

Creative Educational  
Development  
at  
Uppsala University  
2010-2012

CrED  
10-12

Webb version 12/05/2013

# Contents

Preface.....	4
Part 1. Overall conclusions of the CrED Project: Challenges for continuing educational development at Uppsala University.....	6
Background .....	6
The CrED panel's overarching observations and recommendations.....	7
Areas singled out for development .....	8
"Wake-up calls" .....	8
"Reminders" .....	11
The CrED Project itself.....	14
Who is to pursue what? .....	16
Part 2: Report of the international panel.....	19
Overview of the CrED project and review process .....	19
Panel membership for final visit .....	20
The context of the review.....	21
Research-Teaching linkages.....	23
Accessibility of the document.....	26
Development work accomplished within domains/faculties .....	27
Sustaining the projects and development work .....	27
University-nominated themes.....	29
Reward and recognition of teaching.....	30
Central support for educational development .....	32
Design of the CrED project.....	34
University-wide seminars and forums.....	35
Documenting and reporting outcomes and achievements.....	36
Sustainability of projects and initiatives.....	37
Conclusion .....	38
Summary of recommendations.....	39
1. Design and content of the Guidelines: Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University.....	39
2. Development work accomplished within domains/faculties .....	39
3. Central support for educational development.....	40

4. Design of the CrED project .....	40
Part 3. Observations, comments and conclusions by the project management .....	42
Observations .....	42
Project management comments and conclusions on panel recommendations .....	44
Del 1. Sammanfattande slutsatser av KrUUt-projektet: utmaningar för fortsatt utbildningsutveckling vid Uppsala universitet .....	53
Bakgrund .....	53
KrUUt-panelens övergripande iakttagelser och rekommendationer .....	53
Identifierade utvecklingsområden .....	55
"Väckarklockor" .....	55
"Påminnelser" .....	58
Själva KrUUt-projektet .....	61
Vem jobbar vidare med vad? .....	62

# Preface

In 2010 the Vice-Chancellor made the decision to implement the *Creative Educational Development at Uppsala University 2010–2012* Project - abbreviated CrED 10-12 (In Swedish: Kreativ utbildningsutveckling 2010-2012 – KrUUt10-12). The purpose of the project was to stimulate educational development, enhance exchange and the dissemination of good ideas among colleagues, and generally to spotlight the educational mission of the University.

During the period 2010–2011 developmental work was undertaken in the disciplinary domains and faculties, backed up by pan-University activities. This developmental phase was followed in 2012 by a final follow-up with an international panel.

The following constitutes a comprehensive documentation of the CrED Project, comprising:

- 1) Overall conclusions drawn from the CrED Project: Challenges for Continued Educational Development at Uppsala University (also in Swedish at the end of the report).
- 2) The report of the international panel in its entirety.
- 3) Observations, comments, and conclusions from the project leaders.

Part 1 – the introductory summary – presents the most obvious areas for development against the background of the panel’s report. Work to winnow down these areas has been done against the background of the observations of project leaders and in consultation with the Quality Council.

Five of the areas for development have the character of “wake-up calls”. This does not mean that initiatives are lacking in these areas, but that greater awareness and more systematic approaches are required for advances to be more dynamic. These areas include linking teaching to research, student participation in instruction, implementation of tools for e-learning, the involvement of management in educational development, and the evaluation of programmes from a holistic perspective.

The remaining four areas can be regarded as “reminders”, that is, the general awareness of the need for development is already relatively good and measures have already been taken planned to a greater extent. In these areas it is a matter of not losing steam. They include rewarding good teaching efforts, development of cross-disciplinary education, coordination of support for educational development, and revision of the Guidelines for Educational Activity and Development: Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University (hereafter referred to as the Guidelines).

The summary concludes with a description of “who is to pursue what” in efforts to take requisite measures, along with a few examples of pan-University measures that are already in the pipeline.

In the next step in the process the disciplinary domains and faculties will provide accounts of what measures they plan to implement in relation to the developmental areas identified, as adapted to their local needs and priorities. These accounts will be present under a special agenda during the autumn of 2013.

One observation. The conclusions from the CrED Project do not provide any fully comprehensive summary the challenges Uppsala University faces in terms of educational development. The evaluation panel's report reflects the documents submitted to the panel and the panel's thoughts about them. Of course, there are other questions that require attention, for example, the quality of placements, examinations, and the administrative systems that help to create the preconditions for good educational quality. Nonetheless, the panel's report does single out some areas that a group of competent international colleagues have recognized as important for Uppsala University to relate to in order provide world-class programmes and courses now and in the future.

In conclusion we would like to express the gratitude of Uppsala University to those who have invested their engagement and energy in pursuing matters of educational development within the framework of the CrED Project: Thomas Bull and Lars Hagborg, who have served as project leader and project secretary, respectively, other members of the CrED Secretariat, the Quality Council, which has been our steering group, the reference group, the international panel headed by its chair, Denise Chalmers, boards and offices, support functions, and not least all the committed teachers and students who have driven and participated in various CrED activities.

Anders Malmberg  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor

Åsa Kettis  
Chief Quality Assurance Officer

# Part 1. Overall conclusions of the CrED Project: Challenges for continuing educational development at Uppsala University

---

Åsa Kettis and Anders Malmberg

## Background

In 2010 the Vice-Chancellor made the decision to implement the *Creative Educational Development at Uppsala University 2010–2012 Project* (abbreviated CrED 10-12). The purpose of the Project was to stimulate educational development, enhance exchange and the dissemination of good ideas among colleagues, and generally to spotlight the educational mission of the University. The project was grounded in *Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University. Guidelines for Educational Activity and Development* - hereafter referred to as *the Guidelines* (In Swedish: Pedagogiskt program för Uppsala universitet ) -and was largely based on areas for development that had been identified by the faculties/disciplinary domains themselves as urgent in terms of local needs and two common developmental areas: linkage to research and educational collaboration across domain/faculty boundaries.

During the period 2010–2011 various pan-University activities were undertaken to support the on-going developmental work at the disciplinary domains and faculties. This developmental phase was followed in 2012 by a concluding evaluation with an international panel of experts in education from sister universities in the international Matariki Network, Lund University and the University of Gothenburg, along with three international experts on quality in education. The panel visited Uppsala University for a preliminary meeting in the autumn of 2011 and paid its second and final visit in late September 2012.

In advance of its second site visit in September 2012 the panel received documents describing developmental work that had taken place at faculties and disciplinary domains in 2010-2011, as well as operations at Uppsala University's central support functions (Division for Development of Teaching and Learning (PU), Uppsala Learning Lab (ULL), Quality and Evaluation Unit (KoU), Office for Leadership and Organisational Development, the Library and the Museums).

## The CrED panel's overarching observations and recommendations

The panel states that research-intensive universities around the world are placing greater and greater focus on educational issues, that is, how the university can best prepare tomorrow's academicians to move society forward. It is the view of the panel that universities that have their self-evident core in research need to transform themselves in order to stay abreast of developments that are underway in the educational field. New methods of instruction, new technology and research into what promotes student learning are challenging established traditions of teaching and subject-area cultures. At the same time the panel stresses that enhanced focus on education does not conflict with continued commitment to research – both missions require attention and involvement, and moreover they complement each other.

Against the background of these developments, the panel praised Uppsala University for proactively stimulating educational development through the adoption of the Guidelines, followed by the Creative Educational Development Project 2010-2012. According to the panel, the very fact that Uppsala University is also evaluating its educational development with the help of an international panel demonstrates the ambition of the University to offer its students world-class programmes and courses. The panel expresses its gratitude for the collegiality, hospitality, and openness with which it was received in its site visits. All staff and students that the panel met exuded enthusiasm and commitment.

The panel's report shows that Uppsala University has several manifest strengths of importance for work with achieving good quality in teaching. In particular, the panel lauds the great commitment they found among teachers and students, the vigorous developmental work being done at the disciplinary domains, the dedicated support for educational development, and the content and design of the Guidelines. But they also pointed to areas that require greater attention in future work to maintain and enhance the quality of education at Uppsala University.

The panel feels that the CrED Project has helped to intensify the conversation about educational issues at Uppsala University, to highlight developmental work that is underway, and to enhance the exchange of knowledge and experience among the various parts of the University. The challenge is now to find systematic modes of working to make such discussions and exchanges permanent features of operations. Moreover, the panel would like to see more strategic thinking about educational development, though at the same time preserving the force of the good initiatives coming from below. Attaining this balance will be a major challenge for leaders at all levels, as the panel sees it.

The international panel's report (Part 2) contains a large number of observations and recommendations. In Part 3 the CrED leaders provide a systematic review and discussion of all of these recommendations.

In the present introduction, we attempt to highlight and distil some of the recommendations that we feel represent especially great challenges for continuing educational development at Uppsala University.

## Areas singled out for development

### “Wake-up calls”

Below we identify a handful of developmental areas that have the character of wake-up calls. This does not mean that initiatives are lacking in these areas, but that greater awareness and more systematic approaches are required for advances to be more dynamic.

### *Linking teaching to research*

*What the panel thought:* In many contexts people have a narrow and unexamined view of what is meant by research-teaching linkages. During the panel’s site visits some leaders and teachers expressed the view that research-teaching linkages is automatically established if the person doing the teaching has a doctorate, while others maintained that genuine research-teaching linkages occur only if students are given the opportunity to develop their own research skills. The panel maintains that UU has not fully taken advantage of the potential for deliberate and well-developed research-teaching linkages that such a prominent research university offers.

#### *The panel recommends:*

- Start an open, pan-University conversation about research- teaching linkages.
- Consciously design teaching in such a way that all students encounter genuinely research-related education – first-cycle students included.
- Find inspiration in existing models of research-teaching linkages that demonstrate in various ways how research-teaching linkages can be understood and achieved.
- Ensure the research-teaching linkages also in the sense that the instructional methods employed are supported by current research.
- Disseminate the good examples of well-executed research teaching-linkages that exist in each disciplinary domain.

### *Student participation in instruction*

*What the panel thought:* The panel was impressed with the commitment to educational development found among UU students and underscores the important function of students as “change agents”. They also highlight the good collaboration – the “partnership” – they sensed between students and staff at UU.

The panel draws special attention to the so-called SIG (Special Interest Group) within the CrED Project that worked with stimulating student participation in teaching with the support of the CrED Secretariat and the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning (PU). The student



participation in question is peer learning, i.e. students who assist each other in their learning in a structured manner. This includes everything from pilots and mentors for first-semester students to senior students who run entire courses.

The panel felt that the SIG, which was student-led and involved both teachers and students from different parts of the University, evinced a remarkably high level of activity during the project period. Activities included seminars with invited experts from Sweden and the surrounding world. This work resulted in an anthology: *Students, the University's Unspent Resource*<sup>1</sup> with the student Johan Gärdebo and the visiting researcher Mattias Wiggberg as editors.

The panel observed that initiatives for student participation in instruction are being taken in different places within UU – sometimes by students and sometimes by teachers – and that they are often unaware of each other's existence. Some initiatives have been run by enthusiasts and petered out owing to lack of support and continuity, while others have found a form that enables long-term survival.

*The panel recommends:* Have students and teachers working with student participation in various parts of the University work together to craft an Uppsala model for sustainable, integrated student participation in instruction. This work should be done within a prescribed period of time and receive central assistance.

### **E-learning**

*The panel recommends:* UU should assume a more proactive, strategic role and anticipate future challenges in higher education based on national and international trends. E-learning is an area that needs such attention.

### **On educational development at disciplinary domains and faculties**

*What the panel thought:* The panel was impressed with the extensive developmental work that is being done within the University. The developmental projects submitted varied from well-established initiatives to recently started ones, though their presentations varied in quality, which made it difficult for the panel to evaluate and make pronouncements about specific projects. However, the panel did find a great commitment to educational development. In connection with the site visits, many leaders and teachers testified to favourable changes in the direction of greater interest in matters of teaching and a shift from focusing on the teacher to focusing on student learning. The panel also praises the dedication of students and the mutual trust between teachers and students at UU.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gärdebo J. & Wiggberg, M. (eds.) *Students, the University's Unspent Resource: Revolutionising Higher Education Through Active Student Participation*. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2012.

The panel describes, through examples, how the dissemination of ideas within the University can take place spontaneously and without planning. A good idea generated at one faculty is adopted by another, which develops it further, adapting to its own conditions and needs. The central support functions – such as the Division of Development of Teaching and Learning, Uppsala Learning Lab, the Office for Leadership and Organisational Development, the Unit for Quality and Evaluation– are important hubs in this dissemination, providing both contacts and expertise.

The panel thought they detected a risk that promising developmental projects might peter out as a result of lack of funding. The panel was surprised at the occasional lack of interest on the part of management – even in projects that management had chosen to fund. Support for continued implementation of completed developmental projects is often weak, which the panel felt constitutes a waste of resources. Management at different levels is quite simply not sufficiently involved in planning, following up, and stewarding the developmental projects that are underway. This entails lost potential for developing operations and jeopardises the commitment of the employees that actively contribute to these developmental efforts. Teaching initiatives, just like research, require management support and resources if they are to be fruitful.

The panel stresses that examples of strategic support for educational development do exist at the Disciplinary Domain of Medicine and Pharmacy and at the Disciplinary Domain of Science and Technology. In these domains the panel noted that there is targeted economic support for development in certain areas, as well as project funding available by application. The panel highlighted TUR (the Council for Educational Development at the Faculty of Science and Technology) as the most prominent example of coherent and vigorous support for educational development.

At the Disciplinary Domain of Humanities and Social Sciences, there are also examples of good local initiatives, but the panel finds that decentralisation of resources and management leads to variations in educational development across the domain.

*The panel recommends:* For developmental work at UU to have an even greater impact, the following should be borne in mind:

- Developmental projects should be built on clear strategic educational considerations at different levels.
- Management should be more committed to developmental projects. High-priority projects must receive active management support, resources, and clear frameworks. The level providing the funding should be responsible for ensuring this involvement.
- Management should ensure that employees involved in high-priority developmental work receive recognition for their efforts.
- More distinct follow-up of results is required and should be undertaken at the board level.

- Forms need to be developed for more dynamic dissemination of experience across faculty and domain boundaries (and also outside the University).
- Developmental projects that can be sustained within prevailing cost frameworks, that is, also after any additional funding in connection with developmental work, should be prioritised.

### *Self-initiated curriculum reviews*

*What the panel thought:* The panel observed excessive faith in external evaluations, such as those performed by the Swedish Higher Education Authority (formerly the Swedish Agency for Higher Education) or external accreditations. It noted that the internal study programme evaluations that are carried out are more or less well designed. The panel brought to our attention that many universities throughout the world undertake systematic “curriculum reviews” where all programmes at the higher-education institution are recurrently evaluated in a holistic perspective at specific time intervals.

The panel thus indicates that a key component is missing from the UU “quality system”: some form of self-initiated, systematic, recurrent educational evaluation in a holistic perspective where conclusions concerning the continued development of the programme are drawn following analysis of factors like application pressure, dropouts, throughput, student satisfaction, employability, stakeholder satisfaction, and review of the programme by colleagues from other institutions of higher education. The panel maintains that coherent and recurrent analyses of these factors provide important information for ensuring that programmes remain up to date and relevant.

*The panel recommends:* Carry out systematic study programme/educational evaluations for all programmes and courses and provide faculties/domains with the support needed for planning and executing such evaluations.

### *“Reminders”*

Four further panel recommendations can be regarded as “reminders”, that is, the general awareness of the need for development is already relatively great and measures have already been taken or planned. Concerning all of these areas, the challenge is for work already initiated to continue and further advance.

