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USING THE “PUBLISHING HOOK” FOR SoTL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Presented by 2010-2011 IPFW SoTL Work Group Members:

Zubovic, Yvonne, zubovic@ipfw.edu, Department of Mathematical Sciences, SoTL Fellow, CASTL committee member, and consultant on faculty SoTL projects, FACET liaison.

Bendele, Michael, bendele@ipfw.edu, Department of Psychology, specializing in research methods, co-facilitator of SoTL Reading Circle, advisory board member for CELT, CASTL committee member, CASTL paper co-author.

Goodson, Ludwika “Ludy,” goodsonl@ipfw.edu, Instructional Consultant and Designer at CELT, 2008 UCEA South award-winning team member for “Program of Excellence” in faculty development, CASTL committee member, CASTL paper co-author.

Batagiannis, Stella, batagias@ipfw.edu, College of Education and Public Policy, co-editor of college’s Center for Excellence journal: scholarlypartnershipsedu, Mid-Western Educational Research Association editorial board member, advisory board member for the center, AERA-SIG secretary/treasurer, FACET member.

Rathbun, Gail, rathbun@ipfw.edu, Director of CELT, Chair of CASTL committee, CASTL paper co-author, advisor to faculty SoTL projects, international teacher training experiences.

NOTES: Names are listed in sequence of presentation and do not suggest any greater or lesser contribution to workshop development. “CASTL paper” designates “The Difference CASTL has Made: Building on a Solid Foundation,” Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal (July 2010); “FACET” designates Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching. We acknowledge manuscript samples and inspiration from Gregg W. Wentzell, Ph.D., Managing Editor, Journal on Excellence in College Teaching from a workshop “Making it Count: Prospective SoTL Publications,” Lilly Conference Workshop, Traverse City, Michigan, September 2010.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 Welcome, Introductions, and Objectives (Yvonne Zubovic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Scholarly Articles &amp; Scholarly Teaching (Michael Bendele)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 Scholarly Teaching Stages (Ludy Goodson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 Manuscript Review Activity (Stella Batagiannis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 SoTL Project Reflections (Gail Rathbun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 “Publishing” and “Wrap Up” (Yvonne Zubovic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#1001 SoTL Manuscript Review Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript Title:</th>
<th>Evidence Use in Group Quiz Discussions: How do Students Support Preferred Choices?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Date of Review:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. For this manuscript, circle, check, “x,” or highlight the rating that best describes your assessment for standards 1-9 listed below. If another standard also is important for this manuscript, add it in item 10.

- **Unacceptable**—manuscript does not meet this standard
- **Acceptable**—manuscript meets this standard
- **Excellent**—manuscript exceeds minimum expectations for this standard
- **NA**—this standard does not apply to this manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Importance of the problem</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Clarity of purpose/goals related to problem</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Relevance &amp; comprehensiveness of literature reviewed</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Implications for particular learning/teaching concepts</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Research design and systematic observations</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Relevance of evidence/data</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Appropriateness and clarity of evidence/data analysis</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Appropriateness of conclusions and implications</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Writing and presentation of evidence/data</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Other (specify):</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Recommendation:

- ____ **Publish** (with copy editing only to prepare for publication)
- ____ **Publish** (after minor revisions as indicated below or in separate attachment)
- ____ **Reconsider** (after major revisions as indicated below or in separate attachment)
- ____ **Reject** (but encourage revision as indicated below or in separate attachment)
- ____ **Reject** (do not encourage revision—manuscript should not be considered for publication)

C. What suggestions do you have for any criterion that you rated below “acceptable?” (Please write on back if needed.)
Group-centered learning (often referred to as cooperative or collaborative learning) is an instructional method in which students work together in groups to discuss information, solve problems, search for solutions, or develop a product (Cohen, 1994). Despite the extensive literature documenting the benefits of group-centered learning, little research has focused on the processes that occur in learning group discussions. This study examines the argumentative process in learning groups who are completing group quizzes.

