

- Goals and examinations

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Theology

Faculty: Theology

Department: Theology

Project title/developmental activity: Development of grading criteria, with a special focus on the bachelor thesis

What did you do? During the spring semester 2010 the Department of Theology initiated the task of formulating written grading criteria with a special focus on the bachelor thesis.

Why did you choose to do what you did? This work, a prioritized pedagogical area within the faculty given pedagogical gains and student legal aspects, was already well anchored among many lecturers and the study guardian, but due to lack of resources this work had not been possible to launch until now. At this point there were special motives (KrUUt) and possibilities (granted funding of this pedagogical project/PUMA) to realize this work systematically.

How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms? In a team, consisting of the director of studies (pedagogical) and all pedagogical mentors (lecturers) of the four main fields of study, the work of formulating written grading criteria was followed out. In the autumn of 2010 the criteria were presented to and discussed with the students. This interaction with the students gave rise to possibilities to improve the criteria. During the spring semester of 2010 the criteria were tested in all main fields of study, revised and sanctioned by the Faculty board 2010-09-20. Since then these criteria are used at the Department of Theology (bachelor thesis).

The work of formulating written grading criteria for other courses is in continuous progress.

What were the main results? The interest for and the use of grading criteria at the Department of Theology is increasing. We have noted good results when using the grading criteria for the bachelor thesis both when teaching, supervising, examining and grading. We have also noticed that when applying the criteria in teaching situations, supervising and examining, students seem to get a deeper comprehension of the constructive linkage between goal achievement and their grades.

Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other? The head of department, the director of studies (pedagogical), five pedagogical mentors (lecturers) and an amount of other lecturers, professors and students (approximately 50 in total).

Strategy for possible further implementation. The work of formulating written grading criteria for all our courses is in continuous progress, and from the autumn of 2012 the director of studies (pedagogical) is emphasizing the follow-up of this work. At the Pedagogical day of the faculty 2011 we also invited Cecilia Almlöv (pedagogical developer at SLU), who gave an in depth lecture on grading criteria and examination (followed up by fruitful workshops).

Advice to others wishing to do something similar. Let your work with grading criteria take time, engage many persons (with different teaching skills and experiences) in the work and make sure to try them out using the students before sanctioning them.

Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar.

Maria Essunger (Director of studies at the Department of Theology),
maria.essunger@teol.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Humanities and Social Sciences

Faculty: Law

Department: Law

Project title/developmental activity:

Development of a new syllabus for the Thesis course for the Degree of Master of Laws

1. What did you do?

We have developed a new syllabus for the Thesis course for the Degree of Master of Laws. The new syllabus includes grading criteria for the different grade levels. The functions as supervisor and examiner have been separated.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

The initiative to develop a new system for the Thesis was taken in cooperation with other providers of legal education in Sweden. The main goal was to achieve a greater differentiation between grades. In the past almost all law students at Swedish universities received the highest grade on their final thesis. A joint strategy for the universities was needed due to the country-wide competition between graduate students for positions as law clerks and other professional positions.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

The work began with discussions between the Law Departments in Sweden. After this strategic, nation-wide discussion, the course director for the course in Uppsala worked out proposals on the syllabus and the grading criteria for the course. These proposals were discussed and subsequently adopted by the Teaching Committee. A more comprehensive discussion on the implementation was also conducted at the departmental level with the teachers of the institution.

4. What were the main results?

The grading criteria have been implemented and the functions of supervisor and examiner have been separated. The course director has been charged with a more active role in the administration of the course. An improvement in quality of the theses can also be seen as regards these that receives that the highest grades. The reform has also started a differentiation of the grades given. The number of students with the highest grades has fallen to about 82%, having previously been close to 100%. The same trend is seen at other Law Departments in Sweden.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

The primary responsibility for developing the new curriculum was carried by the course director, but the work has involved also the Teaching Committee and all of the teachers involved as supervisors and examiners at the Faculty.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The new curriculum for the thesis course was implemented during the autumn semester 2011. The new system will be evaluated in 2012 and areas and issues that can be further developed will be identified.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

A change in a course which is also given at other Universities requires that it is anchored both at the local, Faculty level, as well as among the other providers of the same course. It also requires repeated contacts between the different Universities during the work, as well as discussions and common evaluations.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Olle Mårsäter, Director of Studies, Faculty of Law, olle.marsater@jur.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Hum-sam

Faculty: of arts

Department: History

Project title/developmental activity: Learning outcomes and grading criteria

1. What did you do?

Revise all learning outcomes for our courses and formulate grading criteria for them.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

Setting out from trying to formulate grading criteria for our master courses, we soon became aware of how closely related they are to the learning outcomes for each course. These outcomes needed to be thoroughly revised, showing what we actually did and wanted to achieve with each course. The next step, then, was to use them to formulate course specific grading criteria.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

The work started within a group of 7-8 persons, who worked with master theses courses. For the rest of the courses, the whole department was involved. We had a conference on the topic, where all participants had prepared suggestions for outcomes and criteria in advance. People from the PU department took part at the conference, providing feedback and advices on our work.

