issotl09
International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning

2009 ISSOTL PRE-CONFERNECE WORKSHOPS
All Pre-Conference Workshops are scheduled for Thursday, October 22nd

8:00am – 11:30am

Some Major SOTL Research Traditions: Their Implications for Teaching and For Designing Further Research
Leader: Craig E. Nelson

In this workshop we will examine exemplary works and their classroom implications from several major traditions for studying learning and teaching at the college-university level. The approaches will be examined in terms of an overall model for SOTL that emphasizes the interplay among narrative, qualitative and quantitative approaches. The 8-12 traditions examined will include various aspects of learning theory, active learning, cognitive and holistic development and disciplinary discourse. The workshop may help you consider possibilities for your own next SOTL project, either in terms of core questions or of alternative hypotheses you should be considering. With luck, it may also change your teaching next week or next term.

9:30am – 11:30am

It's So Simple, Why Is It So Difficult?: Using a Theories of Difficulty Approach to SOTL Studies
Leaders: Nancy V Chism, Shrinika Weerakoon

Using a "Theories of Difficulty" approach to conceptualizing SOTL studies involves focusing on the nature of student mistakes, yielding results that go beyond instrumental applications to teaching practice and instead produce fundamental understandings about student learning. In this workshop, participants will learn how a simple SOTL study was transformed through the use of a Theories of Difficulty framework. Participants will have the opportunity to apply the framework to their own studies and ultimately to their teaching.

Facilitators:
Nancy Van Note Chism, IUPUI, and Shrinika Weerakoon, University of Colombo. Nancy Chism has presented workshops on conducting SOTL at several U.S. universities as well as internationally (Hong Kong, Saudi Arabia, and Thailand). In her past work as an educational developer, she has helped many faculty conduct SOTL studies, has conducted workshops on how to approach SOTL, and has also written about these efforts. Shrinika Weerakoon has presented her work on SOTL at the London SOTL conference in 2006 and the Wabash SOTL conference in 2009. During the 2008-09 academic year, she served as a Fulbright Scholar at IUPUI, researching the practice of SOTL in U.S. universities.

Session Goals:
1. Explore the Theories of Difficulty approach to doing SOTL
    a. General Concepts
    b. b. Application to APA style study
2. Engage participants in reconsidering their own SOTL studies in light of the Theories of Difficulty approach

Learning Outcomes:
Participants will 1. Be able to articulate basic concepts of the Theories of Difficulty approach 2. Be able to apply the Theories of Difficulty approach to current and future studies

Conceptual Framework:
Perkins (2009) advocates a "Theories of Difficulty" approach to student learning. Briefly, Theories of Difficulty are fundamental explanations about human reasoning that can be used to analyze performance problems. Examples are the "threshold concepts" of Meyer and Land (2006) and Perkin's own "troublesome knowledge" (1999). Using a

theories of approach involves abandoning such initial reactions to student mistakes as blaming the learner (for laziness, poor study habits, etc.), settling for a formulaic fix (teach harder, use repetition, etc.), and focusing on the topic rather than the symptom and the symptom rather than the cause. The approach aims at reaching a deeper understanding of student difficulties that transcends immediate applications to the problem at hand. Perkins' ideas are aligned with the scholarship on scientific misconceptions and other approaches that center on cognitive bottlenecks.

Plan for Participants' Engagement
To share the power of using a Theories of Difficulty approach, this workshop will be organized into the following segments: 1. (20 minutes) A basic explanation of the Theories of Difficulty approach (lecture-discussion) 2. (20 minutes) Illustration of the use of a Theories of Difficulty approach to the SOTL study on APA style, contrasting an instrumental approach with a Theories of Difficulty approach (lecture-discussion) 3. (40 minutes) Opportunities for participants to reconsider their past or future SOTL studies in light of the Theories of Difficulty approach (small group, then large group discussion) 4. (10 minute) Summary and final thoughts (large group discussion)

References
Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2006) Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: An introduction. In J. Meyer & R. Land (Eds.), *Overcoming barriers to student understanding* (pp. 3-18). London: Routledge.

Perkins, D. (1999). The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Leadership*, 57 (3) 6-11.

Perkins, D. (2008, October). *Theories of Difficulty*. Presentation at Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.. Slides also retrieved May 13, 2009, from www.tla.ed.ac.uk/events/bjep2005/presentations/perkins.ppt.

9:30am – 11:30am

Building Scholarly Communities of Practice
Leaders: Teresa A Johnson, Alice Macpherson, Jane MacKenzie, Jacqui Gingras, Joy Mighty, Brian Smentkowski, Linda Cooper, Andy Leger, Denise Stockley, Alan Kalish, Balbir Gurm, Dennis Pearl, Elaine Van Melle

This interactive workshop, facilitated by the CASTL Cluster "Building Scholarly Communities", will assist participants in identifying and creating strategies and priorities for advancing SOTL through building scholarly communities of practice. The session will include opportunities for participants to share challenges and collaborate to devise strategies for success. Finally, we will explore the possibility of forming an ISSOTL interest group on scholarly communities of practice.

Over the last three years six post-secondary institutions have come together through a Carnegie initiative to form their own learning community based on using learning communities to advance SOTL at their own institutions. This workshop, facilitated by members of the CASTL group "Building Scholarly Communities", will allow participants to identify and create strategies and priorities for advancing SOTL at their own institutions through building scholarly communities of practice. Because we encompass a wide range of institutional contexts, we have gained a wide range of experience in creating and maintaining scholarly communities. As a whole we are convinced that the learning community models are excellent tools for SOTL support on many different kinds of campuses (e.g., Cox, 2001). The specific lessons learned through this CASTL initiative range from strategies for building institutional buy-in, designing SOTL programs for sustainability, communication strategies for recruiting faculty, and functional models for scholarly communities (Transformative Dialogues, in press July 2009). Our efforts to build SOTL culture through communities of practice over the last three years have resulted in tangible incremental changes on all of our campuses. We understand that beginning this process of building a SOTL culture can be overwhelming to those charged with that goal. The six institutions will share their accomplishments and struggles of creating scholarly communities through a poster tour and discussion. Other learning activities include guided processes for creation, identification, and discussion of: • unique aspects of individual institutional contexts, • driving and restraining forces for SOTL development, • community structure models that would support SOTL, and • communication strategies for recruitment and participation in scholarly communities.

