

# Teaching formats draft model

## Background

ITU systematically works towards all of its study programmes becoming ideal which i.a. means that the academic contents and the teaching are both world-class. The quality standards handling this were found to lack a description of the proportion of different teaching formats in each course. Head of Studies therefore initiated a project of including teaching formats in ITU's quality standards and appointed a working group to come up with a suggestion. The working group counts Lene Pries-Heje, Peter Sestoft, Rachel Douglas-Jones, Aske Kammer, Annelise Agertoft and Mikkel Hvidtfeldt Andersen. Initially, the idea was to revise quality standard 2.9, but the working group decided that it was a better solution to add the teaching formats to quality standard 2.10.

The aim of the teaching format addition to the quality standard 2.10 is to enhance the quality of the teaching and assure that ILOs are met. By increasing the awareness and ensuring a more clear articulation of the teaching formats in the preparation of courses and at the same time aligning expectations with the students, the hope is that the improved quality of teaching will positively influence both student evaluations and completion rates.

The purpose of the present document is to outline a model for how to present the teaching formats to both faculty and students. Based on input from Peter Sestoft, Rachel Douglas-Jones, Aske Kammer, other university web sites and the literature sources mentioned in the reference list at the end of this document, Mikkel and Annelise from Learning Support have produced this draft model for teaching formats as a replacement of quality standard 2.9 (Contact & Feedback) and a further qualification of quality standard 2.10 (Constructive Alignment). Once the model and the revised quality standard has been approved by EG and EM, the revised quality standard becomes effective.

## The proposed model

The proposed model consists of two budgets:

1. A teaching budget (seen from the teacher perspective)
2. A student activity budget (seen from the student (and authority?) perspective)

## Teaching budget categories

For any course at ITU there will be a standard set of upper level learning categories – the teaching budget. These are the proposed categories to comprise all types of learning activities:

1. Preparation for lectures
2. Participation in lectures
3. Preparation for exercises
4. Participation in exercises
5. Project work<sup>1</sup>
6. Mandatory activities including preparation<sup>2</sup>
7. Exam

---

<sup>1</sup> This category stands for project work which is **not** part of exercises.

<sup>2</sup> In case a course comprises mandatory activities, the course manager must estimate the total hours a student should spend on them. Time spent on mandatory activities may not be counted double (= do not count in i.e. exercises as well, but subtract equal number of hours from both preparation of exercise and participation in exercise).

## 8. Other<sup>3</sup>

### The process of working with the teaching budget from a course manager's perspective

The teaching budget work becomes part of the course manager's quality assurance of the course descriptions in the course catalogue.

When planning a course and describing it in the course catalogue, the course manager will be prompted to pick a number of the teaching budget categories in a drop down menu.

When distributing the workload on the teaching budget categories, the course manager will do this based on course ECTS. For each teaching budget category, the course manager must state how many hours of the total course hours the average student is expected to spend on the activity. The course catalogue will remind the course manager of the expected workload for each ECTS amount, including exam:

- 2.5 ECTS = 69 hours
- 7.5 ECTS = 206 hours
- 15 ECTS = 412 hours

Besides the choice of standard teaching budget categories, the course manager writes a short prose based text as an argument for the choice of learning activities in relation to the intended learning outcomes (this is as the model is currently).

### Example of Student activity budget

The below list is an example of what the student would see in the course base for a 7.5 ECTS course with oral exam (B1) incl. 20 minutes of preparation and exam preparation at home.

Each student is expected to participate in the following activities with the below estimated distribution of hours:

Activity	Hours	Hours without mandatory activities
Preparation for lectures	72	77
Participation in lectures	9	14
Preparation for exercises	72	77
Participation in exercises	9	14
Mandatory activities including preparation	20	
Exam	24	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>206</b>

The below list is an example of what the student would see in the course base for a 7.5 ECTS course with exam submission for groups with following oral exam supplemented by the submission (DG2) incl. exam preparation at home and project work throughout semester.

Each student is expected to participate in the following activities with the below estimated distribution of hours:

---

<sup>3</sup> Any activities that may not fit one or more of the upper level categories.

Activity	Hours	Hours without mandatory activities
Preparation for lectures	42	42
Participation in lectures	28	28
Preparation for exercises	28	28
Participation in exercises	52	52
Mandatory activities including preparation		
Exam	24	24
Other	32	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>206</b>

## Learning activities

The below list attempts to include all types of learning activities at ITU grouped according to the upper level categories defined above. We have listed them here as a quality check whether all ITU learning activities may fit in the teaching budget categories. The list need be qualified by members of the faculty with regard to learning activities that are actually applied at ITU. Anything missing?

Learning activities/ teaching budget	Preparation for lectures	Participation in lectures	Preparation for exercises	Participation in exercises	Project Work	Mandatory activities incl. prep.	Exam	Other
Data collection			X		X	X		
Exercises w. TA				X	X			
Exercises w/o. TA				X	X			
Field work			X		X	X		
Giving feedback (teacher/TA)			X	X	X			
Group work w. supervision			X	X	X			
Group work w/o. supervision			X	X	X			
Lab work			X	X	X			
Lecture		X						
Listening to podcasts	X				X		X	
Literature search	X		X		X		X	
Peer feedback	X	X			X	X		
Pitching		X			X			
Portfolio			X			X		
Poster sessions		X		X	X	X		
Project work	X		X	X	X	X		
Reading	X		X		X		X	
Receiving feedback	X	X			X	X		
Roleplay		X		X				
Seminars		X		X				
Solving tasks/assignments	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Student presentations		X		X	X	X		
Supervision (group or multiple groups)					X	X		
Watching videos	X	X	X				X	
Workshop		X		X		X		
Writing assignments	X		X		X	X		
Other	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

## Suggested change of Quality Standard 2.10

Existing text is shown in black and the proposed new text in red.

2.10 Quality Standard	
Constructive Alignment	
Summary	All courses are designed according to the <a href="#">Constructive Alignment principles</a> .
Predicate	<p>New/changed course descriptions are not finalised unless they have been approved by Learning Support. Every semester, before course start, Learning Support check the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intended Learning Outcome (ILO) description is written according to the SOLO taxonomy;</li> <li>- ILOs, planned Learning Activities and Exam Forms are aligned and described in some detail.</li> <li>- <b>Teaching formats budget are selected and student activity budget are presented and aligned to ILOs.</b></li> </ul>
Responsible	Learning Support
(Quality) Work Process	<p>Before the beginning of each semester, Learning Support check all course descriptions. In cases where the ILOs are not consistent with the SOLO taxonomy, where ILOs planned Learning Activities and Exam Forms are not in alignment <b>or in cases where teaching formats budget and student activity budget are not presented</b>, Learning Support have an e-mail correspondence or a one-to-one meeting with the Course Manager, who then modifies the course description for the approval of Learning Support. If Learning Support cannot approve a course description, they inform the relevant Head of Study Programme in writing.</p>
Place of record	Study Programme Report
Alarm Handling Process	Mandatory: The Head of Study Programme records cases of unapproved course descriptions in the Study Programme Report, for the consideration of the Education Group.

## Reference List

John Biggs & Catherine Tang, Teaching for Quality Learning at University, McGraw-Hill, 2011 (4. edition).

Svinicki & McKeachie McKeachie's teaching tips (strategies, research, and theory for College and University Teaching), Cengage Learning, 14th revised ed.

Rienecker, Lotte, Jørgensen, Peter Stray, Ingerslev, Gitte Holten & Dolin, Jens (red) (2013): Universitetspædagogik. Samfundslitteratur. (In Danish) - In English: "University teaching and learning".