

WASHINGTON CENTER

Occasional Paper

for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education

Winter 2003 Number 1

Designing Integrated Learning for Students: A Heuristic for Teaching, Assessment and Curriculum Design

Gillies Malnarich and Emily Decker Lardner, Co-Directors, Washington Center

What we have learned from working with faculty at a number of institutions is that while learning communities (LCs) create a space for learning, the substance of what happens within that space is what matters most for students, regardless of how that space is configured. What students learn is shaped by the assignments or assessments they are invited to do. The focus of this heuristic, which can be adapted for use in many kinds of institutional settings, is on designing compelling, substantive and integrative experiences of learning for students.

Introduction

Thirty years ago, the Washington State Legislature founded The Evergreen State College as a public alternative liberal arts college shaped in large part by the debates on higher education that took place in the 1960's. Its most direct antecedents are Joseph Tussman's experiment at Berkeley and, before that, Alexander Meiklejohn's college at the University of Wisconsin. The founding administrators departed from traditional academic structures with a series of "no's": no academic departments, no faculty rank, no tenure, no merit pay increases, no grades, no majors, no distribution requirements, no required sequences of courses. Instead, college founders created a curriculum vehicle: "what they decided during the planning year was that the center and chief raison d'être of Evergreen would be curriculum consisting not of individual courses or course sequences but of integrated academic programs called Coordinated Studies Programs. These programs were to constitute full-time work for both the students and faculty. That is, a student was to take only one academic program at a time, and faculty were to teach but one at a time, usually for a full academic year" (Finkel and Arney, 1995, p. 6). Programs were interdisciplinary, a-disciplinary, or even anti-disciplinary, taught by teams of three to seven faculty who wanted to investigate a problem, theme or question together. Programs were bound by only two requirements:

weekly or twice weekly "book seminars"—regular meetings of twenty students and one faculty member to discuss a book read in common, and weekly "faculty seminars" for faculty to discuss a reading among themselves with no students present (Finkel and Arney, 1995).

Coordinated Studies Programs as "curricular vehicles" became the basis for the founding of the Washington Center for Improving Undergraduate Education in 1985 as a public service center of Evergreen. "Through the collaboration of community colleges and four-year institutions, we have invented a model of curricular and faculty development that is low-cost, transferable, systematic, and designed to overcome some of the structural barriers to educational excellence... Most importantly, we are convinced that the development of partnerships and the exchange of faculty and ideas through team-teaching in model programs can be powerful in revitalizing both teachers and curricular thinking" (Smith, 1986). By 2002, over 500 campuses nationwide have adapted and adopted versions of this curricular vehicle, now known widely as learning communities (Smith, 2001). The term encompasses a wide range of curricular restructuring efforts ranging from establishing cohorts of students who take classes together, to linked classes, to coordinated studies programs taught by teams of teachers. What we have learned from working with faculty at a number of institutions is that

while learning communities (LCs) can create a space where learning occurs, what happens within that space, however configured, is what matters most for students.

Faculty Development: The Original LC Design Heuristic

Early on in its history, the Washington Center began hosting overnight “curriculum planning retreats” for faculty teams working on curriculum for the following academic year. These retreats are designed to accommodate about twenty to thirty teams, from twelve to fifteen different colleges, about seventy people in all. The retreats are held off campus at quiet locations, where faculty can work uninterrupted in a reflective, focused way. Meals and breaks provide opportunities for conversations across teams, as well as the kind of informal interactions that can help knit teams together. A core practice at these retreats is an exercise called *Designing a Learning Community in an Hour*. Developed by Jean MacGregor and Barbara Smith when they directed the Washington Center, the exercise, or heuristic, has been widely used at conferences and workshops across the country.¹ The purpose of the heuristic is to help teams imaginatively design the beginnings of what could become a team-taught Coordinated Studies Program. An abbreviated version of the exercise appears below.

