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**Introduction**

I am the Director of the Centre for Instructional Support at the Faculty of Applied Science at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada. I have worked for 32 years at UBC in faculty support and for the last 13 years have led the Centre for Instructional Support in Applied Science. Beyond running the Centre and its services, I typically consult with individual faculty and small groups of faculty on teaching skills, course design, and curriculum development. With many years of experience in adult education, faculty support, and faculty development, I am in a position to help faculty really succeed in their teaching. The heart of my work is helping people progress, finding out where they are, who they are, and what they want to achieve, and then finding ways for them to enhance and develop their practice. I focus on high impact practices that can enhance and transform the students learning experience and the instructor teaching experience. My current focus includes implementation of Team-Based Learning, Flipped classroom teaching, measuring the difficult to measure for accreditation, and using peer editing and peer evaluation.

**Approach to Teaching and Learning**

Inspiring people take well thought out instructional "chances" in the safest way possible is at the heart of my practice. My primary task as a faculty developer is to help develop faculty members understanding of the connections between pedagogic possibility and practical, authentic, and meaningful instruction. I believe in creating an environment where faculty can make well informed decisions based both on ideas presented in workshops and consultations, and their own particular context. I believe strongly in the need to model the strategies and behaviours that I advocate for, so that when faculty leave a workshop they should be able to understand what they have learned and where it might fit into their own teaching approach and philosophy.

I am a voracious collector of stories: stories of success, failures, and limitations, stories from UBC faculty, students and staff, and stories from the literature. These all provide excellent ways to make the ideas and strategies I advocate for – authentic, possible, realistic and well grounded in the craft of teaching. For example, a large aspect of my work and teaching is informed by my listening to faculty success stories and frustrations, it allows me to fairly present the benefits and risks of a new or innovative instructional strategy, this makes faculty more likely to trust and respect what is presented. The gathering and sharing of stories allows me to honour the wisdom in the stories, share them with others, and build a shared story of success with my faculty.

My experience with the success of Team-Based Learning has profoundly affected the way I design and deliver instruction. Seeing large lecture spaces, large numbers of students, and increasing diversity in our learners as an opportunity rather then problem or constraint has helped me inspire my faculty to really change what they believe is possible in our larger classes. A quote from "Teaching with your Mouth Shut" sums up my approach nicely "good teaching is all about creating an environment where students can generate deep, enduring understanding"(Finkel, 2000).

The *4E faculty development model* has also influenced my perception of my own work. The *4E model* categorizes a teachers development on a continuum starting with Expert, moving to Entertainer, moving to Engineer, and finally to Equal. When I reflect on my own progress with my initial teaching experiences with extensive preparation trying to ensure my role as 'Expert", then I began to work on speaking and presenting better (Entertainer), then to being perfectly organized, researched and delivered (Engineer). I am now at a place where I would rather ask a good question then have a good answer (Equal), where I view teaching experiences for an opportunity for both the participants and I to learn something, and my primary responsibility lies in creating an environment where significant and deep learning can take place. The joy of uncovering the wisdom of the room is at the heart of my practice. This approach aligns well with my own teaching perspective (teachingperspectives.com) that highlights my preference to nurture and support others development.

**Major Contributions to Teaching**

My most recent contribution is the new book “Getting Started with Team-Based Learning” which is to be published by Stylus Publishing in July 2014. The book was co-written with Dr. Peter Ostafichuk from the department of Mechanical Engineering at University of British Columbia. The book is a compilation of our 10-year experience with TBL interspersed with interview snippets from 54 interviews with TBL teachers from around the world.

My major focus continues to be designing and delivering a wide range of pedagogically focused workshops, developing new programs for faculty (including writing a Guide to Teaching for New Faculty at UBC), and researching and helping my faculty solve specific instructional and pedagogical challenges that they might encounter.

My goals have shifted from knowledge building to inspiring faculty to reconsider how and why they teach the way they do. Two recent comments about my teaching lead me to believe I might be succeeding.

"I have never met someone so helpful. Always trying to find ways to help others succeed. As they say down here - *good on ya mate!*" - Mark Freeman - Australian Higher Education Council

"To be effective for the complex task facing us, one also need a high level of teaching and learning expertise and that is impossible for most faculty to achieve. It requires a collaboration with someone like Jim Sibley who has the discipline expertise and a passion for teaching and learning that, quite frankly, I found to be inspiring." - Elizabeth Brauer, Northern Arizona University

My understanding of the educational experience has evolved. Initially, as a new teacher I focused on the transmission of information (cognitive domain objectives) , but now I work to inspire workshop participants to consider changing their beliefs to morph their teaching practice (usually a shift to more affective domain objectives). I am pleased with the level of interest my workshops can generate, and am especially pleased when I inspire people to actually change their teaching practice. My teaching includes a variety of instructional settings and consultation settings. I consult with individuals and groups, and develop targeted, context sensitive program for larger groups. I host many instructional programs within Applied Science, across the UBC campus, at neighbouring institutions, and internationally.

I have given over 100 pedagogically focused workshops at Applied Science, at UBC, and all over the world, including workshops at the American University of Technology, Biuret, Lebanon, Aga Kahn University in Karachi, Pakistan, the University of Adelaide, Australia, the Catholic University of Korea Medical School, University of Alaska, Miami University, Philadelphia University, Cal North State University, the University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point, the UC Davis Medical School, and St. Rose College in Albany, New York.

I have given numerous conference presentations, including presentations at the Lily conferences on teaching, Professional Organizational Development Network Conferences, Team-Based Learning Collaborative Meetings, Improving University Teaching Conference, International Association for Medical Science Educators Meetings, the Educause Learning Initiative, the National Learning Infrastructure Initiative, BC Net and many others.

