At the end of my first day of teaching this fall, one of my students posted to Twitter: “This is certainly the first class I’ve taken where we are encouraged to be distracted by mobile devices.” During that first class session, I had them all take out their iPads and download apps that would be relevant for the discussions. To begin, let me note how odd it was to say to a class, “Everyone, please take out your iPads.” Yet, since this was a course for the University of Maryland’s Digital Cultures and Creativity Program (DCC), all of the students were given iPads when they entered the program. The idea behind giving the students iPads was that they would have a common platform through which they could engage digital objects, data, and other forms of online content. I was skeptical. I hadn’t owned a tablet until the DCC Program gave me one so I could utilize it in the classroom. I had no idea how I was going to do that.

The challenge, for me, was to figure out what practices the iPad promoted that were more dynamic than simply using non-digital tools like pen and paper. One of the first things I had my students do is to download a Twitter application so they could interact with each other during lecture on that platform. Students created what is termed a “Twitter backchannel” that allows them to post a message that is read in real time by the other students. I require that they do this at least once during the lecture. In their Twitter messages (aka “tweets”), they can respond to something I say, a comment...
By requiring a “general” or core curriculum, institutions prepare students to grow as successful citizens capable of responding to a changing world where, research shows, students will change careers at least several times. In its attempt to promote liberal education for all students, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) national initiative suggests that broad, deep, and connected learning leads to “economic creativity and democratic vitality” (www.aacu.org/leap/). LEAP defines liberal education as a broader and more descriptive term than “general education” because it also includes how schools approach the major. I especially like their description of liberal education as an “education that liberates” and the argument that general education provides intellectual training and necessary life skills in complement to those provided by the major.

The national, and indeed global, attention to liberal and general education is one that has also played out locally in our campus community. In its final report to the University Senate in April 2010, the General Education Taskforce reported that the goals for Maryland’s new General Education program are: “to develop the skills necessary for all students to succeed in their academic careers and professional lives by enabling them to write clearly, speak effectively, and reason analytically; to complement and strengthen students’ major areas of study; to hone students with a broad view of civilizations past and present; to enhance the ability of students to thrive both intellectually and materially, and to support themselves, their families, and their community through a broad understanding of the world in which they live and work and to engage students in defining the ethical imperatives necessary to create a just society, in their own communities and in the larger world” (www.provost.umd.edu/GenEdReport/). Consequently, the campus is in the process of implementing the new General Education Program, which will take full effect in Fall 2012 for all incoming students. In support of this process, CTE has partnered with the Office of Undergraduate Studies on a series of workshops highlighting three new components of GenEd: I-Series courses, Scholarship in Practice courses, and the revised Diversity requirement, which consists of two parts—Understanding Plural Societies and Cultural Competence. It is these three components of the new program that I want to comment on.

The I-Series courses (www.iseries.umd.edu) represent the signature courses for the new GenEd Program. Designed to address complex disciplinary challenges and to inspire inventive ideas, I-Series courses were piloted in Spring 2010 and featured new and redesigned courses across campus that engage students by grappling with big questions ranging from: “What does it mean to be human?” to “Does climate change cause severe weather patterns?” to “Why are Palestinians and Israelis unable to resolve their conflict?” As one of the facilitators for the I-Series faculty learning community, I am often amazed and inspired by the quality and pioneering nature of these courses, which are primarily directed toward first and second year students. A recent survey of students in the I-Series courses indicates almost all students (> 80%) liked their class and perceived it to be a valuable learning experience. Individuals interested in developing an I-Series course can go to the I-Series course website (www.iseries.umd.edu) or contact Douglas Roberts in Undergraduate Studies. Proposals for new I-Series
Answers to Frequently Asked Questions About Scholarship in Practice

The following is an interview between Lisa Rhody, the editor of Teaching and Learning News and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies Doug Roberts. As we draw nearer to the official launch of the new General Education program, we have been including articles about the signature components of the new program. This installment offers a general introduction to what faculty need to know about the Scholarship in Practice requirement.

What was the rationale for the Scholarship in Practice requirement in the new GenEd program?
Scholarship in Practice has generally not been part of the traditional menu type GenEd programs that you see throughout the country, and Maryland strives to be a leader in innovative undergraduate education. Scholarship in Practice provides a mechanism where all disciplines can have a seat at the GenEd table. Traditionally, agriculture, engineering, business, journalism and other professional schools have not provided many GenEd offerings. Currently 90% of our GenEd courses are taught out of only three colleges on this campus; thus, the current CORE program does not represent the full breadth of what this campus offers. Giving all students the opportunity to experience what our campus does as a whole should be part of GenEd. Another reason is that about 1/3 of the students come into the University with undeclared majors, and students in the first two years take, primarily, GenEd courses. So, if students are given opportunities through GenEd to take a course in the scholarship that defines a discipline, they will be better prepared to make informed decisions about what they want to do. Scholarship in Practice courses gives students exposure to what a variety of disciplines do and may allow students to consider career options and pathways they previously may not have considered.

How many courses will students need to take in Scholarship in Practice in the New GenEd program?
Students will need 6 credits hours, which will typically be 2 courses, to fill the requirement. One of those courses may be in their major.

