



**AFRICA CENTER
FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES**

AMEP Faculty Development Workshop

SYLLABUS

Antananarivo, Madagascar

18-22 June 2018



AFRICA CENTER FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES

AMEP Faculty Development Workshop

18-22 June 2018
Antananarivo, Madagascar

SYLLABUS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Africa Center	2-3
Overview	4
Map of Africa	5
Session 1: Faculty Development in African PME Institutions	6
Session 2: Cognitive Processing & Learning Styles	7-8
Session 3: Collaborative Learning Techniques	9
Session 4: Bloom's Taxonomy	10-11
Session 5: Rubrics	12-14
Session 6: Assessment and Evaluation	15-18
Sessions 7 & 8: Lesson Plan Overview and Practical Exercise	29-20

About the Africa Center

Since its inception in 1999, the Africa Center has served as a forum for research, academic programs, and the exchange of ideas with the aim of enhancing citizen security by strengthening the effectiveness and accountability of African institutions, in support of U.S.-Africa policy.

VISION

Security for all Africans championed by effective institutions accountable to their citizens.

Realizing the vision of an Africa free from organized armed violence guaranteed by African institutions that are committed to protecting African citizens is the driving motivation of the Africa Center. This aim underscores the Center's commitment to contributing to tangible impacts by working with our African partners – military and civilian, governmental and civil society, as well as national and regional. All have valuable roles to play in mitigating the complex drivers of conflict on the continent today. Accountability to citizens is an important element of our vision as it reinforces the point that in order to be effective, security institutions must not just be “strong,” but also be responsive to and protective of the rights of citizens.

MISSION

To advance African security by expanding understanding, providing a trusted platform for dialogue, building enduring partnerships, and catalyzing strategic solutions.

The Africa Center's mission revolves around the generation and dissemination of knowledge through our research, academic programs, strategic communications, and community chapters. Drawing on the practical experiences and lessons learned from security efforts on the continent, we aim to generate relevant insight and analysis that can inform practitioners and policymakers on the pressing security challenges that they face. Recognizing that addressing serious challenges can only come about through candid and thoughtful exchanges, the Center provides face-to-face and virtual platforms where partners can exchange views on priorities and sound practices. These exchanges foster relationships that, in turn, are maintained over time through the Center's community chapters, communities of interest, follow-on programs, and ongoing dialogue between participants and staff. This dialogue—infused with real world experiences and fresh analysis—provides an opportunity for continued learning and catalyzes concrete actions.

MANDATE

The Africa Center is a U. S. Department of Defense institution established and funded by Congress for the study of security issues relating to Africa and serving as a forum for bilateral and multilateral research, communication, exchange of ideas, and training involving military and civilian participants. (10 U.S.C 342)

About AMEP

The Africa Military Education Program (AMEP), established in 2013, is a United States Government program designed to contribute to the professionalization of African professional military education (PME) institutions. As the defense education component of Defense Institution Building (DIB), the program supports the capacity building of individual African professional military education and training institutions. AMEP is focused on faculty and curriculum in PME schools and tailored to meet partner nation education requirements. For faculty development, AMEP aims to improve the quality and efficacy of faculty instruction at partner nation PME institutions through trainings, workshops, and visits to U.S. PME institutions.

Overview

At the AMEP program workshop in Kigali on 1 November 2016, participating AMEP partners recommended the formation of a faculty development working group. This workshop is designed as the first iteration and will be conducted in both plenary and small group formats incorporating train-the-trainer' approaches. With a focus on addressing effective teaching methodologies designed to enhance student critical thinking, this first program of the workshop will review select learning principles and sound practices, learner characteristics and styles, and techniques to foster active learning. The program will cover teaching methods and assessment and evaluation techniques. Participants will practice and discuss the skills they learn and refine and relate them to previous and current teaching experiences and challenges. A concluding module will include lesson plan development: Each participant will apply the knowledge learned in previous sessions in the design and assessment of a lesson.

Anticipated Outcomes

The workshop will prepare participants to become better instructors and enhance faculty development programs in professional military education institutions. The workshop will also commence the process of building a community of interest/practice for faculty development while promoting networking and collaboration among AMEP partner nations.

