














Luca Di Stasio

Early Stage Researcher

-  D-CPR Certified (FR, SE)
-  Driver License Cat. B (IT)
-  Italian & EU citizen
-  Stormvägen 299
SE-97634 Luleå, Sweden
-  +46 76 453 21 60
-  luca.distasio@gmail.com
-  www.lucadistasioengineering.com

Contents

- p. 1**
 -  Background
 -  Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes
- p. 2**
 -  Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education
- p. 3**
 -  Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development
- p. 6**
 -  Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
 -  Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
 -  Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
 -  Pedagogic Activities outside the University
- p. 7**
 -  Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers
- p. 9**
 -  Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019
- p. 12**
 -  Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Background

I am currently employed as a full-time PhD candidate in Polymeric Composite Materials at the Division of Materials Science, Department of Engineering Sciences and Mathematics, Luleå tekniska universitet (LTU) in Luleå, Sweden. I teach in 4 graduate-level courses offered in the subject of Polymeric Composite Materials. The courses are offered as part of the LTU-offered Master programme in Composite Materials and the international joint Master programmes in Materials Science and Engineering EEIGM/EUSMAT (European School of Materials Science and Engineering) and AMASE (Advanced Materials Science and Engineering).

Previously, I taught at the École Européenne d'Ingénieurs en Génie des Matériaux (EEIGM) in Nancy, France in undergraduate- and graduate-level courses in Solid Mechanics, Viscoelasticity, Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics, Mechanics of Composite Materials.

I also contribute to the research activities of the Polymeric Composite Materials subject at LTU, working on integrated computational and experimental mechanics of polymers and polymer composites with a focus on fatigue, fracture and damage (see my Research Statement for more details).

In addition, I am involved in the supervision of graduate students in the context of Master theses and project courses. I am actively involved in the continuous improvement of teaching practices in the subject of Polymeric Composite Materials by proposing new experimental activities for students (composites repair laboratory, bi-axial strain gauge measurements) as well as improving the virtual learning space of the courses offered in the subject. Furthermore, I actively contribute to the pedagogical research in Higher Education; currently I am working on a contribution (article and oral presentation) to the upcoming *Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019*.

Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes

Subject Related Courses

As detailed in my resumé, I have received a BSc in Aerospace Engineering (2010) from Politecnico di Milano (Milan, Italy), a MSc in Mechanical Engineering (2012) from Drexel University (Philadelphia, USA), a MSc in Space Engineering (2013) from Politecnico di Milano (Milan, Italy), a PhD in Materials Science and Engineering (exp. Dec. 2019) from Université de Lorraine (Nancy, France) and a PhD in Polymeric Composite Materials (exp. Dec. 2019) from Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden).

The courses I attended in these programs qualify me to teach within the specializations of Polymeric Composite Materials, Computational Mechanics, Experimental Mechanics, Computational Materials Science. I have also published peer-reviewed journal articles and conference papers and given several oral presentations in international conferences and seminars on Polymeric Composite Materials and Computational Mechanics (see my full list of publications for a more detailed account).

Pedagogic Courses

I have successfully completed the 7.5 ECTS course *Qualifying course for university teachers* at Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden) in February 2019.

During my stay at the École Européenne d'Ingénieurs en Génie des Matériaux (EEIGM) in Nancy, France, I also completed the following courses (in-presence or online) on Higher Education: Teaching in Higher Education (4 ECTS), Teaching Sustainability and Sustainable Development (2 ECTS), Oral Communication and Body Language in the Workplace (3.5 ECTS).

Furthermore, in 2017 I completed the *Software Carpentry Instructor Training Program* proposed by *The Carpentries* to become a Certified Workshop Instructor. *The Carpentries* is non-profit association whose aim is to teach software development and data science skills to researcher and to promote Open Science values and best practices.

p. 1	Background
p. 2	Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes
p. 3	Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development
p. 7	Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
p. 9	Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
p. 12	Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers
	Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019
	Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education

Teaching

Solid Mechanics, École Européenne d'Ingénieurs en Génie des Matériaux (Nancy, France), 2017, Spring Term, Bachelor's Level (2nd year)

I was in charge of the laboratory sessions devoted to tensile testing of aluminum, strain gauge measurements and thermomechanical measurements. I was also responsible for the examination (oral exam) and grading on this part of the course.

Mechanics of Materials I, École Européenne d'Ingénieurs en Génie des Matériaux (Nancy, France), 2017, Autumn Term, Bachelor's Level (3rd year)

I taught tutorials to groups of 15-20 students on problems of viscoelasticity and linear elastic fracture mechanics in the form of interactive problem solving sessions. I also conducted workshops on the use of Finite Elements in materials modeling using the software Abaqus to groups of 15-20 students.

Composite Materials, École Européenne d'Ingénieurs en Génie des Matériaux (Nancy, France), 2017, Autumn Term, Master's Level (1st year)

I conducted workshops on the use of Finite Elements in composite materials modeling using the software Abaqus to groups of 15-20 students.

T7020T - Composites: Design and Numerical Methods, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), 2018, Autumn Term, Master's Level

I was responsible for the laboratory sessions devoted to Mode I delamination testing (Double Cantilever Beam) of composites and calculation of Uni-Directional (UD) elastic properties from experimental data.

T7005T - Aerospace Materials, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), 2018 - 2019, Spring Term, Master's Level (1st year)

The course was divided into 3 main thematic sections: fatigue, fracture and damage in fiber-reinforced composites; joining techniques for composites; advanced metallic alloys. The first part, on fatigue, fracture and damage of composites, involved laboratory sessions of which I was in charge. In the 2019 edition of the course, I also defined the research topic of the laboratory session and designed the corresponding learning activities. I also improved the virtual learning space of the course by restructuring its content and appearance. Furthermore, I helped the design of the seminar activity in the section on advanced metallic alloys.

T7012T - Composite Materials, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), 2018 - 2019, Autumn and Winter Term, Master's Level (1st year)

I was responsible for the laboratory sessions devoted to manual manufacturing of composites, mechanical testing and calculation of Uni-Directional (UD) elastic properties from experimental data.

T7011T - Mechanics of Fiber Composites, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), 2019, Winter Term, Master's Level (1st year)

I was in charge of the laboratory sessions devoted to mechanical testing of composites and calculation of Uni-Directional (UD) elastic properties from experimental data.

Supervision

Bachelor and Master's theses and project courses

E7009T - Degree Project, Materials Technology, 30 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden) and Università di Padova (Padova, Italy), 2019, Spring Term, Master's Level (2nd year)

I co-supervised the Master's thesis work of an exchange student from Università di Padova (Padova, Italy). I met the student for 2-3 hours every week over 4 months and supported his activity by introducing him to experimental techniques, methods of design of experiments, programming languages and data analysis strategies. The student and I met with the main supervisor at Luleå tekniska universitet once every month.

T7009T - Project Course, Materials Science and Engineering, 30 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), 2019, Autumn Term, Master's Level (2nd year)

I co-supervised the Project Course work of a Master level student. I formulated the research question of the project and designed the main learning activities.

p. 1	Background
p. 2	Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes
p. 3	Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development
p. 6	Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
p. 6	Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
p. 6	Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities outside the University
p. 7	Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers
p. 9	Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019
p. 12	Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development

Teaching Excellence: a Model of Target Attributes

At the beginning of my journey as a teacher in Higher Education, my original Model of Teaching Excellence was built upon my personal experience as a student and as a teacher. Being an Excellent Teacher, as I envisioned it, was thus to be the teacher I would have loved to meet when I was a student. That was the teacher I tried to be working with my first students. It was the product of my personal reflection over my experience, but no pedagogical foundation was present. A set of 8 attributes described this model of Excellent Teacher, ordered from the most to the least needed: empathic, understanding, respectful, listener, communicator, open-minded, life-long learner, expert. It was the image of a University teacher who capable of seeing each student as a responsible adult, available to help, open to different perspective and her/himself a curious learner. Expertise, meant as the expertise in one's own field of teaching, was a less salient trait, as subject-knowledge is an ephemeral skill (today's pace of progress requires life-long learning in the scientific and technical fields) and could be developed along the way.

This vision of Excellent Teacher resonated with Kierkegaard's idea of learning facilitator [1, 2]: "All genuine helping begins with humility before the person I want to help and therefore I must understand that helping is not to dominate, but to serve". His humanistic approach to teaching was an eye-opener and represented the first critical comparison between my personal reflection on experience and the pedagogical literature. From this first encounter with Higher Education pedagogy I gained confidence and, quite frankly, a sense of relief: my reflections were in agreement with other authors, they were not only my personal views! Such realization was for me especially important, as I had been growing professionally in technical environments where teaching is usually regarded as a minor duty.

Since then, my Model of Excellent Teaching and its Attributes have been evolving through a continuous comparison between experience in the classroom, personal reflection, study of pedagogical principles and experimentation of learning techniques. I currently envision the Excellent Teacher as: a counselor, an active listener, an open-minded person, a communicator, a life-long learner, a pedagogical expert and a team-player.