Designing a Learning Community in an Hour

1. GETTING FOCUSED

TIME: About 5 minutes

Begin with some quiet reflective time to read through these instructions and to do some thinking and "free-writing" in response to the following task: If you had the opportunity to teach in some sort of learning community format, what THEME or THEMES might intrigue you?

Ways to get started: what larger meaningful interdisciplinary questions, issues, ideas or problems might be intriguing for you and for students to explore?

2. INTRODUCTIONS

TIME: About 10 minutes

Your group's timekeeper needs to start keeping time with this task. *Taking no more than 3-5 minutes per person (be disciplined about this) introduce yourself to the group, and name (no need to elaborate on) what your work is at your college or university, and if you are a faculty member, what courses you usually teach or what your discipline is. Then, briefly describe the interests that grow out of your expertise and passions – interests that are both intriguing to you, and might be intriguing to students today.*

¹ *Designing a Learning Community in an Hour* is available at www.evergreen.edu/washcenter in the resources section.

3. TOGETHER, CHOOSE A THEME for your program.

TIME: About 5-10 minutes

Once your group has generated ideas for possible learning community themes, see if you can come to consensus on any common theme, question, or topic that could conceivably be the organizing idea for a learning community. If members of your group are widely divergent in your interests, you should simply take a leap of faith and settle on one of the themes with which everyone feels comfortable working on in this exercise.

4. FLESH OUT THE THEME & ACTIVITIES

TIME: About 25 minutes

Given an imaginary quarter or semester in which your group was teaching collaboratively around this theme, what might you and your students do? Flesh out the substance of your program in brainstorm fashion – that is, GENERATE particular sub-themes, concepts, authors or titles of texts (reading of primary sources is encouraged!), films, field experiences, dramatic performances or research projects which might illustrate the THEME. No need to prioritize or to lock in a sequence at this stage. Generate as many ideas as you can.

5. MAKE A SUMMARY POSTER OF YOUR WORK

TIME: last 10-15 minutes

Now, distill out and summarize some of the key ideas or activities in your learning community design that might underpin a real program. Make sure your poster includes at least some of the following:

A title that portrays a theme

Major concepts and learning activities

Key learnings for students

Possible embedded disciplines or courses

Revising the Heuristic

In working with faculty at varied institutions, we began to adapt this exercise in response to local conditions. We started adding more specific language about the importance of developing a conceptual framework to organize curriculum planning, about taking stock of each teacher's preoccupations and personal concerns, and about considering students' interests and concerns. At one campus, we substituted this text for the “Getting Focused” section:

“To develop a strong learning community program, you and your colleague(s) need to find some common intellectual ground which will also be of interest to your students. The most powerful learning communities have some sort of conceptual framework that guides their overall shape. It might be in the form of a critical question or a set of questions, or be embedded in a real problem, or in the form of some key concepts. When you first start planning, it is often very helpful to explore the issues, questions, ideas and problems that are on your mind, on the minds of your colleagues, and, as you best can predict, on the minds of your students. So, as you

think about your disciplines, your students, your own life experiences, what larger interdisciplinary questions, issues, ideas or problems might be intriguing for you and for students to explore?"

We also added a new category to the heuristic to try to encourage more collaboration by asking team members to work on ways each of them could support their colleagues in helping students develop an understanding of the learning outcomes that mattered most to them. We called the section "Going Further":

GOING FURTHER

TIME: 25-30 minutes

Now that you have a focus for your learning community, it's time to move to more specific planning. To do this, you have to become very selective. Each of the teachers in your team needs to choose the one concept/outcome/idea that is most critical to them, of all the possible outcomes that come along with each course. Identity the one that is most important to you and write it down. Taken together, these are the most crucial outcomes for your learning community. Consider each outcome in turn. Pick one outcome. Discuss it enough so that everyone shares an understanding of what it means. Then shift to writing. The person who named the outcome should write down the kind of support s/he needs from colleagues in designing experiences so that students learn this. At the same time, the colleagues, the "not-lead" teachers, should write down how they think they could help the lead teacher help students learn this concept. Share your writing with each other, and be sure that someone (or everyone) is taking notes. Move on to the next outcome.