4. What were the main results?

The director of studies continued the work, and we now have revised outcomes and new grading criteria for most of our courses. A consequence of this was that we also needed to revise the programme syllabus for our master programmes. Again staff from PU was involved, which was very helpful. The syllabuses are now in accordance with both the "Examensordning" for master studies and the courses within the programme.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

The work affects all students and teachers, since it clearly shows what the students can expect and what the teachers must provide. By integrating all staff at the department in this work, the importance of it became apparent for everyone.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

Since the grading criteria are new, we need to evaluate them to see if they are “useful” or not. It is also important that teachers inform the students on this part at the beginning of each course.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

A general advice is to involve all personnel in this kind of work.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Gudrun Andersson, Department of history, gudrun.andersson@hist.uu.se

Erik Lindberg, Department of history, studierektor-ma@hist.uu.se

Developmental activity:

Development of assessment criteria for the master programme in ALM.

1. What did you do?

The department applied to the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning and received funding for a project aimed at developing assessment criteria for courses included in the master programme in ALM. The aim is to strengthen the constructive alignment between learning outcomes, teaching, and examination.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

The programme had assessment criteria for some courses, but the design of the criteria varied. We found that a comprehensive approach was needed.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

A project group collected all different kinds of examinations, individual and group assignments, and seminar questions that form the basis for assessment. These were compared with the learning outcomes expressed in the course syllabuses. Assessment criteria were also for comparative reasons collected from other departments. Students are involved in the process of designing assessment criteria, and later in evaluation of changes made.

4. What were the main results?

The project is still ongoing. So far the learning outcomes in the course syllabuses are being revised, and a preliminary set of assessment criteria has been developed. The work continues during the rest of 2012.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

The project group consists of four teachers. 6-7 other teachers, and a group of students, have so far been consulted.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The work will continue until we have good assessment criteria for all our courses. These will then have to be repeatedly evaluated and revised when necessary.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Same as above: Do not hesitate to contact the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning. They are very competent and helpful.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Reine Rydén
Department of ALM
reine.ryden@abm.uu.se

KrUUt-rapport från Inst. För idé- och lärdomshistoria

Faculty of Arts

Department of History of Science

1. What did you do?

During the academic year the Department of History of Science and Ideas has undertaken a thorough review of its course syllabuses. It has similarly devised new and more appropriate criteria for grading essays and degree projects at all levels. At the same time discussions on what characterises a good degree project and how students can best be helped to produce them have intensified among the teams of teachers. In addition, active use has begun to be made of these grading criteria in teaching at different levels.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

There are a number of reasons for implementing these changes. It has partly been a question of producing grading criteria that better match not only the qualification descriptors in the Higher Education Ordinance [Högskoleverket] but also the teachers' concept of what constitutes academic quality. In addition, there has been an ambition to devise criteria that can be used actively in teaching and that make it easier for teachers to explain to students on what grounds their work is assessed.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

A working group composed of the department's director of studies and three experienced teachers created proposals for the new course plans and grading criteria and presented them to the other teachers at a teachers' meeting. The proposals were also presented to the faculty programme director [fakultetens utbildningsledare]. The final versions were then produced.

When the grading criteria were completed, a special teachers' meeting was arranged for which all of the department's teachers were asked to read two sample texts, a B-essay and a first-cycle degree project. These texts were then used as the basis for discussion of how the new criteria could be applied in practice.

The grading criteria have also been introduced in the teaching at different levels, where they provide the basis for seminars and different practical exercises. For instance, students at the department are asked to review essays and degree projects from preceding semester using the new grading criteria. In this way the introduction of the new criteria has made it possible to introduce more proficiency practice into the essay courses.

4. What were the main results?

The work of producing new course syllabuses and grading criteria has led among other things to more intensive discussion of the teaching among the teams of teachers. Although it has been difficult to ascertain whether this has really been the outcome, it is hoped that this in its turn will result in a reduction of variation in assessment by

different teachers. When the discussion of what characterised a good essay had in fact intensified, it soon seemed natural to reform other elements in the teaching to attain greater correspondence with the aims of the essay courses. Another important result has been that more teachers have come to perceive examining as not merely a question of grading but also part of the educational process in its own right.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

All of the permanently employed and substitute teaching staff; at the Department of History of Science and Ideas a total of about 10 individuals.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The reforms will be monitored and evaluated continuously. The idea is to arrange new seminars on teaching at intervals of one year, at which one subject of discussion will be course syllabuses and grading criteria.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar.

Peter Josephson peter.josephson@idehist.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Humanities and Social Sciences

Faculty: Languages

Department: All

Project title/developmental activity:

Degree projects

1. What did you do?

The faculty board has formulated and adopted guidelines for courses with degree projects and grading criteria of degree projects.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

Formulating and adopting guidelines and criteria is one of the ways in which the faculty board assures the quality in education involving degree projects. The actual process of identifying and discussing the documents also created a space for reflecting on what quality in degree projects actually entail.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

The process was initiated with a colloquium to which all teachers at the faculty were invited. A presentation of how one can go about working with criteria of evaluation was given by teacher from the Faculty of pharmacy (name, received together with two colleagues the pedagogical award for developing criteria of evaluation), and in group discussions the teachers of the faculty found the common basis for similar work within the faculty.