I believe that Maslow's hierarchy of needs [3] represents a clear and workable reference model of an individual's motivations to act, albeit not a complete or self-contained explanation of it. At the lower levels of Maslow's pyramid sit basic needs such as physiological ones (hunger, thirst, rest, ...) and physical safety; they are followed by psychological needs, expressed in the need of belonging, of having meaning relationship, of having self-esteem; learning belongs to the top, i.e. self-actualization, creativity, the need to fulfill one own's potential. Although the hierarchy should not be taken as a strict, one-way procedure to achieve self-fulfilment, it certainly grasps some important and, alas, often overlook workings of the human being: there exists a relation of urgency between needs and desires, and the lack of fulfillment of one level of the hierarchy affects the higher levels. Given that learning sits at the top, we can argument that learning is affected by feelings, physical and psychological. If a student feels discriminated, harassed or in danger, s/he will not perform well. The first duty of the teacher is to observe students and listen to them: hear their grievances and evaluate them fairly, investigate with tact situations of personal hardship and guide students to the right source of help (financial, psychological, physical, ...). It is in this sense that I view the Excellent Teacher as a counselor and an active listener: someone capable of listening and understanding students, guiding them to the right help, and ensuring that the learning environment is safe, fair, free from discrimination of any kind, open to all contributions.

In a more comprehensive way, the learning environment should be inclusive. My understanding of the problem of inclusion starts by recalling the GAP model of disability [4]: a disability exists when there is a gap between an individual's capabilities and demands from the environment. The teacher should be attentive to any case in which such gap between individual's capabilities and learning activities' requirements prevents the student from achieving the intended learning outcomes. Indeed in Sweden, where I am currently employed, the teacher is required to act in accordance to the Swedish Discrimination Act [5] in the case the student reports a medically certified disability. However, in the perspective of the affective taxonomic domain [6], I believe this is a low-level behavior: responding or committing to ideas, values, principles and actions as mandated by the law and by the role.

p. 1	Background
p. 2	Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes
p. 3	Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development
p. 6	Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
p. 6	Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
p. 6	Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities outside the University
p. 7	Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers
p. 9	Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019
p. 12	Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

The Excellent Teacher should not be satisfied at this level: the aim should be the highest taxonomic level, i.e. internalization. The Excellent Teacher should be proactive, talk with students, listen to them, understand their problems and direct them to the most suited help available. The Excellent Teacher should at the same time respect students' privacy and not be intrusive. The Excellent Teacher is, first and foremost, a counselor.

Feedback is in this sense the primary tool of the Excellent Teacher [7]. Feedback represents the chance for the teacher to verify the alignment [7] of the learning activity designed with the intended learning outcomes. For the student, feedback shows whether the effort spent has produced the expected learning, and how it should or could be improved. For the feedback to be effective, the teacher should listen and should understand what the student is communicating: understanding cannot be shallow (the mere literal meaning), but deep (the intended content). This is what is called "active listening" in the counseling community [8, 9]. The Excellent Teacher is not only a listener, but an active listener. On the other hand, to receive feedback and use it for improvement, the Excellent Teacher must be open to critiques on one's own work: the Excellent Teacher is open-minded.












Communication is thus at heart of the teaching activity: creation of a safe and welcoming environment, inclusion, feedback require good communication skills. The Excellent Teacher needs to be a good communicator.

Motivation is key to students' engagement and focus [10, 11, 12] and intrinsically motivated students tend to prefer deep approaches to learning [10, 12]. The best and probably simplest way for the teacher to relate to students' intrinsic motivation is to show strong interest and passion for the subject taught, to present its links with the students' future profession and today's world in general. This is achieved if the teacher is a life-long learner. It means that the teacher has a strong desire to learn and improve and that the teacher regards the teaching assignment first and foremost as a learning moment. Therefore, the Excellent Teacher is a life-long learner.

Effective design of learning activities is achieved by following the principles of constructive alignment[13, 14, 15] and using tools such as the taxonomies[6, 16, 17], Kolb's cycle [18] and the ICAP framework [19]. Pedagogical expertise is thus a fundamental skill of the teacher, who should be able to correctly formulate learning outcomes and design learning activities aligned with these outcomes. The Excellent Teacher should be a pedagogical expert. As design of learning activities very often occur in teams, being an Excellent Teacher implies being a team-player.

Future Work and Development

In the context of my pedagogical formation, I have developed a set of competencies of learner- (or learning-) centric design which I would like to put more deeply into practice. Although I have had certainly room to act in the context of my teaching assignments, wider and more drastic proposals will likely face the opposition of an environment in which the belief in traditional teacher-centric design is strong. I will need to motivate my ideas and proposals with results from the literature and from my experience, which will require a continuous work of recording students' feedback and performance. I regard it as an interest challenge ahead of me, strictly related to the development of my teaching practice as documented by the portfolio.

p. 1	
	Background
	Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes
p. 2	
	Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education
p. 3	
	Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development
p. 6	
	Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
	Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
	Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
	Pedagogic Activities outside the University
p. 7	
	Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers
p. 9	
	Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019
p. 12	
	Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

References

- [1] Kierkegaard, S. (1859). *Synspunktet for min Forfatter-Virksomhed.: En ligefrem Meddelelse: Rapport till Historien*. Kjöbenhavn: Reitzel.
- [2] Kierkegaard, S. (1998). *The Point of View..* [Translated by Hong, H. V. and Hong E. H.] Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press.
- [3] Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- [4] Ahlmark D. L. *Universal Design for Learning (UDL)*. Available at: https://ltu.instructure.com/courses/5889/pages/what-is-more-to-master-inclusion-1-5h?module_item_id=78900.
- [5] *Discrimination Act (2008:567)*. Available at: <https://www.government.se/information-material/2015/09/discrimination-act-2008567/>.
- [6] Krathwohl D. R., Bloom B. S., & Masia B. B. (1973). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, the Classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.
- [7] Elmgren M., Henriksson A.-S. (2015). *Academic Teaching*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.
- [8] Knights S. (1985). *Reflection and learning: the importance of a listener*. In: *Reflection, turning experience into learning*. Eds.: Boud D., Keogh R., Walker D. New York: Nichols Publishing Company.
- [9] Robertson K. (2005). *Active listening: More than just paying attention*. Australian Family Physician, 34(12).
- [10] Rust C. (2013). *What do we think we know about student learning, and what are the implications of improving that learning? Foreword*. Improving Learning through Research and Scholarship. Oxford Brookes University.
- [11] Ariely D., Kamenica E. and Prelec D. (2008). *The man's search for meaning: the case of legos*. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organisation, 67(3-4), 671-677.
- [12] Yeager D. S., Henderson M., Paunesku D., Walton G. M., D'Mello S., Spitzer B. J. and Duckworth A. L. (2014). *Boring but Important: A Self-Transcendent Purpose for Learning Fosters Academic Self-Regulation*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107(4), 559-580.
- [13] Schuel T. J. (1986). *Cognitive Conceptions of Learning*. Review of Educational Research, 56, 411-436.
- [14] Biggs. J. (2003). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University – What the Student Does (2nd Edition)*. SRHE / Open University Press, Buckingham.
- [15] Wadsworth B. J. (2004). *Piaget's theory of cognitive and affective development: Foundations of constructivism*. Longman Publishing.
- [16] Anderson L. W., Krathwohl D. R. and Bloom B. S. (ed., 2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: a revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- [17] Dave R. H. (1975). *Developing and Writing Behavioural Objectives*. Ed.: Armstrong R. J. Educational Innovators Press.
- [18] Kolb D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- [19] Chi M. T. and Wylie R. (2014). *The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes*. Educational Psychologist, 49(4), 219-243.

p. 1	Background
p. 2	Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes
p. 3	Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development
p. 6	Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
p. 6	Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
p. 6	Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
p. 6	Pedagogic Activities outside the University
p. 7	Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers
p. 9	Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019
p. 12	Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources

T7005T - Aerospace Materials, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), 2018 - 2019, Spring Term, Master's Level (1st year)

I participated in the preparation of the hand-out, in the form of a presentation, describing the tasks of the group-based project. I worked on improving the virtual learning space of the course by organizing its content and structuring its appearance.

Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs

As part of the coursework for the 7.5 ECTS course *Qualifying course for university teachers* at Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden), I re-designed the 7.5 ECTS course *T7005T - Aerospace Materials* (see attachment for more details). To this end, I proposed a new format of flipped-classroom learning for the theoretical part of the course and a more articulated management of the group-based project. The core idea of this new design is to bring passive-active (with respect to the ICAP framework), lower taxonomy level activities outside of the classroom and focus the in-class work on constructive and interactive behaviors aimed to the construction of new knowledge. As this course is propedeutic to independent research projects in the last year of studies, the new version of the course would provide a fail-safe training ground similar to the daily activity of the researcher and the engineer, who develop projects with uncertain initial boundaries and need to interact with co-workers, team leaders, customers and stakeholders.



Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge

I am currently preparing a contribution in the form of conference article and oral presentation, which has been accepted for the upcoming *Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019* to be held at Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden) in November 2019. In this contribution I present, in the form of a work in progress, a reflection on the relation between the signature pedagogy of mechanics of materials and its threshold concepts, and I further propose a revised flipped-classroom format for lectures on mechanics of materials based on the signature pedagogy. In the long-term, the goal is to be experiment this revised flipped-classroom format in a course on mechanics of materials and verify its effectiveness through students' feedback and review from peers. The results would then be amenable for publication in a peer-reviewed international journal to get feedback from the wider community of practitioners in Higher Education.