Preparation, Delivery, and Resources

The workshop will feature presentations by experts and practitioners on faculty development. Interactive question-and-answer sessions will follow the presentations in each plenary session. Participants will be divided into discussion sections, where facilitators with relevant expertise and background will lead the interaction. As is customary, all activities will be conducted under a policy of strict non-attribution. This policy allows for candid and productive deliberations during and after the workshop.

Participants are provided with this syllabus, which discusses pertinent aspects of the various sessions and includes references to relevant publications. The syllabus serves to outline the flow of the workshop and set the stage for discussion group interactions. Neither the syllabus nor the readings represent the policy position of any government or institution. Rather, these documents serve as academic input for critical thinking and deliberation. The workshop will be conducted in English and French.

Session 1: Faculty Development in African PME Institutions

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Objectives

- Explain the linkage between PME and Military Professionalism
- Differentiate between core components of Faculty and Curriculum Development
- Identify commonalities and differences among African PME institutions as they inform faculty development

Background

Professional Military Education (PME) has long been associated with efforts to foster military professionalism, but quantifying or measuring the linkage is often difficult to calibrate. Leadership and ethics are just two examples of subjects that can potentially demonstrate such linkages, but effective knowledge transfer is more than the curriculum for those subjects or “what to teach.” The competence of the faculty conveying that information, “how to teach,” is pivotal to higher level learning.

Traditional methods of instruction often are informed by historical context—French-based education systems, British-based systems, etc. PME institutions by definition instruct adults, offering greater opportunities for peer-to-peer learning. Lectures with little interaction can now be augmented or substituted with collaborative learning techniques or other more active modes of learning that better engage adult students. Technology can sometimes assist through provision of simulation, audio, video, internet, etc., but in and of itself is not a substitute for quality instruction.

Discussion Questions

1. How concretely does PME support military professionalism? Provide examples.
2. Are there fundamental challenges among African PME institutions that inhibit faculty development? How important is technology?
3. What might be some sound principles and practices to shape the enhancement of faculty development?

Recommended Reading

Emile Ouédraogo, “Advancing Military Professionalism in Africa,” Africa Center for Strategic Studies, Africa Center Research Paper No. 6, July 2014. In English and French: <https://africacenter.org/publication/advancing-military-professionalism-in-africa/>

Session 2: Cognitive Processing & Learning Styles

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Objectives

- Comprehend and apply the sensory and cognitive learning styles
- Analyze how the learning styles apply to instructors and students

Background

This session addresses sensory and cognitive learning styles. Everyone learns differently. Some people learn through observation, and other learn through doing. Learning style inventories are a tool help people understand the learning process, their own learning preferences, and that people have different ways of learning. Learning styles are not a fixed trait, but instead a preference. It is how we perceive new information, and then how we process what we perceive. Sensory learning styles generally use four modalities that are applied to learning. The four modalities are visual, auditory, read/write, and kinesthetic. Cognitive learning styles are described as the information processing habits of an individual. It is the typical mode of thinking, perceiving, remembering, or problem solving. This session will also discuss Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle, and the Command and General Staff College Experiential Learning Model.

Two learning style questionnaires will be administered to all participants. After participants complete their learning styles questionnaires, we will break into four small groups for a practical exercise and group discussion. The learning style questionnaires create self-awareness for the instructor, as well as an awareness of their students' different learning styles in the classroom. A greater understanding of the different learning styles allows the instructor and course developer to design and instruct classes that accommodate multiple learning styles within the classroom.

Discussion Questions

1. What are learning styles?
2. What are the strengths and limitations associated with learning styles?
3. How can you use learning styles in your institution to improve teaching and learning?
4. How do you characterize the way in which you learn?
5. What do you think is your greatest strength and weakness as a learner?
6. Did your learning style predictions match the results of your learning style questionnaire?