The session will also include opportunities for participants to share their own challenges and collaborate to devise strategies for success. There will be the potential for forming an ISSOTL interest group concerned with forming scholarly communities of practice.

References

Cox, M. D. Faculty Learning Communities: Change agents for transforming institutions into learning organizations. *To Improve the Academy*, 2001, 19, 69-93.

Gurm, B., Macpherson, A., & Valleau, A. (2009) Building Scholarly Communities, CASTL [Special Issue]. *Transformative Dialogues*, July 2009. Available from http://kwantlen.ca/TD

9:30am – 11:30am

Faculty Centered Reflections: Student Centered Learning
Leaders: George Rehrey, David Dees, Eric Metzler

Subtly but profoundly, colleges are shifting to a student-centered learning paradigm. This workshop allows educators to examine how their stated beliefs and implied assumptions about learning are reflected in their classrooms. Working in small groups, participants create a taxonomy for the evidence of student learning specific to their own discipline. Then, through a collaborative peer review process, participants explore how such frameworks might be used to align student learning and intended course outcomes with classroom activities and course materials.

A paradigm shift is taking hold in American higher education. In its briefest form, the paradigm shift is this: instead of existing to provide instruction, colleges now exist to produce learning. This shift changes everything. It is both needed and wanted (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 13).

Barr and Tagg's (1995) classic discussion regarding the importance of re-thinking the role of higher education has presented a consistent challenge. In this paradigm the role of the faculty member is to create dynamic learning environments that are designed to allow students to discover and construct meaning. As this shift has developed over the years (Fear et al., 2003; Tagg, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2007), one of the fundamental questions that has inspired this work is "What is learning?" This interactive workshop gives educators an opportunity to explore the implications of a paradigm that embraces student centered learning, identify their own conceptions of learning, and explore, through collegial peer review, how these conceptions of learning are reflected in classroom environments. Conceptions of learning are very diverse. Bloom (1956), Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), Wiggins (1998), Perry (1970), and Fink (2003) have all provided taxonomies to frame learning. Shulman (2002), while offering his own table of learning, notes that taxonomies ". . . help us to think more clearly about what we're doing and they afford us a language through which we can exchange ideas and dilemmas. They point to the mutually interdependent facets of an educated person's life of mind, of emotion, and of action." (p. 42).

In the first segment of this workshop, participants, working in small groups, will visually create and represent their own taxonomies of learning. During the second segment, they participate in peer review. The collegial development of teaching through peer review (Berk, 2006; Berstein, Jonson, & Smith, 2000; Blackmore, 2005; Chism, 1999; Hammersley-Fletcher & Orsmond, 2005; Hutchings, 1995, 1996; Keig & Waggoner, 1995) has a long and elaborate history. Formative peer review provides educators with tangible evidence that can guide professional reflection. During the second half of the session participants will, in pairs or in small groups, use the created taxonomies of learning as visual rubrics to provide insight and feedback on peers' representative course materials.

The overarching goal of this session is to provide attendees with collegial feedback and insight regarding the implementation of personal beliefs in our classroom environments. By framing the conversation within the newly created taxonomies participants will, as Argyris and Schön (1974, 1978) advocate, examine how our "espoused theories" match and/or deviate from our "theories in use." In the learning paradigm, colleges and universities desire to learn about themselves. In this session, we will learn about how we put into practice our own conceptions of learning in the classroom environments we create with our students.

Designing Evidence-Based Courses: Facilitating, Assessing, and Documenting Learning
Leader: Laurie Richlin

Practicing doctors and college teachers are applied professionals, practical people making interventions in the lives of their patients/students in order to promote worthwhile ends—health and learning. Many doctors draw upon research about the effects of their practice to inform and improve their decisions; most teachers do not. This workshop will prepare instructors to utilize evidence-based practice to improve their students' learning (scholarly teaching) and to produce evidence from their teaching (SOTL).

Practicing doctors and college teachers are applied professionals, practical people making interventions in the lives of their patients/students in order to promote worthwhile ends—health and learning. Doctors and teachers are similar in that they make decisions involving complex judgments. Many doctors draw upon research about the effects of their practice to inform and improve their decisions; most teachers do not, and this is a difference.

With the skills gained from this workshop, instructors will be able to utilize evidence about teaching and learning (scholarly teaching) , design educational experiences, and produce evidence (SOTL) from their teaching-learning experiences. Participants will learn how to use evidence-based learning and teaching to help their students learn better, save time on all aspects of teaching including grading, get better teaching evaluations, and have more fun in the process. It is an intensive faculty workshop based on principles and practices for designing and conducting evidence-based courses.

This session will bring together what we know, how we know it, and what we should do about the evidence we have for enhancing learning and teaching. The presenter will provide details and background on current research contributions to evidence-based learning, as well as two aspects of evidence-based teaching: using evidence (scholarly teaching) and producing evidence (SOTL). Evidence-based learning is the key to the development of critical thinking. The workshop goes farther than displaying the evidence; it provides scaffolding for new and experienced faculty members to build, facilitate, assess, and document their evidence-based courses in scholarly portfolios, presentations, and publications.

Upon completion of this workshop, participants will be able to describe a wide array of concepts and theories providing evidence for successful learning and teaching; they will

1. reflect on their own teaching goals in their discipline and for their students,
2. use the theories and concepts of evidence-based course design to design/redesign a course with clear learning objectives; useful learning experiences; and effective assessment of students learning
3. select scaffolding techniques for students to develop deeper learning and cultural awareness
4. document student learning
5. reflect on and explain course design choices

The session has three parts: what we know about learning (a review of learning theories), using evidence to enhance student learning (scholarly teaching), and producing evidence from teaching (the scholarship of teaching and learning). It will address individual participant's teaching responsibilities. Each participant will select a course on which to focus for the workshop. Using handouts developed by the presenter, participants will work through their learning objectives, learning experiences, and learning assessment using evidence and planning on producing scholarly results.

