

# ***BUSH BRIEFS***

*March, 2000*

Five Augustana faculty attended the February Collaboration Conference in Minneapolis **Sustaining Innovation: Content and Pedagogy for a New Century**. Two first-time attendees, Susan Bies and Sharon Gray, offer thoughts and insights on their conference experience.

## **Collaboration Conference Comments**

**by Susan Bies**

The Collaboration Conference was a great way to kick off my new administrative role with the Academic Development and Support Services

Department. I was able to interact with others from Augustana and from other educational centers.

## **Pre-Conference Workshop**

I chose to attend a pre-conference workshop called **Deciding to Decide** presented by Dorothy Engan-Barker, Ph.D. from Minnesota State University, Mankato. Dorothy's presentation allowed for plenty of dialog, activities and reflection. In brief, she guided us

through defining effective decision making, identifying the roots that influence choice, visualizing the future, and mapping the journey or implementing an important decision. This particular topic was timely and relevant as I had recently assumed new responsibilities.

## **Keynote Address**

Dr. Paul C. Light, vice president and director of governmental studies at the Brookings Institution and a Sioux Falls native, gave an enlightening and entertaining overview of sustaining innovation in organizations. He cited

organization, which realized it wasn't "just a zoo," but also a resource center and, more importantly, an entertainment venue competing for customers (families) like Valleyfair.

examples: one being the Minnesota Zoo as an

innovating organizations share these common characteristics:

- Has mission at the center of everything it does.
- Lowers barriers to new ways of thinking.
- Allows leaders to make mistakes so innovation can occur.
- Knows when to quit innovating.
- Has faith in the overall plan.

Dr. Light has determined that successful

I couldn't help but think of Augustana as possessing some of the characteristics of an innovating organization. Our five values now serve as guideposts for all of us as we relate to our varied constituents and to each other.

Other sessions I attended were very informative with plenty of interactive exercises. I returned to campus with a variety of beneficial materials and contacts.

## **Collaboration Conference Review**

by Sharon Gray

### **Keynote Address: Sustaining Innovation:**

#### **How Innovation Can Be An Extraordinarily Ordinary Event**

*Paul C. Light, VP and Director, Governmental Studies, Brookings Institution*

Light argued that *any* organization can innovate once. That's easy. The real trick is to innovate twice and beyond, making innovation an *ordinary* event. That requires putting the organization's mission at the center of everything the organization does. It requires lowering the barriers to new ideas, supporting

leaders who encourage mistakes, and knowing when to *stop* innovating. He elaborated on his last point, knowing when to stop innovating, adding that innovation for innovation's sake is counter-productive. It's important for an organization to be able to recognize when it is doing something well, and support that.

### **Closing Plenary Session: Keeping Teaching Innovation Alive**

*Marilla Svinicki Director, Center for Teaching Effectiveness*

Svinicki shared her ideas on ways to generate teaching innovations from the individual level through the course, content, and program levels on up to the institutional level. She stressed the following:

- Organizations should make innovation the norm, not the exception.
- Plan from the outset how you will

- It's important to pick a problem that you care about.
- Design for small and early successes and celebrate them.
- Involve others from the outset. Help them make a connection to your idea.
- Believe in your idea, but gather data.
- Scan the environment for support and ideas.

sustain your innovation.

She emphasized that change is influenced by motivation. Motivation is influenced by “task value” estimates, meaning the individual has to see the task as a valuable experience as well as something with a chance of success. If the

individual sees the task as either not a valuable experience, or as something with little chance of success, his or her motivation will be reduced.

**Teaching Styles, Personalities, and Distance Learning**  
**Dorothy Fuller, Rena Fay Norby, Kristi Pearce, Sharon Strand**  
**(all from Black Hills State University)**

The presenters reported on a pilot study they ran in which they found that some personality types are more compatible with (translate into “enjoyed”) online teaching. They used the Myers-Briggs assessment and the Gregorc inventory to determine individuals’ personality types and preferred means of “transacting” with their environment. They found that Myers-Briggs\* “J’s” were *least* likely to enjoy teaching online. The “E’s” and “N’s” appeared *most* likely to enjoy teaching online. In particular, the “INFP’s” and the “ENFP’s” were *most* satisfied with teaching online. Regarding the Gregorc\*\* inventory, the “randoms” (either concrete or abstract) were *most* likely to enjoy online teaching. Their point was that, by determining how various personality types respond to teaching online, more effective faculty development programs can be developed to assist faculty in making the transition to teaching online. (At the end of

the presentation, they shared a humorous website, “Myers-Briggs Type Prayers,” at <http://www.mmcom.com/demos/MBIPrayer.html>.)

\*A quick Myers-Briggs refresher→ After answering a barrage of questions, individuals tend to fall into the following categories: “Introversion-I” or “Extroversion-E”, “Sensing-S” or “Intuition-I”, “Feeling-F” or “Thinking-T”, and “Judgemental-J” or “Perceptive-P.” They are then said to be an “ISTJ” or an “ESFP” or another of the 16 possible combinations.

