

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Series editor's preface</i>	x
1 Global approaches to teaching, learning and assessment	1
Introduction	1
Do we currently have a global higher education environment?	3
Do we have shared concepts of pedagogy?	3
Discussion	3
Diverse assessment approaches	6
Diverse expectations concerning feedback	7
Teaching approaches	8
Do we have shared learning and communication technologies?	9
Do we have shared learning contexts?	10
Do we have shared languages for learning?	11
Do we have shared concepts of student support?	16
Conclusions	18
2 Changing paradigms underpinning higher education learning internationally	20
Introduction	20
Designing for 21st century learning	20
Making learning happen in universities	23
Learning to think in the 21st century	24
Conclusions	30
3 Designing, managing, reviewing and refreshing your curriculum	32
Introduction	32
Designing the curriculum	32
Choosing what is to be taught	33
Creative curriculum design: a checklist	34
How will the topic be taught?	36
Fostering autonomous learning	39
How will the curriculum be assessed?	42

Reviewing the quality of the curriculum	45
Refreshing and revalidating programmes	48
External examiners	49
Learning from student evaluations	50
Conclusions	54
4 Delivering the curriculum in diverse contexts	55
Lecturing: is the lecture dead?	56
Making better use of traditional lectures	56
Some things it's best to avoid	58
Flipping classrooms	58
Some tips on flipping classrooms	59
What do students do in lectures?	62
What is a large group?	66
Conclusions	73
5 Making spaces for learning work: learning in diverse settings	75
Introduction	75
Laboratories as active learning spaces	76
Art and design studios	79
Fieldwork	80
Simulations: for fieldwork when you can't get out in the field	83
Reviewing teaching in diverse learning settings	83
Conclusions	86
6 Helping students develop appropriate literacies for effective learning	88
Introduction	88
Academic literacy	88
Information literacy	92
Assessment literacy	98
Social and interpersonal literacy	101
Conclusions	105
7 Making assessment and feedback fit-for-purpose	106
Assessment in context	106
Propositions for assessment reform	106
Assessment <i>for</i> learning	107
Quality assurance and enhancement initiatives	109
A strategy for making assessment 'fit-for-purpose'	110

Eight principles underpinning fit-for-purpose assessment	112
Conclusions	126
8 Designing and implementing assessment and feedback for learning	127
Designing good assessment	127
The importance of giving good feedback	128
Six ways of giving feedback efficiently and effectively	132
Computer-assisted assessment to improve the efficiency of assessment	135
Other forms of computer-assisted assessment	137
Audio feedback	140
Encouraging students to use feedback well	143
Fairness and good academic conduct	143
Assessing fairly	144
Poor academic conduct	145
The big picture: towards programme-level assessment	148
Conclusions	150
9 Using appropriate technologies to support learning	151
Introduction	151
What are the appropriate technologies?	151
Technologies to support curriculum delivery	152
Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)	157
Technologies to support student engagement: using digital and social media to support networking and collaboration	160
Using Twitter for academic purposes	161
Technologies to support assessment	164
Technologies to support student engagement	166
Technologies to support curriculum management and quality assurance	169
Conclusions	171
10 Fostering students' employability and community engagement	172
Introduction	172
Determining and developing relevant and transferable graduate attributes	172
Demonstrating evidence of employability	174
Community engagement	182
Conclusions	185

11 Supporting those who deliver good learning, teaching and assessment	186
Introduction	186
Initial training for those new to university teaching	186
Beyond initial training	192
Conclusions	200
12 Conclusions: key pedagogic issues in global higher education	201
<i>References and further reading</i>	205
<i>Index</i>	215

1 Global approaches to teaching, learning and assessment

► Introduction

There are many books on teaching and assessment at higher educational level, both scholarly reviews of academic practice and pragmatic guidance books offering advice to novices and others on how to be an effective student-centred academic. So why write another? My aim here is to use the best of the scholarship underpinning teaching and learning in universities in the last half-century or more while at the same time taking account of the changing nature of the student body, higher education institutions and potentially of learning itself. However, my particular ambition in this volume is to do so from a global perspective, recognising that many extant texts about tertiary teaching are written from the perspective of a single nation, or a very limited group of nations, usually within highly-advantaged, commonly English-speaking nations. What I have sought to do here is draw on good practice from six continents, supported by a framework of pedagogic discussion and review, which is designed to be of highly practical value to educators worldwide.

This book cannot provide comprehensive coverage of all national practices, nor do I claim that the good practices I include here are the only ones worth discussing. While I cover a wide range of teaching approaches across subjects and disciplines, and refer to undergraduate, masters level and doctoral education, it would be inappropriate to suggest that this is a complete compendium of global perspectives. What I can claim is that I am proud to celebrate here alternative voices, and to help to make them audible beyond their home nations through the good practice accounts (GPAs) I include from six continents. I chose to shun the arrogance of the term 'best practice', since it is impossible to judge what is 'best' without knowing all of the possible alternatives. In seeking international perspectives, I looked for descriptions of pedagogic practice that were regarded as strong in their

own countries, without trying to impose my own quality judgements. I have been delighted with the range and scale of the accounts, and by the generosity of the authors in sharing them.