Pedagogic Activities outside the University

I am an active member of the non-profit organization *The Carpentries*, with which I collaborate on a volunteer basis. The main objective of the organization is to teach foundational skills in software development and data analysis to researchers and academics at all levels (from students to professors) and to promote Open Science values and best practices. To achieve this goal, it offers free online tutorials on different technical topics and organizes, upon request from local institutions, in-person workshops. To this end, the organization trains its volunteer members on active learning strategies. To distinguish members who have acquired such skills, *The Carpentries* proposes a specific training path which, upon successful completion, provides the status of *Certified Instructor* and the possibility to teach in workshops. I completed the instructor training in 2017 and I am, since then, a *Certified Instructor*. In October 2018, I participated as main instructor in a Carpentry workshop offered by the High Performance Computing Center North (HPC2N) at Umeå University (Umeå, Sweden), where I taught the use of bash, bash scripting, Git and Github. In addition, I contributed to the development of the workshop lessons material, which is freely available on Github. I contributed also to a Task Force to develop recommendations on handling incidents outside the Code of Conduct of the *The Carpentries*.


p. 1

-  Background
-  Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes





p. 2

-  Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education


p. 3

-  Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development


p. 6

-  Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
-  Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
-  Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
-  Pedagogic Activities outside the University


p. 7

-  Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

p. 9

-  Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019

p. 12

-  Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Annex A

Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden)



COURSE CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that

Luca di Stasio **880419-3376**

has participated successfully in the course

Qualifying course for university teachers, 7,5 credits

Third-Cycle



After the course the course participant will be able to:

- plan and conduct a basic teaching and from a given teachingsituation independently analyze and reflect over possible improvements, with support from significant aspects on teaching and learning in Higher Education.
- reflect and discuss over teaching in a known field, with support from pedagogical concepts, proven experience and constructive alignment.
- relate to laws, rules and regulation, on a both national and local level in the planning and enactment of education in Higher Education.
- reflect over the impact of different learning environments on learning, and consciously make benefit of both physical and digital environments.
- use LTU-supported systems with relevance for planning, enactment and evaluation of teaching.
- teach based on a scientific foundation and proven experience and within their teaching practice formulate a personal pedagogical philosophy.


Luleå, February 7, 2019

Oskar Gedda
Examiner


p. 1

-  Background
-  Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes





p. 2

-  Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education

p. 3

-  Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development


p. 6

-  Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
-  Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
-  Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
-  Pedagogic Activities outside the University


p. 7

-  Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

p. 9

-  Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019

p. 12

-  Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Annex B

Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019, November 2019, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden)

A REFLECTION ON THE ENGINEERING SIGNATURE PEDAGOGY AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE DESIGN OF FLIPPED-LEARNING ACTIVITIES IN AN ADVANCED ENGINEERING COURSE

Luca Di Stasio

¹ Luleå University of Technology, University Campus, SE-97187 Luleå, Sweden

² Université de Lorraine, IJL, EEIGM, 6 Rue Bastien Lepage, F-54010 Nancy, France

*luca.di.stasio@ltu.se

Activity: Work in progress

Language: English

Abstract

Engineering sciences are characterized by a wide and deep body of theoretical knowledge, built on physical observations and mathematical principles. Following the epistemological considerations proposed by Meyer and Land (2005), this core theoretical knowledge can be analyzed through the principle of *threshold concepts*. Two main *threshold concepts* of engineering can be identified: *model* and *accuracy*. The first concept refers to the ability and the possibility of developing a set of equations and/or algorithms to predict the behavior of a system, i.e. a *model* of the system. However, different such sets of predictive tools (different *models*) are always possible for the same system (*multiplicity of models*). At this point, the concept of *accuracy* comes into play: predictions of different models reach the target to different degrees, i.e. with a different accuracy. It is a trade-off between the level of accuracy required and the cost, in terms of time and money, of model implementation that determines the use of one specific model among the pool of available ones (*model selection*). Shulman (2005) proposed to look at signature pedagogies, i.e. how one is taught or “nursed”, in order to understand how members of a profession act and think. A glance at the classic, teacher-centered, engineering signature pedagogy reveals a structure geared toward teaching students the *threshold concepts* of *model* and *accuracy*, albeit in a passive way. Flipped-learning approaches, as those for example presented in (Kim, Kim, Khera, & Getman, 2014), (Kanelopoulos, Papanikolaou, & Zalimidis, 2017) and (McCabe, 2018), have tried to engage students in more active and interactive learning activities, focusing mainly on in-class problem-solving and leaving the knowledge-building part of the pedagogy to passive activities (videos, readings) outside the class. Thus, the learner still assumes in a passive way the key concepts of *model* and *accuracy* and the fundamental skills of model development, validation and evaluation. By analyzing the deep structure of the classic engineering signature pedagogy, an innovative flipped-learning approach is proposed here that puts the construction and the evaluation of models at the center of students in-class active learning.



Meyer, J. H. F., & Land, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education*, 49, 373-388.

Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134, 52-59.


Kim, M. K., Kim, S. M., Khera, O., & Getman, J. (2014). The experience of three flipped classrooms in an urban university: an exploration of design principles. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 22, 37-50.

- Kanelopoulos, J., Papanikolaou, K. A., & Zalimidis, P. (2017). Flipping the classroom to increase students' engagement and interaction in a mechanical engineering course on machine design. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP)*, 7, 19-34.
- McCabe, B. A. (2018). Experiences of flipped learning in a civil engineering module. *Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 4, 11-15.


p. 1

-  Background
-  Higher Education Courses and Study Programmes





p. 2

-  Experience of Teaching and Supervision within Higher Education


p. 3

-  Pedagogic Activities: Description, Reflection and Development


p. 6

-  Development of Teaching Materials and Student Learning Resources
-  Experience of Leading, Administering and Developing Courses and Study Programs
-  Development, Depth of Study, Research and Dissemination of Knowledge
-  Pedagogic Activities outside the University


p. 7

-  Annex A - Certificate of Completion: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

p. 9

-  Annex B - Accepted Contribution to the Development Conference for Swedish Engineering Education 2019

p. 12

-  Annex C - Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers

Annex C

Final Course Assignment: Qualifying Course for University Teachers, 7.5 ECTS, Luleå tekniska universitet (Luleå, Sweden)

Redesigning the T7005T-Aerospace Materials course: a flipped learning approach

Luca Di Stasio^{a,b}

^a*Université de Lorraine, EEIGM, IJL, 6 Rue Bastien Lepage, F-54010 Nancy, France*

^b*Luleå University of Technology, University Campus, SE-97187 Luleå, Sweden*

Abstract

The design of the course *T7005T-Aerospace Materials* is analyzed according to the pedagogical principles of constructive alignment [1, 2]. It is found that a design issue exists, particularly in the section of the course devoted to damage in composite materials. This view is supported by the feedback gathered from students who attended the course in the previous academic year. Upon consideration of examples available in the literature, the flipped learning approach is regarded as a good fit to correct the identified design issue. Based on the analysis of the signature pedagogy [3] and of the threshold concepts [4] of Materials Science & Engineering, a new flipped-classroom design is proposed for the *Aerospace Materials* course.

This report, by its very length,
defends itself against the risk of
being read.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Contents

1 Analysis of the constructive (mis)alignment of the T7005T-Aerospace Materials course	2
1.1 The T7005T-Aerospace Materials course	2

1.2	Student profile	3
1.3	Programme goal and objectives	3
1.4	Course objectives and learning outcomes	6
1.5	Course structure and activities	8
1.6	An issue of constructive (mis)alignment	12
1.7	Students feedback	12
2	A flipped-learning design of the Damage in composites section of the Aerospace Materials course	14
2.1	The flipped classroom approach and the engineering signature pedagogy	14
2.2	Course goal and learning outcomes	19
2.3	Outline of learning activities and assessment	23
2.4	Risks	35
1.	Analysis of the constructive (mis)alignment of the T7005T-Aerospace Materials course	

1.1. The T7005T-Aerospace Materials course

The course *T7005T - Aerospace Materials* is a 7.5 credits second-cycle level course in the subject of Polymer Engineering offered by the Department of Engineering Sciences and Mathematics. The course represents an elective option for first-year students (semester 2) of the Master Programme in Composite Materials, first-year students (semester 2) of the Master Programme in Materials Engineering - Track 2 Polymers and Composites and third- (semester 6) and fourth-year students (semester 8) of the 5-years Master Programme in Materials Science & Engineering (EEIGM) - no specialisation track and International Materials track. The course is offered every year in study period 4 for a total duration of 10 weeks with 50% day-time teaching. The language of instruction is English. Topics dealt in the course are related to contemporary issues in research and development of advanced materials for aerospace applications,

addressing three main aspects: damage in Fiber Reinforced Polymer Composite (FRPC) materials; technologies for multi-material joints; manufacturing and characteristics of advanced metal alloys.

