

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.....	1
SI04 – THE PLANNING STAGE	1
<i>The SI04 team</i>	1
<i>Admission of participants and finding our venue</i>	2
<i>Planning meetings fall 2003 and spring 2004</i>	2
<i>Pre-thinking assignments for the participants</i>	4
SI04 – DELIVERY AT ÅKERBY MANSION JUNE 6-11	5
<i>‘Learners for Change’ – the theme of SI04</i>	5
<i>The SI04 program</i>	6
<i>Literature</i>	8
<i>Groups</i>	8
<i>Projects</i>	8
SI04 PART 2 – THE WINTER INSTITUTE	9
EVALUATION.....	10
<i>Summary of feed back cards</i>	10
<i>Project narratives and grid comments</i>	14
SI04 – THE FUTURE	16
<i>The SI Alumni</i>	16
<i>The SI-Web and Forum</i>	16
SI 04 – FINANCIAL REPORT.....	16
CONCLUDING REMARKS	17
APPENDICES	18
1. <i>Invitation</i>	18
2. <i>Guidelines for admission</i>	21
3. <i>List of participants</i>	24
4. <i>Pre-thinking</i>	25
5. <i>Invitation to the Winter Institute 2005</i>	29
6. <i>Minutes from meetings with the reference group</i>	32
7. <i>Literature</i>	35

Introductory remarks

Since the beginning of the Swedish Summer Institute in 2000, four institutes have been delivered. In addition to the regular institutes there have been two Winter Institutes and two reunion meetings in connection to the Summer Institutes of -01 and -03. The Summer Institute 2004 introduced some changes to the concept but maintained the original idea of providing a forum for young teacher-researchers who take an interest in facilitating learning and developing their identity as informed professionals in higher education. The fourth Summer Institute also introduced new members to the project team and during the time from the decision to offer the fourth Summer Institute to its actual delivery, there were also additional activities for alumni which suggest avenues for the future development of the Summer Institute.

The objective of this report is to account for some of the factors that affected the delivery of the Summer Institute 2004 and to document some of the ideas and issues that we seek to pursue during the Summer Institute process. The report therefore, accounts for the planning stage during 2003 and spring 2004 as well as the actual delivery June 6 – 11, 2004. As one of the additions to the Summer Institute 2004 was to introduce a second meeting after the fall term, this report also offers a brief account of the delivery of the Winter Institute 2005 and the ideas informing that institute. The report also outlines a number of issues for the future and presents a financial report. In addition, the avid reader will find some of the information and material as well as the guidelines for the admissions board and some minutes from meetings with the reference group among the appendices.

SI04 – The planning stage

The planning of the Summer Institute 2004 (SI04) started on the day that the Summer Institute 2003 (SI03) closed. The SI03 project team sat down to articulate some of the most immediate impressions of SI03 and the reunion session for SI01 alumni. As responsible for the reunion session during SI03 and also as the next SI project manager Magnus Gustafsson also took part in this meeting. This was an important session in that the SI03 project team had announced that three out of five members would not be part of the next SI. The two team members who stayed on were Catherine Robinson, Hong Kong University and the Council representative Åsa Rurling.

The SI04 team

During the summer and fall of 2003, the priority was to find the two new project team members that were needed for the SI. At national level, Charlotte Silén, Linköping University, was contacted and agreed to be part of the team. The next new member was Neill Thew, Sussex University at Brighton, who accepted the invitation to the team in early fall. The team, thus, consisted of five members:

Project manager Magnus Gustafsson, Head of the Centre for Language and Communication, Chalmers University of Technology.

Åsa Rurling, The Council for the Renewal of Higher Education

Charlotte Silén, Head of the Unit for Pedagogical Development & Research, Linköping University

Neill Thew, Head of the Teaching & Learning Development Unit, University of Sussex at Brighton.