Can a Scholarship in Practice course satisfy multiple GenEd requirements? (e.g., I-course and Distributive Studies?)
Yes, but it can only count for one distributive studies requirement. It could be an I-Series course and a Scholarship in Practice course. But taking a course that counts for two areas doesn’t mean that students will be able to take fewer distributive studies credits in GenEd. Students still need 25 credits in distributive studies. In other words, taking courses that can count in multiple ways does not mean that students have reduced the total number of courses they need to fulfill the distributive studies requirement. Furthermore, faculty who are proposing these courses should think carefully about whether or not it really satisfies the requirements in more than one category. Independent faculty committees review course proposals for the distributive subject areas and Scholarship in Practice, and they are going consider to if the students are getting 3 credits worth of material in each of the areas and if it meets the learning outcomes for each GenEd category. I would encourage faculty to be realistic about what is possible to accomplish in a one semester course.

What is the difference between an I-course and a Scholarship in Practice course?
I-Series courses are designed to address big issues and big topics from the perspective of a particular...
Mutual Expectations; or,
What Are They Thinking?

By Dave Eubanks
Associate Director for College Park Scholars

Some years ago, CTE organized a panel of undergraduates and invited them to talk about their expectations of classes and instructors at Maryland. It seemed to be a valuable start to a useful exchange, if only because it was imagined as an alternative to making assumptions about the student view. Of course, only a small number of students were able to participate, and those panelists were selected to sit on that panel by faculty who knew them. And for what it’s worth, none of the attending faculty and staff voiced their expectations of students; that’s what good syllabi do.

In May of this year, at the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching, I was able to take part in an exercise, “mutual expectations,” that follows on the premise of and expands the work of the CTE undergraduate panel by creating an exchange of both parties’ expectations. In mutual expectations, students and faculty are separated and asked to develop two short lists of expectations: one for the other group and one for themselves. They discuss possibilities and refine those lists enough to present them to each other. In that presentation, facilitators invite questions and provoke elaboration. So, for instance, the student group that expects faculty to provide study guides is asked why that matters to them and in what ways they might use a guide. The faculty group that expects students to participate in class discussion might be prompted to define good participation. Most important, though, each group must create and share expectations they commit to meeting themselves. In that exercise, participants articulate what they view as their contribution to teaching and learning. The exercise is not adversarial (here’s why your expectations are outlandish) but a mechanism to talk about perspectives and perhaps to help the other side, as it were, learn. This is more like the process of creating a contract to collaborate than writing a contract to protect.

College Park Scholars has used the mutual expectations exercise with the talented undergraduate students who work for our central programs and, in August, with the Resident Assistants in the Cambridge Community halls in which Scholars live. In the latter, RAs and Scholars faculty discussed the ways we support our students and begin to develop sustainable ways to communicate between the classroom and the residence hall so that Scholars continue to thrive in the best a living-learning program can offer.

The mutual expectations model may take more energy and more planning than introducing a course on its first day in our conventional way, but as it teaches students about what lies ahead, it will also require that they say out loud what they expect of themselves as students and what they expect of the course. As assessment, the exercise’s results may surprise faculty; they will also give a sense of likely challenges and of rewarding directions. At the very least, participants will have a better idea of how a course and its students and instructor might meet and the ways they might need to rethink plans.

The Honor Pledge

The Student Honor Council encourages instructors to include the following information in course syllabi:

“The University of Maryland, College Park has a nationally recognized Code of Academic Integrity, administered by the Student Honor Council. This Code sets standards for academic integrity at Maryland for all undergraduate and graduate students. As a student you are responsible for upholding these standards for this course. It is very important for you to be aware of the consequences of cheating, fabrication, facilitation, and plagiarism. For more information on the Code of Academic Integrity or the Student Honor Council, please visit http://www.shc.umd.edu. To further exhibit your commitment to academic integrity, remember to sign the Honor Pledge on all examinations and assignments: “I pledge on my honor that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this examination (assignment).”
The First Year Book:  
**Reading The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks**

By Kathryn Wong  
An Undergraduate Student in Biology and Education

Rebecca Skloot’s *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* is the story of a woman whose cells revolutionized medical research. Known as HeLa cells, Henrietta Lacks’s cells have been used to develop the polio vaccine, to research HIV/AIDS treatment, and to study the effects of environmental stressors. Skloot’s book retells the story of how Henrietta Lacks’s cells were taken without her knowledge, mass produced, and used for scientific research without her ever knowing about it. Using interviews with family members and piecing together newspaper articles and scientific research, Skloot uncovers one of the most riveting untold stories of a breach in medical ethics.

The HeLa cell line originated in 1951 when Lacks sought treatment at Johns Hopkins Hospital for serious pains in her abdomen. A mother of five, she realized that this pain was different from any she had ever felt before. Very shortly after her first visit to Johns Hopkins, she was diagnosed with cervical cancer and prescribed radium treatments. During her first treatment, doctors removed a sample of cells from her cervix—partly from the tumor, and partly from healthy tissue. Dr. George Gey discovered the cells’ potential: HeLa cells are especially unique because they are able to continue to grow for prolonged periods outside of the body. Proving to be incredibly robust, HeLa cells have been surviving for many years and have been used in research for over half a century. Skloot reports that “more than 60,000 scientific articles have been published about research done on HeLa, and that number was increasing steadily at a rate of more than 300 papers each month” (312). Despite all of her contributions to medical science, though, neither Lacks nor her family were ever asked permission nor made aware of the use of her tissue for these purposes.