1.2. Student profile

Students attending the *Aerospace Materials* course are advanced-level students who hold a Bachelor degree or have an equivalent level of study. They have already attended 3 study periods of Master-level courses devoted to different advanced aspects of Materials Science and Engineering. Courses offered in study period 4 as the *Aerospace Materials* course are the last in which students learn in an instructor-guided setting, before spending the last year of study doing individual project work in the Materials Science and Engineering Project Course (30 credits) and the final Degree Project (30 credits). Students are thus expected to have a solid background in the foundational subjects, such as Mathematics, Physics, Computational Science, Solid Mechanics. Their attendance to the course (being elective and not compulsory) is motivated by interest in the topics proposed. Furthermore, students' background is highly international with many of them (often the majority of attendees) foreigners. Swedish students attending the course have usually already spent time abroad at this point of their study path. Usually 10-15 students attend the course.

1.3. Programme goal and objectives

The goal of the Master Programme in Materials Engineering is stated to be¹:

to educate only the very best students to a level where they can either continue and get a PhD-degree in a very short period of time or seek prestigious employment anywhere in the world

while the goal of the Master Programme in Composite Materials states that²:

¹LTU Catalog, Master Programme in Materials Engineering

²LTU Catalog, Master Programme in Composite Materials

this master program in materials technology will provide you with a unique competence in important aspects of composites manufacturing and design technologies. The education is strongly connected to companies such as Swerea SICOMP and ABB Composites who have announced a need for composite experts.

These overall goals are specified by a set of learning objectives which is shared by both programmes³⁴:

for a Master of Science (120 credits), major Materials Engineering the student shall have:

- *demonstrated very good knowledge in materials engineering and materials science,*
- *demonstrated a strong background for research and development work in materials engineering and materials science related fields,*
- *demonstrated very good skills in oral and written presentations of scientific and technical materials in English,*
- *demonstrated ability for collaboration.*

In the case of the Programme in Composite Materials, two further objectives are added:

... the student shall have:

- *demonstrated very good knowledge in Polymer Composite Materials,*
- *demonstrated a strong background for research and development work in design and manufacturing technologies of Polymer Composite Materials.*

³LTU Qualification descriptor, Master Programme in Materials Engineering

⁴LTU Qualification descriptor, Master Programme in Composite Materials

By using the ABCD (Audience, Behaviour, Condition, Degree) and S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Oriented) models [5, 6, 7], it is possible to observe that the objectives appear to be poorly phrased. In particular, the behavior is not expressed in a specific and measurable manner: it is always expressed by the use of “the student shall have demonstrated” followed by a noun describing knowledge (“knowledge”, “background”, “skills”, “ability”) specified by a generic non-measurable attribute (“very good”, “strong”). They seem however to aim quite clearly at the highest levels of the taxonomies, those that correspond to an independent actor of the field who should be able to “get a PhD-degree in a very short period”, “seek prestigious employment anywhere in the world” in “companies such as Swerea SICOMP and ABB Composites” or become a “composite expert”.

In support of this view, objectives defining the level of Master of Science/Arts are reported in both two Programmes’ list of objectives from the Higher Education Ordinance:

Knowledge and understanding

For a Master of Arts/Science (120 credits) the student shall have:

- *demonstrated knowledge and understanding in the main field of study, including both broad knowledge of the field and a considerable degree of specialised knowledge in certain areas of the field as well as insight into current research and development work, and*
- *demonstrated specialised methodological knowledge in the main field of study.*

Competence and skills

For a Master of Arts/Science (120 credits) the student shall have:

- *demonstrated the ability to critically and systematically integrate knowledge and analyse, assess and deal with complex phenomena, issues and situations even with limited information,*

- *demonstrated the ability to identify and formulate issues critically, autonomously and creatively as well as to plan and, using appropriate methods, undertake advanced tasks within predetermined time frames and so contribute to the formation of knowledge as well as the ability to evaluate this work,*
- *demonstrated the ability in speech and writing both nationally and internationally to report clearly and discuss his or her conclusions and the knowledge and arguments on which they are based in dialogue with different audiences, and*
- *demonstrated the skills required for participation in research and development work or autonomous employment in some other qualified capacity.*

Judgement and approach

For a Master of Arts/Science (120 credits) the student shall have:

- *demonstrated the ability to make assessments in the main field of study informed by relevant disciplinary, social and ethical issues and also to demonstrate awareness of ethical aspects of research and development work,*
- *demonstrated insight into the possibilities and limitations of research, its role in society and the responsibility of the individual for how it is used, and*
- *demonstrated the ability to identify the personal need for further knowledge and take responsibility for his or her ongoing learning.*

1.4. Course objectives and learning outcomes

Course objectives and learning outcomes are detailed in its online syllabus⁵:

⁵Course syllabus, Aerospace Materials 7.5 Credits

After the end of this course the student is supposed to

- *have deep knowledge about structure and behaviour of high performance materials used in aerospace industry;*
- *be able to evaluate properties of composites, ceramic materials and alloys to perform optimal material selection for use in harsh environments and service conditions;*
- *know and understand the most important degradation mechanisms that initiate and evolve due to thermal and mechanical loads and lead to material fatigue and reduced durability;*
- *be able to produce long fiber composites, to measure their mechanical properties, to observe and to quantify damage modes and to analyse their effect on properties;*
- *be able to apply composite material degradation models, to perform fracture mechanics analysis in alloys and to predict time dependent material behaviour;*
- *be able to perform numerical simulations of structures using commercial software to design optimized structures;*
- *have good skills in analysing research papers and writing research reports.*

Course learning outcomes appear to be better structured and thought-through than programme outcomes. Both the cognitive (“knowledge about”, “analysing research papers”) [8, 9] and the psychomotor [10] taxonomies (“produce”, “measure”, “perform”) are addressed and verbs gradually reaching the higher levels of the taxonomies are used (“understand”, “evaluate”, “apply”). The course learning outcomes thus appear to be aligned with the programme outcomes and goal, which pointed to the student’s development into an independent professional figure in the field of materials engineering. At the course level, the competencies of this figure are specified in terms of the cognitive and psychomotor skills required

to perform independent tasks of characterization and modeling of advanced materials for aerospace applications.

1.5. Course structure and activities

The course is thematically divided in 3 parts, which are treated in parallel under the direction of 3 different professors and the intervention of another 4-5 instructors: damage in composites, worth 65% of the time allotted and of the final grade; mechanics of adhesive hybrid joints, 10% of learning time and final grade; advanced alloys and ceramics, worth 25% of learning time and final grade. The design of teaching activities of each of the three parts is described in the following.

Damage in composites. The *Damage in composites* section represents the main part of the course, in which several different activities are conducted. First, topics are introduced in class during frontal lectures, in which the teacher uses a mix of oral presentation, slides with informative pictures and writing on the blackboard. Students are thus involved in both passive and active activities (ICAP, [11]): listening to the instructor and watching the presentation (*passive*) as well as note-taking and quick back-of-the-envelope calculations (*active*). Students are divided in groups of 6-7 students and assigned the same project. The project is presented only in a draft format at the beginning of the course, supposedly to mimic the evolution of a research project. At each lecture, a specific task of the project is outlined in detail through step-by-step instructions. Furthermore, the theory related to the task is introduced and explained in the same lecture and all the main equations and relations needed to complete the task are provided. The project involves several tasks of different nature: application of analytical models through general-purpose (Excel, Matlab) as well as dedicated software (LAP); manufacturing and testing of Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Composites; experimental data reduction and comparison with analytical predictions; numerical simulation with the Finite Element Method (FEM) using commercial softwares (Abaqus, Ansys).

The work is the same for each group and students are asked to hand in a final report of 30-50 pages at the end of the course. However, the evolution of the work is monitored through weekly seminars in which students present the state of the work together with problems, issues and obstacle to the advancement. These are discussed with all the course participants under the supervision of the instructor. All types of activities as envisioned by the ICAP framework are considered in the project: reading assigned and suggested papers, revise course notes and slides, reading manufacturing and testing procedures (*passive*); highlighting useful project-related information, manufacturing and testing; developing FEM models (*active*); proposing solutions based on results obtained, analyzing the merits of analytical models by comparison with experimental results, infer conclusions about the mechanical behavior of materials from numerical simulations (*constructive*); co-working and co-supervision during manufacturing and testing, co-development of numerical models and algorithms, writing of a shared report, discussion of issues faced (*interactive*). The project takes place during the first 7 weeks, with the 8th and last dedicated to the writing of the final report. Attendance to lectures is not mandatory and an oral exam is supposed to take place at the end of the course. However, at the oral exam the instructor asks one question for each lecture missed. Full attendance thus implies no questions at the oral exam or, in other words, no oral exam. The work of this section of the *Aerospace Materials* course touches upon both the cognitive as well as the psychomotor domain. The format of lecture detailing project task's instructions with the related theory, equations and algorithms followed by group-based work reaches only a mid-level on the taxonomic scale: *applying* for the cognitive domain and *manipulation/precision* for the psychomotor one.

Mechanics of adhesive joints. This theme is the smallest among the three.