Recommended Reading

McLeod, S. (2017). Kolb – learning styles. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/learning-kolb.html>

Zhong-Lin, L. (n.d.) Sensory learning. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/learning-kolb.html>

Cognitive/Learning Styles (2018). InstructionalDesign.org. Retrieved from <http://www.instructionaldesign.org/concepts/cognitive-styles/>

Cahey, R. Honorez, M. Monfort, B. Remy, F. Therer, J. Les styles d'apprentissage Une recherche du LEM (Laboratoire d'Enseignement Multimédia de l'Université de Liège) http://www.lem.ulg.ac.be/StyleApprent/StyleApprent_CG/media/StyleApprent.pdf

Session 3: Collaborative Learning Techniques

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Objectives

- Describe fundamental principles and concepts of collaborative learning
- Practice and employ appropriate activities, methods, media and interventions
- Recognize individual learner behaviors and preferences, group dynamics, and learning environment conditions

Background

Collaborative, group, or peer-to-peer learning has been widely recognized as having broad potential in adult learning environments such as PME institutions. Group learning is essentially different from individual learning because of the interactive nature of the knowledge construction process. Collaborative learning requires students to assume new roles and develop skills that are different from those they are accustomed to using in traditional classrooms. One of the key challenges in collaborative learning is ensuring individual accountability while promoting positive group interdependence.

This session focuses on describing, practicing, and optimizing several collaborative techniques in plenary and discussion sessions. Many collaborative learning techniques are available to instructors and students. Some techniques are widely known such as “think, pair, share;” others less so. Collaborative learning techniques should be tailored to the subject matter and the students.

Discussion Questions

1. What are the defining characteristics of effective learning groups?
2. How would you describe three different collaborative learning techniques?
3. What collaborative learning techniques do you believe are optimal for your institution? Why?

Recommended Reading

Arcand, D., Apprentissage coopératif. Available at:

http://www.tact.fse.ulaval.ca/fr/html/coop/2app_coo/cadre2.htm

Arcand, D., La formation de base en apprentissage coopératif. Available at:

<http://www.tact.fse.ulaval.ca/fr/html/coop/1projet/formatn.htm>

Barkley, Cross & Major (2014), *Collaborative Learning Techniques*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collaborative Learning Techniques (CoLTs) Quick Reference

<https://library.gwu.edu/sites/default/files/tlc/CoLT%20Quick%20Reference.pdf>

Session 4: Bloom's Taxonomy

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Session Objectives

- Describe the levels of learning, and knowledge types in Bloom's taxonomy
- Analyze the relationships among the taxonomy levels and the verbs used in the levels
- Describe how the taxonomy may be used for lesson design

Background

Education systems, military or civilian, must begin with decisions about what knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students should learn. For many years academics across university systems did not have a mechanism to share common expectations or outcomes of similar instructional programs. Benjamin Bloom, an American educational psychologist, led a group of education measurement experts to create a system of classification in order to enable sharing test items among universities. The original taxonomy was published in 1956 and has achieved widespread adoption as the foundation for writing curriculum outcomes and lesson objectives.

The taxonomy articulated categories of cognitive processes, simple to complex, associated with levels of learning for a particular topic. Completion of learning objectives in a topic at lower levels are prerequisite to attaining the higher levels of learning. For example, a student would need to comprehend a concept before they could analyze whether an example could be classified as that concept. A group of cognitive psychology researchers published an updated taxonomy in 2001. The authors updated the cognitive process definitions and added a second dimension, knowledge, to the taxonomy. The separation of the knowledge dimension permits users to more carefully align the cognitive process level with how knowledge is used, thereby improving the accuracy of educational objectives. This update also applied many years of cognitive psychology research that improved our understanding of how humans use different types of knowledge.

While the taxonomy has served as a guide for writing objectives, an equally important outcome has been focused effort to align the educational objectives, instructional strategies, and assessments in learning programs. This session will help participants examine how Bloom's taxonomy is used as the foundation for educational curriculums as well as how instructors should use the taxonomy to guide instructional and assessment activities.

Discussion Questions

1. What constructs, other than Bloom's taxonomy, may be used for writing lesson objectives?
2. What are the differences between using the taxonomy for curriculum design and lesson design?
3. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using the taxonomy.