In structured academic controversy, students engage in formal procedures that include presentation of positions, advocacy, refutation rebuttal, and final consensus. Wittrock (1978) suggested that students who engage in elaborations or cognitive restructuring of material under study are better able to remember the material. Argument may be particularly central in group quiz situations, in which students take a quiz individually, hand that quiz into the instructor, and then take the quiz again in a group. During the group quiz, members are allowed to discuss each question until they reach a collective decision about the correct answer. Scores from both sets of quizzes typically count toward the student’s grade in the course. Past research on group quizzes consistently demonstrates that group quiz scores are higher than the average individual quiz score, and often are higher than the best individual quiz score. Yet we know nothing about what happens in the group quiz discussion, nor what contributes to improved scores. In this study, we examine the types of argumentative evidence that students present in group quiz discussions to shed some light on this “black box.”

Undergraduate students (junior and seniors) enrolled in a communication course were randomly assigned to learning groups. During the final 40 minutes of each of fourteen class periods, students completed first an individual and then a group quiz. Each group moved to a separate room equipped with videotape equipment to complete the group version. All group discussions were videotaped. After a coding scheme was developed, videotapes of group discussion quizzes (extraneous to this investigation) were viewed multiple times (by the first and second authors) to get a general sense of the types and forms of argumentative interaction in these discussions. Raters were trained and cross-calibrated using extraneous videotapes to achieve high (>85%) inter-rater reliability before they coded study tapes.

Hypotheses based upon learning theory and group argument predicted that groups would perform better than individuals on quiz scores, evidence use would be common when groups disagreed, and that higher achieving groups and individuals would use greater amounts of argumentative evidence. Data from learning group discussions were coded and analyzed to test the hypotheses. Results indicate that: (1) group quiz scores were significantly higher than the average individual quiz scores and groups (in approximately 70% of cases) scored as well as, or higher, than the best individual group member, (2) members of disagreement-based groups used significantly more evidence in their discussions than did members of agreement-based groups, (3) high achievement students used significantly more evidence statements than low achievement students in resolving disagreement, although this finding did not hold for high achievement groups.

This study suggests that in order to maximize the potential of group centered learning, teachers should teach students why and how to use evidence I group discussions. Such an instructional endeavor has the potential for long-term consequences for our students, our workplaces, and our civic society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Manuscript sample used with permission from Gregg Wentzell, Managing Editor, Journal on Excellence in College Teaching.
**Manuscript Title:** The Learning-Centered Classroom: A Model for 21st Century Teacher Preparation

**Reviewer:**

A. For this manuscript, circle, check, “x,” or highlight the rating that best describes your assessment for standards 1-9 listed below. If another standard also is important for this manuscript, add it in item 10.

- **Unacceptable**—manuscript does not meet this standard
- **Acceptable**—manuscript meets this standard
- **Excellent**—manuscript exceeds minimum expectations for this standard
- **NA**—this standard does not apply to this manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Description</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Importance of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Clarity of purpose/goals related to problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Relevance &amp; comprehensiveness of literature reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Implications for particular learning/teaching concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Research design and systematic observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Relevance of evidence/data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Appropriateness and clarity of evidence/data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Appropriateness of conclusions and implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Writing and presentation of evidence/data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Recommendation:**

- ___ **Publish** (with copy editing only to prepare for publication)
- ___ **Publish** (after minor revisions as indicated below or in separate attachment)
- ___ **Reconsider** (after major revisions as indicated below or in separate attachment)
- ___ **Reject** (but encourage revision as indicated below or in separate attachment)
- ___ **Reject** (do not encourage revision—manuscript should not be considered for publication)

C. What suggestions do you have for any criterion that you rated below “acceptable?” (Please write on back if needed.)

#2002 The Learning-Centered Classroom: A Model for 21st Century Teacher Preparation
This article presents learner-centered classrooms as a model for teaching in the twenty-first century. The information provided is based on a graduate course for students entering the teaching profession. The study looks at the effect of integrating learning centered techniques and the impact these have on fostering effective, student-centered instruction.

