

# CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING

"How Former Students As Undergraduate Teaching Assistants (UTA's) Can Empower Active Learning"

Theme: Student Engagement & Active Learning



Joe Packowski, Lecturer: Communications and Professional Skills, Indiana University – Bloomington. Kelley School of Business

#### I. Abstract:

As an instructor in higher education, have you ever asked yourself any of these questions when reflecting on your teaching:

- "Why aren't my students participating more in the classroom?"
- "Am I lecturing too much and for too long?""Can I quantify student learning?"

What is the research saying about active learning and student engagement in higher education classrooms? And how can I positively and proactively influence change in my courses?

### II. Research / Opportunity:

- Brophy argued that active and purposeful student engagement must "focus on encouraging students to engage in activities with motivation to learn". 1
- The Self Determination Theory has evolved to now embrace this as "a more general theory of human motivation, personality development, and wellness".<sup>2</sup>

Inspired by this research, I applied for and was awarded a 2023 Grant through C.I.T.L. (Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning) with a focus on active learning. I implemented an UTA application process with current students, via an optional bonus assignment, who were passionate to collaborate with me. Within BUS T-275/T-276: Strategic Recruiting Preparedness, we created a vision to achieve a 50% lecture to 50% student engagement ratio (historically/anecdotally, I experienced 75%/25%).



## III. Partnership **↑** Assessment **↓**:

1. Quantified Observation Tool					Efforts (PAITE) assessment tool for capturing lecture/student							3. Classroom Assessment Techniques (CAT's)				UTA partnerships, diversified classroom CAT offerings: polls, movement, think- pair-share, reflections, dry-erase boards/tents, surveys, class bookend reflections, word clouds, and group think.								
2. Qualified Observation Processes						Complementary to PAITE, captured thematic observations including attentiveness, willingness, purposeful engagement, and/or distractions.							4. Check-In Cadence					In addition to instructor/UTA shared file system, met frequently to assess, discuss, and/or enhance our course design to impact within the current semester.						
Date		18/21/20			Class		US T-2					ructer			ckowsk		1			ber of S			45	Ī
	1	SEA:	Listeniz Studen	g/Taking t Engage	Notes.	ITPS -	= Individ = Stud	dual Thi ent Que	king/Pr	sp = St	Solving. udent P	TPS = Tresentar	Think, P	air, Sha QS = Qu	re. GW iz or Su	= Gros	p Work V = Wa	SE1 =	1 Stude 0 = Oth	nt Egna er.	gement.	SEM=	Student	
	2	MOV	- Lectur - Movis	e Only.	RTW-	Real 7	ime We	ork. FO	TS = Fo	edback Group	on Th	e Spot. I = Adn	FTEC -	= Feedb	ack with	h Techi IT = V	ology.	LA = L or resp	istenin: onse. C	e / Ansv O = Othe	vering.			ı
			For	each 2	minu	te inte	rval, c	heck o	dumn	s to sh	ow wh	at's ha	ppeni	ng in e	ach ca	_					check	multi	ole col	
Mane	175   FDS   TBS   697				1. Students are Doing SE1   SEG   SEA   SQ   SP   QS   W										2. Instructor is Doing									
56-58	X	IIrs	123	GIII	38.1	SEC	SEA	3Q	50"	Qs	"	0	LEC	XIII	1013	FIEC	X.	7107	161	10G	ADM	WAST	0	İ
58-60			x		X	X											X			x	-	-		ł
62-64	x		X		X	X	x						x				x			1	1			ł
64-66	X												x											I
68-70		X														X				-				ł
70-72		X									_					X				-	-	-	_	

#### IV. Outcomes:<sup>3</sup>

49.2% / 50.8%	Ratio achieved of instructor lecture to student engagement.
-81.5%	Reduction in number of quizzes / assignments I offer through personal course map design assessments.
92.1%	Students strongly agreeing (70.2%) or agreeing they felt empowered to learn (added question to end of semester student evaluation of teaching – OCQ).
+38.0%	Increase in student self-reported level of learning (through PrePost Quiz analysis - comparative to detive Learning Classroom)
+13.1%	Grades (satisfactory work) earned by students as part of my Evidence of Learning (EoL) analysis (Neveraging Specifications Grading versus Traditional Grading)
0.36%	End of semester student grade disputes (n-= 1,066 - leveraging Specifications Grading versus Traditional Grading)

#### V. Learnings:

#### UTA's (Ishan and Paige) and Joe Packowski:

- Variations observed between class days and times.
- High engagement classes leveraged dry erase boards.
- UTA's should host own student consultation time.
- Implement UTA Individual Development Plans.
- UTA opportunity to engage during participation time.

#### VI. Future Considerations:

- Recommend UTA's for assessing active learning!
- Apply for a C.I.T.L. Active Learning Grant.
- Aligns to IU's 2030 Strategic Plan: Student Success.
- Potential teaching theory and pedagogy alignment.
- Partnership proposed and accepted with C.I.T.L. on inaugural UTA Faculty Learning Community:
   Engage, Track, Adapt – Fall 2024, IU Bloomington.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> R.M. Ryan, B. Soenens, M. Vansteenkiste. Reflections on self-determination theory as an organizing framework for personality psychology: Interfaces, integrations, issues, and unfinished business Journal of Personality, 87 (1) (2019), pp. 115-145