Recommended Reading

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 55, 212-128. Retrieved from

<https://www.depauw.edu/files/resources/krathwohl.pdf>

Anne Clerc et Daniel Martin "L'étude collective d'une leçon, une démarche de formation pour développer et évaluer la construction des compétences professionnelles des futurs enseignants" *Revue internationale de pédagogie de l'enseignement supérieur* <https://journals.openedition.org/ripes/514>

Additional Reading

Anderson, L. W. & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy of learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Fink, D. L. (2013). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Neill, G. & Murphy, F. (2010). *Guide to taxonomies of learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/ucdtla0034.pdf>

Session 5: Rubrics

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Session Objectives

- Describe the types of commonly used rubrics;
- Identify the common elements of a rubric;
- Describe how rubrics are used as assessment and feedback tools;
- Construct different types of rubrics.

Background

This session addresses rubrics. Some of you may use these in your teaching, but some may not be familiar with the concept. “A rubric is a coherent set of criteria for students' work that includes descriptions of levels of performance quality on the criteria. It should be clear from the definition that rubrics have two major aspects: coherent sets of criteria and descriptions of levels of performance for these criteria.” The criteria and the performance descriptions are the critical components of a rubric.

When a rubric is well defined and articulated, learners know exactly what their instructors expect of them, how they can achieve success, and how their work is assessed. A rubric is also a formative type of assessment because it is part of the whole teaching and learning process. Rubrics can be descriptive or evaluative. The latter is probably the most common use of a rubric. If you or your institution have not used rubrics, this can be a daunting task. Our purpose today is to introduce you to the concept, demonstrate how to create one, and apply a rubric to an academic assignment.

We will discuss four types of rubrics. These are generic or general, criterion based performance lists, holistic, and analytic rubrics. The latter is the most detailed and the one we will emphasize in today's session. Generic rubrics contain criteria that are general across tasks and can be used for similar tasks or performances. Generic rubrics are useful when students will not all be doing exactly the same task and when students have a choice as to what evidence will be chosen to show competence on a particular skill or product. Criterion-based performance lists contain the criteria, elements, or traits of a performance. They do not contain a detailed description of the performance levels and may be judged simply as YES or NO. When using holistic rubrics, all criteria are assessed as a single score. Holistic rubrics are good for evaluating overall performance on a task. Because only one score is given, holistic rubrics tend to be easier to score. This type of rubric is useful for getting a quick snapshot of overall quality or achievement of a learner performance or product. Analytic rubrics assess each criterion separately, using different descriptive ratings. Each criterion receives a separate score. Analytical rubrics take more

time to score but provide feedback that is more detailed. Analytic rubrics provide information that is more specific and enhance the quality of feedback to students.

Susan M. Brookhart identified several significant benefits with rubrics. She concluded, “Rubrics give structure to observations. Matching your observations of a student's work to the descriptions in the rubric averts the rush to judgment that can occur in classroom evaluation situations. Instead of judging the performance, the rubric describes the performance. The resulting judgment of quality based on a rubric therefore also contains within it a description of performance that can be used for feedback and teaching. This is different from a judgment of quality from a score or a grade arrived at without a rubric. Judgments without descriptions stop the action in a classroom.” (See <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/112001/chapters/What-Are-Rubrics-and-Why-Are-They-Important%C2%A2.aspx>)

The rubric that you choose to use must assess what you set out to assess. Align your goals and your assessment for a true picture of what the student can do. Show the rubric to the students BEFORE they start to work on the product or performance. We will discuss and review various rubrics used by civilian and military institutions. We will continue to discuss the value of rubrics in the assessment and evaluation session that follows. Rubrics can be a positive addition to your faculty and for your students if properly developed and used.

Discussion Questions

1. What are rubrics?
2. What are the strengths and limitations associated with using rubrics?
3. How can you use rubrics at your institution to improve teaching and learning?