Catherine Robinson, Centre for the Advancement of University Teaching, University of Hong Kong

Admission of participants and finding our venue

Concurrently, with this process of setting up the new team. Magnus Gustafsson and Åsa Rurling also arranged with the invitation to SI04 and contacted a new admissions board consisting of Dr. Jonas Nordquist, The Karolinska Institute and project manager of the 2000 Summer Institute, Dr. Lena Vesterlund, Luleå University of Technology and Council board member, Prof. Gunnar Berg, Mid Sweden University. We also revised the guidelines for admission in view of the large increase of applicants to the SI. An important new aspect of this group's work was the change of phrase in the invitation where the absolute age limit was omitted in favour of a phrase indicating 'the beginning of your teaching career'.

During November, the 20 delegates were accepted and the Council administered the bid for the venue. This process is expensive and time consuming particularly so as the only valid bid was submitted by Åkerby Mansion, the venue for the past two SIs. Åsa and Magnus did however, visit an alternative venue in the Norrtälje archipelago but as the bid turned out to be flawed there was never any doubt – the venue for SI04 would be Åkerby Mansion outside Nora. Åkerby Mansion is a very suitable venue for the SI and the service is flawless so we were very satisfied with the prospects of going back to Åkerby.

Planning meetings fall 2003 and spring 2004

The new project team's first meeting took place in Lysekil in November 2003. Apart from forming a new team, the most important issue on the agenda was to introduce the new project members to the notion of a Summer Institute. As Catherine had experienced two SIs she took a central role in conveying the picture of the previous SIs and some of the thinking that had gone into them. In this hand-over, Catherine also isolated and articulated the aspects of previous SIs that were crucial to their success as well as what particular parts of the SIs that could possibly be done in different ways or replaced. Among the central aspects, we agreed that it is crucial to maintain the reflective element of the SI as well as the formative evaluations. We also saw the emphasis on developing a

professional identity as inimical to the SI concept and wanted to find additional ways of supporting that dimension of the SI. Nevertheless, in view of SI04, some issues were specifically addressed during this meeting. We consolidated our understanding of the theme for SI04 – ‘Learners for Change’ – and re-considered the outline in view of our desire to prolong the SI-process over time. We never questioned the given that SI is informed by a learning perspective.

The theme was considered a challenge with its multiple foci on 1) higher education students needing the ability to observe and adjust to change and variation and; 2) higher education professionals needing the strategies to accommodate the changes in post-modern higher education and the student body as well as; 3) higher education professionals acting as agents of change themselves. In view of the theme of change, we wanted the possibility of prolonging the SI by introducing the idea of delegates bringing pedagogical projects to be defined and articulated during the SI-week and carried out during the fall term 2004 and finally reported and documented during the spring 2005. Neill assumed great responsibility for the projects and wanted the guiding idea of projects to be one of ‘improving student learning’. Charlotte then saw how the project orientation lent itself to a problem based approach but that the week format did not allow for a full implementation of a PBL-cycle.

Additional issues that were discussed during our first planning meeting included how to go about introducing the notion of the four scholarships and how to begin to raise the critical awareness of being an informed higher education professional. We also wanted to explore the connection between research (collective learning) and teaching (facilitating individual learning). Modes of learning also had to be experienced in the SI and we considered different alternatives and agreed that the single most important element would be to model as far as possible the various approaches we wanted to include. Related to this issue of using as many models as possible, we discussed the use or not of guest lecturing. It has been an element of previous SIs but never really had the impact it can have. In the end, we decided against guest lecturing for a variety of reasons. A specific addition we wanted to make to previous SIs was to introduce a Reader with some core texts offered and room to add texts during the week (see appendix 7)

During the November meeting, we decided to set up a virtual project platform in the Claroline environment available at Chalmers. We shared documents and discussed individual sessions in preparation for our next meeting which was set for March -04 in connection with the Winter Institute 04 offered at Stockholm University on January 14-15. The project team met for three days but only in partial constellations. Neill was sick and stayed in the UK and we did two telephone conferences to keep him in the loop and to have his input. Charlotte had a full schedule and went back on the Thursday leaving Catherine and Magnus to discuss texts for reading matter (appendix 7).

