outcomes • Identify impact education has had (changes in thought, beliefs, values, self-awareness, etc.)

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY & GERONTOLOGY

SUBMITTED BY MARGARET JENDREK

1. My involvement in COPEL has been both professionally and personally rewarding. After teaching 30 plus years (yes, it is true), I am finally “getting” why some students seem unable to pick a topic for a term paper or seem unable to discuss a topic without relating it to their personal experience. My finally “getting it” has been eye opening.

As a consequence of learning about student development (and Rodney also describes this in his response to this question), I am rethinking my goals for the classes that I teach. The rethinking of goals combined with my new knowledge about student development means that I will experiment with new-to-me teaching techniques. That experimentation is both exciting and scary!

The excitement stems from a belief that as students become “self-authored” they value and assume responsibility for their own learning and that value transcends any particular topic (e.g., sociology, civic responsibility, social justice). Consequently, to embrace the developmental model and to move students in that model is to encourage life-long learning in all areas of life. The scary aspect stems from the fact that I am “an old prof who is trying to learn new tricks.” Actually, that idea is both exciting and scary!

2. Rodney describes many of the benefits for our department. I would like to add that our participation in COPEL and our raising the engaged learning issues in department meetings has (and will) lead to more discussion about program goals, course sequencing, the meanings behind course numbers, and course/program assessment.

3. I think the COPEL group started the process and each participant serves as an emissary for promoting the development of engaged learning among faculty/staff. Although the formal meeting of the currently composed group is coming to a close, I wonder if people within the community want to and plan to continue the discussion. I know I would welcome the opportunity to meet with faculty to discuss how they/we implement engaged learning in both individual assignments/classes and programs.

4. Rodney describes some of our concrete plans. In addition, we have already had one department meeting devoted to a discussion of the stages of student learning. Marcia facilitated that discussion. Next week’s department meeting will be devoted to the implementation of engaged learning (student development, course sequencing) in our programs.

We plan to continue to facilitate meetings with our departmental faculty to explain, describe, and discuss engaged learning. Ultimately, it is our hope that these discussions will inform our curriculum and help, as Rodney indicates, in the structuring of our new social justice major.

SUBMITTED BY RODNEY COATES

As a consequence of involvement with COPEL we have gained significant insights that will hopefully facilitate pedagogical enhancements within and across the Department of Sociology and Gerontology. We have come to better appreciate how engaged learning is both an essential and exciting dimension to our curricular efforts. Already we have seen the fruits of this, in a modest way, by redesigning a capstone class. We are eagerly anticipating utilizing these strategies as we design a new major in social justice. Our department has recently indicated support of the essence of COPEL as it grapples with future assessment needs, outcomes of major

indicators, and curricula developments. All in all, this has been an exhilarating process.

With respects to the redesigned capstone, Rodney Coates began with some basic assumptions associated with a) development, b) engagement, and c) expected outcomes. Specifically, he reconsidered the goals of the capstone experience in Sociology and restructured the course to maximize both student engagement and outcomes. Restructuring began with an assessment of where the students were and where they should be, given a excellent capstone experience. The immediate shifts occurred by establishing explicit guidelines, target goals, and requirements that would facilitate the transformation of the student from a passive into an active participant. These shifts were graduated through a series of planned classroom situations which sequentially encouraged increasing student engagement, along with ownership. As this was a capstone experience, certain assumptions regarding pervious learning outcomes (such as minimal number of Soc. courses, upper class status, and writing/research capabilities) were taken as givens. To maximize the growth and engagement of the students, accountability measures were introduced. These accountability measures required weekly, and increased levels of engagement on the part of the students. Quarterly, students produced reflective papers which important feedback to both students and the professor. The papers, graded within a week of submission, were intended to both assess and to further the process. Students quickly learned that active engagement in class discussions, and the material had obvious payoffs with greatly improved papers. Each of the quarterly papers were graded on an ever increasing and intensive scale in order to provide the steepest curve toward maximal growth and development.

Even more, as I thought about engagement, I saw that it's parameters could be much more broadly applied to the entire University. Many of the problems we face, many of the issues that we are confronted suggests opportunities to step back, take a deep breath and invite all participants to take ownership, demonstrate responsibility, and become more engaged. As we look at various segments of our student population, what more can we achieve by understanding how to transcend locational biases, help all to feel included, and to engage in more diverse conversations. I anticipate that as this process continues to develop, and as more embrace the possibilities that COPEL will become the pedagogical face of Miami.

