



EBL supporting student dialogue and collaboration across faiths, genders, sexual orientations and other diversities in Religions & Theology

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Benda, R., Snape, A., Stuerzenhofecker, K., Goldring, L., & Powell, N. (2010). *EBL supporting student dialogue and collaboration across faiths, genders, sexual orientations and other diversities in Religions & Theology*. (Small Projects 2008-10). Centre for Excellence in Enquiry-Based Learning.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



EBL Supporting Student Dialogue and Collaboration across Faiths, Genders, Sexual Orientations and Other Diversities in Religions & Theology

Richard Benda, Anna Snape and Katja Stuerzenhofecker, School of Arts, Histories and Cultures; Louise Goldring and Norman Powell, CEEBL

Abstract

This case-study describes the continued evaluation and development of a level-two module, Religion, Culture and Gender. The main aim of this project was to support students' experiential learning of issues and challenges in inter-faith dialogue and other inter-dialogues. The emancipatory theories of feminism that underlie the module are reflected in the pedagogical approach of EBL, which emphasises the active role of the learner in knowledge construction and the link between theory and experience. These are further reflected in the participatory approach taken in the evaluation.

Among the lessons drawn out through this process are:

- the invaluable contribution of a student as a member of the evaluation team;
- the invaluable contribution of CEEBL staff and the continuity of their involvement over a number of development cycles;
- the successes that the continued reflection of the module team and refinement of the module have brought to the student learning experience; and
- the importance of structuring and integrating the elements of the module, be they the skills workshops or the topics of discussions and individual assessment.

Background

Religion, Culture and Gender is an optional level-two module (20 credits) available to students on Theology, Religious Studies and Combined Studies degree programmes. It usually attracts about 35 students from a range of academic and personal backgrounds in terms of their age, gender (although the majority are female), religion, sexuality and attitude towards gender issues. The module aims to evaluate a century of changing attitudes towards the nature of gender identity, roles and relationships in Western societies and religious traditions. The learning and teaching approach is based on feminist pedagogy and employs appropriate methods that emphasise the active role of the learner in knowledge construction and the link between theory and real life situations and experiences.

In this module, students are not only expected to contribute to discussions on contentious societal issues, such as the treatment of young Irish girls by the Catholic Church in the *Magdalene Laundries* and its media depiction (Mullen 2003), but in the Student-led Discussions. Small teams are expected to preface a debate with a presentation, based on their research of two key readings. They must then trigger the debate with appropriate questions and facilitate that debate, while scribing key points for other students to use in their reflections upon that debate. This process aligns with the radical, emancipatory theories of feminism that underlie the module, where the implicit power relations of the classroom and deference to authoritative sources are critiqued (Stuerzenhofecker 2007; Stuerzenhofecker 2008). Through the process, the voices, experiences and intellectual contributions of the students should be heard as part of the debate and should be validated as sources of knowledge by the other students.

Rationale

The controversial nature of Religion, Culture & Gender and the diversity of students enrolled on the module often lead to destructive classroom interactions if not mitigated. CEEBL-supported action research in 2007-08 tested several mechanisms for harnessing diversity for induction and knowledge creation (Hutchings 2007), and for developing emotional competency (Newbern and Dansereau, 2001).

Continuous evaluation of the module showed that EBL tasks (introduced in 2005-06, developed with TQEF 2006-07, and CEEBL 2007-08) were not fully developed and not effectively aligned with each other. However, EBL provides teaching and learning methods that are consistent with the feminist pedagogy that underlies the module. The content and quality of students'

coursework have also confirmed over the years that EBL allows students to engage competently with the open-ended and complex character of the issues and debates that are studied.

The EBL tasks in 2007-08 comprised of Student-led Discussions (SLDs) and the composition of an individual Guide. Evaluation of these tasks found the following:

- The Student-led Discussions (SLDs), which were facilitated by groups of two, were only formatively assessed and not directly linked to the Guide, with a detrimental effect on student motivation (Boud *et al.*, 1999). The small group size caused some dysfunctional groups and had minimal constructive diversity. The discussions led to ineffective validation of peer learning outcomes.
- The Guide (40% of final mark) was written on a contemporary public issue, of individual student choice, around religion, culture and gender providing various positions, theories, policies and anecdotal evidence. This was individual work with no opportunity for dialogue and collaboration.