Sharing the Future of What We VALUE: Faculty deliberations about assessment rubrics for and as SOTL
Leaders: Darren Cambridge, Judith Kirkpatrick, Melissa Peet, William Rickards

Deliberations amongst faculty developing rubrics for assessment can constitute rich, collaborative work guided by the principles of SOTL that define what is significant about learning and how it varies across contexts and individuals. This workshop will share the experiences of teams at Alverno College, George Mason University,

Kapi'olani Community College, and the University of Michigan participating in AAC&U's VALUE project. Participants will experience the deliberation process and discuss the challenge of making it more public.

Many scholars of teaching and learning are engaged in developing rubrics for assessing learning at the programmatic, institutional, and national levels. While some see this process as a distraction from the real work of inquiry into teaching and learning imposed by unwelcome external stakeholders, our experience suggests that such processes can be sites for the kind of intellectual work at the heart of SOTL. Assessment deliberations can constitute rich, collaborative work guided by the principles of SOTL that define what is significant about learning and how it varies across contexts and individuals. Our experience suggests that deliberations can both be informed by the results of SOTL and raise new questions about our teaching and our students learning that can inform future investigations.

This workshop will share the experiences of four institutions in the United States, Alverno College, George Mason University, Kapi'olani Community College, and the University of Michigan. Groups of faculty on each of these campuses have engaged in deliberation over rubrics for the assessment of eportfolios, both to track institution-specific outcomes and as part of the Associate for American Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project. The teams have worked to define and evaluate rubrics for such outcomes as integrative learning, quantitative reasoning, written communication, and civic engagement. Our experiences suggest that faculty deliberations can lead to powerful conversations about learning that lead to new knowledge that can be used to support learning rather than just assess it, new knowledge that has impacted teaching practices. Our deliberations have helped us reconsider and deepen what we consider "learning" to be, and therein, the process has lead to institutional knowledge-making about the purpose and goals of an undergraduate education that is driving institutional decision-making.

We will share video of faculty interviews, as well as drafts of rubrics in process and changed curricular materials, to help participants understand the dynamics assessment deliberations as inquiry into teaching and learning. Workshop participants will work in groups with drafts of rubrics, samples of student work, and SOTL-related materials that inform their development in order to experience deliberation about them as a form of SOTL and will have the opportunity to discuss how this activity relates to their own experiences and plans.

While faculty deliberations are collaborative and lead to new insights into teaching and learning grounded in analysis of student work, they are still largely private. The complexity of the understanding of student learning they articulate is often masked by the need for the resulting rubrics to be simple and unambiguous. Through writing and discussion, we will engage participants in envisioning ways in which faculty deliberations can be documented and made public and open to critique, as well as the political challenges such new publicity might raise.

12:30pm – 2:30pm

Student Assessment - a manifesto for change
Leader: Chris Rust

Experts in the field of assessment, including from outside the UK, were brought together to consider perceived problems with UK assessment practice. The outcome was a six point manifesto for change. After a brief summary of the manifesto, and the thinking behind it, participants will be encouraged to consider whether the identified problems apply outside the UK, and the degree to which the manifesto might be applicable in other national contexts.

In response to published national concerns about assessment practice in the UK, in November 2007 ASKe (Assessment Standards Knowledge exchange - the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Oxford Brookes University) brought together over 40 experts in the field of assessment, including some from outside the UK. The result of their discussions was a manifesto for change, with six tenets. The session will start with a short summary of the context and thinking behind the manifesto, an explanation of why changes in practice are needed in the UK, and the reasoning behind each of the six tenets. This workshop will then encourage participants to consider whether, and to what extent, the identified problems with assessment practice apply outside the UK, and explore the degree to which, possibly with adaptation, the manifesto might be applicable and useful in other national contexts.

Leader's relevant experience for this workshop: Chris is Head of the Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development and Deputy Director of ASKe (Assessment Standards Knowledge Exchange), a Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) at Brookes University, UK. He contributed to the design and delivery of a national programme of staff development in higher education on the issue of teaching more students and has run numerous workshops around the country and internationally on a range of other issues including assessment strategies, developing teaching in higher education, and course design and evaluation. Chris Rust is currently involved in research into improving student learning through active engagement with assessment feedback; he also researches the significance of both explicit articulation and socialisation processes in improving students' understanding of assessment requirements and their understanding of assessment feedback. He was a member of the authoring group behind the ASKe assessment manifesto – the subject of the workshop. He is a Fellow of SEDA (Staff and Educational Development Association); of the RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce); and a Senior Fellow of the UK Higher Education Academy.

Learning goals and outcomes for the workshop: By the end of the workshop, participants will be able to: • Summarise identified problems in UK assessment practice; • Summarise the the ASKe manifesto for change, and its underpinning theory • Identify problems in their own assessment practices • Judge the usefulness, and appropriateness of the manifesto to offer solutions to their own assessment problems

Plans for participants' engagement: 1. Presentation of the context and background (30 mins. max); 2. Group discussion - participants will be put into groups to consider two questions: i). to what extent do they and their institutions recognize and/or share the problems with assessment identified in the UK?; ii). to what extent, possibly following amendment, might they find the ASKe manifesto applicable and/or useful? (30 mins) 3. Plenary discussion of key points from the groups (30 mins)

12:30pm – 2:30pm

Developing Processes and Criteria for External Reviews of Scholarly Teaching
Leaders: Amy Goodburn, Paul Savory, Dan Bernstein

This workshop explores theoretical questions and practical strategies for how to develop peer reviewers for faculty required to document their scholarly teaching. After reading two mini case-studies of how faculty have documented the intellectual work of their teaching, participants will engage in guided discussion about reviewing and assessing such work and about developing faculty communities equipped to do such work. Presenter(s) also will seek feedback on guidelines that they have developed for external reviewers of scholarly teaching.

