

## **The Large Enrollment Taskforce Final Report**

David Pruett (Performing Arts), Chair; David Areford (Art), Matthew Brown (English), Jessie Quintero (Communication) and Carol Smith (Psychology), Members

## **Table of Contents**

1. Purpose of Taskforce	(p. 3)
2. Preamble: Our Urban Mission and Commitment to Engaged Pedagogy	(p. 4)
3. Section One: Pedagogical Considerations and Recommendations	(p. 5)
4. Section Two: Workload Considerations and Recommendations	(p. 8)
5. Section Three: Logistical and Scheduling Considerations and Recommendations	(p. 12)
6. Appendix A: Links to LE Aids at Selected Universities	(p. 14)
7. Appendix B: Large Section CLA Survey: Past and Future Practices	(p. 19)
8. Appendix C: CLA Survey Results	(p. 21)

## **Taskforce Purpose**

In spring 2012, Dean McDermott proposed that CLA move from a 3:3 teaching load for tenure track faculty to a 2:2 load. After consultation with department chairs and the faculty Senate, it was decided to pilot this change in spring 2013 in ways that would be resource neutral. Each department was charged with developing a spring schedule that taught the same number (or more) students, while assigning tenure track faculty a maximum of two, rather than three sections, and not increasing the number of sections taught by NTT faculty. It was acknowledged that with the existing system of course load reductions, some departments already had close to a 2:2 schedule, which in part was what made this (formal) switch more feasible. However, some further adjustments would be needed, including: making some modifications to the current course load reduction system and ways of crediting undergraduate and graduate courses as well as offering more large section courses than CLA had previously done.

To understand and set guidelines for this change to a 2:2 teaching load, Dean McDermott in consultation with the faculty Senate created 5 Taskforces to examine and make recommendations about different aspects of this change. In summer 2012 the Taskforce on Large Enrollment (LE) Classes convened at the request of Dean McDermott to address three issues: 1) pedagogical concerns involved in expanding the CLA's offering of LE courses, 2) course load crediting concerns, to examine how faculty are compensated for teaching LE courses, and 3) logistical concerns of infrastructure such as technology and classroom availability.

The following report is the result of the Taskforce's five formal meetings, regular email exchanges from May through October 2012, thoughtful discussion, extensive data collection, and careful attention to both short term and long term goals for the university, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), and each department therein. Our deliberations have included researching "best practices" for teaching LE courses at a variety of other universities, soliciting feedback from all departments within the CLA about the type of LE courses they offer, the kind of TA support they have or would need, and the kind of crediting practices they have used in the past and would regard as appropriate in the future, discussing each facet of LE courses and 2-2 implementation, formulating our own conclusions, and verbalizing our concerns and suggestions to the dean. The Taskforce's report includes our recommendations on how to integrate more large enrollment courses into the curriculum in ways that support our continued commitment to our students and to an engaged pedagogy and that allow for departmental flexibility, transparency, fairness, equity, and systematic stability throughout the CLA as the college advances forward towards its short-term goal of implementing the 2-2 course load in spring 2013 and the university's long term goal of becoming a Research One institution.

## **Preamble: Our Urban Mission and Commitment to Engaged Pedagogy**

To set our report in context, it is helpful to remind ourselves of who we are, whom we teach, and what we value as an urban, public research institution. Throughout our 50-year history, our faculty have embraced not only the values of being creative scholars, but also engaged public citizens and effective teachers of a diverse student body, many of whom are the first in their family to graduate with a baccalaureate degree. We have been committed to creating vibrant learning communities, where diverse students felt included and respected, and where they are involved and challenged to develop new understandings and abilities that can transform their lives and enrich their communities. The current UMB mission statement reaffirms these ideals when it states:

The University of Massachusetts Boston is a public research university with a dynamic culture of teaching and learning, and a special commitment to urban and global engagement. Our vibrant, multi-cultural educational environment encourages our broadly diverse campus community to thrive and succeed. Our distinguished scholarship, dedicated teaching, and engaged public serve are mutually reinforcing, creating new knowledge while serving the public good of our city, our commonwealth, our nation, and the world.

The UMB campus was designed and built in the 1970s with mainly small classrooms on the assumption that one of the best ways to carry out that mission was through small classes where students could have a personal connection with their teachers and other class members. Although small class size does not guarantee an engaged pedagogy, and is not the only effective form in which to teach, it does make it more likely that faculty and students get to know each other as individuals. Clearly, there are both logistical challenges in moving to offering more LE classes (given the limited number of LE classrooms at UMB) and there are a variety of pedagogical challenges as well, especially if one goal is to create learning communities and a sense of connection for students. The following report reflects on these challenges, as well as considers some of the positive opportunities that can be afforded by large enrollment courses, and makes some recommendations about how to proceed in ways that we hope will encourage and support our faculty in their quest to maintaining teaching excellence.

