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**Some suggestions for preparing your Round table discussion**

1. Ask yourself what topic you would like to discuss with colleagues. On what matter would you like a dialogue that can help you getting a step further in your research? Design one or more clear and targeted questions.
2. Create an A4 with the information needed to explain your key question. The goal of this A4 is that colleagues can grasp the main idea of the study and the key question you want to discuss. Make sure your question is clearly stated at the A4. Feel free to create your own design!
3. Also prepare how you will present this A4 in 2 minutes (without audio-visual devices). Imagine that you will be at a table with colleagues interested in your research and question(s) and that your talk is the starting point for the dialogue. Grasp your chance!

Below you can find two examples of an A4.

*Example 1*

**Collective learning as a tool for promoting the implementation of Assessment for Learning**

**J. Castelijns, Hogeschool De Kempel, the Netherlands,** **j.castelijns@kempel.nl**

**D. Baas, Maastricht University, the Netherlands,** **d.baas@maastrichtuniversity.nl**

*Background*

Insert your foto here to help others knowing who you are ☺

The role of collective learning in the development of teachers’ competencies is widely acknowledged. Collective learning aims at promoting student learning by developing relevant teacher competencies. It is characterized by an inquiry based cyclic approach in which a collective ambition is defined, information is collected and actions are taken based on the derived consequences (see fig. 1 and 2).

*Setting*The inquiry based and cyclic approach central to collective learning is also acknowledged as essential in the literature on Assessment for Learning (AfL). AfL is ‘…the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning process, where they need to go and how best to get there’ (ARG, 2002, p.2). Birenbaum et al. (2009) emphasize that when collaborative learning at the organizational level has a prominent place in schools this will, more likely, result in a high quality implementation of AfL in classrooms.

In order to stimulate the implementation of AfL in 6 elementary schools, a professional development trajectory was developed that supported schools to engage in a collective learning inquiry.

*Preliminary results*

Based on the preliminary analysis of the qualitative data we found that the participating schools differed in the extent to which they were able to take the consecutive steps of the cycle for collective learning. This can be illustrated by the collective learning cycle of two different schools (figure 1 & 2).

Figure 1: School A

Figure 2: School B
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*Roundtable discussion*

* What indicators are useful to determine whether a collective ambition is actually owned by the entire teacher staff?
* How can a collective ambition be used as a frame of reference in supporting schools in implementing Assessment for Learning?
	+ Which conditions or interventions facilitate this process?
	+ How to support these conditions or interventions?

*Example 2*

Title: **Evolving Team Cognition**

Authors:
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**S. van der Haar,** Maastricht University, the Netherlands, s.vanderhaar@maastrichtuniversity.nl

**J. Li,** Georg-August-University Göttingen, Germany, jia.li@psych.uni-goettingen.de

**M. Segers,** Maastricht University, the Netherlands, m.segers@maastrichtuniversity.nl

**Karen A. Jehn,** Melbourne Business School, Australia, k.jehn@mbs.edu

**P. Van den Bossche,** University of Antwerp, Belgium, piet.vandenbossche@uantwerpen.be

*Well begun is half done.* --- English proverb.

*Background*

A pivotal recent development in team cognition research is a shifting focus to the temporal dynamic nature of team cognition. Not only has team cognition been identified as an emergent state varying as a function of team context, inputs, processes, and outcomes over time (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001; Mohammed, Ferzandi, & Hamilton, 2010), but new team cognition concepts have also been introduced to address the temporal dynamic nature and to distinguish from established concepts. A notable example is the team situation model (TSM) that refers to “mental representations associated with a dynamic understanding of the current situation (i.e. environment, task, team) that is developed by team members moment by moment” (Rico, Sánchez-Manzanares, Gil, & Gibson, 2008, p.167).

The **key question** is how this TSM evolves over time. Is there a change in the level of similarity? How does this appear **in the early stage of teams** that work with high pressure and time constraints such as **emergency management command-and-control teams**?



*Design*

* 32 real-life multidisciplinary on-scene-command teams (fire department, police, disaster medicine) with the command-and-control at the scene of emergency situations (e.g. a fire, a large collision at a high way, or water flood), participating in a simulation exercise.
* **Independent variable**: the change of the TSM similarity between meeting 1 and 2. Two measures of the TSM: after team meeting 1 and after team meeting 2.
* **Dependent variable**: team effectiveness in terms of goal achievement and quality of actions, measured after finishing the simulation.
* **Methodological approach**: 1) an inter-team longitudinal approach that examines the change in the similarity score at the sample level (does a change influence team effectiveness?) and 2) an intra-team longitudinal approach (Li & Roe, 2012) that examines the influence of individual team change patterns (increase, stable, decrease) on team effectiveness.

Change in TSM similarity

Team effectiveness

*Results*

1. TSM change in general is positively related to team effectiveness (both quality of actions and goal achievement).
2. Teams with increasing TSM similarity patterns tend to deliver higher team effectiveness than teams with stable TSM patterns but not than teams with decreasing TSM patterns.

*Roundtable discussion*

* How can we interpret the second finding? Why could a stable similarity pattern in the early stage of a team be unfortunate for team effectiveness? And what explains the finding that the effect of the increasing and the decreasing pattern is comparable?
* How to practically design a study in which the development of TSM similarity over a longer period can be investigated?