SOPHOMORE YEAR PROGRAMS

SUBMITTED BY MIKE O'NEAL

I am actually in a unique position where I must collaborate with many partners on campus. Upon my arrival at Miami University, one of the first things I did was to review literature on the developmental issues of second-year students and develop learning outcomes for my program. I already have a strong assessment background and always consider the assessment of learning outcomes when developing programs.

Sophomore students return to college after their freshman year and find that much of the support provided to them as first-year students is now gone. They are not necessarily accepted into a major, and graduation looks a long way off. During their first-year, they were dealing with many developmental and transitional issues, but mostly concentrated on being a freshman. During their second year they start to realize that there is life after college, they must decide on a major and career, and that developmental issues they dealt with their first year are not resolved.

The academic research on first-year students is abundant within the literature on student development. Little research exists that specifically examines the needs of second-year students. Much still needs to be learned about the needs of second-year students. The research that does exist suggests that second-year students are experiencing developmental transitions in defining self, knowledge and moral decision making processes.

Research suggests

- Integration into the social and academic environment serves as a means for greater institutional and goal commitment, higher completion rates and early success. (Tinto)
- Sophomore persistence is related to successfully adjusting to stress, grade satisfaction, time management and stabilization of career choice. (Gohn, Swartz & Donnelly)
- A strong relationship between in-class and out-of class experience leads to enhanced learning and development if they are complimentary. (Schroeder and Mable)
- The journey to self authorship requires reflection. Schaller describes four stages of decision making that sophomores may experience.
- Baxter-Magolda writes that sophomores should be at a “crossroads” stage of change by the end of their sophomore year, i.e. developing an evolving awareness of different views on knowledge (epistemological), identity (intrapersonal), and relationships (interpersonal).

Miami University’s Second Year Programs has been developed around these research themes into four major programming areas: 1) Local and Global Citizenship; 2) Major Selection and Commitment to Major; 3) Connecting Academic Experiences; and 4) Health and Well Being.

At this point I am comfortable saying that I am using the material from COPEL to design, collaboratively, programs with the Career Center, Career Education and Testing Center, the Rinella Learning Center, the Office of Community Engagement and Service, Residence Life, Office of Diversity Affairs, the Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Education, the Office of Off-Campus Affairs and Tribal Relations, the Cliff Alexander Office of Fraternal and Sorority Life and Leadership and Study Abroad.

I am also working with various academic divisions to develop programs to meet the needs of their second-year students. I am currently working with an ad-hoc faculty committee chaired by Michael Dantley to bring sophomore issues into the curriculum of the university. All these initiatives are at various stages of development and involve the Learning Partnership Model with the goal of developing self authorship to different degrees. In the middle of all this, bringing it all together is the e-portfolio. I have been involved with the campus initiative to find an e-portfolio to meet the needs of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The e-portfolio will be our main tool in helping students reflect on their self-actualization process.

One specific program that I can speak about, as an example, is my own interaction with residence life in the training of professional staff. My first project was to design a curriculum for residence life staff that work with the upper class halls, and who already have a working knowledge of the Learning Partnership Model. If I had not attended COPEL, I would have simply gathered some data on second-year students and presented the information to the staff at a training session.

Instead, I’ve developed a curriculum that I want the staff to go through during the next year (I will meet with them monthly). The curriculum incorporates the Learning Partnership Model, consists of some research and looking at what other university programs are doing, but it also contains reflective assignments where staff will process and reflect upon their own undergraduate experience and take lessons from that reflection in order to understand some of their own second-year student issues. Helping staff to reflect on their own experiences will help them understand current student issues and help them better work with their own residents and RA’s.

They will then also be challenged to take those reflective processes to their staffs and use them with their own development of their RA’s. Professional staff will challenge student staff to reflect on their own values and goals (both career and in life) and how that relates to their behaviors and actions both on and off campus. The goal is

that the process will positively impact RA's and help them to create more developmentally appropriate programs and strategies to work with their own residents and meet the needs of second-year students.

Professional staff could use their staff meeting time with their RA's and create reflective activities for the RA's do together in the meeting. Professional staff would model how to moderate the process. RA's could then take this format to their residents. As an example, there could be a reflective conversation during a staff meeting about major selection. RA's could then take that model within a residence hall, have a "Coffee Nite" program where coffee, cake is served, a faculty member is invited to be part of the discussion, and the RA could lead a discussion on how people picked their majors, and lead the conversation as to why that major is correct for that person. The faculty member would be part of that conversation and reflect on their own processes.