This workshop explores theoretical questions and practical strategies for how to develop peer reviewers for faculty required to document their scholarly teaching. After reading two mini case-studies of how faculty have documented the intellectual work of their teaching, participants will engage in guided discussion about reviewing and assessing such work and about developing faculty communities equipped to do such work. Presenter(s) also will seek feedback on guidelines that they have developed for external reviewers of SOTL work. The exigency for developing models for the external review of scholarly teaching is especially clear given changing faculty work profiles within higher education. Gappa, Austin, and Trice's Rethinking Faculty Work (2007) outlines how the changing nature of faculty appointments has impacted academics' sense of community. As Turner and Hamilton (2007) further suggest, "…universities have created faculties made up of colleagues who may not be peers, and who cannot evaluate the work and the promise of each other because they lack experience and/or training in the work to be evaluated." In response, Turner and Hamilton argue that universities must "…find ways for faculty with varied responsibilities and training to act as peers in all aspects of faculty work." At research one institutions, new faculty appointments, such as "professors of practice" or endowed professorships in teaching, require external peer reviews of teaching for purposes of promotion and merit review. Yet little discussion has focused on issues entailed in drawing upon models of peer review for documenting these faculty members' work. This workshop session addresses this "next stage" for promoting scholarly teaching by focusing on theoretical questions and practical strategies for building larger communities of faculty readers with the expertise to review, evaluate, and reward teaching as intellectual work. After a brief introduction to the topic, participants will read two examples of how faculty have documented their work as scholarly teachers for the purposes of external peer review. Participants also will be provided guidelines from two institutions which outline categories for the external review of teaching. Discussion will focus on some of the following questions: What are the challenges in providing an external review of one's teaching? What parallels with Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (Scholarship Assessed, 1997) are useful? Where are their differences?

Participants also will examine the two institutional guidelines to discuss their usefulness in guiding peer reviewers - which categories are essential, which are not? are there categories/elements missing that one would include? what types of external reviews would be most valuable to institutional committees that assess and reward teaching? By the end of the session, participants will have had the opportunity to 1) discuss and reflect upon the challenges of externally reviewing and assessing the intellectual work of teaching; 2) review and suggest revisions for the institutional guidelines and 3) share effective strategies for how they have developed faculty communities or approaches who can peer review the intellectual work of teaching.

12:30pm – 2:30pm

Developing evidence-based tools to assess pedagogy course outcomes for multiple teacher-scholar populations
Leaders: Katherine D Kearns, Lauren Miller, Valerie D O'Loughlin

Numerous studies have examined the role of graduate pedagogy courses on graduate student development using short-term affective outcomes. But long-term graduate student progression as reflective teacher-scholars has received comparatively little attention. Participants will articulate learning outcomes and create innovative, evidence-based approaches to assess graduate students' attainment of pedagogy course goals. This workshop also will broaden participants' perceptions of the populations who may benefit from engaging in reflective teaching practice about pedagogy courses.

Graduate student development programs and measures of these programs' effectiveness have been a subject of inquiry for over 20 years (Chism, 1998; Wulff et al., 2004). However, the influence of pedagogy courses on the long-term development of graduate students as reflective teacher-scholars and future faculty has received little attention. Many pedagogy courses emphasize scholarly understandings of teaching as best practices (excellent teaching), as evidence gathering and analysis (scholarly teaching), and as "community property" (scholarship of teaching) (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999). Yet studies that have examined the outcomes of pedagogy courses typically relied on short-term affective responses such as course evaluations (e.g., Carroll, 1980; Schussler et al., 2008).

Participants will receive examples of and develop their own innovative, evidence-based approaches to assess graduate students' long-term attainment of pedagogy course goals. This workshop also will broaden participants' perceptions of the individuals who may benefit from engaging in reflective teaching practice about pedagogy courses, as participants hear experiences from representatives of different teacher-scholar populations.

After establishing the workshop goals, we will briefly review the literature about the role of pedagogy courses and future faculty programs in graduate student development and summarize typical course learning goals, activities, and assignments (15 min). Then participants will work in small groups to brainstorm assignments and tools for assessing graduate student achievement of pedagogy course goals (15 min). Groups will share their assessment tools.

The presenters-- a faculty member, a graduate student researcher, and an instructional consultant--will share examples of tools they developed to investigate influence of a health sciences pedagogy course on graduate student development as teacher-scholars (15 min). We will explain the rubrics we developed to quantitatively analyze teaching philosophy statements and portfolios. We will also describe our analysis of interviews conducted with the students six months after completing the course.

Participants will apply to their own contexts the assessment tools created in the workshop and shared by the presenters (15 min). Specifically, participants will develop a learning goal assessment for their own pedagogy courses and then pair up to share their innovations and receive feedback. Examples will be shared with the entire group.

Finally, participants will discuss tools for assessing the influence of the pedagogy course on faculty mentors, graduate student researchers, and instructional consultants (15 min). We will explicitly consider how the scholarship of teaching and learning can both bring together and facilitate the development of these diverse populations of teacher-scholars.

We will allow time for reflection and discussion at the end of the session (15 min).

References

Carroll, J.G. (1980). *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(2), 167-183.

Chism, N.V.N. (1998). In M. Marincovich, J. Prostko, and F. Stout (Eds.), *The Professional Development of Graduate Teaching Assistants*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Hutchings, P. & L.S. Shulman. (1999). *Change*, 31(5), 10-15.

Schussler, E., et al. (2008). *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 38(1), 32-36.

Wulff, D.H., et al. (2004). In D.H. Wulff, A.E. Austin, and Associates (Eds.), *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty* (pp. 46-73). San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.

12:30pm – 2:30pm

Crafting Meta-Cognitive Interventions and Analyzing Their Impact on Disciplinary Thinking
Leaders: Matthew Kaplan, Deborah Meizlish, Naomi Silver

This workshop examines instructional interventions designed to foster meta-cognition through student writing practices. How can we best create effective pedagogical techniques that are easily disseminated and will help students better understand not only course content, but also discipline-specific modes of thinking and writing? Participants will discuss preliminary data from experiments currently underway at the University of Michigan and consider the applicability of the underlying framework to their own disciplines and institutions.