### *Rewards and recognition for teaching efforts*

*What the panel thought:* The panel mentions that the most common ways to increase the recognition of teaching efforts include distinguished teaching awards, conferment of medals for educational development, and promotion/career advancement – and points out that the last form of recognition is the most difficult kind to achieve. The panel notes further that the Guidelines places the responsibility for greater recognition of teaching performance with the

faculty/domain level, with the support of central support functions like the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning.

The panel then draws the conclusion that this work seems to have reached a standstill. Clear incentives and promotion criteria are lacking in parts of the University.

*The panel recommends:*

- Encourage management at all levels to work to achieve a culture that accords weight to good quality in teaching and rewards those who contribute to it.
- Train management in how good teaching performance can be assessed in a systematic way.
- Establish networks for teachers who are recognised for their skills (excellent teachers, distinguished teaching prize-winners) and have them help disseminate good ideas, along with developing interdisciplinary tertiary-level didactic research, educational leadership, mentoring, and educational strategies.
- Establish a model with work groups consisting of skilled teachers from various parts of the University (from the above network, for example) who can devote set amounts of time to strategically important issues regarding, for example, quality of teaching, pedagogical competence, and student involvement.
- Train members of recruitment committees (or the equivalent) in performing advanced evaluations of teaching skills.

*Cross-disciplinary course and programme offerings*

*What the panel thought:* Cross-disciplinary programmes appear primarily to exist *within* the disciplinary domains rather than between them. Programmes that span disciplinary domain boundaries occur primarily at the master (second-cycle) level.

*The panel recommends:*

- Make better use of the breadth of the University, especially in the first cycle.
- Stimulate the movement of students across disciplinary domain boundaries.
- Follow up results of developments that have taken place in interdisciplinary education.

*Central support for educational development*

*What the panel thought:* The panel praises previous and current University management for its support of educational development. During its site visit the panel noted clear indications that the central support provided by the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning, the Unit for Quality and Evaluation, Uppsala Learning Lab, and the Office for Leadership and Organisational Development is appreciated at all levels within the University. During its second

visit, the panel also had an opportunity to gain a clearer picture of how the libraries and museums help to fulfil the educational goals of UU.

The panel especially recommends what it calls the “the hub-and-spoke model” of staff dividing their time between central entities and working at faculty/domain levels. In this way central support is complemented by support that is more directly adapted to various subject areas. The panel highlights TUR as the most prominent example of such a hub-and-spoke model, with staff that works with educational leadership both within TUR and at the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning. Another example highlighted by the panel is the close collaboration between the Unit for Quality and Evaluation and the Disciplinary Domain of Medicine and Pharmacy in terms of various types of evaluations.

The panel directs special praise to the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning for its successful work with continued training in education and its consultative work, but also realises that its activities could be further developed on a few points.

*The panel recommends:* The panel maintains the importance of central support functions being well coordinated mutually and in relation to the support functions in place at the faculty and domain levels.

- Evaluate the current distribution of roles among support functions (Division for Development of Teaching and Learning, Unit for Quality and Evaluation, Uppsala Learning Lab, Office for Leadership and Organisational Development, and support functions at the faculty/domain level) with an eye to further enhancing communication, coordination, and collaboration.
- Establish forums for the exchange of ideas between central support functions and those in charge of education at the domain and faculty levels.
- Develop ways in which the University’s libraries and museums can be integrated in education and used as tools for learning.
- The Division for Development of Teaching and Learning should take on a more proactive, strategic role and anticipate future challenges to higher education based on national and international trends. Examples of thematic areas that could be strengthened: curriculum development, linking teaching to research, and e-learning (in collaboration with ULL), student participation in instruction/SI and the importance of management in educational quality.

#### ***Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University. The Guidelines for Educational Activity and Development:***

*What the panel thought:* The panel extols the Guidelines as a way to provide structure and guidance in work with educational development and to highlight important aspects. It is good that the responsibility of realising various goals is delineated and that the Guidelines cover the responsibility of students in their obtaining a good education. Students the panel met during the

site visit related that they appreciate having their role clarified in the Guidelines and that they are working to disseminate the Guidelines among their fellow students. The panel also established that the Guidelines are well known among employees in various parts of the University.

The panel feels nonetheless that good Guidelines can be made even better. The role of students is described as somewhat passive, and in some goals there is no formulation whatsoever of how students can contribute to making their education rewarding. For example, the panel maintains that students can indeed contribute to the development of their teachers' competence and that the possibility of student participation in instruction should be written up (e.g. Supplemental Instruction and other mentoring). The panel also notes that implementation of the Guidelines has had varying degrees of success in various parts of the University. The Disciplinary Domain of Science and Technology is put forward as a good example, largely owing to the creation of TUR, which is tasked with operationalising the Guidelines and supporting its implementation at the domain level. The panel points out that there is no corresponding system in the allocation of roles and responsibilities for implementing the Guidelines at the Disciplinary Domain of Humanities and Social Sciences.

*The panel recommends:*

- Develop, in collaboration with students, the part of the Guidelines that deals with the role of students in ensuring the quality of their education.
- Specify the distribution of responsibility for achieving good education under the part of the Guidelines that treats the role of the University.
- Develop those parts of the Guidelines that deal with systematic programme and subject evaluations, that is, curriculum reviews.
- Develop the parts of the Guidelines that deal with linking teaching to research.
- Formulate how implementation of the Guidelines is to be followed up in order to ensure that they reach all parts of the University.
- Enhance the usefulness of the Guidelines by adding “subguidelines” – one optimised for teachers and one for students.

## **The CrED Project itself**

*What the panel thought:* The panel feels that the CrED Project – with its genuine developmental focus and review by an international panel – is groundbreaking and innovative. The panel maintains that the project has achieved a successful balance between efforts initiated from the “bottom up” and from the “top down”, respectively. The areas for development that have been in focus are a combination of those identified by faculties/domains and those that University management wished everyone to work with (cross-faculty/domain study programmes and research linkage). The panel finds that the initiatives generated from below are often innovative

and touch on issues of concrete importance to teachers and students, whereas initiatives from above can ensure that strategically important initiatives are implemented systematically.

The panel established that the so-called CrED seminars based on various themes were to the point and appreciated by participants. At the same time the panel pointed out that participation was limited.

The panel felt that the documentation of developmental activities that it was given access to provided a good picture of the project and testified to the great commitment to educational development at the University.

One of the purposes of the CrED Project was to stimulate the implementation of the Guidelines, and the panel feels that work remains to be done here. The degree of implementation varies considerably within the University.

*The panel recommends:* The panel notes that certain elements incorporated in the design of the CrED Project could be made “permanent” in regular operations and recommended the following:

- Continue to facilitate cross-faculty/domain meetings in the form of, for example:
  - thematic seminars where teachers and students from different parts of the University gather to address common issues of educational development
  - SIGs, that is, cross-faculty/domain groups of teachers and students that meet recurrently as long as the need for exchange and knowledge acquisition exists within a certain area
- Maximise participation in seminars on educational matters by selecting themes that relate to issues of interest to many people (“just-in-time information”).
- Use the project descriptions developed for the project in order to identify groups of individuals working with the same questions and who can benefit from working together.
- Consider having the project descriptions serve as a bank of ideas that is updated with results from both current and new projects. This requires careful cost-benefit analysis as such a bank of ideas needs to be maintained.
- If UU wishes to base future educational development work on pan-University themes, ample time must be allotted. Forms must be devised for the exchange of ideas, and work implemented needs to be followed up. A possible theme might be first-cycle programmes and courses.

## Who is to pursue what?

For a project like this to be useful, it is necessary to retain its results and conclusions in our memory and use them as a platform for concrete measures. Continued work resulting from the developmental areas highlighted here is to be pursued within the framework of Uppsala University's regular "quality system" as follows:

**Measures at the pan-University level.** The Vice-Chancellor is ultimately responsible for the quality of operations at Uppsala University and makes decisions to stimulate development that is vital to the entire University – regardless of disciplinary domain. This can be done, for example, in the form of decisions concerning pan-University guidelines, plans of action, or in the form of various strategic initiatives.

**Measures at the faculty/domain level.** Under the Work Regulations for Uppsala University, domain/faculty boards are responsible for the quality of their operations. The responsibility for devising and implementing measures against the background of identified developmental needs therefore lies primarily with the domain/faculty boards and with departments. These boards are best suited to determine what measures are most urgent in terms of local circumstances and needs.

**The role of the Quality Council.** The Quality Council is responsible for facilitating in various ways the exchange of knowledge and experience across domain and faculty boundaries. The Quality Council should be specifically assigned the task of creating opportunities for such exchange of knowledge and experience concerning measures to be taken in the areas singled out for development. Within the framework of its mission to advise the Vice-Chancellor, the Quality Council should also make proposals for pan-University initiatives that can help to stimulate developments in relation to the nine developmental areas.

**The role of students.** Students are represented in decision-making and preparatory bodies at all levels within the University and thereby help to ensure that any measures taken are relevant and well constructed from the student perspective.

**The role of central support functions.** The Division for Quality Enhancement and Academic Teaching and Learning ( i.e. Division for Development of Teaching and Learning, parts of Uppsala Learning Lab, and the Unit for Quality and Evaluation), and the Office for Leadership and Organisational Development contribute support for developmental work. The support functions should build up a knowledge base in relation to the identified developmental areas and disseminate knowledge and experience through their courses and in their consultative support to domains, faculties, departments, and individual teachers. This work should be carried out in collaboration with existing support functions at the faculty and domain levels.



In work with the areas for development, ideas should be sought, beyond the exchange of knowledge and experience within the University, in the surrounding world (e.g. other institutions of higher education).

**Follow-up.** As a first step, disciplinary domains/faculties are to describe what measures they plan to take as a result of the observations of the panel against the background of local circumstances and needs. Accounts are to be written during the autumn of 2013 and compiled in a report.

Follow-up of implemented developmental work is then to be arranged in some form. This is to be done in connection with regular operational reporting and possibly under a separate agenda. This follow-up must be formed in such a way as to contribute to quality development and not to burden operations beyond its usefulness.

## Planned developmental projects

The following concrete measures are currently planned at the pan-University level:

- **Programme analyses:** Advertise funding available as support for faculties wishing to introduce work with designing a model for systematic analysis of study programmes in a holistic perspective. The model is to be devised in a way that domain/faculty board in charge finds most suitable for its own operations, but with attention paid to certain fundamental requirements. The responsibility for designing and executing programme analyses lies with the domain/faculty board, while support in this work will be provided by the Unit for Quality Enhancement and Academic Teaching and Learning (i.e. Quality and Evaluation, the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning and parts of ULL).
- **Excellent teachers:** Advertise funding to be applied for by teachers wishing to advance their qualifications in advance of applying for admittance as excellent teachers. Funding is to be used to enable the dissemination of educational developmental work at educational conferences or the equivalent. This funding should also be available for application by teachers who have already been admitted as excellent teachers and wish to further advance their skills, for example by participating in conferences or paying study visits to other higher-education institutions.
- **Special Interest Groups:** Advertise funding to enable the establishment of so-called SIGs for different themes. These funds are supposed to make it possible for individual teachers and students to take the initiative for gatherings across subject boundaries for joint acquisition of knowledge within a specific period of time. This funding may be used to invite experts or to arrange seminars/workshops and the like.

- *Expert groups:* The Quality Council is tasked with arranging seminars on various themes that relate to the areas for development. These seminars are to be based on the identification of individuals who are actively working with a certain issue within the University and should contribute to the dissemination of ideas across domain and faculty boundaries. The corps of excellent teachers should be regarded as a resource in this connection.
- *Support functions:* As a step towards better coordination of support functions, as of 1 April 2013 the Division for Development of Teaching and Learning, the Unit for Quality and Evaluation and parts of ULL merged to form a joint unit – *the Unit for Quality Enhancement and Academic Teaching and Learning*. The head of this unit should be tasked with striving, in collaboration with the heads of the other support functions, both central and domain/faculty-based, to enhance the coordination of aggregate support operations. This coordination must also involve faculty programme directors.
- *The Teaching and Learning Guidelines.* The Guidelines will be revised in light of the panel's recommendations.
- *Thematic seminars:* The Quality Council recently initiated a seminar series with the purpose of addressing current quality issues of common interest to the entire University. Issues placed on the agenda by CrED will be treated there, but also issues involving research and administrative operations. The value of recording these seminars and uploading them to the Web should be investigated.

# Part 2: Report of the international panel

## Overview of the CrED project and review process

During 2010–2012, Uppsala University implemented a university-wide project, Creative Development of University Education (KrUUt/CrED). The focus of the project was to enhance the quality in education within disciplines as well as encouraging the exchange of ideas and experiences across disciplines. The project supported the implementation of the University's Teaching and Learning Guidelines for Educational Activity and Development (2008). It was intended that the project would provide evidence of Uppsala University's commitment to providing a high quality educational experience for its students and provide some direction for the revision of the Teaching and Learning Guidelines for Educational Activity and Development.

The University identified two enhancement themes as its priorities:

- Boundary-spanning courses/programmes
- Research-teaching linkages

In addition, a number of themes were generated from the domains and faculties. These included:

- Teaching
- Goals and Examinations
- Learning Environment
- Teacher Competence
- Evaluation
- Comprehensive (spanning a number of the above themes)

The External Panel (see details below) completed two site-visits to Uppsala University. The first visit was 9–11 November 2011 and the second was 25–28 September 2012 (see programmes for both visits attached as Appendix A and B). In both phases of the project, the Panel's role was to act as 'a critical friend' to the University through recognising good practice and recommending future enhancement actions that would guide the development of the CrED activities and projects in 2012. For the first visit, the Panel was invited to provide support and encouragement to the CrED project and to the University, as it extended the project into its final phase. The Panel provided an interim report that identified:

- Ways to approach the prioritised enhancement themes
- Strategies in stimulating educational development, especially cross-disciplinary initiatives

- Ways in which to carry out the evaluation of the project in 2012.

The primary role of the Panel on the final visit, was to provide its view on the University's strengths, weaknesses and potential for development in the following areas:

- The design and content for the Guidelines Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University
- Developmental work accomplished within the domains and faculties
- Central support for educational development
- Design of the CrEd project.

The membership of the Panel was drawn from national and international universities and higher education organisations. Four members were from the Matariki Network of universities, two members were from cognate national universities that had recently engaged in a benchmarking process called GUL (BLUE 11 and EQ11) and three members were from the higher education quality field based in the United Kingdom. The Panel was assisted by an external secretary. The Panel membership for both visits remained the same, with the exception of one panel member being unavailable for the second visit. This consistency in the membership of the Panel over two visits was very important for the Panel members to engage in dialogue with the CrEd project team and to follow up on earlier observations, discussion and outcomes of projects that had been started or were in early stages of development in 2012.