The original and revised versions of *Designing a Learning Community in an Hour* reveal the inventiveness of educators. As Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe in *Understanding by Design* write, "Teachers are designers. An essential act of our profession is the design of curriculum and learning experiences to meet specified purposes" (1998, p. 2). At Washington Center workshops and institutes on learning communities, teams of strangers in twos, threes and fours surprise themselves with their collaborative creations. Without fail, within little more than an hour of intensive collaborative work, teams post proposed titles for fictitious programs, focus learning on central issues and big questions, name books and films, plan field trips, and begin to devise student projects.

But the keenest of faculty arrive home to the realities of curriculum integration on their campus. Often, learning is compartmentalized and constrained not only by program, discipline and course hierarchies but also by apparently inflexible institutional practices from scheduling classes to booking rooms. How do you move from a generative, empowering exercise to beginning an actual learning community program? How do you move from teaching on your own to working with colleagues you know but have never taught alongside or even engaged in a conversation with about teaching and

learning? The more we tinkered with revisions to the original exercise, the more we realized that we needed a new heuristic, one that would honor the work of faculty in a variety of teaching situations who are committed to working with their colleagues to design integrated learning experiences for students.

A New and Evolving Heuristic: Designing Integrated Learning for Students

While the questions that preoccupy faculty and campuses new to LCs differ in degree and sometimes in kind from those voiced by faculty and administrators from campuses where LC programs already exist, we find that we are asked to do similar work in both instances: "please help us plan integrated curriculum for students at our campus."

We developed *Designing Integrated Learning for Students*² in response to requests to work with faculty teams on their home ground. By emphasizing *integrated learning* as compared to integrated curriculum, we choose to highlight student learning from the outset. Like other educators, we appreciate that "what a student knows and can do" is a more accurate reflection of what is learned than a focus on what a teacher does (Biggs, 1999), even if the activity is to connect curriculum from "over here" with curriculum from "over there" to promote integrated learning (Stiehl and Lewchuk, 2000).

Designing Integrated Learning for Students makes no judgments about relative degrees of curricular integration and the quality of student learning. What students know and can do in a variety of circumstances—that is, expected student outcomes tied to evidence of student learning—is supported by carefully designed assignments or assessments regardless of the type of learning community students find themselves in. *Designing Integrated Learning for Students* gives us an opportunity to engage in interesting conversations with faculty about student learning on any campus, and based on our experience, we are convinced that opportunities for integrated learning can occur on *all* campuses and in *all* sectors in higher education. Some of the most acclaimed and sustainable LCs in the country began with modest experiments in integrating learning through linked assignments.

As a companion piece to *Designing a LC in an Hour*, the new heuristic can be used 'as is' but unlike its predecessor, *Designing Integrated Learning for Students* anticipates and even encourages messy yet critical conversations among faculty. Our experience reminds us that both the delight and the bedevilment in doing collaborative work and team teaching flourishes or flounders in the details.

This heuristic is a work-in-progress that purposefully weaves together approaches to teaching, learning, assessment, and curricular design. It can be adapted for use in a two-hour session, a two-day institute,

² See pp.7-8, this paper. The heuristic is also available at www.evergreen.edu/washcenter in the resources section.

or a series of faculty development workshops. We intersperse hands-on activities with reflective writing, extended faculty conversations with intentional planning sessions, “seminaring” on selected articles with scrutinizing schedules to find time for faculty and students to do the collaborative work associated with integrated learning. All these adaptations are not included in the heuristic that accompanies this article.

Common to all of the various versions of the *Designing Integrated Learning for Students* we have field-tested in the last few years at curriculum planning retreats, during campus visits, and at national learning communities project institutes, are these essential practices:

- we draw on faculty’s individual experiences of learning and teaching as a basis for developing a solid foundation for collaborative work;
- we focus curriculum and assessment design on the specifics of student learning that faculty most value and that reflect using what one knows in the world;
- we ground planning for integrated learning in the actual circumstances of faculty work and student learning on a given campus.

