

**Meeting on: 28 November 2012**  
**Conference centre room 1.1**  
**Working group for evaluation of teaching.**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Berit Lassen, Ken Henriksen, Eva Karring, Klaus Mors Kristensen, Hanne S. Birkmose, Lars Brian Krogh, Ole Sonne, Jonas Geil Pedersen, Jonas Ostersen and Hanne Kargaard Thomsen (minutes)

**Absent:** Tina Keiding, Erik Østergaard and Nina Bjerre

Ref. HKT

**1. Background for the work in the working group for evaluation of teaching.**

BELAS and HKT introduced the background for the work of the group. Aarhus University quality policy, as of today. The policy is attached to the minutes.

Date: 08. April 2013

**2. Round of introduction**

See schedule at the end of the document.

Page 1/9

**3. Experience with teaching evaluations at the main academic areas**

The four main academic areas gave an introduction to the main academic area's teaching evaluation practices based on the short presentation that had been sent in advance as well as examples of teaching evaluations. In connection to the drafting of the written presentation, some had experienced that information about the work of the group did not make it all the way round and that there was some uncertainty in the organisation regarding its aims.

HKT and BELAS would pass on the need for wider communication.

**ST by Lars Brian:** Traditionally there has only been one approach at "the old ST", but several evaluation methods have followed with the fusion. For example at the graduate engineer degree program where the instructor gets to decide the focus, but has to write a memo at the end of the course and point out improvement opportunities. Furthermore there is an explicit follow-up procedure. The method makes it difficult to compare across subjects.

Additionally at ST they have evaluated their evaluation practice through interviews and formulated a number of basic principles.

1. Minimal: Only the necessary and in demand
2. Flexible: for both students and teachers (that the instructors can add something extra)
3. Meaningful: evident that the evaluations are used (moved forward the evaluations so the teacher had time to do something about it)
4. Fast response and optimally automatised (must be able to do a report quickly)
5. Development-orientated (formative evaluation)

They have run a pilot project at ST entitled “New course evaluation” containing:

- Some compulsory questions
- The option that the teacher can add extra questions/comments
- A “question bank”

The evaluations in the pilot project were carried out before the exam, while typically at ST it has been after the exam.

The project is currently run aground because of technical/financial challenges.

**BSS by Hanne Birkmose:** At BSS there have been different practices at the former ASB and the former SAM. At the former ASB the evaluation of teaching has been relatively standardised in both form and frequency. At the former SAM there was more variation. Klaus Mors has tried to standardise the logistics regarding performance, and evaluation is carried out digitally. Typically the evaluation is prior to the exam, some also do interim evaluations.

The results are sent to the teacher, the head of department, the board of studies and the vice-dean.

The Board of Studies for Business Administration follows up at <2.5. At language and communication the evaluations are consistently used in the employee performance interviews with the teachers.

**HE by Ole Sonne:** At HE there is a standardised evaluation tool, which can be fitted to the individual degree programmes/subject’s needs. Lectures and classroom lessons are evaluated collectively and the evaluation is done on paper. Centre for Medical Education is in charge of the coordination. The results are sent to the degree programmes for comments and to the board of studies for processing. The vice-dean also receives the results. More general qualitative statements are removed before the results are sent out.

The open comment field has been adjusted: What is good about the instruction? Do you have specific suggestions for improvements? This have given more useful feedback.

At some courses the standardised form is supplemented with a qualitative meeting with two class representatives from each class as well as representatives on later terms to add another perspective to the discussions.

The evaluation takes place at the end of the term and it is difficult to get a valid estimate of the hours spent by students.

It is typically repeated substandard evaluations that cause the board of studies to follow up.

Centre for Medical Education assesses the results from the last four years and is able to determine whether the various initiatives have worked and thereby get an idea of the development trend.

**AR by Jonas Ostersen:** Jonas handed out an overview of the evaluation practice at AR. There is a great diversity in the evaluation practices, however all courses are orally evaluated during the term. There is also a final evaluation which can be either oral or written (on paper or electronically submitted) on all courses. Aesthetics and Communication and Culture and Society furthermore make use of a clarification of mutual expectations prior to the start of a course and moreover the two boards of studies use the same evaluation policy.

Follow up is done at the board of studies and the head of board of studies.

#### 4. The process of the work of the group

Parts of the future process was discussed in relation to the mandate of the group. During the process all participants will contribute to the report with written input.

The immediate issue is the report part.

The mandate of the group states: *“An account of existing teaching evaluation practice internally at AU as well as drawing on relevant Danish and international experience while focusing on which evaluation methods and initiatives ensure a high degree of quality and development of the teaching and other learning activities as well as ensuring optimum learning outcomes for the students.”*

At this first meeting the issue of evaluation practices at AU have been touched upon.