Small Group Exercises

- Server Rubrics (Plenary)
- “Using Rubrics” (Article Discussion) (Small Group)
- Develop Executive Summary Rubric (Small Group) (Applied in the Assessment and Evaluation session)

Required Reading

Korycinski, D. K. (2011) Using Rubrics.

https://www.usma.edu/cfe/Literature/Korycinski_11.pdf

Additional/Optional Reading

Arter, J., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: Using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Atkin, J. M., Coffey J. E. (2003) *Everyday Assessment in the Science Classroom*, Arlington: NSTA press

Brookfield S. D. (2006). *The skillful teacher _ on technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom*, San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Brookhart S. M. (2013) *How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading* (Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development) Alexandria, ASCD.

Dondelinger, S., & Reuter, B. (2015). Un outil d'évaluation formative et de remédiation pour les cours de tableur.

Goigoux, R., Jarlégan, A., & Piquée, C. (2015). Évaluer l'influence des pratiques d'enseignement du lire-écrire sur les apprentissages des élèves: enjeux et choix méthodologiques. *Recherches en didactiques*, (1), 9-37.

Petty, G. (2009.). *Teaching today* (4th edition). London: Nelson Thornes Ltd, UK.

Thomas A. Angelo, K. P. (1993) *Classroom Assessment Techniques A Handbook for College Teachers*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Stevens, D. & Levi, A. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics. As assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning*. Sterling: Stylus Publishing, LLC

Wilson, M. (2005). *Constructing measures: An item response modeling approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Session 6: Assessment and Evaluation

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Session Objectives

- Describe the ADDIE model
- Discuss the relationship between institutional outcomes, assessment, and evaluation
- Identify the three types of assessment
- Identify the four levels of the Kirkpatrick Evaluation Model

Background

This session is designed to address some of the critical concepts associated with curriculum development, design, and institutional effectiveness. We will address the relationship between learning outcomes, assessments, and evaluation. One of the most popular and most widely used models associated with curriculum development and institutional effectiveness is the ADDIE framework. ADDIE is the acronym for the five-step method associated with this model. The five steps, analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation, are iterative and continuous. Academic institutions use ADDIE to analyze and assess the quality and the effectiveness of their curriculum. The US Army's Command and General Staff College (CGSC), for example, uses this framework in its Accountable Instruction System. More than likely, all civilian and military educational institutions use a variation of this process.

The first step is analysis. During this step, the curriculum developer or designer needs to identify the problems or gaps in the curriculum that address institutional outcomes. It is also important during this phase to consider the learning environment and any constraints, limitations, or timelines linked to the curriculum. During the design phase, specific learning objectives are associated with the institutional outcomes. We should see this relationship in today's presentation. Once the outcomes and objectives have been outlined, the actual creation of the curriculum begins in the development phase. This is when the lesson plans associated with specific learning objectives in support of learning outcomes are created. Some institutions develop standardized lesson plans while others entrust their faculty to develop their own lesson plans based on department or institutional guidance. The implementation phase is somewhat self-explanatory. This is where the individual lesson plan is delivered to the students. The last stage is evaluation phase that consists of formative and summative assessments or evaluations that we will discuss in today's session. Typically, in accordance with the Kirkpatrick model, this is the phase where you evaluate the student responses to the courseware and compare it to the actual learning results. We will discuss the four steps of the Kirkpatrick model in today's session.

The US military's approach to professional military education is learner centric. This week's sessions demonstrate the importance and value of a learner centric environment. US Army institutions, for example, are "expected create and sustain a learner-centric environment by focusing on the dynamic interaction between faculty, students, and relevant outcomes-based programs of instruction or curricula." Learning outcomes can be articulated at the institutional, program, course, or lesson plan level. We usually identify lesson outcomes as objectives to distinguish them from outcomes associated with course and higher educational activities. A student learning outcome is essentially what students are expected to learn in a course or program. In today's session, we will see how the CGSC identifies its institutional outcomes and develops various learning objectives to support those outcomes. Good learning outcomes should identify what the students should know at the end of the course and what they should be able to do after completing the course or program of instruction. Effective learning outcomes should be observable, measurable, realistic, support the curriculum, focused on the learner, offer a timeline for completion, and linked to assessment.

