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**Case Study #1**

Herreid, C. F. (2021). A case of cheating? *National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science*. Department of Biological Sciences. Retrieved from: <https://sciencecases.lib.buffalo.edu/files/cheating.pdf>.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Criteria** |
| Overview | Margaret Blake, a professor in introductory physics at Metropolitan College, was informed by Paula, one of her students, that two of her Asian students, Charles and Bill, were cheating while the professor left during the quiz. Paula was upset with this because she studied hard all semester to receive A's. Since it was the last quiz of the semester and the last day of class, there was not much that the professor could do. However, because the student's final exam would be held that Friday, the professor explained to Paula that the students would not sit in groups to cheat and to express her concern on the peer evaluation sheet at the end of class.  Professor Blake's teaching approach was different from other professors. She believed in team learning, a cooperative learning approach that allowed students to work collaboratively in groups. She created six heterogeneous groups with five students in each group (which were chosen based on student responses at the beginning of the semester- major and grade point average). At the beginning of each class, students had time to ask questions and then completed a mini quiz on scantrons and discussed answers within their group, utilizing their textbook as a resource. Since the groups worked at their own pace, some groups would complete their quizzes faster, speaking about their answers aloud. This became a concern once professor Blake had to stop Charles' group (group 2) from speaking aloud after their quiz as Bill's group (group 3) could overhear.  At the end of class, professor Blake had her students complete the peer evaluation survey as she pulled to speak to the students (Bill) who scored below grade point average and could not adjust to her teaching style. Everyone in Bill's group scored him below the passing score on the peer evaluation sheet, indicating that he did not put in the effort and was frequently late, except Thomas, one of professor Blake's prior students who had failed the introductory physics course and had to retake it. Charles was another student who received a low evaluation score from his group members with accusations of cheating, lack of focus, and tardiness. However, professor Blake could not prove that the students were cheating, other than the peer evaluation responses. She knew she had many options but did not know which approach to take with the accusations of students cheating |
| Needs Analysis | Brown and Green (2020) explain that the first step in a needs assessment is defining the audience and the type of data needed to be collected about the audience. The focus in this case study is twofold; professor Blake's teaching approach and her students cheating. The professor's team learning approach did not go as planned, and her objective was not met. All of her students were not collaborative and did not influence positive habits or behavior on each other. Even though professor Blake's intentionality was to enhance student engagement and learning, not all her students enjoyed learning this way nor grasped the content required. The students may have been treated equally (as they all were in equal groups accomplishing the same task together) with this teaching approach; however, equity was missing. Professor Blake may have to rearrange her teaching approach yearly based on the students' interests and learning style and form positive relations with and between her students by instilling trust, a love for learning, and a positive classroom environment to reach her goal of collaborative learning and students not cheating in the classroom. |
| Task  Analysis | Morrison et al. (2012) emphasize that task analysis can be referred to in many ways; content analysis, subject matter analysis, or learning task analysis. However, regardless of which terminology is being utilized, the main purpose is to gather information about the content and/or tasks that need to be a part of the instruction being developed. Equity must be formulated in the classroom. Professor Blake was trying to create a positive classroom environment where collaboration and student motivation were vital to student learning. However, because the equity piece was missing (giving each student access to the resources they need to learn and thrive), the goal was not met.  Bill and Charles did not enjoy learning through constant group work, answering scantron questions, and reviewing answers from a book. In order to meet all her students, a variety of e-learning evidence-based teaching practices can be implemented. Forms of e-learning can be digital visuals, graphs, one-on-one, video-based, app-based, article-based (Clark & Mayer, 2016). Professor Blake can create lesson plans utilizing Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Utilizing this framework in her teaching approach will allow her students with varying needs and racial backgrounds to become involved in learning through hands-on or digital lessons that address diversity, flexibility, and equity in the classroom (CAST, 2021). |
| Learner Analysis | Brown and Green (2020) explain that an effective learning analysis is understanding if the human needs are being met, whether the learners are choosing to participate in the instruction or if they are obligated to, and if the data collected during the analysis is being utilized to create a learning environment conducive to the students' needs. All of professor Blake's students would have succeeded in the course if she worked collaboratively with them. By listening to their needs and interests and observing their learning styles, the students would have been exposed to a classroom environment full of engagement, trust, cultural understanding, and a love of learning. Lastly, by being present in the classroom and showing encouragement and positive affirmations, her students, especially Bill, Thomas, and Charles, would have been motivated to do well and ensure that they were on time to class (or express why they were late). Communication would be clear and sincere throughout the semester. |
| Goals-  Objectives | Goal (general statements of desired learning): To have all of her students with varying needs and backgrounds become involved in learning through hands-on or digital lessons that address diversity, flexibility, and equity in the classroom by utilizing UDL as the teaching framework and encouragement for motivation.  Performance Objective: Condition, Behavior, Criteria- (What students will be able to do when they complete the instruction).  Objective 1: Address diversity and learning needs by incorporating hands-on, digital, one-one-one, small group, lecture, and student-centered lessons based on students learning styles and levels.  Objective 2: Acknowledge flexibility and allow student learning choice by providing specific targeted differentiated activities to meet the required standards.  Objective 3: Increase student motivation by using words of affirmation, supporting students through their learning journey, and providing guidance when and as needed.  By implementing this goal and following through with these objectives, a positive culture and climate will form, trust will be instilled, and the willingness to learn will increase. |

