

Meeting on: 11 December 2012
Conference centre, conference room 1.1
The working group for evaluation of teaching

MINUTES

Present: Berit Lassesen, Ken Henriksen, Eva Karring, Klaus Mors Kristensen, Hanne S. Birkmose, Lars Brian Krogh, Ole Sonne, Jonas Ostersen, Erik Østergaard og Hanne Kargaard Thomsen (keeper of the minutes)

Absent: Nina Bjerre and Jonas Geil Pedersen

Guest Torben K. Jensen, CUL (Centre for Teaching and Learning)

1. The minutes from 28 November 2012 were approved with few adjustments

Ref. HKT

2. Recap from the last meeting

Date: 23. April 2013

3. How can we structure the compilation of other Danish and international experience regarding evaluations of teaching? Torben K. Jensen from CUL had an inspirational presentation in which he touched upon the following topics (presentation enclosed):

Page 1/2

- a. Introductory remarkings regarding evaluation theory
 - Department of examination: Measures whether or not the students learned something vs the department of evaluation: Measures whether or not the teaching supported student learning.
 - An evaluation arrangement contains the following three elements:
 - Compilation of data
 - Procedure for analysis and discussion of data
 - Determination of responsibility for follow-up
 - Teaching can be meaningfully and beneficially evaluated in many different ways
 - It is important that the evaluation is rooted in theories of quality in teaching, learning theory, evaluation theory (and theories of questionnaires in which questionnaires are included).
- b. Evaluation theory:
 - What is the purpose of the evaluation? (there might be several purposes)
 - Who is the educator/who is evaluating? (the student, the teacher or a colleague?)
 - Time of the evaluation? (TKJ: For practical reasons, the best time is shortly before the conclusion of the teaching. Offering time for the com-

pletion of the form and offering feedback during the following lectures are important).

- Method: Data basis? Procedure? Follow-up?
- **Standard:** When is something good enough?
- **Criterion:** That the learning is appropriately backed (activity, increased interest and motivation, independent thinking, appropriate learning strategy (learning in depth) etc.
- Who is the evaluand? (The lecturer? The student? The process?)

Page 2/2

c. Learning theory

- What supports student learning?
 - That the students make an effort
 - Motivation
 - Alignment and transparency between content, learning goals, type of examination, methods of teaching, and media
 - Committed lecturers

d. Examples of evaluation arrangement (important that they are rooted in evaluation theory and learning theory)

- TKJ brought several examples of evaluation forms, procedures etc.

e. Vision and pitfalls

- That the lecturers evaluate because they cannot not do it

f. Methodology in analyses of evaluation arrangements

- That the evaluation instrument hurts the teaching

4. The next steps in the process

The group started looking at the next steps in the process. For the part of the mandate relating to establishing evaluation practice at AU, in the rest of Denmark and internationally, the group is aiming to be finished in the beginning of March.

The following three working groups were set up:

1. *A general description of the purpose of the evaluation of teaching:* Berit Lassesen and Lars Brian Krogh (Hanne Kargaard supplements)
2. *Establishment part 1: Description of AU evaluation practice and other experience from the rest of Denmark:* Klaus Mors Kristensen (coordinator), Jonas Ostersen, Jonas Geil and Nina Bjerre
3. *Establishment part 2: International experience:* Hanne S. Birkmose (coordinator), Ken Henriksen, Eva Karring, Erik Østergaard and Ole Sonne

Home assignment for groups 2 and 3 for next time: To find substantiated choices for candidates (group 2 nationally besides AU and group 3 internationally) for description based on the following considerations:

1. It must be universities with focus on:
“methods of evaluation and initiatives that ensure high quality and teaching development and other learning activities and that ensure the optimal learning benefits for the students.”,

Page 3/2

... and which can support the group’s overall task: “to draw up a proposal for common goals for systematic evaluation of teaching at AU which recognises the various evaluation cultures, methods of teaching and educational objectives.” Cf. the mandate.

2. The group discussed the general importance of choosing universities that have implemented a general system/common goals which apply to all of the university/possibly a major main academic area.

3. Furthermore, the group discussed that a place to start would be contacting the university pedagogical units in the main academic areas.

5. The next meeting will be on 14 January 2013, 2 pm - 4 pm

Topic: Planning a work process - discussion of final inclusion criteria for description:

- Who is to participate? Based on what inclusion criteria?
- How should the descriptions be structured? Dimensions?