There were two pieces of reading that we were particularly interested in. We had decided on a seminar during the Monday that was to focus on course development and the types of decisions course managers make for various changes in courses. We wanted three

comparatively short and quasi-narrative texts about pedagogical development that would exemplify varying levels of more or less informed decisions by course managers. These three texts turned out to be quite difficult to decide on and in the end we found ourselves with only two and a third text of a more meta-cognitive approach that related more to the overall theme of the week than to a specific session. The second reading issue we needed to decide on was the preparatory reading matter to be sent to the delegates in advance of the SI. This text should reflect the theme of the SI and offer avenues into some of the issues to be articulated during the institute. For SI03, the text chosen was Boyer's brief outline of the four scholarships and while we wanted a similar text, Catherine felt that the Boyer text was not specific enough for the SI-context. We subsequently decided on a Schön-text from *Change* that we thought would offer relevant ways into the idea of scholarship and the change of paradigms in higher education (see appendix 4 for the pre-thinking material).

So far in the preparations of SI04 everything was as scheduled. However, shortly after the March meeting Catherine Robinson sadly had to cancel her participation in the actual week due to illness. This left the project team in some unease and we had to re-think some of our ideas and the various sessions where Catherine had planned to take specific responsibilities. Contrary to our previous November decision, we then decided to invite a guest lecturer for one of the sessions that Catherine would have been facilitating. We also decided to meet in Gothenburg in mid-May to re-think some dimensions of the program and establish a firmer understanding of the project progression during the week and the interconnections between project progression and issues introduced in the SI.

Magnus and Neill met in Gothenburg on May 10-12 and had two telephone conferences with Charlotte. During this meeting, we finalised many of the remaining sessions with respect to the new terms under which we would be delivering the SI and we arrived at a very well-structured and helpful set of project checkpoints for which Neill assumed responsibility. While we all worked on developing the projects during the SI week, it was essentially Neill who helped structure the project progression during the week.

Pre-thinking assignments for the participants

Reading the Schön-text was only one part of the various preparations we assigned the participants. Based on the good practice of previous SIs, we knew that requiring a fair amount of preparations was crucial to the success of the intensive SI week and we therefore considered what we needed the participants to have done before coming to Åkerby. First of all, they obviously needed to introduce themselves on the designated SI04-conference at the Council forum. The second assignment we designed was for the delegates to bring a typical piece of research from their field. This piece of footing in their own disciplines was to form a starting point as we wanted to discuss not only their understanding of teaching-research but also begin to explore the understanding of knowledge in the various disciplines at the SI and also, eventually, within the field of pedagogical research. We also gave the participants a notebook and encouraged them to start their reflective journal in it. We used the journal at various points during the SI week

and tried to help keep it in an active document. One of the aspects that could have gone into the journal before coming to the SI was a description-cum-reflection on the teacher/researcher related problem we asked them to bring to SI04. Finally, in view of the forming of an identity as a higher education professional, we asked the participants to bring a picture or image that somehow represented to them what working in higher education is like.

SI04 – Delivery at Åkerby Mansion June 6-11

Like the previous two SIs, SI04 was delivered through an intensive week from Sunday afternoon to Friday lunch at Åkerby Mansion. The theme and the program were closely related but the basic set-up of groups and the use of projects to inform the progression of the week were also factors that helped make SI04 a very rewarding experience for everyone involved. Yet, the SI is what the participants make of it and more than anything the project group has to facilitate as many avenues as possible during one short week. Our decision to use a reader for SI04 in addition to the regular book table is one example of that and while the evaluation comments mention it, the full impact of the reader will not be felt until during the fall and later than that so it is difficult to assess at this point.