Participants in this workshop will 1. gain familiarity with a theoretical framework on meta-cognition and its impact on student thinking 2. analyze and discuss preliminary findings from one study 3. apply this framework to their own contexts and gain insight into ways of fostering disciplinary thinking 4. obtain resources on meta-cognition and disciplinary thinking 5. have an opportunity to build connections with others interested in these research questions

Scholars have identified the importance of helping students develop the ability to monitor their own comprehension and to make their thinking processes explicit to teachers. For example, Shulman (2000) has noted that students often demonstrate an "illusory understanding" that belies their actual grasp of course material. The field of metacognition provides a number of models and frameworks for addressing these issues (Hartman, 2001; Kuhn & Pearsall, 1998; Zohar & David, 2008; Bannert & Mengelkamp, 2008; Díaz et al., 2008).

This workshop examines instructional interventions designed to foster deeper disciplinary thinking via the application of meta-cognitive strategies related to student writing assignments. Our questions include: Which reflective practices will help students better understand course content and discipline-specific modes of thinking and writing (Pace, 2004)? Which of these strategies will help faculty gain insight into the depth of student understanding (Bass, 1999)? At what point(s) in the assignment process is it most effective to intervene with metacognitive strategies (Schraw, 2001)? Is there an additive effect of using multiple strategies? Which of these strategies can be easily disseminated across disciplines and instructional settings?

The workshop will present two meta-cognitive approaches currently being studied, separately and in combination, in upper-level writing courses at the University of Michigan: asking faculty to conduct in-class discussions to elicit student reflection on what an assignment is "about" (the disciplinary and other thinking skills it involves) before students begin writing, and asking students to provide reflective commentary on iterative drafts of their writing assignments (inserting three to five comments or questions on moments in their writing they found difficult, interesting, or successful). These strategies are ideally suited for upper-level courses designed to foster knowledge of disciplinary thinking and rhetoric through iterative writing and instructor feedback. They were designed to systematically uncover students' internal thinking in such a way that, together, instructors and students "can test it, move it around, rearrange it, co-construct it, and repair it" (Shulman, 2000).

Participants in this workshop will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of our approach to meta-cognition and its impact on student learning. They will analyze intervention protocols and findings from the first year of a three-year study and offer their own interpretations of the available data, gleaned from a variety of sources (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, student writing, and students' meta-reflective comments on their own work). In small groups, they will discuss the applicability of this study's underlying framework to their own disciplines and institutions, and they will be invited to suggest alternative ways of fostering student engagement with key modes of disciplinary thinking and writing.

References

Bannert, M., & Mengelkamp, C. (2008). Assessment of metacognitive skills by means of instruction to think aloud and reflect when prompted. Does the verbalisation method affect learning? *Metacognitive Learning*, *3*, 39-58.

Bass, R. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: What's the problem? *Inventio*, *1*(1). Retrieved May 15, 2009, from http://www.doiiit.gmu.edu/Archives/feb98/randybass.htm

Díaz, A., Middendorf, J., Pace, D., & Shopkow, L. (2008). The history learning project: A department "decodes" its students. *Journal of American History*, *94* 4). 1211-1244.

Kuhn, D., & Pearsall, S. (1998). Relations between metastrategic knowledge and strategic performance. *Cognitive Development*, *13*. 227-247.

Pace, D. (2004). Decoding the reading of history: An example of the process. In D. Pace & J. Middendorf (Eds.), *Decoding the disciplines* (pp. 13-21). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 98. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schraw, G. (2001). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. In H. J. Hartman (Ed.), *Metacognition in learning and instruction: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 3-15). Dodrecht, Holland: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Shulman, L. S. (2000). Teacher development: Roles of domain expertise and pedagogical knowledge. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *21*(1). 129-135.

Zohar, A., & David, A. B. (2008). Explicit teaching of meta-strategic knowledge in authentic classroom situations. *Metacognitive Learning, 3*. 59-82.

12:30pm – 5:00pm (*with ½ hour break*)

Judging excellent university teaching - the importance of assessment standards
Leaders: Thomas Olsson, Torgny Roxå, Anders Ahlberg

The participants of this workshop will actively work with and share ideas in relation to the important questions of what constitutes excellence in university teaching and what procedures and methods could be used in a systematic and scholarly assessment of teaching excellence. Criteria on which assessments could be based, evidence that show if the criteria are met and especially standards to judge the evidence by will be discussed and tested using authentic applications for promotions and teaching rewards as case studies.

In this workshop we will examine what constitutes excellence in university teaching and how it could be assessed. Participants will share their ideas with each other and contrast them with findings from the higher education research literature. This literature shows that excellent teachers should be able to use their disciplinary expertise within a teaching practice based on relevant pedagogical understanding. It is not enough for an excellent teacher to be an excellent lecturer in the classroom (Magin, 1998). An excellent teacher should be proficient within a variety of competencies focusing on the student learning process and a scholarly approach to teaching and learning (Trigwell, 2001). A systematic and scholarly assessment of teaching excellence requires relevant *criteria* on which the assessment is based, *evidence* showing that the criteria are met, and *standards* to judge the evidence against the

criteria. Appropriate standards are of vital importance in the assessment process. However, surprisingly little is written about this in the literature (Ramsden & Martin, 1996; Chism, 2006).

During the workshop actual applications and teaching portfolios for promotions and teaching rewards will be analysed and assessed. Participants will also use and discuss a comprehensive model of teaching excellence, which is based on Kolb's (1984) principles of experiential learning. Even though the focal point is the actual teaching practice as it supports student learning, it is assumed that improvements in teaching are dependent on the teacher's ability to observe teaching and learning, to understand observations made, and to plan for further development. These three latter aspects – observe, understand, and plan – support and initiate development in the first aspect – teaching practice.

A previous interpretation of the model has been discussed as a two-dimensional matrix (Antman & Olsson, 2007; Kreber, 2002). Through this model we were able to evaluate the complexity of teachers' pedagogical reasoning and understanding in relation to their proved capacity to reflect scholarly on their teaching practice. During the workshop we will discuss an extended model where evidence of student learning is incorporated as a third dimension. Through this third dimension we discuss the possibilities to distinguish between *unreflected (or no) observations* of student learning, *reflected observations* of student learning, and *systematic investigations and analyses* of student learning. The lowest level represents at best a tacit knowledge, but without a necessary alignment with teaching strategies, whereas at the higher levels teachers demonstrate increased awareness and strategic approaches that continuously influence the teaching practice.

