

Er det tid til at smide Susan og Robert ud af universitetet?

“The solution to the problem, briefly, is a matter of immersing students in a teaching environment that *requires them* to use learning activities that are likely to lead to the intended outcomes” (Biggs 1999: 3) [min fremhævnings]

min kronik, kort fortalt

- “Vi skal basalt set få studerende til at indse, at verden er konstrueret på en bestemt måde, som kunne være anderledes. Og at det er deres opgave at forsøge at få verden til at se anderledes ud. På den måde får vi studerende, som ikke forholder sig passivt, men som selvstændigt vælger til og fra.”
- De tre bud:
 - De skal øve sig i at finde ud af, hvad de brænder for.
 - De skal blive stadigt bedre til at sidde på deres bagdel og koncentrere sig.
 - De skal blive stadigt bedre til at forstå, hvornår de ikke forstår noget, og hvad de skal gøre for at komme til at forstå det.

-
- fra læringsmål til læringsstrategier?
 - fra underviserens ansvar til den studerendes ansvar?

baggrunden – Biggs' Susan & Robert

From didactic to active learning

Active learning seeks to encourage all students to employ the learning strategies of successful students. To explain this, Biggs (1999) employs a device for illustrating a key distinction between more and less academically successful students. Within the current student population, Biggs suggests that lecturers will encounter 'Susan' and 'Robert'. 'Susan' is 'academically committed' and learns in an 'academic way' (Biggs, 1999: 3). 'Robert', on the other hand, is 'less committed', 'possibly not as bright' and has a 'less developed background of relevant knowledge'.

The central justification for Biggs' approach to teaching is that Susan 'spontaneously' uses active learning, in the form of higher-order cognitive processes such as relating and theorizing, in teaching situations towards the 'passive' end of the teaching method continuum, such as lectures. Robert, however, does not. Biggs suggest that the large gap between Susan's and Robert's levels of engagement is significantly reduced by active methods such as problem-based learning, in which higher-order cognitive activities are not optional, but required.

Hilary Burgess, Imogen Taylor (2005: 6)
"Effective Learning and Teaching in Social Policy and Social Work"

- konsekvensen af masseuniversitetet er resultatorienteret undervisning (*outcomes-based education* / outcomes-based teaching and learning)
 - folk er på uni for at få en uddannelse, ikke for at studere
- constructive alignment:
 - “we systematically align the teaching/learning activities, and the assessment tasks to the intended learning outcomes, according to the *learning activities* required in the outcomes” (Biggs 1999: 7)
- studerendes læringsstrategier
 - “hang til” dybdelæring eller overfladelæring
- underviseren: reflektiv praktiker (+ekspert på sit felt)
 - fx adj.pædagogisk grundkursus

“det handler ikke om hvad du siger, det handler om, hvad den studerende gør”

og kan vi ikke finde på noget bedre end Susan og Robert? Noget, der giver den studerende ansvaret tilbage?

men hvad gør man så, når de ikke gør noget?

så faldt jeg over det her:

- “I have realized that my classroom invariably contains multiple audiences – those with an antipathy to history, a severe learning disability, functional illiteracy, or an allergy to opening the textbook who are just hoping to escape my clutches with a barely-passing grade; a few coveted slots for Honors students who are usually strong discussants but are rarely history majors; some passionate budding young historians or future schoolteachers; recent immigrants for whom American history is a vast cipher; sometimes even a retiree on the free-tuition program whose life experience overlaps the course content... and usually the majority of young people eager to learn and engage with course ideas but so overworked from second jobs and demands of the commuter-student life that they are more likely than not to fall asleep in class and would prefer to be “fed” information rather than be made to work for their knowledge.”

så faldt jeg over det her:

