Learning-centred and Reflective Teaching. From Theory to Good Practice. Curriculum of an Educational Development Program for PhD. Students

Program Document

Kurikulum predmetu pre doktorandov – začínajúcich VŠ učiteľov

Prepared as part of the collaborative project *Extending and reinforcing good practice in teacher development*, 2016-1-SK01-KA203-022551
by Roisín Curran, Vicky Davies, Mari Karm, Marvi Remmik, Torgny Roxå, Eszter Simon, Matyas Szabó
with Gabriela Pleschová and Agi Simon as the lead editors

Output: O1
This version finalised on: 16 October 2017
This program document includes following sections:

Co-funded by Erasmus+ program of the European Union

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Purpose of the Program

This program is designed to assist Central and Eastern European doctoral students in the social sciences in enhancing their teaching capacity. This aim is to be achieved through program participants embracing the principles of student-centered education, improving their ability to critically reflect on teaching and student learning, and acquiring essential theories related to higher education learning and teaching. The overall focus of the program is on improving student learning and institutional change.

2. The Program's Guiding Principles

a. Student-centered education. The teacher's focus is on how his/her students learn, rather than on his/her own performance in all activities related to teaching from curriculum design and lesson planning across leading classes to student assessment. Student choice is facilitated; the student is encouraged to do more than the lecturer and/or the shift in the power relationship between the student and the teacher can be observed. The teacher pays attention to who his/her students are and how they learn, so that good learning can occur.

b. A sound knowledge of the essential theories of learning and teaching in higher education. The teacher can identify fundamental concepts, models and approaches related to various aspects of university teaching and learning. The teacher can summarize assumptions of these theories and use at least one theory when designing and evaluating his/her teaching.

c. Critically reflective skills related to planning, implementing and evaluating teaching. The teacher demonstrates that he/she has thought about the reasons why good/poor quality learning occurs in his/her students; can summarize these reasons in a clear and comprehensive way and the reasons seem realistic. The teacher can identify both positive and problematic aspects/outcomes of his/her own teaching and the assumed reasons for them. The teacher may also manifest the connections he/she can see between his/her own research and teaching. Based on this understanding, the teacher can suggest changes for future teaching and their expected effects on student learning.

3. Expected Learning Outcomes for the Program Participants

By the end of the program, participants will have

- recognised the principles of student-centred education as important for their teaching practice;
- demonstrated reflective and critical skills related to planning, implementing and evaluating their teaching;
- obtained a sound knowledge of the essential theories of learning and teaching in higher education;
- used the newly acquired knowledge and skills for designing a teaching innovation. By innovation we mean the introduction of learning and teaching methods, approaches, or activities into their teaching practice that program participants have not used before and/or that are not commonly used in their institution;

- taught a session or a series of sessions of a course following this design in the Fall 2017 semester; and
- collected and evaluated the evidence about the outcomes of their teaching innovation on student learning.

4. Program Team[1]

a. Program Coordinator
Pleschová, Gabriela, *University of Economics, Bratislava,* Slovakia (gabriela.pleschova@euba.sk)

b. Session Leaders/Coaches
Curran, Roisín, *Ulster University,* United Kingdom (curranroisin3@gmail.com)
Davies, Vicky, *Staff and Educational Development Association*, United Kingdom (vickydavies01@gmail.com)
Simon, Agnes, *Masaryk University, Brno,* Czech Republic (asimon@mail.muni.cz)
Simon, Eszter, *University of Birmingham,* United Kingdom (eszter_simon@yahoo.com)
Szabo, Matyas, *Central European University,* Hungary (szabom@ceu.edu)

c. Supporting Staff Members
Puškárová, Paula, *University of Economics, Bratislava,* Slovakia (paula.puskarova@euba.sk),
Vespalcová, Vendula, *Masaryk University,* Czech Republic (vendula.vespalcova@seznam.cz)

5. Brief Overview of the Program

The program starts with an 8-day face-to-face summer school during which program participants will have the opportunity to discuss essential theories in higher education. They will be encouraged to apply that knowledge through designing such educational tools as a course syllabus or a session plan, a learning activity, and a learning assessment method. Additionally, they will be invited to apply the acquired knowledge to their teaching practice by preparing a short teaching demonstration and to use this experience to reflect on how to become more effective practitioners.
The second part of the program is a year-long online coaching program that will provide support to the participants in the daily challenges of their teaching. During this segment of the program participants will work with a coach, who will guide them toward a deepened internalization of good pedagogic practices. Participants will be assigned a series of tasks designed around the implementation of their teaching innovation.

6. Program Evaluation

Participants completing the program will be awarded a certificate of attendance. This program is worth 10 ECTS credits. The program is also accredited internationally by the Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) under the auspices of its Professional Development Framework (SEDA-PDF: https://www.seda.ac.uk/pdf) and the SEDA-PDF award Supporting Learning (https://www.seda.ac.uk/supporting-learning). SEDA is the professional

[1] To learn more about the program coordinator and session leaders, consult their bibliographies in Appendix A at the end of the document.

association for staff and educational developers in the UK, promoting innovation and good practice in higher education, and is seen by many as the shaper of thought and initiator of action in staff and educational development, not only in the UK but in the international domain also.

7. Program Fees/Funding

There is no participation fee. The program is supported through an Erasmus+ grant, which covers the costs of the program including the summer school and the subsequent coaching component.

8. Eligibility and Application

a. <u>Eligibility</u>: Doctoral students from all fields of study of the University of Economics in Bratislava (EUBA) and from the Faculty of Social Studies at Masaryk University (MUNI) are eligible to apply. Prospective participants are expected to teach in the Fall 2017 semester to be able to fulfill the requirements of this program.

b. <u>Application</u>: Interested applicants are required to submit the following documents:

1) *Brief curriculum vitae*.
In no more than 1-2-pages, they should highlight their educational background, most significant publications, previous and current teaching-related responsibilities (if any), and teaching and research interests.

2) *An essay on teaching experience*.
In this essay of about 800 words applicants should discuss their **teaching experience** reflecting on the following questions:
- Have they taught at the university level either by acting as seminar leaders, teaching assistants or independent lecturers?
- What characterizes the course(s) they have taught so far? (name, subject, class size, level, student preparedness, class composition, number of sessions per week, length of the sessions, etc.)
If they have taught more than one course, it is preferred that—after listing all courses taught—they single out one course and discuss that course in the rest of the essay.
- How did they teach? (Prevalent teaching methods, experience with using other methods —e.g. lectures, discussion, lab activities, games, simulations, etc.)
- What was one aspect of their teaching they think went well? What did they consider the biggest challenge they faced?
- Whom and how frequently do they discuss their teaching with? What do their conversations entail?

If the applicant has not taught in any capacity thus far, s/he should note this at the beginning of the essay, and discuss the above issues related to the university course they liked most during their undergraduate career. This entails an evaluation of the teaching practices of the professor of the chosen course and renders a couple of the above questions (e.g. other courses taught) void.

3) *Motivation Letter*
   In a second essay of 400-600 words, applicants should address their motivation to participate in the program and their **future plans and ambitions as educators**. In this, they should consider the following questions:
   - What kind of educators they want to become? What do they currently do to improve as teachers?
   - What has motivated them to apply for this program?
   - What do they think characterizes good teaching?
   - How do they see themselves different at the end of the program from who they are today as a teacher?

c. <u>Criteria for Assessing the Applications</u>
   Twenty participants will be selected each year for the program. The following criteria will be used in selecting the program participants:
   1) applicants' level of interest for participating in the program;
   2) their level of commitment to work as a teacher and to improve their own teaching as well as their student's learning experience; and
   3) the overall quality of the application.