For years, the Lacks family was kept in the dark about what was done with Henrietta’s cells. Scientists, doctors, and reporters would constantly contact them, wanting to learn more about their family. One researcher even convinced the Lacks family to donate some of their blood so they could be “tested for cancer,” when in fact it was just for more research. Henrietta’s daughter Deborah was so afraid of getting this cancer, that she believed what they told her. After calling Hopkins for many days and getting no response, the entire Lacks family was left wary of any future interaction with any kind of doctor or researcher. They were afraid of being exploited as they had already been for many years, and upon learning about the mass production and sale of Henrietta’s cells, the Lacks family was outraged. Her son Lawrence explained to Skloot: “She’s the most important person in the world and her family living in poverty. If our mother so important to science, why can’t we get health insurance?” (168)

Focusing on ethics in medical research, *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* raises many questions that I had never even considered. Do I own my cells? Does anyone have the right to use my cells to make a profit? Henrietta’s cells were taken without permission or knowledge and sold throughout the world for 20 years before the family ever learned about it.
2010-2011 CTE-Lilly Graduate Fellows Project: Attaining Definitional Clarity through a Study of UMD Instructional Faculty’s Understandings of “Civic Engagement” and “Service Learning”

Amanda T. Berger, Steven G. Buzinski, Paul Dean, Theresa A. Donofrio, Abram Fox, Lynne P. Heighton, Ali Fuad Selvi, and Lenea H. Stocker

The terms “civic engagement” and “service learning” are often bandied about in discussions of active learning pedagogies. A general survey of university offerings demonstrates no shortage of programs or projects designed to help instructors incorporate these constructs into their classes: Drexel University’s Lindy Center for Civic Engagement hosts a database full of civic engagement projects, the University of Washington’s Center for Communication & Civic Engagement’s website details their numerous programs, and here at the University of Maryland, in 2008, Dr. Linda L. Moghadam and J. Michael Ryan compiled the “Faculty Resource Manual for Civic Engagement and Leadership in the Curriculum at the University of Maryland.” The impression conveyed by the discourses around “civic engagement” and “service learning” is that both techniques are desirable strategies for instructors to facilitate and advance student learning.

Despite the seemingly positive connotations ascribed to both terms within learning communities seeking to improve and promote active learning, locating clear, concise and consistent definitions for these terms can be a challenge. Civic engagement is defined by Thomas Ehrlich (as reproduced in the New York Times) as “working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes.”

According to Adler and Goggin, civic engagement means “the ways in which citizens participate in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community’s future.”

Service learning, according to the National Service-Learning Clearing House, “is a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities.” Campus Compact holds, “[s]ervice-learning incorporates community work into the curriculum, giving students real-world learning experiences that enhance their academic learning while providing a tangible benefit for the community.” Although these definitions are similar, multiple scholars have noted that there exists an abundance of differing perspectives on these two concepts. Above and beyond any logistical challenges involved in implementing these active learning pedagogies, this lack of conceptual clarity can frustrate the employment of these pedagogical tactics from the start.

Last academic year, the 2010-2011 CTE-Lilly Graduate Fellows began their work cognizant of the trends

---
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courses are now accepted and reviewed on a rolling basis.

The Scholarship in Practice category is a bold and innovative introduction to the curriculum because it requires that students become active participants in the kinds of research faculty are engaged within their disciplinary fields. As far as I am aware, Maryland is the first university to require that students gain hands-on experience in a field outside of his or her major, especially as early as their first two years. Many universities and general education programs have a capstone/scholarship experience requirements within the major; however, promoting student engagement in scholarship outside their own discipline makes this new General Education requirement unique. This year’s CTE-Lilly Faculty Fellows will spend the year discussing the challenges of teaching Scholarship in Practice courses. Developing Scholarship in Practice courses in sufficient enough numbers to meet students’ needs outside of their major will be challenging; however, it offers opportunities for innovation and creativity. It is possible for a course to be both an I-Series Course and a Scholarship in Practice course.

While the current CORE general education program includes a diversity requirement, the new General Education diversity requirement differs in significant ways. It contains two components, one focused on the theoretical aspects of understanding and living in plural societies and a second component focused on developing the skills necessary to function in an increasingly inter-connected, diverse world. According to the General Education Learning Outcomes statement, “Understanding Plural Societies is the centerpiece of the University’s Diversity requirement... and speaks to both the foundations—cultural, material, psychological, historical, social, and biological—of human difference and the operation or function of plural societies.” Students will be required to take two courses in the diversity category, one of which must be an Understanding Plural Societies course. The second course can either be designated as Understanding Plural Societies or Cultural Competence. Cultural Competence courses require students to engage in thoughtful consideration of issues of equity and justice and to develop and employ interpersonal skills through activities designed to improve critical thinking, self-reflection, and empathy, as a way to negotiate cross-cultural situations or conflicts. Cultural Competence courses allow for a wide rage of academic approaches from single-credit small seminar courses to Education Abroad experiences. Like all of the new General Education courses they must achieve carefully articulated learning outcomes and each course will be reviewed and approved by a faculty committee through a supportive process. In other words, the faculty review committee is designed to help faculty develop courses that meet the new criteria of the General Education program.

Information on the new General Education program and its implementation can be found at the following URL [www.ugst.umd.edu/ged-inf.html](http://www.ugst.umd.edu/ged-inf.html) and in the Provost Publication “Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland, which can be found at [www.provost.umd.edu/GenEdReport/GenEdPublic-Decl2010.pdf](http://www.provost.umd.edu/GenEdReport/GenEdPublic-Decl2010.pdf). You can also learn more by contacting the Office of Undergraduate Studies on their website at [www.ugst.umd.edu](http://www.ugst.umd.edu).
a student raises in class, or a comment that a student raises on the backchannel. One of the immediate issues of using a tool like the iPad in this way during the class session is the problem of competing spaces of attention. Students engage the Twitter discussion happening and students engage the in-class discussion. But the prevailing idea has been that they cannot effectively do both. So, essentially, it seems like I was requiring that my students be distracted during the class.