### **Panel membership for final visit**

Prof Denise Chalmers, Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning, University of Western Australia, Australia (Chair)

Prof Bengt Ove Bostrom, Deputy Vice Chancellor University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Dr Claire Carney, Head of Quality Enhancement, QAA Scotland. UK. External Expert

Dr Victoria Gunn, Director, Academic Development Unit, Glasgow University, UK. External Expert

Prof Lee Harvey, Consultant, UK. External Expert

Prof Stefan Lindgren, Project leader of EQ11, Lund University, Sweden

Prof Thomas Luxon, Director, Centre for the Advancement of Learning, Dartmouth University, USA

Prof Brenda Ravenscroft, Associate Dean of Studies, Arts & Science, Queens University, Canada

Prof Vernon Squire, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic & International) Otago University, New Zealand

Dr Lars Geschwind, Researcher, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden (Secretary)

The resources and programme for the final visit included:

- A series of reports collected and collated into a resource pack organised into several sections and provided to all members of the Panel and members of the University leadership by the CrED team. This was provided to the panel electronically prior to the visit and a paper copy on arrival. Uppsala University staff who participated in discussions with the Panel were also provided with project reports from the relevant theme.
- Additional documents provided throughout the visit, for example, a publication by CEMUS Transcending Boundaries and a book edited by students Johan Gardebo and Mattias Wiggberg and supported by PU titled Students, the university's unspent resource.
- The scheduled programme for the Panel during the final site visit (attached Appendix 1). This provided the Panel members with the opportunity to meet with teachers, professional staff and students to discuss their experiences and outcomes encompassed under the broad themes with each other and the panel members. The programme also provided opportunities for the Panel to meet with members of the university leadership, central support units and students in both in formal meetings and informally over meals.
- Panel only meetings scheduled throughout the programme to enable discussion and recording of observations.
- An opportunity to visit some of the museums, libraries, student nations and other university buildings (additional to those visited during the first Panel meeting), which increased our appreciation of Uppsala University as a learning environment.
- A welcome to the members of the Panel by the University, through its representatives, with a spirit of openness and warm hospitality.
- An informal report of preliminary observations and conclusions to the University's senior management team and subsequently presented at an Open Hearing attended by Uppsala University staff.

The observations made during both visits to the University, the wide-ranging discussions with a broad range of university leaders, teachers, professional staff and students and the documents provided to the Panel, form the empirical basis of the report.

### **The context of the review**

Universities worldwide are challenged by the need to embrace opportunities afforded by student-focused learning models, new technologies and research into effective teaching and learning practices in a context where some traditional teaching and entrenched disciplinary practices may challenge initiatives that are needed to address the current and future needs of students and universities. Universities in the last century have transformed themselves into effective engines for research and the production of new knowledge by means of robustly supported research. Universities now recognise the need to transform themselves to provide the most effective education and learning experience for their students: undergraduate, postgraduate and research students alike. A transformation in teaching and learning requires consideration of new approaches to pedagogy; approaches that recognise students learn best when actively engaged in their learning and the context in which it applies. Research and teaching are not in competition with each other— indeed there is a

long recognised nexus—particularly when students are invited to engage in disciplinary research as co-learners and researchers. The University has recognised the importance of the research teaching linkages in its Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University Guidelines (2008) and setting research teaching linkages as one of the university priorities in the CrED initiative.

The University is commended for its proactive approach to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning supported by the development of the Guidelines and the subsequent establishment of the CrED project as a way to encourage, highlight and disseminate teaching and learning initiatives. The evaluation of the CrED project and Guidelines by an external panel further highlights the University's commitment to ensuring it is providing a world standard education to its students. During both visits, the members of the Panel were particularly appreciative of the collegiality and hospitality extended to them by the University and the openness with which those in the many meetings shared their successes, challenges and future plans. Without exception, the Panel met with highly motivated staff and students who were committed to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in their discipline and across the university.

The CrEd project at Uppsala University extended a university-wide invitation to domains and faculties to showcase their efforts in this difficult and rewarding enterprise of shifting the culture of higher education towards re-invigorating the University's important task of preparing the scholars, thinkers and change agents of the future.

In the following pages, we will respond to the four areas identified by the CrED project management team (specified above, p. 1).

#### 1. Design and content of the Guidelines: Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University

The Panel commends the Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University Guidelines as a policy document that provides a coherent structure to draw attention to important educational aspects for the development of teaching and learning under the following broad section headings:

1. Conditions for student learning
2. Development of educational programmes
3. Professional development in teaching and learning
4. Value of teaching qualifications

The Panel agreed that it was a good example of identifying key responsibilities and tasks across the institution. The Guidelines were well recognised across the University community (teachers, leaders and students) and it would appear that they have served the university well as an instigator of many initiatives highlighted by the CrEd project. The Panel recognised that it was a powerful tool for quality enhancement, though there was agreement by members of the Panel and many we spoke to, that they have been underutilised as a tool for quality review. As the University reviews this document in 2013,

the Panel offers a number of comments and recommendations to strengthen an already sound document.

While the Guidelines are widely recognised throughout the University, we observed that they are implemented to a greater or lesser degree in various parts of the University. For this reason we do not recommend a wholesale change to the content of document but rather suggest:

1. an expansion and/or development of some sections
2. greater focus on specifying roles for responsibility in implementing the Guidelines
3. Strengthening requirements for accountability and evaluation.

We conclude by suggesting ways in which the document, once revised, might be made more accessible to the wider university community.

(a) Expansion or development of sections

Curriculum development and review

There was some discussion with programme coordinators and faculty leaders on their processes to carry out systematic curriculum development and review. Responses included an overreliance on external accreditation processes while others, particularly those in non-externally accredited programmes, appeared to be more ad hoc and relied on individuals to instigate reviews that might be more or less comprehensive. On examination of the Guidelines, systemic curriculum development and review was implied but not clearly identified. We recommend that a section under 2. Development of Educational Programmes, and following 2.1 Clear educational leadership, would be usefully followed by a section on Systematic curriculum development and review of programmes. There are many examples of policies and practices in many universities to draw on and develop for the Uppsala University context. For example, a number of universities carry out systemic reviews of curriculum every 3–5 years, drawing on teaching quality indicator data such as demand, attrition, completion, student satisfaction, employment outcomes, employer satisfaction, expert external review and future directions of the discipline. While these data are often used to monitor a programme of study, ensuring that a comprehensive review is undertaken regularly ensures that the programme of study remains current and relevant.

Recommendation 1: Expand section 2. Development of Educational Programmes to include Systematic curriculum development and review of programmes and develop policies, processes, resources and assign accountability to support its implementation.

### Research-Teaching linkages

Teaching research linkages is one of two priorities identified by the University in the CrED project. During our interviews, and in the reports provided in the documents, we found a large number of definitions of this concept. For example, many leaders and teachers considered that a teacher holding a PhD or engaging in research was sufficient evidence of research-teaching linkages. Others were creating learning experiences for students to be actively engaging in aspects of research understanding and skills in their courses. Others

responded that their new Masters (but not their undergraduate) programmes would provide students with research experiences. These examples illustrated a limited model of research-led teaching. There are different models and approaches to consider including research-orientated, research-based, inquiry-based and research-informed (see references at the end of this report that elaborate on the different approaches to research teaching linkages). Few responded to our questions on research-teaching linkages by referring to the need for teaching to be informed by scholarship and research on effective teaching, a critical, though neglected aspect of research-teaching linkages. In light of this variability, the Panel encourages the University to open a full discussion of the issues, to come to a shared understanding on the research-teaching linkages that students should reasonably expect to engage in while studying at the University and for these to be more fully elaborated in the Guidelines and subsequently reflected in the students' study programme documents and curricula and planned learning experiences, particularly in the undergraduate programmes. As a highly ranked comprehensive research university, we consider that the University may not be capitalising on their extraordinary resources and opportunities to the extent that it could. By engaging in defining research-teaching linkages and undertaking a planned approach to how best to create research-teaching linkages into the curriculum, into teaching practices and into the development of students' research skills, methods and experience at all levels of the academic programme, the university will be able to create a distinct and valuable learning synergy with its students, teachers and researchers.

Recommendation 2: Under section 1. Conditions for student learning, 1.1 A scientific approach. Provide clarity on the Uppsala University's approach and expectations of research-teaching linkages in the curriculum and student learning experiences as it is developed in each programme of study, in particular in undergraduate programmes.

#### (b) Roles and responsibilities

##### Students' role

We recognise and commend the intent to include the Students' Role in the Guidelines to signal their role as active participants in the teaching and learning life of the University. Students told us they appreciated their role being recognised in the document and had actively promoted this to their fellow students.

It is now timely to review the students' role and examine ways that it can be expanded and expressed in a more proactive way. It is our view that the students' roles as written tend towards casting the students as passive and responsive and imply that student engagement is limited to providing feedback or complaining. We recommend a shift in the current role focus to explore a range of ways students can be engaged in learning and teaching design and evaluation that is more proactive. We also noted that many of the 'Students' Role' cells were empty, which may convey to students that they have a limited role in the teaching and learning. For example, there are no student roles assigned in 3. Professional development in teaching and learning. Students may be engaged in the development of teachers through participating, as a student panel, in professional development programmes for new staff to talk about the qualities they appreciate in a teacher. Students under the CrED initiative were



very active in instigating or supporting supplemental instruction and this may be an aspect where they might also be represented under this category. The intention is to establish a process of consultation with the students to increase their understanding of the Guidelines as representing a shared partnership between them and the University, with their role to contribute as positive “agents for change”.

Recommendation 3: Review the ‘Students’ Role’ in the Guidelines through a participatory consultation process, with a focus on achieving students more active and participatory engagement with their learning through identified roles across as many of the section cells as feasible.

#### University’s roles

Over time new roles are established and responsibilities shift with them. As the Guidelines were developed in 2008, it is likely that new positions and structures have been established. It is timely to review the existing Executive responsibility and Enabling responsibility roles to ensure that these reflect the current positions, expectations and allocation of roles and responsibilities in the faculties and domains. There may be also need to be more layers to be considered in the allocation of responsibility to a number of positions, or to a hierarchy of positions to support their implementation. For example, the Domains of Science and Technology and Medicine and Pharmacy have established several positions with educational responsibility. These may now have ‘Executive’ or ‘Enabling’ responsibilities that may need to be represented in the revised Guidelines documents.

Recommendation 4: Review the ‘University’s Role’, particularly the allocation of responsibility to Executive responsibility and Enabling responsibility roles, to ensure that responsibility is assigned to the current and most appropriate roles.

#### (c) Accountability and evaluation

The Panel is very mindful of the importance of accountability and evaluation in a quality cycle. From our discussions and review of the documents, it was our observation that there was a need to clarify and strengthen the accountability and evaluation requirements with regular reporting and accountability to the senior leadership team if the Guidelines are to be deeply implemented and embedded across the University.

Many of the responses we received during our discussion on the Guidelines related not to its content but to its implementation and the lack of engagement by some of those with responsibility for its implementation. So while many of those we spoke to felt that the Guidelines were very good, there was concern about its implementation at the faculty and discipline level as well as at the teacher level.

We observed that some of the domains had established structural organisations and roles that facilitated the implementation of educational innovation and the Guidelines more broadly. For example, the Domain of Science and Technology had established several senior leadership roles and educational roles, some within TUR, and funding initiatives that facilitated the assignment of roles and implementation of the Guidelines. As a result, this domain has been able to make significant progress on implementing the Guidelines,

particularly section 4. The value of teaching qualifications, to a greater extent than we had observed in the other domains or faculties. Similarly, the Domain of Medicine and Pharmacy had established positions and assigned roles that facilitate the implementation of the Guidelines and the development of quality processes and practices.

The Domain of Social Sciences and Humanities by contrast has a devolved faculty-based structure, so it was harder to observe systematic allocation of responsibility and implementation of the Guidelines, though there is clearly some very innovative and thoughtful educational development taking place. While structural or organisational frameworks may facilitate the implementation of the Guidelines, the panel were of the opinion that regardless of the structural and organisational practices adopted, there needed to be clear allocation of roles, responsibility and accountability assigned for the achievement of the Guidelines with regular reporting and review of their achievements and outcomes to the discipline, domain or faculty leadership and the senior leadership team.

Recommendation 5: Clarify and strengthen the accountability and evaluation requirements in the Guidelines with regular reporting and accountability to the discipline, faculty and domain leadership to the senior leadership team in order to achieve the implementation and deep embedding of the Guidelines across the University.

### **Accessibility of the document**

The current document has wide recognition and has been used widely by students, teachers and leaders to focus educational innovation and to review and further develop their policies and practices. The upcoming review of the Guidelines in 2013 provides an opportunity to consider a range of strategies to increase the understanding of its shared ownership, for its implementation and to disseminate the new document to increase its reach and impact.

There are many advantages with having a single document for academic staff and leaders, students and administration and support staff as well as for people outside the University as it gives a coherent overview and demonstrates how the university as a whole engages in educational activity and development around teaching and learning. Following the development of the Guidelines into the revised document, the Panel would encourage the University to consider ways in which it can be made even more accessible to the various stakeholder groups. For example, a companion document, drawn from the master document that provides a 'student-friendly' version outlining their roles and ways they are expected to engage with the university, may be useful for communicating with students. Similarly, a 'teacher-friendly' and a 'tutor-friendly' companion document may provide an accessible tool to help teachers and tutors to identify their roles and responsibilities.

Recommendation 6: When reviewing the Guidelines document, consider ways in which it can be made even more accessible to the various stakeholder groups, utilising dissemination and consultation strategies to increase the sense of ownership of the stakeholders and to expand its reach and impact.

### **Development work accomplished within domains/faculties**

As was demonstrated during the presentations in our first visit and evident in the theme discussions and in the reports during our second visit, an impressive amount of educational innovation and developmental work is being undertaken across the University. The reports detail the great variety of practices and projects undertaken in disciplinary and organisational contexts to address educational and quality compliance issues. Many of the projects reported are in various stages of development, with some well-established after years of development while others are in their early stages, which means that their results, outcomes and impacts are yet to be fully realised. We found that the reports did not always convey the full scope of the projects so that it was only during the theme focused discussions that we could gain a better understanding of the work that had been undertaken and the extent of their success. As not all project leaders could attend the discussions, and some reports were more detailed than others, we have chosen not to highlight any particular projects, other than to illustrate some of our observations and recommendations. We are aware that this might be disappointing to some who have invested considerable time and effort into their projects. But because of the different stages of development of the projects and levels of reporting and our own limited observations, we feel it would do all projects a disservice if we highlighted some projects over others. We are confident that the University leadership is heartened by the many innovations, promising projects and the focus on establishing quality practices that have been supported and celebrated throughout the domains and faculties. The CrED project has provided a mechanism to promote these to the wider university community.

It is important that these promising projects have the opportunity to grow and develop further and opportunities for engaging in networking are provided when the CrED project is completed.

Our overall impression is that there is widespread engagement and a commitment to quality educational development and student learning by many of the leaders and staff in the university. Many reported that they had experienced an overall positive change towards quality in teaching and learning in general, with a focus placed on educational development and quality issues. This was evident across all the parts of the university we visited. A number of the participants in the interviews and discussion sessions also stressed the shift from a teaching-focused perspective to a focus on students' learning. Furthermore, we recognised and compliment the engagement of students across the university and the high level of trust and engagement that was evident between the students and the University.

### **Sustaining the projects and development work**

It became evident during the theme discussions that some well-developed projects initiated earlier had sparked interest, ideas and collaborations in subsequent projects in other parts of the University. For example, a project in Pharmacy to develop, define and match learning outcomes and assessment was reported within the domain and to University teaching and learning forums. This led to conversations with those who attended the sessions and a project was subsequently initiated to undertake similar work in a department in the

Domain of Science and Technology. Separately, there was interest by a team in the Faculty of Theology to develop its learning outcomes and assessment, who contacted the PU for assistance. Staff in the PU knew of the Pharmacy project and were able to connect the Pharmacy and Theology teams to share some of their tools and experiences. Related projects have followed in various disciplines. The initial project in Pharmacy was highly innovative as it first initiated the project and then extended its impact beyond its own project boundaries, contributing tools and experience to the development of the subsequent projects. However, each subsequent project required innovation and commitment for the project to be initiated in their disciplinary context, engage with their leadership and teaching teams and establish the project in their own disciplines. This example illustrates two points: (1) the difficulty of selecting some projects to highlight over others, when all have their own qualities and achievements; and (2) the importance of active networks and dissemination through combined top-down and bottom-up support that provides opportunities to spark ideas and to share experience and expertise.