**See Appendix 1: Teaching Duties**

**See Appendix 2; Campus Service**

**See Appendix 3: External Service**

**Assessment of Teaching: Critical Reflections**

The goals of my teaching have shifted over the years. When I started I was more content-centric - being well organized, giving lucid explanations, and focusing on knowledge "transmission". I have increasingly asked the question - does my teaching inspire change? Knowledge building rather than transmission, critical reflection, and creating socially constructed "truths" are now at the heart of my work. I now look for feedback that talk of inspiration, the courage to change, and the curiosity to know more – to know that I am “hitting the mark”.

The trends in my feedback over the last few years about my teaching lead me to believe I might be succeeding. Here are some illustrative snippets:

* It was very rich, fulfilling, inspiring and helpful.
* This was the missing piece for me in my teaching practice.
* Yes, the context is rich and practical.
* Thank you for your time and generosity
* I found it to be inspiring
* Your contribution stimulate much thoughtful and productive discussion, and has inspired us to begin thinking of ways to implement this valuable teaching-learning tool in our own classrooms

I have received a wide variety of valuable feedback on my teaching over the years. With the limited duration of many events, the feedback, my reflection and subsequent improvements are typically targeted at the next workshop, next talk, or next presentation. My teaching has followed a fairly typical progression, from well-organized lectures to more learner-centred approaches, using the wisdom of the room to uncover and solve interesting problem. I find this kind of learner-centered approach the most satisfying.

I am most proud of my evaluations from my students in PRIN 420 (Principals of Human Anatomy) – I was facilitating using an unfamiliar pedagogy (PBL) and had no content expertise (Immunology). This was intimidating, but very rewarding. I often took some comfort in knowing that learning needed to happen in the students’ head, not in my own. My job was to create the best possible learning environment where my students got what they needed, when they needed it, to develop deep, enduring understanding.

Evaluations Available

* Using Teams in Large Classes - CTLT - October 2010
* **Course Design Workshop Series - compilation 2008-2009**
* Multiple-Choice Question Writing - May 2008
* Instructional Skills Workshop Facilitator - March 2007
* **PBL Tutor (Faculty of Medicine) PRIN 420 - Nov. 2005** 
  + **Students Evaluations of Tutor**
  + Faculty Peer Evaluation of Tutor
* Team-Based Learning Conference May 2007
  + Making Student Thinking Visible
  + How to facilitate a TBL workshop at your Institution
* The Basics of TBL - CTLT - May 2006
* Introduction to TBL - CTLT - May 2005
* Teamwork and Collaborative Writing - May 2004

**See Appendix 4: Teaching Evaluations (bold evaluations provided in appendix)Professional Development**

**Recent Professional Development**

* Graphic Facilitation – UBC - September 2013
* Your Story, Your Voice – Fringe Festival - September 2103

**Past PD Workhops**

* Faculty Learning Communities Boot Camp – Cal Poly University - June 2012
* Collaborative Learning – Miami University - November 2012
* Transformational Speaking - HollyHock Retreat Centre- September 2010
* Case Based Teaching - UBC - February 2010
* Facilitation Techniques - UBC - November 2009
* Voice Intensive – Simon Fraser University - February 2008
* Facilitator Training for PeerReview.ca - UBC - February 2008
* Edward Tufte: Presenting Data and Information Workshop - Seattle, Washington - July 2007
* Facilitator Training for Instructional Skills Workshops – Simon Fraser University - December 2006
* Learning Technology Leadership Program - Educause - Penn State - July 2006
* Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth – Seminars (25+)
* Digital Storytelling - Train the Trainer - Ukiah, California - October 2006
* Problem Based Learning - Tutor Training - UBC Faculty of Medicine - September 2005
* Digital Storytelling - Centre for Digital Storytelling, Berkley, California - July 2003
* WebCT Trainer the Trainer - January 2001

**Mentorship (**TBLC Train the Trainer Program)

* Marie Thomas – Psychology - California State University– San Marcos, CA (2013)
* Loretta Whitehorne – Nursing, Registered Nurses Association of Canada, St. John, NB (2011)
* Rick Goedde – Business Management, St. Olaf College, Minnesota (2010)

**Future Professional Development Goals**

My PD goal is to continue to develop my skills and find new ways to help my faculty. My recent focus has been on conversion success (i.e. does workshop effect classroom practice?). I am trying to move beyond "I really enjoyed your session". The major question is do people change their practice on the basis of the ideas from the workshops? I have been trying to use powerful storytelling to foster this change. I have been thinking about what stories to tell, how to tell them, and when to tell them.

My PD goals align with these interests - learn how to inspire people by telling a better story, to incorporate the wisdom in the diffusion of innovation literature to be able to target the "right" people to effect the most change, and learning, trying and evaluating new and novel active learning strategies. My immediate PD goals are around developing my storytelling, visual facilitation and my voice. I have sought out a variety of speaking venue's to work on my craft - Toastmaster, BC Brain Injury Society, and the Flame storytelling circle.