A group consisting of the deputy dean, the directors of studies, a student and the faulty director of studies of research then formulated drafts of the guidelines and criteria, building from the material provided by the departments of already existing criteria. The drafts were submitted to the departments for review before being presented to the faculty board. Finally, the departments were instructed to adapt the grading criteria to needs of the different disciplines.

4. What were the main results?

- Teachers were involved in a reflection on quality issues, thus making the principles well-established from the start with the adjustments made in the different disciplines.
- A higher degree of predictability in examination

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

All teachers involved in degree projects. The discipline collegiums in many cases also included student representatives.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The faculty is in the process of formulating and adapting grading criteria for other courses as well. Due to very large number of courses this is rather time consuming.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

- Invite teachers from other parts of the university who already have done something similar.
- Get the disciplines involved, using actual courses that need criteria already in the first seminars; when it feels that the practical work has already started, it is easier to finish than if the start involved only general principles.
- Avoid formulations such as “a higher degree of...” etc

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Anette Månsson, Deputy Dean, Faculty of Languages
anette.mansson@lingfil.uu.se

Lars Hagborg, Faculty Director of Studies and Research, Faculty of Languages
lars.hagborg@uadm.uu.se

Lise Horneman Hansen, Director of Studies, Department of Nordic Languages
lise.horneman-hansen@nordiska.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain:

Faculty: Faculty of educational sciences

Department: Department of education

Project title/developmental activity:

Improved quality in the examination of internship

1. What did you do?

The program committee of the teacher education program appointed a group including students, representatives from different disciplines participating in the program and representatives from the schools and preschools where the students do their internship. The group met three times and submitted a report to the program committee analysing different aspects of examination of internship.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

The students at the teacher education program have expressed concerns relating to the examination of internship: During internship the students have different access to qualified mentorship from teachers in schools or preschools. Furthermore, some schools or classes have problems regarding to discipline whereas others are well functioning. All this will impact on the ability of the student to perform well during the internship. However, the teachers at the teacher education program have very limited opportunities to visit the students in the schools. This leads to a situation where the examination of the internship to a large degree depends upon the reports of the mentors in the schools/preschools. In addition to this the students experience that different teachers at the teacher education program seem to evaluate the scale and character of the assignments the students do during their internship. In spite of these different circumstances students are graded in regard to the same grading scale.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

We had three meetings where the issues above were discussed

4. What were the main results?

We decided to suggest the use a grading scale of two, instead of three steps in all courses that involved internship, we produced a rapport with guidelines and regulations and made an overview of the written material for assessment used by mentors at schools/preschools.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

Five to six teachers from different disciplines involved in the teacher education program

One representative from the Student Union

Three representatives from schools/preschools

Two coordinators of the courses involving internship

The report was also discussed in the program committee of the teacher education program: 15 persons.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

To develop the written material for assessment used by mentors in schools and preschools to illuminate important skills of teaching that is not included in the course syllabus of courses including internship.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

?

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Jonas Almqvist: department of education: Jonas.almqvist@edu.uu.se

Anna Hagborg: Office of humanities and social sciences: Anna.hagborg@uadm.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Neurosciences, Physiotherapist program

Project title/developmental activity: Constructive alignment and assessment criteria for thesis at ground- and advanced level Physiotherapy/Examination

1. What did you do?

Assessment criteria have been formulated and implemented in the thesis courses in the Physiotherapy programme as well as in advanced level thesis course in Physiotherapy. The criteria matches and align with the intended learning goals/outcomes.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

Our aim was to further set up a learning environment that supports students' learning and their ability to achieve the desired learning outcome in relation to writing a scientific thesis. The assessment criteria not only state what we want our students to learn but formulate how well we want the students' to understand each learning goal. Furthermore, our aim was to facilitate thesis supervision and ensure more equal examination of final thesis and to be able to distinguish the difference between expectations on a ground level and an advanced level thesis.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

Old learning outcomes and assessment criteria were revised and aligned and discussed in a group of senior lecturers. They were also compared and discussed with a corresponding teacher group at the Nursing Programme at Uppsala University. Furthermore, the assessment criteria and the criteria distinguishing ground level theses in Physiotherapy with an advanced level thesis in Physiotherapy were compared, discussed and coordinated with the Karolinska Programme of Physiotherapy, Stockholm. We regard this process of comparing and aligning our outcome measures with another Physiotherapy programme nationally and another caring programme in our own university as a validation process. The criteria has also been implemented in the programme and at advanced level as well as reviewed and discussed with the teachers and supervisors.

4. What were the results?

All involved parts have supported the process of aligning learning activities, goals and assessment criteria. The teachers have greatly appreciated clearer and more precise criteria to guide their feedback to the students. Examiners of thesis feel more secure with clearer assessment criteria and demands. Our next step is now to perform focus group interviews with the students at the end of the term in order to investigate their experiences and suggestions to further improve our learning environment for thesis. Assessment criteria have also been developed and implemented with regard to students' being opponents on another student's thesis. The students are now being examined on how well they can critically analyse and discuss another thesis.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

All teachers involved in supervising and examining thesis have been involved in the implementing the assessment criteria. So have also all the students in the thesis course during the past year. The coordination with other teacher groups within Nursing and Physiotherapy programmes in Uppsala and at the Karolinska Institute are continuing.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The evaluation phase of implementing learning goals aligned with clearer and more precise assessment criteria are still in progress and will lead to continuous revisions and specifications.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