It is treated through 2 frontal lectures, in which the teacher explains the main issues and technological solutions in the context of the mechanics of

adhesive joints. Students are mostly *passive* during these 2 lectures [11], as the presentation is always aided by slides later uploaded on Canvas. Students are then divided into groups of 2-3 people and each group is assigned a scientific article about the mechanics of adhesive joints. The group has to read, analyze and present the article to the rest of the class during a dedicated seminar day. After the presentation, a class-wide discussion of the presentation is conducted lead by the instructor. This seminar activity constitutes the assessment for this part of the *Aerospace Materials* course, as well as its closing session. The seminar task requires the student to move up along the ICAP scale [11], in fact they need to: read the article (*passive*); highlight key informations of the paper (*active*); analyze the article and compare it with the corresponding literature (*constructive*); debate the article in the group and agree on a shared analysis to be presented in class (*interactive*); debate with peers in class (*interactive*). The task points to a learning in the cognitive domain, and aims to the high level of *evaluation* as it asks students to analyze and criticize a scientific article and defend the conclusions of the analysis in front of peers. Notice that assessment is based only on the presentation to the class and on the answers provided singularly (not group-wise) to the questions asked by the teacher.

Advanced alloys and ceramics. A series of 5 lectures takes place in this thread, each one devoted to a specific class of materials in the family of advanced alloys and ceramics. Lectures are frontal, with the teacher presenting the topic with the aide of slides later uploaded to Canvas. Students are thus mostly *passive* during the lectures [11]. Students are then divided in groups of 2-3 and assigned a group-wise seminar task. 2 groups are assigned to the same topic. Each one of these two groups needs to investigate the same question about a class of materials and provide a report. The report is then submitted to the other group. Each member of the group has to review the report and prepare an opposition in the form of a short

report to be handed to the teacher on the seminar day. On seminar day, each group has to come prepared to present their findings and thus have also all the necessary supporting material (usually slides). Then, one of the two groups is extracted randomly to present; the other one will instead be the oponent. After course day, all the presentations are uploaded on Canvas to be used as study material. The seminar task has a good balance of acitivities according to the ICAP framework [11]: *passive*, like reading scientific papers and textbooks on the topic and the other group's report; *active*, like highlighting and extracting relevant information from sources and finding relevant points in the reviewed report; *constructive*, as they need to develop a scientifically based answer to the seminar question and develop counter-arguments to the other group's report; *interactive*, in the development of the group's report and presentation and in the seminar day discussion. The task reaches the higher level of the cognitive taxonomy, as students are asked to: develop an essay in which they answer an issue of current interest in the field based on the available scientific literature; evaluate and criticize the other group's work; debate the findings and argue for their choices. Assessment takes place during seminar preparation (hand-in of reports and reviews) and seminar day. Furthermore, students are asked to sit a closed-books written exam on this section of the course with open-ended questions on the topics treated (comprising the seminar).

A Canvas room exists for this course. It consists of a single page with links to the lectures' slides, organized in 3 sections according to the thematic division of the course. There is no reference to the pedagogical team, to the course structure, learning outcomes, no clear description of assessment. The Canvas room works almost exclusively as a repository of files (slides, raw data, examples of numerical models, assigned and suggested readings) and for sporadic email exchanges to organize the different laboratory sessions.

1.6. An issue of constructive (mis)alignment

A misalignment between course design and course outcomes and between the different thematic sections of the course seems to be present. Course outcomes, in alignment with programme outcomes, envision a student who is able, at the end of the *Aerospace Materials* course, to undertake an independent research project under the supervision of the University research staff. The student is thus expected to be able to:

1. read, analyze and criticize the scientific literature;
2. investigate the state-of-art in the field to understand which questions still need to be answered;
3. propose experimental designs and numerical models to verify hypothesis based on examples in the literature;
4. successfully perform the experiments and construct the numerical models;
5. independently derive analytical models and results starting from the information provided in scientific articles;
6. compare the predictions of different models with experimental measurements and derive conclusions about the behavior of materials.

Thus, the high levels of the taxonomies need to be addressed. The first two sets of skills are addressed at a high taxonomic level [8, 9, 10] in the *Mechanics of adhesive joints* and *Advanced alloys and ceramics* sections of the course. The rest of them should be addressed in the *Damage in composites* section: however, activities proposed here focus on the mid-level of the taxonomies, i.e. reception, understanding and application of knowledge [8, 9]. There is consequently a misalignment: the high taxonomic level expected is not achieved and the corresponding learning outcomes and objectives are not fulfilled.

1.7. Students feedback

To verify the previous conclusions and gain more insights on the effectiveness of the current structure of the *Aerospace Materials* course, two students⁶

⁶Lena Brunnacker and Pauline Leonard. The author thanks them for their time and help.

were interviewed. They attended the course in SP 4 of year 2018 respectively as part of the Master Programme in Composite Materials and of the Master Programme in Materials Science & Engineering (EEIGM). Here is a summary of their feedback on the course, with a focus on the *Damage in composites* section.

- The project in composite damage is very interesting and should be kept;
- organisation is lacking: no clear deadlines, the project tasks are not clearly outlined from the beginning of the course;
- groups for the project in composite damage should be smaller (3-4 students) and randomly selected, as people tend to stay with those they know to the disadvantage usually of foreign and exchange students;
- seminars as a moment to exchange ideas between groups are a good idea, but should be used more deeply and not only to show the results as it has been done;
- lectures are hard to follow;
- formulas and equations explained during lectures are applied to the resolution of the project task without any real learning of the assumptions, principles and derivation methods;
- no proposed article was read as time was scarce and there was no clear connection between reading the articles and completion of project tasks;
- tutorials about the software used should be provided earlier in the course;
- work in groups was divided among the members based on their background and previous experience, thus students who already knew the software and methods worked with them.

The misalignment previously described is confirmed by the students' comments: articles are not read because the need for them is not clear; lectures are hard to follow and the models presented are applied to the solution of the

project without learning them; interaction with peers is useful and welcome but should be deeper; no real learning of the software and tools proposed takes place because work is subdivided among group members in the way that best fits the time-constraint, i.e. assigning the task to those who already know how to solve it.

2. A flipped-learning design of the Damage in composites section of the Aerospace Materials course

2.1. The flipped classroom approach and the engineering signature pedagogy

In the previous section, a misalignment between learning outcomes and the implemented learning activities has been identified in the *Damage in composites* section of the course. Thus, a new design is proposed in this section to solve the identified issue based on the flipped learning approach.

The flipped learning approach is a form of learning design in which what in a traditional setting happens inside the class is moved outside it (and viceversa) [12], which implies a change of the role of the teacher from the source of knowledge (“the sage on stage”) to a coach guiding and supporting the learning process (“the guide on the side”) [13]. Recent advances in Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) have helped the implementation of flipped classroom settings, and different examples are available in the literature about its use in engineering and higher education in general. Recent reviews [14, 15, 16] have pointed out that, although quantitative statistically significant evidence is scarce that flipped learning has any effect on students’ academic performance, its implementation in different formats always favors higher-order learning in the classroom and uses outside-the-classroom time for low-level processing of information. This in turn translated in greater engagement by the students and by increased students’ confidence in tackling critical thinking tasks in the academic and work environments. Examples of the application of flipped learning designs in engineering education (biomedical [17], mechanical [18] and civil [19] engineering) show some common traits:

- the teacher is no longer explaining the theory (principles, theorem, equations, formulas) in class with the help of the blackboard and eventually slides;
- the explanation of the theory is recorded in videos where the teachers presents principles, theorem, equations, formulas with the use of a virtual or real blackboard and slides;
- students can access the videos through the course Learning Management System (LMS), where they can also found additional supporting material in the form of slides, tutorials, compendia;
- in-class time is devoted to students' questions and to problem-solving activities, usually calculation-based problems similar to those appearing in the final exam;
- problems are selected in order to provide a professional perspective to the course topics (real-life scenarios, issues of current interest, ...) and they might be used to promote discussions between students.