**Appendix 1 - Teaching Duties /Conference Presentations**

* Introduction to Team-Based Learning (TBL) – Philadelphia University - April 2014
* Introduction to TBL – University of Alaska - Anchorage - January 2014
* Writing Good Multiple Choice Questions – University of Alaska - Anchorage - January 2014
* Introduction to Course Design – University of Alaska - Anchorage - January 2014
* Designing Effective Tasks for Teams – University of Alaska - Anchorage - January 2014
* Introduction to TBL - Lily Conference on Teaching and Learning, November 2013
* Current Research in Learning Theory – POD birds of a feather session – Professional Organizational Development (POD) Conference – Pittsburgh, PA – November 2013
* Introduction to TBL – UBC Okanogan Learning Conference - May 2013
* Introduction to TBL – American University of Technology, Lebanon - March 2013
* Introduction to TBL – Beirut High School District PD day, Lebanon - March 2013
* Effective team work in the workplace – American University of Technology, Lebanon - March 2013
* Introduction to TBL – Simon Fraser University (SFU) - November 2012
* Introduction to TBL - Douglas College - August 2012
* Writing multiple-choice questions - Douglas College - August 2012
* Course Design for Active Classrooms - Douglas College - May 2012
* Introduction to TBL – UBC Faculty of Arts Brown Bag lunch – March 2012
* Developing a facilitation framework for TBL - poster - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Meeting - March 2012
* Using Faculty Learning Communities to foster TBL – concurrent session - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Meeting - March 2012
* Introduction to TBL – British Columbia Institute of Technology – November 2011
* Introduction to course design for TBL – British Columbia Institute of Technology – November 2011
* Developing TBL activities and modules – British Columbia Institute of Technology – November 2011
* Writing multiple-choice questions for the Readiness Assurance Process – British Columbia Institute of Technology – November 2011
* Trainer the TBL Trainer - workshop - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Meeting March 2-4, 2011
* Using TBL in Engineering: What we have learned along the way - session - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Meeting March 2-4, 2011
* Comparing Various Method of Peer Evaluation - poster - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Meeting March 2-4, 2011
* Evaluation Planning for Post-Docs - Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT) – Feb 2011
* 3 day Course Design Intensive - CTLT - December 2010
* Using Teams in Large Classrooms - Sauder Springboard Session - November 2010
* Building Learning Teams to Promote Active Learning in Large Classes - POD Conference, November 2010
* Can you teach using an iPad? Applied Science Brown Bag Lunch - November 2010
* Building Learning Teams to Promote Active Learning in Large Classes –CTLT- October 2010
* Teaching in Large Spaces - Arts New Faculty, CTLT, September 2010
* Starting Right: Orientation for New Faculty - CTLT, Science and Applied Science - September 2010
* Designing TBL Courses - University of Wisconsin - Steven Point - June/July 2010
* 3 day Course Design Intensive – (Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth) TAG - June 2010
* Introduction to TBL - UBC TAG Spring Institute May 2010
* Multiple Choice Question Writing - UBC TAG Spring Institute May 2010
* TBL - 2 day workshop - University of Adelaide, Australia May 2010
* Introduction to TBL - Camosun College, Victoria, British Columbia, April 2010
* Introduction to TBL Question Writing - UBC TAG Spring Institute May 2009
* Using TBL to Teach Multiple Choice Question Writing - UBC TAG Spring Institute May 2009
* 3 day Course Design Institute -TAG, UBC June 2009
* Online Seminar - TBL 101 Team-Based Learning Collaborative Current Topics in TBL June 2009
* Introduction to TBL - Delegation from King Faud University July 2009
* Introduction to TBL - Improving University Teaching Conference - SFU July 2009
* What the History of Engineering Education Reform can Teach Us - Invited Speaker - Department of Civil Engineering Retreat May 2009
* 2nd Annual Applied Science Learning Conference - Teaching in Large Classrooms May 2009
* Technology Snow Days Panel - BC Net Conference April 2009
* Online Seminar - TBL 101 - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Current Topics in TBL April 2009
* The Wisdom of the TBL ListServe - Developing Community Best Practices - 8th Team-Based Learning Conference - Austin, Texas March 2009
* Can we use Team-Based Learning to teach Project Management? Continuing Studies - UBC Robson September 2008
* Introduction to PODcasting and ScreenCasting - Applied Science Brown Bag Lunch - UBC August 2008
* Are Clickers Right for your Classroom? - Applied Science Brown Bag Lunch - UBC August 2008
* TBL 101 - International Association of Medical Science Educators Annual Meeting - Salt lake City, Utah July, 2008
* Introduction to TBL - TAG June 2008
* Using TBL to Teach Resume and Cover Letter Writing - UBC Engineering Co-op Facilitators June 2008
* Using TBL to Teach Multiple Choice Question Writing - UBC TAG Spring Institute May, 2008
* First Annual Applied Science Learning Conference 2020 Kaiser - UBC Vancouver May 2008
* Active Learning: TBL vs. Problem-Based Learning Workshop - St. Rose College, Albany, New York - May 2008
* Instructional Skills Workshop for faculty and graduate students - TAG April 2008
* 3 Day TBL Workshop - Catholic University of Korea - Medical School October 2007
* Civil Engineering One (Civil 201) Fall 2007 Co-Instructor
* Team-Based Learning Conference May 31-June 1, 2007 Vancouver, BC - Conference chair, 2 workshops and poster
* Interactive Teaching: Use of ‘Clickers’ (PRS RF) in the Classroom May 2007 Pre-conference workshop - TBL Conference
* UBCO Learning Conference May 2007 Two Workshops - TBL and Classroom Response Systems Workshops
* BC Net Conference April 2007 Vancouver - BC Panel on Academic Dishonesty
* Instructional Skills Workshop for faculty and graduate students TAG Feb. 2007
* ELI Educause Conference 2007 Atlanta, GA Jan. 2007 Team-Based Learning - Experience IT Session
* Introduction to TBL September 2006 - Land and Food Systems - Brown Bag Lunch
* Digital Story Telling Workshop - Train the Trainer - October 2006 Ukiah, California
* TBL Workshops - October 2006 - UC Davis Medical School
* Introduction to TBL - June 2006 - TAG Institute
* Creating Effective Assignments for Teams - June 2006 e-Learning Institute
* Interactive Teaching: Use of ‘Clickers’ (PRS RF) in the Classroom - June 2006
* Summer Series: Developing a Team-Based Learning Course June - July 2006 A series of weekly roundtables to develop the materials for a Team-Based Learning Course
* TBL - Experience It Session May 2006 - UBCO Learning Conference
* TBL - Experience It Session May 2006 - UBC Learning Conference
* Tutoring PBL in Principles of Human Biology - PRIN 410 November-December 2005
* Orientation for New Faculty - Office of Learning Technologies August 2005
* iPeer - Peer Evaluation Online February 2006 – Teaching, Learning and Technology Series (TAG)
* TBL 101 - Workshop Feb 2006 - TAG Seminar
* Clickers in the Classroom: classroom response system pilot project in Applied Science Feb 2006 - Faculty of Applied Science
* TBL 101 - Short Overview January 2006 - School of Nursing
* TBL 101 - Workshop November 2005 - Telestudios
* TBL 101 - Workshop September 2005 - UBCO
* TBL 101 - Workshop April 2005 - UBC Robson Square Workshop
* Introduction to WebCT
* Online Communication Tools
* Using WebCT to increase community in your course
* Managing digital assignments and quizzes with WebCT