It is important to validate the level of outcome measures for thesis work with other similar programmes nationally and within our own university. There is a tendency to steadily increase the expectations on the ground level thesis and not to have a clear and distinguished difference identified in relation to the advanced level thesis.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Cathrin Martin, Department of neurosciences, Cathrin.martin@neuro.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Neuroscience, Specialist Nurse Program

Project title/developmental activity: Clinical examination of professional competence in nursing, at a postgraduate level/Examination

1. What did you do?

We developed more standardized assessments of clinical examinations in the education of Specialist Nurse in Psychiatric Care. Assessment measures and checklists were designed in order to facilitate and get a more reliable assessment of communication skills on an advanced level in a station-based examination.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

Clinical examinations are used in programs where the exercises of the profession command high theoretical and clinical competence. Studies on a graduate level demands result in employability and the objectives of the course/program have to be examined in an appropriate way. Clinical education in the program is located in the area where the profession will be practiced. This is in many ways properly, but the clinical reality brings on differences for students in training and in examination. We wanted to adopt a more standardized approach in examination and the choice was the Objective Structured Clinical Examination. In addition to the development of the station based examination we wanted to subtilize the assessment of communication skills, as this is one of the most central competences in psychiatric nursing.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms? A project group with four clinical psychiatric specialist nurses also clinical supervisors, have together with a senior lecturer responsible for the project, search for literature with focus on communication as a nursing skill. Furthermore, students in the psychiatric nursing program at the postgraduate level have in a theory-based seminar illustrated the progression of the communication skill between the undergraduate and postgraduate level, as well as between course I and II in the program. Based on course literature, the project group constructed new checklists for assessment of communication and two of the teachers in the program validated the content. In addition, the group remodelled and developed scenarios with the intention to be pedagogical models with two different levels and different complexities in the examination (semester I and II).

4. What were the results?

The new assessment measures and checklists have been used in two clinical examinations. Discussions in the project have also contributed to clarify the need for and development of progression in the communication skills between the courses in semester I and II. More substantial information to the students about the examination with the content, procedures and criteria for assessments, is now in use. One station is soon becoming a film sequence for further information and preparation to the students. The film will also be used for inter reliability test between the examiners. The students have reported good-to-excellent learning from the examination and all of them recommend the use of same stations in the next program. The project has also brought about an extended course in communication in the program in order to prepare the students for the examination.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

The students have been nine, in each examination. Four clinical supervisors acting as patients and 3 examiners have been involved.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

Information, inspiration and our experiences will be directed to the nursing program on an advanced level so that clinical examinations can be further developed, adjusted and implemented in the different specialties.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Involve the students in the project.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Caia Öster, Department of Neuroscience. Unit of Psychiatry, Caia.oster@neuro.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Neuroscience, Master Programme in Biomedicine

Project title/developmental activity: Master project guidelines/Examination

1. What did you do?

We formulated guidelines for evaluation of the Master projects as well as instructions to supervisors and students on how the projects should be done. We also made a contract with a project plan to be filled in by the student and the supervisor at the start of the project.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

We wanted to have a clear basis for evaluation of the project so that all should be treated using the same criteria to safeguard objectivity. We also wanted to have clear instructions regarding the project so that both supervisors and students know what are expected of them.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

We looked up similar documents from other programmes and universities and put these together to documents that suited us, and the program.

4. What were the results?

We now have documents readily available for students and supervisors on the programme site on Studentportalen. They can clearly see what is expected of them. We also have a checklist to evaluate the students written and oral work - both for the presentation itself, but also a part concerning the laboratory work that for the supervisors to fill in. This gives a good basis for equal grading of the students.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

Erik Fries, the course leader for the Master projects, was mainly responsible for this work. Myself, Lina Thorvaldson, who is programme coordinator and Karin Nygren, the programme administrator have also read the different versions and helped formulating the documents.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

These documents will be used forthwith for the master projects.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Keep the documents concise and not too long, so that they will be read by the students. When writing the grading checklist, keep the number of criteria down to a reasonable number.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Erik Fries, Department of Medical Biochemistry and Microbiology, Erik.Fries@imbim.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Surgical Sciences, Nurse Program

Project title/developmental activity: Pre-hospital education in the ambulance/Generic Skills; Examination

1. What did you do?

With a specific education ambulance and an ambulance equipped with a patient simulator (SimMan), develop, improve and making quality assurance of the supervision and the education, aiming to improve the students knowledge and skills towards an advanced level.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

The project manager is one of the supervisors and has long experience of education to ambulance staff

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

The project manager in collaboration with ambulance supervisor and the Clinical Training Centre (KTC) implemented the project in daily operations in the ambulance care and worked together to develop procedures, assessment data and realistic training moments and examinations for the students. The supervisors were specially trained for the task.