<u>THE SUMMER SCHOOL</u>

1. Summer School Preparations

Successful applicants selected for participating in the program should arrive prepared to the summer school by having completed a series of shorter tasks. These are:

a. <u>Filling out a questionnaire about the course they are going to teach in the next semester</u>
   This questionnaire will be based on the course they are going to teach in the next semester. Those who have not yet been informed of their teaching assignment should contact the person responsible for assigning teaching duties for doctoral students and inquire about their assignment. (If this yields no result, they may consider completing the exercise based on the course most often assigned to a student of their standing and interest.)
   They will have to provide information on:
   - Name, type (compulsory, elective) and level of the course (bachelor, master), year of study (first, final, etc.)
   - Class size
   - Scheduling (time and place)
   - Type of a potential classroom: size, seating, available equipment (a board, flipchart, technology, etc.)
   - Teaching expectations toward doctoral students (teaching style, involvement in assessing students, prevalent teaching and learning approaches, full course vs. a few sessions or discussion sections, freedom over course content, teaching/learning methods and assessment, etc.)

b. Interviewing an experienced educator.

Program participants should talk to an experienced educator—a faculty member, not a doctoral student—in their home institution. The interviewee should have ideally taught the course that the program participant is (likely to be) assigned. The purpose of the interview is to proactively seek out a senior faculty member and learn via his or her experience. Participants are expected to summarize their findings in a short (1-2-page) report (it may be bullet-pointed). Participants are expected to address the following issues:

1) *Interviewee experience* (number of times the interviewed person has taught the course the participant is (likely) to teach; how has s/he taught this course; challenges of teaching this course)
2) *Expected student profile* (type and characteristics of students taking this course in the past, e.g. majors vs. non-majors, 1st year vs. advanced students; learning habits of students: active or passive during their classes, regularly completing their assignments or not, typical difficulties students encounter, etc.)
3) *Reflections* (student expectations regarding the course; most common complaints; how much student feedback on course evaluation form is useful; in what way, if at all, the interviewee adjusts his/her teaching as a reflection to feedback; has his/her delivery of content material changed since he started teaching, and if yes, how; what advice can the interviewee share, etc.)
4) *Institutional characteristics* (process of assigning courses to faculty members and doctoral students; influence over the courses to be taught; the level of freedom over course content, teaching/learning methods and assessment of student performance; expectations toward doctoral students regarding their teaching performance and the content of their teaching; if an undergraduate student is challenging the grade what is the grievance procedure, etc.)

Program participants are recommended to conduct the interview before the end of the Spring 2017 semester.

c. Gathering course evaluation information

Program participants should collect information on the process of student (teaching) evaluations conducted in their institutions. This includes obtaining a copy of the feedback form and learning about how the form is administered (online, face-to-face, by whom, and when course instructors get the feedback in hand). Participants should write 2-paragraphs to summarize their findings. In this summary, they should describe the kind of evaluation carried out in their institution, and state and justify their opinion on if the collected information is sufficient for instructors to enhance their teaching in the future.

d. Session plans/notes

Participants who have taught previously at the university level and used a session plan or notes for their class detailing what they planned to do and/or say during the session are asked to submit one of these plans. It is up to the participant to choose the session plan she or he wants to submit, but the original plan should not be modified in any ways. Handwritten session plans or plans in another language than English are also acceptable. The submission should include the title of the course and actual class.

e. Readings

Participants are expected to complete a series of short readings that session leaders assign for some of their sessions, and thus, arrive prepared to all sessions. These readings are listed under "preparatory reading" in the session descriptions below and instrumental to the completion of a successful session and for participants to get the most of their summer school experience. Participants will receive the assigned readings before the beginning of the summer.

Some session descriptions also contain "follow-up readings", which are recommended (but not compulsory) to consult in case participants would like to refresh they knowledge about or to explore further a certain topic. Additionally, those interested in consulting other sources with regard to issues raised during the summer school may start by checking out the following material:

Phil Race. 2009. *In at the Deep End – Starting to Teach in Higher Education*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University (55 pages).

For the actual readings consult each summer school session below or the reading list in Appendix B.

2. List and Description of Summer School Sessions

Each session lasts for 90 minutes and is held in Hotel Premium except when otherwise noted.

a. Session 1: Practical Introduction to the Summer School

Session Leader: Eszter Simon

Day and time: Monday, August 28, 18:30-19:45.

Description: The purpose of this session is to introduce the program (goals, structure, sponsors, session leaders and participants) and facilitate participants' cooperation and active involvement in the summer school. The session will start with participants completing a questionnaire for the research component of the grant project. The session will then continue with the general introduction of the program participants, their motivation to attend the summer school, and their expectations regarding the week ahead. The session will conclude with imparting essential information about the program. Participants will be invited to ask practical questions relating to the program.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- identify expectations toward the program
- appreciate the value of peers as learning companions for own learning
- feel more comfortable about the new learning environment

Preparatory reading: None.

Other: Participants should bring their laptop/tablet to the session.

b. Session 2: Student-Centred Learning

Session Leader: Eszter Simon

Date and time: Monday, August 28, 20:00-21:30.

Description: The purpose of the session is to introduce students to the idea of student-centeredness. The session will start out from taking a snapshot of participants' current understanding of 'teaching' and 'learning' before introducing the idea of student-centeredness. Then the class will explore the meaning of student-centeredness at different areas of teaching and in contrast with teacher-centeredness. The session will also seek to deconstruct misconceptions of student-centeredness. The concluding part of the session will explore the question of 'how one becomes a student-centered instructor?'.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- define and give examples of student-centered learning
- identify the advantages and challenges of student-centered teaching/learning
- understand how they can move their teaching towards a more student-centered direction

Preparatory reading: None.

Follow-up reading (Recommended): Peter Kugel. 1983. "How professors develop as teachers." *Studies in Higher Education* 18(3): 315-328.

c. Session 3: Student-Centredness and Institutional Context

Session Leader: Roisín Curran

Day and time: Tuesday, August 29, 9:00-10:30.

Description: This session will allow participants to focus on some of the wider issues that inform curriculum design and delivery. Specifically, participants will draw on their summer school preparation and preparatory reading to consider the impact of: self, students, and institution and how these interact to inform a developing understanding of teaching as a social practice.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will be able to

- reflect on the needs of their student cohorts and the implication of this for course design.
- explore the interplay between their disciplinary background and personal beliefs and how this contributes to the process of becoming a teacher.
- examine any institutional characteristics and identify constraints and opportunities for curriculum design and delivery.

Preparatory reading: Saranne Weller. 2016. "Becoming a teacher in higher education." In *Academic practice: developing as a professional in higher education*. London: Sage. pp. 1-7.

d. Session 4: Course Design

Session Leader: Roisín Curran

Day and time: Tuesday, August 29, 11:00:12:30.

Description: This session will introduce participants to an outcomes-based curriculum. The main theoretical underpinning of this approach is provided by Biggs (2003) model of constructive alignment. Participants will consider how sessions, courses and programmes are designed such that their students should be able to demonstrate the achievement of skills and knowledge (written as outcomes) appropriate for the level and size of the taught session etc.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will be able to

- explore a basic model of an aligned curriculum
- critique an example of constructive alignment in a curriculum
- relate the constructive alignment model to learning taxonomies

Preparatory reading: John Biggs. An introduction to Constructive Alignment.

e. <u>Session 5: Class Planning</u>
<u>Session Leader</u>: Roisín Curran
<u>Day and time</u>: Tuesday, August 29, 13:45-15:15.
<u>Description</u>: This session will draw on theoretical underpinnings explored in sessions 3 and 4 along with an exploration of deep and surface learning. Participants will engage in designing learning outcomes using constructive alignment and Bloom's taxonomy for a real-life course that they will deliver in the Fall semester. In addition, participants will consider the sequencing of class sessions for their course to enable their students to achieve the learning outcomes. This practical session will allow the application of theory to practice and as such will be interactive and formative in nature.
<u>Learning outcomes</u>: By the end of this session participants will be able to
- structure a real-life teaching session using Bigg's model of constructive alignment
- consider equally session content, learning activities, how the student is assessed and the disposition of self as tutor.
- apply learning taxonomies to the planned session as appropriate so that students will adopt a deep approach to learning.