The chapters in this book are designed to provide a broad perspective on enhancing the diverse practices that comprise the design, delivery, assessment and support of the curriculum, together with some thoughts about how we can best support the people charged with undertaking those tasks, including academics, learning support staff and managers, and on how to work strategically to improve the ways we make it happen.

After exploring in this chapter some of the differences students and their teachers experience across the globe, and how we might respond to them, I next explore in Chapter 2 some of the theories and concepts that underpin successful teaching in higher education. Chapter 3 is concerned with translating these into the curriculum we offer our students, ensuring that everything we do is constructively designed (Biggs and Tang, 2007), by working out in advance what we need our students to know and be able to do at the end of the programme, then thinking through how to deliver this, assess whether the students actually can do what we anticipated they could and evaluate our success at doing so. This process is not something that can be undertaken and then continuously implemented, so the chapter also covers enhancement of the quality of provision, through review and refreshment. In Chapter 4 I move to discussing the concept of curriculum delivery and some of the ways we actually do deliver in a range of settings, particularly but not exclusively in lectures, and in Chapter 5, I consider other settings in which students work, within and beyond the campus. Chapter 6 focuses on students, the recipients of curriculum delivery, stressing the importance of fostering various literacies: academic literacy, information and digital literacy, assessment literacy and social and interpersonal literacies, which together are necessary to help students achieve their best. The next two chapters cover aspects of assessment: in Chapter 7 looking especially at how we can make it fit for the purposes it was designed to achieve, and in Chapter 8 considering how assessment can be fully integrated with the learning process, rather than being a separate activity tagged on to the end. Crossing all chapters, but particularly covered in Chapter 9 are thoughts on technologies to support learning and good examples of how these are put into practice. Looking towards the end of the student lifecycle, on graduation students move beyond the university, so Chapter 10 reviews how we can promulgate not just students' employability but also how they can integrate into the wider community, with a toolkit of knowledge, skills and capabilities to equip them to make the best of life opportunities. Recognising

the importance of ensuring the effectiveness of those who help students learn, Chapter 11 examines initial and ongoing training and development activities for university teachers, so they can be competent and current in their practices. The final chapter offers some conclusions on what really matters in higher education and how those of us who work in it can practise to good effect in a global community.

At the outset, therefore, I want to raise a number of questions about higher education pedagogical approaches and practices, and to unpack some of the assumptions that are currently made about how teaching and assessment are actually undertaken in universities in different nations, since unsurprisingly academics commonly assume that the dominant discourses in their own nations are the ones that prevail worldwide.

► **Do we currently have a global higher education environment?**

Do we have, for example, shared concepts of pedagogy, compatible technologies for learning, comparable learning contexts, shared languages for learning and shared concepts of student support between nations? I would argue that we do not, and that gaining greater mutual understanding in these areas can be enormously helpful in supporting the recruitment and retention of international students and staff, in improving success rates and satisfaction scores, and in helping to make universities supportive learning communities.

► **Do we have shared concepts of pedagogy?**

Table 1.1 aims to tease out some of the underlying perceptions we each have about pedagogies in our own nations. Consider what your answer would be to each of the questions: 'Yes. Of course, without hesitation, what's the problem'; 'It depends. Possibly'; 'No. Under no circumstances. It would be completely inappropriate'.

► **Discussion**

There can be significant variations in approaches to teaching and learning based on cultural factors. These can, according to Ryan (2000), centre on the extent to which historical texts and previously accumulated knowledge

Table 1.1 International perceptions of pedagogy

Would you as a lecturer/ academic tutor:		Yes	Possibly	No	Comments
1	Accept your final year student's invitation to his wedding?				Would this depend on how long you had taught the student? On how lavish the wedding is expected to be?
2	Encourage your students to interrupt and ask questions in your lecture?				In some nations, lectures are encouraged to be dialogic, but in others they are formal occasions with very large cohorts where interruptions are strongly discouraged.
3	Accept gifts from your students?				Would it depend on the size of the gift? The timing (e.g. not just before an assessment period? After graduation?) Does your university have a policy on this?
4	Encourage your students to pose opposing views to your own?				Would your response be the same in relation to seminars, lectures, tutorials, private conversations?
5	Let your students 'friend' you on Facebook?				This might depend on how you are using your own Facebook page and what privacy settings you have on it.
6	Follow your students on Twitter? Encourage your students to follow you on Twitter?				Might this depend on whether you have a Twitter account solely for academic/professional purposes?
7	Meet up with your students in a bar after classes?				If you said no, is the issue meeting outside class, or is it the location (a place where alcohol is served)?
8	Advise your student on how to use the university toilets?				One of the GPAs in this book mentions doing this, as does one of the authors quoted in this chapter
9	Help your students with graduate job applications? Will you write references for them?				Does your response depend on how long and how well you know them?
10	Provide detailed feedback and advice on draft assignments?				Does this depend upon the stage within the programme? Some academics comment extensively on first assignments. In some countries very detailed feedback on drafts is an expectation at all levels.