Over the years, I have made a pedagogical shift away from lecture based instruction. Restructuring my active practice to adhere to the dimensions of teaching and learning (author, 1987), I worked to foster student learning that is both dynamic and interactive. I structure each class session with a focus on student engagement. Through my own use of learner-centered approaches in my courses, I have observed my own students transferring these pedagogical principles to their own approaches in the teaching realm.

Evaluating the success of student centered learning has been one of my major goals. As such, I have attempted to integrate authentic assessment processes such as portfolios, peer review opportunities, and self-assessment into each of my courses. These opportunities for self-evaluation support students in articulating specific learning objectives and criteria for assessing their own growth over time. In addition, this approach to student learning has allowed me to reflect critically on the quality of my instruction as it is linked to students own learning experiences.

In an effort to understand the extent to which graduate students entering the teaching profession had integrated learner-centered principles into their own teaching practices, I asked a random sample of students from two of my courses to respond to a self-reflection questionnaire. Nine students, representing a range of experience from novice to experienced teachers, volunteered to participate. One major finding from students self reports was that they perceived that they had improved ability to establish a positive culture for learning and social interaction. Additionally, students reported a sense of increased effectiveness in designing coursework and assessment techniques that corresponded more directly with the individual learning needs of students in their classroom. Student teachers also reported that as a result of increasing their pedagogical knowledge in a specific subject area, they were better able to transmit their learning into more engaging, student-centered lessons.

It appears that learner-centered approaches to teaching introduce student-teachers to the value of collaborative practice. Moving away from traditional models of teaching that often took shape in isolation, the literature on both teacher education and workplace performance points towards the usefulness of classroom settings that are more interactive and engaged. Instructional techniques in teacher preparation courses should model the learner-centered methods that we hope those teachers will employ.

I conclude that learner-centered instruction within the higher education community promotes the development of higher levels of communication, reflection and cognition among students. Furthermore, my experiences confirm the potential of the learner-centered classroom to promote collegiality and leadership within the university setting. In closing, my findings suggest that the learner-centered classroom is a useful model for re-envisioning higher education in the twenty-first century.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Manuscript sample used with permission from Gregg Wentzell, Managing Editor, Journal on Excellence in College Teaching.

USING THE “PUBLISHING HOOK” FOR SOTL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT:

Scholarly Teaching Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify Big Questions in Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Teaching Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose &amp; Use Learning Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Systematic Observation &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain Peer Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Using the “Publishing Hook” for SoTL Project Development:**
**Resources, Journals, and Conferences**
Resources

Getting SoTL articles published:
[The URL is http://www.sotl.ilstu.edu/resLinks/sotlMats/getPub.shtml.]

Center for Teaching, Vanderbilt SoTL:
[The URL is http://ctf.vanderbilt.edu/teaching-guides/reflecting/sotl/.]

Journals

Academic Exchange Quarterly: [The URL is http://www.rapidintellect.com/AEQweb/.]

Action Learning: Research and Practice:
[The URL is http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/14767333.asp.]

Active Learning in Higher Education: [The URL is http://alh.sagepub.com/.]

American Educational Research Journal:
[The URL is http://www.aera.net/publications/?id=315.]

Arts and Humanities in Higher Education: [The URL is http://ahh.sagepub.com/.]

College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal:
[The URL is http://journals.cluteonline.com/index.php/CTMS.]

Currents in Teaching and Learning:
[The URL is http://www.worcester.edu/Currents/default.aspx.]


International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:
[The URL is http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ljso/t/index.htm.]

International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education:
[The URL is http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/cfp.cfm.]

Inventio: Creative Thinking about Teaching and Learning:
[The URL is http://doit.gmu.edu//inventio/.]