RA's could tie that same kind of activity into a visit to the Career Center which only focuses on their materials, not "why did you pick that career". The goal of this type of career planning is to get students to move from external formulas where students might pick a major because their parents suggested it; their parents majored in that; or they want to make a lot of money, to a place that is closer to the "crossroads", where students would be questioning a decision to pick a major because their parents suggested in, to picking a major and career because it is in line with their values and life goals.

I am also developing a second-year student retreat that is an overnight, off campus experience which will be September 18 and 19, 2009. I am developing programming, again, in collaboration with other offices, that will be very reflective and Learning Partnership Model focused. I am creating a Second-Year Advisory Council made up of (mostly) sophomore students to help identify programming needs for second-year students for next year. This student group will also experience some developmental experiences based around the Learning Partnership Model and self-authorship.

STUDENT AFFAIRS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (SAHE) PROGRAM

SUBMITTED BY TARAN CARDONE AND MARCIA BAXTER MAGOLDA

PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF THE COPEL

The COPEL provided us an opportunity to make connections with various individuals and departments, which will undoubtedly serve us well in this process of becoming an engaged university. This group also allowed us to apply theoretical concepts regarding engaged learning and student development theory to various practical contexts, thereby further contributing to our understanding of how student learning plays out across campus. Furthermore, COPEL gave us a unique opportunity to observe intergroup dialogue (among faculty, student affairs educators, administrators, and students) over a sustained period of time. As a result, we were able to directly witness the impact of this type of communication on individuals' beliefs, identities, and relationships as related to their perspective on effective teaching and working within the university. Likewise, by conducting the COPEL in congruence with the Learning Partnerships Model, we were able to observe the effects of that learning paradigm on the members of this group. Therefore, this endeavor only further confirmed the incredible potential of creating similar learning opportunities for students on a macrolevel.

PERSONAL BENEFITS OF THE COPEL

I found COPEL to be a really engaging and encouraging community during my adjustment to Miami as a graduate student. This group gave me a vital opportunity to see myself as a co-authority in an inviting learning community. Carolyn, Kari, and Marcia role modeled an effective vision of teaching and learning throughout the planning and

execution processes of this endeavor. Consequently, all three of them became important learning partners for my journey here at Miami. ~ Taran Cardone

Interacting with COPEL members deepened my understanding of the complexity of this transformation in various disciplinary and student affairs contexts. Exploring participants' genuine concerns helped me consider more effective ways to engage them in entertaining engaged learning. ~ Marcia Baxter Magolda

KEY BENEFITS FOR SAHE MS PROGRAM

Our participation in COPEL has provided a forum for us to synthesize information from various sources into an explicit vision of the overarching learning outcomes of the MS program and three developmentally sequenced phases for students to achieve them. This vision will integrate components of the program – admission, orientation, advising, the curriculum, and assessment of student learning – around the learning outcomes. The process of refining learning outcomes and phases in community dialogues with students and faculty is helping us envision how students can take responsibility for maximizing their learning in their graduate experience.

FUTURE EFFORTS FOR FACULTY AND STAFF EDUCATORS' DEVELOPMENT REGARDING ENGAGED LEARNING

The success of the COPEL makes a compelling argument for similar efforts in which various constituencies (faculty, student affairs educators, administrators, and students) engage in sustained dialogue regarding the tenets of engaged learning and the resulting implications for student learning in different contexts. Current participants in the COPEL can be encouraged to lead future COPELs in which even more members of the campus community engage in this conversation. Ideally, CELT would join both ideologically and administratively with this initiative, thereby creating a central hub from which these efforts materialize. Key staff in CELT should have the benefit of exploring this paradigm shift. Following these measures, future engaged learning resources, workshops, and incentives could be made available through CELT for all faculty and staff educators. Integrating existing student affairs professional development work into CELT would also be idea. In addition, the university should create ample opportunities to allow exemplar role models of engaged learning to: 1) assess the impacts of engaged learning in their respective learning context and 2) showcase their pedagogical philosophies, techniques and developmental/ learning outcomes as related to this work.