Furthermore there was a discussion concerning the need to involve the board of studies. It was agreed that it could be beneficial to involve them in relation to identifying

challenges and finding good examples of evaluation practices with development projects that have made a difference. The issue will be addressed again at a later time.

Page 4/9

The idea of hosting a seminar with participation of international scientist within the field of study was briefly discussed. HKT and BELAS will follow up on this in relation to the financial possibilities.

**5. The next meeting is at 11 December 2012 2 pm - 4 pm**

The main topic at the next meeting will be a discussion on how to structure the gathering of other Danish and international experience with teaching evaluations. The discussion will take an inspirational presentation by Torben K. as its starting point. Jensen from Centre for Teaching and Learning.

## Item 2. Presentation

Participants	Experience	Challenges (Teaching evaluations = UE)	Visions for AU
Hanne S. Birkmose (BSS)	Director of studies for BSc in Business Administration and Business Law/MSc in Business Administration and Business Law - have been in the Study Committee for the BSc in Economics and Business Administration for many years, also as a student representative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To make UE less mechanical.</li> <li>To be more supportive about the UE through support which the teachers can utilise independently of the UE.</li> <li>To secure the interaction/unify the rolls in relation to the board of studies in a quality assurance perspective and the head of department with staff responsibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To refrain from doing it out of duty and in stead to a greater extent make it a meaningful pedagogical tool.</li> <li>To see the subjects/the separate evaluation in a wider context.</li> </ul>
Eva Sidelmann Karring (HE)	Director of Studies/Chairman of the Board of Studies for about 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To make UE less mechanical.</li> <li>To handle UE in relation to the entertaining teacher (who will often score high) versus teachers who do not necessarily score as high, but make use of well thought out learning processes and pedagogy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To have a reliable, fair tool which can be general/common but which is utilised differently under the consideration of the individual degree programme.</li> </ul>
Ole Sonne (HE)	Course manager at Physiology at Health, former head of department/-manager - coordinator for teaching evaluation group.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repetition term after term (the mechanical element).</li> <li>Popularity measuring versus learning processes.</li> <li>To get a sufficiently high response rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To get useful evaluations which can be used to improve both the course and the teaching staff</li> <li>To complete fewer but more thorough UE, including being able to analyse in depth /cross tabulations.</li> </ul>
Jonas Bering Ostersen (AR)	Member of staff at TDM/has a sociological background - has been study environment coordinator and handled evaluations at Department of Information and Media Studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure the meaningful</li> <li>To see the connection to the consequences of the follow-up on the completed evaluations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To have meaningful evaluations with focus on the good process and a degree of freedom of method.</li> <li>That it is the teaching which is evaluated.</li> <li>To have common guidelines for bringing together the evaluation results/the reports.</li> </ul>
Ken Henriksen (AR)	Director of Studies at DAC, experience with evaluations as Director of Studies/Chairman of the Board of Studies - helped draw up a general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Securing/control and development: a challenge to handle both.</li> <li>The local versus the central/general - how should the interface be, to be most suitable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To have a procedure at AU level which can function as a development potential.</li> <li>To recognise the good teachers/courses.</li> </ul>

	policy.		
--	---------	--	--

Lars Brian Krogh (ST)	Employed at CSE (Centre for Science Education), has participated in teaching committees, has worked as a teacher at an upper secondary school where there is a heavy focus on UE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have a form of evaluation that impart involvement made.</li> <li>• To have the real development perspective put in.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have a form of evaluation that impart involvement made</li> <li>• To have focus on the development perspective.</li> <li>• To secure a support system in relation to the follow-up on UE.</li> </ul>
Klaus Mors Kristensen (BSS)	Administrator, in charge of operations management in the completion of UE, which are done electronically. Also secures the preparation of reports/aggregations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Huge logistic work to adjust the individual questionnaire and there are many different evaluations.</li> <li>• Technical challenge - AU-mail is not seen by all students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have a central system based on the questionnaire method, consisting of elements/building blocks in relation to adjusting evaluation to one's own study programme.</li> </ul>

<p>Jonas Gejl Pedersen – student representative (BSS)</p>	<p>Vice-chairman of the Board of Studies, Political Science/member of the Kvalitetssikringsgruppen (the quality assurance group).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Securing/control versus development: a challenge to handle both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To move beyond the fact, that UE is a private matter.</li> </ul>
<p>Berit Lassen (BSS)</p>	<p>Employed at Centre for Teaching and Learning (CUL), does research on students' learning.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To create a heightened awareness among teachers and students of what UE can be used for.</li> <li>• To create a variety of measuring instruments to pick from. Measuring instruments which cover simple to large evaluations and which take into consideration the differences at Main Academic Areas/subjects.</li> <li>• To secure the pedagogical support, where the teachers see it as an opportunity to change and develop - and not a control mechanism.</li> </ul>