<u>Preparatory reading</u>: None.

f. <u>Session 6: Morning Feedback: Course Design Planning</u>
<u>Session Leader</u>: Roisín Curran
<u>Day and time</u>: Wednesday, August 30, 9:00-10:30.
<u>Description</u>: This session will be structured for peer review of the draft course design plans completed the previous evening. Participants will be allocated in groups of three and within these groups each participant will read the course design of their two peers, spending a minimum of 5 minutes on each design (a rubric will be provided to aid the peer-review). A ten-minute discussion session will follow when each group will discuss the merits and challenges of their respective course designs. Feedback from each group will then be discussed in a plenary session with signposting to further resources where appropriate.
<u>Learning outcomes</u>: By the end of this session participants will be able to
- Give and receive formative constructive feedback in relation to the integration of Bigg's model of constructive alignment in course design.
- Challenge their own conceptions of what makes an optimum course design.
- Gain confidence in enhancing their designs and recognize that curriculum design is an iterative practice requiring ongoing reflection and enhancement.

<u>Preparatory reading</u>: None.
<u>Session preparation</u>: Participant will prepare a course design/session plan based on instructions distributed during the summer school.

g. <u>Session 7: Learning Activities for Small Groups</u>
<u>Session Leader</u>: Agnes Simon
<u>Day and time</u>: Wednesday, August 30, 11:00-12:30.
<u>Description</u>: We often associate small group teaching (SGT) with discussions – indeed, small group sections are called 'discussion groups' in some colleges. While discussion may be particularly appealing in such an environment, there is a wide variety of other teaching approaches that can facilitate learning in small groups. This session will

explore these alternative teaching instruments. We will analyze the advantages and disadvantages of SGT as well as the necessary skills and investment from both the student and the teacher for SGT to succeed. We will use our reading as a thesaurus while students will apply those that they find most applicable to their teaching.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will be able to

- appreciate the importance of small group teaching for an enhanced learning experience in a college setting;
- tackle issues arising out of in-class discussions;
- use a couple of SGT activities in their teaching.

Preparatory reading: Kate Exley and Reg Dennick. 2004. "Chapter 4: Working with Student Groups. Techniques and Methods in the Classroom." In *Small Group Teaching. Tutorial Seminars and Beyond*. London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer. pp. 50-75.
Reading related task: After reading the required text, participants should draw up two columns: in one they should list those methods that they think can be applied in the course they teach in Fall 2017 and in the other column they list methods they think would not work. The should list all methods in one or the other column.
Other: Participate should bring the compulsory reading to class in either printed or digital format.

h. Session 8: Learning Activities for Large Groups
Session Leader: Agnes Simon
Day and time: Wednesday, August 30, 13:45-15:15.
Description: As students, all of us have taken at least one lecture course where we were very interested in the subject and yet felt pain suffering though the actual classes. However, large group teaching should not be synonymous with either boring or frontal lecturing. Nor should it depend solely on the oratorical skills of the instructor. There are several ways to capture the attention of students and involve them in the learning process even in large groups. This session will introduce participants to those methods including transforming your large group into small groups and inserting shorter activities into a lecture.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will be able to

- utilize the good practices of large group teaching in class preparations
- appreciate the benefits of active learning methods for student learning in large groups
- build active learning exercises into their large group teaching.

Preparatory reading: Linda B. Nilson. 2014. "Making the Lecture a Learning Experience." In *Teaching at its Best. A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 113-125.

i. Session 9: Morning Feedback: Learning Activities
Session Leader: Agnes Simon
Day and time: Thursday, August 31, 9:00-10:30.
Description: This is a practical session where participants are going to work with the daily activity exercises on learning activities that they have submitted the previous evening. They will work in pairs/groups and we will also use plenary discussions to provide constructive formative feedback. In doing so, participants will critically assess their exercise against the various criteria included in the rubrics provided with the

original instructions for the exercise. Participants will also reflect on the strengths and weakness of their draft design.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- be able to critically assess their own and their peers' learning activity design
- gain confidence in giving and receiving formative feedback about teaching designs
- learn how to align in-class activities with learning objectives of the full class session and the entire course

Preparatory reading: None.

Session preparations: Participants will prepare an active learning activity for their students based on instructions distributed during the summer school.

j. Session 10: Assessment 1: Theoretical Background

Session Leader: Matyas Szabo

Day and time: Thursday, August 31, 11:00-12:30.

Description: Assessment is integral to the achievement of good university learning and to good course design. This session will discuss the general role and major characteristics of student assessment in a student-centered learning paradigm, by looking at assessment as a way of enhancing learning, rather than only measuring the fulfillment of learning outcomes. The session will also address the question on how to select and align assessment tools to the aims, and learning outcomes of a given course.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will be able to

- reflect on the role of assessment in a student-centered university course
- distinguish between formative and summative, continuous and final assessment, as well as between implicit and explicit grading criteria.
- select the most appropriate assessment method for a new or revised course that they design, and align it to other parts of the course

Preparatory reading: Phil Race. 2003. "Why Assess Innovatively." In *Assessment Matters in Higher Education: Choosing and Using Diverse Approaches*, eds. Sally Brown and Angela Glasner. Buckingham: The Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press, pp. 57-70.

k. Session 11: Assessment 2: Practical Implementation

Session Leader: Matyas Szabo

Day and time: Thursday, August 31, 13:45-15:15.

Description: This session provides an essential understanding of the most problematic issues in students' assessment and explores the most widely used forms of assessment in a critical way (by outlining their usefulness and shortcomings). The session will then move on to look at more complex and innovative assessment methods that encourage self-development and collaborative learning (such as group projects, portfolios, self-assessment tools, learning diaries): good practices, concrete examples will be discussed, as well as various ways of marking/grading students' performances.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will have

- analyzed various existing assessment methods and described the contexts in which they should be used
- identified the shortcomings of the traditional ways of assessing student learning and responded to some disadvantages of existing assessment techniques

- designed innovative and complex assessment tools appropriate for newly designed university courses

Preparatory reading: Rebecca Attwood. 2009. "Well, what do you know?" *Times Higher Education*, January 29.
Reading related task: Based on this article, summer school participants should write a list of the shortcomings of traditional final exams and essays, and think of a method of assessment that would meet most of the 10 principles of effective assessment formulated by the National Union of Students (towards the end of the article).

l. Session 12: Morning Feedback: Assessment
Session Leader: Matyas Szabo
Day and time: Friday, September 1, 9:00-10:30.
Description: During this feedback session participants will review each other's home assignments and provide constructive feedback. They will be divided into small groups of 3 or 4, based on their disciplines, in such a way as to make sure that everybody in the class receives feedback from peers working either within the same discipline or in related ones. Each participant will be asked to read all parts of their peers' assignment, but will need to comment and provide suggestions only on one particular part of the assignment (either the overall description of the assessment in the course, or the rubric for a specific type of assessment). After these group discussions, each group will choose one of the assignments to be presented to the rest of the class, and outline the suggestions its author received from peers.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will
    - become familiar with and critically analyze different possible types of assessment methods within their discipline (or related ones) based on the principle of constructive alignment
    - be able to offer constructive feedback to peers on the overall design of their course assessment and on rubrics for assessing different types of student tasks

Preparatory reading: None.
Other: Participant will prepare a student assessment based on instructions distributed during the summer school.