The topic of distraction (couched in terms like “absent presence”) is something I bring up in my recent book, Mobile Interface Theory: Embodied Space and Locative Media. My discussion of this topic is meant to challenge the recent work done by people like Sherry Turkle (Alone Together) and William Powers (Hamlet’s Blackberry), who both argue that, as Powers puts it: “[A]lthough we think of our screens as productivity tools, they actually undermine the serial focus that’s the essence of true productivity. And the faster and more intense our connectedness becomes, the further we move away from that ideal. Digital busyness is the enemy of depth.” While I tend to agree with the recent studies that demonstrate that we are all bad at multitasking (and, as is obvious in my own day-to-day practices, it is increasingly difficult to stay focused on a single task without jumping from interface to interface), my work in this field puts forth some strong reservations with the idea that our devices are luring us away from a deep connection with each other and with our spaces. While our devices can and do pull us away from a deep engagement with people and spaces, this doesn’t have to be the default mode for the ways we use our mobile media. Instead, my theory of the embodied interface argues that the emerging trend is seen in practices of our mobile technologies that actually get us to engage with each other and with the spaces we move through in deep, meaningful, and context-rich ways.

The results thus far in my undergraduate course have been interesting. The Twitter backchannel has produced nearly 650 tweets by the middle of the semester. Among the contributions made, the students who self-identified as “shy” to me have contributed an average of 38% more Twitter updates than required (and as much as 75% more contributions than required). So, in one sense, I am getting more engagement and participation from the students who are reticent during the in-class discussion. Yet, the question remains: are the students paying attention to both my lecture and the Twitter backchannel? Absolutely not. It is apparent that they shift between the two classroom spheres. Does this “distraction” take them away from engaging with the content I’m presenting? Quite the contrary. In my estimation, they are engaged with the material that is being discussed in a much more sustained way because the devices that have typically distracted them in the past (e.g. using the laptop or the mobile phone to access Facebook) are now being utilized to constantly engage them with the material.

Let me offer one other example that was motivated by a key question in my research: “How can our mobile devices transform the way we give meaning to our spaces?” I wanted to find a way for students to engage the space of the university campus with their iPads. Thus far, we have had three field experiments with this. The first was a site-specific quiz that I gave them that required them to use their iPads to guide them to different spots on campus. At these places, they would access some relevant information about that space.

---


space (such as the history of the Rossborough Inn accessed through an audio narrative on the Broadcastr app) and answer a quiz question attached to that location. In this example — as with the other two field experiments, one in which we transformed the campus into a gameboard and one in which we tracked each others’ movements as we wandered around the university — the students employed their mobile devices to give them a deeper sense of context for a space that they have become very familiar with. The “information overload” that has accompanied the rise of mobile computing (and computing culture in general) does not have to be conflated with a lack of depth. Instead, by accessing site-specific information, we can have a much richer and deeper understanding of the spaces we inhabit.

Soon, if it hasn’t happened already, every teacher in higher education will have to develop a strategy for mobile phone use in the classroom (whether that be to integrate the technology or to ban it). Currently, mobile phones are the most pervasive computing technology in existence. There are currently over 5.3 billion mobile phone subscribers worldwide. In a planet of almost 7 billion people, that’s around 76% of the world that has access to — and uses — a mobile phone.iii Almost all of our students have them. The mobile device is something that they have on them throughout the day and has become embedded into the fabric of their everyday lives. While it will be some time before the same can be said of tablet computers like the iPad, it is still worth noting at this stage that simply responding to these pervasive technologies by banning them from the classroom does little to address the importance of these media in our students’ everyday lives. From my perspective, as an educator, I must respond to those practices that have become pervasive in the lives of my students, demonstrate that there are many ways to use these tools, and, ultimately, show them how to analyze and critique their own everyday practices. I am taking small steps toward figuring out the best techniques to achieve those goals.

---

discipline, exposing students to the ways in which that discipline approaches, analyzes, and interprets relevant issues and questions within a discipline or profession. When a student goes into a research laboratory and does research that ends up getting published, that’s great! That’s Scholarship in Practice. The nature of the question a researcher is asking in that situation tends to be very focused, getting into the nuts and bolts of something specific. Addressing narrow questions is not an I-course experience, though, because I-courses look at large challenges confronting a discipline or profession. It’s a matter of scale. I think that’s probably one of the biggest differences.

Whom should faculty contact if they want to create a Scholarship in Practice course?
If they have questions about whether an existing course or a new course can count for Scholarship in Practice, I am happy to talk to them. If they are creating a new course they would need to talk to their department to make sure that it fits into the department’s overall plan. In order to submit a course, they need to have approval from their department and their college for the proposed course before it is reviewed by the GenEd Faculty review boards.

What elements need to included in a Scholarship in Practice Course proposal?
We are looking for courses that meet the Scholarship in Practice learning outcomes, which can be found on the GenEd website (www.ugst.umd.edu/gened-info.html). What the proposer should clearly identify is the body of scholarship or knowledge that students will be putting into practice in the course. There is no hard and fast rule, but we will look at the ratio of practice to discipline content. Disciplines may approach the idea of Scholarship in Practice in diverse ways, and until we see more course proposals, the exact balance between content and practice will remain somewhat unclear. I would estimate that the practice part should be in the range of 1/2 to 1/3 of the course, and it could be as much as 100% in cases where content comes from prerequisites. Personally, I would be hesitant to approve a course where practice activities only occur in the last week of the class.