REDESIGN PLANS

We envision our learning outcomes and developmental phases to achieve them as a living, evolving document that will guide community discussions throughout the year. In summer 2009, we will ask incoming students to complete a reflective assignment describing how their prior educational experiences have shaped who they are as a learner and how this will affect their approach to our program. Returning students will complete a similar reflection on how their learning experiences in the first year shaped their approach to learning and the implications of that approach to their second year in the program. These reflections will serve as students' baseline assessment of their learning characteristics for the year. Orientation activities prior to start of classes will offer an opportunity for students to share their reflections in the context of the program learning outcomes. These sessions will introduce the concept of students' planning their educational experience based on identifying the phase that best matches their current development. Academic advising will initially focus on helping individual students plan their approaches to meeting the learning outcomes, starting in the appropriate phase. Advising will also focus on helping students identify ways to assess and document their progress on the learning outcomes. EDL 656, the supervised practice course in which students are enrolled in all four semesters, will support students in organizing their assistantship and practica experience position contracts based on their current phase of pursuing the learning outcomes. Evaluation of these experiences will provide an assessment of progress on the learning

outcomes. Faculty will also educate assistantship and practica supervisors about our overarching learning outcomes and the developmental phases of these outcomes. Course syllabi will articulate how course learning outcomes relate to the overarching learning outcomes and assignments will be flexible to allow students to adjust them to fit their current developmental phase. As we build the reflective framework to scaffold students' pursuit of the developmental phases, we will also build an assessment process that provides guidance in pursuing learning outcomes and a culminating assessment of students' achievement at the end of the program. Progress on these efforts in 2009 will set the stage for revising our admission essay to make it the first reflection/assessment of this process. In summer 2009 we will revise our program website to articulate the learning outcomes of the program.

UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM

SUBMITTED BY KARI TAYLOR AND CAROLYN HAYNES

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

Kari: The opportunity to collaborate with Carolyn Haynes and Marcia Baxter Magolda to facilitate the Community of Practice on Engaged Learning has helped me better understand how to effect lasting change at an institutional level. For instance, as we worked to unite the community during the first few sessions, I realized the importance of clearly communicating the role each member plays in the student learning process. I also realized that educators—much like the students with whom we work—pay close attention to implicit cultural cues to determine how to use their time and energy. Thus, certain procedures and processes such as evaluations that focus on customer satisfaction make many educators afraid to design experiences that expect students to accept greater responsibility for their education given that such experiences may not yield increased satisfaction (though they would yield greater learning). While I used to dismiss such fears, I am now more diligent in understanding what an individual educator perceives as barriers/challenges to fully embracing the engaged learning philosophy so that I am better able to co-construct with them a way to move forward.

On a personal level, the COPEL has sparked my interest in educator development. Before this year, I centered my professional identity on enriching student learning and development; now, I have broadened my focus to encompass the learning and development of all those involved in higher education—faculty, staff, parents, alumni, and students. Moreover, the COPEL has allowed me to build meaningful and productive partnerships with a diverse group of faculty and staff. Through one-on-one meetings with various units, I have gained a better understanding of how to apply student development theory to contexts ranging from information literacy programs to introductory geology courses.

Carolyn: I have led numerous faculty development workshops at a range of institutions. The COPEL experience was my first opportunity not only to collaborate with my own colleagues at Miami in the design and implementation of the workshops but also to engage in a year-long, sustained development opportunity for both faculty and professional staff. To describe it as personally rewarding would be an understatement. Put simply, it has been the most enriching learning opportunity of my professional career, and it has instilled in me a profound respect for my co-facilitators (Marcia and Kari), but also fostered a deep respect for the intelligence, creativity and commitment to students of Miami faculty and staff.

DEPARTMENTAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

The key benefits/tangible outcomes of COPEL for the University Honors Program include the following:

- A detailed plan and process for helping faculty and staff members design engaged learning experiences

- A network of fellow Miami educators who are committed to engaged learning with whom we can partner as we continue to implement the new Honors Program framework
- A developmentally sequenced, learning-centered advising system that helps students progressively move from authority dependence to internal definition
- A detailed rubric for assessing how students make progress toward meeting the Honors tiered set of student learning outcomes

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

One way to improve efforts in developing faculty and staff educators is to have this year's COPEL participants facilitate similar learning communities in the future so as to broaden and sustain the dialogue regarding engaged learning. Another way, though less direct, is to help students and their parents understand the value of engaged learning through the admission and orientation process, which will help create a culture that truly supports and aligns with faculty and staff's efforts to create engaged learning experiences. In essence, having key stakeholders such as students and parents buy in to engaged learning will generate greater openness to the philosophy and thus encourage more educators to take steps to learn about how to better enact the philosophy.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM IN OUR PROGRAM

Beginning in fall 2009, the University Honors Program will feature a new developmental, outcomes-based framework that will guide students' learning experiences. Under this new framework, University Honors students will be required to complete a set of developmental outcomes focused in six areas of competence: critical and integrative thinking, collaboration, inquiry, communication, intercultural understanding, and self-reflection. Each competency area includes 10 outcomes that are sequenced according to students' developmental process; the sequence is based on Marcia Baxter Magolda's 20-year longitudinal study of college and adult development.

