

# **Seminar on University Teaching**

**Spring 2002**

## **Seminar evaluation**

### **Introduction and description of evaluation methods**

The seminar was evaluated in two different ways. First, Provost Heath and Associate Provost Nasr chaired a one-hour evaluation session during the last session of the seminar. Minutes of this session were taken by Dr. Amal BouZeineddine and are presented in Appendix IV. Second, participants filled out a questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part was a five-point Likert Type scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly disagree). The values of the options on the Likert scale were as follows: Strongly agree: 5 point, Agree: 4 points, Neutral: 3 points, Disagree: 2 points, and Strongly disagree: 1 point. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 7 open-ended questions. Sixteen faculty members filled out the questionnaire. Results are presented in Appendix V.

### **Summary of results:**

#### ***Discussion led Provost Heath and Associate Provost Nasr***

Three themes emerged from the discussion lead by Provost Heath and Associate Provost Nasr, namely, the need for more time to discuss issues related to seminar topics, the need to provide a variety of seminar options for faculty members to choose from (discussion groups, training workshops, or other formats), and the need to involve faculty members who register in planning the Seminar. Other issues that emerged from the discussion included the need to consider teaching quality in the University reward system, and the need for Seminar participants to take charge of their learning by reading materials from the textbooks distributed for the purposes of the Seminar. In terms of Seminar organization and logistics, a few participants suggested using the seating arrangement used in this year's seminar in future ones and keep enrollment to 20.

#### ***Evaluation Questionnaire: Part 1***

Response of the sixteen faculty members showed that they agreed (Score of 4 or higher on the Likert scale) that the place/setting was supportive of discussion/reflection, the materials were informative and interesting, and the size of the group was reasonable. Moreover, they agreed that having participants from different disciplines was advantageous, information was useful to improve future teaching practices, and that the seminar provided pedagogical space that was both bounded and open, hospitable and charged, welcomed both silence and speech, invited the voice of the individual and the voice of the group, and honored 'little' stories of the participants and 'big' stories of teaching/learning. Finally, respondents agreed that the facilitators, created an environment supportive of reflection, raised good questions, and guided group discussion without being too directive.

Participants' responses to other items of the Likert-type component of the questionnaire showed scores between 3.5 and 3.9 out of 4. These included the items that asked about the sufficiency of duration and appropriateness of the time of the

Seminar, whether or not the Seminar met participants' expectations, and whether or not the facilitators were good listeners and overall did a great job. Finally, participants were neutral when asked about the comprehensiveness of the Seminar topics and seemed to disagree with the statement that said that the seminar topics were difficult.

### ***Evaluation Questionnaire: Part 2***

A few participants (3 participants) suggested that all sessions were useful. However, other participants felt that the session on teaching portfolios was the most useful (6 participants), followed by the one on technology (4 participants), student oriented methods (3 participants), identifying objectives (2 participants) in which a lecture was shown on video. The least useful session according to participants was the one on evaluation (4 participants), followed by the ones on specifying objectives, teacher-oriented methods, and the session in which a video was shown (2 participants each) and the session on using technology (1 participant).

Participants seemed to think that none of the sessions covered the topic completely. Consequently, they thought that they needed more information about all the topics discussed in the Seminar. Moreover, participants liked the fact that the Seminar provided opportunities for sharing and discussing ideas and experiences and interacting with colleagues from other faculties. On the other hand, there was no consensus on what was not liked. A few participants (4 participants) said that they did not like the use of exercises in some sessions. On the other hand, the fact that sessions were short, the listserv, excessive comments by a few participants, and lack of answers to some questions were mentioned by one participant each. Finally, the majority of participants thought that the listserv was useful (11 participants).

Suggestions for future seminars focused on providing flexibility of offerings and delivery methods to provide faculty members the opportunity to choose based on need and/or interest. Specific suggestions included organizing seminars for specific departments, workshops on effective classroom techniques, hands-on training, special interest groups, follow-up sessions that focus on one or two topics, workshops on evaluation of teaching and learning, and forum for sharing ideas and experiences. Other suggestions addressed assigning readings before each session and taking it a step further in discussions during the session, inviting renowned teachers to deliver model lectures in different subject areas, and creating e-mail discussion groups.

