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Topics…

What constitutes excellence in university teaching?
How can we assess excellent teaching?

A model of pedagogical competence

Teaching portfolios

How to write and assess portfolios

Rewarding excellent teaching

A reward system – The Pedagogical Academy

Development

Quality discussions
What constitutes excellence in university teaching?

... what is an excellent university teacher?
... what kind of teachers do you want at your university?

Brainstorming and priorities – in groups

Discussion
How can we assess university teaching?

… what should we look for?
… quantity vs. quality?

**Brainstorming and priorities – in groups**

**Discussion**
Pedagogical competence – a model

**THEORY**
- Knowledge about teaching and student learning
- Informed pedagogical discussions
- Pedagogical theories

**PRACTICE**
- Teaching
- Observations of teaching and learning

**TEACHING SKILLS**
- Demonstrated proficiency

**PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE**
- Documented achievement

**Going public**
- Limiting aspects
- Possibilities

References:
- Olsson et al. (2010)
- Olsson & Roxå (2013)
- Magin (1998)
Teaching portfolios

- problems and possibilities when teachers write their teaching portfolios

some slides from Anders Ahlberg, Lund University
A significant teaching and learning situation

Talk to each other (in pairs) about a teaching and learning situation you consider significant

- What happened?
- What was good/problematic?
- Why?
- How do we know this?
- How will this influence your teaching in the future?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy, action</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>My view on education is...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...and there for I do...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...which has resulted in...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I participated in a pedagogical course...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...which made me change my practise in the following way...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...which in turn has resulted in clearer student understanding of...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I analysed the learning outcome of last years lab-course (frustration..)...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...which made me change the structure of the exercise as follows...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...lab-reports now reveal better understanding and abilities in...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After Apelgren & Giertz (2001)*
Subject matter content knowledge

Substantive structures - the ways in which basic principles and concepts are organised to incorporate its facts

Syntactic structures - discipline specific sets of ways in which truth/validity are established (to be familiar with the ”grammar of the discipline”)

Pedagogical content knowledge

To have a discipline specific arsenal of analogies to choose from

To be aware of discipline specific learning hurdles and useful learning pathways

Curricular knowledge

To access the full variety of instructional materials and ways through the subject discipline

To be able to link subject discipline to sister disciplines

Lee Shulman (1986)
Common reflective text components

- A very **brief** teacher biography
- Teaching **philosophy**/favourite educational principles (including references to the literature)
- Your key **concrete teaching practice** examples (representative selection)
  - Why did you develop teaching?
  - How did you develop teaching?
  - With which student learning results?
- Possibly an integrative discussion making your development as a teacher over time clear to the reader
- A **brief** statement of future plans
Assessing excellent teaching

The literature …
Criteria  ... on which the assessment is based

Evidence  ... to show that the criteria are met

Standards  ... to judge the evidence

Chism (2006); Ramsden & Martin (1996);
Elton (1998); Trigwell (2001);
McAlpine & Harris (2002); Gibbs (1995); ...
Assessment criteria (Lund University – Engineering)

1 **A clear focus on student learning**
   - A practice based on a learning perspective
   - An integrated relation between theory and practice
   - A practice based on a sound relation to students

2 **A clear development over time**
   - An effort to, over time, consciously and systematically develop students’ learning
   - An idea for continued development

3 **A scholarly approach to teaching and learning**
   - A reflection on practice based in educational theory relevant for the applicant’s discipline
   - A search for and creation of knowledge about student learning in the applicant’s discipline
   - An effort to make findings public with a purpose of collaboration and interaction
Assessment criteria – improvement ... Shulman (1986)

4 New criteria focusing on **the importance of the subject**

Subject matter content knowledge

the subject

Pedagogical content knowledge

teaching and learning in relation to the subject

Curricular knowledge

relations to other disciplines/ the course as part of a programme
Struggling portfolio-writers