m. Session 13: Supervision
Session Leader: Vicky Davies
Day and time: Friday, September 1, 11:00-12:30.
Description: Supervision is an essential but often ignored part of the teaching profession in higher education. Everyone who has been a PhD candidate has a thorough knowledge of this process from the receiving end. This session will use that experience as a starting point in first defining the expectations toward professors in tutoring and supervision and then discussing how we could best provide the students with these. The session will discuss the meaning, elements, and conduct of supervision and tutoring. One aim of this session is to discuss how to increase efficiency at this area: increase dissertation quality, improve supervisor-supervisee communication, achieve some level of student-satisfaction with the advisory process, and enhance them with adequate time-management for tutors and supervisors.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- understand and critically evaluate the expectations and characteristics of effective supervision
- identify techniques and tools for enhancement of the supervision experience

Preparatory video: Qualities of a good research supervisor (Griffith University, Australia)

n. Session 14: Technology Enhanced Learning
Session Leader: Vicky Davies
Day and time: Friday, September 1, 13:45-15:15.
Description: This session is designed to give participants a flavor of how technology-enhanced learning (TEL) approaches can be used to promote flexible and active learning engagement for students. It also provides participants with an opportunity to explore ways in which they may incorporate a TEL approach to their own learning and teaching practice.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- appreciate the range of TEL approaches and how these may be utilized in key learning scenarios;
- understand the challenges and opportunities of integrating a TEL approach to learning and teaching;
- reflect on and plan for how they may adopt a TEL approach within their own learning and teaching practice.

Preparatory videos: 1) Technology-Enhanced Learning (Concordia University); Blended Learning and Technology Integration (Jen Johnson)
Assigned material related task: Whilst participants are watching the clips they should complete the grid below to allow them to capture the main points of the clips and think about them within their own learning and teaching context.

	Technology-Enhanced Learning (Concordia University)	Blended Learning and Technology Integration (Jen Johnson)
What are the main pedagogies used within the TEL examples outlined?		
In what ways might you think of using these TEL elements within your own teaching?		
What challenges might you encounter in trying to integrate these approaches within your own practice?		
What professional development might you need to undertake to help you integrate these		

TEL elements within your own practice?		

Follow-up reading (Recommended): James Pickering. 2015. *How to start using technology in your teaching*. York: Higher Education Academy.

o. Session 15: Using Feedback to Enhance Teaching
Session Leader: Vicky Davies
Day and time: Saturday, September 2, 8:30-10:00.
Description: This session is designed to challenge participants' perceptions of the nature and purpose of feedback from both the student and tutor's perspectives. It will present some recent assessment and feedback projects and critically examine their recommendations. Participants will be asked to review their own current feedback practices and identify effective approaches they might adopt going forward.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- critically evaluate the purpose of feedback from the perspective of the student and the educator;
- identify feedback mechanisms to enhance their students' learning;
- conceptualize ways in which their own feedback practice might be enhanced.

Preparatory reading: Feedback FAQs for staff (University of Edinburgh)
Reading related task: Prior to accessing the webpage above, participants should complete the first column of the grid below to analyze their current thoughts and/or practice with regard to feedback. Afterwards, they are asked to read the webpage and make a note of the ideas mentioned in the second column. Finally, they should think about the any similarities and/or differences between their own attitudes and practice and those of the article.

	Your thoughts and beliefs	Ideas from Feedback FAQs for staff (University of Edinburgh)
Why does feedback matter?		
What is feedback given on?		
What counts as 'feedback'?		
What forms does feedback take?		
Who can give feedback?		
What evidence is there that feedback actually makes a difference?		
Why might feedback become a cause for concern?		

Follow-up reading (Recommended): Higher Education Academy. 2012. *10 strategies to engage students with feedback*. York: HEA.

p. Session 16: Becoming a Reflective Practitioner
Session Leader: Vicky Davies
Day and time: Saturday, September 2, 10:15-11:45.

Description: This session will introduce participants to the concept of reflective practice in learning and teaching, through the exploration of key models of reflective practice. It will allow participants to explore ways in which their own reflection on practice may be developed based on scholarship and/or professional knowledge and evaluation.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- describe the role of reflective practice
- recognize some models of reflective practice
- identify ways in which evidence and scholarship may be used to effectively support their own reflection and development

Preparatory reading: None.

q. Sessions 17-19: Microteaching
Location: University of Economics, Bratislava
Session Leaders: Agnes Simon, Eszter Simon, Matyas Szabo
Day and time: Sunday, September 3, 9:15-10:30; 10:45-12:15; and 12:30-13:45
Location: University of Economics (EUBA)
Description: In this session, participants will have the opportunity to try in a small group and "safe setting" some of the teaching techniques they intend to use in their future courses, and will receive constructive peer feedback from colleagues who will perform the role of students and classroom observers. The group will experience a range of different teaching strategies and styles, and will thus have the opportunity to see various classroom management techniques, and think about the possibility to adapt those to their own classroom practices. Participants will be offered the chance to have their performance recorded and shared with them for the purposes of self-evaluation.
Learning outcomes: By the end of the session participants should be able to:

- Prepare and demonstrate a micro-teaching session in their own discipline: align elements of teaching to the intended outcomes of a teaching-learning activity
- identify the strengths and shortcomings of their own and their peers' teaching techniques
- provide constructive feedback on various teaching techniques and suggest ways to improve them
- analyze the effect of certain teaching approaches on students' classroom behaviors and performances

Preparatory reading: None.
Session preparations: Participants will design your micro-teaching presentation based on instructions distributed during the summer school.

r. Session 20: Potential Challenges and How to Deal with Them
Session Leader: Eszter Simon
Day and time: Monday, September 4, 9:00:10:30
Description: The purpose of this session is to facilitate the practical implementation of what participants have learnt from the summer school once they return to their institutions. During this session, session leader(s) and participants will jointly identify potential obstacles, and will seek solutions for them. The precise list of issues will depend on participants to a large degree. The session is designed to explore ways to enable participants to overcome institutional barriers, to take control, to build a support network, to overcome personal insecurities, and to avoid burnout.

Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- be aware of issues that may decrease the effectiveness of applying the principles of student-centered learning into their classroom practice.
- identify several copying strategies to these problems
- feel more in control with regard to their teaching

Preparatory reading: None.

s. Session 21: Concluding Session
Session Leader: Agnes Simon
Day and time: Monday, September 4, 11:00-13:00
Description: In this practical session, participants will conclude their summer school by completing a survey and receiving a certificate. They will also be reminded of the exercises that they will need to revise and upload to the course's website. Participants will also be introduced to the nature and structure of the upcoming 1-year online segment of the course. We will also talk more in depth about the first assignment and participants will also have the opportunity to ask questions they may have.
Learning outcomes: By the end of this session participants will

- know what is expected of them to close their summer school activity
- learn the purpose and details of the 1-year online module program

Preparatory reading: None.
Other: Participants should bring their laptop/tablet to the session.

3. Summer School Schedule

See schedule in Appendix C.