Each year, University Honors students will complete a "learning map" that includes intensive reflection on students' learning in relation to the outcomes, an "individualized plan of study" (which will meet their honors and liberal education requirements), and a "electronic portfolio" (which demonstrates additional evidence of students' engagement with the learning outcomes). Students' learning map and electronic portfolio will be submitted using Chalk & Wire's technology system.

Trained staff, faculty, and student leaders affiliated with the University Honors Program will assess students' learning maps and portfolios using a developmental rubric that has been created by our staff and tested for consistency and reliability. Honors advisers will meet with students to share feedback regarding the reviewers' assessment of their learning maps and portfolios and help them use the assessment results to decide how to continue meeting the developmental outcomes

Also in fall 2009, we will implement a new Honors core curriculum that consists of the following courses:

- *HON 181 "Foundations of Engaged Learning I"* (required one-credit fall course) will focus on setting goals for college; identifying interests and beliefs; exploring opportunities and resources with the UHP and across the University; creating the learning map and portfolio; and building a sense of community. Each HON 181 section will be part of a interdisciplinary, theme-based cluster that helps students make connections among disciplines and between in-class and out-of-class experiences.
- *HON 182 "Foundations of Engaged Learning II"* (required one-credit spring course) will function as a "practicum," offering students a glimpse into various areas for future leadership involvement, including: inquiry/research; community engagement; leadership; civic engagement; global and international issues;

recruitment and marketing; peer learning and mentoring; student culture and life; alumni relations and fundraising; communication.

- *HON 281 “Explorations into Engaged Learning I”* (two credit, optional course) will offer students the opportunity to explore the theoretical foundations of one of the thematic areas introduced in HON 182 and develop plans for how to enact those theories. Each section focuses on a distinct thematic area, such as: recruitment/marketing; community engagement; research and inquiry; student culture and life.
- *HON 282 “Explorations into Engaged Learning II”* (two-credit, optional course) will offer students the opportunity to implement and reflect on the effectiveness of their plans. HON 281-282 will allow students to meaningfully participate in developing and sustaining the UHP mission.
- *HON 381 “Leadership of Engaged Learning”* (one-credit optional course) enables students the opportunity to collaborate with University Honors staff to design, teach and assess student learning and student projects in either HON 181/182 or 281/282. Staff will meet with the students each week to review relevant professional literature on student learning, the relevant thematic area, and pedagogy, to plan the week’s activities, and to reflect on student work in the HON course. HON 381 students will be required to develop a professional portfolio that includes a reflective journal.

In essence, the new Honors core curriculum will provide students with the appropriate structure and challenge for gradually accepting responsibility for their own and others’ learning.

WESTERN PROGRAM

SUBMITTED BY HAYS CUMMINS AND KIM ERNSTING

BENEFITS OF COPEL

Hays: The COPEL project could not have happened at a better time for me. I am a faculty member of the ‘new western’ program and our current focus is to create a curriculum for Western. COPEL has provided an essential framework for discussion and action in the development of our curriculum. Two areas that I have focused on are the creation of a Western Inquiry Center and the rethinking of the Western senior creative project.

I’m pushing for the integration of our Inquiry Center into the entire new Western Curriculum, from the first year thru the fourth year. One goal is to have each Western course interface with the inquiry center. Students and faculty in the Western Program would have a critical role in making this happen. Student leaders will teach and facilitate inquiry as well as faculty.

Another goal is to integrate the Inquiry Center’s activities across the university such that the ‘center’ serves the entire Miami University community. For example, we are discussing the possibility of having an ‘inquiry journal’ that celebrates undergraduate scholarship in the social sciences, humanities and the sciences. The journal would be published by students whose home base would be in the Western inquiry center.

I can’t imagine being in a more suitable place for the integration of engaged learning into and across the new Western curriculum.

See **Kim’s** comments (above in Academic Advising report).

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

In order for the COPEL effort to be taken more seriously across the campus, I believe that there needs to be a system in place that rewards faculty for their efforts in engaged learning pedagogy. I predict that until that happens, the COPEL effort will face substantial resistance.

PLANS FOR DESIGNING CURRICULUM

WESTERN COLLEGE CURRICULUM

Kim: Hays Cummins, Ben Jacks and I have been meeting with the new Western Program (WST) faculty and have had several brainstorming sessions about student outcomes. We have learned along the way that it is best to talk about the process for arriving at the outcomes in terms other than developmental theory. The WST faculty have embraced Caroline's suggestion to think about the "bookends" of the curriculum to get started. Hays and I are working on the "Ends" bookend of the program and are identifying options for the final culminating senior project. Ben is working with two faculty members on the "Beginnings" bookend.