A common challenge for large, comprehensive universities is to ensure that educational projects and initiatives that have been successfully trialled and implemented are sustained in their own context and, where feasible, extended into other programmes and disciplines. Many of the project leaders we spoke to were justifiably proud of their work and achievements but were concerned that there was little support available to continue or extend their projects into the future. Many of the written reports also reflected this anxiety. Some projects do, and should have, a limited life-span when the issue has been addressed, or it was not successful, but other projects and innovations are enhancements on previous ineffective practices or address persistent issues. Failure to support these into embedded and widespread use represents a significant loss of opportunity, a poor investment of time and resources by the leadership and a risk to the ongoing goodwill and commitment of the staff who were involved, who may subsequently feel disillusioned and unappreciated. Educational initiatives require ongoing leadership support and investment in the same way that research initiatives need to be supported over an extended period if significant outcomes are to be realised. Uppsala University has an opportunity to take these proven innovative projects and, where feasible, expand them to other disciplines and domains as evidence of its stated aim to become a development-oriented university.

The Domains of Science and Technology and Medicine and Pharmacy have separately established approaches and organisational structures that have identified, funded and supported a number of larger scale initiatives that have been supported over an extended period. For example, the Domain of Science and Technology has established TUR, TUK and TUFF to achieve a strategic and ongoing commitment to the pedagogical training of their staff, recognition of teaching quality through their 'excellent teacher' titles and engagement in educational disciplinary research. The Domain of Medicine and Pharmacy, while differently organised, has also taken an integrated and strategic approach to support the educational functions of the domain and to promote and support educational initiatives, establishing formal roles with educational responsibility, providing funding and supporting a range of initiatives, for example, in the area of assessment of knowledge, clinical professional and generic skills. The different disciplinary areas within the domain have

been proactive in identifying issues and strategies to address them, for example the language development programme for pharmacy students in collaboration with the Department of Linguistics and the interdisciplinary health reception run by students working in highly interdisciplinary teams.

The Domain of Social Science and Humanities has adopted a devolved model with faculties operating more-or-less independently of the other faculties within their domain. As a consequence, the support for teaching and learning development is more localised and variable. Some faculties have achieved significant outcomes. For example, the Faculty of Law, taking a national approach, worked with other law faculties in Sweden to define their learning criteria and outcomes. The Faculty of Languages, taking a programme approach focused on developing its grading criteria and extending its use of educational technologies. The Faculty of Theology focused on extending work-based learning opportunities for their students. The Department of Business, through their 'Smart' Project undertook a comprehensive course review and restructure. Some initiatives have been led by individuals who have invested a great deal of time and energy to achieve significant outcomes but have received little recognition and feel they cannot continue without further support and resources from their faculty leadership. Among these examples are other initiatives that are in early stages of progress or flagged but yet to begin, seemingly through lack of a strategic approach, support and resources. The faculties in this domain face challenges of distributed resources and leadership that can result in highly variable engagement in quality enhancement of their educational programmes.

Recommendation 7: That strategic educational development plans are developed, linked to the Guidelines, with specific resources, support, responsibility and timelines identified and allocated. Responsibility should be allocated at the level where resources are located. Reporting of the plans and review of the outcomes should be undertaken at the domain level. Dissemination of the projects (both successful and unsuccessful) should take place within the domain, across the University and to disciplinary and external forums where appropriate.

### University-nominated themes

The two themes nominated by the university in the CrED initiative were research-teaching linkages and boundary-spanning courses/programmes. Most of the educational initiatives reported were on the former. Overall, there was a limited engagement with the University-nominated themes compared to the engagement in the domain- or faculty-nominated themes.

#### Research-Teaching linkages

Based on the reports and our observations during the discussions, the predominant view of many of the leaders on what constitutes research-teaching linkages was an understanding that an active researcher conducting the teaching in a course was providing that linkage. There were limited responses suggested that incorporating research methods into the teaching curriculum, or having students engaging in research as part of their programme of study had been considered (see references on different approaches to research teaching

linkages in the disciplines). This was particularly evident when discussing programmes at the different undergraduate and postgraduate levels. When pressed for examples, we were told of plans at the Master's degree level but very few at the Bachelor degree level. If this impression is true, this represents a significant loss of opportunity for the University and their students to engage meaningfully in learning about, and engaging in, research at the undergraduate and subsequent degree levels at Uppsala University.

We note that a university-wide seminar was held to explore the concept and examples of research-teaching linkages and to encourage the provision of further opportunities both in seminars and within disciplines and faculties for programme coordinators and teachers to continue to explore ways in which they can embed relevant research understanding, experiences and skills development in their courses and programmes. We noted that there were very good examples in each of the domains where teaching-research linkages were explicitly built into the programmes of study and would encourage these to be further promoted as examples.

#### Boundary-spanning courses

Evidence and examples of boundary-spanning courses were primarily found within the domains, rather than across domains. Across-domain examples were primarily found at the Masters level rather than undergraduate level. In discussion, it was agreed that boundary-spanning courses and programmes had primarily been developed within the domain and that provision of opportunities for students studying across domain was more difficult to provide.

The nomination of University themes is an important strategy to focus attention and to engage in change towards agreed outcomes, though realising both of these are hard to achieve in a large, comprehensive university, particularly over a relatively short period of time. This suggests that the selection of university-wide themes need: to be seen as requiring longer-term engagement; central and locally led exploration of the concept(s); to work towards developing an agreed approach and strategy for the University, with strategies developed and resourced at both the central and local levels and supported by a cycle of monitoring, review and evaluation, supported by a process of dissemination and exchange of ideas and practices. When implementing University-wide themes, the area that would appear to be most resistant to changes, and therefore where particular attention for their implementation would be needed, is at the undergraduate programmes.

Recommendation 8: That the University undertakes a systematic review of the outcomes of the development of the University-wide themes of research-teaching linkages and boundary-spanning courses, particularly in the undergraduate programmes to identify where these might be strengthened and further developed.

#### Reward and recognition of teaching

Teaching has been traditionally recognised and rewarded through the provision of: awards and fellowships for teaching; professional development and grants; and career progression. These continue to be the main mechanisms used in universities today, with promotion and

career progression continuing to be the most difficult to achieve (Chalmers, 2011). At Uppsala University, these three mechanisms are largely delegated in the Guidelines as the responsibility of the Head of Department and Chairperson of the Faculty Boards, supported by some of the central units, such as PU and the Quality Office. This seems to be an area that has stalled in its implementation, with many reporting that initiatives in this area are in their early stages or pending.

There were several discussions about the continued lack of clarity and progress on the way in which excellence in teaching and educational development is recognised and rewarded. While the commitment to enact the Guidelines to reward and recognise teachers is highly commendable, there remains a lack of clear incentives and promotion criteria in many areas in the university, which makes it very difficult for staff to manage their workloads and competing priorities. We encourage the University to continue encouraging the faculties and heads of departments to build a culture that supports and encourages quality educational outcomes and recognises and promotes those who contribute to this. It is important that the supervisors of the teachers and leaders at different levels in the University understand and apply the teaching quality criteria once developed and that they understand their role is to contribute positively to the continued development of their excellent staff.

There is an opportunity to create a vibrant network of current and past teaching-excellence winners from across the university to share practice and to raise the profile of teaching more broadly across and beyond the university. Such a network signals the potential for a critical mass of pedagogic-focused academics across the university who might engage activities such as cross-disciplinary pedagogic research, providing leadership in education policy development and teaching initiatives and engaging in mentoring and support of colleagues. Capitalising on a group such as this requires both the continued support for formal and informal networks and consideration of task-based working groups that would bring together excellent teachers, with similar interests from across the University, to work on time-limited projects and themes, for example, teaching excellence, teaching competence and student engagement.

It is crucial to maintain and embed the culture change going on at the university and to keep education quality on the agenda. The challenge will be to both encourage the champions in the organisation and, in addition, to recognise and encourage the achievement of both quality research and teaching achievements. The University leaders' responsibilities are to ensure that they support those who have demonstrated excellence and support the evolving initiatives. It is recognised that this will be differently understood and enacted as Uppsala University is a large institution with different academic cultures and ways of working. This does not lessen the need for a systematic approach at every level where responsibility is devolved to ensuring that high quality teaching and teachers are appropriately, transparently and consistently rewarded and recognised.

Recommendation 9: That the University, with some urgency, at all levels of the organisation, engages in developing and defining criteria and processes to recognise and reward teaching

and teachers, including addressing the training and support of supervisors and the training and membership of promotion committees.

### **Central support for educational development**

We congratulate the University leadership for its demonstrated strong support for educational development. During both visits, we gained a clear view that the work and support provided by the central units of PU, KoU and ULL are regarded positively at multiple levels across the University. During our second visit we also learnt more of the work of the libraries and museums and their significant contribution to the educational goals of the university. There is an opportunity to maintain and extend the momentum and linkages that have been established between each of these units and with the domains, faculties and teaching teams and staff.

The PU 'hub and spoke' model of having key staff located centrally in the PU and pedagogical leaders based in the domain/faculty working within and with the PU seems to be a very effective model for educational and professional development and for ensuring disciplinary applications and practices are considered and draw on the strengths of both resources. We thought the TUR structure was an excellent example of the potential of the hub and spoke model, with domain-based academic staff within a discipline in the TUR, linked to the PU through their part time appointments and university-wide projects being undertaken.

Another good example of central support working well with the domains and faculties is the interaction between the Domain of Medicine and Pharmacy and the KoU to use surveys as teaching intelligence. This is an example of how close cooperation between domain/discipline areas and university central services can work to the benefit of all.

There are several central units that all share the mission, in different ways, to enhance quality in education. It is, as we noted in the previous report, crucial that there is a coordination of activities and a good communication between the units. The CrED initiative, the review and panel meetings have provided an opportunity for these different units to meet and discuss their roles, work and planned initiatives. It was apparent to both the leaders from these central units and the members of the panel that there would be great benefit in them continuing to meet on a regular basis to communicate, plan and extend the impact of their work and resources. These meetings might also be attended by those who hold domain-based educational development roles, such as a representative from the TUR or others who hold overall responsibility for educational development in their domain or faculty. This would assist with the development of coordinated and integrated development plans and projects. As noted in the previous report, it is crucial that there is a coordination of activities and a good communication between the organisational units.

**Recommendation 10:** That the leaders of the central units, with leaders from the domains/faculties meet on a regular basis to communicate, plan, coordinate and extend the impact of their work and resources where feasible.



The CrEd initiative highlighted where there were opportunities for, and in some cases the need for, some central coordination and support to ensure that some initiatives could continue to be developed. For example, there was a discussion around how the role of the PU might be expanded to undertake a proactive role in the future planning process; to raise the upcoming educational needs based on national or international trends. For example, the need to work strategically with programme teams on curriculum development, to embed teaching research linkages and, in conjunction with the ULL, to extend the use of educational technologies into programmes. Such a plan would benefit from having objectives planned over a three-year cycle; mapping areas of priority in relation to the Guidelines and learning and teaching policy and working with individuals and teams in the disciplines identified to take the agreed actions forward.

In addition to continuing their highly regarded work in inducting new staff through their professional development programmes and working with the disciplines and staff on teaching and learning matters, we see the following aspects of development work the PU might consider in their future planning:

- Strategic priorities (including a strategy to target initiatives for maximising impact, for example, programme focus rather than individual courses)
- Capacity to respond to demand as relevant to different services' resources
- Ability to identify and support initial ideas and practice sharing such as detailed in many of the CrED initiatives (Recognition, reward, exploration of systematic approaches to developing the links)
- Capacity to generate scholarship, research and institutional intelligence focused on informing both immediate and longer-term culture change interventions around learning and teaching and engaging with other units (e.g., Quality) and centres (e.g., TUR)
- Engaging with students systematically to help enact the revised Guidelines. The Student Services group and PU may have a role in working with students and faculties to identify ways in which students have some guidance and support in enacting their role, as identified in the Guidelines

Another role for the PU might be to support initiatives that have grown up under the CrED initiative, which need to be fostered to assist in their sustainability and deeper embedding. For example, those working in the areas of Supplemental Instruction were brought together by the CrED initiative for a theme discussion with some members of the Panel. Some projects were student initiated and others had Supplemental Instruction coordinators appointed on staff. Many were unaware of the existence of each other and the models employed. They spoke of initiatives that had started and then stopped through lack of support while others had been well supported and funded through their faculty for many years. This has been a particularly engaged and committed group that would benefit from central support to bring the various staff and student groups together for the short-to-medium term to ensure sustainability and continuity while working towards the establishment of an embedded Uppsala University model of Supplemental Instruction. No

doubt there are more examples of initiatives across the university where central support can help maintain momentum and extend the project outcomes beyond the CrED project.

Recently, as a consequence of change in the leadership of PU, an opportunity for a closer connection between learning and teaching development and the leadership-training programme was established. Opportunities such as these to integrate teaching and learning with leadership and research development are to be embraced as it breaks down artificial boundaries and serves to reinforce that educational development is not just an issue for teachers but for everyone, and particularly for those in a leadership role.

Libraries and museums are important tools for learning at universities in general. In Uppsala, this is perhaps more so than in most places. The collections of arts, books and artefacts are an important part of the Swedish historical heritage. This enormously rich source provides great potential in enhancing the learning environment for students and we encourage further discussion to explore ways in which these resources and facilities can be further integrated into the educational programmes of students.

Recommendation 11: That the roles of the central services are reviewed to ensure that important initiatives are supported and extended and that ways to increase communication, coordination and cooperation between them are established to avoid silos and to increase impact.

### Design of the CrED project

The overarching goal of CrED was to contribute to and support the realisation of the Guidelines (2008). While the educational developmental work is the responsibility of the domains and faculties, the CrED project was designed to support and further enhance the work taking place in the domains and faculties by shedding light on good examples of educational development and facilitating the exchange of experience regarding developmental work carried out in various parts of the University. Some of the strategies utilised in the CrED project included:

- Conducting university-wide seminars to initiate discussion, share examples and to extend the participants' understanding of the topic
- Identifying common themes from the developmental initiatives from across the university and sharing the progress and outcomes through reports and discussion groups
- Drawing together reports from the project leaders, the faculty and domain leadership and central units to capture the scope and breadth of educational development from across the university
- Facilitating exchange through the seminars, reports, discussion, panel review process and using these to establish web resources and further opportunities to discuss and share into the future. The exchange of the CrED project outcomes continues through to the end of 2012.

The CrED project was established as a way to put a focus on education development and signal the importance the University leadership placed on implementing the policy

document Guidelines Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University, following on from the earlier extensive review of research. The University leadership decided that rather than undertaking a comprehensive evaluation of all programmes, CrED was chosen as an enhancement-led approach to reviewing educational development. A CrED management team was established with the following membership:

- Professor Thomas Bull (Chair)
- Dr Lars Hagborg (Secretary)
- Professor Anders Malmberg (Deputy Vice Chancellor)
- Dr Karin Apelgren, Head, Student Affairs
- Associate Professor Åsa Kettis, Chief Quality Assurance Officer
- Mr David Larsson, Student Representative

The CrED initiative has facilitated and extended the identification and dissemination of good practices across the university. There is evidence of more discussions and sharing of resources and experience within the faculties and across domain boundaries. The CrED management team, with the central and faculty-based teams that have supported them are complimented on the extent of the dissemination activities undertaken. Many projects and initiatives have been highlighted that otherwise may not have been recognised. An aspect of particular note is the number and quality of bottom-up initiatives that have been developed in all areas of the university. Ensuring a balance between top-down and bottom-up initiatives is difficult to achieve but important to strive for. Bottom-up initiatives are often highly innovative and address concrete issues faced by teachers and students. Top-down initiatives are important to implement policy and to achieve the embedding of coherent and strategic initiatives. Both top-down and bottom-up initiatives and strategies have been features of this project.