Finally, workshop participants will discuss cultural and organisational consequences of what is regarded as teaching excellence – especially the importance of tenure and promotion. A successful strategy could be to influence the local academic culture towards a scholarly approach to teaching and learning (Olsson & Roxå, 2008). Interesting questions include: Who are being considered as excellent? How are their careers affected? How are researchers engaged? How are university policy levels affected? Are there any connections to funding and distribution of resources? Do teachers regarded as excellent by the university really organise and conduct high quality teaching?

After the workshop, the participants have reached: a more multifaceted understanding of what might constitute excellence in university teaching; a practical assessment experience using research-based models for judging evidence against criteria; and an increased awareness of the cultural and organisational aspects of teaching excellence.

References

Antman, L. & Olsson, T. (2007). A Two-Dimensional Matrix Model for Analysing Scholarly Approaches to Teaching and Learning. In Rust, C. (Ed.), *Improving Student Learning through Teaching* (pp. 54-72). The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development

Chism, N.V.N. (2006). Teaching Awards: What Do They Award? *The Journal of H E*, 77(4): 589- 617

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall

Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching Excellence, Teaching Expertise, and the Scholarship of Teaching. *Innovative H E,* 27(1): 5-23

Magin, D.J. (1998). Rewarding good teaching: A matter of demonstrated proficiency or documented achievement? *The Int J for Acad Dev*, 3(2): 124-135

Olsson, T. & Roxå, T. (2008). Evaluating rewards for excellent teaching – a cultural approach, *The HERDSA Annual Conference*, Rotorua, NZ

Ramsden, P. & Martin, E. (1996). Recognition of Good University Teaching: policies from an Australian study. *Studies in H E*, 21(3): 299-315

Trigwell, K. (2001). Judging university teaching. *The Int J for Acad Dev*, 6(1): 65-73

12:30pm – 5:00pm (*with ½ hour break*)

Using student rubrics to assess teaching and learning: A surprising and generative SOTL opportunity
Leaders: Dannelle D Stevens, Micki M Caskey

More and more faculty are using rubrics to grade student work. Faculty know that rubrics save grading time, communicate course expectations as well as convey effective feedback. Yet, rubrics can also be used to improve classroom instruction. . In this workshop, participants will learn about basic rubric creation and, then, how to use student rubric scores to design a SOTL project for the next time they teach the class.

Learning goals: 1. Participants will learn about the fundamentals of rubric construction. 2. Participants will learn how to match a task description found in a syllabus with the dimensions of a rubric. 3. Participants will learn how to use a rubric that can lead to teaching improvement.. 6. Participants will learn how to, then, design a teaching improvement project that can fall along the continuum from scholarly teaching to the scholarship of teaching.

Plans: 2 hours 1. Introduction to elements of a rubric. 20 minutes 2. Case study (in small groups): (1 hour) Check alignment of task description with the rubric dimensions. Examine photocopies of student rubrics. Put student scores on each dimension of a single rubric. Look for patterns across the scores. Where was student work strong? Where weak? Given these patterns, brainstorm some ways to change instruction to improve student learning. 3. Begin to design a teaching and learning improvement project that falls along the continuum from scholarly teaching to the scholarship of teaching. 4. Reflect on how to use this process to design their own SOTL study in their own classroom. 5. Write an action plan to begin to use rubrics for scholarly teaching.

Summary: More and more faculty are using rubrics to grade student work. Faculty know that rubrics save grading time, communicate course expectations as well as convey effective feedback. Yet, rubrics can also be used to improve classroom instruction. . In this workshop, participants will learn about basic rubric creation and, then, how to use student rubric scores to design a SOTL project for the next time they teach the class.

Abstract: When faculty use rubrics for classroom assessment, they communicate expectations more clearly and give students more timely feedback (Stevens & Levi, 2005; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Creating the rubric is a way to identify and clarify what faculty want students to learn and how they want students to demonstrate that learning through a "product", such as an oral presentation or a term paper (Peat, 2008). The rubric includes a task description and dimensions that divide the task into parts like organization, content, writing conventions. Of course, these dimensions vary depending on the task and the academic discipline. Connelly & Wolf (2007) designed rubrics for art. Peat (2008) worked on rubrics for a literature review in public administration. Spurlin, Rajala & Lavelle (2008) have identified rubrics in engineering education. Stevens & Cooper (2009) show how to develop rubrics for classroom journal writing activities. There are more and more examples of studies using rubrics for instruction. What faculty may not have thought about, however, is that the student scores on the rubrics are valuable and informative instructional feedback as well. After students have turned in their "product", faculty can photocopy the scored student rubrics and use the scores to assess the effectiveness of their teaching (Stevens & Levi, 2005). By reflecting on how students scored within each dimension of the rubric, faculty can identify strengths and weaknesses in student work. After they collect all the student scores within each dimension, it is then time to reflect on their own teaching. In which dimension did they score the highest? Where did they score the lowest? Where are student strengths? Where are their weaknesses? Do I need to get the Writing Center faculty to help students with writing conventions? What should I emphasize the next time I teach this class that might help students create a better product? Through focusing on student data and reflecting on its meaning in relation to the course expectations, faculty can identify instructional changes that they want to initiate in the future. In other words, they can create a "study" of their classroom instruction, hence, a SOTL project.

References

Connelly, M., & Wolf, K. (2007). The art of rubrics: Painting by number? *Teaching Artist Journal*, 5(4), 279-288.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.

Peat, B. (2008). Integrating writing and research skills: Development and testing of a rubric to measure student outcomes. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 12(3):295-311.

Spurlin, J. E., Rajala, S. A., & Lavelle, J. P. (Eds.) (2008). *Designing better engineering education through assessment.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Stevens, D. D., & Cooper, J. E. (2009). Chapter 6. Grading classroom journals. *Journal keeping: How to use reflective writing for learning, teaching, professional insight and positive change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. J. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback and promote student learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Stevens, D. D. & Levi, A. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers.