4. List of Theories Introduced during the Summer School

a. General approaches to learning and teaching
Student-centered teaching
Reflective teaching
Scholarship of teaching and learning
Community of practice

b. Concepts
Bloom's taxonomy
Constructive alignment
Deep and surface learning
Formative and summative assessment

5. Assessment of Summer School Performance (Teaching Portfolio)

Participants' performance will be assessed formatively during the summer school, that is, they will receive feedback on their assignments so that they can identify their strengths and weaknesses and focus on areas where they need further work. Accordingly, during the summer school program participants are expected to build a teaching portfolio that comprises a series of documents:

a. Course Design
Using a template provided by the instructor, participants will create a course design for the course that they will teach in the Fall 2017 semester. In doing so, they apply in practice Biggs' model of constructive alignment while considering equally the session content, outcomes, learning activities, how the student is assessed, and their own disposition as instructor. They will apply learning taxonomies to the planned course sessions as appropriate so that their students will adopt a deep approach to learning.

b. Design for a Learning Activity
Participants will plan a 15-30-minute long in-class learning activity for a class selected from the above course design. This activity will teach a concept, theory, or approach to the students that the participant is to cover in that class, using an active learning method from those discussed during the summer school.

c. Design for an Assessment Instrument
Working with their course design plan, participant will design the modes of assessment for their course. In this, they will align assessment tools with the learning outcomes of the course and create a grading rubric for one of those tools.

d. Short reflection on the microteaching exercise
Participants will prepare an 800-word report on their microteaching presentation experience in which they will discuss the following issues:
   1) *A brief summary of the microteaching design*. Participants provide information on the content and teaching approach/method of their microteaching. During this, they demonstrate how the concepts of teaching and learning that they have become familiar with during the summer school have influenced their thinking.
   2) *Critical assessment of the microteaching presentation*. In this section participants will reflect on (1) what they think were the strongest points of their teaching and why, (2) what they think were the shortcomings of their microteaching and why, and (3) how much their presentation was in line with the requirements for good teaching practices.
   3) *Vision of developing as a teacher*. Based on the above, they conclude with discussing (1) how they are going to make use of this microteaching experience the next time they teach and/or (2) in what ways the microteaching assignment has helped them to develop further as an instructor the next time you are going to teach. Their focus should be on both what they want to keep unchanged from their teaching practice and what they think they will do differently and how.

Program participants will draw up the first draft of the documents in the afternoon following the daily sessions. These assignments give the participants an opportunity to apply knowledge and skills from the formal sessions and are due 10 p.m. the same day by uploading them to the course site. Program participants are also expected to bring an electronic copy of each assignment—and, if available, an electronic device such as a laptop or tablet on which they can read the assignments—with them to the relevant following morning session, where good

practices and common challenges, will be addressed and discussed with participants in a collective feedback session.
An improved version of each document, addressing points raised in the feedback the participant received during the summer school, is to be uploaded to the course site by 10 p.m., Sunday, 17 September, 2017.

6. Surveys

Summer school participants will be asked to fill out an online survey at both the beginning and end of the summer school. The content of their response is not going to influence their assessment but will be invaluable to the evaluation and enhancement of the program itself.

THE ONLINE COACHING ELEMENT

The one-year online segment of the program consists of a semester-long teaching practicum and a series of related written and oral assignments to be completed by the participants. The online part will last from September 2017 until May 2018. Each participant will be assigned a coach with whom they will consult about his or her teaching practice and receive guidance and feedback on assignments. Completing the summer school is a prerequisite for enrolling on to the online segment. Participants will sign up for the online part together with the summer school. It is assumed that only those who teach in the Fall term can participate in the program as the program includes work based practice.

1. The Coaching Relationship

a. The Coach

A coach is a type of mentor whose role is to guide, advise and support a teacher to achieve the program outcomes. Coaches support participants through consultations and feedback. Consultations between the coach and the teacher should mainly relate to program assignments and can be initiated by either side. Coaches are expected to devote about 10 hours per semester to guiding, advising and providing feedback to each of their coachees. Coaches may also be consulted about any difficulties program participants experience during their teaching practice.

b. The Program Participant

Each participant will have the opportunity to list his or her preferred choice for a coach among summer school session leaders by no later than 10pm, Friday, 1 September 2017. Participants are encouraged to base their preference on professional criteria such as the nature and subject of their planned teaching innovation. Participant preferences will be honored as best as possible given the requisite of equal number of participants per coach. Participants will be informed about their coach in 24 hours. A good start is fundamental for establishing a good work relationship between coach and coachees. Therefore, coaches who are present in the summer school may decide to hold their first consultation before the summer school ends. If the coach does not initiate such a meeting, participants are encouraged to seek his or her coach out and set up either a meeting in person during the summer school (if feasible) or schedule a Skype chat by no later than 12 September 2017 to discuss the upcoming tasks and establish a routine for distance communication and establish a routine for distance communication.

The participant has the right to receive feedback on their work in a timely fashion, i.e. within 5 working days after the submission deadline. If the coach is busy with other responsibilities, he or she is expected to indicate within this timeline when the response will be given. In case the participant receives no timely feedback, they are advised to contact the program coordinator as soon as possible. This does not apply for late submissions—in this case the swiftness and depth of the feedback depend upon the coach's schedule and may affect provided feedback.

c. Communication

Communication between the coach and the participant is conducted through electronic means such as email and Skype. Therefore, both the coach and the participant are expected to access and respond to their emails in a timely manner. When using Skype, it is recommended that calls are recorded so that the participant can revisit comments from his/her coach (There is freely downloadable software for this purpose, for example, http://voipcallrecording.com/MP3_Skype_Recorder). If feasible, the coach and the program participant may also agree and meet in person.

The language of communication between the coaches and program participants is English.

2. The (Virtual) Classroom

The program has its own e-learning website within the Masaryk University learning management website. Upon admission to the program participants receive the link to this online platform where, after registering, they can access program documents. Since detailed assignment descriptions, templates, reading materials, etc. are posted to this site and it is also where participants submit their assignments, participants (and coaches) are advised to check the site at the beginning of each week to see if there is new information posted. Participants are required to submit all their assignments via this website, where they will also receive their feedback from their coaches.

3. Participant Activities

a. Expected Hours of Study/Work per Week

On average, program participants are expected to devote about 3 hours per week to program related activities excluding their teaching hours. This is likely to be unevenly distributed across the weeks.

b. Assignments

Program participants will have a series of tasks to complete during the semester. In general, these converge around five major assignments. The descriptions below give a general sense of the nature of these assignments; detailed instructions will be distributed in due course during the program.

- **Teaching Innovation**

  This assignment consists of three steps and will be completed in the Fall semester.

  1) *Teaching Innovation Proposal*

     Participants will decide upon and justify the teaching innovation they would like to carry out during the semester. In this, they will reflect upon a series of such issues as their student audience/class composition, topic of the innovation, the teaching challenge that prompted them to try a new approach, the related pedagogical concept, what they would like to do as part of the innovation, how they expect the new approach to enhance student learning, and how they will evaluate the outcomes of the innovation on student learning. Participants will present their answers to these and other questions by completing a short questionnaire.

2) *Teaching Innovation Session Plans and Research Design*
Participants will prepare a 1-page outline for each class session of their teaching innovation describing how they plan to execute their teaching innovation. Session plan(s) should be based on the good practices of session design that program participants learnt about during the summer school.
Participants are also required to submit a 600-word essay on the research design relating to the evaluation of the impact of their teaching innovation. This essay should contain information on data collection instruments (survey, student assignment or exercise, classroom observation, etc.), proposed method(s) of analysis (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods), and a justification for their selection.
The innovation is expected to be implemented at least in three classes. Similarly, data should be collected on the outcomes of teaching in at least three classes.
If the participant introduces his/her own data collection document(s) (for example a self-designed student feedback survey), rather than rely on an exercise already designed and included in the syllabus, this needs to be submitted at this time as well.

3) *Implementation of Innovation and Data Collection*
Once the coach approves the participant's research design, session plan(s), and, if relevant, the data collection instrument(s), the participant has to put those into practice during their teaching and collect the actual data.