#### University-wide seminars and forums

Several university-wide seminars were convened over the three-year period to promote discussion and engagement on the University-wide priority themes of research-teaching linkages and boundary-spanning programmes. In addition, seminars were convened on topics related to the Guidelines and faculty priorities including aspects of assessment and recognising and rewarding teaching. Special Interest Group (SIG) themes were identified from the faculty priorities as well as student and staff nominated themes. One SIG group was convened and met several times to explore issues of active student participation.

The topic seminars were appropriate for the project and the design of programmes drew on local and external expertise and examples. These were well received by those who attended, although some were poorly attended. Several people indicated that they were interested but did not attend through pressures of work. Good attendance at seminars, whether locally or centrally facilitated is an ongoing challenge for organisers. Staff have many competing priorities and finding time to attend a seminar is a constant challenge. Absence does not necessarily signal a lack of interest, though it may reflect the perceived priorities of the

management at university, domain and faculty levels. Using digital media may be an option for some seminars but this will not be applicable for all forums where meeting and teasing out ideas is important. There is a challenge of providing "just in time" information regarding educational development. People need to be able to learn about specific initiatives at a time when it is an issue for them. This calls for a systematic approach, coordinated at university level.

The Special Interest Group (SIG) was particularly active and involved both staff and students participating and setting the programme to meet their interests and needs, organisationally supported and facilitated by the central units. It was anticipated that the opportunity to meet as a SIG would be taken up by more theme groups. For many of the faculty-priority theme groups, the first time they had met as a group was during the Panel meetings in September 2012, when many of their projects were developed or completed. Indeed, the organisation of theme discussions as part of the Panel's site visit has shown there is a great potential for theme discussions in the future. One example was the theme group's discussion on generic skills, where the meeting was a dissemination event in itself with real 'sharing and learning' for all who attended. Panel members became facilitators of discussion rather than interviewers. It is recommended that the University continues to explore options to encourage this type of sharing and engagement.

It is possible that there will be more interest in meeting as a SIG or as theme groups once the reports are made more widely available and when the groups meet again at the end of the year, as flagged in the CrEd review documents. The opportunity to form SIG groups into 2013 related to the faculty or University priorities is something the University might consider facilitating as a way to further disseminate project outcomes but perhaps more importantly, to develop the expertise and interest of the participants concerned so that the ideas and educational initiatives continue to grow over time.

Recommendation 12: That the university continue to support and proactively facilitate opportunities for staff to meet (physically and virtually) in a range of different forums, that might be centrally organised, locally organised, a theme or a SIG, for the extension and development of educational initiatives and student learning matters. In addition to meetings, a range of options for effective dissemination, exchanging ideas and engaging in projects should be identified and utilised where appropriate.

### **Documenting and reporting outcomes and achievements**

The compilation of the project and initiatives reports, the faculty/domain reports, central unit reports, quality assurance overview and CrED report together provide a tangible and significant artefact of the CrED project but more broadly, they document the extent of engagement in educational development work across the university.

By establishing this reporting mechanism, CRED has allowed project leaders to shine a light on their own efforts and to be recognised for those efforts by colleagues, administrators, leaders and by an international panel. The catalogue of practices can be used to identify projects in areas of common interest and may lead to further discussions or SIGs. It will also

be important to explore how these can be used within the central service units' strategic plans and contribute to constructive conversations between teachers and their students.

We noted that some of the reports did not always convey the extent of the project and its outcomes and so encouraged the CrED team to invite the contributors to consider further developing their reports before they are published and made available more widely. The University will need to consider how it plans to use this document into the future whether it is:

1. considered as a snapshot of practice at a particular point in time or
2. developed as an interactive and updatable document, with the possibility to update reports and outcomes and add new initiatives as they are undertaken for many interesting projects had just started and so were yet to report their outcomes.

If the second option is taken, it might also be possible to tag projects to show which ones were linked, or sparked interest for new projects or initiatives in different ways. This second option will require ongoing resourcing to maintain it as an active resource and the benefit may not be sufficient to warrant the cost.

Recommendation 13: That the university considers how best to record and report its educational development initiatives, projects and outcomes, examples of practice, events and seminars that take place centrally and within faculties and domains.

#### **Sustainability of projects and initiatives**

It is important that sustainability/legacy and evaluation are considered in the design of projects. We noted that a number of the projects were not designed with sustainability in mind and instead explored practices that were unlikely to be supported into the future by the faculty once the funding ceased. We noted also that sustainability is not always about funding: many initiatives required a change in traditional disciplinary practices or administrative procedures. These can sometimes be more difficult to change so we encourage the examination of the processes and practices around the administration of courses and teaching to achieve efficiencies and enhancements of the students' learning experiences. Sustainability of projects is not wholly dependent on funding and we would encourage more thinking around designing and implementing 'efficient' projects that can continue beyond the initial funding period.

The Panel members were at times surprised by the lack of engagement and commitment to the outcomes of projects by some leaders with projects that had been supported by faculty/domain funding and undertaken by their staff. The Panel would like to recommend that faculty/discipline leaders demonstrate greater engagement and commitment to educational projects that are undertaken by prioritising projects that are of strategic importance to the faculty/domain and then ensuring that the staff involved in the project receive an appropriate workload and funding allocation to carry out the project. The Panel would also encourage the recognition of those involved in the projects and a celebration of the outcomes (even when it might not have been successful) by the faculty leaders. Uppsala University and the faculties/domains have a tremendous resource in this group of engaged

people and it is suggested that a mechanism be found to celebrate and develop this group as learning and teaching 'champions'.

Recommendation 14: That faculty/disciplinary leaders demonstrate greater engagement and commitment to educational projects that are undertaken by prioritising those projects that are of strategic importance to the faculty/domain and ensuring that the project staff are allocated sufficient workload and funding to carry out the project.

Recommendation 15: That domain/faculty/disciplinary leaders recognise those involved in the educational initiatives and projects and celebrate the outcomes and identify ways to develop and support these staff as learning and teaching 'champions'.

The Panel concludes that the CrED project has largely achieved its goal of putting a focus on education development; however it was less successful in signalling the importance of implementing the policy document Guidelines Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University. The Panel did not consider this a failure on the part of the CrED team but more a reflection of the variable engagement with the Guidelines by leaders within some domains and faculties.

From the perspective of the Panel, the invitation to be involved in the review provided us an opportunity for sharing our experiences with the University and each other, as well as learning about the experiences and practices at the University. While an expert panel of peers is more common in a research review, it is a novel approach to review educational developments and an important part of the CrED project itself. And as such is a genuine and innovative enhancement approach.

The CrED project has highlighted gaps and opportunities for the future. All of the Panel members would like to thank all the people involved in their honest engagement in the review process. We have been invited as critical friends and asked questions accordingly. At all sessions, we have been met with friendliness and a willingness to share achievements and challenges. We would particularly like to thank the students for their engagement with the CrED initiative and their hospitality to us. We were impressed by the students we met and their commitment to the University and their fellow students. The relationship that has been established with the University staff to engage together in building a high quality educational and learning experience for the students is commendable; noting the commitment to further develop the relationship and responsibilities of both.

In a sense, the CrED project has been a starting point. It has elevated the conversation about teaching and learning; leaders have learned about initiatives within their own level and sharing has occurred between areas. Now comes a crucial phase when the work needs to move to a more integrated, more systematic approach but without losing opportunities for bottom-up initiatives to flourish. Working together to achieve this is a challenge for all levels of the University leadership.

## Conclusion

The Uppsala University is commended for its commitment to developing the teaching and educational quality of its programmes and practices. It has developed and adopted a quality

enhancement framework tool through the Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University Guidelines (2008). It has promoted and supported their development and implementation within the domain/faculties and programmes. Through establishing the CrED initiative (2010–12), the University leadership further signalled to the domains/faculties and central support units the importance and expectation of implementing the Guidelines. The invitation to have the CrED project reviewed by a large external panel comprised of national and international expert colleagues to provide advice and comment on the educational development work that has taken place to date speaks further of the University's vision and goal to achieve an internationally high quality in their teaching and high standard in their educational programmes as well as their research.

## Summary of recommendations

### 1. Design and content of the Guidelines: Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University

Recommendation 1: Expand section 2. Development of Educational Programmes to include Systematic curriculum development and review of programmes and develop policies, processes, resources and assign accountability to support its implementation.

Recommendation 2: Under section 1. Conditions for student learning, 1.1 A scientific approach. Provide clarity on the Uppsala University's approach and expectations of research teaching linkages in the curriculum and student learning experiences as it is developed in each programme of study and in undergraduate programmes in particular.

Recommendation 3: Review the Students' Role in the Guidelines through a participatory consultation process, with a focus on achieving the students more active and participatory engagement with their learning through identified roles across as many of the section cells as feasible.

Recommendation 4: Review the University's Role, particularly the allocation of responsibility to roles for the- Executive responsibility and Enabling responsibility to ensure that responsibility is assigned to the current and most appropriate roles.

Recommendation 5: Clarify and strengthen the accountability and evaluation requirements in the Guidelines with regular reporting and accountability to the discipline, faculty and domain leadership to the senior leadership team in order to achieve the implementation and deep embedding of the Guidelines across the University.

Recommendation 6: When reviewing the Guidelines document, consider ways in which it can be made even more accessible to the various stakeholder groups, utilising dissemination and consultation strategies to increase the sense of ownership of the stakeholders and to expand its reach and impact.

### 2. Development work accomplished within domains/faculties

Recommendation 7: That strategic educational development plans are developed, linked to the Guidelines, with specific resources, support, responsibility and timelines identified and allocated. Responsibility should be allocated at the level where resources are located. Reporting of the plans and review of the outcomes should be undertaken at the domain



level. Dissemination of the projects (both successful and unsuccessful) should take place within the domain, across the University and to disciplinary and external forums where appropriate.

Recommendation 8: That the University undertakes a systematic review of the outcomes of the development of the university-wide themes of research-teaching linkages and boundary spanning courses, particularly in the undergraduate programmes to identify where these might be strengthened and developed.

Recommendation 9: That the University with some urgency, at all levels of the organisation, engages in developing and defining criteria and processes to recognise and reward teaching and teachers, including addressing the training and support of supervisors and the training and membership of promotion committees.

### **3. Central support for educational development**

Recommendation 10: That the leaders of the central units, with leaders from the domains/faculties meet on a regular basis to communicate, plan, coordinate and extend the impact of their work and resources where feasible.

Recommendation 11: That the roles of the central services are reviewed to ensure that important initiatives are supported and extended and that ways to increase communication, coordination and cooperation between them are established to avoid silos and to increase impact.

### **4. Design of the CrED project**

Recommendation 12: That the university continue to support and proactively facilitate opportunities for staff to meet (physically and virtually) in a range of different fora that might be centrally organised, locally organised, theme or SIG for the extension and development of educational initiatives and student learning matters. In addition to meetings, a range of options for effective dissemination, exchanging ideas and engaging in projects should be identified and utilised where appropriate.

Recommendation 13: That the university considers how best to record and report its educational development initiatives, projects and outcomes, examples of practice, events and seminars that take place centrally and within faculties and domains.

Recommendation 14: That faculty/disciplinary leaders demonstrate greater engagement and commitment to educational projects that are undertaken by prioritising projects that are of strategic importance to the faculty/domain and ensuring that the project staff are allocated sufficient workload and funding to carry out the project.

Recommendation 15: That domain/faculty/disciplinary leaders recognise those involved in the educational initiatives and projects and celebrate the outcomes and identify ways to develop and support these staff as learning and teaching 'champions'.



## References

Chalmers, D. 2011. Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of the Scholarship of Teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30 (1), 25-38

Griffiths R. (2004). Knowledge production and the research-teaching nexus: the case of the built environment disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29 (6), 709-726.

Healey, M. 2000. Developing the Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education: A discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 19(2), 169-189

Healey, M. & Jenkins, A. (2009). *Developing undergraduate research and inquiry*. York: The Higher Education Academy.

[www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/publications/DevelopingUndergraduate\\_Final.pdf](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/resources/publications/DevelopingUndergraduate_Final.pdf)

Jenkins A., Healey M., & Zetter R. (2007) *Linking teaching and research in disciplines and departments*. York: The Higher Education Academy April

A useful website, providing an international listing of key resources to support teaching-research links, can be found at: <http://trnexus.edu.au>

The Scottish QAA Enhancement Themes Project undertook a project on enhancing graduate attributes through research-teaching linkages in 2006-2008. This generated a number of resources including 9 disciplinary specific projects, all of which are available on the website. In addition to valuable resources about developing effective links between discipline-based research and the curriculum there is a substantial index of online resources from the HEA, CETL's and

internationally. [www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/ResearchTeaching/default.asp](http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/ResearchTeaching/default.asp)

# Part 3. Observations, comments and conclusions by the project management

Thomas Bull and Lars Hagborg

## Observations

It may first be noted that one outcome of a project concerning the involvement of many different departments and units across a full university is the fact that so many will focus on one particular issue (or collection of issues) at the roughly same time. Discussing, starting up and reporting on activities (scientific or educational) has value in itself as it brings those questions to the forefront of the organization and serves as a common baseline for future initiatives. Current and future activities and ambitions can be compared, discussed and evaluated according to the needs and traditions of the different stakeholders within the University. The establishment of such a common baseline is a first outcome of the CrED Project.

The collection of initiatives, projects and activities gathered in the reports from the faculties/domains is in itself a tool for further enhancement of educational quality at Uppsala University. It can be used to highlight best practices and to establish contacts and developing collaboration between teachers in different part of the University. It also provides a snapshot of the ambitions and level of advancement in educational development across the University as a whole, a unique documentation that can be used for reflection and evaluation in the future. Used in concert with the panel's report and the other material generated by the CrED Project (particularly the VODs from seminars held during the project), this collection will be a valuable tool for any future initiative in area of educational development at Uppsala University.

Among its general recommendations, the panel concluded that the Guidelines for Educational Activity and Development: Teaching and Learning at Uppsala University - hereafter referred to as *the Guidelines* (In Swedish: Uppsala universitets pedagogiska program) - is a commendable initiative, which can be developed further by stressing the active participation of students. The potential to better use students as a resource in implementing the educational goal of the University was something the panel expressed in various ways. The panel also concludes that the issue of teaching – research linkages in study programmes at Uppsala University can be developed further at almost all faculties/domains.

Lastly, the panel finds the CrED Project to be a welcome and innovative initiative, but identifies a certain lack of long-term strategies for mutual learning and sharing within

domains and the University as a whole. While CrED was (among other things) an attempt to facilitate and intensify mutual sharing, it cannot be said to have succeeded in doing so in a comprehensive way. The panel notes how the Disciplinary Domain of Science and Technology, and the establishment of “TUR” with specific responsibilities in educational development, may be a model for future work within other faculties/domains. On the issue of how the University at the central level is to promote such sharing in the future, the panel notes the valuable contributions made during its visit in 2012 when faculty/domain leaders met and shared experiences from this field and recommends that such opportunities should be provided regularly.