## **Section One: Pedagogical Considerations and Recommendations**

In this section of the report, we provide an overview of the many pedagogical challenges of LE classes as well as some of the potential benefits that these courses offer. We conclude by providing key recommendations for the implementation of LE classes. A list of pedagogical resources for teaching LE courses is included as **Appendix A** to this report.

### ***Pedagogical Challenges Related to Large Enrollment Classes***

The Taskforce recognizes that LE classes pose many pedagogical challenges, including the potential that:

- a. students may feel “anonymous” and like their presence isn’t noticed or doesn’t matter,
- b. students may tune out during lecture (although small classes involve lecture, too),
- c. the larger class numbers may discourage teachers from engaging students in reflective or extensive writing,
- d. there will be less time for student questions, discussion and experimental activities,
- e. the main voice heard may be teacher’s rather than students,
- f. student attendance and or motivation may decrease,
- g. administering larger numbers of makeup exams will become more inconvenient
- h. there will be less time for assisting individual students during office hours,
- i. students may experience increased anxiety during class participation,
- j. risk for academic dishonesty during exams or in written assignments may increase,
- k. printing costs for distribution of paper materials such as exams and syllabi may increase significantly, and
- l. less direct engagement may result in poorer student retention,

### ***Pedagogical Benefits Related to Large Enrollment Classes***

We believe there are some potential benefits of having (a moderate number of well chosen) large section courses, and there are ways that the challenges may be met so that both students and faculty can benefit. Advantages include the lowering of university costs, efficient use of faculty time and talent, increased interdepartmental dialogue in regards to pedagogical practices within the CLA, increased student independence, and student assumption of more responsibility for their respective educational development. The Taskforce recommends that each department within the CLA reaffirm its commitment to maintaining high pedagogical standards in their respective discipline and foster within the broader university an ecosystem of academic and pedagogical excellence, especially given the increased numbers of LE courses planned for implementation beginning spring 2013.

### ***Pedagogical Recommendations for Implementation of Large Enrollment Classes***

Per the charge of this Large Enrollment Classes Taskforce, we provide the following pedagogical recommendations for instructors, departments, and the university.

### *Recommendations for Instructors*

1. Instructors should make every effort to engage the students through a variety of interactive pedagogies such as dynamic lecturing, creative interactivity such as breakout sessions facilitated by TAs or use of i-clickers, along with peer discussion. Teachers of LE courses at many universities have been writing about how such interactive pedagogies can be infused in LE courses. **Appendix A** includes a partial bibliography of some key books and articles on the subject.
2. Instructors should promote student independence by increasing students' information literacy, including the ability to recognize when information is needed and to acquire, evaluate, organize, maintain, interpret, and communicate the needed information.
3. Instructors familiarize themselves with the benefits and pitfalls of online quizzes, e.g., instant assessment vs. potential for academic dishonesty
4. Instructors maintain a commitment to their continued education, experimentation, innovation in regards to integrating effective pedagogies into the LE classroom.
5. Instructors should also work actively with their TAs to create a welcoming and responsive class environment that provides opportunities for individual meetings and frequent feedback to students.
6. Instructors should promote greater interaction between instructor-student and student-student, both in the classroom and through the use of online enhancements to the learning environment

### *Recommendations for Departments*

1. Departments should discuss internally the many challenges of large enrollment classes, including the maintenance of high quality instruction and the design of appropriate and effective exams, readings, and written assignments. Especially important is correlating the methods of student evaluation in large classes with the goals of the department's Student Outcomes Assessment.
2. Maintain high quality among LE faculty. Individual departments should exercise due diligence in maintaining standards of excellence among instructors who teach LE courses, including faculty mentoring, careful selection of LE instructors, and the availability, clarity, and consistency of departmental support.
3. Professors should be encouraged at the departmental level to experiment with a variety of pedagogical methods, including different lecture styles, discussion techniques, activity-driven instruction, use of PowerPoint, amplification, websites, wikis, blogs, clickers, etc., and that professional development opportunities and appropriate funding be made available to professors wishing to integrate new technologies into their LE classes.
4. Departments are encouraged to establish a peer mentoring program for instructors of LE classes and that such mentoring include frequent evaluation and assessment of LE teaching methods.
5. Departments with graduate programs should have ways of supporting the training of their graduate students to be effective TAs for their LE courses.

