STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON OUTCOMES: INSIGHTS FOR COURSE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN OBL AND 335 FRAMEWORKS

Local Context: OBL and 334/5

- 334/5:
  - This is an opportunity to not only expand our learning paradigm, but reexamine it (Kennedy, 2009)
  - Importance of understanding our approach in terms of "new" learners (Hanstedt & Deneen, 2010)

- OBL
  - A system of curricular design and implementation which focuses and organizes its components around the anticipated achievement of learners.
  - Learner-centered and results-oriented (Baron & Boschee, 1996)

What do we mean by outcomes?

- There are various definitions of student learning outcomes (SLOs).
  - Briefly: What do I want students to demonstrably achieve?
- Towards a typology: Dwyer, Millett and Payne (2006)
  1. workplace readiness and general education skills
  2. content-/discipline-specific knowledge and skills
  3. "soft skills" (non-cognitive skills)
- Research suggests students place high value on category 1 SLOs and SLOs that are "context-specific" (Drew, 1998)

If we're learner centered... where are the learners' voices?

- Student "voice" exists partially through SETs, but that's no guarantee of students being heard (Gravestock, & Gregor-Greenleaf , 2008)
- Students' conceptions "count" in terms of students' demonstration of outcome achievement (Peterson, Brown, & Irving, 2010)
- Some research has been done into student perceptions of outcomes (Drew, 1998)... but not much.
- The critical question, then: What does a research-based inquiry into students' identification and valuing of outcomes reveal?

Our research questions

The research questions for this study were:

- What outcomes do students identify for a course intended to be outcomes-based?
- How closely do those identified outcomes match the intended outcomes for the course? *(ongoing inquiry)*
- How useful are the student-identified outcomes for success as a teacher, according to students?
  - Through the "lens" of category 1: workplace readiness and general education skills (Dwyer, Millett and Payne, 2006)

Sample and setting

- Course: C&I module, "CUI5046 Curriculum and Assessment".
  - compulsory core course for the PGDE
  - aims to provide students with knowledge needed to understand and contribute to curriculum development and assessment tools development in Hong Kong
- Students: 76 students, registered in the Postgraduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) at The Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIED) in 2nd semester in 2009-2020. Predominantly ESL.
  - EMI: 50
  - CMI: 26
- 2 lecturers, both Chinese, native Cantonese speakers, both functioning as participants and co-investigators
- A word about researcher-participants
  - Appropriate and transformative (Kanno, 1997)
  - Especially relevant to a Teaching Development Grant: designed as inquiry and improvement

Data collection

- Survey administered after multiple classes
  - EMI: 5 classes
  - CMI: 9 classes

- Post-course focus groups
  - EMI/CMI student groups
  - Instructor interview
  - Ethnographic interviewing protocols (Spradley, 1979)
    - Grand and mini-tour questions
  - Using Morgan's (1997) Focus Group protocols

Survey instrument

學生評鑑與學習成果調查

學號：

第一部分 (Section 1)

請寫出三項今天的課程希望你達成的學習成果，包含知識性的、理解性的或是技巧性的、(Please write down 3 expected learning outcomes from your course today, including knowledge based, comprehensive based or technical based)

學習成果一：(learning outcome 1)

學習成果二：(learning outcome 2)

學習成果三：(learning outcome 3)

第二部分 (section 2)

從你做爲一位教師/實習教師的經驗來看，在第一部分你所指出的學習成果中，對於成爲一位成功的教師有沒有幫助？請依照上列學習成果順序，在下表適當的地方勾選、(Based on the experience of being a teacher/student teacher, the learning outcomes that you pointed out in Section 1, did they help you in being a successful teacher? Please check in the boxes below following the learning outcomes listed above.