**Appendix 2 - Campus Service**

**Committees**

* Learning Management System Steering Committee (2011-present)
* Pedagogical Working Group (2013 - present)
* Learning Technology Advisory Council (2009-2012)
* Civil Curriculum Committee (2009)
* UBC Classroom Response System Technology Review Committee (2008)
* Civil Capstone Development Team (Fall 2006)
* Applied Science Laptop Initiative Advisory Committee (Fall 2006)
* UBC Enterprise Course Management Advisory Committee (2004 - 2009)
* UBC CMS Governance Committee (2003-2005)
* UBC CMS Administration Resource Team - Past Chair (2002-2006)
* UBC Classroom Response Systems Selection Committee (2005-2007)
* e-Learning Institute (2001-2007)

**Awards**

* Featured Profile - UBC Annual Report - 2010
* Nominated for UBC Staff Service Award - 2008, 2010
* Deans Award for Staff Service Excellence - 2010
* UBC Spencer Award for Campus IT Leadership - 2009

**UBC Teaching and Learning Enhancement Grants**

* Creating a sustainable framework for capstone experiences in Chemical Engineering - 2005-2006
* Team Based Learning: An Opportunity for Engaging Students in Large Class Settings - 2004-2005 (Principal Investigator)
* Student-Led Capstone Laboratory Experience in Chemical Engineering - 2004-2005
* Global Software Engineering Capstone Projects - 2004-2005
* ASSIST 2005 - Academic Success: Summer International Students Transition Program - 2004-2005
* Implementing an innovative course model for traditional laboratory courses (Chemical Engineering) - 2003-2004
* Capstone Design Project (CDP) in Civil Engineering - 2003-2004
* Remote Fluid Mechanics Laboratory - Part II- 2003-2004
* ASSIST - Academic Success: Summer International Students Transition Program - 2003-2004
* Remote Fluid Mechanics Laboratory - Part I - 2002-2003
* Supporting Faculty and Student Engagement in Teaching and Learning Technology - 2002-2003
* Coordinated Metadata Infrastructure for Learning Object Repositories at UBC - 2002-2003

**Appendix 3 - External Service**

**Curriculum Consulting**

* University of Philadelphia – April 2014
* University of Alaska – Anchorage – January 2014
* Simon Fraser University – November 2012
* Douglas College – August 2012
* American University of Technology, Lebanon – March 2012
* British Columbia Institute of Technology – September 2011
* Cal North State University, Sacramento, California - January 2011
* Mount St. Mary College, Los Angles, CA - January 2011   
  (phone consult - classroom design for active learning)
* University of Wisconsin- Stevens Point - June 2010
* Educational Research Group of Adelaide (Australia) - May 2010
* St. Rose College - Albany, New York - May 2008
* Catholic University of Korea - Medical School - October 2007
* University of California - Davis School of Medicine - October 2006
* Aga Kahn University - Medical School, Pakistan - November 2002

**Boards and Committees**

* Conference Organizing Committee - 14th TBL Conference, March 2014, Fort Worth, Texas
* Conference Organizing Committee - 8th TBL Conference, March 2009, Austin, Texas
* Team-Based Learning Collaborative - Membership Committee Member (2010-2012)
* Team-Based Learning Collaborative - Education Committee Member (2008-2010)
* Team-Based Learning Collaborative - Board Member (2008-present)
* Conference Host and Chair - 6th TBL Conference, May 2007, Vancouver, BC Canada
* Wimba Product Advisory Board (2006-2009)
* WebCT Exemplary Courses Selection Committee (2003)

**Webinars**

* Flipping your class using Team-Based Learning. Magana Publishing – Webinar – May 2014
* What are good questions and tasks for teams? International Association for Medical Science Education - Webinar Series - October 2010
* Introduction to Team-Based Learning - Team-Based Learning Collaborative Webinar Series - September 2009
* Introduction to Team-Based Learning - Wimba Distinguished Lecture Series - February 2007

At a personal level, I am a board member for the Vancouver Fringe festival, a past member of Pacific Spirit Toastmasters, a volunteer at the OSA Wildlife Sanctuary, and a volunteer for the Fauna Foundation. I was a past President of the Canadian Alpine Club - Vancouver Section, past executive member of Vancouver Kayak Club, former Volunteer Ocean Kayaking instructor for Locarno Sailing Club, and past member of editorial board for the Canadian Alpine Journal.

**Appendix 4 - Teaching Evaluations**

I have included two significant evaluations; (1) compilation of feedback from the first 3 iteration of UBC’s Centre for Teaching, Learning and technology's Course Design Intensive, (2) my evaluation in my role as PBL tutor in the Faculty of Medicine at UBC.