Finally, the comments and conclusions of the CrED Project on the panel’s report is an outcome of the project that can be used for further enhancing and evaluative activities locally and centrally at the University. The faculties’ prime role as initiator and evaluator should be stressed here and – accordingly – the importance that faculties include the top leadership in issues of education as well (and as naturally) as in issues on academic and administrative activities. There is now an opportunity to build on the experiences of CrED and engage that leadership more than had been done in the past, an outcome that still lies in the future, but is certainly easier to attain now than before. Another outcome – connected with the issue of management involvement – is the very clear realization that sustainability is the “soft spot” of all types of educational development within the University. Much is left to individual initiative and activity, which leaves many good practices unnecessarily vulnerable to changes in staff, resources etc. While such dependence is nothing unusual in the academic sphere of the University’s activities – and to a certain degree unavoidable in any organization – it is hard to argue for the wide variation of continuity in the educational sphere as something “natural” and therefore acceptable. Strategies for meeting the challenge of high-quality educational development over time need to be discussed across the University without preconceived ideas about exactly where and how responsibilities should be distributed. Perhaps not surprisingly, this outcome may be summarized as the identification of a need of furthering the academic dialogue within the University on issues connected to educational development.

In the next section, the final report of the International Panel as well as the conclusions drawn will be presented. However, drawing on the two reports of the international panel and insights from other project activities, the CrED management team observes two major items for action:

*Increased sharing and collaboration within and between the disciplinary domains*

The University should act to increase the sharing of ideas and best practices with and between the disciplinary domains. Though TUR has proved to be highly successful within the Disciplinary Domain of Science and Technology it may not be possible to copy and paste this approach to the other domains. While GRUNK and GRUFF, at the Disciplinary Domain of Medicine and Pharmacy, achieve many of same the objectives as TUR, the need for increased sharing and focus is more urgent within the Disciplinary Domain of Humanities and Social Sciences.

The University should also create systematic ways of establishing feedback between the central support units and the domain/faculty boards in order to ensure that the priorities of these units are in agreement with the needs of the boards.

#### *Research-teaching linkages*

The University should initiate a deepened discussion on research-teaching linkages in order to make full use of the extraordinary resources and opportunities at Uppsala. This includes exploring the ways in which the actual teaching methods could be informed by research on effective teaching.

### **Project management comments and conclusions on panel recommendations**

Below, the CrED Project will comment on and discuss the findings of the panel, following its recommendations one by one. As the panel's report includes some discussions on the same topic from different angles (i.e. research-teaching linkages), our comments will also at times be recurrent.

**Recommendation 1:** Expand section 2. *Development of Educational Programmes* to include *Systematic curriculum development and review of programmes* and develop policies, processes, resources and assign accountability to support its implementation.

#### *Comment*

The CrED Project has the impression that most or all programmes at the University already have some form of recurring overview of curriculum, teaching methods etc. From that perspective an addition to the Guidelines on this topic would not place a new demand on departments and individual teachers and thus be relatively easy to implement for most providers of education within the University. The task is mostly to assess how and when such developments and reviews are taking place, something that reasonably falls within the responsibilities of faculties and/or domains. In doing such assessments, faculties/domains should consider the added value of an international component so as to ensure that the University's ambition to be an educational institution of the highest international standard is realized.

Stressing the importance of systematic reviews and other tools for evaluation of educational work in a document intended to steer the educational environment of the University is something that must be done with some caution, however. From the perspective of departments and individual teachers, every demand on specific activities to be carried out must be balanced against the resources available as a whole and the impact on teaching and research at the department. Reviews and evaluations are tools to be used in order to enhance educational quality and, like all tools, they should be fit for their purpose, no more and no less. The form and time-scale of such tools can and must vary across the University.

**Conclusion:** Faculty boards/domains should assess how and how often systematic development and review of programmes and courses should be done, bearing in mind the potential added value of international perspectives.

**Recommendation 2:** Under section 1. *Conditions for student learning*, 1.1 *A scientific approach*. Provide clarity on Uppsala University's approach and expectations of research-teaching linkages in the curriculum and student learning experiences as they are developed in each programme of study and in undergraduate programmes in particular.

*Comment:*

The panel's discussions with representatives of the educational departments of the University and the reports' findings in the area of research-teaching linkages is one of the most important and useful parts of the international panel's contribution to the CrED project. It shows that the issue of scientific approaches in the various programs and courses is not so self-evident or easily resolved as many representatives of the educational departments seem to think. More thought needs to be devoted to this complex issue, and we will return to it below. In this context it suffices to highlight the possibilities the Guidelines offer to establish a university-wide discussion on this fundamental topic.

**Conclusion: Include a fuller explanation of the approach to research-teaching linkages in the Guideline. Faculty boards/domains have the prime responsibility to take any necessary initiatives, using, among other channels, contacts established during the CrED Project and supported by central units.**

**Recommendation 3:** Review the Students' Role in the Guidelines through a participatory consultation process, with a focus on rendering students more active and participatorily engaged with their learning through identified roles across as many of the section cells as feasible.

*Comment*

The inclusion of students and their role was, in itself, an innovation at the time when the Guidelines were conceived. The panel identifies a rather "passive" role for students as receivers of education in the Guidelines. The CrED Project agrees and sees a more inclusive role for students as a natural step in the development of the Guidelines. A possible way forward is a review of the aspect of the Guidelines by a working group in which students are in the majority. This is the way the Guidelines were put together the first time and there are no reasons to change that approach.

**Conclusion: The recommendation should be embraced. Responsibility for development should be placed at central units (PU), in collaboration with faculty boards/domains and student union.**

**Recommendation 4:** Review the 'University's Role', particularly the allocation of responsibility to roles for the *Executive responsibility* and *Enabling responsibility* to ensure that responsibility is assigned to the current and most appropriate roles.

*Comment*

Recurring assessment of the organization of central, domain and faculty levels is necessary in an organization as large as the University, and changes and adaptations should be reflected in the Guidelines. In that work, it is important to seek to match such things as

resources and responsibilities in order to avoid unclear lines of accountability, etc. It also important to recognize that there is no single solution to the issues concerning the University's role in relationship to domains, faculties and departments. That role must be allowed to change and develop differently in different areas of a comprehensive university such as Uppsala. The role of the University should be reconsidered continuously but with the regard given to the differences between the parts of the University.

**Conclusion: The Guidelines should be updated in order to reflect the current distribution of roles and responsibilities.**

**Recommendation 5:** Clarify and strengthen the accountability and evaluation requirements in the Guidelines with regular reporting and accountability to the department, faculty and domain leadership to the senior leadership team in order to achieve the implementation and deep embedding of the Guidelines across the University.

Comment

From the perspective of the CrED Project, the major insight from this point of the panel's report is the apparent lack of communication between providers of education (departments, programmes) and academic leadership (domain and faculty boards). Use of the Guidelines as criteria in regular reporting and assessing the progress of educational activities in faculties and domains could be instrumental to widen and deepen the educational policies of the University. Such use can also be instrumental in making it easier to compare the development of educational activities across the university as well as lessening potentially wasteful use of resources in evaluative work.

**Conclusion: All evaluation, i.e. course evaluation, programme evaluation etc., should use the Guidelines as criteria. Regular planning and follow-up activities should also use the same criteria in order to facilitate comparison and avoid overlapping work.**

**Recommendation 6:** When reviewing the Guidelines consider ways in which they can be made even more accessible to the various stakeholder groups, utilising dissemination and consultation strategies to increase the sense of ownership of the stakeholders and to expand its reach and impact.

Comment

The CrED Project notes that even if the Guidelines were formulated in a bottom-up process, there is still a certain lack of knowledge and use of the Guidelines in everyday educational work throughout the University. There are several reasons for this, for example that the University is a very large department in which it is difficult to include everyone and that it is an educational environment that changes often in regard to personnel. The people that were involved in the process of formulating the Guidelines are in many cases not in the same positions as then, and new staff have not been included in the same way and may therefore have less knowledge of the Guidelines' practical potential. The Guidelines could probably be promoted more actively and more directly to the concerned groups within the University. One way of doing that would be to have versions of the Guidelines that only concerns one particular group, i.e. teachers, leaders, students etc.

**Conclusion: Central unit on educational development (PU) should take initiatives in order to encourage a wider a more direct use of the Guidelines . Faculty boards/domains are responsible for dissemination and implementation of the Guidelines and should have long-term strategies for their use.**

### **1. Developmental work accomplished within domains/faculties**

**Recommendation 7:** That strategic educational development plans are developed, linked to the *Guidelines* , with specific resources, support, responsibility and timelines identified and allocated. Responsibility should be allocated at the level where resources are located. Reporting of the plans and review of the outcomes should be undertaken at the domain level. Dissemination of the projects (both successful and unsuccessful) should take place within the domain, across the University and to disciplinary and external forums where appropriate.

#### Comment

The most important observation of the panel, according to the CrED Project, is the strategic responsibility of educational development in faculty/domain boards and the need to increase the sharing of experiences and initiatives across the University. The connection between responsibility and resources needs to be taken into account here. Some of the connections between faculties/domains established during the CrED Project could be used as a tool for quality assurance, for example by peer review between relevant actors (domain/faculty/department). Faculty/domain boards should identify concrete ways of educational development relevant for its educational environment and describe what is being done in that field as well as what is planned.

**Conclusion: Faculty boards/domains take a more active part in issues concerning strategic development of educational development. Use of peer exchanges between actors should be included in this work, as well as identification and description of practical ways in place or such that are planned.**

**Recommendation 8:** That the University undertakes a systematic review of the outcomes of the development of the University-wide themes of research-teaching linkages and boundary-spanning courses, particularly in the undergraduate programmes to identify where these might be strengthened and developed.

#### Comment

The panel identifies a certain lack of a wide and developed sense of what a connection between research and teaching might include in practical pedagogical terms. The CrED Project can only subscribe to the views of the panel. In discussions of this topic during the project, the use of teachers with a doctoral degree was often mentioned as the first (and sometimes only) sign of a conscious linkage between research and teaching. That is unsatisfactory for several reasons and evidence of a crude view on what constitutes research-teaching linkages in a modern university. Another wide-spread conception that the panel points out is that research-issues are best left for the advanced parts of an

education and that this might include such topics as critical perspectives on methodology and theoretical disagreements in the field. Put bluntly, undergraduate programs and courses can have rather low ambitions when it comes to research-teaching linkages: that is something for the advanced levels of education. This is evidently not satisfactory for a university that strives to have research and teaching go hand in hand in all its activities, and it does pose a problem for students that might take a lot of basic courses in order to get a degree, but in that way get only small glimpses of any given subject's more advanced content and thus can finish their years of studies without any extensive exposure to scientific thinking and standards.

**Conclusion: See under recommendation 2.**

**Recommendation 9:** That the University with some urgency, at all levels of the organisation, engages in developing and defining criteria and processes to recognise and reward teaching and teachers, including addressing the training and support of supervisors and the training and membership of promotion committees.

*Comment*

The CrED Project thinks that the panel's stressing of the urgency of this point is somewhat over-done. There are already several ways of recognizing and rewarding teachers (teaching) in place at the University. The specific title of excellent teacher has been introduced in all faculties/domains during 2012, even though it may not be fully in place all over the University until 2013. Some of the work done by faculties and domains on this topic has been inspired by other faculties/domains, and there is an opportunity to continue those contacts in order to facilitate implementation and monitor its progress. Sharing of experiences should be simple by using established contacts, and a time frame of – for example – two years could be reasonable for evaluation of the impact of reforms. However, the project agrees that more can be done, for example on prompt implementation of the new policies as well as finding other, perhaps more mundane but also more enduring, ways of recognizing teachers and teaching.

**Conclusion: Recommended action is to a certain degree already in place. Established contacts should be used to further support and evaluate implementation.**

## **2. Central support for educational development**

**Recommendation 10:** That the leaders of the central support units, with leaders from the domains/faculties meet on a regular basis to communicate, plan, coordinate and extend the impact of their work and resources where feasible.

*Comment*

It has been obvious from the activities done during the CrED Project that communication between central units and leadership of faculties/domains on issues of educational development could be improved. Such communication does of course exist, and it tends to be done by senior civil servants in the organisation both centrally and at the domain/faculty



level, but does not include the faculty and domain leadership itself. Recurring contacts between the highest levels of organisations involved across the university would be beneficial to the work of educational development.

**Conclusion: The CrED Project subscribes to the views of the panel. Faculty/domain-wise assessment of needs/resources should be made easier, considering the possibilities of arranging faculty/domain-wise structures to support such activities. Regular meetings on the topic of educational development should be held between leaders of central support units, and leaders of faculties/domains, but also including faculty programme directors.**

**Recommendation 11:** That the roles of the central services are reviewed to ensure that important initiatives are supported and extended and that ways to increase communication, coordination and cooperation between them are established to avoid silos and to increase impact.

#### Comment

One major observation that the panel has helped the CrED Project to identify is the difficulties in sharing good examples across the University and its many different faculties and departments. The role of central units in disseminating any new development could be enhanced. The issue of the long-term feasibility of local initiatives needs to be addressed by relevant actors, to ensure that lack of resources is not the main reason to thwart made progress in the field of educational development.

**Conclusion: The Cred Project subscribes to the recommendation of the panel. Strategic meetings on a regular basis by actors with academic leadership (central, faculty/domain) could be helpful in guaranteeing that important initiatives are not lost to the rest of the University.**

### **3. Design of the CrED Project**

**Recommendation 12:** That the university continue to support and proactively facilitate opportunities for staff to meet (physically and virtually) in a range of fora that might be centrally organised, locally organised, thematic or SIG for the extension and development of educational initiatives and student learning matters. In addition to meetings, a range of options for effective dissemination and exchange of ideas and engaging in projects should be identified and utilised where appropriate.

#### Comment

The CrED Project seems to have been one of the first occasions in the University's recent history where a range of actors across the whole University – from academic leaders to junior staff – were brought together in an exercise focused on educational development. The value of such face-to-face meetings cannot be stressed enough in this context, as the true differences and similarities of teaching and learning experiences from across the University only reveal themselves in that kind of context. From the perspective of the project, it is

obvious that this opening of new ways of communication and sharing of views has contributed to the potential for educational development at the University. The concept of Special Interest Groups (SIG) did not have the immediate response that the CrED Project had hoped for, but several fresh initiatives along those lines are currently in progress.

**Conclusion: Continuous central and faculty/domain-wise support of a long-term way of fostering mutual learning across the university is needed, but the form and content of such support need to be discussed further. Some SIGs are in progress and might be an example to build upon for the future.**

**Recommendation 13:** That the university considers how best to record and report its educational development initiatives, projects and outcomes, examples of practice, events and seminars that take place centrally and within faculties and domains.

Comment

The CrED Project has documented its work and the activities done through its initiative. This material is easily accessible already. The reports of faculties/domains on activities done during the CrED Project are another source of information on the massive efforts put into educational development across the University. The panel's report supplements this documentation. Together with this summarising report of the CrED Project, the University and its different faculties/domain have a wealth of information on issues of educational development.

**Conclusion: A collection of ideas (idea bank) could easily be constructed from the material gathered during the CrED Project. Such a tool for spreading information and ideas should be focused on practical issues such as where and by whom a certain initiative was carried out.**

**Recommendation 14:** That faculty/disciplinary leaders demonstrate greater engagement and commitment to educational projects that are undertaken by prioritising projects that are of strategic importance to the faculty/domain and ensuring that the project staff are allocated sufficient workload and funding to carry out the project.

Comment

This has been addressed above under recommendation 7.

**Conclusion: Faculty boards identify and describe (or find out) strategies for educational development and procedures that assure that the faculty is continuously engaged in this field.**

**Recommendation 15:** That domain/faculty/disciplinary leaders recognise those involved in the educational initiatives and projects and celebrate the outcomes and identify ways to develop and support this staff as learning and teaching 'champions'.