12:30pm – 5:00pm (*with ½ hour break*)

Engaging Communities of Practice to Develop SOTL: Projects, Presentations, and Publication
Leaders: Milton D Cox, Gregg Wentzell, Cecilia Shore, Laurie Richlin

Educational developers are becoming involved with assisting faculty in developing classroom research projects that can lead to SOTL. We will share and engage strategies that have proven successful in developing SOTL in communities of practice, from projects to preparation for presentations and publication. We will include results of a major survey that confirms the success of a learning community approach to developing SOTL and the project types that were engaged at the involved institutions.

Conceptual Framework and Facilitators: The founding of ISSOTL and the interest with which early adopters are engaging in SOTL confirms its increasing importance in higher education (Robinson & Nelson, 2003). SOTL is an educational development opportunity (Saylor & Harper, 2003). Two facilitators of this workshop, Cox and Richlin, have had several years of experience working with faculty to develop, present, and publish SOTL using communities of practice (Cox, 2003) in the U. S. and elsewhere (Roxå, Cox, & Mårtensson, 2005). The success of this model is confirmed by outcomes at institutions participating in state and federal grant-supported projects (Beach & Cox, 2009). A third facilitator, Shore, Is experienced in assessment of student learning and has facilitated a Graduate Student Teaching Enhancement Community that prepares graduate students to be scholarly teachers and provides foundational skills for SOTL as a research endeavor. We have found that structured assignments that encourage reflection on one's own teaching, including teaching portfolios and classroom research projects, have supported graduate students' development as scholarly teachers. SOTL developed in learning communities has shown an increase in terms of faculty presentations at teaching conferences and manuscripts submitted to pedagogy journals. The fourth facilitator, Wentzell, is the managing editor of a peer-reviewed journal publishing SOTL and is program director of a national conference at which SOTL is presented.

We divide this workshop into 5 parts: (1) Introduction and overview (2) Teaching or institutional projects (3) Assessment of student learning (4) Presentation and publication of SOTL (5) Research and survey results confirming a learning community approach for developing SOTL

We can provide a handbook, now in its 6th edition, for the participants. The cost of the handbook is $20. If this is not feasible, we can provide a handout that can have some key points covered.

Description of Activities and Interaction: During each workshop section we will engage participants in active learning such as think, pair, share and preparation of a participant's teaching project in order to practice SOTL development work with faculty. Participants will receive a handbook or handout to use back at home.

Expected outcomes for participants: After this session, participants will be able to (1) assist faculty and graduate students in exploring and developing teaching projects and assessment that can lead to SOTL (2) advise colleagues on practices that lead to effective presentations of SOTL (3) recommend strategies and preparation to publish SOTL (4) incorporate some of the national and state funded research results into their practices

References (some omitted due to 500 word limit)

Beach, A. L., & Cox, M. D. (2009). The impact of faculty learning communities on teaching and learning. Learning communities journal 1 (1). Cox, M. D. (2003). Fostering the scholarship of teaching through faculty learning communities. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 14 (2/3), 161-198.

Roxå, T., Cox, M. D., & Mårtensson, K. (2005, May). What initiates and enables becoming a scholarly teacher and SOTL? Paper presented at the 5th annual London SOTL Conference.

12:30pm – 5:00pm *(with ½ hour break)*

Developing a systematic SOTL inquiry project using the "Decoding the Disciplines" methodology
Leaders: Leah Shopkow, Arlene Diaz, Joan Middendorf, David Pace

Despite the existence of much SOTL research, many instructors are unsure of how to start and sustain their own programs of inquiry. Applying the "Decoding the Disciplines" methodology, the facilitators will lead participants in this cross-disciplinary workshop through the steps of creating a systematic research plan to address a bottleneck to student learning in their own disciplines. Participants should bring their course calendar, an assignment students have difficulty with, and samples of student work.

The performative conception [of knowledge] foregrounds not just how much knowledge you have but how much you can do with what you have. Performance depends on possession--you have to have it in order to think with it--but goes beyond possession--how well you understand something depends on whether you can reason with it, make predictions, offer critiques, build something, invent something." (Perkins, 2008, p. 4)

Although many instructors recognize and understand bottlenecks to student learning or threshold concepts in their disciplines, they have neither the tools nor time to create systematic means to inquire into these impediments and to assess their experiments. In this cross-disciplinary workshop, participants will consider one bottleneck to student learning they have experienced in a class, and create a plan to inquire into it systematically, using the "Decoding the Disciplines" process to make disciplinary knowledge explicit. Participants will be briefly led through the first two steps of the methodology (determining the bottleneck and defining what experts in the discipline do to negotiate through it).

This workshop, however, will focus on steps three and four of the process (modeling and practice and feedback), helping faculty to turn their knowledge about SOTL research into performative knowledge and revise assignments addressed to the contents of the disciplines, which may require but not explicitly call for disciplinary moves, to draw the tacit expectations up to the explicit (Perkins 2005). Because the work of Meyer and Land (2006) on the length of time students may stay in "liminal" states with regard to threshold concepts, as well as that of the Freshman Learning Project (2004), suggests that a single round of modeling and practice is insufficient for many students to master some disciplinary skills, so that opportunities for practice and feedback need to be systematically built in across a course. In the course of this workshop, participants will be guided in designing this kind of research project in a class in their discipline and will explore how the "decoding" process can help them turn their classroom interventions into the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Participants will bring all or some of the following with them: a course calendar, assignment students have particular difficulties with or an exam question or assignment essential to their course (on that if a student can't do well on it,

the student would not be considered to have been successful in their course), samples of weak student performance on the assignment.

References

Meyer, Jan H. F. and Ray Land (2006). Threshold Concepts: Issues of Liminality and Troublesome Knowledge. In Jan H. F. Meyer and Ray Land (Eds.), *Overcoming Barriers to Student Understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge* (pp. 19-32). Abingdon: Routledge.

Perkins, David (2008). Beyond Understanding. In Ray Land, Jan H. F. Meyer, and Jan Smith (Eds.), *Threshold Concepts within the Disciplines* (pp. 3-19). Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense Publications.