**Compilation and Responses to CDI Feedback**

***Course Design Intensive – Feedback***

*Date: June 24-26, 2009*

*Facilitators: Susan Nesbit, Janice Johnson, Ellen Rosenberg, Trish Rosseel, Jim Sibley, and Joanne Nakonechny*

1. **I found the following aspects of this Institute valuable**

* Resources; variety of activities, lots of experiential learning opportunities; DACUM, context, expectations, coherence of design from course inception, design, delivery through reflection.
* I found it all valuable.
* Collegial atmosphere, a planning structure (6 topic sequence – I can use it too), time to work on my own course.
* All of it! Truly. I wouldn’t want to see anything removed. All topics were helpful and valuable.
* The facilitators’ breadth of experience and knowledge. The diversity of participants (esp. including instructors from career/professional programs).
* Comprehensive approach to course design. Collaborative structure of re-workshop.
* The manner in which course design can be though of in 6 pieces. Understanding that course design is a work-in-progress and that I won’t achieve perfection on the first tries.
* Great overview and many follow up resources.
* Focus on how to map out form start to finish, great structure and time keeping.
* Organization and sequence of topics. Time to work on your own. Activities that allowed us to interact and network.
* 6 facilitators, “6 aspects” identified on day 1, “transparency and stewardship of the 3 day journey”. Collegial, safe, active learning environment.
* All of it.
* Speaking to people who were willing to share their expertise, point me to resources and actually show me how to do things right now. Reassurance that my previous approach to curriculum design is reasonable, and tangible options for changing my approach in the future.
* The variety of facilitators with their different experiences and varied disciplines.
* DACUM, creating (rubtics?), learning from peers.
* The group activities, purposeful and allowed for greater participation of everyone.
* Resources. Presentation of relevant theories of teaching and learning.
* The people – the diversity of knowledge in the room.
* Knowledge of subject matter by the facilitators. Welcoming environment. Good steady pace.
* The tools for building learning objectives and linking these to course design. All of the major concepts presented were very helpful.
* Networking. Refresher of PIDD 3101.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | DACUM  Breadth of Experience, variety of voices  Organization, structure, clear map  Group activities effective |

1. **I would like to suggest the following change(s) to the Institute… because…**

* Perhaps a 2x2 design on two weeks to allow for homework opportunities and accommodation of new learning. Perhaps a balance of convergent and divergent perspective in activities to focus learning.
* Individual working time in larger blocks.
* Ask about food needs in the pre planning survey so you know how many veggies there are.
* Very well done. Mind suggestions – let people know that bringing a UBC stick does not mean access to computers while working on material. Maybe three days in a row, because it would allow time to work on material and return with materials developed and get feedback. Instead of three days in a row perhaps time 4 - 6 to work on materials.
* The session on appraisal could be a little more didactic because of the wide diversity of experiences of participants and lack of familiarity with terminology and practices.
* More space for the same number of participants, because there were times when it was difficult to concentrate because of other participants’ proximity.
* For me, it may have been helpful for groups to be formed after our arrivals and according to our interests, this would allow for a case study approach whereby we work together on going through all six steps. A way of perhaps think of it this is: small group (natural sciences and social sciences/humanities) and large group (natural sciences and social sciences/humanities). A bit more emphasis on the practical would help me to learn.
* Start with general intro to topic and then split up into groups depending on participant’s interest/needs and not according to tables/numbers…
* Fresh air and more veggie sandwiches! A more focused approach for our time working on our own project, because mine was too large to accomplish much in the time given.
* Some info/”warning” at the beginning to new instructors, like the comment Jan made on day 2, because that would help to align expectations and have an idea about what the final product would look like.
* “Graphic syllabus” for modeling the whole process, not just each individual component.
* I’d like an overall structure to hang my things on – perhaps something like a graphic chart of the course or a huge outline we can relate each section to, which we’d fill in as we go along – I saw the idea of a syllabus as such.
* Not sure why, but day 2 -3 room layout was more comfortable than day 1.
* Provide examples, templates of ideas discussed (e.g. leading strategies, learning activities) and a few disciplines where it will work, because it will assist in applying what I learned.
* More time for the Institute, because I felt two more days would have been perfect for me to assimilate more effectively.
* No fundamental change as ling as the parameters are well laid-out.
* Find more ways to get us moving when the energy levels get low, because we all benefit when everyone is attentive and participating.
* Use case studies more to help focus the work on solutions because I think many of the activities were very divergent.
* Minor things that were already identified.
* More focused time and attention on the basics such as learning objectives and learning activities would have been great, because I’m worried that I may not have internalized enough of the detail.
* Clarify scope of CD and goals of workshop so participants will know where they are in the system (CD) and where they are going.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Alternative time/day sequence?  More time to work on my stuff |

1. **I would / would not recommend this Institute to others because**

* It was very rich, fulfilling, inspiring and helpful.
* Would recommend it, so much usable info.
* It gives a very useful broad framework for planning and revising courses plus lots of specific tips and ideas for implementation.
* So many teachers need this content. We may be passionate about and skilled in our discipline but may be weak educating – hence TAG.
* Would! Every instructor should do this at least once in his/her career.
* Would. The three days were valuable in setting the stage for design and organizing the courses I teach.
* Definitely would recommend as it opens up an important conversation that all teachers need to think about (specially new ones).
* Very time-intensive.
* I would, it was a wonderful experience, very knowledgeable facilitators and plenty of encouragement. I now feel I have the tools and can get started.
* I would, it’s an eye opener to the variety of resources that can be used in course design and teaching in general.
* I would because of the expertise of facilitators and participants.
* I would.
* I would, it provides an excellent point with tools and choices of approaches to designing a course. It also puts ones own teaching into a larger context (through meeting others).
* It keeps one grounded and coming back to why we are educators. Sometimes we are very busy with the content we are the expert and we forget how to work until we provide the environment where learning can take place.
* It was awesome! This is a must-have resource that will equip any teacher.
* Yes, the context is rich and practical.
* It helped to organize my thoughts around teaching practice and reinforced beliefs I hold around good teaching that are not always supported or emphasized by my home department.
* It gives a solid foundation to the big issues that come up in teaching, it lets people connect to a community and keep learning.
* I would. My associates and peers often discuss the issues/challenges we covered in the Institute.
* I’d highly recommend.
* Good opportunity for teachers to reflect on their current practices and learn new techniques.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Good, valuable, a must once in a career  Organization appreciated |