Depending on workshop and institute schedules, the number of faculty and the needs of a group, we have lengthened and shortened and created adaptations organized around five core steps.

Personally engaging learning: reflections on our own powerful learning experiences as a way to invite an examination of the common features associated with personally engaging learning that is significant and memorable for us and for students;

Passions and aspirations for students’ learning: an acknowledgement of what really matters to us as educators in the context of our respective disciplines, fields and programs and the eventual implications of this when we work collaboratively with a teaching team;

Essential integration of expectations for student learning: the merging of individual faculty member’s expectations to develop a collective set of expectations that becomes the core for curriculum planning;

Schedules/making a space for integrated learning: the very practical matter of identifying the time available for integrated learning, as well as individual faculty beliefs about best uses of any shared class time;

Assignments as assessments/designing down: the creation of an assignment or series of assignments that serves as a vehicle for integrating student learning as well as a basis for assessing student learning.

In what follows, we briefly describe the work we have done with faculty under each step, as well as describing the research that informs our practice.

Personally Engaging Learning

In our work with campus teams, the learning experiences that have been significant for us as educators are both a

fundamental starting-point and an ongoing touchstone for assessing the effectiveness of any curricular design. The first activity in *Designing Integrated Learning for Students* invites faculty to recall their own powerful experiences of learning within or outside school. The exercise offers faculty a chance to reflect on their own experiences, as well as opportunities for insight into team members’ valued experiences of learning. That combination of individual reflection and shared insights provides the means to analyze what is common to the complexities of ‘enduring learning.’ These conversations help create conditions for collegial teaching because in spite of differences among team members—in academic rank, years of experience, race, gender, cultural background—everyone present contributes something to the conversation about the conditions that make learning powerful.

One of the long-standing goals of Evergreen’s Coordinated Studies Programs, shared by many of the LC variations that have ensued over the years, is that students be educated so that they can participate fully in the public sphere. Public participation, in Hannah Arendt’s terms, requires that people enter the public realm as equals, thinking for themselves, aware of who they are in relation to others, ready to meet others as peers (1958). For students, observing faculty teaching together as peers, doing collegial teaching, provides an opportunity to see public participation in action. “What is crucial to collegial teaching is that the two (or more) teachers join together out of a common intellectual interest. What brings the colleagues together must be genuine interest, not an interest invented as a pretext for creating a course. And there must be some common ground in their intellectual interests so together they can formulate a question or project the joint pursuit of which will be genuinely interesting to each—though not necessarily for the same reasons” (Finkel and Arney, p. 194). Bill Readings (1996) makes a similar argument for inviting students to witness collegial teaching in *The University in Ruins*. In his view, the purpose of the university is to be a place where people can practice thinking together. The purpose of inviting faculty to reflect on their own experiences as learners, then, is to begin to create the conditions that can lead to a genuine joint pursuit or inquiry among colleagues, which students will be invited to join.

Passions and Aspirations for Students’ Learning

In this step, we give faculty pads of “post-it” notes (stickies), and invite them to write out their passions and aspirations for students’ learning—one per sticky. We use the practice of quick writes and notations on stickies to capture what Lee Shulman (1993) refers to as the “pedagogy of substance” or the particularities of expertise in teaching—with particular contexts, particular students, particular curriculum and particular outcomes in mind. Since the idea of curriculum integration or “integrating learning” is understood by many faculty to represent a potential loss of valued content-specific teaching and learning time, we begin the work of integrating learning at

the place where faculty members' practice is the most developed, in their own classroom, teaching curricula they have designed to students whose struggles to understand ideas they know well. Inviting faculty to identify the substance of students' learning that matters most to them draws on the research about deep vs. surface learning and the designing down approach to creating curriculum and assessments of student learning.