- **Reflection Paper on the Outcomes of the Teaching Innovation**

4) *Reflection Paper*
The 2,400-word reflection paper describes the nature of the participants' innovation and evaluates its impact on student learning (i.e. analyses the results of the teaching innovation). As a culmination of the activities completed during the online segment of the program, this reflection paper contains a) a brief description of the teaching and learning context; b) description of the problem the teacher aims to tackle with the innovation; c) identification of a pedagogic theory or concept on which the participant has based the innovation and what, following that theory, the participant expects to find when assessing the impact of the innovation (i.e. hypotheses); d) research design including method(s) of data collection and analysis; and e) description and evaluation of the results together with a discussion to what extent those meet the innovation objective(s) and how they relate to extant theories and empirical analysis. In addition to detailed instructions, participants will also be provided with sample reflection

papers, which were produced as part of a previous program. Papers that successfully present the outcomes of teaching innovation will be invited as contributions to an edited volume. More details about this can be found under "Scholarship Opportunity" below.

- **Teaching Philosophy**

5) *Statement of Teaching Philosophy*
In this 600-word statement, program participants will explain what they consider their aim(s) of teaching and learning in higher education and connect it with their pedagogic practice. When writing their teaching philosophy, participants are suggested to discuss some of these issues:
    - what they think teaching and learning in higher education should aim for, how they see their job as a teacher,
    - how they are trying to attain the aim(s) of their teaching in their everyday classes,
    - how they believe student learning should be assessed,
    - what educational theory or principle they find particularly important and how they try to reflect it in their teaching practice,
    - what they consider major challenge(s) while teaching, specifically for their discipline, for them as a beginner teacher, for their institution, etc.
    - how they attempt to address these challenges,
    - what links they see between their research and teaching,
    - why and how they think they would like to change their teaching in the future,
    - if they feel the need for improvement as a teacher and in what areas.

- **Contribution to Program Evaluation**

6) *Filling Out an Electronic Questionnaire*
The program ends with the participants filling out an online questionnaire to provide feedback to the organizers. The questionnaire will be available during the last week of the semester and after the last major assignment (the reflection paper) is submitted. While the completion of the questionnaire is mandatory for the fulfillment of program requirements, opinions expressed therein has no bearing on participant performance assessment.

c. Schedule of Assignments
All writing assignments will require the submission of a first draft and a final version and submitting both documents is a requirement for the successful completion of the program. Both the draft and final versions are expected to be completed according to the participants' best effort. Final versions should incorporate revisions that address suggestions and concerns raised by the participant's coach in his/her feedback on the first draft.
Each of the assignments has a date by which it should be submitted. While the program coordinator and coaches can accommodate emergency situations and changes in the

participants' obligations, participants are expected to communicate any changes as soon as possible.
Coaches may choose to remind program participants of impending deadlines, but it remains the participants' responsibility to submit assignments on time, and communicate with their coaches when assistance is needed.
Coaches and program participants should consider keeping electronic and/or printed copies of all of their assignments and feedback so that they can consult them later.

Assignment Category	Tasks		Due Date
--	Skype or other communication with coach		12 September 2017
Teaching innovation	1) Teaching innovation proposal	1st Draft	17 September 2017
		Final Version	1 October 2017
	2) Teaching innovation session plan(s) and research design	1st Draft	15 October 2017
		Final Version	29 October 2017[2]
	3) Implementation of teaching innovation including data collection		End of fall semester
Reflection paper on the outcomes of innovation	4) Reflection paper	1st Draft	16 February 2018
		Final Version	25 March 2018
Teaching philosophy	5) Statement of teaching philosophy	1st Draft	22 April 2018
		Final Version	6 May 2018
Contribution to program evaluation	6) Completion of the program evaluation questionnaire		20 May 2018

d. <u>Fostering a community of practice (optional activities)</u>
A community of practice is often essential in finding like-minded people and support. Hence, the purpose of the following non-compulsory activities is to allow opportunities for program participants to engage in regular discussions about teaching and learning and receive feedback and advice from colleagues. It is expected that this will contribute to creating a community of practice among colleagues that consider teaching as important, work to improve student learning, and support each other.

- **Classroom Observation of Teaching Innovation**
  As part of the implementation of their teaching innovation in the Fall (November/early December), participants are strongly encouraged to arrange a one-time classroom visit of a fellow program participant. The visitor shall observe and take notes on classroom activities, dynamics, instructor and student behavior, and so on, preferably by completing the classroom observation protocol prepared by program organizers. The participant and the visitor are expected to meet afterwards to discuss the visitor's comments. In their reflection paper, participants are encouraged to consider comments received during the peer observation.

[2] If a program participant teaches earlier than in November (as for example when working as a teaching assistant to a professor), he or she is expected to contact the program coordinator and his or her coach as soon as possible to arrange earlier dates of submission.

- **Informal Coffee and Cake Meetings**
  Program coordinators will organize an informal meeting at each institution. While enjoying free coffee and cake participants will have the opportunity to meet again and discuss how their teaching practice in general and teaching innovation in particular are going. The meeting is planned for November.

4. Scholarship Opportunity

The program organizers offer 20 scholarships—of €200 to successful program graduates, who submit all assignments in the required quality and are willing to develop further their teaching innovation reflection paper for publication in an edited volume. This scholarship serves as a partial compensation for participants' commitment to the program and devoting time and effort to collecting, evaluating and reporting on the outcomes of innovation on student learning to produce a high-quality report.

5. Program Board

Program board is the final board to record the final decision in relation to outcomes from the program and SEDA award

Meeting of the Board: The Board meets the week after the end of the program. The 2017/2018 program ends on 20 May 2018 and the meeting of the Board is going to take place between 21 and 25 of May 2018.

Roles of the Board: The Board is to determine regarding each program participants if they met the conditions set for the successful completion of the program. The Board also selects the program participants who will be awarded scholarships.

Composition of the Board: The Board consists of the Program Coordinator, an External Reviewer and a third member. The External Reviewer is a person who neither serves as a session leader/online coach for any of the program participants nor is affiliated with the institution offering the program, i.e. the University of Economics. In 2017/2018 the role of the External Reviewer is filled by Dr. Pusa Nastase, who is a Senior Manager at the Yehuda Elkana Center for Higher Education at Central European University. The third member is a professional in higher education teaching and learning. In 2017/2018 this will be a person working for one of project partners, i.e. University of Tartu or Lund University.

Roles of the External Reviewer: The External Reviewer has multiple duties. First, the Reviewer reads a sample of participant assignments, assesses them using the same evaluation criteria as the program coaches, and compares his/her evaluations with those of the program coaches. This is used to evaluate the participants' fulfilment of program outcomes. Second, in case a participant contests the assessment of his/her coach, the Reviewer reads the assignment to make the final judgement in cooperation with the other Board members. Third, the Reviewer contributes to the review of the program by participating in the discussion regarding the program evaluation and feedback about the program.

Successful Completion of the Program: Participants who engage with the program and submit all the required assignments and whose assignments meet the expected standard defined here are considered to have successfully completed the program and are awarded a certificate of completion. The "expected standard" means that (1) the participant follows the main instructions of the assignment, including its expected length, structure and deadlines, and, (2) where relevant, implements the feedback received from his/her coach for the draft version into the final version of the assignment. As for the deadlines, under exceptional circumstances when a participant's other duties conflict with the program requirements, the program coordinator and the respective coach may extend the deadline(s). Conflicting obligations and a request for modified deadlines needs to be communicated to the respective coach and/or program coordinator ahead of the deadline.

Awarding the SEDA Certificate. Where the participant has successfully completed the program (as outlined above) and all his/her assignments are assessed to have fulfilled all three program outcomes (student-centeredness, critically-reflective approach to teaching and use of pedagogic theory) at least at "low level", a SEDA Certificate for Supporting Learning will be awarded.

Awarding the scholarship. Participants who have successfully completed the program and achieved the SEDA certificate may also be awarded a scholarship. Various levels for the completion of program outcomes are defined in the Coach Evaluation form, which is included in the Participant handbook (Appendix A). In the case where there are fewer scholarships than the number of participants meeting these criteria, scholarships will be awarded to participants with the best assessment based on the outcomes recorded on the Coaches Evaluation form.