1. **A specific example of how this Institute will change the way I teach is**

* Clarity (even more) of expectations, more regular of a variety of feedback strategies to use in reflection.
* Adding graphics to syllabus and being more explicit in syllabus to make expectations clearer to students.
* Many! The biggest ones are a) a deliberate structure to how I approach course design that reflects my teaching philosophy, and b) I will approach my teaching colleagues across campus with more confidence.
* I will be recharged to review learning objective and lesson plans. I will increase formative student assessment of the course/me.
* I will search out and access more opportunities for professional growth to refine these strategies.
* More use of troths in my classroom, more explicit in my expectations and learning lectures. More consciousness effort to engage the students.
* Be more prepared, plan ahead but be flexible, be explicit.
* Be clearer about expectations and develop a better overall concept that involves student feedback.
* I’ll try to use different evaluations and more robust rubrics. Also a new graphical syllabus.
* To have course goals and learning objectives guide my course design and development.
* Re-write course syllabus and thoughtful clear accurate components (transparency) and present them in the context of devoting class time to them, perhaps as a group activity, where they discuss and post notes and bring back groups, and also incorporate concurrent student feedback.
* I’ll definitely consider the MI activities, reflect and use regular feedback, assessment evaluation, etc.
* The DACUM has allowed me to reduce the number of LOS and make my course description more concise.
* I plan to make the learning objectives more transparent and specific so to provide clarity for students.
* I will no longer give arbitrarily assignments. I will use the overall goal to decide on assignments and will incorporate formative assessment.
* Pay more attention to having a colorful room.
* I will add more room for student feedback and re-consider how I organize by lesson plans.
* Using the DACUM process to design workshops/programs/courses – fantastic, flexible, fast and fun!
* I am revitalized and refocused. I’ve forgotten many of the fundamentals and have been brought back to the mainstream.
* Much more organized and attentive to detail.
* Offer blog/Wiki/webpage as support.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Website support please  DACUM |

1. **I suggest, as follow-up to this Institute**

* Would it be too greedy to ask for a follow up to this particular Institute?
* More courses and access to non-UBC faculty. A use of technology course.
* Invite the same people back to a similar session in about 6 months to “focus in” on specific aspects.
* A one day “alumni” workshop next year to review, revise and revitalize.
* The practical piece suggested above – working trough a case study, perhaps with one facilitator assigned to each group.
* Have something like an informal get together.
* Review of the course we designed or worked on or changes we made? An “alumni” meeting at a follow-up?
* An event where participants of this Institute could go back and evaluate what worked and what didn’t work (after a year or so).
* Graduates return for coffee and sharing info in 3-6 months.
* You could do a series of mini institutes for specific areas in order to give more chances for acting on them.
* An opportunity to bring a draft of a course and have peers/participants review and provide feedback. And sharing opportunity so we can see and hear about other courses and methods.
* To come back every 2-3 years, to see what changes in any we’ve made in our teaching practices.
* More on teaching strategies and tools.
* More focused 3-hour sessions as outlined/listed in TAG. Invite outsiders.
* A Wiki with resources available and a Community of Practice invite to all involved so people can stay connected.
* A one-day refresher/recap/discussions of what we have achieved in 6 months.
* That perhaps a consideration of “beginners” and an “advanced” course to move at a slower pace.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Follow-up please (alumni event, one day refresher, coffee sharing reunion)  More on use of technology  Website/wiki |

**Please circle the appropriate number for each aspect of the Institute:**

**(Not helpful 1 – Very helpful 5)**

**Administrative**

* Registration procedure: 4.5
* Information provided prior to the Institute: 4
* Facilities: 4.5

**Please comment specifically on any of the above:**

Fast, easy, clear registration

Very helpful to be sent map for those of us not from UBC.

Juice at lunch would have been great.

Roselyn was very helpful.

I liked the questionnaires but I felt they gave the impression we would be designing a course syllabus – not realizing the magnitude of the topics involved.

The workroom was too cold.

I’m not sure of the themes/topics to be covered.

Registration was very easy; however, the website did not give me a clear idea of what I was getting myself into.

Windows in the room would have been nice.

**Facilitation**

* Visual aids, handouts and other material: 4.6
* Modeling of teaching techniques by facilitators: 4.4
* Teamwork among facilitators: 4.7
* Flow of the Institute: 4.4

**Please comment specifically on any of the above:**

Really appreciated the generosity of resources and all the responsive and proactive effort that the instructors devoted to the course design.

I found the instruction not completely clear for a couple of the group exercises.

I enjoy observing others – it makes my own teaching/facilitation better.

**Working on your course**

* Having time to work on your course: 4
* Initial activities from facilitators: 4.5
* Feedback from peers: 4.5
* Feedback from facilitators: 4.6

**Please comment specifically on any of the above:**

I would have liked more time to work on my specific course and yet I was very content with the information offered; I appreciated the instructors’ contact and feedback.

Time blocks weren’t long enough, but not sure how else it could have been organized.

It’s hard to ask for feedback yet.

I didn’t work on my own course that much as had so much more to do for each piece that time allowed.

I (ofty?) idea to work on all my course material, but really enjoyed the “availability” of the facilitators’ input.

Providing participants with an electronic form of the institute is great.

Maybe if these were 5 days instead of 3 there could be more time to incorporate these new principles into designing our courses. Regardless of the limited time, I was able to work on the course somewhat!

The review of resources has been excellent.

I appreciated having course time, but was often too tired to get much substantive work done.