## *Recommendations for the University*

1. It is important to establish university-wide instructor learning communities. Instructors should be encouraged to participate in a proposed annual, on-campus luncheon/workshop where they can share their respective pedagogies with other LE instructors.
2. Distribution of Teaching Assistants
  - i. The CLA should acknowledge the importance of teaching assistants for all departments, that departments be allotted teaching assistants if requested, and that assistants be allotted sufficient number of hours per week to meet with professor, hold office hours, grading assignments, monitor attendance, and/or attend lectures if necessary
  - ii. The Taskforce recommends that a clear and consistent policy be formulated regarding the distribution of teaching assistants and that the policy be applicable throughout the CLA
  - iii. Graduate teaching assistants should receive effective training and consistent mentoring from faculty in regards to LE pedagogies
  - iv. Present practice for assigning teaching assistants should continue for departments that have graduate programs.
  - v. Assignment of teaching assistants should be conducted in advance of the semester's begin, allowing ample time for instructors to meet their assistants and to discuss semester duties.
3. Accessibility to professional development on LE class pedagogies. The university Center for Innovative Teaching (CIT) should set up a webpage dedicated to teaching LE classes and provide regular workshops on teaching LE classes.
  - i. The webpage should contain a variety of teaching aids, including links to articles on teaching LE classes, implementing current technologies, and contact info for faculty mentors (see **Appendix A** below for examples).
4. Reduce administrative burdens on faculty so that they may dedicate more time to pedagogy and working with students.
5. The college should appropriate necessary funds to help offset departmental costs associated with LE classes that include but are not limited to: added expense of photocopying, Scantrons, and potential off-campus workshops for professional development in LE pedagogy.

## **Section 2: Workload Considerations and Recommendations**

In this section of the report, we provide an overview of a survey of department chairs about the past practices related to large enrollment courses and anticipated changes in practice with the implementation of the 2-2 system. We also provide recommendations for course credit, course releases, and the assignment of teaching assistants.

### ***Survey of Department Chairs Regarding Workload Considerations***

In June 2012, members of the LE Taskforce sent a two-page survey to all CLA department chairs, questioning them both about their department's past policies for crediting large section courses for both tenure track and NTT faculty, the changes in large section courses they anticipated making as a result of the switch to the 2:2 Workload, and how much they thought large section courses should be credited with the switch to a 2:2 Workload. All but one department responded to the survey. In this section we briefly summarize the main findings from the summary. (See **Appendix B** for a copy of the full survey and **Appendix C** for a summary of responses for each Department.)

### ***Past Practice in CLA Regarding Large Enrollment Sections***

Of the 17 Departments in CLA, 10 already offered one or more courses in large section format. The number of different courses a department offered in large format ranged from one to ten. Most departments (8 of 10) offered three or fewer large section courses; Psychology and Classics were the two exceptions as each had ten different courses in large section format. The size of large lecture courses ranged from 60-200, with most between 80-125. Only two departments reported having breakout sections for any of these courses (Psych for its large Intro and English for its courses). Most (8 of 10) of the departments reported having some TA support for large sections that came from students in related Masters or Ph.D. Programs in their departments; only two departments (Art, Performing Arts) taught large lecture courses with no TA support and both were departments who also have no graduate students to draw on. English had a particularly intensive and exemplary process of training students to be graduate TAs.

For all departments except Classics *the existing practice was to count large section courses as equivalent to two courses* for tenure track faculty, and either two courses or double pay for NTT. In Classics they reported that had been their earlier practice as well, although in recent years they had moved to getting 1 CLR granted to the department for every three classes > 60.

### ***Anticipated Changes in Practice Regarding Crediting Large Enrollment Sections***

Thirteen of the 17 CLA departments said they planned to offer at least one large lecture course as part of the Spring 2013 pilot with classes ranging in size from 80 to 200. Thus, three more departments from before decided to offer large section courses, and some departments who already offered large lectures said they would offer them more regularly (or more). The three new departments (Communication, Economics, and Philosophy) offering large lecture courses in the spring pilot needed to have TA support for these classes. One Department (Economics) will be able to get TA support from its new Applied Economics Masters program, but the other two do not have existing graduate programs that could provide them with TA support.

Among those departments who already taught large lecture courses and had TA support from their graduate students, several indicated they would need an increased number of TA stipends to cover the greater number of large sections. Modern Languages and Latin American/Iberian Studies said that in general their pedagogy precludes having large lecture classes (indeed their class size for language classes has to be small); however, Latin American Studies planned to add 3 45-person sections and Modern Languages one 70 person section for courses offered in English. Neither Women's Studies nor Africana Studies planned to have large sections.