Deep vs. surface learning

How might we teach for learning that is evidence of a deep understanding of key conceptions, in contrast to learning that skips over the surface of ideas? This question has been the subject of a unique set of experiments on students' experiences of learning, initiated in Sweden in the late 1970s (Marton, Hounsell, and Entwistle, 1984; 2nd edition, 1997). These studies caught the attention of adult education researchers in the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada (Ramsden, 1988), and the United States (Marchese, 1997), and continue to be an inspiration for educational reform, including a plan for a proposed 21st century university outlined in *The University of Learning: Beyond Quality and Competence in Higher Education* (Bowden and Marton, 1998).

In an early experiment, the disjunction between what higher education faculty value in learning and what students actually learn became evident. Mechanical engineering students with a background in physics, when asked what forces act on a car traveling along a road in a straight line at a constant speed, relied on an Aristotelian conception for their explanation and not Newton's Laws of Motion, although they could summarize these with ease when asked to do so (Johansson, 1983). Beyond the obvious disconnect between schooled learning and its application to everyday phenomenon, a series of related experiments led researchers to an unexpected finding: students' conceptions of knowledge affect their approaches to learning and what they actually learn. The researchers drew a distinction between quantitative conceptions and qualitative conceptions of knowledge. For students who equate learning with a trivial pursuits conception of knowledge, dominant in the culture and in education where an emphasis on coverage rewards "how much" a student knows, one listens and reads to accumulate details and facts. By contrast, an approach to learning that is qualitative focuses on the deeper meaning and complexities of ideas. The opportunity to challenge students' conceptions and to examine fewer ideas in greater depth from the vantage point of multiple perspectives has long been the appeal of interdisciplinary studies and curriculum integration. The first exercise with stickies helps faculty begin to name what those ideas might be.

A "designing down" approach

The process with sticky notes also introduces faculty to a "designing down" approach to curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment (Stiehl and Lewchuk, 2000) or "backward design" (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998). We

invite faculty to think about what students need to be able to do after they finish a course, and what that means in terms of what students should learn to be able to do within the course. The designing down method helps faculty develop a common way of thinking about student learning outcomes—applicable to all courses, programs and the entire campus—through the use of a reiterative heuristic that builds on the academic tradition of inquiry-based, active learning. It reverses the usual practice of organizing what is to be learned by first grouping academic topics or themes together, then figuring out the contribution of each discipline, and then deciding the sequence of readings, seminars and lectures, followed by the development of student assignments. By contrast, the designing down approach focuses on intended student outcomes from the beginning, and it is this clarity of purpose that informs curriculum planning, teaching and assessment-as-student learning.

Essential Integration of Expectations for Student Learning

In the third step of the heuristic, we purposefully move from individuals' specific experiences and aspirations for student learning toward the possibilities for negotiated collaboration. In an effort to break away from the "behind closed door" world of teaching and move toward the discovery of common ground for integrating learning, we invite faculty to do a very simple thing. Teams are sitting in two's or three's or four's, depending on the circumstances of their institutions. We invite them to put their stickies up on a piece of newsprint, one at a time, reading it aloud to the group. If someone has a related sticky, they post it next to the initial one. In this way, the team begins to make a poster of their combined stickies, clumping and clustering those that seem related, saving outliers for later conversations. The beauty of the stickies is that they are moveable, so multiple drafts are possible. As well, every team member has his or her own individual stack to contribute to the collective whole. In effect, team members are comparing the results of their private "designing down" inquiries, and creating a collective one that incorporates elements from each. These rough drafts of clusters of related ideas form the skeleton for their joint curriculum planning.