Pace, D., & Middendorf, J. (Eds.) (2004). *Decoding the disciplines: Helping students learn disciplinary ways of thinking*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

<mark>3:00pm – 5:00pm</mark>

(When) You are What You Teach: How Race and Gender Identities Affect Teaching about Race and Gender
Leader: Karyn Loscocco

In this workshop we put the challenges of teaching about race and gender inequality for women of color and white women under the microscope. Participants will explore how living what one teaches can affect teaching effectiveness, course evaluations, and feelings about teaching. Once key dimensions of the challenge are identified, we will discuss possible strategies for improving the teaching experience.

The study of race and gender inequality is at the heart of the sociological enterprise according to scholarly leaders (Persell et al., 2007), suggesting that most instructors will teach about the topic often. Whether in the context of an introduction to sociology course, a section in a course on work or crime, or a course devoted specifically to gender, race, or their intersection, most sociology instructors teach about race and gender dynamics and inequalities. As others have suggested, it is particularly difficult to teach about topics that push students' emotional buttons (e.g. Davis, 1992; Friedman and Rosenberg 2007). When the instructor is someone who occupies the disadvantaged gender and/or racial category, it becomes even more difficult (Kardia and Wright, 2004).

The goal of this workshop is to examine closely both the obvious and the hidden challenges of teaching about race and gender inequalities for women of color and white women. When an instructor is clearly a member of the oppressed group, she must devote even greater attention to course content and teaching strategies when teaching about that oppression than is true for a member of the dominant group. As Sprague and Massoni (2005) document, students bring gendered expectations to the classroom, and these create more work for women instructors. Research documenting the intersecting oppressions on women of color at work (e.g. Bell and Nkomo, 2004; Dill and Zambrana, 2004) suggests that the burden for these women is even greater. Gendered racial dynamics and racialized gender dynamics play out in classrooms, with the potential to make all aspects of the job of teaching more difficult (Trusmith and Reddy 1997). Women of color likely have to pay even more attention than white women to course content, presentation of self, and classroom management strategies.

It is especially important to examine the self-talk of women who teach about gender and race. After all, they are living what they are teaching. Tackling these topics, in particular, may heighten awareness that women will never fit the idealized image of "professor", which continues to be a white man (c.f. Sprague and Missoni, 2005). As Costello's (2006) study of law and social work students shows, the process of preparing for professions is racialized and gendered, often causing identity dissonance for women of color and white women. How do feelings of pretending, "selling out", or never quite measuring up, affect how women teach about race and gender? Do they embrace the fact that they embody what they are teaching, or do they try to "erase" their discredited status, fitting the idealized image of professor as best they can? How do such women manage the often difficult race and gender dynamics in their classrooms?

After an overview of the topic, we use writing exercises to stimulate discussion of the dimensions of the challenge and strategies to overcome them. The workshop should provide important dialogue and sharing of strategies. Ideally, it will foster connections for support after the conference, and strengthen further research on the topic.

References

Bell, Ella Edmonson and Stella M. Nkomo 2003. *Our Separate Ways: Black and White Women and the Struggle for Professional Identity*. Perseus.

Costello Carrie Yang. 2006 *Professional Identity Crisis: Race, Class, Gender and Success at Professional Schools.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Davis, Nancy J. "Teaching about inequality: Student resistance, paralysis and rage" *Teaching Sociology* 20:232-238.

Dill, Dill Bonnie Thornton and Ruth Enid Zambrana, eds. 2009 *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*. N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Freidman, Kathie and Karen Rosenberg "Performing Identities in the Classroom: Teaching Jewish Women's Studies." *Teaching Sociology* 35: 315-333.

Kardia, Diana and Mary Wright, 2004. "Instructor identity: The Impact of gender and race on faculty experiences with teaching." Center for Research on Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan.

Persell, Caroline Hodges, Kathryn May Pfeiffer and Ali Syed 2007. "What should students understand after taking introduction to sociology?" *Teaching Sociology* 35: 300-314.

Sprague, Joey and Kelley Massoni 2005. "Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us." *Sex Roles* 53: 779-793.

Trusmith, Bonnie and Maureen T. Reddy, 2002. *Race in the College Classroom: Pedagogy and Politics.* N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

3:00pm – 5:00pm

Belief Perseverance: the larger cognitive story
Leader: Leah Savion

The presentation offers three segments, each contains brief expositions, group-work on direct applications, culminating with a fair-share:

Exposing the phenomenon of belief perseverance: • "Clinging to falsehood" devices students use • Group work: identify content/discipline specific issues

The players in the cognitive game • Trace the specific cognitive culprits

Pedagogical devices: exploring ideas • Suggested perseverance "smoking out" devices • Collaborative specific treatments of disciplinary examples • Discussion: groups share ideas, suggestions for SOTL research

Understanding the cognitive forces behind our students' perseverance of naïve conceptions, and tailoring teaching techniques accordingly are essential tools for effective teaching. A large body of research demonstrates the power of initial conceptions, stereotypes, and scripts, the inevitable results of our naïve theories. Prior knowledge, the single most influential component in learning, enhances understanding when it connects well to the academically sanctioned, but hinders learning when in conflict with it. Theories contradicting existing beliefs are conveniently misinterpreted, treated as insignificant, or taken as valid only within the confines of classrooms. Belief-perseverance – persistence of known discredited beliefs - is ubiquitous to the point of serving as the ultimate evidence of the

feebleness of our mind and the futility of formal education. My thesis is that neither is true. This presentation suggests an explanatory model of belief-perseverance, which links basic cognitive adaptive needs (e.g., causality, coherence, and ego maintenance) with the mental tools we brings to bear on our survival tasks (e.g., heuristics). These combine to create naive theories that contain misconceptions that all students bring to class. The mind's governing principles (cognitive economy, cognitive and emotive equilibrium, and ecological rationality) dictate inevitable trade-offs between quantities of information, speed of processing, accuracy, and dissonance-avoidance, resulting in a costly maintenance of prior knowledge and inadequate long-term learning. The perseverance of some naïve misconceptions cannot be dismissed as emotive, dispositional, or irrational. I call to educators to invest in comprehending the larger cognitive picture, in order to combat the frustrating phenomenon successfully.