It was the overwhelming opinion of the department chairs that faculty teaching large section courses should receive at least *1.5 course credit in the new 2:2 workload system for tenure track faculty (and some argued it should be 2)*. Although there was only one class meeting time, the great increase in student numbers (more than doubling and often tripling) increased the faculty workload in grading papers, meeting with students, and /or supervising TAs beyond that of a single section course. They noted faculty would need some incentive to teach them and to preserve pedagogical practices of offering home works and varied writing assignments. A number argued that they should count as 2 courses, especially if there was no TA support provided, or if they were very large sections. One mentioned we might also have a mechanism for revising credit up or down in particular cases (based on documented reasons). For example, if a faculty member choose to only have Scantron-based assessment, with no writing component, that could be a basis for revising their workload credit down; or if a faculty member had to teach the course with significant numbers without TA support that would be a reason for revising credit upwards.

It was the general consensus that if the NTT Workload was unchanged in the switch to a 2:2 load for tenure track faculty, that the existing practice of counting large lectures as double credit or double pay should continue.

### ***Workload Recommendations for Implementation of Large Enrollment Courses***

Per the charge of this Large Enrollment Classes Taskforce, we provide the following recommendations regarding course credit, course releases, and the assignment of teaching assistants.

#### *Recommendations for Course Credit*

1. Tenure-track faculty should receive 1.5 course credits for teaching large enrollment classes wherein large enrollment is defined as a course with a minimum of 70 students.
  - a. *Rationale:* We defined a large enrollment course as one having 70 or more students enrolled, as this is at least twice the size of a typical regular enrollment class (which for most departments is between 30-35 students). We deemed 1.5 course credits appropriate, assuming all instructors teaching these courses have access to adequate TA support if they so desire. It is important that the University recognize that large enrollment courses represent more work for instructors than regular size courses due to increased time spent grading student assignments and papers, meeting with students, and supervising TAs, although potentially less work than teaching two regular size sections of the same course (because there is only one set of lectures and also some TA support). Without giving more credit

- for these courses, there would be no incentive to teach them, or to maintain a pedagogy that involves students in writing papers.
- b. In the rare instance that a LE course in the CLA reach an enrollment of 150 or more students, the Taskforce recommends that the CLA afford the instructor additional attention that may include more course credit (with appropriate rationale and documentation of need.) and/or a greater level of TA support.
2. Full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty should receive 2.0 course credits for teaching large enrollment classes.
    - a. *Rationale:* Because the teaching load for NTT is not changing with the switch to the 2:2 load, we thought the policy for crediting large lecture courses should not be changed from what it has been in the past. Given that in the past NTT faculty either had the course count double or get double pay, we propose to maintain that policy. We would, however, change the number needed to count as large from 60 to 70, to match the new definition of large lecture course.

#### *Recommendations for Course Releases*

1. Faculty should have discretion to determine when they want to use the course releases granted for teaching large enrollment courses.
  - a. *Rationale:* We recommend that, for those courses that have a demonstrable history of filling the necessary enrollment minimum to meet the criteria for large enrollment course, faculty should have the option to apply for a course release during any semester, including the semester in which the LE course is taught for the second time. A system that forces faculty to bank course release credits until the completion of two semesters of LE instruction (which can be spread out over several years) has the potential to dissuade faculty from teaching such courses. In the event that a faculty member wants to use a course release while teaching a large enrollment course, he or she must demonstrate that the course has a history of filling to minimum capacity (i.e., during the previous semester, the course had a minimum of 70 students). We suggest that this system gives faculty more incentive to teach large enrollment courses.

#### *Recommendations for Assignment of Teaching Assistants*

1. We recommend that all faculty who teach large enrollment courses have the option to have a graduate teaching assistant and the amount of assistance be commensurate with course needs and structure (courses with regular break-out or discussion sections need more TAs than those that do not) and the demands imposed by size of enrollment.
  - a. *Rationale:* Central to balancing the pedagogical and workload demands of teaching large enrollment courses is the need for teaching assistants. In some cases (as mentioned above), faculty who teach large enrollment courses will come from academic departments that do not have a graduate program and/or a pool of graduate assistants. In such cases, we recommend that CLA implement a systematic procedure for the selection and assignment of

graduate teaching assistants. Such a system should clearly delineate the process used to select and assign to graduate teaching assistants to large enrollment courses as well as the expectations for supervision of those graduate students. Here, we think it is especially important to consider the pedagogical ramifications of assigning graduate students to large enrollment courses that may be somewhat far-removed from their academic expertise. The assignment of graduate assistants to large enrollment courses must balance the pedagogical demands of those graduate students with the workload demands of the faculty who will need assistance with their large courses.