Schedules: Making a Space for Integrated Learning

Conversations among faculty about teaching and learning, however rewarding, eventually need to move from exploratory anecdotes to intentional planning, especially if faculty are serious about designing integrated learning for diverse students. Furthermore, in the excitement of finding common ground as teachers, it is critical for teams to talk about *time* in at least two ways. First, they need to be explicit about what their teaching schedules allow in terms of curricular integration. Team-taught coordinated studies programs have the luxury of blocks of time together, but many other forms of learning communities are based on cohort registrations rather than shared time for faculty in the classroom. Furthermore, not all linked

classes are taught back-to-back, which may mean that faculty will have to create occasions outside their regular schedules to bring everyone together. Teams need to be clear about whether they are working towards a single integrated assignment that may include one joint meeting of two classes, or a more fully integrated set of assignments. Again, our intent is not to judge the level of integration possible, but rather to help people stay focused on working with the conditions they find themselves in. The other dimension of schedules that needs to be discussed is individual faculty's ideas about best uses of students' time in any shared sessions—how much lecturing, how much discussion, and how many workshops. This step often feels extremely prosaic, but faculty say it is worthwhile to have these practical conversations.

Assignments as Assessments/Designing Down

The exercise introducing this section of the heuristic asks us to analyze our “products of work”, that is assignments, in relation to the “products of work” we receive from our students. During workshops we encourage a frank account of what works well and what needs a lot of work, since in the *doing* of assignments by both faculty and students, student learning is assessed; what students understand and how well they understand it is deeply connected to our teaching practices. K. Patricia Cross once remarked in a keynote address that assessment is the “zipper” that connects teaching and learning. Well-crafted assignments are opportunities to discover what students know and can do and, hence, what we need to do better to support their personal and intellectual development.

The paradigm shift Alverno College faculty made in their practice of assessing student learning rests on whether students “possession” of knowledge is being evaluated/tested or their “use” of knowledge is being assessed (1994). A story associated with early work in authentic assessment illustrates the radical difference between testing and assessment. The problem is familiar: a faculty member is trying to design an exit exam, in this instance one that would evaluate students enrolled in a two-year education administration program. What to do? The instructor, noticing the in-box on a desk, invents a deceptively simple assignment: she designs an assessment based on an imaginary administrator's fictitious inbox, creates items, some contentious and very hot, others more routine, puts them in a manila envelope, gives an identical envelope to each student and asks them to explain what item(s) they would deal with first, why, and how.

In the context of intellectual work, Newmann & Associates, in *Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality* (1996), define authentic academic achievement in relation to “three criteria critical to significant intellectual accomplishment: the construction of knowledge, disciplined inquiry, and the value of achievement beyond school” (pp. 23-24). The Committee on the Foundations of Assessment, National Research Council (2001) argues that assessments of

academic achievement need to be based on the most current knowledge about human cognition and learning, specifically “on how students represent knowledge and develop competence in a domain” (p.54). As faculty, we want to know how this particular person will use what s/he knows in these particular circumstances; we are keen to assess substantive learning, to find evidence of a developmental process at work. Biggs encourages faculty to assess level of understanding using various formats—presentations, projects, case studies, reflective journals, and portfolios (1999, pp. 178-185).

This section on assignments as assessments builds on earlier work with sticky-notes, where teams have identified, clustered and mapped commonly held expectations for student learning on flip-chart paper. At this point, teams have agreed on some common learning outcomes, they have ideas about what constitute powerful experiences of learning, and they are aware of the time constraints they are working with. In designing an assessment, we ask faculty to reflect on how they would know students have achieved the intended outcomes and what constitutes evidence of learning. With some groups, we brainstorm possible ways students can demonstrate learning, from multiple choice exams to essay exams, to papers and presentations, to community-demonstration projects, and we encourage faculty to move one step along the continuum towards more authentic assessments, from whatever place they are starting.

We design down or unpack the knowledge and abilities students would need to be successful in providing evidence of learning, considering the following three questions: 1) what are the key conceptions, methods of inquiry, abilities/skills, values and habits of mind associated with the intended outcome? 2) What learning experiences are necessary to prepare the student? 3) What must students be able to do before engaging in this work? We facilitate with caution, using the language faculty use, translating outcomes talk into “evidence of learning” talk. The intuitive quality of the designing down process is appealing for faculty who are able to envision a certain kind of learning for their students “out there” but who are not sure what this implies for curriculum design.