Are there things that might routinely disqualify a Scholarship in Practice proposal?
No. However, courses titled or described as “introduction to” or “survey of” are probably not going to be approved, especially if they focus on content coverage. Still, if the course is an introduction to “methodologies of” or “applications of” then that is more in line with the Scholarship in Practice learning outcomes. In addition, courses in distributive studies need to be at least three credits. One or two credit Scholarship in Practice courses would be disqualified, unless they were part of a set of, say, 3 one-credit courses proposed as a multi-course sequence in which students must take all three in order to get Scholarship in Practice credit. Three credits need to come together. Some may be more, but there must be at least three. In a couple of cases this is already happening. Students don’t get to pick and choose which courses to package together. The unit offering the course needs to define the course progression required to satisfy the Scholarship in Practice requirement, and, of course, that would need to be approved by the faculty review board.

Doesn’t a student need a firm basis in the subject area before they can “practice” it?
Not always. In some introductory engineering courses students build or design something or put their learning into practice right away and where the scholarship and practice is present in the early part of the course. That’s where the amount of subject matter versus practice comes into play. Often, some teaching
of content needs to happen in a Scholarship in Practice course, but it should be more narrow and limited in scope and directly related to the practice component. As a general rule, GenEd courses should not have a lot of prerequisites and should be open to students across campus; yet, there is recognition that in some cases students may need to take prerequisites to learn some body of knowledge before they start putting it into practice.

**Do laboratory courses automatically qualify as Scholarship in Practice courses?**

No. Laboratory courses that are so structured that students simply follow the lab manual step-by-step would not qualify for the Scholarship in Practice designation. While these courses can teach important skills (i.e., how to use certain pieces of equipment or certain laboratory techniques or analysis tools) and while those skills may help students to then perform original research, just learning how to use the lab does not satisfy the scholarship component of the requirement. In other words, if the lab experience lacks inquiry and student creativity, then it would not count. However, if the lab course involves students doing original or open-ended research, yes, that could easily be Scholarship in Practice.

**Do internships and experiential learning courses satisfy the Scholarship in Practice requirement?**

First, let me say that internships and experiential learning are not a required part of the GenEd program. However, if students have learning experiences that fulfill the learning outcomes of the Scholarship in Practice category, then they could apply the internship or experimental learning activity toward their GenEd requirement. Some existing internship programs would qualify; in particular I am thinking of structured programs where a specific course number is tied to the internship within the major. These programs require students to do preliminary work to prepare for their internship and often involve reflective activities afterward. In such cases, internships under that course number would count as Scholarship in Practice because the internships themselves have been vetted by the department, are structured, and they often model what practitioners in the discipline do. Also, that means the course has already been approved by the GenEd faculty review committee. In the case where a student finds his or her own internship either on or off campus, that may or may not be Scholarship in Practice. Experiential learning means a lot of different things, and not all internship experiences are scholarly. From research opportunities, to internships, to student teaching, I think there are many places where students can get experiential learning opportunities, but often not much scholarship is involved because the purpose is to learn how to work in a particular environment. That’s a valuable experience, but not a scholarly one. For instance, if a student interns on the Hill, he or she may experience the inner workings of the government, but are they actually putting some body of scholarship into practice? Often that is not clear. In those instances things will have to be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

**Where can faculty find more information and forms?**

Information on Scholarship in Practice and the GenEd program is available at www.ugst.umd.edu/gened-info.html. Questions should be directed to me in UGST droberts at umd.edu.

**What else would you like faculty and students to know about Scholarship in Practice?**

There is no cookie cutter model for what a Scholarship in Practice course must look like. I think people should try to be as creative and open-minded as they can be about what they want their course to be and accomplish. Since this is a new GenEd category, it is an opportunity for innovation and creativity. Faculty have the chance to create courses that maybe they’ve wanted to teach for some time, but there hasn’t been a place or need for it. This is the time and the place for new thought and practices about what GenEd can be.
toward the embrace of civic engagement and service learning across universities yet aware of the difficulty of defining these terms. The Lilly Graduate Fellows were also inspired by unique situational exigencies: As they were doing their work to improve the quality of instruction at the University of Maryland, campus administrators were simultaneously working to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction through changes to the general education plan. Amongst the changes to be implemented, the University of Maryland’s general education curriculum will include a new pedagogical category: “scholarship in practice.” The early information circulating about this new category as the Lilly Graduate Fellows were conceptualizing their project suggested that its goals aligned with the promotion of active learning styles like civic engagement and service learning. Aware of the pending changes to the general education curriculum on campus, the 2010-2011 Lilly Graduate Fellows decided to undertake a survey of the state of knowledge on campus about civic engagement and service learning, including a focus on instructional faculty’s understanding of these terms.

Their project involved a campus-wide survey sent to all UMD instructors of record (which included graduate students teaching autonomously) to amass qualitative and quantitative data about instructors’ perceptions of these concepts. The survey asked for definitions of “civic engagement” and “service learning” and included a number of questions designed to assess the ways these concepts are used (or not used) in UMD classes. The survey yielded hundreds of definitions and an abundance of rich statistical data about use patterns and resource needs.