### **Section Three: Logistical and Scheduling Considerations and Recommendations**

The Taskforce recognizes that there are two main logistical challenges facing the successful implementation of more LE courses in the CLA. The first is classroom availability (there are only ten classrooms on campus that can accommodate more than 70 students, including the large classroom at the Massachusetts State Archives). The second, related point, is the ability to schedule and successfully enroll 70-person (or more) lecture courses at all hours of the University's teaching time blocks in order to maximize space and use. Furthermore, with the increasing enrollments across UMass Boston, significantly more pressure is being put on a finite amount of classroom space. Obviously, the opening of the General Academic Building will alleviate some of these concerns. But, in the short-term, some logistical problems are inevitable. The current plan is to increase the number of 70-person (or more) lecture courses in CLA from 21 in the Spring 2012 semester to 34 in Spring 2013. With this many lectures courses being offered in Spring 2013, the taskforce is concerned that the CLA risks having a number of under-enrolled lecture courses, as it is not clear that simply combining several regular sections (currently offered at different days and times) will translate into full enrollment into one large section (offered only at a specific time.) Further, these LE sections might also negatively impact enrollments in our smaller regular or seminar courses throughout the college.

#### ***Logistical and Scheduling Recommendations for Implementation of Large Enrollment Courses***

1. The taskforce recognizes the superb efforts of the CLA Dean's Office and, especially, Diann Simmons, Assistant Dean of Scheduling and Special Projects, who has already been able to find classroom space for a majority of lectures in CLA offered during the Spring 13 semester in ways that matched department requests and needs. Going forward, the Dean's Office should continue to provide a balance of lecture courses on MWF and TuTh, distributed across all available time-blocks, to ensure that students will be able to put together a balanced academic schedule.
2. The taskforce, however, cautions against scheduling lectures in non-traditional university time blocks, for students are often unwilling or unable to schedule one course across two time blocks (e.g., a lecture course that meets from 12:00-1:15 on MW). If departments wish to schedule an LE course during a non-traditional time block, for reasons that are consistent with the pedagogical aims of the course, they should work with Diann Simmons to do so.
3. The Dean's Office needs to work with individual departments to publicize, as needed, their new or ongoing lecture courses across campus. Many departments do not have a budget for this, and the taskforce feels that an aggressive PR campaign in CLA is necessary for successfully enrolling 34 LE courses in Spring 2013.
4. Departments and individual faculty members are encouraged to work with Dean's Office in order to determine a lecture classroom space appropriate to the course content, enrollment cap., and so on, keeping in mind the limitations of teaching technology in many classrooms around campus. Departments and faculty members are encouraged to request lecture classrooms that best suit their needs on an ongoing basis so that these faculty members are given priority in certain classrooms. This should be worked out between each department in CLA and Diann Simmons.
5. Departments who are offering break-out sections as part of their lecture course (e.g., a twenty-person discussion section taught by a teaching assistant) should be aware of

increased scheduling difficulties as a result of an increase in the number of LE classes and are encouraged to work with Diann Simmons to coordinate appropriate section classrooms.

## Appendix A

### Taskforce on Large-Enrollment Courses (LE)

Links to LE aids at selected universities:

1. University of Pittsburgh:
  - a. [http://www.cidde.pitt.edu/fds/lrn\\_lrg\\_class.htm](http://www.cidde.pitt.edu/fds/lrn_lrg_class.htm)
  - b. <http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=2384>
2. Portland State University:
  - a. <http://pdx.edu/cae/articles-and-handbooks-related-large-enrollment-classes>
3. Vanderbilt University:
  - a. <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/teaching-guides/preparing-to-teach/large-enrollment-classes/>
4. UNC-Chapel Hill:
  - a. [http://cfe.unc.edu/e-learning/course\\_redesign.html](http://cfe.unc.edu/e-learning/course_redesign.html)
5. UC Berkeley:
  - a. <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/largeenrollment.html>
  - b. <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/bgd/largelecture.html>
6. University of Vermont:
  - a. [http://www.uvm.edu/ctl/?Page=services-programs/largeclassprogram/index.php&SM=m\\_sp.html](http://www.uvm.edu/ctl/?Page=services-programs/largeclassprogram/index.php&SM=m_sp.html)
7. Univ. of Wisconsin-Whitewater:
  - a. <http://www.uww.edu/learn/largeclasses.php>
  - b. Univ. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
    - i. <http://www.uwsa.edu/ttt/articles/jjohnson.htm>
8. Univ. of New Mexico:
  - a. <http://oset.unm.edu/SupportingDocuments/PIUSS/Resources%20for%20Effective%20Teaching/RET%20files/Teaching-large-enrollment-classes.html>
  - b. <http://oset.unm.edu/SupportingDocuments/PIUSS/Resources%20for%20Effective%20Teaching/RET%20files/Dans%20Docs/Dan%20DocChallengesBenefits.pdf>
9. Iowa State University
  - a. <http://engl.iastate.edu/facultystaff/largerenrollmentclasses/lectech.pdf>
10. Bowling Green State University, Teaching Large Classes
  - a. <http://www.bgsu.edu/ctl/page46206.html>
11. Carleton College, Teaching Large Classes
  - a. <http://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/earlycareer/teaching/LargeClasses.html>
12. Iowa State University: Instructors Share Ideas: Large Class Teaching Tips
  - a. [http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching/instructors\\_share.html](http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching/instructors_share.html)
13. UNC Charlotte: A Survival Handbook for Teaching Large Classes
  - a. <http://teaching.uncc.edu/resources/best-practice-articles/large-classes/handbook-large-classes>
14. University of Maryland: Teaching Large Classes
  - a. <http://www.cte.umd.edu/library/teachingLargeClass/index.html>
15. University of Washington, Resources: Teaching Large Classes
  - a. <http://depts.washington.edu/cidrweb/resources/lecturetools.html>