‘Learners for Change’ – the theme of SI04

Focussing on change and learners it is a theme that well reflects the SI tradition and one that will hopefully be seen as contributing to finding new ways of articulating professionalism in higher education. On the one hand it focuses on ‘learners’ as students. This basic and perhaps preliminary dimension of the theme is informed by Bowden and Marton and their ideas on deep learning involving an ability to discern variation and change (see appendix 7, Bowden and Marton). As many pedagogical ideas, learning as relating to change is quite demanding to re-fit into a specific course context or in terms of facilitating a given learning meeting but we hope that SI04 modelled how it could be done and that it also offered examples for participants of how to do that in their own learning activities.

The second aspect of the theme involved the facilitators in higher education needing strategies to cope with externally imposed change such as the changing student body, limited resources, and re-negotiated demands on higher education. This was to some extent present in many of the problems the participants brought to SI04 and also implicit in some of the pictures the participants had chosen to represent ‘working in higher education’. In combination with the third aspect of the theme – the participants as agents of change – I believe we addressed this in very many ways. As the program indicates, we had dedicated sessions on ‘strategies for change’ and on exploring the ‘Higher education context’ but more importantly, the preceding sessions on inquiry, assessment and learning were also decisive in providing new tools with which to approach and new angles from which to approach potential problems in higher education.

The theme was one with a great potential and I believe we can make better use of it in the future now that we have learnt from SI04. Therefore, we will use the same theme for

SI05 but work it with greater care during the week. Where possible during the week, we will attempt to articulate all three dimensions of the theme and relate them to what we have been doing.

The SI04 program

In general, the outline for SI04 kept very many elements of the outlines of previous SIs. We wanted to keep the by now classic ‘feedback cards’ which are so appreciated. We also wanted to keep the long lunches. The SI week is intensive and finding time for participants to simply spend time on their own is a great bonus. Another recurring aspect of the outline that is not visualised is the time participants spent with their respective learning partners.

While we relied heavily on previous SIs we did introduce a few new ostensibly new sessions which deserve some brief narrative comments. The **Sunday** was introductory in character and involved us getting to know each other. It also involved the participants beginning to articulate their problem in the entire group and also their writing a letter to themselves regarding their expectations on the week and their problem.

The **Monday** was a day of confusion in trying to get to grips with what ‘inquiry’ was like in one’s field through briefly discussing the piece of field specific research each participant had brought. We then wanted to connect that sense of inquiry to what inquiry might be for pedagogical work by comparing two examples of pedagogical development work in relation to an article on whether or not the scholarship or teaching is at all recognised among higher education teachers (appendix 7). This was a tall order for our participants who found themselves confused in midst of all the available epistemologies. Nevertheless, as the evaluation indicates this Monday confusing was generative and created a deep level approach to the rest of the week and informed a significant part of the critical awareness in subsequent sessions.

The **Tuesday** was similarly very generative but possibly less demanding. The session on assessment was intentionally placed before the session on learning to make room for some sense of discovery. In addition, we wanted to introduce additional ways of learning before the session on learning so we asked an artist come to offer a workshop where we were asked to paint a painting together in groups. This experience of teamwork, verbal and non-verbal communication, and visualisation offered a good sense of relief from the expected learning environment and also prepared the participants for choosing a picture that represented ‘learning’ for them.

That choice of picture carried into the **Wednesday**, where a guest lecturer (Lars Owe Dahlgren) offered a 90-minute lecture on ‘learning’ from the point of view of pedagogical research. The Wednesday also included activities to ensure an active follow-up on a given lecture activity and we tried various writing-to-learn examples. The Wednesday afternoon then pursued the notion of learning in the wider context of Swedish higher education frameworks of the higher education act and the higher education

ordinance. We closed the Wednesday on a look at ways for the participants to strategically adapt to the context of higher education within their own university environment. Looking at various strategies for change, we nevertheless focused on spheres of influence and spheres of impact and the idea of supporting networks.

