Blended Learning Taskforce Meeting
February 5, 2016, 11:00 am
Summary

Present: Amanda Balkhi (student), Dr. M. Moorhouse, Dr. G. Hack, Dr. S. Hanson, Dr. M. Marsiske, Dr. C. Prins, Dr. Rick Kates, Dr. M. Hart, Dr. M. Marsiske, Dr. O. Shechtman

• Welcome to New Members
  • Dr. Hanson welcomed Dr. Rick Kates, representing HSRMP, and Dr. Michael Moorhouse, representing the undergraduate health science program.

• Initiating Design of Teaching Excellence Program
  • Based on outcome of last meeting, Dr. Hanson discussed using a matrix design as suggested in the last meeting as an organizational structure for the Teaching Excellence Program (TEP). In the matrix design, various levels of skill acquisition would be defined for each TEP competency rather than using beginner, intermediate, and advanced cohorts. This would have several advantages:
    o Ease of application by faculty during self-assessment
    o Ability of faculty to match individual areas of strength to individual competencies rather than selecting a single broad category (e.g. beginner)
    o Use by facilitators in focusing resources
    o Providing a measure of change/progression over time for individuals

The majority of the meeting focused on challenges in defining number and types of benchmark levels, ensuring we can successfully use this type of approach for all levels of instruction (e.g. undergraduate, graduate, type of class, etc), capturing the characteristics of instructors who are already known to be exceptional, and everyone generally taking the same approach to define the matrix components.

Decisions: We will divide into 3 groups with 4 task force members in each group. The charge of each group is to take 3 competencies and design levels of progression within each competency. (Individuals volunteered for a group during the meeting; assigned competencies were handed out in the meeting prior to volunteers being requested and are attached at the end of these minutes.)

We agreed to use a 5-level matrix design. The dimension boundaries will be based on level 3 representing the standard of competent, adequate teaching skills and the boundaries being...
(none/minimal skill) and 5 (excellent but nuances or really advanced skills to work on). Please note: the boundaries above define the beginning, not the completion of that level.

In response to questions, Dr. Hanson indicated that specific activities and metrics will be developed later in the TEP design. The focus of this task is solely on level definition. As faculty work on levels, it may help to simultaneously generate a list of questions for a faculty member to use in self-assessment of skill level but the primary task is definitional.

It was suggested that we map one competency as an example before proceeding but a compromise was offered in the interest of creativity. Subgroups will meet during the next regularly scheduled task force meeting on Feb. 19 and begin to define their competencies. After that meeting if groups are struggling to define their levels, we will meet as a whole task force on March 4 to further problem solve. If subgroups believe they are making progress, they will meet in their subgroups again on March 4 to finalize their work. In that latter case, the task force as a whole will not come together until March 18. This will allow 2 meetings for subgroups to complete their work. Subgroups were encouraged to share their work once completed.

**Action Items:**
- Subgroups will organize themselves
- Dr. Hanson will contact Dr. Cantrell, Dr. Pomeranz and Dr. Miller for them to select a group to join and will then notify appropriate subgroup.

**Next meeting:**
- **Entire group:** March 18, 2016
- **Subgroups:** February 19 and March 4 (depending on progress)

---

**TEP COMPETENCIES**
2/5/16

**Group 1: George Hack Facilitator, Mike Moorhouse, Amanda Balkhi**
1. Detail his or her teaching philosophy
2. Operationalize learning objectives that support achievement of course goals and align with curricular/program needs, including accreditation requirements
8. Develop and implement pathway to educational scholarship

**Group 2: Stephanie Hanson, Cindy Prins, Orit Shechtman**
3. Design and use a syllabus as an effective communication tool for course objectives, assignments, and outcomes
5. Integrate educational technologies (e.g. specific teaching tools) into course design and delivery to facilitate achievement of course objectives
   b. In class
6. Maximize positive learning environment through use of effective communication and classroom management skills

Group 3: Rick Kates, Mark Hart, Michael Marsiske
4. Design and implement learning activities and methods that align with student attributes and promote mastery of course material
5. Integrate educational technologies (e.g. specific teaching tools) into course design and delivery to facilitate achievement of course objectives
   a. Online
7. Develop, use, and/or interpret formative and summative assessments of student performance and teacher effectiveness to improve current and/or future course experience and outcomes