Approach

The module has been going through a continuous cycle of development and evaluation since 2006-07. In 2007-08, an appreciative and participatory evaluation process was designed by Norman Powell and Katja Stuerzenhofecker (Powell *et al.* 2009) and carried out, together with Anna Snape (a former student), in order to identify factors contributing to a positive student experience of classroom discussions (Stuerzenhofecker 2008). The aim was to find better ways of replicating Anna's positive experience by means of appropriate facilitation skills training and diversity awareness-raising. A key insight that was gained at this stage was that peer-learning was not generally recognised by students as having the same value and authority as tutor input and set readings for knowledge construction.

Two main changes to the SLD framework were decided upon by Anna and Katja through their consultation and development work. First, both Anna and Katja felt that having two people per SLD group was an insufficient number to facilitate a class discussion. Therefore, the SLD groups were enlarged to groups of four or five. The aim of this change was to enable students to practise facilitation techniques within their own small group discussions before moving on to whole-class facilitation. Second, it was decided that the two key readings assigned for the student's SLD group should be linked to their individual guides. We hoped that by placing

these readings in dual assessments, it would encourage the students to engage with the SLD topic and the material in greater depth.

There was also consultation and development work by Louise, Anna and Katja in order to redesign the group work skills workshops so that they specifically addressed facilitation skills. Two important changes were made: First, an evaluation of the previous cohort's SLDs suggested that the students had not grasped a proper understanding of what skills were required for facilitating a SLD. The workshops were, therefore, altered so that they addressed what makes good facilitation techniques, and they incorporated activities such as 'harnessing the negative', where negative preconceptions of facilitation were turned into positive ones. Second, because the module covers controversial topics, the workshops addressed how to facilitate a class discussion on a topic with emotive content; an issue which we believe the previous year had felt difficult to deal with. It was decided that this workshop activity should involve emotive content material that was not directly related to the module in order to prevent any judgemental or stereotypical attitudes forming amongst the students in the first week of the module. We, therefore, devised a workshop where the students had to facilitate a group discussion on hedgehog culling. It was noted after the workshops had been delivered that there was still little information given to students on how to formulate good questions. To remedy this situation, Bloom's Taxonomy of Thinking Skills was added to the SLD guidance (Appendix 1) but minimal direction was provided as to its use.

The transition from WebCT to Blackboard, at the beginning of 2008-09, with the institutional minimum requirements for online presence, was a natural point for reviewing the structure and content of the virtual learning environment (VLE) of the module. Overall, the aim was to improve the VLE in order to make it as user-friendly as possible and to reduce student anxieties. Furthermore, the increased size of student groups preparing their SLDs together suggested a bigger role for the VLE's discussion and blogging functionality. It was noted during the review that Blackboard is not well suited to some of the teaching, learning and assessment requirements and practices in Humanities subjects. For example, online quizzes and self-assessments work better for multiple choice and 'true or false' tests, rather than open, narrative assignments, which are common in the Humanities. Hence, the use of Blackboard to support the assessment strategy of this module is limited.

The delivery of the module followed this pattern: a) introductory lectures by Katja to run through the syllabus and introduce the students to the requirements of the portfolio; b) group work and facilitation skills workshops by Louise with the support of CEEBL Student Interns; and c) a combination of lectures (2 hours/week) and seminars (1 hour/week). In the time between the CEEBL workshops and reading week/half term, the seminars were devoted to the

preparation of SLDs by means of researching two key texts. After reading week, students delivered their SLDs.

A significant factor regarding the delivery of the module and the sustainability of the delivery of EBL was the addition to the teaching team of a Graduate Teaching Assistant, Richard Benda. The recruitment led to some significant changes in the delivery of the module. Katja continued to deliver the weekly lectures but her involvement with seminars was significantly reduced as Richard took charge of half the groups with the aim of emphasizing the seminars as student spaces. Richard's position as an observer of both lectures and seminars also led to our recognition that lectures should explicitly model the facilitation techniques offered in the workshops.

Assessment

The SLDs were linked to several summatively-assessed tasks in the form of dialogical written feedback and reflective writing. Although it was discussed that the introduction of peer assessment and a higher percentage of the portfolio mark would be beneficial for student motivation and achievement, lack of time meant that this was not implemented in 2008-09 (see under *Evaluation* below).