Would you as a lecturer/ academic tutor:		Yes	Possibly	No	Comments
11	Routinely spend an hour with your students after a lecture discussing queries?				In some cultures, academics are timetabled for at least an hour after lectures to clarify issues. In others, it's normal to speed from one lecture to another.
12	Ask your students to call you by your first name?				Whether you do or not will depend on cultural mores and the power distinction between academics and students.
13	Require your students to participate in assignments where they are assessed as members of a group?				In some nations this is uncommon or indeed frowned on.
14	Allow your students to negotiate the mark you are awarding them?				Might it be possible for students to convince you that they deserved a higher mark? Or is this completely out of the question?
15	Timetable exams on Friday afternoons, Saturdays or Sundays?				This might be problematic for students with devout religious convictions.

is respected and how much students are expected to have their own ideas, how far authority figures, including teachers, are respected (or not) and in particular, how far it is acceptable to be overtly critical of authoritative texts or figures, whether a 'correct' answer is sought, and the extent to which alternative responses are acceptable.

Cultural mores can impact on expectations of behaviour and thereby can impact on assessment. For example, 'Eastern, Latin American and some Caribbean cultures can deem it rude to make firm eye contact: while in the UK it is often thought rude not to' (Grace and Gravestock, 2009, p. 61). Maori students in New Zealand similarly retain close eye contact for personal relationships (or to frighten enemies). An insistence on the desirability of direct eye contact can be problematic where the assessment criteria for a presentation specifically mention it, which may be difficult for some students, including female students from cultures where eye contact with males is considered brazen.

Expectations around participation in **group work** can similarly pose problems, with some students being thrown by expectations to do so as part of assessed activities if they have no experience of it to date. Until

recently in Denmark assessing students collectively in groups was illegal in higher education, due to government ministers' uncertainties about assessment. In some nations, group work is an expectation of students throughout school education, so nothing strange to encounter at university, but for students from other nations, it may be a first! Students from cultures where the genders are usually strictly segregated may find participating in mixed groups challenging initially.

Asking and answering questions: in many Western nations, there is often an atmosphere of 'give and take' in lectures, with questions and interruptions welcomed, but in some Eastern European nations, for example, to stop a lecturer in full flow for a query would be considered quite rude. There can be issues in cultures where staff are almost venerated and students are not prepared to ask questions in class or seek support, for fear of 'losing face' themselves or causing the teacher to 'lose face'. These divergences are not problematic so long as the local contextual 'rules' are shared, otherwise some students can be regarded as inappropriately forward and others as excessively passive.

Similarly, the extent to which students expect academics to find time to talk to them personally, live or electronically, can vary across cultures. Some universities in Pacific Rim nations provide substantially more one-to-one support than students might expect in the UK, for example, acting almost *in loco parentis* to help students do well, so their students might feel short changed when arriving to study in a nation where fees are high and overall expectations of support are lower.

Some nations provide substantially less support than is common in the UK. For example, in some higher education institutions (HEIs) in Italy, it is not uncommon for the (very low) fees to cover only mass lectures, with seminars and personal tutoring available as extras.

There is diversity in the extent to which **robust discussion** is valued, with students from some cultures preferring to focus on the importance of harmony and co-operation within the group rather than the interests of the individual within it (Ryan, op. cit.), and others where challenge is more highly valued.

► **Diverse assessment approaches**

There are likely to be differences in emphasis on unseen time-constrained exams (which are fairly ubiquitous, but vary in length from one hour on the Indian subcontinent commonly to nine hours in Norway!), multiple-choice questions (widely used in the US and many Pacific Rim nations) and

oral defences, vivas and presentations, which are much more common in Northern Europe and Scandinavia than in the UK. What is actually assessed is variable too, since some national contexts prize accurately demonstrating the learning of content above all other elements, whereas in others, use of that information in context is the prime expectation. As Beetham proposes:

‘When the focus is on accuracy of reproduction, learners will be given opportunities to practise the required concept or skill until they can reproduce it exactly as taught. When the focus is on internalisation, learners will be given opportunities to integrate a concept or skill with their existing beliefs and capabilities, to reflect on what it means to them, and to make sense of it in a variety of ways.’

Beetham, 2007, p. 33

Group assessment is strongly encouraged in nations where problem-based learning is commonplace and is frowned on or banned in others. (Denmark, as mentioned earlier, has only recently repealed a law preventing higher education students being assessed in groups.) Negotiation of marks is considered part of the process in some nations, but is completely unacceptable in others.