### Comment

The CrED Project thinks that the panel has put its finger on a soft spot of the University's day-to-day way of dealing with educational issues. There are several efficient and functional systems of dealing with education that do not (for one reason or the other) live up to expectations, but much less attention is afforded promotion of the good work and the truly excellent efforts of individuals and teams across the many departments of the University. Attention to, recognition of and – as appropriate – celebration of such important nucleuses of educational development is probably a cheap, efficient and sustainable way of promoting educational quality.

**Conclusion: The CrED Project subscribes to the view of the panel. Faculty boards/domains have the prime responsibility to find ways of improving such attention and recognition according to the special circumstances of the educational context. One important part of that work should be to benefit from the information-sharing capacity of central units at the University.**



# Del 1. Sammanfattande slutsatser av KrUUt-projektet: utmaningar för fortsatt utbildningsutveckling vid Uppsala universitet

Åsa Kettis och Anders Malmberg

## Bakgrund

2010 fattades ett rektorsbeslut om genomförande av projektet *Kreativ utbildningsutveckling vid Uppsala universitetet 2010–2012* - KrUUt 10-12 (På engelska: Creative Educational Development 2010-2012 – CrED 10-12). Avsikten med projektet var att stimulera utbildningsutveckling, öka det kollegiala utbytet och spridningen av goda idéer samt allmänt höja fanan för utbildningsuppgiften. Projektet tog avstamp i Uppsala universitets pedagogiska program och byggde i hög grad på de utvecklingsområden som fakulteter/områden själva hade identifierat som angelägna utifrån lokala behov samt två gemensamma utvecklingsområden: forskningsanknytning och områdes-/fakultetsöverskridande utbildningssamverkan.

Under perioden 2010–2011 genomfördes olika universitetsövergripande aktiviteter för att stödja det pågående utvecklingsarbetet inom vetenskapsområden och fakulteter. Denna utvecklingsfas följdes under 2012 av en avslutande utvärdering med en internationell panel av utbildningskunniga kollegor från systeruniversitet i det internationella Matarikinätverket, Lunds universitet och Göteborgs universitet samt tre internationella experter på utbildningskvalitet. Panelen besökte Uppsala universitet vid ett förberedande besök hösten 2011 och gjorde ett andra och sista besök i slutet av september 2012.

Inför sitt andra platsbesök i september 2012 fick panelen ett underlag med beskrivning av det utvecklingsarbete som har ägt rum inom fakulteter och vetenskapsområden under 2010-2011, liksom av verksamheten vid Uppsala universitets centrala stödfunktioner (avdelningen för universitetspedagogisk utveckling (PU), Uppsala Learning Lab (ULL), enheten för kvalitet och utvärdering (KoU), Kompetensforum, biblioteket och muséerna).

## KrUUt-panelens övergripande iakttagelser och rekommendationer

Panelen konstaterar att forskningsintensiva universitet världen över lägger allt större fokus på utbildningsfrågor, dvs. hur universitetet bäst rustar framtidens akademiker för att driva samhällsutvecklingen framåt. Panelen menar att de universitet som har sin självklara

tyngdpunkt på forskning måste transformeras för att hänga med i den utveckling som sker på utbildningssidan. Nya undervisningsmetoder, ny teknologi och forskning om vad som gynnar studenters lärande utmanar etablerade undervisningstraditioner och ämneskulturer. Samtidigt betonar panelen att ett ökat fokus på utbildning inte står i konflikt med fortsatt satsning på forskning – båda uppgifterna kräver uppmärksamhet och engagemang och dessutom hänger de samman.

Mot bakgrund av denna utveckling lovordar panelen Uppsala universitet för att proaktivt stimulera utbildningsutveckling genom framtagandet av det pedagogiska programmet följt av projektet Kreativ utbildningsutveckling 2010-2012. Att Uppsala universitet också granskar sin utbildningsutveckling med hjälp av en internationell panel menar panelen visar på universitetets ambition att erbjuda sina studenter en utbildning i världsklass. Panelen uttrycker tacksamhet över den kollegialitet, gästfrihet, och öppenhet som mötte den vid platsbesöken. Engagemanget var påfallande hos all personal och studenter som panelen träffade.

Panelens rapport visar att Uppsala universitet har flera påtagliga styrkor av betydelse för arbetet med att åstadkomma god utbildningskvalitet. Panelen lovordar särskilt det stora engagemang de mötte hos lärare och studenter, det livaktiga utvecklingsarbetet inom vetenskapsområdena, det ändamålsenliga stödet för utbildningsutveckling och det pedagogiska programmets innehåll och utformning. Men de pekade också ut områden som kräver ökad uppmärksamhet i det fortsatta arbetet med att upprätthålla och utveckla utbildningskvaliteten vid Uppsala universitet.

Panelen menar att KrUUt-projektet har bidragit till en intensifierad diskussion om utbildningsfrågor vid Uppsala universitet, synliggörande av det utvecklingsarbete som sker och ett ökat utbyte av kunskaper och erfarenheter mellan universitetets olika delar. Utmaningen är nu att hitta systematiska arbetssätt som gör att sådana diskussioner och utbyten blir bestående inslag i verksamheten. Panelen efterfrågar dessutom ett ökat strategiskt tänkande kring utbildningsutveckling, med samtidigt bevarande av kraften i de goda initiativ som uppstår underifrån. Att åstadkomma detta ser panelen som en stor utmaning för ledningen på alla nivåer.

Den internationella panelens rapport (del 2) innehåller ett stort antal iakttagelser och rekommendationer. I del 3 redovisar KrUUt:s projektledning en systematisk genomgång och diskussion av samtliga dessa rekommendationer.

I föreliggande inledning försöker vi lyfta fram och "spetsformulera" några av rekommendationer som vi menar innebär särskilt stora utmaningar för den fortsatta utbildningsutvecklingen vid Uppsala universitet.

## Identifierade utvecklingsområden

### ”Väckarklockor”

I det följande identifieras en handfull utvecklingsområden som har karaktären av väckarklockor. Det betyder inte att initiativ saknas inom dessa områden, men att en större allmän medvetenhet och mer systematiska angreppssätt krävs för att utvecklingen ska bli mer kraftfull.

### Forskningsanknytning av utbildningen

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Det finns i många sammanhang ett snäv och outvecklad syn på vad forskningsanknytning innebär. Vid platsbesöken gav vissa ledare och lärare uttryck för uppfattningen att forskningsanknytning uppstår med automatik genom att den som undervisar är disputerad, medan andra ansåg att verklig forskningsanknytning sker först om studenterna ges tillfälle att utveckla sina egna forskningsfärdigheter. Panelen anser att UU inte fullt ut har tillvaratagit den potential till genomtänkt och väl utvecklad forskningsanknytning som ett så framstående forskningsuniversitet besitter.

#### *Det här rekommenderar panelen:*

- Inled en öppen, universitetsövergripande diskussion om forskningsanknytning av utbildningen.
- Utforma medvetet undervisningen på ett sätt så att alla studenter får en ordentligt forskningsanknuten utbildning – även de på grundnivå.
- Inspireras av de modeller för forskningsanknytning av utbildning som finns och som visar på de olika sätt forskningsanknytning kan förstås och åstadkommas.
- Säkerställ forskningsanknuten utbildning även i bemärkelsen att de undervisningsmetoder som används har stöd i aktuell forskning.
- Sprid de goda exempel på väl genomförd forskningsanknytning av utbildningen som finns inom varje vetenskapsområde.

### Studentmedverkan i utbildningen

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen är imponerad av det engagemang för utbildningsutveckling som finns bland UU:s studenter och understryker studenternas viktiga funktion som förändringskatalysatorer (”change agents”). De lyfter även fram den goda samverkan – det ”partnership” – som de tycker sig se mellan studenter och personal vid UU.

Panelen lyfter särskilt fram den så kallade SIG (Special Interest Group) inom KrUUt-projektet som arbetade med att stimulera studentmedverkan i undervisningen med stöd av KrUUt-sekretariatet och PU. Den studentmedverkan som avses är i form av studenter som

bistår varandra i lärandet på ett strukturerat sätt. Det kan avse allt från lotsar och mentorer åt förstaårsstudenter till seniora studenter som driver hela kurser.

Panelen ansåg att SIG:en, som var studentledd och engagerade både lärare och studenter från olika delar av universitetet, uppvisade anmärkningsvärt hög aktivitet under projektperioden. Till aktiviteterna hörde seminarier med inbjudna experter från Sverige och omvärlden. Arbetet resulterade i en antologi: *Students, the university's unspent resource*<sup>2</sup> med studenten Johan Gärdebo och gästforskare Mattias Wiggberg som redaktörer.

Panelen konstaterar att initiativ till studentmedverkan i undervisningen tas på olika håll inom UU – ibland av studenter och ibland av lärare – och många gånger vet de olika initiativtagarna inte om varandras existens. Vissa initiativ har drivits av eldsjälar och dött ut på grund av bristande stöd och kontinuitet, medan andra har hittat en form som möjliggör långsiktig fortlevnad.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:* Låt de studenter och lärare som arbetar med studentmedverkan inom olika delar av universitetet gemensamt utarbeta en uppsalamodell för långsiktigt hållbar, integrerad studentmedverkan i undervisningen. Arbetet bör ske under en tidsbegränsad period och med centralt stöd.

### **E-lärande**

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:* UU bör ta en mer proaktiv, strategisk roll och förutse framtida utmaningar för högre utbildning baserat på nationella och internationella trender. E-lärande är ett område som bör ges sådan uppmärksamhet.

### **Om utbildningsutveckling inom områden och fakulteter**

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen imponerades över det omfattande utvecklingsarbete som bedrivs inom universitetet. De redovisade utvecklingsprojekten varierade från att vara väl etablerade initiativ till nyligen initierade och de var mer eller mindre väl beskrivna, vilket gjorde det svårt för panelen att värdera och uttala sig om specifika projekt. Panelen tyckte sig dock se ett stort engagemang för utbildningsutveckling. I samband med platsbesöken vittnade många ledare och lärare om en positiv förändring i riktning mot ett större intresse för utbildningsfrågor och ett skifte från fokus på läraren till fokus på studenternas lärande. Panelen lovordar också studenternas engagemang och det förtroende som finns mellan lärare och studenter vid UU.

Panelen beskriver genom exempel hur spridningen av idéer inom universitetet kan ske spontant och oplanerat. En god idé som har genererats vid en fakultet anammas sedan av en annan som vidareutvecklar och anpassar den efter sina egna förutsättningar och behov. De centrala

---

<sup>2</sup> Gärdebo J. & Wiggberg, M. (eds.) *Students, the University's Unspent Resource: Revolutionising Higher Education Through Active Student Participation*. Uppsala, Uppsala University, 2012.



stödfunktionerna – som PU, ULL, Kompetensforum och KoU – är viktiga nav i denna spridning och bistår med såväl kontaktförmedling som med sakkunskap.

Panelen tyckte sig se en risk för att lovvärda utvecklingsprojekt riskerar att rinna ut i sanden på grund av bristande finansiering, svårigheter att förändra etablerade arbetssätt och administrativa hinder. Panelen överraskades av den brist på intresse som ledningen ibland visade – till och med för projekt som de har valt att finansiera. Stödet för den fortsatta implementeringen av genomförda utvecklingsprojekt är ofta svagt, vilket panelen betraktar som slöseri. Ledningen på olika nivåer är helt enkelt inte tillräckligt engagerad i att planera, följa upp och tillvarata de utvecklingsprojekt som pågår. Möjligheter till utveckling av verksamheten går därigenom förlorade och det riskerar även engagemanget hos den personal som bidrar aktivt till utvecklingsarbetet göra. Utbildningsinitiativ kräver, precis som forskning, ledningsstöd och resurser om de ska ge resultat.

Panelen betonar att det finns exempel på strategiskt stöd för utbildningsutveckling inom medicinska och farmaceutiska vetenskapsområdet och teknisk-naturvetenskapliga vetenskapsområdet. Inom dessa områden noterade panelen att det finns riktat ekonomiskt stöd för utveckling inom vissa områden, liksom sökbara projektmedel. Panelen lyfter fram TUR (Teknisk-naturvetenskapliga fakultetens universitetspedagogiska råd) som det förnämsta exemplet på ett sammanhållet och kraftfullt stöd för utbildningsutveckling.

Inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskapliga vetenskapsområdet finns också exempel på lokala goda initiativ, men panelen konstaterar att spridda resurser och dito ledarskap gör att stödet till utbildningsutveckling varierar inom området.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:* För att utvecklingsarbetet vid UU ska få ännu större genomslag bör följande beaktas:

- Utvecklingsprojekt bör bygga på tydliga utbildningsstrategiska överväganden på olika nivåer.
- Ledningen bör engagera sig mer i utvecklingsprojekten. Prioriterade projekt ska ges aktivt ledningsstöd, resurser och tydliga ramar. Den nivå som svarar för resurserna ansvarar för att detta sker.
- Ledningen bör tillse att den personal som är engagerad i prioriterat utvecklingsarbete ges erkännande för sina insatser.
- Tydligare resultatuppföljning krävs och denna bör ske på nämndnivå.
- Former behöver utvecklas för mer kraftfull spridning av erfarenheter över fakultets- och områdesgränser (och även utanför universitetet).
- Utvecklingsprojekt som kan fortleva inom gällande kostnadsramar, dvs. även efter eventuell resursförstärkning i samband med utvecklingsarbetet, bör prioriteras.

### *Egeninitierade utbildningsutvärderingar*

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen iakttog en överdriven tilltro till externa utvärderingar (så som Universitetskanslersämbetets (f.d. Högskolverkets) utvärderingar eller externa ackrediteringar). Den noterade att de interna program-/utbildningsutvärderingar som förekommer genomförs ad hoc och är mer eller mindre genomtänkta. Den uppmärksammar oss på att många universitet världen över genomför systematiska "curriculum reviews" där samtliga utbildningar vid lärosätet återkommande utvärderas ur ett helhetsperspektiv med visst tidsintervall.

Panelen antyder alltså att det saknas en viktig komponent i UU:s "kvalitetssystem": någon form av egeninitierade, systematiska, återkommande utbildningsutvärderingar ur helhetsperspektiv där slutsatser om utbildningens fortsatta utveckling dras efter analys av faktorer som t.ex. söktryck, avhopp, genomströmning, studentnöjdhet, anställningsbarhet, avnämarnöjdhet och granskning av utbildningen av kollegor från andra lärosäten. Panelen menar att en sammanhållen och återkommande analys av dessa faktorer ger viktigt underlag för säkerställandet av att utbildningarna hålls aktuella och relevanta.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:* Genomför systematiska program-/utbildningsutvärderingar för all utbildning och erbjud fakulteter/vetenskapsområden stöd för planering och genomförande av sådana.

### **"Påminnelser"**

Ytterligare fyra panelrekommendationer kan ses som "påminnelser", dvs. den allmänna medvetenheten om utvecklingsbehovet är redan relativt stor och åtgärder är redan vidtagna eller planerade. När det gäller dessa områden är utmaningen att initierat arbete fortlöper och leder vidare.

### *Belöning och erkännande för undervisningsinsatser*

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen nämner att de vanligaste sätten att öka erkännandet för undervisningsinsatser är pedagogiska priser, tilldelning av medel för utbildningsutveckling och befordran/karriärutveckling – och konstaterar samtidigt att det sistnämnda är det som är svårast att åstadkomma. Panelen noterar vidare att det pedagogiska programmet lägger ansvaret för ett ökat erkännande av undervisningsinsatser på fakultets-/områdesnivå med stöd av centrala stödfunktioner som t.ex. PU.