Conclusion: Necessary Next Steps

We have heard from faculty on many campuses that this approach to designing integrated learning is effective, but our work with faculty focuses mostly on the creation of assignments and courses. The next step in our own professional development is to invent strategies for following up with faculty teams, inviting them to reflect on the work they do after this initial planning process. Because we work with many institutions that critical step of follow-up has been difficult. To that end, we are exploring ways to work with faculty at our home campus to adapt course portfolios to help document learning, their own and that of their students. Our experience as teachers and our conversations with faculty remind us that the particularities of who is present in our classrooms,

including our colleagues, mixed with the intention of teaching and learning *something*, is never straightforward and endlessly fascinating—the stuff that leads to the

References

- Alverno College Faculty. (1994). *Student assessment-as-learning at Alverno College*. Alverno College.
- Arendt, Hannah. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Bowden, J. and Marton, F. (1998). *The university of learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Finkel, D.L. and Arney, W.R. (1995). *Educating for freedom: The paradox of pedagogy*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Johansson, B. (1983). Forces in motion: Technological students conceptions of some basic phenomena in mechanics. *Reports from the Department of Education*, 14, University of Göteborg, Sweden.
- Marchese, Theodore J. (1997). The new conversations about learning: Insights from neuroscience and anthropology, cognitive science and work-place studies. In *Assessing Impact: Evidence and Action* (pp. 79-95). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Marton, F., Hounsell, D. and Entwistle, N. (eds) (1984). *The experience of learning*. Scottish Academic Press: Edinburgh.
- National Research Council. (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. Committee on the Foundations of Assessment, J.W. Pellegrino, N. Chudowsky, and R. Glaser (Eds.). Board on Testing and Assessment, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Newmann, F. M. and Associates (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ramsden, P. (ed) (1988). *Improving learning: New perspectives*. Kogan Page: London.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Shulman, L. (1989). Toward a pedagogy of substance. *AAHE Bulletin* 41 (10): 8-13.
- Smith, B.L. (1986). Director's letter—Working together to improve undergraduate education. *Washington Center News* Vol.1(1).
- Smith, B.L. (2001). The challenge of learning communities as a growing national movement. *Peer Review*, Vol.3/4 (4/1): 4-8.
- Stiehler, R. and Lewchuk, L. (2000). *The outcomes primer: Reconstructing the college curriculum*. The Learning Organization: Corvallis, Oregon.
- Wiggins, G. and McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Merrill Education/Prentice Hall.

questioning of assumptions and critical reflective inquiry, which is at the heart of faculty development practice.

Designing Integrated Learning for Students **Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education**

This exercise explores possibilities for integrating student learning on your campus with the aim of discovering what is *doable*. After setting the groundwork for collaboration, from what matters most to us as educators to our expectations for student learning, we work with you and at least one other partner—using courses currently taught—to create enriched learning opportunities for students enrolled in two or more classes. From designing a shared activity/assignment to a capstone project, the emphasis is on how to work in ways so that new opportunities for learning can be tried on your campus in the next quarter or semester.

You will need your class schedule for the coming term, office hours and days/times of any standing obligations (e.g. meetings). For reference, you may want to bring your course syllabus.

Supplies

Index cards, pads of “2x2” or “2x3” sticky-notes, flip-chart paper, felt marking pens, masking tape, sticky dots.

1. Personally engaging learning

Take a moment to reflect on your own *powerful experiences of learning* at any age, either inside or outside school. Based on an experience that first comes to mind, do a ‘quick write’ on an index card, noting what you learned. Share brief accounts of these experiences with your teaching partners (or in 2s or 3s); identify key points/common threads and write these on flip-chart paper and post. Circulate and read colleagues’ posters. Choose

three points from among those posted that you would like to emphasize in designing integrated learning opportunities for students; mark these with sticky dots.

