Teaching portfolio

Johanne Stege Philipsen
Centre for Human Interactivity
Department of Language and Communication

Email: johannesp@sdu.dk
Phone: 61674417

1. CV of teaching

1.1. Teaching experience, Courses and Supervision

Creativity and Process facilitation (Course language: Danish)

at Department of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark
Teaching period: 05/02/2019 → ...
Level: Bachelor; ECTS points: 5 ECTS
Course director and Teacher: Johanne S. Philipsen
Occurrences:
Semester: Spring; Year: 2019
Course details:
Size: 18-25 people, Teaching activities: Plenary discussions, Dialogical Mini-lectures, Group work, Practical exercises, Case-work
Exam form: Synopsis (2 – 3 pages) with Oral Exam, Exam time: 30 mins, Assessment: Graded (7-point grading scale). Censorship Form: Internal Censorship
Responsibilities: Course planning, designing the curriculum (see 3. Appendix), designing practical exercises (see 3. Appendix), making power-point-materials, designing e-learning materials (see 3. Appendix), selecting and designing case materials and exam questions for oral examination

Interactivity and Cognition in Organizations (Course language: Danish)

at Department of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark
Teaching period: 01/02/2016 → 01/06/2018 Level: Bachelor; ECTS points: 10 ECTS
Course director: Professor Sune Vork Steffensen Teacher: Johanne S. Philipsen
Occurrences:
Semester: Spring; Year: 2018
Semester: Spring, Year: 2017
Semester: Spring; Year: 2016 (Guest teacher)
Course details:
Size: 18-25 people, Teaching activities: Lectures, Plenary discussions, Group work, Practical exercises, Student presentations
Exam form: Synopsis (2 – 3 pages) with Oral Exam, Exam time: 30 mins,
Assessment: Graded (7-point grading scale). Censorship Form: Internal Censorship Responsibilities: Updating the curriculum, designing group exercises, making power-point- materials, making exam questions for oral examination

Social Cognition (Course language: English)

at Department of Communication and Culture, Center for Semiotics, University of Aarhus
Teaching period: 01/09/2015 → 15/12/2015
Level: Candidate; ECTS points: 10 ECTS
Course director: Associate Professor Svend Østergaard
Teacher: Johanne S. Philipsen
Occurrences:
Semester: Autumn; Year: 2015
Course details:
Size: 18-25 people, Teaching activities: Lectures, Plenary discussions, Group exercises Exam form: Bound home assignment, 10-13 pages, Exam time: 7 days,
Assessment: Graded (7-point grading scale). Censorship Form: External Censorship Responsibilities: Updating the curriculum, designing group exercises, making power-point- materials, supervising paper assignments

Supervision

I have supervised Master Theses and Bachelor projects at International Business Communication and Negot in various topics such as Interpersonal communication, Language and grammar, Identity on Social Network Sites, Feminist theory and Conservation communication. In written feedback, my students have described my supervision as follows: "I would characterize Johanne's approach to educating as positive, inclusive and well structured. To me, Johanne has been a competent and knowledgeable academic advisor who has assisted me in every professional regard when needed and done so in a way that enabled me to reflect upon the question at hand independently." (- BA project student at IVK). "As supervisor Johanne always had a lot of great and insightful inputs, but there was also so much room for me to evolve and gain a lot of knowledge on the topic." (-BA project student at IVK).

1.2. Formal pedagogical training

Courses on Didactics

- "The Role of the Teacher"; Donna Hurford, SDUUP
- "Feedback"; Donna Hurford, SDUUP
- Workshop: "Teaching Larger Classes"; Donna Hurford, SDUUP
- "Pedagogical Theory"; Kasper Bergstrøm, SDUUP
- "Constructive Alignment"; Cita Nørgaard and Kasper Bergstrøm, SDUUP
- "Motivating Students To Learn"; PhD Nadia Dyrberg Egemose