Panelen drar sedan slutsatsen att arbetet verkar ha gått i stå. Det saknas klara incitament och befordringskriterier inom delar av universitetet.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:*

- Uppmuntra ledningen på alla nivåer att verka för en kultur som tillmäter god undervisningskvalitet vikt och belönar dem som bidrar till denna.
- Utbilda ledare i hur god undervisningsskicklighet kan bedömas på ett systematiskt sätt.

- Etablera nätverk för erkänt skickliga lärare (excellenta lärare, pedagogiska pristagare) och låt det bidra till spridning av goda idéer, liksom till utveckling av tvärvetenskaplig universitetsdidaktisk forskning, pedagogiskt ledarskap, mentorshandledning samt utbildningsstrategier.
- Etablera en modell med arbetsgrupper bestående av skickliga lärare från olika delar av universitetet (gärna från ovanstående nätverk) som kan arbeta tidsbegränsat med strategiskt viktiga frågor om t.ex. undervisningskvalitet, pedagogisk kompetens och studentengagemang.
- Utbilda ledamöter i rekryteringskommittéer (motsvarande) att göra kvalificerade pedagogiska meritvärderingar.

### *Utbudet av gränsöverskridande kurser och utbildningar*

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Gränsöverskridande utbildningar verkar främst finnas inom vetenskapsområden snarare än mellan dem. Utbildningar över vetenskapsområdesgränser förekommer främst på masternivå.

### *Det här rekommenderar panelen:*

- Utnyttja universitetets bredd bättre, särskilt i utbildning på grundnivå.
- Stimulera studenters rörlighet över vetenskapsområdesgränser.
- Följ upp resultaten av den utveckling av gränsöverskridande utbildning som har skett.

### *Det centrala stödet för utbildningsutveckling*

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen lovordar tidigare och nuvarande universitetsledning för dess stöd till utbildningsutveckling. Vid platsbesöken fick de tydliga indikationer på att det centrala stöd som ges av PU, KoU, ULL och Kompetensforum var uppskattat på alla nivåer inom universitetet. Vid det andra besöket fick panelen dessutom en klarare bild av på vilket vis biblioteken och muséerna bidrar till att uppfylla UU:s mål för utbildningen.

Panelen förordar särskilt vad de benämner som "the hub and spoke model" (nav och ekrar) med personal som delar sin tid mellan centrala enheter och arbete på fakultets- och områdesnivå. På så sätt kompletteras det centrala stödet med stöd som är direkt anpassat efter aktuellt ämnesområde. Panelen lyfter fram TUR som det mest framträdande exemplet på en sådan "nav och ekrar"-modell, med personal som arbetar med pedagogiskt ledningsarbete såväl inom TUR som vid PU. Ett annat exempel som lyfts fram av panelen är det nära samarbetet mellan KoU och medicinska och farmaceutiska vetenskapsområdet när det gäller olika typer av utvärderingar.

Panelen ger en särskild eloge till PU för dess framgångsrika arbete med pedagogisk fortbildning och konsultativ verksamhet, men ser också att verksamheten skulle kunna vidareutvecklas på några punkter.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:* Panelen framhåller vikten av att de centrala stödfunktionerna är väl koordinerade sinsemellan och i relation till de stödfunktioner som finns på fakultets- och områdesnivå.

- Utvärdera nuvarande rollfördelning mellan olika stödfunktioner (PU, KoU, ULL, Kompetensforum och stödfunktioner på fakultets-/områdesnivå) med sikte på att ytterligare förbättra kommunikation, koordinering och samarbete.
- Etablera mötesplatser för idéutbyten mellan centrala stödfunktioner och utbildningsansvariga på områdes- och fakultetsnivå.
- Utveckla de sätt på vilka universitetets bibliotek och muséer kan integreras i utbildningen och användas som verktyg för lärandet.
- PU bör ta en mer proaktiv, strategisk roll och förutse framtida utmaningar för högre utbildning baserat på nationella och internationella trender. Exempel på temaområden som skulle kunna förstärkas: utbildningsutveckling ("curriculum development"), forskningsanknytning av utbildningen, och e-lärande (i samarbete med ULL), studentmedverkan i undervisningen/SI och ledarskapets betydelse för utbildningskvalitet.

### *Pedagogiska programmet*

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen lovordar UU:s pedagogiska program som ett sätt att ge struktur och vägledning åt arbetet med utbildningsutveckling och sätta ljuset på viktiga aspekter. Det är bra att huvudansvariga för att realisera olika mål anges och att programmet omfattar studenternas ansvar för att de ska få en bra utbildning. Studenter som panelen mötte under platsbesöket berättade att de uppskattar att deras roll är tydliggjord i programmet och att de arbetar för att sprida programmet bland medstudenter. Panelen konstaterar också att programmet är väl känt bland personalen i olika delar av universitetet.

Inte desto mindre anser panelen att ett bra program kan bli ännu bättre. Studenternas roll är lite väl passivt formulerad och på vissa mål saknas helt formulering av hur studenterna kan bidra till en bra utbildning. Panelen menar t.ex. att studenter visst kan bidra till lärares kompetensutveckling och att möjligheten till studentmedverkan i undervisningen bör skrivas fram (t.ex. Supplemental Instruction och annan mentorshandledning). Panelen noterar dessutom att implementeringen av programmet har fungerat bättre och sämre inom olika delar av universitetet. Teknisk-naturvetenskapliga vetenskapsområdet lyfts fram som ett gott exempel, till stor del på grund av skapandet av TUR som har till uppgift att operationalisera det pedagogiska programmet och stödja implementeringen på områdesnivå. Panelen konstaterar att det inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskapliga vetenskapsområdet inte finns någon

motsvarande systematik i fördelningen av roller och ansvar för implementeringen av programmet.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:*

- Utveckla, i samarbete med studenterna, den del av programmet som behandlar studenternas roll för att åstadkomma en god utbildning.
- Precisera ansvarsfördelningen för att åstadkomma en god utbildning under den del av pedagogiska programmet som rör universitetets roll.
- Utveckla de delar av programmet som behandlar systematiska program- och ämnesutvärderingar ("curriculum reviews").
- Utveckla de delar av programmet som rör forskningsanknytning av utbildningen.
- Formulera hur implementeringen av programmet ska följas upp för att säkerställa att sådan sker inom hela universitetet.
- Öka användbarheten av programmet genom att lägga till "underprogram" – ett som är optimerat för lärare och ett för studenter.

## Själva KrUUt-projektet

*Det här tyckte panelen:* Panelen anser att KrUUt-projektet – med sitt genuina utvecklingsfokus och granskning av en internationell panel – är nydanande och innovativt. Panelen menar att projektet har haft en lyckosam avvägning mellan insatser som initierats "bottom up" respektive "top down". De utvecklingsområden som stått i fokus är en kombination av sådana som identifierades av fakulteter/områden och sådana som universitetsledningen önskade att alla ska arbeta med (fakultets-/områdesövergripande utbildningar och forskningsanknytning). Panelen menar att initiativ genererade underifrån ofta är innovativa och rör frågor av konkret betydelse för lärare och studenter, medan ovanifrån kommande initiativ kan säkerställa att strategiskt viktiga initiativ implementeras systematiskt.

Panelen konstaterade att de så kallade KrUUt-seminarierna på olika teman var ändamålsenliga och uppskattade av deltagarna. Samtidigt noterade panelen att deltagandet var begränsat.

Panelen ansåg att den dokumentation av utvecklingsaktiviteter som den fick ta del av gav en god bild av projektet och synliggjorde det stora engagemanget för utbildningsutveckling vid universitetet.

Ett av syftena med KrUUt-projektet var att stimulera implementeringen av det pedagogiska programmet och där anser panelen att en del återstår. Graden av implementering varierar påtagligt inom universitetet.

*Det här rekommenderar panelen:* Panelen noterar att vissa element som ingick i KrUUt-projektets design skulle kunna "permanentas" i den ordinarie verksamheten och rekommenderar följande:

- Fortsätt att möjliggöra fakultets-/områdesöverskridande möten t.ex. i form av:
  - temaseminarier där lärare och studenter från olika delar av universitetet samlas kring gemensamma frågor om utbildningsutveckling
  - SIG:ar dvs. fakultets-/områdesöverskridande grupper av lärare och studenter som möts återkommande så länge behov av utbyte och kunskapsinhämtning inom ett visst område finns
- Maximera deltagandet i seminarier om utbildningsfrågor genom att välja teman som knyter an till frågor som är aktuella för många ("just in time information").
- Använd de projektbeskrivningar som togs fram genom projektet för att identifiera grupper av personer som arbetar med samma frågor och kan dra nytta av varandra.
- Låt eventuellt projektbeskrivningarna utgöra grunden till en idébank som uppdateras med resultat från såväl pågående som nya projekt. Detta förutsätter nogsam konstadsnyttoavvägning eftersom en sådan idébank kräver löpande underhåll.
- Om UU önskar utgå från universitetsövergripande teman i framtida utvecklingsarbete måste tiden vara väl tilltagen. Det måste även finnas former för idéutbyte och genomfört arbete måste följas upp. Ett tänkbart tema är utbildning på grundnivå.

## Vem jobbar vidare med vad?

För att ett projekt som detta ska vara till nytta krävs att resultat och slutsatser hålls i minnet och används som underlag för konkreta åtgärder. Fortsatt arbete till följd av de utvecklingsområden som har lyfts här hanteras inom ramen för Uppsala universitets ordinarie "kvalitetssystem" enligt följande:

**Åtgärder på universitetsövergripande nivå.** Rektor har det yttersta ansvaret för kvaliteten i verksamheten vid Uppsala universitet och kan genom beslut stimulera utveckling som är angelägen för hela universitetet – oavsett vetenskapsområde. Det kan till exempel ske genom beslut om universitetsövergripande program, handlingsplaner och riktlinjer eller genom olika strategiska satsningar.

**Åtgärder på områdes-/fakultetsnivå.** Enligt Uppsala universitets arbetsordning ansvarar områdes-/fakultetsnämnderna för kvaliteten i verksamheten. Ansvaret för att utforma och vidta åtgärder mot bakgrund av identifierade utvecklingsbehov ligger därför i första hand på områdes-/ fakultetsnämnderna och institutionerna. Det är nämnderna som bäst avgör vilka åtgärder som är mest angelägna utifrån lokala förutsättningar och behov.

**Kvalitetsrådets roll.** Kvalitetsrådet har ansvar för att på olika sätt underlätta utbyte av kunskaper och erfarenheter över områdes- och fakultetsgränser. Kvalitetsrådet bör ges i särskilt uppdrag att skapa möjligheter för sådant kunskaps- och erfarenhetsutbyte när det gäller åtgärdsarbetet inom de utpekade utvecklingsområdena. Kvalitetsrådet bör även, inom ramen för sitt uppdrag som rådgivande till rektor, ge förslag på universitetsövergripande insatser som kan bidra till att stimulera fortsatt utveckling i relation de nio utvecklingsområdena.

**Studenternas roll.** Studenterna ingår som representanter i beslutande och beredande organ på alla nivåer inom universitetet bidrar därmed till att de åtgärder som vidtas är relevanta och väl utformade ur studentperspektiv.

**De centrala stödfunktionernas roll.** Enheten för kvalitetsutveckling och universitetspedagogik (dvs. kvalitet och utvärdering, universitetspedagogisk utveckling och delar av ULL) och Kompetensforum bidrar med stöd i utvecklingsarbetet. Stödfunktionerna bör bygga upp en kunskapsbas i relation till de identifierade utvecklingsområdena och sprida kunskaper och erfarenheter genom sina kurser och i sitt konsultativa stöd till områden, fakulteter, institutioner och enskilda lärare. Detta arbete bör ske i samverkan med förekommande stödfunktioner på fakultets- och områdesnivå.

I arbetet med utvecklingsområdena bör, utöver utbytet av kunskaper och erfarenheter inom universitetet, idéer sökas i omvärlden (t.ex. vid andra lärosäten).

**Uppföljning.** I ett första steg kommer vetenskapsområden/fakulteter att beskriva vilka åtgärder de planerar att vidta till följd av panelens iakttagelser mot bakgrund av lokala förutsättningar och behov. Redovisningen sker under hösten 2013 och sammanställs i en rapport.

Uppföljning av genomfört utvecklingsarbete ska sedan ske i någon form. Det sker i samband med den ordinarie verksamhetsredovisningen och eventuellt i särskild ordning, t. ex. i samband med att pedagogiska programmet följs upp i sin helhet. Uppföljningen ska utformas så att den bidrar till kvalitetsutveckling och inte tynger verksamheten mer än den är till nytta.

## Planerade utvecklingsprojekt

Följande konkreta åtgärder planeras i dagsläget på universitetsövergripande nivå:

- **Utbildningsanalyser:** Utlysning av medel som stöd för de fakulteter som avser inleda arbetet med att utforma en modell för systematisk analys av utbildningar ur helhetsperspektiv. Modellen ska utformas på det sätt som ansvarig områdes-/fakultetsnämnd finner vara mest ändamålsenligt för den egna verksamheten, men med beaktande av vissa grundkrav. Ansvaret för utformning och genomförande av

programanalyser vilar hos områdes-/fakultetsnämnden, medan stöd i arbetet ges av enheten för kvalitetsutveckling och universitetspedagogik (dvs. kvalitet och utvärdering, universitetspedagogisk utveckling och delar av ULL).

- *Excellenta lärare*: Utlysning av medel som kan sökas av lärare som strävar efter att meritera sig för utnämning till excellent lärare. Medlen ska möjliggöra spridning av pedagogiskt utvecklingsarbete vid pedagogiska konferenser/motsvarande. Medlen kommer också att kunna sökas av lärare som redan har fått titeln excellent lärare och som önskar vidareutveckla sin skicklighet, t ex genom konferensdeltagande eller studiebesök vid andra lärosäten.
  - *Special Interest Groups*: Utlysning av medel för att möjliggöra etablering av så kallade SIG:ar på olika teman. Medlen ska möjliggöra för enskilda lärare och studenter att ta initiativ till samling över ämnesområdesgränser för gemensam kunskapsinhämtning inom ett visst område under en tidsbegränsad period. Medlen kan användas för att bjuda in experter eller anordna seminarier/workshops och liknande.
  - *Expertgrupper*: Kvalitetsrådet ges i uppdrag att anordna seminarier på olika teman som relaterar till utvecklingsområdena. Seminarierna ska bygga på identifiering av personer som arbetar aktivt med en viss fråga inom universitetet och bidra till spridning av idéer över områdes- och fakultetsgränser, liksom till kvalitetsrådets och stödfunktionernas kunskapsuppbyggnad. Gruppen excellenta lärare bör ses som en resurs i sammanhanget.
  - *Stödfunktionerna*: Som ett led i en bättre samordning av stödfunktionerna bildade avdelningen för universitetspedagogisk utveckling, enheten för kvalitet och utvärdering och delar av ULL en gemensam enhet den 1 april 2013 – enheten för kvalitetsutveckling och universitetspedagogik. Enhetschefen bör ges i uppdrag att tillsammans med cheferna för övriga stödfunktioner, så väl de centrala som de på områdes-/fakultetsnivå, verka för förbättrad koordination av den samlade stödverksamheten. Samordningen ska även involvera utbildningsledarna.
  - *Pedagogiska programmet*: Det pedagogiska programmet kommer att revideras med beaktande av panelens rekommendationer.
  - *Temaseminarier*: Kvalitetsrådet har nyligen initierat en seminarieserie vilken syftar till att behandla aktuella kvalitetsfrågor av gemensamt intresse för hela universitetet. De frågor som aktualiseras till följd av KrUUt kommer att behandlas där, men även kvalitetsfrågor med bäring på forskning och administrativ verksamhet. Värdet av att spela in dessa och lägga ut dem på webben bör undersökas.
-