Students were given a self-assessment form (Appendix 2) to be completed individually after their SLD and to be submitted to the lecturers for feedback. Successful submission of the completed form was rewarded with 2.5% of the overall portfolio mark. Students were asked to assess the group work process, the formal elements of the SLD (structure, delivery and visual aids) and the discussion process and its outcomes.

The Guide (40% of the overall portfolio mark) was assessed summatively against Religions & Theology's standard criteria for written coursework. It is worth highlighting that the format of the Guide differs from the standard essay in that it does not allow students to put forward their preferred interpretation of a self-elected topic like 'Christian marriage vows and domestic violence'. On the contrary, the task demands their detachment in order to present a range of practices and their justifications as neutrally as possible. This ties in with the SLDs' aim of developing students' empathy with attitudes and practices remote from their own.

One of the main reflective assessment tasks was a Learning Journal (25% of the overall portfolio mark), which students completed after each meeting. The guidance emphasised the importance of peer-learning from SLDs and classroom discussions during lectures as a source of

knowledge, and therefore as a resource for reflection in the Learning Journal. Additional 'Before' and 'After' logs included questions concerning the SLDs, active participation and the contribution of peer-learning activities to students' progress.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the project activities drew from a variety of rich qualitative sources, including the detailed reflective journals of the students and the observations of the teaching staff. While Richard Benda gave written feedback, he also identified potential qualitative sources from students' self-assessment of their SLDs and later collated the excerpts. It is worth highlighting two things here. First, having Richard as a GTA provided the team with the time required to evaluate the large number of sources. Second, although the module's use of reflection for assessment might seem exaggerated to some, its short-term and long-term value for student learning, as well as course development, has proven its worth time and again.

An important additional resource was the contribution by Anna Snape, who, through attending a focus group in 2007-08, became an insightful and valuable contributor to the evaluation process, representing and providing insight into the views of her peers, as well as her own. Her contribution in this way emphasises the participatory approach (Burke 1998; Cousins and Whitmore 1998) that was adopted, aligning the evaluation with the emancipatory principles of both the subject matter and the pedagogy employed. Anna's role as a partner in the evaluation and co-producer of knowledge is recognised in part by her role in disseminating that knowledge (*e.g.*, Snape and Stuerzenhofecker 2009). The evaluation also took an appreciative aspect (Cooperrider 2001) in exploring Anna's positive experiences to understand how this experience can be extended to the rest of the cohort. Through this enquiry, the concept of academic assertiveness (Moon 2009) was adopted to frame the skills and competences that students need to develop.

Unfortunately, we were unable to recruit participants to two student focus groups in 2008-09. Hence, the evaluation process has been conducted only by the authors of this report without the input from students of the current cohort. We recognize that this is a weakness based on our experience of Anna's invaluable input in the previous cycle and her ongoing involvement in the development of the module. For 2009-10, the decision has been taken to move the focus group closer to the students by scheduling it at the end of teaching, in continuity with the lecture time and place. This has the disadvantage that the assessment cycle will not have been completed at that point, and therefore it requires assurance to students that focus group data will not be made available to markers until after results have been published. However, it is

hoped that the focus group will be seen as part of the module, albeit voluntary, and therefore recruitment will be more satisfactory.

The evaluation focused on the following questions:

- How has EBL helped students to harness diversity and develop emotional competency?
- How can the resources and the EBL design be refined?
- What is the most effective support model for group work facilitation?

The evaluation process focussed initially on the question of effective support for group work facilitation. This was prompted by our perception of significant student resistance to the facilitation skills training at the start of the module. We found this experience very disheartening when we thought we had made crucial improvements. This perception of student resistance effectively overshadowed our appreciation for the main focus of the project, namely the quality and character of the knowledge construction in peer-learning activities and individual reflection.

It was only when we analysed student reflection on the quality of the SLDs that we realised that, unlike ourselves, students had moved on from their negative experience of the facilitation skills workshops and embraced the SLDs with much enthusiasm.

Of the two changes made to the group work facilitation skills workshop, all but one proved successful. The improved level of facilitation skills was particularly apparent in the first group's SLD on popular culture, which set the other students a good example. There was also a large improvement in the quality of the students' Guides. This demonstrated that through facilitating a class discussion on two key texts, the students were analysing and evaluating the texts with a greater depth of understanding, not only in their SLDs but in their Guides as well.