2. Passions and aspirations for students’ learning

In the context of your discipline, field or program area, what questions, issues, inquiry, and/or learning do you care deeply about? What *enduring learning* do you want students to gain from studying and working with you? Select a course/program that will be the starting-point for designing integrated learning. Think of actual students and imagine their lives, three or more years from now, in multiple contexts (further education, workplace,

community, family, another country, etc.). *What do you want students to know and be able to do as a result of their participation in the course?* Write each of your responses to this question on a sticky-note (one point per note). Treat this as a brainstorming activity, getting down as many responses as you can (try to avoid single word responses).

3. Essential integration of expectations for student learning

Compare sticky-notes with your potential teaching collaborator(s); share expectations and make new sticky-notes if new expectations come to mind during your conversation. Cluster and chunk sticky-notes on a sheet of flipchart paper and look for meaningful connections (related themes, issues, concepts, expected understanding, habits of mind, abilities, skill sets, attitudes, etc.). Move sticky-notes around until the clusters make sense to everyone. Label clusters using additional sticky-notes or marking pens; take time to find the appropriate words that best describe the expectation for learning that is common to the cluster. Set sticky-notes to the side which do not represent genuine common ground. You will be using this flip-chart sheet as a working diagram for designing assignments so make sure it is clear and well organized.

4. Schedules: Making a space for integrated learning

Make a schedule that details your typical week: class times, office hours, any standing obligations, etc. Share schedules with your partner(s). Pour over your schedules to find any common time when students and faculty could meet face-to-face as *a community of learners*. Your task is to either find time or *make time*, even if it falls outside of scheduled classes and office hours. Be very specific about total time available (e.g. one hour on most Thursdays, total 10 hours; one two-hour block in total on such-and-such a day). Make a diagram showing this 'common time.' Identify a time each week when you could meet with your partner(s) to plan, assess, and reflect on work. Use sticky-notes for details and place on flip-chart diagram.

5. Assignments as assessments: Designing down for integration

In the context of student work and your passions and aspirations for student learning, what stands out as a good assignment and why? What's been your experience of unsuccessful assignments? Do a 'quick write' on an index card and share your insights with your partner(s). Pairing with another team, discuss this question: *what are the characteristics of good assignments?* Write key points on flip-chart paper and post. Read colleagues' work and use sticky dots to identify five essential characteristics.

With the sticky-note diagram of shared expectations for student learning in team members' view,

brainstorm possibilities for integrated student learning, using the diagram as a common reference. After generating a number of ideas, choose one to work with that is appropriate for the time you have available for face-to-face learning. Invent an assignment where students will be able to provide evidence of learning, where they can 'use what they know.' Consider these questions: Does the assignment foster personal engagement (see exercise 1)? Is the assignment designed with the characteristics of 'good' assignments in mind? Is what you care deeply about present?

Adopting a student's perspective, use the method of 'designing down' from the integrated learning assignment to create a sequence of work/assignments so all students have opportunities to develop the understanding and required abilities to do well: what themes, issues, and concepts do they need to know and understand? what habits of mind, abilities, skill sets do they need to practice? Highlight these on your diagram.

Think of actual students who have studied with you: are there abilities they bring to doing this assignment? What do they need to *really* work on? Do a 'quick write'; share with your partner(s). Where will this learning occur—during my class time? In time set aside for collaboration? Return to the time schedule and map out the implications.

Choose a day/time to meet to continue planning. At this meeting refine your assignment to fit the circumstances of your work. Plan to address this question: How will we encourage students' self-reflection and articulation of their own learning needs/experiences?

Emily Decker Lardner and Gillies Malnarich,
Co-Directors

**Washington Center for Improving the
Quality of Undergraduate Education**

Library 2211

The Evergreen State College

Olympia, WA 98505

www.evergreen.edu/washcenter

(360) 867-6611