## Bibliography for Teaching LE Classes

Source:

[http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=%22large%20enrollment%20classes%22%20university&source=web&cd=13&ved=0CG4QFjACOAo&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fau.edu%2Fctl%2FForms%2FFLC\\_Large\\_Lecture\\_Courses\\_Books\\_and\\_Articles.doc&ei=-hwIUzflOjl0QHwjsmnAw&usg=AFQjCNFvq41fMryNTQfapnfJXLmrb6QfWQ](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=%22large%20enrollment%20classes%22%20university&source=web&cd=13&ved=0CG4QFjACOAo&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fau.edu%2Fctl%2FForms%2FFLC_Large_Lecture_Courses_Books_and_Articles.doc&ei=-hwIUzflOjl0QHwjsmnAw&usg=AFQjCNFvq41fMryNTQfapnfJXLmrb6QfWQ)

### Books and articles:

Auslander, G. K. "Using large classes to positive advantage: Involving students as research subjects and active learners." *Social Work Education* 19/4 (2000): 375-385.

Bauer, H. and Snizek, W. "Encouraging students in large classes to ask questions: Some promising results from classes in chemistry and sociology." *Teaching Sociology* (July 1989): 17, 337-340.

Benjamin Jr., Ludy T. "Personalization and active learning in the large introductory psychology class." *Teaching of Psychology* 18/2 (April 1991): 68-74.

Bridges, G. S. and S. Desmond, S. eds. *Teaching and Learning in Large Classes*. New York: American Sociological Association, 2000.

Brown, B. "Making connections with individual learners in large introductory geography courses." *Journal of Geography* 93/3 (1994):132-5.

Buchanan, R. and Rogers, M. "Innovative assessment in large classes." *College Teaching* 38/2 (Spring 1990): 69-73.

The Center for Teaching Excellence. "Challenge of teaching the introductory-level course". *Teaching Excellence* (Fall 1989): University of Hawaii at Manoa: Honolulu, HI.

Carbone, Elisa. *Teaching Large Classes: Tools and Strategies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1998.

Cherian, M., & Mau, R. *Teaching large classes: usable practices from around the world*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Education, 2002.

Chism, N.VN. "Large-Enrollment Classes: Necessary Evil or Not Necessary Evil." *Notes on Teaching*. Columbus: Center for Teaching Excellence, Ohio State University, (June 1989): pp. 1-7.

"Facing the challenges of the big class." *The Teaching Professor* 8/2 (1994): 1.

- Geske, J. "Overcoming the Drawbacks of the Large Lecture Class." *College Teaching* 40/4 (1992): 151-154.
- Gibbs, Graham. and Alan. Jenkins eds. *Teaching Large Classes in Higher Education: How to Maintain Quality with Reduced Resources*. London: Kogan Page, 1992.
- Gleason, M. "Better Communication in Large Courses," *College Teaching* 34/1 (1986): 20-24.
- Heppner, Frank. *Teaching the Large College Class: A Guidebook for Instructors with Multitudes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
- Herr, K. *Improving Teaching and Learning in Large Classes: A Practical Manual*. Fort Collins, CO: Office of Instructional Services, Colorado State University, 1985.
- Holt, D. "Short writing assignments in large classes." *CTL Newsletter*. Cape Girardeau, MO: Center for Teaching and Learning, Southeast Missouri State University, (April 1991.)
- Hosley, Catherine J. "How To Get Reactions From Students In Big, Impersonal Lecture Classes." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (1987): 15.
- Jenkins, J. "Teaching Psychology in Large Classes: Research and Personal Experience." *Teaching Psychology*, 18/2, 74-80.
- Knight, Jennifer K. and William B. Wood. "Teaching More by Lecturing Less." *Cell Biology Education* 4 (Winter, 2005): 298-310.
- Leonard, W., Journet, A., and Ecklund, R. "Overcoming obstacles in teaching large-enrollment lab courses." *American Biology Teacher* 50/1 (1988): 23-28.
- Lewis, Karron G. *Taming the Pedagogical Monster: A Handbook for Large Class Instructors*. Austin, TX: Center for Teaching Effectiveness, University of Texas at Austin, 1990.
- MacGregor, Jean, James L. Cooper, Karl A. Smith, and Pamela Robinson eds. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 81. Strategies for Energizing Large Classes: From Small Groups to Learning Communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Mountford, R. and B. Richardson eds. *A Sourcebook for Large Enrollment Course Instructors: Contributions from the Literature and OSU Faculty*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence, 1988.
- McNeil, L. E. "Challenges for Teaching in Introductory Science Classes: Why They Aren't Hearing What You Think You Are Saying." *The National Teaching and Learning Forum* 4/5 (1995): 4-7.