Introducing a specific workshop on facilitation skills proved successful because it taught students about the specific requirements of facilitation. Again, the SLD on popular culture demonstrated that the skills taught in the workshops had been absorbed. However, the decision to use material that was not related to the module to practise group facilitation about a controversial and emotive topic did not prove too successful. Students suggested that the activity on the hedgehog culling came across as irrelevant and, in some cases, pointless. It is clear, therefore, that the workshop activities in future years should relate directly to the course material so it will seem more relevant.

Regarding the refinement of resources and EBL design, the main changes prompted by the previous development cycle affected the SLDs and the Guide. In making the SLD groups larger, the students were able to practise their facilitation skills within their own group before applying them to the SLD. They also had more time to practise these skills because the SLDs did not take place until after reading week. The introduction of tightly structured worksheets (Appendix 1) for the initial preparation of the SLD case studies allowed students to experience the core elements of textual research with an emphasis on the openness of academic debate. It became apparent that students were unable to address questions around authors' methods and methodologies because of a lack of understanding of these terms. An additional session was designed to provide the required grounding. Subsequent treatment of these questions proved to be satisfactory in most cases.

The emphasis on the importance of scribing in SLDs and the required skills seems to have had the intended effect on the validation of peer learning. This can be measured indirectly through students' perception of the level of insight gained in the SLDs. Students recorded in their 'After the Course' logs that of the four SLDs that were held, 74% regarded them as allowing them to gain either very deep or deep insight (19% good insight, 7% some insight). There was little evidence to suggest that there was an attempt to exaggerate the quality of the student work within the logs that students used to rate the SLDs.

The new thematic structure of the SLDs allowed the introduction of a link between SLDs and the Guides, so that students were explicitly encouraged to write their Guide in the same thematic area as their SLD. The aim was to allow peer discussions to inform the Guides, if not directly, then at least by instilling an open attitude towards a wide range of opinions on the chosen topic. The Guides were supposed to offer the same balanced exploration that was expected of the SLDs. Although the Guide was still prepared individually to allow for students' specialised interests, its use was extended to include small group work and the SLDs. Several students working within the same thematic area took the initiative to form learning communities outside the classroom to consult each other on their Guides. This is a clear indication that the new format has brought us closer to achieving our aims of harnessing student diversity for knowledge construction.

The third evaluation question was to what extent EBL has helped the students to harness diversity and develop emotional competency. Success towards achieving this goal has been modest and limited, but promising. At the limitation end of the spectrum lies the attitude of cautious compromise that still characterises group work and debates (the more there is to offend the less there is to say). The promising aspect was the impact that the preparation and presentation of SLDs had on some groups and individual students. For instance, the group that dealt with Religion, Gender and Popular Culture produced a successful SLD because they

rigorously applied the facilitation techniques learnt, courtesy of the CEEBL workshops, as evidenced in their Learning Journals and SLD self-assessment forms. An efficient application of these EBL-based skills required from the members of this group a positive utilisation of their diverse backgrounds and the creation of a dynamic that allowed disciplined and productive work. However, the most promising fact is probably the way in which other groups appreciated this achievement and rated it as setting the standards for group performance.

The positive effects of collaborative student and staff evaluation have since been incorporated into a presentation by Anna Snape given at the *Active Engagement in Learning Communities* conference held at CEEBL on 12th-13th November 2009. Anna explained how the benefits of collaborative evaluation and development were twofold: the lecturer was able to gain an insight into how she could improve the module for future years; and the student had the satisfaction of knowing not only that her voice had been heard, but that she had helped make positive changes for the next cohort.

Further Development

The next stage of development, which is a seamless continuation of the evaluation of the current project, will focus on the further adaption of the skills workshops and the introduction of peer assessment of the SLDs.

The outcome of our reflection on the delivery model of the workshops is that the teaching team should take on more ownership of the 'skills' workshops in order to:

- Integrate it better with the module, timing the delivery with the need for that element of the skill base. It seems to be important for student buy-in to make it clearer how, when and why the skills are important to their achievement of the module outcomes (and hence their grade).
- Adding validity to the activities, with the teaching team endorsing them through their delivery, so they are seen as an integral part of the module, not a bolt-on from an external unit (as students seemed to perceive).
- Ensure sustainability of the delivery of these activities post-CEEBL.