4. What were the results?

The project will continue until 2013. We will use the instrument Assessment of Clinical Education (AssCE) for the purpose.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

15-20 students per year is the plan.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Johan Lingsarve, Department of Surgical Sciences, johan.lingsarve@surgsci.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Medical Sciences, Medical Program

Project title/developmental activity: Objective structured clinical examination/OSCE for medical students/Examination; Generic Skills

1. What did you do?

Implemented OSCE-examinations in medical program

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

Traditionally written exams have been the only form for assessing medical knowledge but the professional role of a modern doctor is far from theoretical. A modern doctor works in a context where a synthesis of theoretical knowledge and practical skills are essential. Therefore assessment tools are continuously developed in the field of medical education and OSCE-stations are today a valid and well-used assessment tool for integrated medical problems on a high taxonomic learning level. Therefore we introduced this form of assessment as part of summative examinations in our curriculum.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

From learning outcomes we developed theoretically and practically integrated stations at the clinical skill centre and in each station presented an integrated medical problem for the students to solve.

4. What were the results?

Students have to use knowledge on a higher taxonomic level to solve these integrated medical problems meaning that our assessment of medical knowledge now reach beyond isolated medical skills or textbook knowledge only.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

The full faculty for this course where involved in this project.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The OSCE station model is now implemented for summative examinations in Uppsala's medical program.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Start with defining your learning outcomes and build valid integrated medical problem stations based on the learning outcomes.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Eva Tiensuu Jansson, Maria Magnusson and Martin Wohlin, Department of Medical Sciences,
Eva.Tiensuu_Jansson@medsci.uu.se, martin.wohlin@medsci.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Medical Biochemistry and Biochemistry/Biomedical Scientist Program

Project title/developmental activity: Implementing and assessing learning objectives in a consistent way/Examination; General course curriculum revision

1. What did you do?

First, the objectives for Bachelor Degree and Professional Degree from HSV were translated to course objectives in each of the 15 course curricula of the program. Then all seminars and lab instructions were related to the learning objectives (some on semester 5 and 6 are still lacking). Thirdly, we just have started the process to ascertain that the learning objectives are fulfilled through monitoring the examinations during the program.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

A few years ago, an adjustment of all programs to the Bologna-curriculum was implemented. All course coordinators (CCs) followed a course to learn this and started to Bologna-adjust their course curriculum during which they got help from the PC. This had proven to be useful for the CCs especially when the CCs were new, but also for use when instructing teachers in the course. Therefore we wanted to make a complete revision of all documents and courses in the program and since a new program curriculum should start autumn 2010 prompted by HSV's new qualification demands, we started with documents in this program. The Bologna-adjustment was made in all courses with the help of the PC, who thereby got an overview of all contents in all courses; so most of the work with progression was completed at the same time. The PC can also use all objectives to give feedback to each CC to accomplish progression of parts that are included in several courses in the program, like oral presentation. It was also important to make sure that all objectives for the Degrees were covered by at least one of the course curricula.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

The contents of each course and the plans for revising the program curriculum was discussed with CCs and other interested teachers and student representatives at a few meetings. Then the CCs revised their course curriculum with the help of the PC. The PC also helped in adjusting all instructions. This means that soon all the instructions for all course curricula, seminars and laboratory teaching are related to learning objectives and learning outcomes.

4. What were the results?

The advantage is that these documents are tools that CC can use, see part 4, and this system is not so dependent on a specific individual at the CC or teacher level. This also gives a better control over progression with the program and overlaps between courses and can be easily monitored by the PC who has access to all documents on the web.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

11 CCs and 1 PC have been directly involved, beside those who are involved in teaching assignments at different courses. Furthermore, about 5 people from the university facilities have had a role as instigators, e.g. through courses and seminars.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

Some documents are still not finalized, see 3, and we have started to improve the individual examination in all courses using the course objectives, both the written and the practical examination partly inspired by a CrED seminar on the subject. This work started January 2012 with an introduction for all CCs of learning taxonomy, and work is now in progress to analyse the individual examination for all courses. It will continue at the yearly CC meeting in August, first deciding what levels in the learning taxonomy we should reach in different courses and after which hopefully improved individual examination will be tested.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

It takes time, so start as soon as possible ask those who employ your students what they minimally expect them to know when they start working. Decide which Departments that can give relevant education (took 6 years) and design courses from that and from the HSV objectives. All this groundwork was already done when we started this process 7 years ago.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Pia Ek, Department of Medical Biochemistry and Biochemistry, Pia.Ek@imbim.uu.se

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Department of Public Health and Caring Sciences, Nurse-, Physiotherapist-, Dietitian-, Pharmacy- and Medical Programs

Project title/developmental activity: Supervision and Examination of interdisciplinary student run health reception/Generic Skills

1. What did you do?

The interdisciplinary student run health reception took place during the fall 2011 (week 47 and 48). Significantly healthy seniors (visitors) were offered health talks and health education of students who worked in cross-professional couples. Students and tutors from pharmacy, nursing, medicine, physiotherapy and dietetics programs participated. The project was a continuation of the earlier pilot project by autumn 2010. Specifically, the aim in the autumn of 2011 was to develop supervision and examination forms.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

The project gave the students the opportunity to learn more about each other's professional competence, as well as to develop within their own profession with a focus on health and patient-centred conversation (motivational interviewing). Improved supervision and examination forms improved framework for a clear pedagogical model for both tutors and students.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