1.3. Experience with evaluation of teaching

Interdisciplinary Group supervision:
Participants: External SDUUP Supervisor Eva Pors, Christina Maar Andersen (Postdoc, Health, SDU); Johannes Kolind (Assistant Prof. SIMAC, SDU); Kristina Garne Holm (Postdoc, Health, SDU), Tore B. Stage (Assistant Prof. Pharmacology, Health SDU), Spring 2019

External SDUUP Supervision by Eva Pors. Supervision of teaching in the course "Creativity and Process facilitation"

Mentor - Collegial supervision by Associate Prof. Sarah Bro Trasmundi, Department of Language and Communication, HUM, SDU. Supervision of teaching in the course "Creativity and Process facilitation"

2. Teaching philosophy and pedagogical reflections

My teaching philosophy is based on theoretical notions of Active learning (c.f. Bloom's taxonomy (revised by Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001) and SOLO (after Biggs and Collis 1982) in Rienecker 2013, pp. 100-102), Collaborative learning (e.g. Slavin 2014) and Situated Learning (Lave & Wenger 1991; Rienecker et al 2013, s. 81). These approaches to learning very tightly reflect my general scientific approach to thinking and learning, defining human cognition as a fundamentally situated, distributed and embodied activity (e.g. Alač & Hutchins, 2004; Goodwin, 1994, 2000, 2018; Hollan, Hutchins, & Kirsh, 2000; Hutchins, 2010; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). Taking this perspective, in my teaching I pay particular attention to the ways that all learning activities are situated in specific contexts, structured by discourses and enabled by artifacts – all of which have real consequences for learning outcomes. In example, different artifacts have different affordances – i.e. when it comes to note-taking a word processing program on a laptop has different possibilities for action and interaction than a pen and a piece of paper, and the tactile properties are different as well (see e.g. Mueller & Oppenheimer 2014).

My fundamental approach to teaching and learning is reflected in my practice of creating active learning environments where the students are co-creators of the learning activities and their learning paths. I prioritize collective processes where students can discuss and shape their learning paths and learning outcomes. In addition to this, I see it as central to my teaching that students have ample opportunity to relate to, practice and reflect on their theoretical insights in practice. Furthermore, my research background on ecological and embodied approaches to learning creates an increased awareness of students' study practices regarding the use of different technologies and artifacts in learning situations.

My background and teaching philosophy is clearly reflected in the way I structure my teaching and the tools and artifacts I select when creating active, authentic and engaging spaces for learning. Specifically, my teaching activities are centered on dialogical plenum- and group discussions structured through elaborate questioning techniques and ongoing lecture-notes on a black- or whiteboard. Based on my teaching philosophy, I often limit my use of premade presentation materials to present the lesson- and course structure, structure practical exercised and clarify learning objectives so that the students know what is going to happen, what we need to achieve and, not least, why. By using blackboard and powerpoints to anchor my dialogical approach, the students and I shape the approach to the curriculum and learning goals together, in a way that makes sense to them and can be dynamically adapted to their questions, difficulties and needs. In addition, I have a lot of focus on collaborative group processes in my teaching as well as integration of practical exercises and spaces for students to actively reflect on their own study practice.

I have received very good feedback on my teaching from both students and collegial supervision. In addition to positive formal course evaluations, my students have also told me on several occasions that they perceive me as a dedicated and inspiring teacher who is skilled at conveying complicated material in a way that makes it easier to get a hold of. In

particular, my students have told me that they value my teaching style and that they are not very used to dialogical teaching compared to the much more prevalent monologue-based teaching. One student noted at the end of the spring semester this year that because I only use pre-made power-point presentations to a very limited degree, "it feels like you are always very well-prepared and know the curriculum inside-out. You can formulate and re-formulate the teachings based on our questions and you are never just standing there, reading your power-point-slides out loud. It makes it so much more engaging. "(Student at the course "Creativity and Process Facilitation", spring 2019).