We have found that 'skills' is a narrowing term for what is required from the students. Emotional intelligence and academic assertiveness (Moon 2009) seem to be more appropriate concepts. However, the current conception of academic competence focuses on the practicalities of team working, which does not address emotional and interpersonal challenges faced in SLDs. There seems to be a need to develop these ideas to include academic research, analysis, presentation and debate.

To this end, funding has already been secured from the Higher Education Academy Subject Centre for Philosophy and Religious Studies for a continuation project entitled 'Supporting Student-led Academic Debate across Diversities in Theology and Religious Studies' led by Richard Benda and Katja Stuerzenhofecker, and employing Anna Snape and students from the 2009-10 cohort. The project will investigate how to move from student-led open discussions with weak knowledge construction to more outcome-focused, higher quality debates. This will be achieved by developing students' ability and willingness to provide effective facilitation of debates, to make propositions and to challenge peers and be challenged by them. Possible models of debating to be examined are already found in Philosophy, as well as in debating competitions and forensics.

A final comment concerns students' motivations for taking facilitation skills development seriously. It has been noticeable that these learning opportunities have been most welcomed by those students who have an active interest in teaching for future employment or who practise facilitation skills in the setting of voluntary groups. As these interests have only come to the attention of the teaching team late in the semester, there was no opportunity to capitalise on them. There is much room for future development here, as it brings EBL together with employability and knowledge transfer.

References

Boud, D., Cohen, R., and Sampson, J., 1999. Peer Learning and Assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24 (4), 413- 426.

Burke, B., 1998. Evaluating for a Change: Reflections on Participatory Methodology. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 80, 43-56.

Cooperrider, D. L., 2001. Appreciative Inquiry: Releasing the Power of the Positive Question. *Working Paper*. Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA.
http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/uploads/working_paper_AI_and_power_positive_question.pdf [Accessed on 12 February 2010]

Cousins, J.B., Whitmore, E., 1998. Framing Participatory Evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 80, 5-23.

Hutchings, William (2007) 'The philosophical bases of Enquiry-Based Learning', University of Manchester, <http://www.campus.manchester.ac.uk/ceeb/resources/papers/> [Accessed on 12 February 2010]

Moon, J., 2009. *Making groups work: Improving group work through the principles of academic assertiveness in higher education and professional development*. Bristol: ESCalate.

Mullen, P., 2002. *The Magdalene Sisters*. [DVD] UK: Magna Pacific.

Newbern, D., and Dansereau, D. F., 2001. Evolutions in scripted cooperative learning: Emotional competence . In N. Falchikov, ed., *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. London: Routledge, 257-261.

Powell, N. J., Lander, K., Stuerzenhofecker, K. and Snape, A., 2009. Using an Evaluation Framework to Build Capacity in Pedagogical Research and Evaluation. *Proceedings of the 4th International iPED Conference: 'Researching Beyond Boundaries, Academic Communities without Borders*. Coventry University, iPED Research Network. Available from <https://curve.coventry.ac.uk/cu/items/e57a903c-06c3-494b-bf8e-c79b28d75c97/1/iPED%202009%20Proceedings.pdf>.

Snape, A. and Stuerzenhofecker, K., 2009. Students facilitating and validating peer-learning. *Finding your own Way: Inquiry-Based Learning in Theology, Religious Studies and Biblical Studies*. University of Sheffield, Centre for Inquiry-Based Learning in Arts and Social Sciences (CILASS). Available from http://prs.heacademy.ac.uk/projects/inquiry_based_learning/katja_stuerzenhofecker.ppt [Accessed on 12 February 2010].

Stuerzenhofecker, K., 2007. Pedagogy for Sustainable Development: A Feminist Approach. *Graduates as Global Citizens, 2nd International Conference*. Bournemouth University. Available from http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/about/the_global_dimension/centre_for_global_perspectives/ppt/katja%20Stuerzenhofecker.ppt [Accessed on 12 February 2010].

Stuerzenhofecker, K., 2008. Students facilitating and validating peer-learning. *Case-Studies: CEEBL-Supported Projects, 2007-08*. Manchester: Centre for Excellence in Enquiry-Based Learning. Available from <http://www.campus.manchester.ac.uk/ceeb/projects/casestudies/59.pdf> [Accessed on 12 February 2010].