One prominent idea for the "Ends" bookend is that each student will make a proposal about the type of senior culminating project that he/she would like to do. This individualized project would be a reflection of the type of research methodology and presentation most closely associated with his/her area of study. The proposal could include many types of activities such as a journal publication or submission; conference presentation; research/thesis paper; theater presentation; symposium participation; gallery showing; colloquium concept; documentation/Technical Manual; musical composition and recital; or a combination of activities.

Once the proposal is made, the student would defend his/her proposal, perhaps including some type of oral defense answering questions to determine if the student has substantial background in the subject area(s). We are also considering different inquiry-based options for an Interdisciplinary Methodology process/course to prepare the students for the project.

INQUIRY CENTER

Hays: I would like to work with the Western faculty to create plans for a peer learning center focused on advancing inquiry-based learning. Below is a summary of our plans for the center.

Level	Student Traits	Student Learning Outcomes	Educator Role	Possible Learning Opportunities	Director Duties
First <i>Exploring questions, multiple perspectives on thorny problems; introduction to disciplines; gaining a voice</i>	Knowledge viewed as certain; reliance on authorities (e.g., professors, textbooks, the media) as source of knowledge; externally defined value system and identity; act in relationships to acquire approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore one's voice in inquiry; Describe one's discovery process and identify strengths and areas for improvement Summarize and paraphrase another's argument; accurately define thorny concepts; Describe the purpose and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interact personally with students through one-on-one conferences, written feedback and informal discussions; Discuss openly one's own discovery process, struggles and concerns Validate and encourage students' voices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sprint courses on discovery across the curriculum; asking questions, what is interdisciplinarity; introduction to the disciplines, etc. Opportunities to receive one-on-one peer mentoring/tutoring Plunge discovery trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach one sprint course Hire, train and supervise student center workers Offer plunge and co-curricular workshops and projects

		<p>aims of two or three disciplines;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze disciplinary texts (identifying their rhetorical components, evaluating their merits, etc.) 	<p>and viewpoints;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain and demystify various forms of analysis; Spark students' interest in and understanding of the disciplines introduced Provide clear criteria for assignments. 		
<p>Sophomore</p> <p><i>Understanding the inquiry process; comparing and contrasting disciplinary inquiries;</i></p> <p><i>Identifying one's interests and beliefs</i></p>	<p>Evolving awareness of multiple perspectives and uncertainty; evolving awareness of own values and identity and of limitations of dependent relationships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study and analyze good models of disciplinary inquiries by comparing ways that disciplines get defined by insiders and outsiders; comparing disciplinary approaches to a single issue; translating one disciplinary concept for an audience of different discipline; identifying limitations and benefits of various disciplinary worldviews. Conduct inquiries and write about them in 2-3 disciplines. Work within a diverse team to conduct a multi-disciplinary inquiry; use students' varying expertise to produce findings. Reflect on the relationship of one's own values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce topics which interest the students and which allow them to teach each other and the educator Explain and demystify the various forms of inquiry used frequently in the disciplines Participate actively along with the students in the study of two or three disciplines; Encourage students' active involvement in disciplinary work; Facilitate peer collaboration and collaborative learning. Initiate students into the codes, conventions, objectives and practices of disciplinary inquiry; Encourage a free exchange of verbal and written ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three-credit course, "Explorations into Inquiry" Placement service to guide students into labs, internships, community service opportunities, and other engaged learning venues International and domestic field excursion experiences Study groups for students in various interest areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach "Explorations into Inquiry" Course Oversee student workers who are creating placement service and facilitating study groups Offer field excursion experiences Workshops on selecting internships, study abroad experiences, and other research opportunities as well as applying for grants and other learning opportunities