However, although the students express appreciation of my active, dialogue-based teaching-style and have shown great learning outcomes, they have also pointed out some aspects that they are lacking in this approach in their oral feedback to me. In particular, several students have pointed out that they are missing "my" formulations of how they should approach and understand the curriculum so that they can "check if they have understood things correctly" for the exam. This critical and important feedback has led to various considerations. One way of approaching this, would be to meet their feedback in some very concrete ways in order to create a greater sense of security for the students in the final phases up to as well as at the exam. On the one hand, one could go about meeting this request, for example, by assembling lists of glossaries that contain definitions and explanations of the course's central theoretical and methodological concepts. In order to enhance students' learning outcomes, such lists could be compiled in collaboration between the students themselves, for example by including an e- learning tool in the form of a student Wiki, where I as a teacher could simultaneously supervise and comment on the development along the way. A Wiki has the advantage of supporting Collaborative learning, and although a Wiki is basically a tool that primarily supports learning processes at the "low" end of Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001), this exercise could be further developed by having the students self-evaluate and comment on each other's posts. On the other hand, it is worth reflecting on how great an impact such an initiative would have on the students' learning paths and what specific learning outcomes would be supported. For the course in question, the learning objectives are very much focused on moving the students from theory to practice. Thus, in this case, it is central to prioritize a focus on developing their independent and active acquisition of the curriculum and, very importantly; how it can be put into practice. Thus, it seems sensible in this case to avoid spending too much time on concept definitions and the creation of glossaries. An alternative way to support the basic need expressed in these students' feedback is a combination of 1) working on methods to improve the use of the blackboard / whiteboard and powerpoints as well as 2) expanding, supporting and teaching students how to develop their note-taking techniques. Such initiatives would build require paying careful attention to how to support and create focus on the ways that central concepts are discussed and defined during class activities. I have been actively working on both, and I see further ways that these techniques and materials that support the ongoing learning activities can be developed. In the literature on Collaborative Learning (Slavin 2014), one can find inspiration for collaborative exercises aimed at supporting students in picking up on key terms and concepts and taking good and elaborate notes. For example, I have experimented with the following exercise inspired by Slavin (2014): At the beginning of the lecture, the students pair up, and then spend approx. 5 min. each to summarize essential concepts from the previous class. The students each take turns to be active in summarizing and to listen carefully to the descriptions. Afterwards, they have 2 minutes to evaluate and revise their notes in silence.

In conclusion, my approach to teaching to be founded on values of authentic engagement, sound teaching methods and a creative approach to study- and teaching materials and technologies. I consider my approach to teaching to be in continuous development and as such never really "finished". On a final note, my teaching methods have benefitted greatly from my scientific and practical work experience with facilitating co-creative collaborations. My research as well as my basic training in such methods have laid the foundation for an engaged and dialogically based way of teaching, that in its essence have a lot in common with practical approaches to coaching and process facilitation.

References:

Alač, M., & Hutchins, E. (2004). I see what you are saying: Action as cognition in fMRI brain mapping practice. Journal of cognition and culture, 4(3), 629-661.Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing. Abridged Edition.Biggs, J. B., & Collis, K. F. (1982). Evaluation the quality of learning: the SOLO taxonomy (structure of the observed learning outcome). Academic Press.Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. American anthropologist, 96(3), 606-633. Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. Journal ofpragmatics, 32(10), 1489-1522.Goodwin, C. (2018). Co-Operative Action. New York: Cambridge University Press.Hollan, J., Hutchins, E., & Kirsh, D. (2000). Distributed cognition: toward a new foundation for human-computer interaction research. ACM Transactions on Computer-HumanInteraction (TOCHI), 7(2), 174-196.Hutchins, E. (2010). Cognitive ecology. Topics in Cognitive Science, 2(4), 705-715.Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. Psychological Science, 25(6), 1159-1168. Rienecker, L., Jørgensen, P. S., Dolin, J., & Ingerslev, G. H. (2013). Universitetspædagogik.Samfundslitteratur.Slavin, R. E. (2014). Cooperative learning and academic achievement: Why does groupwork work. Anales de psicología, 30(3), 785-791.Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (2011). Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world: Cambridge University Press.