Such designs are a literal application of the description of flipped learning design as found in [12]: what was done in class (teacher explaining theory using the blackboard and slides) is moved to outside the classroom (videos and slides available on the course LMS), while the activities previously done outside the classroom (solving exercises in preparation of the final exam) are now done in class under the guidance and help of the teacher (in-class problem-solving activities). Given that one aspect on the engineering profession is undoubtedly the ability to apply theoretical knowledge to the resolution of design, verification, estimation and prediction problems, the implementation suggested in [17, 18, 19] certainly fosters a deep learning approach to problem-solving which in the classic setting is too often demoted to an exam preparation task, frequently removed from students' interests and professional perspectives (closed problems with an exact solution far away from the open-ended design problems engineers usually

face). However, I argue that these examples still miss a critical aspect of engineering education, which is present in the deep structure of the engineering signature pedagogy [3]. Engineering, especially specializations like mechanical, aerospace, materials, biomedical, civil, is characterized by a wide and deep body of theoretical knowledge built on physical principles and mathematical mastery. This core theoretical knowledge is built around the threshold concepts [4] of *model* and *accuracy*: the idea that, given a specific set of physical, technical, economical and safety constraints, it is possible to develop a set of equations or algorithms with which it is possible to predict the behavior of the system under study to a certain accuracy and design repeatable and controlled human interventions upon it. Accuracy is the second key term: a model provides a prediction with a certain margin of error which can be evaluated by means of experiments, analytical derivations and numerical simulations. Accuracy, together with considerations of economical and technical feasibility, determines which model is used for a specific purpose. Let us discuss an example to clarify these concepts. The motion of a satellite can be predicted by means of different models (based on different physical principles and using different mathematics). A first model that can be used is Newtonian mechanics, based on the work of Newton in the 1600s. A second model that can be used is general relativity, grounded in the results derived by Einstein in the 1900s. Which one is most commonly used to design satellite orbits in industry? Newtonian mechanics (!). Why? Because the increase in accuracy provided by the use of general relativity does not outweigh the increase in time and resources (computers need electricity!) needed to compute the solution. It is important to notice that this is the typical mindset of engineers: physicists, on the other hand, regard general relativity as a step further in the understanding of the world, which holds a higher degree of truth with respect to previous theories like Newtonian mechanics. Learning of these threshold concepts and the development of the engineering mindset is embedded in the deep structure of classic engineering signature pedagogy, as exemplified in Table 1.

In the signature pedagogy described in Table 1, in steps 1-4 student activ-

Table 1: Surface and deep structure of classic engineering signature pedagogy.

		Surface structure	Deep structure
		<i>Who</i>	<i>What</i>
		<i>Where</i>	<i>How</i>
1.	teacher	introduces the system (physical, chemical, biological) to be investigated	definition of the design, verification, estimation or prediction problem
	in class	pictures, videos, slides, artifacts	
2.	teacher	introduces constraints and assumptions	definition of physical, technical, economical and safety constraints
	in class	blackboard, slides	
3.	teacher	introduces governing physical principles and corresponding mathematical laws	foundational physical principles governing the system
	in class	blackboard, slides	
4.	teacher	by applying assumptions and constraints to governing laws, derives predictive formulas and algorithms	development of formulas and algorithms for estimation and prediction
	in class	blackboard, slides	
5.	students	solve problems by application of the derived predictive formulas	application of derived formulas to the quantitative estimation of system behavior
	outside class	pen and paper, computer	
6.	students	verify model's accuracy by conducting experiments	verification of model accuracy by means of experiments
	lab	testing equipment, computer	

ities can be classified as *passive* (mostly listening to the teacher and watching slides) and *active* (mostly note-taking following the teacher’s mathematical derivations at the blackboard) according to ICAP framework [11]. It is worth to notice that in the engineering signature pedagogy, the threshold concepts of model and accuracy together with the conceptual tools to use them (assumptions, first principles, mathematical derivations) are learned through *imitation*, i.e. the students following the derivations of the teacher at the blackboard and writing notes at the same time. Problem-solving is instead at the *constructive* level of the ICAP scale in the classic engineering pedagogy, as students transfer the concepts derived in class by the teacher at the blackboard and noted down (*passive-active*) to new situations (problems to solve). The flipped learning approach as implemented in [17, 18, 19] manages to bring the problem-solving task to the *interactive* level, by moving it inside the classroom and using group-based activities to promote discussion. However, it demotes at the same time the learning of the theory (points 1-4 in Table 1) to a purely *passive* level by using videos, slides and compendia available on the LMS.

I present here a different approach to the flipped classroom in engineering education, which takes into account the signature pedagogy of engineering previously described. Instead of moving activities 1-4 (Table 1) outside and 5 inside the class, steps 1-4 are gradually moved outside the class until only activity 1 is retained inside the classroom (which has a strong link with professional life: the design problem is often assigned by some external stakeholder). Furthermore, step 5 (problem-solving) is moved only in part inside the class in close relationship with activity 6 (experimental verification).

In Section 2.2, a new formulation of course goal and learning outcomes is proposed for the revised design of the *Aerospace Materials* course. In Section 2.3 an outline of the learning activities is suggested based on a weekly planning. Activities are categorized as

in class: activities that take place inside the classroom under the guidance, supervision and/or collaboration of the instructor;

laboratory: activities taking place in the mechanical testing laboratory, i.e. experimental sessions;

outside class: student learning activities happening outside the class and the laboratory and not requiring the use of the online LMS (although not strictly excluding it, for example in a review for exam preparation);

online LMS (Canvas): activities that require the interaction with the online LMS (Canvas), like videos, quizzes, webpages,

Furthermore, it is highlighted which type of assessment and consequent feedback is envisioned for the activities of each week. Finally in Section 2.4 a brief discussion of the risks of the flipped-classroom design is proposed.

2.2. Course goal and learning outcomes

Course goal. On successful completion of the *Aerospace Materials* course, the student will be able to undertake an independent research project in the field of Materials Science & Engineering under the supervision of University research staff either independently or as part of a small team.

Course learning outcomes. Upon completion of the 10-weeks *Aerospace Materials* course, the student in the Master Programmes in Materials Engineering, Composite Materials and Materials Science & Engineering (EEIGM) will be able to:

1. independently search, read, analyze and criticize the scientific literature;
2. discuss and compare with colleagues and agree on shared conclusions upon the relevance of results available in the literature with respect to the research question investigated;
3. given observations about the behavior of a composite material, independently: identify and analyze the relevant constraints, formulate

assumptions and justify them with physically-based arguments, recall and select the relevant first principles, develop predictive formulas and algorithms based on the correct application of mathematical methods selected on purpose (analytical or numerical);

4. independently implement and calibrate the predictive formulas and algorithms (analytical or numerical) and produce quantitative predictions of material behavior;
5. independently construct an experimental design to gather results relevant to the research question investigated based on designs available in the scientific literature;
6. discuss, compare and agree on a common experimental design with colleagues;
7. perform manufacturing and testing of composite specimens according to internationally recognized ASTM standards;
8. compare models of material behavior with the experimental results, evaluate their accuracy and applicability;
9. produce in collaboration with peers a written report amenable to be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal or distributed as an internal research report;
10. independently defend the results and conclusions proposed in a dialogic setting.

ABCD and SMART criteria analysis. For all learning outcomes:

→ **Audience:** the student in the Master Programmes in Materials Engineering, Composite Materials and Materials Science & Engineering (EEIGM); Specific.

→ **Condition:** Upon completion of the 10-weeks *Aerospace Materials* course; Time-oriented, Specific, Achievable, Measurable.

1. → **Behavior:** search, read, analyze and criticize the scientific literature; Specific, Relevant; *Cognitive domain, evaluation level (verb: criticize)*.

→ **Degree:** independently; Specific.

2. →**Behavior**: discuss and compare . . . and agree on shared conclusions upon the relevance of results available in the literature; Specific, Relevant, Achievable; *Cognitive domain, Analysis level (verb: compare)*.
→**Condition**: with colleagues; Specific.
→**Degree**: with respect to the research question investigated; Specific, Relevant.
3. →**Behavior**: identify and analyze the relevant constraints, formulate assumptions and justify them with physically-based arguments, recall and select the relevant first principles, develop predictive formulas and algorithms based on the correct application of mathematical methods selected on purpose (analytical or numerical); Specific, Relevant, Achievable, Measurable; *Cognitive domain, Creation level (verb: formulate, develop)*.
→**Condition**: given observations about the behavior of a composite material; Specific, Relevant.
→**Degree**: independently; Specific, Relevant.
4. →**Behavior**: implement and calibrate the predictive formulas and algorithms (analytical or numerical) and produce . . . predictions of materials behavior; Specific, Relevant, Achievable, Measurable; *Cognitive domain, Application level (verb: implement, produce) and Psychomotor domain, Precision level (verb: calibrate)*.
→**Condition**: quantitative; Specific, Relevant, Measurable.
→**Degree**: independently; Specific, Relevant.
5. →**Behavior**: construct an experimental design to gather results; Specific, Relevant, Achievable; *Cognitive domain, Creation level (verb: construct)*.
→**Condition**: based on designs available in the scientific literature; Specific, Relevant, Measurable.
→**Degree**: independently; Specific, Relevant.
relevant to the research question investigated; Relevant.
6. →**Behavior**: discuss, compare and agree on a common experimental design; Specific, Relevant, Achievable; *Cognitive domain, Analysis level (verb: compare)*.
→**Condition**: with colleagues; Specific.

7. → **Behavior**: perform manufacturing and testing; Specific, Relevant, Achievable, Measurable; *Psychomotor domain, Precision level (verb: perform)*.
→ **Condition**: of composite specimens; Specific, Relevant, Measurable.
→ **Degree**: according to internationally recognized ASTM standards; Specific, Relevant, Measurable.
8. → **Behavior**: compare models of material behavior . . . , evaluate their accuracy and applicability; Specific, Relevant, Achievable, Measurable; *Cognitive domain, Evaluation level (verb: compare, evaluate)*.
→ **Condition**: with the experimental results; Specific, Relevant, Measurable.
9. → **Behavior**: produce a . . . report; Specific, Relevant, Achievable, Measurable; *Cognitive domain, Creation level (verb: produce)*.
→ **Condition**: written; Specific, Measurable.
in collaboration with peers; Specific, Relevant.
→ **Degree**: amenable to be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal or distributed as an internal research report; Specific, Relevant, Achievable.
10. → **Behavior**: defend the results and conclusions proposed; Specific, Relevant, Achievable; *Cognitive domain, Evaluation level (verb: defend)*.
→ **Condition**: in a dialogic setting; Specific, Relevant.
→ **Degree**: independently; Specific, Relevant.