### **Participants' Evaluation of Session 3**

Facilitators of Session 3, *Teacher-oriented Methods*, opted to receive evaluation of the session at the end of and/or during the week the session was given, March 12, 2002. Participants responded to two questions, (1) What did you like most about this session?; (2) How could this session have been done differently. Following is a summary of the participants' feedback: *What was liked about the session*: reflection on issues/ exchange of ideas/ and discussion of concepts (7 participants); moderators organization, techniques given, readings and everything (6 participants); interesting points, questions raised, and small groups (3 participants); handouts, learning from each other, and combination of group and individual work (3 participants). *What needs to be done differently*: more time for discussing and wrapping up (6 participants); discussion on students' expectations, class size, and

principles of adult education (3 participants); too much to cover in one session (1 participant); no need for evaluation of session now (1 participant); questionnaires be sent before session (1 participant); don't know (1 participant).

## Recommendations

It is important to note that the design of this year's Seminar deliberately followed that of last year's in order to have recommendations that may compare with baseline data.

As co-coordinators of this year's Seminar, we recommend that:

1. Release time be given to coordinator(s) given this task;
2. Seminar be redesigned to incorporate workshop sessions as well as discussions;
3. Fewer number of topics be covered and more in depth discussions be given;
4. Number of participants be restricted to 20;
5. Selection of heterogeneous groups of participants and facilitators continue, adding facilitators from previous Seminar's participants;
6. the listserv continue to be established;
7. same resource books be used, yet not to the exclusion of looking for more recent publications if they prove more viable to AUB context;
8. materials from resource books be more clearly incorporated in the sessions;
9. system which ensures Faculty commitment be created so that colleagues who sign up for the Seminar do not reserve their place yet not show up;
10. participants' expectations of the Seminar be part of the Seminar's last planning phase.

## In Closing

We believe that co-coordinating the Seminar was a very enriching experience in many ways. We got to know our colleagues from different faculties, their needs and expectations, and best of all we learned a lot about ourselves.

Sincerely,

Saouma BouJaoude and Amal BouZeineddine

Appendix I

Faculty Seminar in University Teaching

**Dear Colleagues,**

In its continuing effort to support faculty development in the area of university teaching, AUB offers a second Faculty Seminar in University Teaching. The purpose of the Seminar, conducted by faculty members for faculty members, is to provide an intellectual platform for AUB Faculty to: (1) identify strategies for improving teaching skills; (2) discuss topics related to university teaching; and (3) share teaching experiences. We hope that this platform also helps in empowering collegiality at AUB

Full-time faculty members are encouraged to participate in this Seminar. The number of the Seminar group will be restricted to twenty senior and junior faculty and full-time instructors from all Faculties and Schools. At the Seminar's conclusion, each participating faculty member will be granted an acknowledgement certificate.

The duration of the Seminar is eight weeks. We will meet once a week, on Tuesdays, from 5 pm to 7 pm, starting March 5, 2002.

Please be advised that the deadline for registration is Friday, February 22, 2002.

To see the Seminar schedule, please go to:  
<http://webfaculty.aub.edu.lb/~webwork/SeminarOutline.htm>

To sign up for this Seminar, please go to:  
<http://webfaculty.aub.edu.lb/~webwork/FacultySeminar.htm>

If you have any questions or problems opening these files, please contact [boujaoud@aub.edu.lb](mailto:boujaoud@aub.edu.lb) or [bouzein@aub.edu.lb](mailto:bouzein@aub.edu.lb)

**Faculty Seminar in University Teaching - Introductory**

## Overview

In this Seminar, Faculty will discuss various approaches to university teaching; use their experiences to demonstrate or analyze issues relevant to university teaching; reflect on their teaching practices vis-à-vis topics presented; and in groups, develop teaching materials based on Seminar sessions. The Seminar will emphasize interaction and sharing of ideas among faculty members in an atmosphere of collegiality.

## **Objectives**

This Seminar assists faculty to:

- 1- Reflect on their definition of effective university teaching;
- 2- Develop, state and refine course objectives;
- 3- Develop course syllabi;
- 4- Discuss and analyze different effective teaching methods;
- 5- Evaluate teaching and student learning;
- 6- Have a forum to discuss teaching with colleagues.

## Conduct of Seminar

The Seminar will meet once a week for eight weeks in a collaborative learning environment. Each segment will be facilitated by discussion leaders from among your colleagues and will be attended by participants from diverse disciplines to provide an excellent base for discussion of Seminar topics from different points of view. Participants will review readings that will provide a common basis for theory and "expert" advice, then they will share their own ideas and experiences with their colleagues, design various instructional activities and develop their strategies for assessing teaching and learning. Using discussion, interaction and hands-on activities, and group presentations, the Seminar will build on what Faculty know and at an array of approaches that will serve current needs and future developments. The atmosphere is collegial and intended to encourage open exchange among AUB Faculty about approaches to teaching so that we can benefit from each others' experiences.