But how do you know if you have achieved the desired learning outcome? This is where assessment and evaluation come into play. Assessment generally involves "the systematic collection, review, and use of evidence or information related to student learning." There are three basic assessment types. The first is a diagnostic assessment. Diagnostics are important to determine what learners already know and what they don't know about a specific topic or learning outcome. The second type is a formative assessment. These types of assessments help instructors adjust their approach to teaching and determine if their students are achieving the desired learning outcomes as the learning process unfolds. The last type is the summative assessment. This is usually a comprehensive evaluation to determine how well the student has achieved the desired outcomes. Summative assessments provide information needed to make informed judgments about the composition of the curriculum and if the students achieved the desired learning outcomes.

The summative assessment is one part of an overall evaluation of a course, program, or institutional learning outcome. Summative assessments provide an individual learner specific feedback on his or her strengths and weaknesses regarding the achievement of the learning outcome. From an institutional perspective, summative assessments provide valuable data to judge the quality and applicability of the institution's outcomes and to validate its curricula. When we address the "E" in the ADDIE model, it refers to the Kirkpatrick model described in today's session. There are four levels associated with the Kirkpatrick model. These include reaction, learning, behavior, and results. While Kirkpatrick model was originally conceived for training evaluation, it is often used with educational processes. Today, we will look at Level I as well as Level II to demonstrate how you can use this data to evaluate your curriculum. We will also discuss level III and level IV of the model but those generally are more difficult to implement and to assess.

As a result of today's session, you should be able to value the relationship between student learning outcomes, assessment, and evaluation and to apply what you have learned at your institution. Properly constructed student learner outcomes judiciously linked to the various types of assessments and evaluated based on Kirkpatrick's model should help contribute to effective educational programs. Of course, you should modify or adapt these educational ideas and concepts to meet your institution's unique circumstances.

Discussion Questions

1. What is assessment?
2. How do you assess your learners in your institution?
3. What are the three types of assessment?
4. What are some common classroom assessment techniques?
5. What are the strengths and limitations associated with assessment strategies?
6. What is evaluation?
7. How can you use evaluation practices at your institution to improve teaching and learning?

Small Group Exercises

- Assessment Standards Exercise (Plenary)
- Executive Summary Rubric (Small Group) (Read student sample, apply rubric from earlier session, discuss the results) 40 minutes max
- Rubric for rubrics (Handout)
- H100 (Sample rubric)
- Kirkpatrick exercise (Complete the worksheet and discuss ideas within small groups) 40 minutes max.

Required Reading

"Writing and Assessing Course-Level Student Learning Outcomes" (Excerpt from Texas Tech University)

ÉDUCATION, C. E. J. M., & Manitoba, J. (2006). *Repenser l'évaluation en classe en fonction des buts visés: l'évaluation au service de l'apprentissage, l'évaluation en tant qu'apprentissage, l'évaluation de l'apprentissage*, 2e éd. Winnipeg, MB: Gouvernement du Manitoba.

https://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/m12/frpub/me/docs/repenser_eval/docs/document_complet.pdf

Additional/Optional Reading

Angelo, T.A. & Cross, K.P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA:

Atkin, J. M., Coffey J. E. (2003) *Everyday Assessment in the Science Classroom*, Arlington: NSTApress

Brookfield S. D. (2006). *The skillful teacher _ on technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom*, San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Doughty R. (E) (2015) *Innovative Learning*, Fort Leavenworth: The Army Press

Évaluation des résultats d'apprentissage – Manuel Du Praticien Conseil Ontarien de la qualité de l'enseignement supérieur
http://www.heqco.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/HEQCO.LOAhandbook_Fre_2015.pdf

Honey, M. and Mumford, A. (2000). *The Learning Styles Questionnaire*. Peter Honey.

Jossey-Bass. Meyers, C. & Jones, T.B. (1993). *Promoting active learning: Strategies for the college classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kyriacou C. (2007) *Essential Teaching Skills*, Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes

Lakhal, S., Frenette, E., & Sévigny, S. (2012). Les méthodes d'évaluation utilisées à l'ordre d'enseignement universitaire dans les cours en administration des affaires: qu'en pensent les étudiants?. *Mesure et évaluation en éducation*, 35(3), 117-143.