學習成果 (learning outcomes)	評分 (Score)				
	沒有幫助 (Not useful)	沒有太大幫助 (Slightly useful)	稍微有幫助 (Moderately useful)	很有幫助 (Mostly useful)	非常有幫助 (Very useful)
學習成果一 (learning outcome 1)					
學習成果二 (learning outcome 2)					
學習成果三 (learning outcome 3)					

Initial findings: Survey coding

Table 1. Coding families of CMI/EMI survey data

	Parent Code	Child Code
01	Theory & Philosophy	1a: Philosophy, Aims, Values, Epistemology 1b: Curriculum Theory & Concepts 1c: Assessment Theory & Concepts 1d: Learning Theory & Concepts
02	Political Issues	2a: Government Policy 2b: Teachers & Schools 2c: Multiple stakeholders (Govt, Tchrs, Families)
03	Practice and Implementation	3a: System level comparisons 3b: Classroom level

Focus group coding (a work in progress)

Table 2. Coding families of CMI/EMI focus group data

	Parent Code	Child Code
01	Theory & Philosophy	1a: Philosophy, Aims, Values, Epistemology 1b: Curriculum Theory & Concepts 1c: Assessment Theory & Concepts 1d: Learning Theory & Concepts
02	Political Issues	2a: Government Policy 2b: Teachers & Schools 2c: Multiple stakeholders (Govt, Tchrs, Families)
03	Practice and Implementation	3a: System level comparisons 3b: Classroom level
04	PGDE Course Co-ordination -critique of course quality and instructors' pedagogical practices	04a: Positive 04b: Neutral 04c: Improvement-oriented
05	Students Profession Development -issues related to students career development	04a: Positive 04b: Neutral 04c: Improvement-oriented

Quantitative analysis of coded survey data

	Frequency		Total Score		CMI		EMI		Mean Comparisons				
	CMI	EMI	CMI	EMI	Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD	*F*	*p*	*t*	*p*	Cohen's *d*
Category (parent, child)													
1.Theory & Philosophy	268	308	742	820	2.77	0.63	2.66	0.78	20.56	0.00	1.80	0.07	0.16
1a: Philosophy, Aims, Values, Epistemology	1	52	2	129	2.00		2.48	0.85			(0.56)	0.58	
1b: Curriculum Theory & Concepts	122	123	335	338	2.75	0.61	2.75	0.81	3.32	0.07	(0.02)	0.98	0.00
1c: Assessment Theory & Concepts	136	115	382	308	2.81	0.66	2.68	0.72	8.09	0.00	1.49	0.14	0.19
1d: Learning Theory & Concepts	9	18	23	45	2.56	0.53	2.50	0.79	1.77	0.20	0.19	0.85	0.09
2: Political Issues	42	88	116	219	2.76	0.53	2.49	0.77	8.98	0.00	2.35	0.02	0.41
2a: Government Policy	10	18	27	46	2.70	0.48	2.56	0.86	4.12	0.05	0.49	0.63	0.20
2b: Teachers & Schools	23	39	63	98	2.74	0.62	2.51	0.76	1.23	0.27	1.21	0.23	0.33
2c: Multiple stakeholders (Govt, Tchrs, Families)	9	31	26	75	2.89	0.33	2.42	0.76	9.28	0.00	2.66	0.01	0.80
3: Practice and Implementation	158	143	414	393	2.62	0.76	2.75	0.76	0.01	0.93	(1.45)	0.15	(0.17)
3a: System level comparisons	49	55	112	132	2.29	0.65	2.40	0.74	0.83	0.36	(0.84)	0.40	(0.16)
3b: classroom level	109	88	302	261	2.77	0.77	2.97	0.70	0.26	0.61	(1.85)	0.07	(0.27)

The number in ( ) means that it is negative number., e.g. (0.56)= -0.56

(the ongoing) discussion

- Frequency patterns suggest student responses closely following the intended course outcomes (to the degree that we have understood them), however…
  - Discrepancy in what constitutes an "Outcome," Dynamic interactive- "students will achieve" vs. Content area- "I must know"
  - Therefore, what students were identifying may not have been outcomes as much as course content.
- Standard deviations suggest relatively modest variability in students evaluation of outcomes *for success as a teacher. Why?*
  - Possibility 1: PGDE students have a common understanding of what is needed to be successful as a teacher.
  - Possibility 2: Accountability impacts conformity of response (Lerner and Tetlock, 1999). The 學號 factor
  - Possibility 3: We got back an evaluation of course content *as valued by the instructor.* (Tetlock, Skitka, and Boettger, 1989)

(the ongoing) discussion

- Score means of coding families:
  - Both CMI and EMI value classroom level practice and implementation (code 3b)
    - EMI 2.97 CMI 2.77
    - Not surprising given the scope of the inquiry: *success as a teacher*
  - However, differences emerged around political issues involving multiple stakeholders (code 2c)
    - CMI: 2.89 EMI: 2.42, yielding a Cohen's D of .80
    - A significant possibility is that while both groups identified was *instructor emphasis*. This is further supported…

(the ongoing) discussion

… by understanding construct interpretation/validity issues around "outcome"

- the student responses tended to be content statements rather than outcomes. The effect: shifting from the internal to the external. "What have I achieved" to "What should I value?"