Number of scholarships: For 2017/2018 academic year there are twenty scholarships available.

Value of each scholarship: €200

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This program is supported by a generous grant from the European Union's Erasmus+ program ("Extending and Reinforcing Good Practice in Teacher Development" No. 2016-1-SK01-KA203-022551).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project is co-funded by the European Union's Erasmus+ program

Extending and Reinforcing Good Practice in Teacher Development" No. 2016-1-SK01-KA203-022551

Appendix A: Biographies

Roisín Curran is an academic developer at Ulster University. She is a tutor on the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Practice. Her interest in teaching and learning is in curriculum design that moves away from overemphasis on specific discipline knowledge to more process models of curriculum sequencing that scaffolds the student journey and that which promotes: a relational-based partnership approach, active learning, peer support, and ways of thinking and practicing the discipline. She has a particular interest in student engagement and her recent doctoral research focused on the impact of a 'students as partners' approach on staff student engagement. She has also led a cross-disciplinary project team at Ulster as part of a national "What works? Student Retention & Success Change Programme (2013-16)" involving 13 institutions across the UK. This collaborative action research has further extended our knowledge of what works in relation to improving student retention and success. Roisín is a Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.

Vicky Davies is an academic developer at Ulster University. She is a Course Director of the institution's Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Practice, which includes a pathway for post-graduate students. Her interests in learning and teaching include using technology to enhance the learning experience, developing research and project-based skills and innovation in assessment and feedback. She has a particular interest in professional development in higher education, and her current research is focused on the influence of professional recognition on academic identity. She is especially interested in the use of dialogic mechanisms to assess and support academic professional development, and has worked closely with the UK's Higher Education Academy (HEA) in the development of resources to support HE institutions in developing such approaches. She is Co-Chair of the Professional Development Framework Committee of the Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) and an accreditor and consultant for the HEA. Vicky is a Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.

Gabriela Pleschová works at the Institute of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava. She is a graduate from Oxford University (2012, MSc. in Education) and her studies appeared in journals as for example European Political Science and Journal of Political Science Education. She is the co-editor of "Teacher Development in Higher Education. Existing Programs, Program Impact and Future Trends" (Routledge, 2012). She is the co-convenor of Teaching and Learning Politics standing group of the European Consortium for Political Research. In 2013, she was awarded Senior Fellowship from the Higher Educational Academy.

Agnes (Agi) Simon is an Educational Development Advisor at Masaryk University, working on the Erasmus+ Project "Extending and Reinforcing Good Practice in Teacher Development". She has dual interests in Political Science and Teaching and Learning. She specializes in American foreign policy, summit diplomacy, Central European politics, and the relationship of science fiction and politics. Her current research focuses on U.S. presidential summit meetings, the U.S-Soviet Hotline, and teaching about foreign policy decision-making. She taught in various private and public liberal arts and research schools in the United States and has been a facilitator in the ECPR Teaching and Learning Summer School. Her interest in teaching and learning is primarily in online/hybrid learning, the use of simulations and games in the classroom, problem-based learning, improving critical writing skills, and the use of student reflections in the classroom.

Eszter Simon is Research Fellow in International Relations and Psychology at the Institute for Conflict, Cooperation and Security at the University of Birmingham. Dr. Simon has expertise in theories of foreign policy analysis, psychological approaches in particular. Her primary research focus is on the Moscow-Washington Hotline in the Cold War, identifying patterns how trust influenced the use of this communication device. She is also interested in the politics of terrorism and insurgency, American foreign policy in general as well as Hungarian foreign policy. She has published several articles and an edited book about teaching and learning issues. Most recently she edited The Handbook of Teaching and Learning Political Science and International Relations (Edward Elgar Publishing) with John Ishiyama and Will Miller. She is Fellow of the Higher Education Academy and a facilitator at the bi-annual Teaching and Learning Summer School of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). Her particular interest is in the methodology of skills teaching, assessment methods, course design and problem-based learning.

Matyas Szabo, as senior manager at the CEU's Yehuda Elkana Center for Higher Education and former director of the university's Curriculum Resource Center (2001-2012), is one of the center's trainers in higher education. He has offered capacity building and faculty development workshops for university professors and staff in more than 20 countries, and is involved in several international projects targeting curriculum reform and faculty development in higher education. Matyas conducted higher education workshops for a number of partner organizations and projects, such as the Open Society Foundations' Higher Education Support Program, the Civic Education Project, the Palestinian Faculty Development Program, etc. He received his MA from CEU's Sociology department in 1994. He has worked as a junior research fellow and teaching assistant at CEU's Center for the Study of Nationalism, and as an analyst intern at the Radio Free Europe/Open Media Research Institute in Prague. In the area of teaching and learning, Matyas' interests are student-centered learning, course design, and students' assessment.

Appendix B: Summer School Reading List

Compulsory Preparatory Reading or Video (Required)

1. Session 3: Student-Centeredness and Institutional Context, Tuesday, August 29, 9:00-10:30.
   Reading: Saranne Weller. 2016. "Becoming a teacher in higher education." In *Academic practice: developing as a professional in higher education*. London: Sage. pp. 1-7.

2. Session 4: Course Design, Tuesday, August 29, 11:00:12:30.
   Reading: John Biggs. An introduction to Constructive Alignment. (1 page)

3. Session 7: Learning Activities for Small Groups, Wednesday, August 30, 11:00-12:30.
   Reading: Kate Exley and Reg Dennick. 2004. "Chapter 4: Working with Student Groups. Techniques and Methods in the Classroom." In *Small Group Teaching. Tutorial Seminars and Beyond*. London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer. pp. 50-75.

4. Session 8: Learning Activities for Large Groups, Wednesday, August 30, 13:45-15:15.
   Reading: Linda B. Nilson. 2014. "Making the Lecture a Learning Experience." In *Teaching at its Best. A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 113-125.

5. Session 10: Assessment 1: Theoretical Background, Thursday, August 31, 11:00-12:30.
   Reading: Phil Race. 2003. "Why Assess Innovatively." In *Assessment Matters in Higher Education: Choosing and Using Diverse Approaches*, eds. Sally Brown and Angela Glasner. Buckingham: The Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press, pp. 57-70.

6. Session 11: Assessment 2: Practical Implementation, Thursday, August 31, 13:45-15:15
   Reading: Rebecca Attwood. 2009. "Well, what do you know?" *Times Higher Education*, January 29. Thursday, August 31, 13:45-15:15.

7. Session 13: Supervision, Friday, September 1, 11:00-12:30.
   Video: Griffith University, Australia. Qualities of a good research supervisor.

8. Session 14: Technology Enhanced Learning, Friday, September 1, 13:45-15:15.
   Video: 1) Concordia University: Technology-Enhanced Learning; 2. Jen Johnson: Blended Learning and Technology Integration.

9. Session 15: Using Feedback to Enhance Teaching, Saturday, September 2, 8:30-10:00.
   Reading: University of Edinburg: Feedback FAQs for staff. (2 pages)

Follow-up Reading (Recommended)
The items on this list discuss topics covered in selected summer school sessions and provide additional information on those issues.