Rosenkoetter, John S. "Teaching Psychology to Large Classes: Videotapes, PSI, and Lecturing." *Teaching of Psychology* 11 (1984): 85-87.

Silverstein, Brett. "Teaching a Large Lecture Course in Psychology: Turning Defeat into Victory." *Teaching of Psychology* 9 (1982): 150-155.

Smith, D. "Encouraging students' participation in large classes: A modest proposal." *Teaching Sociology* 20 (1992): 337-339.

Stanley, Christine A. and M. Erin Porter. *Engaging Large Classes: Strategies and Techniques for College Faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 2002.

Straits, W. "'She's teaching me': Teaching with care in a large lecture course." *College Teaching* 55/4 (2007); 170-175.

"Teaching large classes well: Solutions from your peers." *Penn State Instructional Development Newsletter* 12 (October 1992): 1.

"Teaching large classes (You can still get active learning!)" in W. J. McKeachie and M. Svinicke eds. *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006: 254-256

Weaver, Richard L. II. "The Small Group in Large Classes." *Educational Forum* 48 (1983): 65-73.

Weimer, Maryellen. ed. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Teaching Large Classes Well*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Wick, John W. "Making a Big Lecture Section a Good Course." *Improving College and University Teaching* 22 (1974): 249-252.

Wingert, D. "Actively engaging large classes in the sciences." *Teaching Professor* 21 (2007): 1-3.

Yazedjian, A., & Kolkhorst, B. B. (2007). "Implementing small-group activities in large lecture classes." *College Teaching* 55/4 (2007): 164-169.

#### **Other Online resources:**

Gillespie, Frank, "The Phenomenon of Large Classes and Practical Suggestions for Teaching Them" <http://teaching.uchicago.edu/pod2/gillespie.html>

Weimer, Maryellen, Teaching Large Classes  
<http://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/effective-teaching-strategies/teaching-large-classes-strategies-for-managing-large-lecture-courses/>

**On Technology in the Classroom**

Patry, Marc, Clickers in Large Classes: From Student Perceptions Towards an Understanding of Best Practices, with extensive bibliography

[http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsofl/v3n2/articles/PDFs/Article\\_Patry.pdf](http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsofl/v3n2/articles/PDFs/Article_Patry.pdf)

**Appendix B**  
**Large Section CLA Survey: Past and Future Practices**

- 1) What courses does your Department **currently** offer in large lecture format? In the table below list those courses, whether taught by TT or NTT (or both), enrollment caps, typical enrollments, course frequency (e.g., once every semester, once a year, etc.), whether they are taught with any TA support, and with any breakout sections.

Course Name and Number	TT NTT	Enrollment Cap	Typical Enrollment	Course Frequency	TA Support	Breakout Sections

- 2) Does your Department also offer the same course(s) in regular lecture format? Explain.
- 3) How does your Department currently credit a large lecture course for TT? For NTT? (1, 1.5, 2, etc.) Explain.
- 4) If some of your courses involve TA support, explain the nature of that support and your source of TA's.
- 5) If some of your courses involve breakout discussion sections, explain how they work (3<sup>rd</sup> hour, extra 4<sup>th</sup> hour, etc.)
- 6) What **changes** in large lecture offerings does your Department anticipate making with the switch to a 2:2 load? (e.g., creating **brand new courses** with large enrollments, changing **enrollment caps** of existing courses, etc.)

7) Given the configuration of expectations in your Department, what would your faculty consider the **appropriate credit** to be given for a large lecture course in a 2:2 system (1, 1.5, 2, etc.) for TT faculty? For NTT faculty? Why?

8) What courses does your Department **plan to** offer in large lecture format for the spring 2013 pilot? In the table below list those courses, who is expected to teach them (TT, NTT), enrollment caps, typical enrollments, course frequency (e.g., once every semester, once a year, etc.), whether they are taught with any TA support, and with any breakout sections.

