

CONDUCTOR OF INTERACTIVE LEARNING “COIL”

These EXPANDED versions of each standard describe 3 *foundational* components (C1, C2, C3). They are used both to train faculty and for peer and self assessment/rating through direct observation, using the Hybrid Scale (Likert and Visual Analog). This process allows for reliability and repeatability to be evaluated for validation.

Standards S1-S7 represent skills that apply directly to COIL (versus Fundamentals, S8 - S16)

S1	Formulated and applied in context, question(s) that were directly linked to goal/s and gave rise to effective, higher order discussions.	Effectively used higher order questions or prompts that directly related to the Goal/s and Learning Objectives of the session (C1). Continued to use these effectively in order to generate discussions that were clearly continuous and related in sequence (C2). Avoided lapses into inappropriately placed, unidirectional lecture style (C3).
S2	Engaged multiple individuals to inspire interactive learning across the large group.	Encouraged and facilitated large group uniformity of participation (e.g., by moving from section to section, engaging left to right, front to back, using names, looking for and focusing on participation gaps (C1), modeling but not overusing highly active participants (C2), regularly pausing for questions while looking around (C3).
S3	Observed and responded appropriately to the comprehension of material across the large group.	In addition to promoting responses and engagement, was able to read the group as to level of comprehension of material. For example, encouraged questions to be asked and answered (C1); asked for best guesses by the students through facilitation of a specific discussion (C2); simplified a topic that wasn't working well (even the most active students were quiet) to provide a meaningful staged approach to arrive at the goal (C3).
S4	Recapped the main components at the end of each subsection of the session with students engaged to contribute to discussion.	Consistently used an approach that followed from framing the session upfront, where different components were summarized and placed into context (C1). Also at this time: a) interactive learning techniques were used to assess broad understanding before moving on (C2); and b) the relevance of knowledge gained in this component to those that follow were elaborated to make the sequential shifts transparent (C3).
S5	Integrated material to enable comprehension that could not have been derived from primary or secondary sources.	Was able to reliably and consistently promote creative scenarios (C1), where examples unfolded to arrive at novel elements of comprehension (C2) and students synthesized distinct but related topics to formulate the big picture (C3). <i>Primary sources</i> include peer reviewed published research articles. <i>Secondary sources</i> include textbooks, websites and published reviews / meta-analyses, etc.
S6	Summarized and explained key concepts in an interactive concluding wrap up.	Placed all of the components of the session into a manageable package that illustrated their cohesion and relevance (C1). What started the session upfront with a framed overview of relevance (Fundamental Standard 10) was followed up here with a concluding synopsis that elaborated the progressive unfolding of the session's components (C2), along with their relatedness and multifactorial relevance (C3).
S7	As moderator of an interdisciplinary teaching faculty TEAM presentation, effectively managed contributions and student involvement.	Similar to individual presenters, but instead, there is a group of educators (two or more) that are contributing, within their area of knowledge expertise, towards a common goal for the session. A moderator (or group leader) oversees the process by: a) introducing the members of the team and their content expertise, b) explaining the relevance of their contributions (C1), c) managing the timing, relevance, and interdisciplinary dynamics of the session (C2), and d) promoting faculty and student interactions (C3). Contributors, other than the moderator, may also be evaluated independently using standards that are applicable to their sub-session roles.