**Group Presentations:** The purpose of the group presentations and critiquing in Session 5 is to provide participants with an opportunity to apply the concepts that have been discussed in sessions 2, 3 and 4 and to provide concrete examples of teaching that can be discussed and shared by the participants. Consequently, volunteers, composed of a group of participants, will be asked to prepare a mini-lesson (approximately 25 minutes). The group members collaborate in preparing the lesson, but only one person presents it. During the presentation, other participants will play the role of "students". The lesson is videotaped. All participants view the

tape, analyze it, discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson as well as the specific strategies used in the presentation, and recommend changes if appropriate.

### **Resources**

- McKeachie, W. J. (1999). McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers (10<sup>th</sup> ed). Boston: Houghton Mufflin Company
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Emerson, D. M., Johnson, R. N., Milner, S. & Plank, K.M. (1997). The Penn State Teacher II: Learning to Teach, Teaching to Learn. University Park, PA: Penn State University Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching.
- Davis, B. G. (1993). Tools for teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Seminar outline

### **Week 1- March 5**

Introduction

- Basis of effective college teaching
- Accreditation
- Our students' characteristics

Facilitators: Provost P. Heath

Prof. W. Nasr

### **Week 2 - March 12**

Specifying what is to be learned

- Identifying and stating objectives

- Preparing course syllabi

Facilitators: Prof. M. Harajli, FEA

Prof. M. Henningsen, FAS

### **Week 3 & 4**

Effective Teaching Methods

### **Week 3 - March 19**

Teacher-oriented methods (lecture, discussion, handling large classrooms, demonstrations, lab experiences)

Facilitators: Prof. R. Souweid Afifi, FHS

Prof. A. BouZeineddine, FAS

Prof. M. Khattar, FAS

### **Week 4 - March 26**

Student-oriented methods (active and collaborative activities, case studies, problem-solving, project management, student presentations/seminars)

Facilitators: Prof. T. Araysi, Faculty of Medicine

Prof. K. Abdallah, School of Business

### **Week 5 - April 2**

Group Presentations and Critiquing

- Presentation Topics:

- \* Effective Teaching Methods (teacher-oriented)
- \* Effective Teaching Methods (student-oriented)
- Videotaping of presentations will take place.
- Critiquing by colleagues will follow

Facilitators: Prof. S. BouJaoude, FAS

Prof. R. Zurayk, FAFS

Prof. N. Dajani, FAS

### **Week 6 & 7**

Measuring and evaluating teaching and learning

### **Week 6 - April 9**

Evaluating student learning:

- Student assessments
- Course grading

Facilitators: Prof. K. El-Hassan, FAS

Prof. F. Alkhal, FEA

Week 7 - April 16

Evaluating teaching: Creating a Teaching Portfolio

Facilitators: Prof. N. Ghaddar, FEA

Mrs. N. Dumit, School of Nursing

**Week 8 - April 23**

Incorporating technology into university teaching

Facilitators: Prof. H. Yaghi, FAS  
Prof. A. Feghali, School of Business  
Prof. M. Al Ghoul, FAS

**Week 9 - April 30**

Wrap-up session and evaluation; dinner hosted by Provost and Associate Provost

Facilitators: Provost P. Heath  
Prof. W. Nasr  
Prof. S. BouJaoude  
Prof. A. BouZeineddine