2.3. Outline of learning activities and assessment

In-class meetings are assumed to take place at the very beginning of the week (Monday morning). Estimated hours of work for an individual student are reported in parenthesis. The workload has been calculated to be roughly equal to 65% of a 7.5 credits course ($\sim 130 - 136$ hours in total) and spread evenly over 10 weeks. Weeks 9 and 10 are reserved for personal study in preparation to the final exam and for the final oral exam itself. Personal study time is counted towards the total of $\sim 130 - 136$ hours. The use of Latex is required for all written assignments (a tutorial is provided during the first week).

Week 1 - 17 h

In class

(1 h) - Teacher introduces course goal and learning outcomes, organization, structure and planning. Teacher introduces the research question of the course (each year a new one), its relevance in the aerospace field, examples from industry and previous research. Supporting material is used like slides, pictures, videos. A few scientific articles are suggested by the teacher. The teacher communicates to the students the structure of the project groups for team-based work. Group members are selected randomly.

Laboratory

<i>Outside class</i>	(13.5 h) - Students conduct an individual survey of the scientific literature around the research question introduced in class. The guiding questions are: what experimental knowledge is available? what experiments were conducted? How were experiments conducted? What models (analytical and numerical) exist for this phenomenon? What is the accuracy of each one? They are asked to produce a commented list of references: for each reference, they should summarize the relevant content in 2-3 sentences. The commented list of reference is submitted through Canvas.
	(0.5 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the commented list of references on one colleague's work. Students of different groups are matched together.
<i>Online LMS (Canvas)</i>	(1 h + 1 h) - One interactive tutorial on Latex and one interactive tutorial on Abaqus. Tutorials are fully web based, with step-by-step explanations followed by small coding exercises. Successful completion of an exercise unlocks the subsequent one ⁷ . Hints are provided and devoted discussion threads on the forum are created, where both students and teacher(s) participate. Tutorials are individual and are personalized (different data, small changes in the geometry,...) through an automatic algorithm.
<i>Assessment</i>	<p><i>Individual:</i> the commented list of references and the two online interactive tutorials.</p> <p><i>Group:</i> none.</p>

⁷A freely-accessible example can be found at freeCodeCamp.

Feedback

Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the commented list of references.

Week 2 - 17 h

In class

(4 h) - Students work with their project group starting from the commented list of references and the feedback received on it. The first objective is to produce a commented table of contents for a *state of the art review* section by selecting which experimental methods to recall and describe, and which models (analytical and numerical) to mention and discuss. The commented table of contents contains title, subtitles, a summary in a few sentences (2-4) of each subsection's content and the list of references pertaining to it. The commented table of contents is submitted through Canvas by the end of the session. The instructor guides and supports the work of the groups.

(2 h) - The second objective is to select, starting from the work on the commented table of contents, the 3 analytical models from the literature that seems the best to answer the research question. The in-class activities are closed by a class-wide discussion on the choice of the 3 analytical models. With the help of the instructor, a final common choice of 3 models is made.

Laboratory

Outside class

(1 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the commented table of contents on another group's work. The peer-review is individual.

	(7 h) - After the reception of feedback on the commented table of contents, students work in group to produce a draft version of the <i>state of the art review</i> section of the final report. The draft is submitted on Canvas.
<i>Online LMS (Canvas)</i>	(1 h + 1 h + 1 h) - One interactive tutorial on Matlab, one interactive tutorial on Excel and one interactive tutorial on Abaqus (see Week 1 for details about their structure).
<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Individual:</i> the three online interactive tutorials. <i>Group:</i> the commented table of contents, the draft <i>state of the art review</i> section.
<i>Feedback</i>	Oral instructor-feedback during in-class activities. Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the commented table of contents. Written instructor-feedback on the draft <i>state of the art review</i> section.
Week 3 - 9.5 h	
<i>In class</i>	(1 h) - Of the 3 models defined in the previous week, the first is treated. The teacher introduces the system, introduces constraints and assumptions and the governing physical principles with the corresponding mathematical laws (steps 1 to 3 of the engineering signature pedagogy, see Table 1).
<i>Laboratory</i>	
<i>Outside class</i>	(2 h) Students work individually on the model introduced and, by applying assumptions and constraints to the governing laws, derive predictive formulas and algorithms (step 4 of the engineering signature pedagogy, see Table 1). They submit their work on Canvas. (1 h) Students proceed to an individual peer-review of another colleague's work on the analytical model.

	(1 h) Given the properties of constituents (fiber and matrix), students estimate individually the elastic properties of the composites using micromechanical models.
	(1 h) Students proceed to an individual peer-review of another colleague's work on the elastic properties estimation.
<i>Online LMS (Canvas)</i>	(1 h +1 h + 1.5 h) One interactive tutorial on Abaqus (see Week 1 for details about their structure). Videos and online readings (Canvas pages) on manufacturing and testing of composites. Optional: interactive course (review) of micromechanical evaluation of elastic properties of composites (topic of a course in the previous study periods).
<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Individual:</i> the submission on the analytical model and the on the elastic properties estimation, the online interactive tutorials, online quiz on manufacturing and testing of composites. <i>Group:</i> none.
<i>Feedback</i>	Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the submission on the analytical model and the on the elastic properties estimation.
Week 4 - 16.5 h	
<i>In class</i>	(2 h) Based on the work of the previous week, students work with their project group and start writing the <i>Theory</i> section of the report by summarizing the first model with relevant mathematical derivations and reference articles. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups. The new report section is submitted on Canvas by the end of the session.

(2 h) Working with their project group, students apply the first analytical model to predict the experimental tests' results using the material properties evaluated in the previous week. Geometry is given and is the same of the specimens manufactured during the same week. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.

(2 h) Working with their project group, students develop the first (of two) numerical model in Abaqus using the material properties evaluated in the previous week. Geometry is given and is the same of the specimens manufactured during the same week. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.

(1.5 h) Working with their project group, students define an experimental procedure to evaluate the elastic properties of composite laminates starting from the references gathered in Week 1. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups. An experimental procedure common to the whole class is agreed through a class-wide discussion lead by the instructor.

(0.5h) Of the 3 models defined in the previous week, the second is treated. The teacher introduces the system and constraints and assumptions (steps 1-2 of the engineering signature pedagogy, see Table 1).

Laboratory

(4 h) In group: manufacturing, cutting and polishing of specimens, gluing of tabs and of strain gauges (if needed).

Outside class

(1 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the *Theory* section of another group. The peer-review is individual.

(2.5 h) Students work individually on the model introduced and, by formulating assumptions and constraints and applying them to the governing laws, derive predictive formulas and algorithms (step 3-4 of the engineering signature pedagogy, see Table 1). They submit their work on Canvas.

(1 h) Students proceed to an individual peer-review of another colleague's work on the analytical model.

Online LMS (Canvas)

Assessment

Individual: the submission on the analytical model.

Group: the *Theory* section of the report.

Feedback

Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the submission on the analytical model. Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the *Theory* section of the report. Oral instructor feedback on the application of the analytical model, the development of the numerical model and the definition of the experimental procedure.

Week 5 - 15 h

In class

(2 h) Based on the work of the previous week, students work with their project group and continue writing the *Theory* section of the report by summarizing the second model with relevant mathematical derivations and reference articles. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups. The updated report section is submitted on Canvas by the end of the session.

(2 h) Working with their project group, students apply the second analytical model to predict the experimental tests' results using the material properties evaluated in Week 3. Geometry is given and is the same of the specimens manufactured during the previous week. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.

(2 h) Working with their project group, students develop the second numerical model in Abaqus using the material properties evaluated in the Week 3. Geometry is given and is the same of the specimens manufactured during the previous week. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.

(1.5 h) Working with their project group, students define an experimental procedure to estimate the level of damage of composite laminates starting from the references gathered in Week 1. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups. An experimental procedure common to the whole class is agreed through a class-wide discussion lead by the instructor.

(0.5h) Of the 3 models defined in the previous week, the third is treated. The teacher introduces the system (steps 1 of the engineering signature pedagogy, see Table 1).

Laboratory

(2 h) In group: testing of specimens to evaluate elastic properties. Raw data are uploaded to Canvas and shared with the other groups.

Outside class

(1 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the *Theory* section of another group. The peer-review is individual.

(3 h) Students work individually on the model introduced and, by identifying constraints, formulating assumptions and applying them to the governing laws, derive predictive formulas and algorithms (step 2-4 of the engineering signature pedagogy, see Table 1). They submit their work on Canvas.

(1 h) Students proceed to an individual peer-review of another colleague's work on the analytical model.