The timetabling of exams can be problematic for some students if they fall at times which are traditionally set aside for religious observances, as can setting multiple exams on the same day if this coincides with days of religious obligation. For example, in further northern and southern latitudes, if Ramadan falls in high summer, fasting can last many hours after dawn, leaving devout Muslim students potentially debilitated towards the later part of the day.

► **Diverse expectations concerning feedback**

There can be significant differences in expectations internationally about the type, timing and purpose of feedback. There is considerable diversity in the explicitness of criteria and the amount of support students can expect if they are struggling with assessed work, with academics in some nations taking a much more intense personal interest in students’ progression than in others.

In some nations, multiple assessment opportunities are provided, and students failing modules simply pick up credits elsewhere (as in Australia and New Zealand for example), which is not the case in other nations, such as the UK, which have much more hidebound regulations on progression issues.

Carroll and Ryan (2005) note common problems about students complying with assignment length regulations: in some nations word limits are merely advisory, but in others they are strictly adhered to, which can cause real problems. For some African students, for example, starting into the main body of the essay without a personal preamble is considered impolite, meaning they frequently go considerably over required assignment word limits, while other students whose first language is not English comment on the problem of writing first-year assignments of say 3,000–4,000 words when their previous writing assignments have been around 1,000 words.

The nature of the **personal relationships** between academic staff and students is hugely variable internationally, with much more formal interactions expected in some nations than others. Knowing what to call your teacher can be a tricky issue: in the UK and US it is not at all unusual to be invited to use a lecturer's given name, but many continental European professors would be alarmed if anyone addressed them with other than their full title. Staff–student friendships outside the university can be either encouraged or regarded as suspect depending on the national context, while staff dating adult students would be considered gross professional misconduct in some nations and is completely acceptable in others.

Gifts to teachers are seen as unproblematic in many cultures, and are actually an expectation in others, for example, Japan. However, in the UK, for example, gifts other than small souvenirs from home nations of items of food or confectionery that can be shared with fellow students are frowned on, and it is a customary requirement in many universities for gifts of any other than trivial value to be recorded in the Gift Book and only acceptable if deemed so by a senior manager. Misconceptions in this area can cause embarrassment on both sides, especially if presents are given immediately before assessment activities.

► Teaching approaches

Students moving from one country to another to study can expect different modes of curriculum delivery. The traditional lecture, delivered from behind a lectern or from a podium, with little interaction between the lecturer and students is much more common in some nations than others and students may find it difficult to readjust to new contexts. A similar diversity exists in the level of provision of support materials students can expect to receive, including handouts, electronic texts and postings within social learning environments, depending on where they are studying.

► **Do we have shared learning and communication technologies?**

This is patently not the case, since there are huge differentials between universities in terms of access not just to kit (mobile devices, laptops, PCs, reliable servers) but also to infrastructure (networks, broadband speeds, liberty to access social networks and so on) and expertise (some academics are much better enabled to support their students through digital and social media than others, for example). This is not just a matter of the wealthiest nations having more of all of these than the less advantaged, since a number of these issues are politically rather than exclusively economically determined. In terms of kit and infrastructure, the near ubiquity of mobile phones and mobile devices in nations without the infrastructure (and reliable power supply) effectively to support fixed IT devices has radically changed some of the assumptions formerly made about access to technology.

Next are some questions to help us consider the extent to which we can say we have shared learning technologies. All of these questions are offered without making value judgements about which is best (or at least aim to do so!):

- Do your students principally write with pens or keyboards? Do they read screens or paper books primarily? Do they physically carry assignments to you or submit electronically? Do your students write notes in lectures? Do you permit/encourage/ban audio/video recording of classes?
- Do students primarily 'access content' (see other chapters for discussion of the issues underlying this seemingly straightforward term) through face-to-face lectures, seminars, lab practicals, studio work, online, through technology-mediated discussions, via Open Access resources or Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)? Are these issues a matter for discussion among your complement of teachers?
- Do your classrooms make it possible for students to access and use the internet, or is Facebook, for example, seen as a distraction from learning and (perhaps futilely) banned?
- Do you permit/encourage the use of Twitter for academic purposes?
- Do you expect your students to bring their own prescribed IT equipment? Do you advocate Apple or Microsoft® or other suppliers? Do you give them laptops? Do you tell them to 'Bring Your Own Device' (BYOD)? Do you work across media and platforms to ensure everyone can access equivalent learning materials?

- ▶ Are your teaching staff qualified, enthusiastic advocates for using technology to support learning? Are they techno-tentatives? Refuseniks?
- ▶ Do you use an assessment management system across the university for alignment of assignments to learning outcomes, submission and return of work, recording and presentation to exam boards of marks? Or do you rely on hard copy approaches?
- ▶ Is communication to and between staff (plans, policies, developments, initiatives) mainly done face-to-face in meetings and committees, by telephone and voicemail, or paper-based memos and documents, or using email, departmental bulletin boards, text messages for important snippets of information, email attachments for longer documents, and so on?
- ▶ How do staff mostly contact students when necessary, and vice versa, about issues such as changes to class venues, cancellations, tutorial appointments, assignment briefings, deadlines, marks/grades, and other such information? By mail and paper-based memos and notes? At face-to-face group meetings? By individual one-to-one appointments? By notices on boards? By phone? By voicemail? By email? Using text messages? Using Twitter? Using bulletin boards on course or departmental web pages?