Appendix II

Faculty Seminar on University Teaching

Participants -- Spring 2001/2002

<b>Name</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1. Amin Tamer	3098	FAS	<a href="mailto:Tamer.amin@aub.edu.lb">Tamer.amin@aub.edu.lb</a>	Education	Assistant Professor
2. Arevian Mary	5972	School of Nursing	mb00@aub.edu.lb	Nursing	Assistant Professor
3. Dumit Myrna	5968	School of Nursing	ma12@aub.edu.lb	Nursing	Ass. Professor
4. Ghaith Ghazi	3072	FASc	gghaith@aub.edu.lb	Education	Associate Professor
5. Haddad, John	4230	FAS	<a href="mailto:jhaddad@aub.edu.lb">jhaddad@aub.edu.lb</a>	Math	Assistant professor
6. Hanna Khauli, Leila	3946	Business	1k02@aub.edu.lb	Marketing	Instructor
7. Hoffmann, Raymond Joseph	4109	FAS	<a href="mailto:rh21@aub.edu.lb">rh21@aub.edu.lb</a>	CS	Assistant Professor
8. Hout Bassima	03/232419	Business	bh03@aub.edu.lb	Accounting	Instructor
9. Houalla Nahla	4540	FAS	nahla@aub.edu.lb	Nutrition & Food Science	Professor
10. Kanj Mayada	4671	FHS	mkanj@aub.edu.lb	Health Behavior & Educ.	Instructor
11. Kazarian Shahe	4374	FASc	sk29@aub.edu.lb	SBS	Professor
12. Khoury Malakeh	03/617276 or 4123	FASc	mk01@aub.edu.lb	English	Instructor
13. Nouredine Samar	5966	Medicine	sn00@aub.edu.lb	School of Nursing	Assistant Professor
14. Nuwayhid	3596	FEA	rida@aub.edu.lb	Mechanical	Associate

Rida					e Professo r
15. Rustom Shehadeh Lamia	03/73922 2 or 4020 - 4029	FASc	1s00@aub.edu.lb	Civilization Sequence Program	Associat e Professo r
16. Sidani Yusuf	3952	Busines s	ys01@aub.edu.lb	Business	Assistant Professo r
17. Tabbal Malek	4302	FASc	malek.tabbal1@aub.edu .lb	Physics	Assistant Professo r
18. Tarraf Charbel	3905	FASc	chtarraf@aub.edu.lb	Biology	Assistant Professo r
19. Usta. Julnar	4885	Medicin e	<u>justa@aub.edu.lb</u>	Biochemistr y	Associat e Professo r
20. Zreik, Hassan	03/66567 4	FAS	<u>Hz00@aub.edu.lb</u>	English	Instructo r

### Appendix III

#### Faculty Seminar on University Teaching

#### Facilitator list

Spring 2001/2002

<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Title</b>
Provost Peter Heath	pheath@aub.edu.lb	
Dr. Waddah Nasr	wnnasr@aub.edu.lb	Associate Provost
Dr. Mohammad Harajli	mharajli@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Engineering and Architecture
Dr. Marj Henningsen	marjh@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Dr. Rima Souweid Afifi	ra15@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Health Sciences
Dr. Amal BouZeineddine	bouzein@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Dr. Medhat Khattar	medhat@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Dr. Thurayya Araysi	ta01@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Medicine
Dr. Kamel Abdallah	ka05@aub.edu.lb	School of Business
Dr. Saouma BouJaoude	boujaoud@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Dr. Rami Zurayk	rzurayk@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Agriculture & Food Sciences
Dr. Nabil Dajani	dajanin@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Karma El-Hassan	kelhasan@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Dr. Farqad Alkhal	fa11@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Engineering and Architecture
Dr. Nesreen Ghaddar	farah@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Engineering and Architecture
Mrs. Nuhad Dumit	ny00@aub.edu.lb	School of Nursing
Dr. Hussein Yaghi	hyaghi@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Dr. Antoine Feghali	feghali@aub.edu.lb	School of Business
Dr. Mazen Al Ghoul	mg05@aub.edu.lb	Faculty of Arts & Sciences

## **Appendix IV**

### **Seminar Evaluation**

April 30, 2002

Minutes taken by Dr. Amal BouZeineddine

Dr. Nasr started seminar evaluation using 3 documents; (1) Seminar objectives as announced in Provost Heath's invitation for the Seminar; (2) Dr. Medhat Khattar's e-mail dated Thursday, March 7, 2002; (3) Evaluation of last year's Seminar.

The evaluation session discussed the following issues:

- \* Which role is more conducive to learning in the seminar, as facilitator or participant?
- \* How can seminar topics be translated into teaching practices that have positive impact on our students?
- \* How much knowledge do students retain from courses taken with us?

### **Suggestions For A Future Faculty Seminar**

The following suggestions were made and discussed:

- \* More time be allotted to discussing topics and sharing experiences.
- \* Less topics be scheduled per Seminar session to allow for more in depth discussions.
- \* Seminar format be more of a workshop style with more practice on implementation.
- \* Seating arrangement be followed as this year's.
- \* More than 8 weeks be scheduled if the purpose of the seminar is training.