Initial training on motivational interviewing was conducted for all new teachers. Additional training on Motivational Interviewing for all teachers and tutors were carried out in 0.5 days. A study afternoon for teachers and supervisors in order to develop supervision and examination for the students during the health clinic was conducted in collaboration with the Department of Educational Development (PU), Uppsala University. The study guide was developed with a structure for student interaction while receiving visits and descriptions of the forms of examination and supervision. The student-activating teaching methods were developed through peer learning. The students collaborated in interdisciplinary pairs around the visitor. One student was primarily responsible for most of the conversation, the other was an observer and took notes and helped if necessary by the end of the conversation. The observer gave feedback after the visit. At the next visit the roles were reversed. Furthermore, a finishing examination seminar was introduced. At the seminar the students, based on health interviews and diary entries, presented what unites and divides the professions. Students were also asked to describe how a relevant health interview could be conducted, explain the relevant tests and present the evidence for various health advices. Written and oral evaluation of students' perception of the health reception ended the week.

4. What were the results?

During the student run health reception the students were given the opportunity to develop in collaboration with other skilled professionals on patient-centred health consultations and teamwork as well as profession-specific methods and approaches. Evaluation shows that both visitors and students welcomed the health clinic after implementation. The students felt that the health clinic provided a good basis for practicing skills on inter-professional learning and patient-

centred health consultations. The students assessed the tutorial from the teachers to be very good.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

Approximately 15 teachers/tutors and 20 students from five programs (pharmacy, nursing, medicine, physiotherapy and dietetics) participated in the project. 110 visitors visited the student run health reception during the two weeks.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The goal is that the student run health reception will be a permanent, scientifically evaluated, and a validated element in all-participating undergraduate programs. Here you will be given the opportunity to practice the student's skills in inter-professional learning and a patient-centred approach and health communication in a work-like environment.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Find resources for the financing, develop and use human networks between different programs, involve students in the process and have fun.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Marta Holm, Department of Public Health and Caring Sciences, Marta.holm@pubcare.uu.se
ann-marie.falk@farmbio.uu.se & lena.klaren@farmbio.uu.se, Department of Pharmaceutical Biosciences

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Medicine

Department: Medical Biochemistry and Microbiology

Project title/developmental activity: Computer based exams, CBE

1. What did you do?

In collaboration with the computer unit at the Biomedical centre, we developed a tool for Computer based exams

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

Although there is a constant pedagogic development of education at the university, this is hardly reflected in the theoretical examinations. Students are still compelled to sit in huge examination halls equipped with papers, pencils and erasers. Administrators are forced to spend hours copying exam questions and sorting exam answers and teachers spend too many late evenings and weekends trying to read cactography. With the aid of computers, handling, answering and correction of exams were expected to be more rational. Moreover, computers would also allow on-site supplementary data, such as high-resolution images, movies etc., which could give additional degrees of flexibility to the exam. Finally, many programs are using EMQs, which demands more paperwork and stricter invigilation. At the computer, much of this can be handled with a click.

3. How did you go about your work in concrete terms?

The development was performed in collaboration with a computer system developer at the computer unit of the Biomedical Centre. Initially, two teachers from the medical and pharmaceutical faculties presented a "wish-list". When the beta version was tested the medical faculty provided financial support for further development. A group of teachers were then acting as a reference group for testing and suggesting improvements.

4. What were the results?

The CBE (given the name "OpenExam") has now been running for more than 18 months. It has so far been used by teachers at the faculties of medicine, pharmacy and science&technology at more than 50 exams. There are also requests from the Swedish University of Agricultural Science to test the system. It is estimated that administrators save approximately 80% in time by using the system. Teachers claim that they can correct exams in less than one third of the time. Corrections can be done anywhere there is an internet connection. Students appreciate the system and claim "one could give better and more elaborate answers in a shorter period of time compared to traditional handwritten examinations."

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the developmental work in some way or other?

Mainly two teachers, one administrator and the computer wizard. Comments from a reference group of about five teachers. Around 150-200 students have used the system

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

Information about the program has been presented at teachers' days, and upon request to smaller groups. The link to the system, as well as general information and manual, will be available

through the faculty of medicine's web site. The limitation so far is the lack of computer halls with the capacity to handle large classes (now we are limited to about 70 students in two adjacent computer rooms. The technical solution for this is being discussed. For the moment, there is only one person that has all knowledge about the system and one administrator that has become an expert on how to handle all functions of the system. Thus we need to guarantee a constant back-up and support and is therefore discussing with MedFarmDoIT about their possibilities to handle the daily system supervision.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Catharina Svensson, IMBIM, catharina.svensson@imbim.uu.se,
Susanne.Tingsborg@imbim.uu.se, Anders.Lovgren@bmc.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Pharmacy

Department: Pharmaceutical Biosciences

Project title/developmental activity:

Examination - Assessment of the undergraduate project in Pharmacology (R6 project)

Generic skills – new instructions and examination procedure with the aim to improve written presentation and to keep given time frames for an assignment

1. What did you do?

Revised the instructions and changed the examination procedure to make the assessment criteria in the degree project in Pharmacology clearer for students at the Bachelor Programme in Pharmacy (Receptarieprogrammet).

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

The projects are carried out individually and we wanted to be able to better examine the student's ability to independently carry out the project and secure the quality and depth of the individual work performed.