I didn’t get much time to work on my own stuff.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | More time to work on my stuff  e-version of course? |

**Another aspect not mentioned**

Please specify and comment specifically:

* Table facilitator 3, our table facilitator felt somewhat (centering-moderative?) on what went in our flip charts, so sometimes voices were not acknowledged or what they contributed was changed in a new collaborative way – I, however, did not work to find a way to give this feedback and this was my responsibility to do as a participant.
* Networking time 3, would have liked more time to get suggestions from others, but not really the focus of this Institute.
* Food was great, thanks for fruits and veggies along with sandwich.
* Approachability of instructors 5.
* I would have preferred to eat out.
* Nutrition, thank you for the food.
* Lunch 5.
* Hospitality 5, thanks!!
* Group dynamic 5, I felt very comfortable opening up to other participants and facilitators.
* Networking during course time 5.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Networking time ID as important |

1. **I found out about this Institute from**

Douglas College (7)

An email from the Associate Dean

TAG website (2)

Email from head (2)

TAG Course Design Community of Practice

Web-ad distributed by faculty.

TAG email

Roselynn

SFU

VCIPD

**I would also like to say**

Many thanks for an invigorating and exhausting three days, I hope to come back.

Thanks!

This was the missing piece for me in my teaching practice.

Is there any way your mandate/mission at the Institute can always include instructors at universities/colleges outside of UBC? I think it will be mutually beneficial for us and for you.

The facilitator team seems to link well together, and it was really great to meet you!

Thank you so much!

I had a great time.

***Course Design Institute - Feedback***

***Date: Dec. 7-9, 2009***

***Facilitator(s):***

***Number of forms: 15***

1. **I found the following aspects of this Institute valuable:**

* All the modules were relevant and well done.

The amount of self-directed session was exactly right as was the freedom to either work on project or learn more on a topic.

* The presentation of a wide variety of course design tools.

Dialogue with peers on design/teaching ideas.

Focus time to apply ideas to my own course.

* Very much. Very informative and 3 days of peace to think and reflect and exchange/learn new ideas.
* DACUM.

Assessment/Evaluation – Appraisal.

* Various components of course design.
* Concrete suggestions for lesson plans, DACUM, course goals and objectives.
* Time to work on our own projects, particularly pair work – really good questions for us to chew on Natasha’s section, Jan’s section on reflection.
* The immense knowledge from the different facilitators and how much of what I learnt in 3 days can be applied to my course.
* The book you provided, the dialogue and feedback you gave on individual questions and the resources.
* DACUM for course planning, small group discussions with facilitators, mini-TBL workshop (JITT?), appraisal activities.
* I liked the length of 3 days. I like balance between workshops and personal time.
* Broad diverse makeup.

Great panel of speakers.

Great topics and pacing.

Loved focused work.

* The many different topics and full coverage of designing a course.
* Working with generic examples: I don’t have my own content yet but this helped me grasp the context regardless.
* Reflection.

Assessment and evaluation.

DACUM.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | DACUM  Balance between workshop/personal time good (3) |

1. **I would like to suggest the following change(s) to the Institute**

* I would not change the curriculum.

Knowing the power point to be emailed helped so I could avoid note taking.

The table set up was a minor problem.

Pop machines were empty; I found others eventually- just tell people where they are.

Found Brett exercises very valuable but each one was a little too short to get to enough exchange to benefit well – conversation just got started and it was over rushed.

The rest of workshop moved well but was enough time to get benefit from (accunty).

* Different room layout if possible – a round table layout would work well.
* When participants have many ideas about the task, completion of the task id less important than focusing on the existing ideas to illustrate the purpose of the task.
* Sometimes time allocations were sparse, but not overly so.
* The context piece felt (muddly) to me. I suggest: clarifying language (context? Expectations?); more framing; the expert vs. novice thing is interesting and very useful but seems to me to belong elsewhere; clearer questions posed in group work.
* I like the 3 day intensive better than spread over 3 weeks because when the course is offered at end of term it doesn’t create a time conflict for me and I’m able to focus on the course.
* More movement activities because of the stationary nature of an intense (nothing?) and because it helps you refocus. Examples of activities you can do to address different styles of learning. I was particularly unsure about implementation.
* Have more info ahead of time (at registration) about the topics covered in the workshop, because it would be helpful in setting goals beforehand.
* I found working on the driving example to be tiring and boring. Would have liked to do this then think of how it relates to my course after, because I would have been more engaged.
* Room was tight but that was beneficial too. Less handouts or another way, perhaps electronic database to save the environment.
* Perhaps doing this less intensive like 6x3hr days so more time for reflection of thinking is available. I did get quite tired in the end and found difficult to give same amount of energy to all activities.
* Increase focus on development of personal course because this is what I came for and would value instructor/peer assistance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Alternate workshop date structure (once a week?) |

1. **I would/would not recommend this Institute to others because**

* Would. It covered all the essentials four course design and provided tools/references/resources. This is an ongoing process but enough of real world examples and a parallel project made it practical.
* I would. I feel that it took me from a clueless standing and moved me to a place where I feel confident in my ability to design my first course.
* I would. Reflection on how to teach own course, i.e. what are own learning outcome, DACUM, Appraisal, Improve – the structure, (scafalding) of own course and strengthen.
* I would, because of number and experience of facilitators and participants also the Institute reinforced/affirmed many points of course design that I felt were in the right direction. Frameworks were provided and rational very useful.
* I would. It is helpful to interact with different facilitators and participants, each bringing their own expertise.
* I would. I feel it offered a lot to both experienced and less experienced instructors.
* Would. A good overview. I saw many people make great leaps and bounds forward in their course design; good opportunity to meet colleagues engaged in teaching.
* I would. I learnt a lot and in a very supportive and enjoyable manner. A safe learning environment.
* Facilitators were warm, open, and varied in their personalities. Content had structure and models for application.
* I would. It helps to guide me through the course redesign process and make it less overwhelming, provide valuable tools and resources.
* No matter what experience you have you can always take your teaching to the next level.
* Would because it really invigorates you and informs better teaching practice.
* Would. If you need grounding on the theory and practice of course design or need terminology this is a very good seminar.
* I would. For me this experience is a good basis from where to start. I would actually like to repeat it once I have my material ready.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Appreciated facilitator openness, helpfulness and support |