▶ **Do we have shared learning contexts?**

It certainly is not the case that learning contexts are the same worldwide, although technological advances are whittling away at some of the differences. Class sizes can be highly variable, with lecture rooms holding over a thousand students very common in some nations (see, for example, the good practice account from Egypt in Chapter 4), whereas in others lecturers regard class sizes of over about 60 students as being unacceptable. The trend internationally is, however, strongly towards the massification of higher education: whereas formerly perhaps 5–10% of the age cohort might be expected to study at university, in many nations this exceeds 50%, moving it from a privilege of the elite to a benefit for the many. However, how that benefit is perceived varies from nations where higher education is regarded as a public good, with society benefiting from having a highly educated populace (and hence state-supported), to nations, such as England at the time of writing where higher education is seen principally as a private good leading to higher employability and thus ultimately to a financial lifelong advantage (and hence high fees being charged).

Index

A

academic conduct 143–8
academic literacy 88–92
academic writing 89–90
accreditation 13, 27, 32, 97, 110,
140, 141, 160, 170
achievable challenges 46–7
active learning 28–30, 76, 77, 163,
203
Adobe connect tool 167–8
Angelo, T. 141, 142
annotated bibliographies 95, 111,
165
answering questions 6, 113
art and design studios 79, 80
asking questions 6, 64, 68
assessed blogs 137–8, 175
assessing teaching practice 130, 132
assessment
agency 111–12
methodologies 111
orientation 112
principles 112, 121
purposes 109, 110
timing 112
see also individual assessment topics
assessment design 42–4, 127–8
assessment for learning 107–8
assessment linked to life 176–7
assessment literacy 98–101
assessment management systems 10,
134, 139
assessment management 141, 142
assessment reform 106–7
assessment vs evaluation 11
assignment return proformas 134
atelier models 79
attendance 28, 124
audio feedback 140–1, 143

Australia 69–70, 189–91
authentic assessment 118–19, 123–5
autonomy 27, 39, 102

B

Bain, K. 74
Banerjee, K. 45–7
Bangladesh 28–30
Barlett, P.F. 177
Bastings, M. 187–9
Beetham, H. 2, 7, 21, 151, 152
Belarus 84–5
Biggs, J. 21, 32, 94, 95, 119, 148
Billett, S. 181, 182
biomedical science 77–9
BLASST 189–91
blended learning approaches 25, 27,
154–7, 162, 176
blogs 96–7, 137, 138, 160, 165, 175,
Bogova, M. 84–5
Boud, D. 80, 98, 102, 106, 107, 116,
117, 119, 126, 144, 150
Boyer, E. L. 75, 87
Boyle, A. 80
Brehony, K. J. 72–3
Brodie, L. 181–2
Brown, S. 50, 57, 110, 111, 137, 147,
186
BYOD (bring your own device) 9

C

cabaret as academic discourse 69–70
Camtasia 62
Canada 178–9
Carroll, J. 8, 145
case studies 54, 64–6, 180
Cejda, B.D. 41
Cercone, K. 166, 168
Chalmers, D. 181–2

Chase, G. W. 177
 China 52–4, 103–4
 choosing what is to be taught 33
 CIBER 93, 95
 Ciobanu, D. 137
 clarity of assessment 115
 Coates, C. 37–8
 Cole, M. 183–5
 communication technologies 9–10, 145, 160
 communities of practice 162, 195, 197, 198, 199
 community engagement 181, 185
 compensation 11, 14, 43, 88, 144
 computer-assisted assessment 135–8
 computer-based assessment 135–8, 164–6, 203
 conceptual change 198–9
 constructive alignment 10, 21, 32, 38, 94, 119, 148–50
 continuous professional development (CPD) 132, 137, 175, 192–3, 196
 Cook, L.S. 66
 Cooke, B. 37–8
 Coonan, E. 93–5
 Co-operative education 178–9
 Cornelius, S. 168
 Costley, C. 182
 Council of Europe 84–5
 course leaders 37, 49, 195
 crits 123–4
 cross-cultural contexts 15, 71–3, 202
 Cross, K. 141–2
 cultural capital 88, 118, 152
 cultural mores 5
 curriculum delivery 2, 8, 26, 48, 54, 55–73, 152, 157
 curriculum design 27, 32–54, 55–73, 119, 127, 148, 150, 170, 179–82, 186, 197, 203
 curriculum quality review 45, 48–9

