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Purpose

- Collaborative Learning
- Faculty Perspective
- Essential Learning Outcome
  - Personal and Social Responsibility
Today’s Agenda

• Literature Review
• Research Questions
• Data Source and Method
• Findings
• Future Research
• Q&A
Literature Review

• Liberal Education
• Collaborative Learning
• Associated Student Gains
  • Practical skills and diversity
  • Personal and cognitive development
• Role of Faculty
Research Questions

• To what extent is the use of collaborative learning as a teaching method affected by course characteristics (e.g., enrollment size, course level, and disciplinary area)?

• To what extent is the use of collaborative learning as a teaching method affected by faculty characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, and rank)?

• To what extent is collaborative learning associated with the promotion of personal and social responsibility?
Data Source

• Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
  Survey designed to complement NSSE and to measure faculty expectations for student engagement in educational practices that are known to be empirically linked with high levels of learning and development

• 2011 administration more than 19,000 faculty from 154 institutions participated

• Two Survey Options (Course-Based)
Core Survey Items

- Faculty perceptions of how often students engage in different activities.
- The importance faculty place on various areas of learning and development.
- The nature and frequency of faculty-student interactions.
- How faculty members organize their time, both in and out of the classroom.
Core Survey Items

- Time spent reflecting on ways to improve teaching
- To what extent they structure their selected course section so that students learned and developed:
  - Working effectively with others
  - Learning effectively on their own
  - Understanding themselves
  - Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
- Personal and Social Responsibility ($\alpha=0.83$)
Core Survey Items

- Selected course characteristics
- Demographics
- Other academic characteristics
Extra Item Set

Faculty Uses of Collaborative Learning  \( (\alpha=.78) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give a course presentation with a group of other students</td>
<td>Never, Sometimes, Often, Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange feedback with other students to prepare course assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn course material by asking and answering questions of other students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a paper with other students for course credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a study group for your course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange feedback with other students after taking an exam (e.g., debating correct answers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample

N=1,434
25 institutions

Institutional Characteristics

Carnegie
  Research 16%
  Master’s 40%
  Baccalaureate 36%

Private 68%
HBCU 28%
Size (1,000-9,999) 76%

Demographics

Race/Ethnicity
  Asian 5%
  Black 16%
  Latino/Hispanic 3%
  White 73%

Women 48%

Academic Characteristics

Rank
  Full 25%
  Associate 26%
  Assistant 28%
  Part-time 24%
# Sample: Selected Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General education requirement</strong></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper division</strong></td>
<td>828</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of selected course section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 students</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50 students</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 students</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplinary area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and humanities</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and other professionals</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

1. Frequencies

2. OLS Regression
   - Model 1
     - DV: Collaborative Learning ($\alpha=0.78$)
     - IV: Demographics, academic, and course characteristics
   - Model 2
     - DV: Personal and Social Responsibility ($\alpha=0.83$)
     - IV: Collaborative Learning, demographics, academic, and course characteristics
   - DV standardized and IV grand mean-centered
### Findings: Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Uses of Collaborative Learning</th>
<th>Often/ Very Often (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write a paper with other students for course credit</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a study group for your course</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange feedback with other students after taking an exam (e.g., debating correct answers)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give a course presentation with a group of other students</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn course material by asking and answering questions of other students</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange feedback with other students to prepare course assignments</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: Model 1

• Course characteristics
  • GEC (+), More than 50 students (---)
  • Disciplinary area\(^1\): EDUC (+), BUS, ENGR, PROF (++)

• Demographics
  • Women (+)
  • Race/ethnicity\(^2\): Black(++) , Latino (+), Other (++)

• Other academic characteristics
  • Full-time (+)
  • Time spent reflecting on teaching practices (+)

\(^1\) Reference group was biological sciences
\(^2\) Reference group was White faculty
# Findings: Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Emphasis on Personal and Social Responsibility</th>
<th>Often/ Very Often (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing a deepened sense of spirituality</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding themselves</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: Model 2

- Course characteristics
  - Lower division (-), GEC (++)
  - Disciplinary area\(^1\): EDUC, PROF (+++), ENGR, PROF, OTHR, A&H, SOC (++) , BUS (+), PHYS (-)

- Demographics
  - Women (+)
  - Race/ethnicity\(^2\) : Asian, Black (+)

- Other academic characteristics
  - Time spent reflecting on teaching practices (+)
  - Faculty Uses of Collaborative Learning (+)

\(^1\) Reference group was biological sciences
\(^2\) Reference group was White faculty
Lessons Learned

• Some CL techniques are used more than others
• Course context and faculty characteristics matter
• Additional support and time to incorporate CL
• Part-time faculty may especially need additional help
• CL positively linked to promoting an essential learning outcome
Future Research

• Differences exist by gender and race

• Discretionary time of part-time faculty and teaching practices

• Effect of institutional characteristics

• Differences among faculty at PWIs and HBCUs
Questions?

• Email: fsse@indiana.edu
• Phone: (812) 856-5824
• FSSE Web site: www.fsse.iub.edu