**Case Study #2**

Herreid, C. F. (2006). Paul Seymour, assistant professor: A dilemma case in teaching. *National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science*. Department of Biological Sciences. Retrieved from: <http://sciencecases.lib.buffalo.edu/cs/files/seymour.pdf>.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Criteria** |
| Overview | Dr. Paul Seymour, an assistant professor in his third semester of teaching molecular evolution at State University at Chicago, was devastated by his first-ever student survey responses for the course. The students did not enjoy the "collaborative learning" teaching approach that Paul acquired from Dr. Mary Craxton, his postdoctoral mentor. His students indicated that they disliked group discussions, papers, and tests, and completing case studies. Students spread their dislike of the course to other professors in the Department of Integrative Biology, and word spread to Professor David Montague, the chairman. Paul was distressed and disappointed as he believed the collaborative learning approach would be successful and worked hard to implement it in his course.  Before working at State University in Chicago, Paul worked under Torkel Gustafeson, a master physiological ecologist, while getting his doctoral degree at Duke University. Upon completion of his doctoral degree, Paul published ten articles for various journals. He continued his postdoctoral degree with Dr. Mary Craxton from John Hopkins University, where he gained his first experience with collaborative learning. Paul was inspired by Dr. Craxton's course structure and found the discussions and active participation fascinating. When he began teaching at State University, he incorporated the same course structure and collaborative learning approach in his courses. His course grading entailed 50% individual work and 50% group work with peer evaluation being a part of the grade. |
| Needs Analysis | Dr. Paul Seymour's students and department faculty members disliked his course structure and integration of collaborative learning. His students' request for change was in demand for a traditional syllabus and lectured-based classes. In addition to this, Paul has not been producing much grant writing for chairman Montague. These two stressors are the main foci of this needs analysis.  Brown and Green (2020) explain that the importance of a needs assessment is determining the missing gaps from anticipated goals and objectives by collecting information to create change. To fill in the missing gaps, Paul can speak with his students individually (if students accept) to discuss their likes and dislikes of the course and how they think it can be improved. If his students do not accept, Paul can send an anonymous survey with specific open-ended questions to help tailor the course instruction.  Paul can also speak with his department faculty members on the importance of collaborative learning and attend further professional development/training on the teaching approach. The faculty members can then observe any of Paul's collaborative learning lessons. This may alter some of the faculty members' traditional ways of thinking and teaching. Lastly, Paul can produce specific literature on the impact collaborative learning has on students and include evidence-based practices in the grant writing for chairman professor Montague. |
| Task  Analysis | Brown and Green (2020) describe task analysis as collecting information/data on the relationship between content and activities. Jonassen et al. (1999) explain that task analysis helps determine the learning goals and objectives, what tasks, skills, or goals should be taught. If Paul was to conduct a topic analysis, he could meet with the department faculty members to revisit the syllabus to see if the current activities he is implementing in the classroom align with the curriculum. The professors can also work together to create activities in order to expand their traditional teaching models and methods. In a procedural analysis, Paul can consider the students' responses and revamp the course, collaboratively setting norms and expectations of students and professor. Lastly, by conducting a critical incident analysis, Paul can review previous specific lessons with student feedback and utilize the data for change. |
| Learner Analysis | In order to initiate positive outcomes, change must occur from all stakeholders. Brown and Green (2020) explain that learner analysis is a critically important component of the instructional design process because the goal is to understand and interpret learner characteristics in a way that helps the design of effective instruction. This means that the 40 students must understand their learning styles, and the professor must take their learning styles and incorporate them into his daily lessons (this can be accomplished by utilizing the UDL framework) to encompass equity and equality in the classroom. |
| Goals-  Objectives | Goal: To increase student and faculty members' understanding and knowledge of collaborative learning and integrate student feedback (needs and wants) into his teaching approach.  Objective 1: Promote positive perceptions of student-centered learning to all stakeholders by attending collaborative learning professional developments with other faculty members and sharing evidence-based best teaching practices (professional development fees would be covered by the university).  Objective 2:  Create differentiated lessons, mixing lecture-based and student-led activities by utilizing students' feedback for innovative and engaging lessons.  Objective 3: Conduct frequent reflections on lessons and student experiences. Have students’ complete surveys and reflections and compare and contrast experiences: review responses and tailor instruction based on responses. Collaboration and trust are critical to a thriving learning environment. |
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