1. **A specific example of how this Institute will change the way I teach is**

* I do many of these things but now I have an organized structured framework to be sure I have not forgotten elements. And I saw many other ways to do similar things.
* I will focus clearly on course goals at the outset of design – emphasize the big picture.
* DACUM, Appraisal.
* Developing assessment/evaluation of my course. Use of resources recommended.
* My course syllabus in informed by what I learn here and my teaching will be too.
* Formative assessment. Use of DACUM. Structuring goals and objectives.
* I’ll be more systematic about using DACUM.
* Application of TBL.
* Make sure the assessments and evaluations are meaningful and present, and consider the student’s context when planning future courses.
* Focus on developing lesson objectives from course objectives/goals, rather than from the course content.
* Student centered teaching.
* DACUM. Assessment formative. TBL.
* The DACUM will most likely change the structure of the course. I’m also likely to add more activities to my current course.
* I have no proper education on teaching and from this I see that I do need to read up and gain pedagogical skills as well as expertise in my subject matter.
* You have rejuvenated my desire to more thoughtfully plan lessons, including more activities, and to do the WHAT NOW piece of reflection.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | DACUM, now understand structure of course design process |

1. **I suggest, as a follow-up to this Institute**

* I need to do many teaching before I’m a position to recommend follow up.
* Could you organize retreats (2-3 days) just for personal work/thinking/feedback from facilitators and colleagues?
* An hour or two follow up with people in January to see how they are using info, what additional tools they might like.
* Maybe a session for people to come back and share how their course implementation is going and get feedback.
* A follow-up workshop on giving effective presentations with tools.
* TBL workshop. Science-specific teaching/learning workshops.
* Don’t understand this question.
* TBL workshop in Kamloops.
* A seminar on linking goals to appraisal would be good since we should have well developed goals by now.
* To do something for members, how to approach building a course for the first time from scratch.
* Send me an email in 3 months to remind me on my resolve!

**Please circle the appropriate number for each aspect of the Institute**

**(Not helpful 1 to Very helpful 5)**

**Administrative**

- Registration procedure 3.8

- Information provided prior to Institute 3.5

- Facilities 3.8

**Please comment specifically on any of the above:**

* Room set up a little inflexible – minor. Good food but breakfast choice low in sugar.
* The registration process was a little confusing – lots of different and slightly contradictory information. Room was also not ideal.
* Outlines of all the talks provided ahead of time would have been helpful.
* Original confirmation email sent was confusing, but rapidly responded by email follow up.
* We got wrong location info; weren’t asked about food preferences; got the handout twice but weren’t told it was for Wednesday.
* Was not present for registration. Pre-readings were good to expose you to material. Two rooms were helpful.
* The info received prior to the workshop was a bit confusing on its own.
* Registration a little confusing.
* Clarify the “what” of the intensive discussion online: “Working… to design on re-design” etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Some registration issues and expectation setting |

**Facilitation**

* Visual aids, handouts, and other material 4.2
* Modeling of teaching techniques by facilitators 4.2
* Teamwork among facilitators 4.7
* Flow of the Institute 4.1

**Please comment specifically on any of the above:**

* Nice balance of handouts – avoided the problem of going home to do all learning with lots of handouts – well selected.
* I’d prefer all handouts in electronic formats with the paper handouts.
* Giving handouts at the beginning as a package so that we can refer to them during the talks.
* Excellent! I am always impressed by the skill and confidence of TAG staff.
* I would have really liked to experience the different methods of teaching to drive them home.
* Everything was good – having done some previous courses in teaching and learning some items were repetitive with what I’d done before, but was still made interesting.
* Teaching quality (variety).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | |
| Jim | Electronic handouts please |

**Working on your course**

* Having time to work on your course4.2
* Initial activities from facilitators 4
* Feedback from peers 4.4
* Feedback from facilitators 4.4

**Please comment specifically on any of the above:**

* I particularly liked the opportunity to discuss projects with facilitators as well.
* Great.
* Pacing of course in (interspesed) with individual, pair, group work was effective.
* I’m unsure how the info provided prior to Institute is linked to it or its usefulness.
* I don’t be moan the work I didn’t do, it’s just I thought I’d do more.
* This part was excellent.
* Feedback from everyone was meaningful; initial activities helped to stimulate course work, but sometimes were confusing (like in the context lecture).
* All very helpful.
* Modify driving activity. Have specific activity to brainstorm each others course.

**Another aspect not mentioned:**

* Good flow of topics – good ending
* I appreciated the flexibility of different options for using independent time.
* Great variety of foods.

1. **I found out about this Institute from**

* TAG emails.
* Departmental info email.
* TAG (4)
* Email to department.
* A friend.
* The skylight website.
* Email.
* Email from SON.
* Email from grad secretary.
* TAG website
* A friend doing a Med.

1. **I would also like to say**

* Thanks, a very worthwhile 3 days.
* This has been an excellent course.
* Thank you so much!
* Thanks! There was a very collegial atmosphere throughout the 3 days with lots of sharing of experience and ideas.
* I had a fantastic time!
* Thank you!
* Thank you very much.
* Great job and thanks!
* Very good (most helpful workshop I’ve ever taken)
* Thanks I’ll be back in spring!
* Thank you for your dedication to developing good teachers.