- Also, this may be compounded by a linguistic issue: chéng guǒ 成 果 = good results
  - achievement, fruit, gain, positive result. Inherent positive connotation may have led to response bias.

- Did we solicit what we through we were soliciting? The two non-Cantonese investigators thought they were asking for outcomes and degree of their "worth." But were we? This is an important implication for outcome development and enactment as well as multi-lingual research.

(the ongoing) discussion

- Disparity between survey and focus group data
  - Methodological difference, but…
  - Possibly an accountability response issue as well: we are soliciting meta-dialogue and reflection, explicitly in the focus groups.
  - What did this bring to the table? Course critique (4) and reflection on connections to their own professionalism (5). POWERFUL!

Paths forward

A TDG should *develop*, so…

Institutional level and further research

- Integrating student perspectives into outcome discussions bi-directionally
  - Supported by developing research (Deneen, Brown, Bond, Shroff, 2010)
- Understanding human psychology factors in identifying and valuing outcomes (Tetlock, Skitka, and Boettger, 1989, Lerner and Tetlock, 1999)
- Language issues
- Instrumentality
  - Moving to a broader scope in outcome typology, outside success as a teacher
  - Refining our scale to allow for greater variability (Deneen, Brown, Bond, and Shroff, 2010, Lam and Klockars, 1982)

Paths forward

Departmental level

- Collect data on student outcomes to inform program and course planning

Course level

- Greater emphasis on outcome-oriented metacognition
- Assembling course-specific materials which speak to identified areas

References

- Baron, M. A., & Boschee, F. (1996). Dispelling the myths surrounding OBE. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77* (8), 574-576.
- Deneen, C, Brown, G.T., Bond, T., & Shroff, R. (2010). They can't tell the difference: A first evaluation of an Outcome-Based Learning innovation in teacher education. International Association for Educational Assessment 36th annual meeting. 22-27 August. Bangkok, Thailand.
- Dwyer, C., Millett, C. M., & Payne, D. G. (2006). *A culture of Evidence: Postsecondary Assessment and Learning Outcomes*. Princeton, N.J.: ETS.
- Ewell, P. (2006). *Applying student learning outcomes concepts and approaches at Hong Kong Higher Education Institutions: Current status and future directions*. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Ginns, P., Prosser, M. & Barrie, S. (2007). Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: the perspective of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(5), 603-615.
- Gravestock, P. & Gregor-Greenleaf, E. (2008). *Student Course Evaluations: Research, Models and Trends*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Hanstedt, P., & Deneen, C. (2010). Assessment and General Education in your course. Fulbright Scholar, Hong Kong 3-3-4 Curricular Reform of Higher Education in HK Workshop. 8 May. Hong Kong, SAR: City University of Hong Kong.
- Hussey, T. & Smith, P. (2003). The uses of learning outcomes. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 8 (3), 357-368.

References, cont.

- Kennedy, K. (2009) Outcome based learning design statement. *HKIEd AQAC Document.*
- Lerner, J. & Tetlock, P.E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 255-275.
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nusche, D. (2007). *Assessment of Learning Outcomes in Higher Education: A comparative review of selected practices.* OECD Education Working Paper Number 15. Paris: OECD.
- Peterson, E. R., Brown, Gavin T.L., & Irving, S.E. Secondary school students' conceptions of learning and their relationship to achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 3(20),167-176*
- Prosser, M., Martin, E., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P. & Middleton, H. (2008). University academics' experience of research and its relationship to their experience of teaching. *Instructional Science,* 36, 3-16.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Tetlock, P. E., Skitka, L., & Boettger, R. (1989). Social and cognitive strategies of coping with accountability: Conformity, complexity, and bolstering. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Interpersonal Relations and Group Dynamics*, 57, 632-641.
- Webb, T. (2009, May). OBA and the Quality of Student Learning. Paper presented at UCG symposium in Hong Kong. Hong Kong: Hong Kong, SAR.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION, FROM ALL OUR TEAM MEMBERS!

C. Deneen, G. Brown, P.H. Lam, K.T. Tsui