- Philosophy detached from teaching practice
- Active, possibly successful change of teaching practice without well established arguments for this change
- Not accepting that teaching practice needs development (not only the portfolio text)
- No future vision
- No observations
- Not including PhD supervision and teaching
Portfolio and assessment biases

- too much focus on quantity
- too much focus on theory
- too much focus on practice
Pedagogical competence

Student learning

Plan

Observe

THEORY

Perspectives on teaching and learning

Limiting aspects
Possibilities

Informed pedagogical discussion
Pedagogical theories

PRACTICE
THEORY Complexity of pedagogical reasoning and understanding*

Holistic approach

Integrated understanding

Structured knowledge

Fragmented knowledge

Atomistic approach

PRACTICE Impacts of theoretical competence on pedagogical practice (informed/reflected practice)**

Intuitive practice

Reflected practice

Scholarly practice

Un-reflected approach

Scholarly approach

Antman & Olsson (2007)

* Biggs & Collis 1982 Didactic triangle
** Kreber 2002 Trigwell & Shale 2004
A reward system…

LTH’s Pedagogical Academy

• rewards teachers with a clear focus on student learning and a developed capability to reflect scholarly on practice

• monetary incentives for individuals and departments

• based on a teaching portfolio which is exposed to peer-review
Application

Applicants hand in …

- Teaching portfolio
  - scholarly reflection (teaching philosophy)
  - integrated examples from the teaching practice
  - supporting documentation

- Recommendation from the Head of Department

- Curriculum Vitae

- Discussions with two critical friends
Assessment

Applicants are assessed …

- Assessment group (peer review)
- Interview
- Decision in Teacher Appointment Committee
Appointment

Successful applicants/departments receive…

- The title ETP (Excellent Teaching Practitioner)
- Rise in salary for the individual teacher
  \( R \ 2\,900 \text{ per month} \)
- Increased teaching grants for the department
  \( R \ 72\,000 \text{ per year per rewarded teacher} \)
Statistics -- 2015

Total 116 (31 women; 85 men)

Different categories

Professor 37
Lecturer (with PhD) 67
Lecturer (without PhD) 12

Departments

All 18 departments
(between 12 and 2 rewarded teachers)
Assessment criteria (Lund University – Engineering)

1. A clear focus on student learning
   - A practice based on a learning perspective
   - An integrated relation between theory and practice
   - A practice based on a sound relation to students

2. A clear development over time
   - An effort to, over time, consciously and systematically develop students’ learning
   - An idea for continued development

3. A scholarly approach to teaching and learning
   - A reflection on practice based in educational theory relevant for the applicant’s discipline
   - A search for and creation of knowledge about student learning in the applicant’s discipline
   - An effort to make findings public with a purpose of collaboration and interaction
Time-line


Idea       Working group

1998

Version 1

2000

Research project

2001

Version 2

2003

Excellence in University Teaching

2004

Nationally / Internationally

2005

National project 2008-10
Ten Swedish universities

2006

International project 2010-
Sweden – South Africa

2015

Workshops/seminars/
keynotes

Sweden, Denmark, Norway,
Finland, Germany, UK, USA,
Canada, Hungary, Macedonia,
Switzerland, Spain, South Africa,
Australia, India, Singapore,…
A Swedish perspective on PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE


Table of content

• About the project – background, organisation and results

• Eight perspectives on pedagogical competence
One, two or three levels

Basic level
Accomplished teacher
Qualified teacher
Excellent teacher
Excellent Teaching Practitioner (ETP)
Examples of two different models

Faculty of Engineering at Lund University

Umeå University
Critical factors for success

Focus on institutional development
Integrated pedagogical development (overall view)
Scholarly approach (scholarship of teaching)

► pedagogical courses (with scholarly based projects)
► local arenas (campus conference, news letter, seminars…)
► monetary incentives (for individuals and institutions)
► support and trust from the leadership
► pedagogical competence defined in relation to teaching skills
► criteria (that are possible to reach)
► peer-review assessment
Development