Initial assessment of this data produced several noteworthy findings. In producing definitions of civic engagement, respondents frequently mentioned such factors as: citizenship & active participation, awareness & altruism, the “greater good” to be done for the community, the role of the university, and the context for student involvement. Definitions of service learning centered on notions of social justice & community collaboration, the outcomes & impact of such practices, professional development & pedagogical advancement, students’ personal commitment, and the degree of choice or mandatory nature of such projects. Although these were common themes, the definitions produced varied widely, with some respondents indicating unfamiliarity with these terms and others suggesting the insignificance or worthlessness of these pedagogical approaches.

The CTE-Lilly Graduate Fellows continued their work on this project throughout the summer and into the fall 2011 semester. Beyond their engagement with the qualitative data and the definitions of “civic engagement” and “service learning” generated by survey respondents, the Lilly Graduate Fellows analyzed the quantitative data measuring instructors’ use of civic engagement and service learning, confidence in their ability to include active learning pedagogies, and concerns about the incorporation of these pedagogies into their classrooms. Additional analysis has also revealed disciplinary differences in faculty approaches to civic engagement and service learning, contrasting humanities perspectives against STEM perspectives, for example. The latest stage of their research has involved attempts to illuminate the differences in the ways faculty in Arts and Humanities, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), and Applied Sciences think about civic engagement and service learning.

The Lilly Graduate Fellows have presented their findings at numerous conferences on campus including the Graduate Research Interaction Day (April 6), a CTE workshop (April 21), and the Innovations in Teaching and Learning Conference (April 29). In June, the Lilly Graduate Fellows attended the Lilly East Conference in Bethesda and facilitated a 60 minute session entitled “Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Scholarship in Practice: Defining and Evaluating Pedagogies for Active Learning.” Currently, the manuscript detailing their findings is in the last stages of preparation for submission to an academic journal. The manuscript elucidates the disciplinary differences in faculty conceptualizations of civic engagement and service learning.

The 2010-2011 CTE-Lilly Graduate Fellows would like to express their appreciation to the Center for Teaching Excellence for...
Teaching Excellence for the support they received to work on this project. Dr. Spencer Benson, Dr. Barbara Jacoby, and Alexis Williams have provided valuable assistance and advice in the development of this project.

Notes


then mass produced and sold throughout the world for twenty years before the family ever learned about it. Skloot talks about HeLa factories, where researchers at the Tuskegee Institute had perfected the storage and shipment of these cells to anyone who wanted them. Eventually they were, “[producing] twenty thousand tubes of HeLa – about 6 trillion cells – every week” (96). I began to wonder how such a thing could happen and how it could be prevented.

Skloot was a welcome change to the Lacks family as someone who showed a genuine interest in their history and who would help them find the answers they were looking for about their mother. The story of the Lacks family took over a decade for Skloot to work out, between interviewing family members and reading countless newspaper articles. She worked closely with Deborah Lacks, sometimes spending entire nights together going through papers and medical records. Throughout the book, Deborah changes as she learns more about her mother’s contributions to science. Skloot’s dedication to learning about Henrietta allowed Deborah to start trusting people outside her family. Although she was too young to have ever gotten to know her mother, she eventually was able to feel a stronger bond with her, and began to accept that her mother was a hero who unknowingly saved millions of lives.

As an undergraduate student in the biology and education departments, I am excited to read a book like this. By tying together a wide variety of content areas including biology, history, and ethics, readers draw connections between science and their daily lives. Educators, especially at the high school and college level will find many ways to integrate this book into their courses. Even though Skloot writes about highly technical topics, she does so conversationally in an easy to follow narrative that tells a wonderful story. Students in all disciplines will find this book interesting and relevant to their lives. It was difficult for me to put the book down.
During the winter break of 2010, 16 graduate students from a variety of departments took part in a three-day workshop to create teaching portfolios. Not unlike a typical workshop, the CTE provided free bagels for the participants. We would argue that free bagels are reason enough to attend any workshop; however, the CTE Graduate Assistant Teaching Portfolio Retreat provided even more.

1. Access to CTE Staff

Workshop moderators Henrike Lehnguth, Coordinator of Graduate Student Programs, and Dave Eubanks, assistant director of the CTE, provided valuable guidance for participants. Working from their own experience in academia, they helped participants to develop the components of a good teaching portfolio. An exercise on the first day of the retreat involved critiquing three different sample teaching philosophies. This activity helped participants to compare different content and styles in preparation for writing their own versions. In addition to guiding discussion and activities, Lehnguth and Eubanks were also available throughout the retreat to give feedback on participants’ work.

2. Time and Space to Work

Built into the workshop schedule was more than 8 hours of time for individual writing. Having this reserved time and space to focus on writing was one of the most beneficial parts of the retreat, and a room full of other people working on the same project created an environment that was conducive for writing. In addition, the format of both individual and group work enabled participants to apply the insights gained from activities to their own teaching portfolios immediately. Most participants left the workshop with nearly complete teaching portfolios. Although these portfolios may not be in their final form, having created a solid foundation at the retreat will make further, individual editing much easier and more productive.

3. Peer Review

Throughout the retreat, participants were encouraged to exchange drafts and provide each other with feedback on content and style. This peer-review process helped reduce writing blocks and improved the quality of the writing.

4. Free lunch too!

In addition to free bagels, a delicious lunch was provided each day. Also, there was always coffee on hand, which some of us found more necessary than others.

5. Preparation for the Job Market

An additional focus of the retreat was how to use teaching portfolios effectively to apply for jobs. Participants learned to post their portfolios online using KEEP accounts. By including the URL in the cover letter of an application, the portfolios can be made accessible to potential employers without sending them excessive or unwanted materials in the mail.