Appendix 1

Student-led discussions guidance

Structure

The Student-led Discussions (total 45 minutes) are broken down into three elements:

1. Your group prepares a short, critical presentation of your topic based on the two readings as case studies (10-15 minutes).
2. Your group formulates and presents to the class three sets of questions that you have developed in response to the readings.
3. Your group facilitates the discussion of these three sets of questions and scribes/captures discussion contributions on the board or PowerPoint (30-35 minutes).

The presentation

Your presentation should use your readings as two case studies in order to:

- Highlight general trends and underlying issues that are relevant to your group's broad topic;
- Analyse methodological issues which arise when studying your group's broad topic;
- Present scholarly debates and unresolved problems in the study of your group's broad topic;

Your presentation and questions should not assume that your audience has prior knowledge of the readings. Your audience should be able to understand your presentation and answer your questions without prior knowledge.

The three sets of questions

Your three sets of questions should relate to the three aspects of your presentation listed above. They should help you and your audience to get to a deeper understanding. They should, therefore, be challenging to further understanding but appropriate to your audience. Use the audience to get answers to your own questions and to find alternative perspectives. Use your questions to help the audience think things through.

Bloom's taxonomy of thinking skills below can help you to develop an effective questioning strategy. This list is hierarchical in that the progression from knowledge recall to evaluation

requires increasingly more complex thinking skills. You could mix and match, e.g. start with an application question to get the discussion going at intermediate level, but if you don't get any responses maybe you need to go back to knowledge and/or comprehension before returning to application. Your sets of questions should be varied and flexible enough for you to be able to respond to the unexpected on the day.

Questioning strategy	Example
Knowledge: Students are required to recall the information learned and repeat it to the teacher.	<i>What is the difference between 'sex' and 'gender'?</i>
Comprehension: Students must explain topics, review items, and discuss issues; this includes translation, interpretation, extrapolation, and focuses on the meaning and intent of the material.	<i>Explain Freud's model of psychosexual development.</i>
Application: Students must use an abstraction (principle, theory, etc.) brought from other experiences. It requires that students apply previously learned knowledge and skills to new situations and necessitates the use of abstractions in specific situations.	<i>How could you use Bem's 'Three Lenses of Gender' to criticise this model?</i>
Analysis: Students must break down material into its component parts and then use a systematic process to reach a logical conclusion.	<i>What are the different factors and actors that affect the development of an individual's gender identity?</i>
Synthesis: Students must hypothesize, predict, and use the available information to arrive at a generalization---putting together elements or parts from many sources to constitute a new pattern or structure.	<i>Which powers are useful to bring about social change?</i>
Evaluation: Students must use specific criteria to assess situations or to justify previous responses.	<i>Can the exclusion of Christian women from the priesthood be justified on the basis of the Bible?</i>

Table 1. Bloom's Taxonomy of Thinking Skills.

Emerging questions

As part of your facilitation, you will also have to use ad hoc questions that advance the discussion. These are questions that help to:

- Clarify and extend: 'Could you say more about this? Could you give an example?'
- Focus: 'How does this relate to the question/topic? How is this different/the same as...?'
- Redirect: 'Is there another way of looking at this?'
- Justify: 'What is the rationale behind your statement?'
- Encourage: 'This is a very useful point. Do you think that...?'
- Move forward: 'Are we ready to move on to the next point?'

Preparation

Things you need to clarify in advance:

- How can we work together effectively, keep in touch and/or meet up?
- How can we formulate 'good' questions that stimulate discussion?
- How can we organise our roles as effective presenters?
- How can we organise our roles as effective facilitators?
- How can we organise our roles as effective scribes?
- How can we design effective PowerPoint slides?
 - They should introduce our topic and group members' names.
 - They should only contain the main points of our presentation.
 - They should contain our three questions for discussion.
 - They should be legible and accessible to all.
 - They should be available on the day in several formats (*e.g.* memory stick and on Blackboard) to avoid technical problems.
- How can we design an effective handout?
 - It should contain the main points of our presentation.
 - It should contain our three questions for discussion.
 - It should be posted on your discussion group by the Wednesday prior to your SLD so that your lecturer can print it for you. Otherwise, you have to pay for 33 copies yourself.