Furthermore, over time we have noticed that more students do not complete their projects within the project period. They linger over prolonged time periods and this is a problem both regarding accessibility of supervisors and also for the students; they do not train the ability to follow specified time limits for a project.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

We introduced a half-time seminar for the degree project in Pharmacology (R6 project) in order to increase the quality and depth of the individual work. In this seminar, the student presents the aim/purpose of the project and the project outline. Thorough feed-back is given by the examiners, for example regarding references, facts and probability of finishing in time.

We revised the instructions and included a defined time schedule for deadlines during the project time. Students who have not completed their projects within the allocated time will from now on be rejected and reported as Failed (Underkänd) in the student register.

The final reports are submitted to and handled in *Studentportalen* and will automatically be checked for plagiarism in *Urkund*.

4. What were the main results?

The introduction of half-time seminars for the R6 projects has improved the final reports and has also given the examiner the possibility to step in early and support the student if problems occur during the work with the project.

Clearer instructions would more effectively guide the activities for students and supervisors. The introduction of time schedule has resulted in more engaged students and they have also become more responsible in their project.

The academic resources are used more effectively.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

1 senior lecturer and 1 professor

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

The project has been presented at the study director meeting at the department and also at other teaching meetings at the faculty of pharmacy. The aim is to introduce similar examination procedures at other degree projects in the faculty and the disciplinary domain of medicine and pharmacy.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Individual assessments are very time-consuming and it is important to think about the best way to perform from the available resources (supervisors or other teachers). Construct detailed instructions, keep firm dead-lines and take care to inform the students about assessment criteria and examination procedures.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Anne-Lie Svensson, Anne-Lie.Svensson@farmbio.uu.se

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Pharmacy

Department: Pharmaceutical Biosciences

Project title/developmental activity:

Examinations - Criteria-based assessment

1. What did you do?

We have defined the assessment criteria for examinations and assignments in some courses. The purpose was to make the examinations and assignments clearly related to the course objectives and then introduce criteria based assessment.

2. Why did you choose to do what you did?

This is a task initiated by Uppsala University to implement constructive alignment in all courses. The undergraduate board (GRUFF) gave us the assignment to introduce assessment criteria for the examinations in at least two mandatory courses in the pharmacy program.

3. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

Course content, assessment criteria and learning outcomes were defined and sometimes revised in the courses Drug Dependence, Adverse drug reactions and Pharmacovigilance, Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacotherapy. In some courses, the work is completed and to test the criteria-based assessment and compare the results with former examination, the examination was performed twice for the same exam, one with the usual procedure and one with the new assessment criteria.

Two of our teachers, well experienced in criteria-based assessment, have been active in supporting those teachers within and outside the department that want to introduce goal-related examinations.

4. What were the main results?

The constructive alignment becomes clearer to the students. The examinations are now clearly linked to the course objectives and learning outcomes. Initially, it creates more work for the examiners but when established the examination procedure works fine. The teachers have to be careful to cover the established criteria in the exam. Working with assessment criteria for the examination gives more transparency into the examination. Most students are positive towards these changes in course evaluations and in oral feedback.

5. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one

way or other?

Approximately 10 teachers including experienced supporting teachers (Emma Lundkvist, Ann-Marie Falk and Maria Swartling) and several students in the courses that have introduced assessment criteria.

6. Strategy for possible further implementation.

Our work will continue throughout the year and we can already now see that assessment criteria for goal-related examinations will be introduced in more courses than initially expected. The overall strategy is to introduce criteria-based assessment in all courses within the Pharmacy Programmes. This will be performed in cooperation with other Faculties within Uppsala University.

7. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Start with discussing what really ought to be learnt in the course. During the work you will probably find that you will have to revise the course objectives. Take advice from each other, invite someone experienced for inspiration and help in the beginning. Form a group, if possible, who can discuss these subjects together and give input to the work. Test the assessment criteria to compare with the previous examination.

8. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Jörgen Bengtsson, Pharmacokinetics, jorgen.bengtsson@farmbio.uu.se
Ann-Marie Falk, Pharmacotherapy, ann-marie.falk@farmbio.uu.se
Emma Lundkvist, Pharmacotherapy, emma.lundkvist@farmbio.uu.se
Ingrid Nylander, Pharmacology, ingrid.nylander@farmbio.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Pharmacy

Department: Medicinal Chemistry

Project title/developmental activity:

Examinations – Criteria-based assessment

9. What did you do?

We have worked with and defined the assessment criteria for the examination in some of our courses with the aim to make the examinations clearly related to the course objectives and to verify that all course objectives are examined with the grades U, G and VG.

10. Why did you choose to do what you did?

This is a task initiated by Uppsala University to implement constructive alignment in all courses. The undergraduate board (GRUFF) gave us the assignment to introduce assessment criteria for the examinations in two courses.

11. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

Assessment criteria have been defined for implementation into the courses ***General Chemistry with Drug Orientation*** and ***Medicinal Chemistry***. The work at the department started with a fruitful introduction and discussion with experienced people from the pedagogic unit (PU) at UU. This was followed by:

A thorough review and proposed revision of the specific course objective in the course in *General Chemistry with Drug Orientation* have been done. The current course objectives were condensed into fewer course objectives and assessment criteria for each objective were defined for grades G and VG. As a pilot study, the written examination this semester was prepared accordingly, ensuring that each course objective was tested twice at both grades G and VG. The examination was evaluated twice, one with the usual procedure with points (valid for the students this time), but also one based on the new assessment criteria. The outcome of this pilot

study will guide final revision of the course objectives and corresponding assessment criteria, to be realized next semester. The written examination prepared this semester will be utilized for coming students to exemplify how the examination and grades will be evaluated.