Course Name and Number	TT NTT	Enrollment Cap	Typical Enrollment	Course Frequency	TA Support	Breakout Sections

9) Who is your target audience for these large lecture courses? (general education students, majors, etc.) For courses that you haven't taught in large lecture format before, what makes you think that these sections would fill?

10) Is there a particular classroom you need for particular large lecture courses? Explain (e.g., class with certain capacity, classroom with special technology, etc.).

Appendix C  
CLA Survey Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	Department	Chair	Number LE Previously offered (enroll cap)	Who taught: (TT, NTT)?	With or without TA Support?	How much Previous Credit?	Number LE in Sp13 (enroll cap)	Who taught? (TT or NTT)	With or Without TAs	Source of TAAs	With Breakout	Recommended Credit-TT	Recommended Credit NTT	Resource Needs
2														
3	Africana Studies	Marc Prou	No response to survey				None entered in WISER > than 40							
4	American Studies	Rachel Rubin	One (100)		TA Support	Double (TT, NTT)	Two*(100)	1 TT; 1 NTT?	Yes	MA Prog	informal	1.5	2	Internet, DVD, Doc Projector
5	Anthropology	Judith Zeitlin	Two (60)	TT	TA Support	Double	Three (80)	2 TT; 1 NTT	1-Yes; 2 Hoped for	MA Prog (Archaeology)	No	1.5 (80-100)	2 or 2.5 (80-100) (or more pay)	standard, DVD, LCD Projector
6	Art	Victoria Weston	Three (90-100)	TT	No TA Support	Double	One* (120)	TT	No	No	No	1.5	Same at TT	High quality projection capacity
7	Classics	Ken Rothwell	Ten (80-125)	TT, NTT	Variable (in past mostly no TA)	Sometimes Double; Every 3 > 60, 1 CLR	Three* (1@80 2@125)	3 TT	1-Yes; 1- Hope so; 1-No	MA Prog	No	at least 1.5 (not clear if this was just opinion of one faculty or chair)	no separate answer	Like Snowden; Healey Media
8	Communication	Ken Lachlan	None				One (150)	TT	1- Hope so	Not sure	No	1.5	NA	Need Standard Projection Equip
9	Economics	Julie Nelson	None				Three* (1@90; 2@155)	3 TT	Yes	New MA program	No	depends (1.5-2)	Same as TT	Standard Projection; I-clicker box helpful
10	English	Cheryl Nixon	Three (60-125)	TT, NTT	TA Support	Double	One (125)	NTT	Yes	MA Prog	Yes	1.5	2	Standard Projection; film; tiered seats
11	History	Roberta Wollons	Two (70-80)	TT	TA Support for > 80	Double	Three* (1@80; 2@ 100)	TT	1-Yes; 1-No; 1 NA	MA Prog	No	depends (1.5-2)	no separate answer	Standard Tech Needs
12	Latin Amer/Iber	Ann Blum	None			Noe applicable	None (but will have 3@ 45)					[Dept only plans 40, which will be 1]		
13	Modern Language	Pratima Prasad	None			Not applicable	None (but will add 1 @70)					1.5 (if keeps same assign structure as regular; if scantron then 1)		
14	Performing Arts	Robert Lublin	Two (100)	TT, NTT	No TA Support	Double	Three* (1 @95; 2@100)	3 NTT*	No	No	No	1.5	no separate answer	Standard Tech
15	Philosophy	Arthur Millman	None				One (80)	TT	Hope so	Not sure		2	2	
16	Political Science	Mo Cunningham	Two (140)	TT	TA Support	Double	Two (160, 200)*	TT	Yes	McCormack School	no	1.5	1.5 Pay	
17	Psychology	Carol Smith	Ten (90-200)	TT, NTT	TA Support	Double	Six (1 @ 80; 4@90; 1@200)	5-TT; 1 NTT	Yes	Ph.D. Prog	Only Intro	1.5 (with TA) 2 (without TA or for large intro)	2	Standard Tech 2; whiteboards
18	Sociology	Russ Schutt	Two (100)	TT, NTT	TA Support	Double (if >80)	Five* (100)	2 TT; 3 NTT	Yes, if give more money to increase numbers	MA Prog	No	1.5-2 (range of views of faculty)	no separate answer	Standard Tech 2; auditorium seating
19	Women's Studies	Shoshanna Ehrlich	None				None					1.5		
20														
21		<b>LEGEND:</b>	LEs have TA support or Dept has grad program	LE need TA but Dept has no grad program	Dept offers no LE courses		* adjusted to what is in WISER (Sept13)							