how to take this course	wading	snorkeling	scuba diving
It's not what you "get" in this course, it's how deep you go. People take a US History survey for lots of reasons, usually variations on "it's required." Think about why someone has decided that learning this material might be essential to your college experience, and what that means for you personally. It is entirely possible to do well in the class without being transformed by your new-found historical knowledge, but it would be a darn shame. I like to think that this (and indeed, any) course operates on three levels. Imagine we are standing on the seashore; the course is the ocean. Enter with me and go as deep as you dare...	you need the basic outlines of US history, the highlights, the main characters & ideas, the surface-level knowledge There's nothing wrong with staying in the shallows; this approach may work for you if this is likely to be your only history course, or if you've never taken one before & it's all new "Waders" will tend to assume that textbook, documents, and professor are mutually reinforcing, telling basically the same story. Waders are mainly concerned with WHAT happened in the past.	you have a grasp of the basics and are ready to think historically and explore what's below the surface Perhaps you've taken US history before, or are a beginning history major. You already know that history is a conversation among differing and/or contradictory perspectives. "Snorkelers" notice historical inconsistencies and they respectfully challenge assumptions through lively debate. Snorkelers are interested in HOW & WHY things happened as they did.	you want to go deeper into the past, using the cognitive equipment & tools of history as a focused critical thinker Experienced? You are well aware of historical controversy and how historical knowledge is constructed. You actively seek alternative sources, interpretations, and voices. "Divers" don't take any of the course's structure or content as natural or inevitable. They see (and then fill) the course's gaps. They are curious, passionate, and concerned with WHY HISTORY MATTERS.

kilde: Tona Hangen, <http://www.tonahangen.com/2011/01/syllabus-makeover/>

- a more apt metaphor is the encounter with an ocean, in which some will wade, others will snorkel, and some will scuba dive.
- **Waders** – GAIN knowledge
 - will be likely to assume that the structure or specific content of the course is “natural” rather than artificially constructed/selected/crafted by the teacher. They are mainly just trying to wrap their heads about **what happened** in the American past.
- **Snorkelers** – EXPAND knowledge
 - are aware of the constructed nature of historical knowledge and perceptive of the areas where their own knowledge is strong or weak. They know that what they’re being offered on the syllabus is not all there is to know. Snorkelers are interested in questions of contingency in history, and in **how and why things happened** as they did.
- **Divers** – APPLY knowledge
 - go beyond the surface, seek out alternative sources, recognize and challenge their own assumptions, eagerly seize the intellectual challenge that a wide-ranging historical survey can be. They are hungry and curious and they reject the assumption that the course’s content or structure is in any way natural. They alternate between wonder and rage. They **critique—and make—lasting historical knowledge**.

BA-projektet: “Undervisermanifest”

- Forløbet skal bidrage med form og arbejdsstrukturer, ikke fagligt indhold. Det skal **iscenesætte den studerendes akademiske udvikling fra BA- til KA-studerende**, og det er derfor den enkelte studerende, der skal være primus motor i at udvikle, formulere og udfolde en problemstilling, som vedkommende finder interessant og faglig relevant. Det skal foregå i en struktur, som underviserne opstiller og vedligeholder undervejs.
- Forløbet skal benytte peer review, peer feedback og peer instruction som omdrejningspunkt. **De studerende skal lære at bruge sig selv og hinanden**, og de skal lære at stole på, at de selv har en faglig og akademisk viden og kunnen, som andre kan have glæde af at høre. **Løbende brug af peer feedback** på hinandens arbejde (litteratursøgninger, problemformuleringer, opgaveudkast) er derfor afgørende, bl.a. fordi man ved at forholde sig kritisk til andres akademiske arbejde bliver tvunget til selv at agere akademisk.
- Som undervisere skal vi trække os tilbage som fagpersoner, og i stedet primært fungere som **proceskonsulenter, der lejlighedsvist bidrager med faglig viden**. Det er derfor vores rolle at opstille en model for, hvordan man kommer fra begyndelse til slutning, så de studerende hjælpes til at forstå, hvordan man eksempelvis disponerer et forløb tidsmæssigt. Det er derimod ikke vores rolle at udfylde modellen med fagligt indhold.
- Forløbets **litteratur skal derfor kun omhandle akademiske arbejdsprocesser**, herunder at designe et forskningsprojekt (som et BA-projekt kan siges at være en mindre ambitiøs version af)

- “LÆS hinandens afleveringer. NOTER dine forslag til, hvad de andre burde/kunne gøre anderledes. FORBERED svar på, hvad der er dit næste skridt. OVERVEJ hvad dine ambitioner er, ift hvad jeg sagde i sidste uge. Har du valgt noget, som holder dig på sikker grund (hvilket er fint) eller søger du noget, som du ikke ved, at/hvordan du kan (hvilket også er fint). Det er to ekstremer på spektret af tilgangsmåder, og det kan være nyttigt at forholde sig aktivt til, hvad man (implicit eller explicit) har valgt.”