Online LMS (Canvas)

Assessment

Individual: the submission on the analytical model.

Group: the *Theory* section of the report.

Feedback

Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the submission on the analytical model. Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the *Theory* section of the report. Oral instructor feedback on the application of the analytical model, the development of the numerical model and the definition of the experimental procedure.

Week 6 - 23 h

In class

(2 h) Based on the work of the previous week, students work with their project group and continue writing the *Theory* section of the report by summarizing the third model with relevant mathematical derivations and reference articles. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups. The updated report section is submitted on Canvas by the end of the session.

	(2 h) Working with their project group, students apply the third analytical model to predict the experimental tests' results using the material properties evaluated in Week 3. Geometry is given and is the same of the specimens manufactured during Week 4. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.
	(2 h) Working with their project group, students analyze the raw data gathered in Week 5 and provide estimations of the elastic properties of the composite material studied. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.
<i>Laboratory</i>	(16 h) In group: testing of specimens to evaluate damage. Raw data are uploaded to Canvas and shared with the other groups.
<i>Outside class</i>	(1 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the <i>Theory</i> section of another group. The peer-review is individual.
<i>Online LMS (Canvas)</i>	
<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Individual:</i> none. <i>Group:</i> the <i>Theory</i> section of the report.
<i>Feedback</i>	Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the <i>Theory</i> section of the report. Oral instructor feedback on the application of analytical models and the analysis of the experimental data.
Week 7 - 12 h	
<i>In class</i>	(2 h) Working with their project group, students analyze the raw data gathered in Week 6 and provide estimations of the evolution of damage of the composite material studied. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.

(1 h) Working with their project group, students calculate new analytical predictions using the 3 models adopted and the material properties evaluated from tests in Weeks 5-6.

(1 h) Working with their project group, students calculate new numerical predictions using the 2 models developed and the material properties evaluated from tests in Weeks 5-6.

(4 h) Working with their project group, students compare analytical and numerical predictions with experimental results, draw conclusions about the use of calculated vs measured elastic properties, evaluate the accuracy of the models used vs their ease of use. The students produce a draft version of the *Results and discussion* section of the report (title, subtitles, main graphs, logical passages summarized in 2-3 sentences), which is submitted on Canvas at the end of the session.

Laboratory

Outside class

(2 h) Working with their project group, students write a draft version of the *Materials and Methods* section of the report, which is submitted on Canvas.

(1 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the *Materials and Methods* section of another group. The peer-review is individual.

(1 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the *Results and discussion* section of another group. The peer-review is individual.

Online LMS (Canvas)

Assessment

Individual: none.

	<i>Group:</i> the <i>Materials and Methods</i> and <i>Results and discussion</i> sections of the report.
<i>Feedback</i>	Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the <i>Materials and Methods</i> and <i>Results and discussion</i> sections of the report. Oral instructor feedback on the analysis of experimental data and on the comparison between experimental, analytical and numerical results.
Week 8 - 14 h	
<i>In class</i>	(8 h) Working with their project group, students gather and review the work done in Weeks 1-7 and produce the final version of the report. The instructor guides and supervises the work of the groups.
<i>Laboratory</i>	
<i>Outside class</i>	(4 h) Working with their project group, students perform the final revision of the report, which is submitted on Canvas. (2 h) - Students conduct a peer-review of the report of another group. The peer-review is individual.
<i>Online LMS (Canvas)</i>	
<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Individual:</i> none. <i>Group:</i> graded assessment by the instructor of the final version of the report.
<i>Feedback</i>	Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the final version of the report. Oral instructor feedback on the preparation of the final version of the report.
Week 9 - 12 h	
<i>In class</i>	
<i>Laboratory</i>	
<i>Outside class</i>	(12 h) Individual study in preparation for the final exam.
<i>Online LMS (Canvas)</i>	

Assessment

Individual: none.

Group: none.

Feedback

Written peer- and instructor-feedback on the final version of the report. Oral instructor feedback on the preparation of the final version of the report.

Week 10 - 0.5/1 h

In class

(0.5/1 h) Final individual oral exam. Discussion starts from the report together with the feedback received upon it and the personal work on the analytical models of Weeks 3-6. The student should show familiarity with the concepts, models and tools used; be able to justify the choices made throughout the project work; identify areas for improvement and suggest ideas for subsequent research.

Laboratory

Outside class

Online LMS (Canvas)

Assessment

Individual: graded oral exam.

Group: none.

Feedback

Oral instructor feedback on the performance in the oral exam.

2.4. Risks

- Class size: the course is designed for a small class, i.e. a maximum of ~ 20 students. If more students register and actively attend the course, especially in-class activities could become hard to manage. A solution could be allowing more instructors inside the classroom. However, there will be a risk of noise and confusion which can lead to a loss in focus.
- Respect of deadlines: many activities depend on the timely completion of the previous ones. If some students are late or miss some submissions,

there might be some organisational problems. Especially critical are the peer-review feedback submissions, although they are always matched by an instructor feedback.

- Workload- and evaluation- related stress. The workload has been calculated to be roughly equal to 65% of a 7.5 credits course ($\sim 130 - 136$ hours in total) and spread evenly over 10 weeks. However, students have reported very packed schedules during the course study period. To prevent the insurgence of workload- and especially evaluation-related stress in students which will hamper an effective learning, it is important to highlight during the course that weekly assessment is formative and counts only as pass/fail.
- Technical issues: no material exists at the moment to support the envisioned Canvas activities. A strong effort is required to develop all the features described. Technical problems may likely arise and can prevent the successful completion of the tasks planned, thus hampering an effective learning experience.
- Design of online tutorials: online tutorials are fundamental in providing the students with the technical skills to perform the tasks required for the report. They must ensure the correct acquisition of the necessary skills and techniques; otherwise, there is a risk that the time allotted for research tasks is not be enough (more training is needed by students) or an uneven division of labor takes place (those who already know do the work). Design of online tutorials is thus critical.

References

- [1] J. Biggs, Teaching for Quality Learning at University - What the Student Does., 1st Edition, SRHE / Open University Press, Buckingham, 1999.
- [2] B. J. Wadsworth, Piaget's theory of cognitive and affective development: Foundations of constructivism., Longman Publishing, 2004.

- [3] L. S. Shulman, Signature pedagogies in the professions, *Daedalus* 134 (3) (2005) 52–59.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027998>
- [4] J. H. F. Meyer, R. Land, Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning, *Higher Education* 49 (3) (2005) 373–388. doi:10.1007/s10734-004-6779-5.
- [5] R. W. Tyler, A generalized technique for conducting achievement tests, *Educational Research Bulletin* 10 (8) (1931) 199–208.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1470345>
- [6] R. W. Tyler, Chapter III: Nature of learning activities, *Review of Educational Research* 1 (1) (1931) 22–29. doi:10.3102/00346543001001022.
- [7] R. W. Tyler, Formulating objectives for tests, *Educational Research Bulletin* 12 (8) (1933) 197–206.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1471251>
- [8] L. W. Anderson, D. R. Krathwohl, B. S. Bloom, A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: a revision of Blooms taxonomy of educational objectives., Longman, New York, 2001.
- [9] D. R. Krathwohl, A revision of bloom’s taxonomy: An overview, *Theory Into Practice* 41 (4) (2002) 212–218. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2.
- [10] R. H. Dave, *Developing and Writing Behavioural Objectives.*, Armstrong R. J. Educational Innovators Press, 1975.
- [11] M. T. H. Chi, R. Wylie, The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes, *Educational Psychologist* 49 (4) (2014) 219–243. doi:10.1080/00461520.2014.965823.
- [12] M. J. Lage, G. J. Platt, M. Treglia, Inverting the classroom: A gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment, *The Journal of Economic*

Education 31 (1) (2000) 30–43.

URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1183338>

- [13] A. King, From sage on the stage to guide on the side, *College Teaching* 41 (1) (1993) 30–35.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27558571>
- [14] J. Bormann, Affordances of flipped learning and its effects on student engagement and achievement, 2014.
- [15] J. O’Flaherty, C. Phillips, The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review, *The Internet and Higher Education* 25 (2015) 85–95. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.02.002.
- [16] A. Karabulut-Ilgu, N. J. Cherrez, C. T. Jähren, A systematic review of research on the flipped learning method in engineering education, *British Journal of Educational Technology* 49 (3) (2017) 398–411. doi:10.1111/bjet.12548.
- [17] M. K. Kim, S. M. Kim, O. Khera, J. Getman, The experience of three flipped classrooms in an urban university: an exploration of design principles, *The Internet and Higher Education* 22 (2014) 37–50. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2014.04.003.
- [18] J. Kanelopoulos, K. A. Papanikolaou, P. Zalimidis, Flipping the classroom to increase students’ engagement and interaction in a mechanical engineering course on machine design, *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP)* 7 (4) (2017) 19. doi:10.3991/ijep.v7i4.7427.
- [19] B. A. McCabe, Experiences of flipped learning in a civil engineering module, *Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning* 4 (1) (2018) 1. doi:10.22554/ijtel.v4i1.31.