Quality enhancement
  teaching portfolios
  campus conference papers

Effects at the Faculty of Engineering
  who, where, …
  students
  policy levels
How is the pedagogical practice expressed in teaching portfolios (development over time)

- What
- How
- Effects
- Link theory/practice
- Sharing/disseminating
Discussions about **What** the teacher teaches about
Discussions about **How** the teacher teaches
Teacher's Link between theory and practice

- Practice, no educational theory
- Educational theory and practice but no link
- Link: use theory to describe practice
- Link: Use theory to develop practice
- Link: Develop theory

Year 2003
Year 2009/2010
Discussions about **Effects** on students’ learning

![Bar chart showing the percentage of discussions about effects on students' learning in two years, 2003 and 2009/2010. The chart is divided into three categories: Not present, Assumptions based on own experience, and Accounts based on investigations. The percentages are not explicitly stated in the image.]
Sharing and disseminating

Development from departmental level to more faculty/university levels and national levels.

More arenas available 2009/10 – clearly evident in the portfolios.
Quality aspects of campus conference papers (development over time)
Focus on students’ learning
Relevant research integrated in the article
Coherence of the article
A clear development of quality (according to certain relevant criteria) of teaching portfolios as well as campus conference papers is evident between 2003 and 2010.

Has the teaching at the faculty improved?

Has student learning improved?
Effects at the Faculty of Engineering
Has the reward system influenced the culture?

Has the reward system had a social impact in terms of who are being rewarded?

- What kind of teachers?
- How many?
- Leaders at faculty level
- Heads of departments
- Different committees

Has the reward system affected policy levels?

- Recruitment and promotion
- Faculty competitiveness
- Official documents
Does the reward system have implications for funding and distribution of resources?
Does the reward system reward good teaching?

Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) by Ramsden (1991)?

- good teaching
- clear goals and standards
- experience of workload
- assessment oriented towards understanding
- overall satisfaction

Results from 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2014 show that rewarded teachers are responsible for high quality courses at the faculty.
Mean (ETP) based on 7797 questionnaires.

Mean (All) based on 84107 questionnaires.
Excellent Teaching Practitioners

*(February 2015)*

**Research (R) Boards and Educational Programme (EP) Boards**

| R Board 1  | 1 / 8 | 13 % |
| R Board 2  | 2 / 6 | 33 % |
| R Board 3  | 3 / 11 | 27 % |
| EP Board A | 0 / 9 | 0 % |
| EP Board B | 2 / 8 | 25 % |
| EP Board C | 4 / 10 | 40 % |
| EP Board D | 4 / 10 | 40 % |
| EP Board E | 4 / 8 | 50 % |

*Of the eight Chairs five are members of the Pedagogical Academy*
Teacher Appointment Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Board</td>
<td>1 / 4</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Board</td>
<td>1 / 4</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Chair of each committee is a member of the Pedagogical Academy*

Departmental Leadership Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>6 / 18</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Management Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Deputy Dean, Vice Deans</td>
<td>2 / 5</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic teachers</td>
<td>6 / 9</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All teachers at the Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of the academy</td>
<td>116 / ~700</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example teaching portfolios

Teaching portfolios (reflective part) written by teachers at the Faculty of Engineering, Lund University…

- Packaging Logistics
- Food Technology
- Mathematics
- Production Management

from their applications to the Pedagogical Academy
Example teaching portfolios

Table 1  Packaging Logistics + Food Technology
Table 2  Mathematics + Production Management
Table 3  Packaging Logistics + Mathematics
Table 4  Food Technology + Production Management
Table 5  Mathematics + Food Technology
Table 6  Packaging Logistics + Production Management
Table 7  Packaging Logistics + Food Technology
Table 8  Mathematics + Production Management
Table 9  Packaging Logistics + Mathematics
Table 10 Food Technology + Production Management
Table 11 Mathematics + Food Technology
Read portfolio texts (two per table)…

Discuss in the groups

Overall observations and comments?
Similarities and differences
Compliance with criteria
Integration between theory and practice?
Level of scholarship?