- \* Look into different ways to follow-up on topics presented.
- \* Keep number of participants 20.
- \* Schedule a planning session with participants who sign up for the Seminar before the initiation of the Seminar. Coordinators would then incorporate participants' responses and suggestions in developing the seminar which would allow for flexibility in designing a seminar closer to participants' expectations and needs
- \* More than one activity be offered to all AUB Faculty: one focuses on sharing experiences and reflecting on them, the other on training workshops. Faculty choose which to join.
- \* Reward systems be considered to accompany and be compatible with improving teaching effectiveness.
- \* Responsibility for seminar involvement (including reading Seminar resource books) and being a catalyst to enhance sharing experiences be exercised to help in attaining Seminar ultimate goal: teaching effectiveness.

**Appendix V**  
**Faculty Seminar in University Teaching**  
**Spring 2001/2002**  
**Evaluation Form**

The following statements describe certain aspects of the seminar. Express your view by marking the appropriate position on the rating scale that best reflects it.

*Part I*

<b><u>Strongly Disagree SD</u></b>	<b><u>Disagree D</u></b>	<b><u>Neutral N</u></b>	<b><u>Agree A</u></b>	<b><u>Strongly Agree SA</u></b>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

	<b>Mean</b>
1. The place/setting was supportive of discussion/reflection	4.3
2. The seminar materials/handouts were:	
i. Informative	4.3
ii. Interesting	4.2
iii. Difficult	2.5
3. The size of the group (20) was reasonable	4.7
4. Having participants from different disciplines enriched discussions	4.6
5. The duration of the seminar (8 weeks) was sufficient	3.6
6. Time (5-7 p.m.) was convenient	3.7
7. The topics covered in the seminar were all inclusive	3.1
8. The seminar experience provided insights that might be helpful in my future teaching practices	4.2
9. The seminar met my expectations	3.7
10. The seminar provided 'pedagogical space' that*	
i. is both bounded and open	4.0
ii. is hospitable and charged at the same time	4.2
iii. welcomed both silence and speech	4.1
iv. invited the voice of the individual and the voice of the group	4.1
v. honored 'little' stories of the participants and 'big' stories of teaching/learning	4.0
11. The facilitators:	
i. created an environment supportive of reflection	4.0
ii. raised good questions	4.2

iii. were good listeners	3.9
iv. guided group discussion without being too directive	4.0
v. overall, they did a great job	3.9

\*Palmer's paradoxical tensions

-

## **Part II**

Please answer the following questions:

**1. Which of the eight sessions was *most* useful? Why?**

- I found the sessions on technology, aligning objectives of course syllabus with AUB mission and teachers' portfolio very useful.
- The one on teaching portfolio because it included useful handouts
- Student-oriented methods
- The one about technology (Incorporating technology into university teaching hypermedia...) because I learned new concepts that might be helpful.
- The syllabus (defining objectives and alignment. I will apply it to my syllabus ASAP.
- Teacher – oriented methods
- Student-oriented methods. Although very difficult to apply in large classroom. I felt that it opened my eyes on many things that I used to take for granted.
- I believe that all sessions were very interesting & important. Looking at the Seminars' outline retrospectively at all sessions I see this seminar as an awareness forum for University teachers. No "least useful" session. We benefited from every session, every facilitators and presenter. I think that concentrated follow up sessions should follow. These seminars raised many important questions that were answered or not answered (most of the time) due to time constraints, but the most important aspect is the sharing experiences that went on. As University teachers we are responsible to initiate critical thinking in our students & I think this seminar was implemented in a way to enrich critical thinking. Although I believe that we needed more time for each session but keeping non-answered raised questions will promote critical thinking & is an incentive to attend future seminars.
- Student oriented methods. The session created a lot of constructive debate about its applicability (problem based learning) in various disciplines.
- Teaching portfolio, the facilitators knew where they were going.
- Technology, It was informative & educative portfolio.
- Portfolio
- Technology and portfolio
- The one that discussed "Teaching Portfolios
- The last session on the lecture. It provided the concrete video recording for a focused discussion.
- Teaching philosophy. I never knew that such things existed before and the facilitators did a good job at driving the point through.



**2. Which was *least* useful? Why?**

- I found all the sessions useful.
- The last session.
- Specifying what is to be learned because basically I knew most of the things discussed.
- Last one.
- Evaluating students learning nothing new, my concerns remained the same as well as the session on course syllabi and objectives.
- Evaluating student learning. There was more lecturing from discussing.
- Evaluating student learning. The discussion was not well controlled so aspects of interest could not be covered.
- Evaluating students learning – Poor planning!
- The first three where exercises carried the day without much discussion.
- Exercises on themes, purpose, etc... of lectures.
- None. The others usefulness was about the same!
- The technology session for one, personally did not teach me anything new.

