

New Models for Mobilizing Undergraduate Research

SAA Workshop 59

Janelle Jenstad and Kim McLean-Fiander

4-6pm Saturday, April 4th 2015

Fairmont Waterfront A

Workshop Description from SAA Bulletin

With the massive increase of online tools, archives, and digital library collections, undergraduates now have the resources to do original research. How can Shakespeareans and early modernists make space for that to happen in the classroom? *The Map of Early Modern London's* pedagogical partnerships provide instructors with materials, students with real-world publication opportunities, and burgeoning digital projects with scholarly content. In this workshop, participants will develop ways of incorporating Research-Based Learning approaches into their teaching and discover new models for engaging students in research.

Groups

We have divided the workshop contributors into 4 groups. Most of you are in more than one group.

1. Past and current MoEML Pedagogical Partners
2. People who have prepared classroom materials for past, current, and future RBL modules
3. People who offer theoretical frameworks for RBL modules
4. Prospective MoEML Pedagogical Partners

Group 1: Past and Current MoEML Pedagogical Partners

Kate McPherson: Spring 2014 Pedagogical Partner

Kate Moncrief: Fall 2014 Pedagogical Partner

Donna Woodford-Gormley: Fall 2014 Pedagogical Partner

Jayne Yeo: Current Pedagogical Partner

Group 2: Classroom Materials

Tassie Gniady: Tassie's written contribution will be distributed to her students as an introduction to R.

Nicola Imbracsio: Nicola's written contribution is her prospective syllabus for a course on "Death and Mourning."

Michael McClintock: Michael's written contribution is his prospective syllabus for a course on "Shakespeare and Comedy."

Kate McPherson: Kate Mc included the syllabus for her "Shakespeare's Histories & Comedies: Original Practices?" course.

Kate Moncrief: Kate Mo included the syllabus for her "Renaissance Drama" course.

Jessica Slights: Jessica's written contribution is the website for her upcoming "Shakespeare: Placing History and Comedy" course.

Kristiane Stapleton: Kristiane's written contribution is her prospective syllabus for a course on "Responding to Shakespeare."

Katy Stavreva: Katy's written contribution is her prospective assignment prompt for a MoEML encyclopedia article on the Middle Temple.

Donna Woodford-Gormley: Donna included the syllabus for her "Shakespeare: From the Globe to the Global" course.

Jayme Yeo: Jayme's written contribution is the materials she is using in her current course, "Readings in British Literature II."

Group 3: Theoretical Frameworks

Tassie Gniady. Her teaching materials are an invitation into an RBL project.

Diane Jakacki: Diane, our respondent, is an expert in digital pedagogies. She has experience with digital RBL modules at Bucknell University and has helped others to implement them.

Kate Moncrief. Her essay about metacognition is generally relevant to RBL.

Group 4: Prospective MoEML Pedagogical Partners

Nicola Imbracsio

Michael McClintock

Jessica Slights

Kristiane Stapleton

Katy Stavreva

Order of Proceeding

I. Introductions (4:00 15 min.)

1. Welcome (**Janelle**)
2. Introductions (just names and affiliations for now -- slightly longer introduction under Question 1.a.)
3. A quick overview of Research-Based Learning and the *MoEML* Pedagogical Partnership, for the benefit of the auditors and to get us in the RBL intellectual space (**Kim**).

II. Practicalities: What we've done & how to make an RBL module work

Research-Based Learning: (4:15 20 min.)

1. **Everyone**: What is/was/will be the relationship between your own research interests and the RBL module in your course? (1 minute max per person!)
2. **Group 1 (start with Kate Mc, Donna, and Kate Mo)**: What did your students derive from their RBL opportunity that they wouldn't have derived from a traditional learning situation?
3. **Group 1**. Did (or how did) the high-stakes publication opportunity with *MoEML* change your usual classroom practice?
4. **Group 1**: How much did you follow, adapt, build on, and/or change the MoEML contributor guidelines in the construction of your assignments and during the unfolding of the module?

Making it Work: Nuts and Bolts [Note that we're expecting pretty "snappy" answers here -- just to keep us on track time-wise.] (4:35 25 min.)

1. **Group 1: Preparation**: How can instructors best prepare (when? key questions?) their students to do the research required?
2. **Donna, and Jayme, and Everyone: Topics**: What's the best strategy for choosing topics? (teachers' perspectives, students' perspectives, distribution of sub-topics, uneven student talent)
3. **Katy and Jessica to initiate: Team Work**: What technologies facilitate collaborative writing, team work, group research? (Wikis, Moodle, Blackboard, Google Docs)
4. **Michael, Kristiane, Katy, Everyone: Time management**: chunking, scaffolding, modeling assignments; ratio of research to writing.
5. **Tassie and Nicola to initiate: Tools and Resources**: how do we introduce and teach new tools (both digital and analog) that give junior researchers the skills they need to do RBL? To what extent can MoEML itself be a resource *and* a publication venue?
6. *Visions and Revisions*
 - a. **Group 4**: Now that you've read through the reflections from **Group 1**, is there anything you want to change about your proposed MoEML module?
 - b. **Group 1**: Now that you've been through a MoEML module and read the prospective syllabi and assignments from **Group 4** contributors, where would you offer encouragement ("Yes, go for it!") and where would you offer a caution.

III. Stretch & Demonstration (5:00 10 min.)

Janelle and **Kim**: Live demo of the new map interface and drawing/selecting/bookmarking tools. Open up teaching possibilities for people to create maps and new assignments.

IV. Theory & Bigger Questions (5:10 35 min.)

1. **Kate Mo**: *Metacognition*: What's the relationship between metacognition and the articulation of "learning outcomes"? **Kristiane** and **Jessica** to jump in.
2. **Kate Mc** to initiate: *Student Professionalization*: What does "peer review" mean for original research generated by students (i.e., the product of RBL)? Who should peer review it and how? To what extent do you think that publication will be part of the appeal to your students? To you? To your institution?
3. **Everyone**: *Your Professionalization*: What do RBL opportunities mean for you as a teacher and your own professionalization? (CV, teaching dossier)
4. **Everyone**: *Pressures, Imperatives, Opportunities*: How do we turn challenge into opportunity? How can we best meet institutional expectations and exploit opportunities when we wish to engage in an RBL module? What resources (libraries, archives, rare materials) are or are not available at your institution? On the internet?
5. **Everyone**: *Extending the Model*: How might you re-purpose this model for your other courses? Can you see other ways to get students involved in RBL opportunities and chances to publish in digital or other forms? **Kate Mc** and **Kate Mo**: How are you going to extend this model to your work on the *ISE Shakespeare's Life & Times 2.0*?
6. **Everyone**: *Square Peg/Round Hole vs. Squaring the Circle*: should an RBL module be just a module in a pre-existing course format or would it be more effective to design an entirely new course using RBL?

V. Open up the Floor to Auditors (5:45: 15 min.)