The **Thursday** might be the day that most surprised us all. We moved the week towards a close by first doing a round-robin of three short seminars on the theme of ‘promoting deep learning’ where one seminar focused on assessment strategies (Neill Thew), one focused on ‘problem based learning’ (Charlotte Silén), and the third seminar focused on ‘writing-to-learn’ (Magnus Gustafsson). The participants then synthesised the round-robin in a plenary discussion with a joint concept map. The rest of the Thursday allowed the participants undisturbed time with their projects. As additional support during the project oriented afternoon we had invited SI-alumni to offer new insights and angles on the various projects in progress. The Thursday afternoon closed on an activity geared both towards formative evaluation of the SI-week as well as project documentation for the participants as we asked them to write down a ‘project narrative’ on how the projects had evolved during the week.

Friday morning started with project presentations in the groups that were set up for the fall period and the rest of the morning was focused on closing activities from group level, via learning partnerships down to individual level. We then closed the summer institute 2004 just before lunch and diplomas by reading out loud from our ‘last’ feedback cards and then placing the cards in the Winter Institute Box for storage until January 2005 when we met to report on the projects and start the process of collecting them in a publication.

Actual Outline for SI04

Time	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
08.30 – 09.00		Feedback Sunday)	Feedback Monday	Feedback Tuesday	Feedback Wednesday	Project narrative
09.00 – 10.30		Inquiry	Assessment	Learning in HE	Parallel sessions	Project presentations
11.00 – 12.30						Closing SI04
12.30 – 14.00		Lunch / Reflection	Lunch / Reflection	Lunch / Reflection	Lunch / Reflection	Lunch and Diplomas
14.00 – 15.30	Welcome	Inquiry into HE learning	Project work	HE Context Strategies for Change	‘Inquiry’ / Project work	
16.00 – 17.30	The problem		ARTIST			
17.30 – 18.00	Letter to myself;	Feedback cards	Learning picture / Feedback cards	Learning picture	Project narrative	
19.00 - ?	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	SI04 Dinner	

Literature

The previous summer institutes have always provided participants with a very inclusive list of literature and further reading as well as handouts during the week. There is also the book table that has stayed with the SI since 2000. For SI04, we wanted to reduce the amount of material handed out during the week and wanted instead to rely more on collecting our articles, chapters and hand-outs in an SI-reader. Appendix 7 offers an incomplete list of the material in the reader as well as some of the material on the book table and the few hand-outs we wanted to keep outside of the reader for various reasons. The literature for any Summer Institute will be incomplete and largely influenced by the project management team and its interests but the main purpose of supplying the literature and material in the first place must be to help indicate to the participants that their informed decisions in facilitating learning are / should be very similar to their research-based decisions about their research related activities.

Groups

Much like during previous SIs, there was a very deliberate use of different group and participant constellations during SI04. Everyday and almost every session involved sessions in plenary of course but apart from the plenary sessions we also worked in **learning partnerships, home teams, and project teams**. The learning partnerships were established on the Sunday and were arranged by us. The criteria for dividing participants into leaning partners involved a desire to mix genders as well as disciplines. The home teams, which were used primarily in the beginning of the week, included 5 participants and again we wanted a mixture of women and men but where possible combine two disciplines or sciences in one home team. With the home teams we also wanted two main geographical clusters per team so that there would be some possibility to stay in contact in parts of home teams. A final criterion for home teams was that we did not want learning partners in the same home team. Our third and final type of group focused on the projects that were more or less defined by Tuesday evening. We gathered six students per project team on the basis of connections between projects, types of problems and alternative ways of solving them. Another factor that had some impact on the project teams was to have an initial group of problems / projects that we as facilitators felt more comfortable to act as coordinators for. The project groups started working together on the Thursday morning during the round-robin and also during the Friday presentations. The Thursday afternoon was largely individual and equally informed by learning partners, home teams, and projects teams.