\*\*A quick Gregorc refresher→ Subjects are asked to rank words based upon first impressions. Based upon the answers, they tend to fall into four categories: “Concrete Sequential,” “Abstract Sequential,” “Abstract Random,” or “Concrete Random.”

**Growing Pains: Examining What Happens When Faculty Integrate Technology Into Their Teaching**  
**Kathy Heltzer, Paula Pedersen-Randall, and Helen Rallis,**  
**(all from the University of Minnesota-Duluth)**

The presenters gave examples of some of the obstacles and difficulties they encountered

language as technical support staff. They suggested having trouble-shooting guides in

integrating technology into their teaching. They spoke to the challenges posed by subject-matter experts not always speaking the same

pointed out, however, that often a faculty member does not have time to trouble-shoot a problem, even if the guide is available.) They also suggested having problem-reporting forms in those same classrooms so that problems encountered get reported and corrected. Some of their suggestions for integrating technology were

- Just because you CAN use technology does not mean you SHOULD.
- Less is often more.
- Start out badly.
- Get help.  
Plan ahead.
- Re-evaluate your teaching paradigm. (They asked, “Is your goal to help students learn or is it to look like you know what you are doing?”) Don’t be afraid to “start out badly.” (By this, they meant for faculty to

technology-enhanced classrooms, so that individuals encountering problems can trouble-shoot those problems themselves. (It was

*expect* that their first use of a particular technology will probably NOT be their best. In fact, one presenter encourages her students to create their idea of a “worst possible” web page. By doing so, the students learn a great deal about what to avoid in creating a *real* web page.)

- Recognize your own individual learning style, your own limits, and your own stage of technology learning.
- Accept that if something can go wrong, it probably will—but that is not necessarily bad (meaning such “failures” can provide unique “teachable moments”).

Their presentation is available at <http://www.d.umn.edu/~hrallis/ITSS/TechTeaching/GrowingPains.html>.

## Grader Agonistes, or How to Take the Pain Out of Grading

*Dr. Gary Henrickson and Deb Dusek (both from North Dakota State College of Science)*

(This session was my personal favorite!) Henrickson and Dusek chose a *very* unique way of presenting their session: Participants acted as a masked Greek Chorus (consisting of South Park characters, for some reason) for skits meant to drive home the idea of **committee grading** as a viable alternative to traditional grading. Henrickson and Dusek are faculty in the English department. They have found that many students are more “grade-oriented” than “learning-oriented.” Therefore, students often gloss over the instructor comments and go straight to the grade. If the paper is a final draft, it’s often

the following steps:

1. Students are provided with a clear rubric of criteria on which papers will be graded.
2. The students write four papers for their writing portfolios during the semester. Of those four papers, the students choose two they think are their best to submit to the committee for grading.
3. The instructor spends 10-12 minutes in an individual conference with each student regarding each of the

tossed with little notice of the instructor comments. Further, instructor comments tend to be negative rather than positive, making the instructor seem more of a judge than the coach. The presenters' solution is a committee grading process that consists of

the student, but the STUDENT writes comments on his or her own paper, rather than the instructor writing the comments. (If the student chooses not to write any comments, that is his or her prerogative.) Advice is given for fixing problems; however no grades are awarded until the end of the term. (The presenters suggested starting with the question, "What problems did you have with this paper?")

6. At the end of the semester, each instructor gets a folder with each student's two papers. (At North Dakota State College of Science, there are three instructors participating in the committee grading process, which means that each instructor will be grading two papers from their own students as

student's four papers.

4. During that conference, the student reads the paper aloud (often noticing their own mistakes).
5. The instructor provides feedback to

well as two papers from each of the other two faculty members' students.)

7. Each instructor reads each paper, but provides a grade for the total writing portfolio (both papers). Grades are awarded on a straight A-F scale, with no "pluses" or "minuses." (NOTE: this process takes considerably less time than when grading in a traditional manner, since no comments are written at this point.)
8. The three instructors grades are averaged to provide the final grade on each paper.

If anyone would like to see the forms (the grading rubric for the papers, the portfolio criteria, or the portfolio grading form) let me know and I'll send you copies.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Now available in the Faculty Resource Collection (in Ole's Oasis in Mikkelsen Library)*  
**Teaching at a Distance: A Handbook for Instructors LC 5800.T43 1999.** *This 92-page handbook offers a concise, straightforward introduction to distance education complete with a how-to section and a glossary. It provides step-by-step instructions for anyone creating a distance-education course whether it be offered via satellite links or over the Web. The book's seven chapters were written by different authors, all with solid distance-education credentials.*

\* \* \* \* \*

***Keep in mind that Bush Course Enhancement Project Grant and Cell Group proposals are due March 17. See the Bush Web Site for details:  
[http://inst.augie.edu/~ bush/](http://inst.augie.edu/~bush/).***