The course in *Medicinal Chemistry* have actively worked with integration and highlighting of the current course objectives during the lectures of the last couple of courses. The course leader has ensured that all course objectives have been evaluated in the exams, although assessed using the traditional way with points. This has led to some minor revisions of the course objectives that will be implemented next semester. The initial work has aided development of the forthcoming examination procedure using assessment criteria and layout of coming examinations.

12. What were the main results?

So far, the work has led to constructive reflections from the teachers and a clearer picture of what should be examined and what should be the course objectives. Very fruitful discussions have taken place between the teachers themselves regarding course content, but also regarding didactic and pedagogical methods, aiding student learning. The students that have actively discussed and worked with the course objectives have appreciated it much and they have shown a positive and reflective attitude. In the course evaluations from the last *Medicinal chemistry* courses a majority of the student scores "to what extent do you think you have fulfilled the course objectives" at the next highest and highest rating.

In general, the constructive alignment becomes clearer to the students. The examinations tend to be more linked to the course objectives and learning activities during courses. Working with assessment criteria for the examination gives more transparency into examination.

13. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

Jacob Haglöf, Mikael Engskog, Christian Sköld, Charlotta Wallinder, and Anja Sandström.

14. Strategy for possible further implementation.

To implement assessment criteria for examinations in all courses within the Pharmacy Programmes. This will be performed in cooperation with other Faculties within Uppsala University.

15. Advice to others wishing to do something similar.

Start with discussing what really ought to be learnt in the course. During the work you will probably find that you will have to revise the course objectives. Take advice from each other, invite someone experienced for inspiration and help in the

beginning. Form a group, if possible, who can discuss these subjects together and give input to the work. Start to discuss and refer to general course objectives with the students during lectures and seminars.

16. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Anja Sandström, anja.sandstrom@orgfarm.uu.se

Christina Sköld, christian.skold@orgfarm.uu.se

Jacob Haglöf, jacob.haglof@farmkemi.uu.se

Charlotta Wallinder, charlotta.wallinder@orgfarm.uu.se

The KrUUt/CrED Follow-up 2012

Report 1. Development initiatives within the prioritised areas (or any other initiative worth highlighting)

Disciplinary domain: Medicine and Pharmacy

Faculty: Pharmacy

Department: Pharmacy

Project title/developmental activity:

Examinations – Criteria-based assessment

9. What did you do?

We have defined the assessment criteria for examinations and assignments in some of our courses.

10. Why did you choose to do what you did?

This is a task initiated by Uppsala University to implement constructive alignment in all courses. The undergraduate board (GRUFF) gave us the assignment to introduce assessment criteria for the examinations in two courses.

11. How did you go about doing your work in concrete terms?

Assessment criteria have been defined and introduced in the courses Pharmaceutical Care and Pharmaceutical Legislation, Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Physical Chemistry. The purpose is to make the examinations and assignments clearly related to the course objectives.

In the course Pharmaceutical Care and Pharmaceutical Legislation course we had recently done a review of the specific course objectives to make them assessable, even so, new changes were made during this work. In the course there are a number of assessments all coupled with one or more course objectives (written examination, oral examination, essay with presentation, short reports). For each of those assessments we discussed how assessment criteria should be constructed. Today assessment criteria are used for two of the assessments: oral examination and essay writing. Criteria are also developed for the written examination; we have done “tests” (comparing the old way of examining with a certain percentage and the new criteria). This autumn we will start using them as well.

In the course Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Physical Chemistry we started to discuss the structure of the course (a mixture of pharmaceutics and physical chemistry) in general. We found it difficult to create assessment criteria in a transparent manner and found it necessary to review the specific course objectives. Ideas, examples and experiences regarding assessment criteria from similar courses at other departments have been transformed into the discussion. We plan to apply our results in the beginning of 2013.

12. What were the main results?

The examinations are more linked to the course objectives and learning activities during courses. This is also made visible for the students. Working with assessment criteria for the examination gives more transparency into examination.

13. Who and roughly how many people have been involved in the activities work in one way or other?

5-7

14. Strategy for possible further implementation.

To implement assessment criteria for examinations in all courses within the Pharmacy Programmes. This will be performed in cooperation with other Faculties within Uppsala University.

15. Advice to others *wishing to do something similar*.

Start with discussing what really ought to be learnt in the course. During the work you will probably find that you will have to revise the course objectives. Take advice from each other, invite someone experienced for inspiration and help in the beginning (and whenever needed). Form a group, if possible, who can discuss these subjects together and give input to the work. Involve students.

16. Name/s (department and e-mail) of person/s to contact in case there are questions from colleagues wishing to do something similar

Sofia Källemark Sporrang, sofia.kallemark-sporrang@farmaci.uu.se

Anders Ericsson, anders.ericsson@farmaci.uu.se