1. Kugel, Peter. 1983. "How professors develop as teachers." *Studies in Higher Education* 18(3): 315-328.

2. Higher Education Academy. 2012. *10 strategies to engage students with feedback*. York: HEA. (5 pages)

3. Pickering, James. 2015. *How to start using technology in your teaching*. York: Higher Education Academy. (15 pages)

4. Race, Phil. 2009. *In at the Deep End – Starting to Teach in Higher Education*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University. (55 pages)

Appendix C: Summer School Schedule

Time	MONDAY August 28	TUESDAY August 29	WEDNESDAY August 30	THURSDAY August 31	FRIDAY September 1	SATURDAY September 2	SUNDAY September 3	MONDAY September 4
7:00-8:30		Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast
8:30-8:45						S15: Using Feedback to Enhance Teaching VICKY		
8:45-9:00							Travel to EUBA	
9:00-9:15		S3: Student-Centeredness and Institutional Context ROISIN	S6: Morning Feedback: Course Design Planning ROISIN	S9: Morning Feedback: Learning Activities AGI	S12: Morning Feedback: Assessment MATYAS			S20: Potential Challenges and How to Deal with Them ESZTER
9:15-10:00							S17: Microteaching ESZTER, MATYAS, AGI	
10:00-10:15						Coffee Break		
10:15-10:30						S16: Becoming a Reflective Practitioner VICKY		
10:30-10:45		Coffee Break	Coffee Break	Coffee Break	Coffee Break		Coffee Break	Coffee Break
10:45-11:00							S18: Microteaching ESZTER, MATYAS, AGI	
11:00-11:45		S4: Course Design ROISIN	S7: Learning Activities for Small Groups AGI	S10: Assessment 1 (Theory) MATYAS	S13: Supervision VICKY			S21: Concluding Session AGI
11:45-12:15						Lunch	Coffee Break	
12:15-12:30								
12:30-12:45						Boat Trip	S19: Microteaching ESZTER, MATYAS, AGI	
12:45-13:00		Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch			
13:00-13:45								Lunch
13:45-14:00		S5: Class Planning ROISIN	S8: Learning Activities for Large Groups AGI	S11: Assessment 2 (Practical implementation) MATYAS	S14: Technology Enhanced Learning VICKY		Travel to Hotel	
14:00-15:00							Lunch	
15:00-18:00								
18:00-18:30	Dinner*	Dinner*	Dinner*	Dinner*	Dinner*			
18:30-19:00	S1: Practical Introduction to the Summer School ESZTER					Free Evening**		
19:00-19:45							Dinner*	
19:45-20:00	Coffee Break							
20:00-21:30	S2: Student-Centered Learning ESZTER							
21:30-22:00								
22:00		**Daily Activity Deadline:** Course design	**Daily Activity Deadline:** Learning Activities	**Daily Activity Deadline:** Assessment	**Deadline:** Coaching Preference Form		**Deadline:** Microteaching Reflection Paper	

* Dinner for MUNI students only.
** No dinner at hotel.

Appendix D: Chronological Schedule for the Online Coaching Program

SUMMER 2017			
Week	*Date*	*Deadline*	*Tasks*
--	--	12 September	Last day for Skype phone call with coach
--	--	17 September	1st draft, teaching innovation proposal

FALL 2017			
Week	*Date*	*Deadline*	*Tasks*
1	18/9-24/09		
2	25/9-1/10	1 October	Final version, teaching innovation proposal
3	2/10-8/10		
4	9/10-15/10	15 October	1st draft, teaching innovation session plans and research design (and related data collection documents)
5	16/10-22/10		
6	23/10-29/10	29 October	Final version, teaching innovation session plans and research design (and related data collection documents)
7	30/10-5/11		
8	6/11-12/11	TBD	Informal coffee & cake meeting in Brno and Bratislava
9	13/11-19/11		
10	20/11-26/11		
11	27/11-3/12		
12	4/12-10/12		
13	11/12-17/12	End of Fall Semester: 17 December	Implementation of teaching innovation and data collection
			Completion of optional classroom visit and follow-up discussion, observation protocol uploaded at the course website
Break	18/12-1/1		
Exam Period	2/1-10/2		
Break	11/2-18/2	16 February	1st draft, reflection paper

SPRING 2018			
Week	*Date*	*Deadline*	*Tasks*
1	19/2-25/2		
2	26/2-4/3		
3	5/3-11/3		
4	12/3-18/3		
5	19/3-25/3	25 March	Final draft, refection paper
6	26/3-1/4		
7	2/4-8/4		
8	9/4-15/4		
9	16/4-22/4	22 April	1st draft, statement of teaching philosophy
10	23/4-28/4		
11	29/4-6/5	6 May	Final version, statement of teaching philosophy
12	7/5-13/5		
13	14/5-20/5	20 May	End of program questionnaire
--	--	1 June	Presentation of certificate of attendance in Brno and Bratislava

Appendix E: Summer School Preparatory Assignments

1. Questionnaire about Fall 2017 Teaching
   Fill out the questionnaire posted together with this assignment based on the course you are going to teach in the Fall 2017 semester.
   If you have not been informed of your teaching assignment yet, please contact the person responsible for assigning teaching duties for doctoral students in your institution to obtain the relevant information. If this yields no result, complete the exercise based on the course most often assigned to a student of your standing and interest and the classroom in which those courses are often taught.

2. Interviewing an Experienced Educator
   Talk to an experienced educator—a faculty member, not a doctoral student—at your university and summarize your findings in brief report. You may conduct the interview in a language other than English, but please write the report in English.
   We recommend that you contact the potential interviewee to set up the interview for a mutually agreeable time and day as soon as possible—our experience is that faculty members are more difficult to get access during the summer.
   The purpose of the interview is to proactively seek out a senior faculty member and learn via his or her experience. Therefore, the ideal person to interview is someone who has taught the course you are likely to teach in the Fall 2017 semester. If you are co-teaching the course with a professor or senior colleague, it is a good idea to interview that person. If no such persons are available, interview someone whose teaching duties are similar to yours in some ways (e.g. also teaches an introductory course, has a specialty similar to yours, teaches large/small groups, etc.)
   The written report should be about 1-2 pages long (500-800 words). The report may use bullet-points where relevant.
   In your report, you should address the following the issues:
   5) *Interviewee experi*ence (number of times the interviewed person has taught the course the participant is (likely) to teach; how has s/he taught this course; challenges of teaching this course)
   6) *Expected student profile* (type and characteristics of students taking this course in the past, e.g. majors vs. non-majors, 1st year vs. advanced students; learning habits of students: active or passive during their classes, regularly completing their assignments or not, typical difficulties students encounter, etc.)
   7) *Reflections* (student expectations regarding the course; most common complaints; how much student feedback on course evaluation form is useful; in what way, if at all, the interviewee adjusts his/her teaching as a reflection to feedback; has his/her delivery of content material changed since he started teaching, and if yes, how; what advice can the interviewee share, etc.)
   8) *Institutional characteristics* (process of assigning courses to faculty members and doctoral students; influence over the courses to be taught; the level of freedom over course content, teaching/learning methods and assessment of student performance; expectations toward doctoral students regarding their teaching performance and the content of their teaching; if an undergraduate student is challenging the grade what is the grievance procedure, etc.)

3. Gathering Information on Course Evaluation
   Collect information on how the students view teaching—also known as student or course—evaluations/feedback conducted at your university and write 2-paragraphs to summarize your findings.
   This includes obtaining a copy of the feedback form itself and learning about how the form is administered (online, face-to-face, by whom, and when course instructors get the feedback in hand). Then write your summary describing the kind of evaluation carried out at your university, state your opinion on whether or not the collected information is sufficient for instructors to enhance their teaching in the future and explain your position.

4. Submitting Session Plans/Notes from Earlier Teaching
   If you have taught previously at the university level and used session plans or notes for your teaching detailing what you planned to do and/or say during the session submit ONE of these plans/notes. It is up to you to choose the session plan you want to submit; however, we ask that you do not modify it in any ways for this submission. In addition to your name, the submission should include the title of the course and the title or topic of the actual class session. Handwritten session plans or plans in another language than English are acceptable.
   If you have not taught at the university level, skip this exercise.