D

Davidowitz, B. 77
 De Beer, J. 64–6
 de Freitas, S. 21, 22, 160

Deem, R. 72, 73
 DeLind, L. 176–7
 Denninger, J. 17
 Derounian, J. 176–7
 design education 123–5
 digital age 2, 9, 21, 26, 37, 88, 92, 93, 96, 137, 151–71, 173, 175, 188, 203
 digital arts education 162–3
 digital badges 175
 digital contexts 151
 disability 12, 22, 86, 113, 117, 127
 disadvantage 202
 redressing 183–5
 disintermediation 93
 diverse approaches to assessment 6, 7
 doctoral supervision 71–3
 drop-in clinics 154
 drop out 28, 99, 115

E

early years teaching 115, 130–2
 e-assessment 116, 118, 119, 135, 136, 138, 165
 EBP *see* evidence-based practice
 educational change 196–7
 educational development 26, 186, 203,
 educational leadership 196–7
 effective reading 90–5
 Egypt 67–8
 Ekaratne, S. 198–9
 elitism 10, 59, 66, 114, 158, 160, 182, 183, 202
 Ellis, R.C.T. 83
 emotional intelligence 86, 101–2
 employability 10, 16, 37, 38, 47, 109, 110, 172–85
 employers 34, 38, 48, 101, 111, 172–9
 engagement 21, 23, 25, 27, 33, 47, 55, 65, 72, 98, 106, 108, 115, 119, 124, 131, 152, 158, 160, 161, 163, 164, 166–9, 172, 182–5, 203
 English language 11, 103–4

- enhancement opportunities 196–7
ensuring quality standards 189–91
Entwistle, N. 24
e-portfolios 137, 165, 175
ERA (Excellence for Research in Australia) 70
ESL (English as a Second Language) 103–4
essays 8, 27, 43, 89, 111, 114, 116, 119–20, 146
ETF European Commission 67–8
evaluation 11, 30, 32, 45, 47, 49–51, 78, 85, 101, 129, 139, 143, 157, 164, 168, 174
evaluation vs assessment 11
evidence of achievement 32, 42, 121, 137, 175
evidence-based practice 106, 127, 138, 148, 155–7, 198
exams 5–7, 11, 14, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33, 35, 43, 45, 53, 59, 76, 103–4, 111, 114, 117, 121–2, 125, 126, 145, 146, 147, 159, 167, 180
Exley, K. 76, 137
expectations 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 26, 29, 38, 47, 72, 101, 108, 117–18, 120, 140, 144, 155, 171, 174, 179, 203
exploded text 133
external examiners 49
- F**
face to face 10, 50, 73, 86, 101, 103, 114, 123, 133, 155, 163, 165, 167–9
Facebook 56, 161
fairness 28, 143–4, 147,
Fe, Fi, Fo, Fun 99–101
feedback
 audio 140–1
 design 128–34
 diverse expectations 7
 effectiveness 132–4
 efficiency 132–4
 from students 50–2
 students use of 143
- field trips 81–2
fieldwork 80–2
final language 102, 144
financial arrangements 12
first year 99–101
Fisher, A. 136–7, 164, 169
fit-for-purpose assessment 106–26
Fitzgerald, P. 37–8
Flint, N. R. 143
flipping classrooms 58–9
followership 102
Fox, S. 156–7
fractional staff 187
France, D. 81–2
Fraser, C. 166–8
- G**
Gacel Avila, J. 201
Garnett, J. 180, 182
Geisler, C. 105
Gertzog, W.A. 199
gifts to teachers 8
global environment 3, 202
Glynn, M. 141–2, 153–4
Godfrey, J. 89–90,
good practice accounts, purposes 1, 2
Google 56, 63, 94–5, 114
Gott, R. 183, 185
Grace, S. 5
Gradebook facility 142
graduate attributes 172, 174
graduate teaching assistants 13, 67, 116, 200
graphic design 123–5
Gravestock, P. 5
Gravett, S. 64–6
Griffiths, T.G. 183–5
group assessment 7, 8
group learning 123–5
group size, lectures 66–7
group work 5–6
Grove, J. 189
Grunefeld, H. 196–7
Guertin, L. 40–1
guest inputs to lectures 57
Gundara, J. 71–2

guru paradigm 28–30
 Guzzo, V. 138–40

H

Hague, J. 28–30
 Hall, T. 81
 Harland, T. 124–5
 Harrison, M. 81
 Harvey, M. 189–91
 hashtags 162–3
 HEA (Higher Education
 Academy) 109, 194–5
 Healey, M. 81
 healthcare education 155–7
 Hensel, N. 41
 Hewson, P.W. 199
 Hill, C. 71–2
 Hill, G. 69–70
 Hofstede, G. 104
 holistic course design 37–8
 Honeyfield, J. 166–8
 Hong Kong 198–9
 Hou, J. 103–4
 Hounsell, D. 130, 140
 Hubbard, A. 101
 Humfrey, C. 15
 Hunt, L. 181–2