The CTE Graduate Assistant Teaching Portfolio Retreat is particularly useful for graduate students planning to apply for academic positions. At the workshop, participants find information, support, guidance, food, and space to be productive. We highly recommend this retreat to anyone planning to teach in the future.
Preparing yourself for the job market can be a tedious task that requires countless hours assembling materials, updating documents, and writing applications. And yet, how many of us actually start preparing these materials well in advance without the motivation of a deadline approaching? Well here is your chance.

Each year the Center for Teaching Excellence provides a Graduate Assistant Portfolio Retreat over the winter break. During this three-day retreat in 2011, graduate students began compiling their teaching portfolios with the guidance and support of the Coordinator of Graduate Student Programs, Alexis Williams, and Communications and Archives Coordinator, Lisa Rhody, while working among graduate students across disciplines.

Anyone who is interested in teaching at the university level already knows that they will need a curriculum vitae, but many are unaware that they will also need to prepare a teaching portfolio. Your teaching portfolio should be a selective document containing a compilation of items such as teaching evaluations, sample lesson plans, syllabi, and the most essential component, the teaching philosophy.

During the retreat, you finally get a chance to make significant headway on writing your teaching philosophy. We spent careful time brainstorming by using exercises intended to gather our thoughts and get our minds ready for writing. By the time we started writing, we had worked out most of our ideas and could incorporate them directly into our philosophy. The peer review process was also very beneficial. We all helped edit each other’s work that resulted in a final product that we were all proud of.

Alexis and Lisa did a fantastic job planning retreat activities and provided us with plenty of resources available at our fingertips including a template portfolio, sample teaching philosophies, and completed teaching portfolios from previous students. They were available to answer any of our questions and were continually supportive even after the retreat.

Not only was the retreat a useful time to start assembling our portfolios, it was also a great place to meet other students interested in teaching and learning. Instead of spending hours writing by myself, I was in the company of other students encountering the same dilemmas as me where we could ask one another for advice. We were also provided with great snacks to keep us motivated.

By the third day, we all had accomplished a significant amount of work and came out with tremendous progress toward assembling our portfolios. Some of us even left with finished products while others were able to lay the foundation for their portfolio that they can continue to edit. I would highly recommend to any graduate students who are interested in a career in higher education to attend one of these retreats and to start assembling your portfolio now before you enter the job market.

Apply for the 2012 CTE Portfolio Retreat

http://www.cte.umd.edu/programs/graduate/GTAPortfolio/index.html

January 3-5, 2012 or January 10-12, 2012, Tuesday through Thursday, 9am-4pm

If you plan to teach on the university level, you will need a statement of teaching philosophy and a teaching portfolio. Join members of the CTE staff and fellow graduate teaching assistants in a three day retreat in which you will write your statement of teaching philosophy and create your portfolio. This is a unique opportunity for all graduate teaching assistants who anticipate entering the job market within the next two years.
The following graduate students have been selected to participate in the 2011-2012 CTE-Lilly Fellows Program. Much like last year’s cohort, whose research is highlighted on page 6 of this newsletter, these students will work on a project designed to improve undergraduate education on campus.

Breanne Robertson
Art History and Archaeology

Andrea A. Andrew
Chemistry and Biochemistry

Katie Hrapczynski
Family Science

Artesha C. Taylor
Communication

Karl Schmitt
Mathematical Computing

Matthew Walker Miller
Kinesiology

Abdel-Hameed Badawy
Electrical and Computer Engineering

Elise A. Larsen
Biology

Mara Dougherty
Chemistry and Biochemistry
The 2011-2012 CTE-Lilly Faculty Fellows

The 2011-12 CTE-Lilly Fellows will discuss and design solutions to challenges and develop model learning activities and course templates for faculty interested in developing Scholarship in Practice courses aimed at non-majors. The Lilly Fellows will consider the challenges of creating a course that engages students and meets the learning outcomes of the Scholarship in Practice category. In developing strategies and models, the Lilly Fellows may consider that many Scholarship in Practice courses will have large enrollments, that non-major and first year students may have limited or no knowledge or experience in the discipline, and the time frame for students to develop and practice scholarship in the discipline is one semester.

Ronald A. Yaros        Journalism
Richard Stewart        Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics
Sahar Khamis        Communication
Sarah Anne Balcom        Animal and Avian Sciences
Allen Stairs        Philosophy
Kevin Roy        Family Science
Melissa Hayes-Gehrke        Astronomy
Madlen Simon        Architecture
Rebecca Z. Kenemuth        College Park Scholars - Life Sciences
Scott Roberts        Psychology

The 2011-2012 International Teaching Fellows

This year’s cohort of International Teaching Fellows and mentors includes the following graduate students:

Fellows:

Bo Yang
Department of Communication

Ning Xie
Department of Communication

Jing Guo
Philip Merrill College of Journalism

Ki Young Chang
Department of Government and Politics

Qingjian Chen
Department of Kinesiology

Shikha Prashad
Department of Kinesiology

Chi-En (Daniel) Yin
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Mentors:

Melda Ina Baysal
Germanic Studies

Abulfazl Fakhari M
Chemistry and Biochemistry

Ana Perez
Women’s Studies

Bedrettin Yazan
Curriculum and Instruction
Announcements

The Lilly-DC Conference on College and University Teaching and Learning

The Lilly-DC Conference on College and University Teaching will be May 31-June 2, 2012. This year’s theme will be Brain-Based Learning and Teaching. University of Maryland faculty and graduate students frequently present at this conference and have enjoyed the community they have found there. Grants will be made available to graduate students to cover the cost of registration and attendance in the Spring. You can find the call for proposals on the conference website at: http://lillyconference.com/dc/default.shtml.