Journal of College Student Development:
[The URL is http://www.jcsdonline.org/submissions.html.]

Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:
[The URL is https://www.iupui.edu/~josotl/.]

Journal on Excellence in College Teaching:
[The URL is http://www.compact.org/resources/journal-of-excellence-in-college-teaching/955/.]
[The alternate URL is http://celt.muohio.edu/ject/.]

Mountain Rise: The International Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:
[The URL is http://mountainrise.wcu.edu/index.php/MtnRise.]

New Directions for Teaching and Learning:
[The URL is http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291536-0768/issues.]

Teaching in Higher Education:
[The URL is http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/13562517.asp.]

Using the “Publishing Hook” for SoTL Project Development:

Resources, Journals, and Conferences (continued)
The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:  
[The URL is http://www.cjsotl-rcacea.ca/]

The Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning:  
[The URL is http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/ijpbl/]

Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal:  
[The URL is http://old.library.georgetown.edu/newjour/t/msg02886.html]

List of journals by discipline:  
[The URL is http://www.libraries.iub.edu/index.php?pageId=3213.]

University of Central Florida:  
[The URL is http://www.fctl.ucf.edu/ResearchAndScholarship/SoTL/journals/]

Conferences

Innovations in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Liberal Arts Colleges:  
[The URL is http://www.wabash.edu/sotl/]

ISSOTL - International Society For The Scholarship Of Teaching & Learning:  
[The URL is http://www.issotl.org/]

Lilly Conferences on College & University Teaching:  [The URL is http://lillyconferences.com/]

Midwest Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:  
[The URL is http://www.iusb.edu/~ucet/sotl.shtml]

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Conference:  
[The URL is http://www.maryville.edu/about-excellence-ctl-conference.htm]

Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SOTL) Academy:  
[The URL is http://www.emich.edu/sotl academy/]

SoTL Symposium of the South:  
[The URL is http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/conference/2011/]

The SoTL Commons: A conference for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning:  
[The URL is http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/conference/2011/]

Listings of conferences also are posted at these sites:  

CELT-IPFW:  [The URL is http://www.ipfw.edu/celt/learning/sotl.shtml]

University of Central Florida:  
[The URL is http://www.fctl.ucf.edu/ResearchAndScholarship/Conferences/]

Illinois State University:  [The URL is http://www.sotl.ilstu.edu/sotlConf/]

CELT-Kennesaw State University:  
[The URL is http://www.kennesaw.edu/cetl/resources/na_conf_list.html]

DePaul Teaching Commons:  
[The URL is http://teachingcommons.depaul.edu/Scholarship/Conferences/index.html]

Indiana University, Bloomington:  [The URL is http://www.indiana.edu/~sotl/eventstop.html]

List of SoTL journals, conferences, and resources:  Michigan State University:  
[The URL is http://fod.msu.edu/oir/Sotl/sotl.asp#cons]
USING THE “PUBLISHING HOOK” FOR SO TL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT:
RESOURCES, JOURNALS, AND CONFERENCES (CONTINUED)


SUMMARY OF “COMMON REASONS WHY JOURNALS REJECT ARTICLES” (PP. 69-91).

Too Narrow or Too Broad:
Tip 1: Set article in broader context, historical background, larger problems.
Tip 2: Aim at broad academic audience; assume readers will have less knowledge than your expertise.
Tip 3: Aim at a smart audience by avoiding encyclopedic information about context.
Tip 4: Give pertinent examples to support your argument.
Tip 5: Relate examples to the argument so that it’s neither too technical nor too narrow.
Tip 6: Keep manuscript within journal’s expectations for length.
Tip 7: Select the appropriate journal to match the focus of your manuscript.

Off Topic:
Tip: Make sure the manuscript focus matches the interests of the journal.