		and the inquiry process			
<p>Junior</p> <p><i>Becoming proficient at methods of inquiry; practicing integration; formulating own inquiry projects aligned with interests and beliefs</i></p>	<p>Evolving awareness of multiple perspectives and uncertainty; evolving awareness of own values and identity and of limitations of dependent relationships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gain practice in and a critical awareness of two or three research methods (e.g., ethnography, surveys, questionnaires, interviews, protocols, case studies, scientific method, quantitative analysis, etc.); Compare and contrast qualitative and quantitative research methods and analyze their purposes within disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship; Utilize two different research methods to investigate a problem, question, issue of their own choosing. Read, study, analyze, compare and evaluate theoretical, qualitative and quantitative models of integration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Familiarize students with a variety of research methods; Foster a collegial community of researchers; Be patient with and provide support for the inevitable frustrations and difficulties students will face in their inquiries Demystify the theoretical, quantitative and qualitative methods and models addressed and provide opportunities for applying them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three-credit methods courses (focusing on qualitative, quantitative, theoretical or action-based approaches) Journal submissions Co-teaching sprint courses and workshops for first-year Workshops on creating grants and proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach 1-2 methods courses Oversee student workers who are creating online inquiry journal; facilitating colloquia, sprint courses and workshops for first-year students;
<p>Senior</p> <p><i>Designing and implementing own integrative</i></p>	<p>Awareness of knowledge as contextual; development of internal belief system and sense of self;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate in a self-conscious and critical manner two or more disciplines in order to respond to or solve a question, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate the growth and development of a scholar community Treat students as equals and valued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four-credit workshop on senior project Journal submissions Senior conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead one section of the senior project workshop Collaborate with student workers to create grant-

<i>inquiries that are personally meaningful</i>	capacity to engage in authentic, interdependent relationships	topic, issue or problem of their own choosing. Depending on the nature of the topic, projects should display a meaningful use of theory and/or methodology.	members of the workshop; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a collegial rapport and relationship with the student; to serve as a coach rather than an expert 		and proposal writing workshops; organize senior conference; edit journal; select prize winners and grant recipients
---	---	---	--	--	---

WOMEN'S STUDIES

SUBMITTED BY ANN FUEHRER AND MADELYN DETLOFF

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS OF COPEL

Ann:

I have participated in a number of faculty learning communities during my 28 years at Miami. All of them have been very valuable experiences for me, so I have sought out opportunities for professional development when reasonable. This experience has likewise been very beneficial. The primary benefits include an opportunity to work closely with my colleague Madelyn Detloff, something that we don't get enough opportunity to do; a chance to think about how to interface my work in the classroom with that done by Student Affairs personnel in creating co-curricular opportunities; a structure for working systematically with Marcia Baxter-Magolda's framework—I had been familiar with her research, but welcomed the impetus to consider it carefully; and, as always, a chance to learn from colleagues who are doing similar exploration. This faculty development opportunity was particularly timely, given President Hodge's emphasis on the model of students as engaged learners. I have always involved students in a similar way in teaching and scholarship; this community enabled me to slightly reframe what I have been doing, and to reflect on how to infuse it throughout the Women's Studies curriculum.

Madelyn:

One of the biggest benefits to me has been the occasion to work closely with my colleague, Ann Fuehrer. We often work together at meetings, but never have had the chance to talk substantively about our teaching goals, styles, and desires for the future of Women's Studies. Like most of my colleagues, I crave frank and constructive conversations about teaching and learning, and COPEL has provided a space for those conversations. I have for many years been a believer in what we are now calling engaged learning. We sometimes call it feminist pedagogy in Women's Studies, and active learning in other contexts. COPEL, for the first time in many years, has given me tremendous hope in the possibilities for making the spirit of engaged learning *real* here at Miami. It is one thing to "talk the talk" about teaching and learning, but COPEL is providing a vision and an infrastructure that I believe will enable us to "walk the walk." The co-curricular element of COPEL seems to me the key to realizing our vision. I have in the past been frustrated by the barriers between student affairs, administration, and faculty collaboration at this and many of my previous institutions. The fact that we sit down and talk with each other, rather than about each other, at

pedagogy meetings is a revolution in practice that is not to be underestimated for its transformational potential. In short, COPEL gives me hope that all of my and our hard work as faculty, staff, and students here will have a positive effect on all of us.

PROGRAM BENEFITS OF COPEL

Ann:

I believe the key benefits of COPEL for the Women's Studies program will be evidenced in several ways. First, we haven't really examined the ways in which the goals and pedagogies of our introductory, mid-level and capstone courses articulate with theories of student development. Madelyn and I will share our insights with our colleagues so that we can better take stages of student development into account in reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of our core courses and, to some extent, our cross-listed courses. Second, we believe we have a significant need to better integrate learning from and progression through our introductory, mid-level and capstone courses. Again, the opportunity to examine individual courses and the entire curriculum as they facilitate the development of students as engaged learners has been valuable, and will impact our thinking about possible course revisions.