CTE International GTA Leadership Network

The IGTA Leadership Network was created by international GTAs who wished they had a go-to person or group to support them as they began teaching. It is an informal group of IGTA from across campus, and includes members of the University Teaching and Learning Program and the International Teaching Fellows, programs sponsored by CTE.

Who? If you are an international graduate teaching assistant or are interested in supporting and sharing the experiences of IGTA, you can benefit from joining the network.

What? Network members can meet to discuss teaching-related concerns, observe one another and provide feedback, and share experiences and knowledge through informal discussions or formal workshops. Members also join an online community through ELMS, which they can use to communicate about their experiences and upcoming events.

How? Contact Divya Gangaramani for information and to be added to our online network: divya.rg@gmail.com

2012 Stamp Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program

The Adele H. Stamp Student Union – Center for Campus Life, in collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence, is pleased to introduce the 2012 Stamp Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program. This program will provide support for 5 faculty members who are interested in creating a new service-learning course or integrating a new, significant service-learning component into an existing course. No knowledge of or experience with service-learning is required.

See http://cte.umd.edu/programs/faculty/stamp/ for details. Applications due November 18th.

Subscribe to Teaching & Learning News

www.cte.umd.edu/contactus/TLNMailingList.html

For more than fifteen years TLN has included articles, notes, and schedules to keep the campus informed about new technologies, available grants, fellowship notices, workshops and roundtables, distinguished lectures, assessment, learning outcomes, classroom management strategies, consultation programs, new conferences, established programs, award winners, grant recipients, University policies on teaching, and other valuable information for faculty and graduate teaching assistants. Most important, it always suggests ways to enhance teaching for better learning. Subscribing to the TLN listserv list takes about twenty seconds and means that you will receive approximately five emails a year, notifying you that a new issue of the only regular campus-wide publication on teaching and learning has arrived.
Work with a Faculty Consultant

The Faculty Teaching Consultation Division is designed to help provide support for campus instructors who would like to improve their teaching. Teachers work one-on-one with a Faculty Teaching Consultant, based on their own goals. The requesting teacher determines the issues to be explored, and the consultant provides an outside perspective, peer support for a plan of action, and suggestions for additional resources.

Consultations can address any number of areas, including, among other issues, assessment, active learning, collaborative learning, lecturing, instructional technology, syllabus construction, rubrics for grading, and scholarship in teaching and learning.

Any faculty member who teaches for the University of Maryland at College Park can request a teaching consultation, and they are completely confidential. For more information, contact the Center for Teaching Excellence at 301-405-9356 or via email at cte@umd.edu.

Upcoming CTE Events

Workshops

Brain Rules and Pedagogy * Wednesday, November 09, 2011 * 3202, Knight Hall * 1:00-2:30 PM
All are welcome! Come view the video accompaniment to the book Brain Rules by author John J. Medina and learn about its teaching applications. Medina’s “rules” are based on research about how the brain works, and our discussion will explore their applications for instructors and students. Dr. Scott will share how he has used the concepts in his own teaching at UM.
RSVP to http://cte.umd.edu/teaching/workshops/Fall2011/Nov09.html and see http://www.brainrules.net/ for more info about the book. See the UTLP Semester Activities newsletter for this and more events.

Big Idea Pedagogies-The I-Courses and Beyond * Thursday, November 10, 2011 * Maryland Room, Marie Mount Hall * 12:00-1:30 PM
In this workshop a panel of faculty will address how they have tackled the many pedagogical challenges of teaching complex, often interdisciplinary issues where there is no single answer or textbook, and for which faculty may not have deep discipline expertise. Come join a stimulating conversation with peers on pedagogies that can be used in many different types of courses to address teaching and learning issues.
RSVP to http://cte.umd.edu/teaching/workshops/Fall2011/Nov10.html.

Getting Started and Being Efficient in Your Teaching * Thursday, November 17, 2011 * Maryland Room, Marie Mount Hall * 12:00-1:30 PM
This workshop is directed at faculty who are new to teaching at Maryland. All faculty are invited and encouraged to attend this interactive workshop. In the workshop we will focus on campus resources that can be used to make teaching more effective, less time demanding, and more enjoyable. A number of studies have shown that faculty who use resources such as CTE are more productive, receive better teaching evaluations, and have a higher career success rate. Come join us in a conversation with peers on how to successfully address teaching and student learning issues and challenges at Maryland.
RSVP to http://cte.umd.edu/teaching/workshops/Fall2011/Nov17.html.
Wishing you a happy, healthy, and productive winter break!

## Calendar

**November**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10, Thursday</td>
<td>12 PM</td>
<td>UGST-CTE Workshop “Big Ideas Pedagogy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, Thursday</td>
<td>12 PM</td>
<td>“Getting Started and Being Efficient in Your Teaching”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, Thursday</td>
<td>4 PM</td>
<td>Distinguished Scholar-Teacher Lawrence Washington: “Cannonballs, Donuts, and Secrets: From Idle Questions to Cryptographic Applications”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, Thursday</td>
<td>4 PM</td>
<td>Distinguished Scholar-Teacher Avis Cohen: “An Interdisciplinary Journey from Lamprey Spinal Cords to Robots”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**December**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, Thursday</td>
<td>Midnight</td>
<td>Book orders for Spring 2012 due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>