**3. Which topic do you think needed more time/information?**

- Use the technology, evaluation of students. I think I would have liked to learn more about the issues.
- Group work structuring to ensure effectiveness.
- Assessment of student learning – Portfolios
- Technology and creating a Teaching Portfolio.
- Most topics were not covered in depth. We needed more time for discussions. Which brings us back to the same question. Should we fully explain a topic (or discuss it) or cover the planned material.
- Evaluation time & information
- All
- Evaluating student learning. This is such an important and broad topic that is of concern and needs more time to be covered.
- Week 3 – Teacher-oriented methods.
- All except for those on technology & portfolio.
- All topics can take more time.
- Portfolio
- Class size and relationship to different faculties.
- All topics would have benefited from less structures & in my view.
- Evaluation.

**4. What did you like most about the seminar?**

- Sharing our experiences, discussing issues with other faculties. I always came out with more questions than when I went in.
- Knowing more colleagues
- The discussions and getting to meet people from other departments or faculties.
- The discussions that took place in the seminar.
- Defining course objectives and relating that to the program
- The sharing of our experiences.
- The interaction with members from different faculties and sharing information and experience.
- Hearing the experiences and insights of people from various disciplines.
- To be made aware of issues that I had never thought about.
- Sharing meeting with colleagues; warmth; understanding; support; interdisciplinary. I can go on and on.
- Discussions
- Sharing of experiences.
- Sharing of ideas
- Learning few tricks.
- Coffee, cookies and the nice environment.
- The fact that a conversation was initiated about teaching among colleagues from disparate disciplines and departments.
- Experiences from different faculties and points of view.

**5. What did you like least?**

- I found the time too short sometimes.
- Lack of answers to questions rose.
- The listserv.
- Some participants' excessive comments that took some time from the other participants' feedback; this is specifically true when some participants delved too deep into their own experience that might not have been relevant.
- The exercises; I think we lost valuable time on them.
- The attitude of very little facilitation.
- In a few sessions, the group exercises took a way from the time of discussion. I suggest for the future to restrict those to not more than one group activities in one session.
- The "same people" were doing most of the discussion.
- Walking and mingling exercises.
- The fact that some sessions were "pasted" together because of lack of coordination between facilitators.
- Group exercises on stating objectives and preparing syllabi.
- Not much chance to demonstrate my own "teaching woes" in a way that is organized (not simply a remark... etc.)
- The facts that discussions weren't sustained long enough.

**6. Was the listserv a useful tool? Please elaborate.**

- Very useful. I looked forward to the continued discussions.
- No. It was sometimes used just to say something whether there was something to be said or not.
- Not really.
- It was quite OK, but some e-mails were not really much relevant to the seminar.
- Definitely- it helped to follow up on the topics that were not fully discussed during the sessions.
- Very much
- Yes. It was a platform for us to say what we could not say during the seminar.
- Yes.
- Yes
- Yes
- I think so although I used it only once and many times didn't have time to read all the messages.
- I could not follow all comments.
- Definitely and should remain so in same way.
- There wasn't as much participation in it as there might have been
- Yes although it couldn't be used more through a moderator.

---

**7. Suggestions for future seminars.**

- To have the option of learning more about a certain area-hands on training & workshops.
- Effective classroom techniques.
- Have special interest groups and follow-up sessions that focus on one or two topics, especially for people who participated in this workshop.
- Have more specific seminars for specific departments and move away from the very general seminars.
- Suggest readings
- before each session and take it a step further in discussions during the session.
- Apply the topics to each individual case.
- Create e-mail addresses that communicate new interesting educational techniques and issues.
- Mix of participants; especially not to have a big group from the same discipline / make the sessions shorter.
- A whole day workshop session or may be sessions.
- Do workshops instead of seminars for some topics, like evaluation of teaching and learning.
- Keep it going.
- Clear topics.
- Sharing ideas and experiences.
- Should have session evaluation (every time), not all sessions were the same; content was different and the facilitators were different.
- Change the content of the "snacks" we had same snack for 8 weeks!!!
- Less topics
- Renowned teachers in various disciplines to give example lecture in science, humanities, social science, etc.
- You are the experts...!
- I would suggest a planning session early on to let participants have a voice in topic discussion format.
- I like the suggestion made today for providing training workshops that support the topic. A general note: we were provided with lots of information. Thank you. In some cases; however, the amount reflected no proper guidance. I think handouts should be more focused. At any rate, thank you for your excellent job.