Petty, G. (2009.). *Teaching today* (4nd edition). London: Nelson Thornes Ltd, UK.

Planification pédagogique Yvon Brunet, inf., M. Éd.
https://mpu.usj.edu.lb/ressources/plan-cours/references/Planification_pedagogique.pdf

Saphier J., Haley-Speca M. A., Gower R. (2008) *The Skillful Teacher - Building Your Teaching Skills, Research for Better Teaching*, Inc

Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Thomas A. Angelo, K. P. (1993) *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

URL

Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs): An Introduction
<http://www.psu.edu/celt/CATs.html> Overview of Several Common Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) <https://citl.indiana.edu/teaching-resources/assessing-student-learning/classroom-assessment-techniques/>

Session 7 - 8: Lesson Plan Overview & Practical Exercise

Format Plenary presentation
 Discussion groups

Session Objectives

- Identify the major sections of a lesson plan and the purpose of each section;
- Create lesson objectives;
- Determine the teaching and assessment techniques to achieve the lesson outcomes;
- Develop a lesson plan

Background

After curriculum designers finish creating a learning program and before the time when students experience learning, one must design the teaching and assessment activities that will facilitate learning. For the purposes of this workshop, we'll define a lesson as the smallest organizational grouping of learning and assessment activities in a learning program is called a lesson. Because instructors play a vital role in creating the learning activities and assessments, it is important that they understand how to create lessons that effective.

The cognitive learning process and principles from the science of learning research serve as the basis for the design and development of lessons. One will find many different lesson structures and varied naming conventions for lesson components; however, the most successful lessons will incorporate what we know about human learning to increase the effectiveness and the efficiency of the learning.

The basic components of each lesson include an overview of what will be learned and how learning will be measured, activities to introduce and practice using new knowledge, and assessment activities to measure progress toward the learning outcomes. Lesson plans will also have administrative information, such as lesson length and required materials, so that instructors know what is necessary to conduct the lesson.

These sessions will provide an overview of how to write a lesson, and how to align the learning objectives, teaching strategies, and assessment techniques. After discussing a sample lesson plan format, you will have an opportunity to apply everything learned in this workshop by designing a lesson and sharing your lesson with other workshop participants.

Discussion Questions

1. What advantages or disadvantages occur when your lessons must fit into a larger curriculum?

2. What are the most challenging aspects of aligning the instructional activities and assessment with the learning objectives?
3. Discuss ways to improve the current lesson format used in your institution.
4. How does knowledge of lesson development fit into a faculty development program?

Recommended Reading

Bowen, Ryan S., (2017). Understanding by Design. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved from <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/understanding-by-design/>

Cégep de Rimouski, (2004). Un plan de leçon un guide vers la réussite. Pédagogotruc no 26, vol.4 no. 1. C., Desbiens, J.-F., Martineau, S. et Presseau
http://www.cegestp.qc.ca/sites/default/files/deuxieme_numero_plan_lecon1.pdf

Levomaa, V., Lysyckina, I., & Hildenbrand, A. (2016). Lesson plans: Backward design and active learning in teaching gender. In Balon et al. (Eds.) *Teaching gender in the military handbook* (131-151). Geneva: DCAF and PfPC. Retrieved from
<https://www.dcaf.ch/sites/default/files/publications/documents/DCAF-PfPC-Teaching-Gender-in-the-Military-Handbook.pdf>

Additional Reading

Ambrose, S. (2014 August 22.) How learning works: 7 Research-based principles for smart teaching with Dr. Susan Ambrose. *Engineering Inclusive Teaching Series* . Videocast retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/104145226>

Ambrose, S., et al. (2010). How learning works: Seven research-based principles for teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from <http://firstliteracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/How-Learning-Works.pdf>

Dirksen, J. (2016). *Design for how people learn* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: New Riders.
 Fink, D. L. (2013). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rocheleau, J., (2011). LA MÉTHODE.
https://oraprdnt.uqtr.quebec.ca/pls/public/docs/GSC2611/F268932518_La_M_thod_e_Apte_finale_07_12_2011.pdf

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2006). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.