I

Iceland 81–2
 Immigration advice 166–9
 inclusive learning 45–7
 inclusivity 12, 102, 117, 118
 incremental feedback 130–2
 India 16–18, 45–7
 inducting students 153–4
 information literacy 92, 95–6
 information skills 93–5
 instructional design 21
 integrated learning 45–7
 intended learning outcomes 10, 32,
 37–8, 42, 59, 64, 108, 109, 113,
 118, 119, 141, 155, 165, 170,
 174, 181, 192
 international students 71–3
 internationalising curriculum 14–15

interpersonal competences 103–4
 interpersonal literacy 101–3
 Ireland 141–2, 153–4, 155–7, 162–3

J

Jackson, R. 81–2
 Jameson, S. 37–8
 Jarvis, P. 20
 Jenkins, A. 66
 JISC 140, 165
 Johnson, B. 143
 Johnson, T.S. 66
 Jones, E. 15
 Jones, S. 37–8
 justice in assessment 112–14

K

Kegan, R. 23
 Key Information Sets (KIS) 195
 Killick, D. 15
 Kingschild, K. 179–82
 Kneale, P.E. 25, 119
 Knight, P. 50, 110
 knowledge 24, 27

L

laboratories 39, 41, 76–9, 81, 140,
 155
 Lacey, C.A. 64, 66
 Land, R. 33
 language education 84–5, 103–4
 large group teaching 64–6, 67–8,
 Laurillard, D. 159
 leadership 29, 38, 102, 116, 119,
 173, 189, 196
 learning contexts 10–13
 learning interactions 76
 learning management systems
 (LMS) 141–2, 152–4
 learning outcomes 10, 32, 37–8, 42,
 59, 64, 108, 109, 113, 118, 119,
 141, 155, 165, 170, 174, 181, 192
 learning spaces 75–87
 learning technologies 9–10
 learning to think 24
 Leask, B. 15

lecture rooms 25, 60–1
 lectures 56–74
 group size 66–7
 student actions 62–4
 traditional 56
 Lee, M. 203
 Leech, M. 155–7
 Leonard, D. 71
 Link, T. 176–7
 literacies for learning 88–105
 Liu, D. 52–4
 Livetext 36, 118, 134, 138–40, 170
 LMS *see* learning management system
 López-Pastor, V.M. 130–2
 Lortie, D.C. 65–6
 losing face 6
 Lyon, D. 166–8

M

maieutic approach 70–1
 Malaysia 71–3
 manageability of assessment 118
 Mansour, H. 67–8
 Maor, D. 157
 Maori 5, 121–3
 marking 11, 44, 76, 98, 113, 118,
 120, 125, 132, 135, 142, 149,
 150, 164, 167, 187
 marks 7, 10, 44, 45, 49, 67, 77, 80,
 88, 98, 112, 113, 115, 118–20,
 129, 131, 133–4, 142–4, 156, 169
 Marsden, R. 145
 Martinez, Y. 123–5
 Mauchiline, A. 81–2
 Mayes, T. 21–2, 160
 McDowell, L. 43, 147, 148
 McKeachie, W.J. 73
 McLoughlin, C. 203
 medicine education 155–7
 Merseth, K. 64, 66
 Meyer, J. 33
 microbiology 81–2
 Millei, Z. 185
 Miller, M. 121–3
 Ministry of Education of People's
 Republic China 52–4

model answers 133
 MOOCs (massive open online
 courses) 9, 21, 26, 154, 157–60
 Moodle 142, 153
 Morey, A.I. 201
 Mortiboys, A. 102
 Mulryan-Kyne, C. 65–6
 multidisciplinary contexts 77–9
 multiple-choice questions
 (MCQs) 135–6, 165
 multiple-choice tests 113, 159, 165
 Murphy, O. 162–3

N

national student surveys 50, 129–30,
 174
 negotiated assignments 121–3
 Netherlands 187–9, 196–7
 New Zealand 121–3, 166–8, 179–82
 Newstead, S.E. 146
 Northedge, A. 89
 novice teachers 187–9
 Nutt, D. 100–1

O

O'Brien, K. 174
 O'Donovan, A. 155–7
 OECD 70
 Oliver, B. 174
 online learning 159, 166–8
 open badges 175
 open educational resources 22, 26,
 48, 57, 158–9
 openness of learning 158–9
 oral feedback reports 132–3

P

pace of learning 36
 paradigms, changing 20–31
 part-time teachers 189–91
 participant-centred training 193–4
 partnership 55, 80, 95, 100, 131,
 202–3
 PASS 43
 patchwork texts 165