Not Scholarly:
Tip 1: Be meticulous about documentation.
Tip 2: Cite recent literature.
Tip 3: Cite multiple sources.
Tip 4: Cite relevant literature.
Tip 5: Reference debates in the field.
Tip 6: Use discipline-related expertise.
Tip 7: Provide a critical framework, i.e., your approach to your topic.
Tip 8: Provide evidence for arguments; don’t just assert that an argument is true.

Too Defensive:
Tip 1: Keep down the number of quotations; abridge the quotations used.
Tip 2: Don’t quote famous authors unless a quote relates explicitly to your focus.
Tip 3: Cite relevant documentation only and skip the rest.
Tip 4: Avoid using jargon.
Tip 5: “Delete all references to former incarnations” (p. 74) of the submitted manuscript.
Tip 6: Mention disagreements with your arguments; acknowledge different perspectives.

Not Sufficiency Original:
Tip 1: Don’t replicate the work already done by others.
Tip 2: Focus on what’s new compared to others’ ideas.
Tip 3: If you offer arguments against other positions, only do so for real ones cited in the literature.
Tip 4: Explain what’s different or original about your focus.
Tip 5: Use phrases such as “The thesis of this paper is” or “I argue that…” or in some other way “claim your ideas.” (p. 75) The authors state that women often fail to do this.
Tip 6. Make the “voice” clear and active without moralizing what you write.
USING THE “PUBLISHING HOOK” FOR SoTL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT:
RESOURCES, JOURNALS, AND CONFERENCES (CONTINUED)


SUMMARY OF “COMMON REASONS WHY JOURNALS REJECT ARTICLES” (PP. 69-9) (CONTINUED).

Poor Structure:
Tip 1: Make structure explicit with “summary paragraphs, subheads,” and transitions.
Tip 2: Stick to your point.
Tip 3: Delete redundant or irrelevant text.
Tip 4: Present facts or data in a clear context, related to a specific idea.
Tip 5: Give “your single significant idea” early in the manuscript.

Not Significant:
Tip 1: Explain the significance, e.g., no one else has written about this, solves a problem, etc.
Tip 2: Select the right journal.

Theoretically or Methodologically Flawed:
Tip 1: Get peer review before submitting your manuscript.
Tip 2: Explain your methodology in detail; cite others who’ve used it or similar methodology.
Tip 3: Balance theory and concrete examples or applications.
Tip 4: Indicate awareness of opposing views.
Tip 5: Review your analysis of data and interpretation of findings.

Too Many Misspellings and Grammatical Errors:
Tip 1: Complete exercises to improve your grammar.
Tip 2: Run a spell and grammar check.
Tip 3: Hire someone to review and edit ($5 to $25 per page).
Tip 4: Follow the journal’s submission guidelines.

No Good Argument:
Tip 1: Craft and present an argument early in your manuscript; express ”a point of view intended to influence” the readers of the journal article (p. 82).
Tip 2: Test whether or not statements in the manuscript can elicit “I agree” or “I disagree.” (p. 83).
Tip 3: Avoid being dogmatic by “build(ing) in a consideration of opposing voices.”
Tip 4: Don’t substitute a “topic” for an “argument” as they are not the same.
Tip 5: Craft arguments in the style familiar to the journal context and discipline.
USING THE “PUBLISHING HOOK” FOR SO TL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT:

WRAP UP ACTIVITY

The purpose of this section of the workshop is to reflect on its value to you as a model to use in your work, and to share your perspectives with other participants. In this way you will leave today with more ideas and better able to remember this experience because you have examined it before moving on to the next session. The other outcome is for us to have a record of your reactions to the workshop so that we may refine or change it to make the experience more effective.

We'd like you to work in triads for about 5 minutes to answer the two questions on the Workshop Reflections sheet. Have one person act as scribe. Please write legibly. We will use the rest of our time to hear your answers. We will collect your responses at the end of the workshop.

1. Which aspects of this workshop would you be most apt to use? Why?

2. What problems would you have implementing this workshop in your context?