Madelyn:

We both continue the process of discovery and collaboration that COPEL facilitated in our WMS program curricular discussions. Our conversations about curriculum cohesion, revision, and synchronization will be more substantive, I believe, as a result of our experience in COPEL. Already the Women's Studies Program has benefitted from the things we have learned in our COPEL meetings. Some of the changes are subtle--such as my now feeling very confident about referring students to the Rinella Learning Center—and some of the changes have been more visible, such as our strong focus on engaged learning at our biennial Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality Conference, themed "Be the Change: Local Interventions in a Global World." The entire organization of the conference was structured to facilitate active, community-based learning and discovery. We sought out and received much more participation from all sectors of the Miami community, from undergraduate and graduate students, community members (including a reverend from Oxford, a rabbi from Louisville and an imam from Dayton), staff, administrators, and faculty. The concluding event, a forum on Grassroots Change through Community Conversation, brought together all of these constituencies for a constructive discussion of how we individually and collectively might become agents of change for a better Miami, Oxford, and by extension, world. COPEL has also inspired me to work more with local student groups at their student-organized co-curricular events. I now see these events as 'co-curricular' opportunities for learning, and that change of perspective has enriched my teaching, learning, and administrative style as the director of WMS.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENGAGED LEARNING AT MIAMI

Ann:

I believe there are several significant challenges to our promoting engaged learning. The most significant impediment to any initiative to involve students more actively in their education, and this has been identified by myself and colleagues in both departmental or program discussions, and in faculty learning communities, is the large size of the courses we teach. In order for students to evolve as engaged learners, they cannot sit back in large lecture classes—they must be actively engaged with peer teaching assistants, graduate students, or faculty mentors. Such learning structures are labor, and time, intensive, both to

prepare and to administer. We just don't have the resources to do all that is asked of us as faculty members, or that we would wish to do. If we are able to negotiate this challenge, and many of us are, few of us have the expertise that we have developed through COPEL. Faculty development workshops in departments and programs could be utilized to provide faculty and graduate students with this framework, so that we can all be more informed about the links among stages of student development, evolution as engaged learners, and the design of curriculum/pedagogy and co-curricular opportunities.

Madelyn:

The key to the success of Engaged Learning at Miami is support for the faculty, staff, and administrators who are dedicated to making the shift from what Paulo Freire calls "banking education" to an Engaged Learning model. Unfortunately, almost all of the assessment and promotion guidelines are what, following Baxter-Magolda, I would call "external formulas"-oriented. If we really believe that Engaged Learning is a lifelong endeavor, then we too, as faculty, staff, and administrators, are still in the process of developing. The University needs to put in place structures, such as sustained faculty/staff learning communities, in order to facilitate continuous development. Also, the balkanization of Student Affairs/Faculty/ Staff/Res. Life/Administrators into units that sometimes have to compete for resources and recognition is not conducive to the kind of collaboration that is necessary for successful Engaged Learning across campus.

PLANS FOR REDESIGNING CURRICULUM IN OUR PROGRAM

Women's Studies have several initiatives underway for redesigning our core curriculum in order to make it more cohesive and appropriately staged for student development.

First: We are in the process of finalizing revisions of our largest Miami Plan Foundation course, Introduction to Women's Studies (WMS 201). One element of the newly designed course will be a common co-curricular experience for all students taking the class in a given semester. (We offer between 4 and 8 sections of WMS 201 per semester for approximately 150 to 300 students.) Although we had discussed this co-curricular element (likely to be a speaker or a film or performance connected to readings on the syllabus) in previous WMS meetings, our experience in COPEL has reinforced our belief in the importance of incorporating this element into our syllabi.

Second: At our end of the year retreat, we will begin discussions (coupled with our assessment and self-study efforts for program review) of ways to better articulate the relationship between our 100 and 200 level courses, our 300-level courses, and our 400/500 level courses. The next step in the process, after finalizing revisions to WMS 201, will be to look together at our 300 level core course, WMS 301, in order to make sure it builds on WMS 201 appropriately, with a bit more emphasis on the "crossroads" experience and nudging students and ourselves further along the path to self-authorship.

Third: We are in the process of developing an internship/practicum course that will provide supervision and service learning opportunities to students who wish to intern in programs that coincide with the pedagogical goals of the program and the Engaged Learning focus of the university. We plan to offer this class in the spring of 2010.

Fourth: We anticipate that after program review next year, we will have more opportunities to reflect on how we can better revise our curriculum and support our instructional staff in order to facilitate effective and appropriate Engaged Learning. COPEL has motivated us to see the assessment and review process as a growth opportunity, rather than an occasion to be surveilled. This mindset, we believe, will make the process more productive.