Assessment: 2.5% of your overall portfolio mark

You will self-assess how the Student-led Discussion went by filling in the 'SLD feedback' form, which can be downloaded from Blackboard. You should then submit the form **as soon as possible** via Blackboard to your lecturer who will return it with written feedback for further self-assessment. The completed form should be submitted via Blackboard as part of your portfolio by **23 January 2009**.

Appendix 2

Student-led discussions: self-assessment and tutor feedback

Student name:

Group:

1. How did we work together as a group? What went well and what was difficult?
2. How could the group work process be improved?
3. How well do I understand the two texts? Did I encounter any specific difficulties?
4. How well did I/we communicate my/our understanding of the two texts in the presentation part? What went particularly well? What was difficult?
5. How well did I/we deliver the presentation part? (audible, engaging, eye contact etc.)
6. How well did I/we structure the presentation part? (Think about the given framework, timing and focus on key points.)
7. How well did I/we design the PowerPoint slides? Did the audience find them easy to read? Did they spend a long time copying information?
8. How appropriate were our chosen questions to the texts? Did they help to explore key issues? Did they stimulate discussion?
9. How did I/we facilitate the discussion? How did we get the audience started? How did we keep the discussion going? How did we respond to unexpected discussion contributions? What went particularly well? What was difficult?
10. How well did I/we capture discussion contributions (on the board or PowerPoint)? Did the scribing and facilitation support each other in order to get more out of the discussion?
11. Did the Student-led Discussion as a whole (presentation & discussion) go as expected? Did I encounter any encouraging and/or challenging surprises?
12. How would I improve the Student-led Discussion?
13. Any other comments?

Appendix 3

Student-led Discussions

Outcome

Today's Student-led Discussion allows you:

- To practice some of the facilitation roles;
- To get to know the other students in your group;
- To exchange ideas about possible Guide topics;
- To analyse and discuss today's reading;
- To prepare the first part of your group presentation.

Choosing a facilitator and a scribe; clarifying roles (max. 5 mins)

The facilitator makes sure that:

- The guidance is being followed;
- All group members have the opportunity to speak.

Decide as a group whether this role should rotate.

The scribe makes sure that:

- The minutes form is filled in correctly and completely;
- Group members review the contents of the minutes form at the end of the seminar and make additions or corrections, if required.

Decide as a group whether this role should rotate. Decide as a group who will type the minutes form up after the seminar (electronic copy of the minutes form in the Blackboard Seminars section) and post it on your group's Blackboard Discussion Group as soon as possible.

All group members make sure that:

- They contribute and don't distract themselves and others (no texting, no off-topic conversation etc.);

- Contributions are respectful; if not, raise it as an issue in the group;
- Activities are kept within the time limits;
- The scribe is able to take the required information down (slow down, check that they've got a comment on paper before moving on etc.).

Getting to know each other (*total 10 minutes*)

- Talk to one other person; you will later introduce this person to the rest of your group (*2 minutes*):
 - Exchange names and Study Programmes (*e.g. R&T*);
 - Exchange your interests in the topic of this group and possible ideas for the Guide.
- Come back to the group. Go around the table and introduce your partner to the rest of the group. (*max. 1 minute each*)

Analysis of the Reading (*total 25 minutes*)

- What is the issue described in the source? (*max. 5 minutes*)
- What is the central argument put forward by the author? (*max. 5 minutes*)
- What methodological issues does the source raise? (*max. 5 minutes*)
- Any critique & counter-arguments you can think of. Also any questions you have. (*max. 5 minutes*)
- Does this source highlight any general trends and underlying issues that are relevant to your group's broad topic? (*max. 5 minutes*)

Checking the minutes form (*5 minutes*)

Go through the minutes form to check for any omissions, late additions or errors. Pass the minutes form to the person who agreed to type it up and post it on your group's Blackboard Discussion Group as soon as possible. You will be using this form again on 30 Oct when you start to prepare your group presentations.

Appendices References

Effective Questioning. <http://www.uab.edu/uasomume/cdm/questioning.htm>

Levels and Types of Questions, <http://www.cte.uiuc.edu/Did/docs/QUESTION/quest1.htm>

Stella Cottrell, 2001. *Teaching study skills and supporting learning*. Palgrave Macmillan.