- pedagogy
 international perceptions 4–5
 shared concepts 3
- peer review 170
- performance anxiety 123
- personal relationships 7
- Petersen, N. 64–6
- PGCHE (Post-Graduate Certificate in Higher Education) 186–7, 192, 198–9
- Pickford, R. 37–8, 99–101
- plagiarism 143–8, 169–70
- political context 13
- Popovic, C. 178–9
- portfolios 27, 85, 96, 111, 123, 137, 139, 149, 160, 164–5, 170, 175, 196
- Posner, G.J. 198–9
- post-graduate learning 176–7
- Powell, A. 137
- PowerPoint, Microsoft® 62, 68
- Prezi 62, 68
- problem-based learning (PBL) 39, 42
- Professional Standards Framework 195
- professionalisation 187–9
- professionalism of assessors 115–16
- programme-level assessment 43, 148
- PSRB requirements 34–6
- purposes of assessment 109–10
- Q**
- QAA (Quality Assurance Agency) 35, 38, 109–10, 192
- quality assurance 35, 138–40
 assessment 109
 requirements 35
- question spotting 146
- R**
- Race, P. 24–5, 42, 57, 59, 75, 83, 111, 137, 172–3, 187, 193–4,
- Ramírez, E. 183–5
- Raven, D. 123–5
- reading 90–2
- reading skills 93–5
- reading tasks in lectures 57–8
- recording lectures 62
- redressing disadvantage 183–5
- reflective accounts 165
- reliability of assessment 112–14, 120, 144
- religious observance 7
- research-led teaching 162–3
- retention 12, 101, 148, 154, 190
- risk-averse views 26, 59
- Roberts, C. 28–30
- Robinson, C. 92
- robust discussion 6
- role play 29, 83–5, 137–8, 180
- Rolfe, V. 170
- Rollnick, M. 77
- Ryan, J. 3, 6, 8
- S**
- Sadler, D.R. 44, 99, 101, 128–9, 130
- Salmon, G. 154–6
- Salovey, P. 101
- Sambell, K. 98, 101, 144,
- Santos, B. de Sousa 1
- scholarships, Boyer 75, 87
- self-efficacy 103–4
- self-paced learning 153–4
- senior managers 8, 14, 18, 26, 49, 53, 195
- sequencing of content 39
- sessional staff 187, 189–91
- Sharpe, R. 21
- Shoesmith, B. 28–30
- Shulman, L. 64, 66
- silences in lectures 58
- Simpson, J. 37–8
- simulations 83–5, 137–8
- slides 68
- Smagorinsky, P. 66
- Smith, S. 37–8
- social literacy 101–3
- social media 9, 13, 21, 26, 81, 96–7, 102, 152, 160–4, 166, 173
- social sciences 187–9
- South Africa 64–6
- Spain 130–2
- Sri Lanka 198–9

staff qualifications 13
standards 11, 14, 35, 43–4, 49, 80,
98, 109, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118,
129, 139, 143, 149, 165, 174,
189–92, 194, 195
statement banks 134
Steele, L. 166–8
STEM (Science, Technology,
Engineering and Maths) 94
Stevenson, S.F. 179–82
Stewart, M. 30
Storify 162
strategic approaches to learning 25
strategy for assessment 110–26
Strike, K.A. 199
student-centred learning 55, 105,
198–9
student engagement 167–8
student evaluations 49, 50–2
student support 16
studios 79–80
Subramaniam, G. 71–2
Sutherland, S. 137

T

Tan, O.S. 39, 42
Tang, C. 2, 32, 119, 148
task-oriented online learning
(TOOL) 156
Taskstream 36, 170
Taylor, P. 157
teacher education 179–82
teacher training 52–4, 64–6,
130–3
teaching approaches 8
teaching development 198–9
teaching practice 40–1, 130–2
technologies 9–10, 151–71
technology-enhanced learning 21,
81–82, 151–171
technology for curriculum
delivery 152
technology for feedback 138–40
TED talks 26
think tanks 123–5
Thomson, S. 37–8

threshold concepts 33–4
timetabling 25–6
toilets 4, 15, 47
TOOL *see* task-oriented online
learning
transferable skills 172–4
transformation 23, 24, 183
transformative learning 30
transforming assessment 109
transparency 141–2
Trees, J. 80, 123–5
trust 72
Turnitin 114, 146, 169–70
Tweeting 56
Twitter 96–7, 161–4

U

UK Professional Standards Framework
(UKPSF) 194–5
ULAB (Bangladesh) 28–30
undergraduate research 40–1
Unsworth, B. 77–9
USA 40–1, 138–40

V

Vaidya, P.M. 16–18
validation 12, 32, 48–9, 150
Van de Rijt, B. 187–9
Venezuela 183–5
veracity in assessment 114–15
visual impairment 22, 57, 141
VLE (virtual learning environment) 64,
113, 133, 134, 152, 155, 160

W

Walsh, E. 156–7
web conferencing 168–9
webinars 168–9
Webster, H. 96–7
weekly reflection 104
Weerakoon, S. 198–9
wikis 165
WIL *see* work-integrated learning
Williams, J. 183–5
Winningham, K. 178–9
work experience 178–9

work-integrated learning
(WIL) 179–82

Workman, B. 182

workshop design 193–4

written feedback reports 133

Y

Yakovchuk, N. 84–5

Yoga education 16–18

Yorke, M. 99, 101, 174, 178–9,
185