Projects

The participants were asked to bring a problem from their everyday professional learning environment to the SI and be prepared to present it very briefly on the Sunday. Our instructions while working with the 'problem' initially was that it should be related to a desire to improve student learning (ISL) and that as we moved away from the problem into the project, the focus on ISL was to be central. During the week we had decided on a series of checkpoints to ensure an adequate development of the project during the week

so that the participants would have project formulation on the Friday that would result in feasible projects for the fall. The checkpoints included

- **Sunday** FOCUS, SCOPE & VISION in terms of students and ISL
- **Monday** RESEARCH & INQUIRY in an attempt to relate to educational research and method
- **Tuesday** FEASIBILITY by looking at the concretisation and reality of the project
- **Wednesday** CONTEXT & CHANGE largely at the level of institutions and change management strategy
- **Thursday** OPTIMISATION by way of dedicated time to draft a coherent project plan
- **Friday** PEER FEEDBACK in the recently established project teams and encouragement to seek review comments at all levels possibly relevant to the project on returning to the home departments.

Needless to say, different projects benefited from different aspects of the week but judging from the project narratives that the participants wrote from Thursday to Friday, many projects changed direction or gathered momentum after the Tuesday. Similarly, the Thursday morning appears to have been very useful in providing tools to implement in many of the projects. The Wednesday with its focus on conceptualising learning and change was very important in providing the participants a framework for formulating the type of learning they wanted to achieve and some possible ways of working the system they would find themselves in during the fall.

SI04 part 2 – the Winter Institute

It was with great anticipation that we looked forward to meeting with the participants again for the second part of the SI04 – the Winter Institute (WI). We met on January 10-11, 2005 at Stockholm School of Economics for a two-day seminar with the purpose of documenting the projects. After some fall term planning with the project team, we decided that a dynamic and feasible genre for documenting their projects would be to think of the projects as case studies in a Swedish Summer Institute 2004 Casebook to improve student learning. Hence, there was a need to discuss the case study genre as such during the seminar as well as actually spending time formulating, re-formulating and focusing the projects for concise and stringent documentation.

Largely, the WI05 offered an opportunity to dedicate time to the writing process involved in any pedagogical development project. Appendix 5 contains the outline of the January meet and we tried to set aside as much time as possible for actually writing text and then having the time to discuss it with peers. However, we also suggested that given the case study genre, we would still need a rhetorical device that could focus the projects into cases. We therefore spent some time on isolating the pattern of situation-problem-solution-evaluation (SPSE) as a dynamic pattern to work with. In addition to providing an intuitive and flexible pattern, the focus on SPSE also helped generate a need to

reformulate the problem of each project in the light of a given situation. Having attempted to re-situate the problem was also a useful way of focusing the peer response sessions during the WI.

The writing of a case study, or even beginning to draft one, offered a rewarding instance of cross-disciplinarity as most of the SIs find themselves in quantitative disciplines where the narrative dimension of the case study and even the possibility of a first person voice would be foreign elements to publications. Our session on the level of informedness and the degree of transferability of the cases was therefore important and generated some useful insights for the writers. Nevertheless, in retrospect, we see how this could have been handled more effectively by already introducing this dimension of the projects during the SI-week in June.

On leaving the WI05, the participating SIs had set up writing partnerships and went home with a draft of a situation-problem reformulation. Many of the partnerships had also been able to agree on checkpoint dates and action plans. The WI05, then, had dedicated some start-up time for the SIs to begin the process of writing up their projects as case studies in the Swedish Summer Institute 2004 Casebook.

Evaluation

In its current phase, the SI04 is not yet completely closed as the project process has not been finished. We have met the participants again in January 2005 for the Winter Institute 2005 and aim for a publication of the projects by summer 2005. It is therefore too early to close the evaluative books on SI04 and look at a summative evaluation. What we did during the week, was to maintain the SI tradition of feedback cards during the week and we added the project narrative as well as an evaluation oriented task of commenting on the grid of the outline with only session names on it. A shared characteristic of all the evaluation related work the participants did was that it was also at the same time part of their learning and not separate from it. For the Winter Institute 2005 we used the feedback cards again and we also added a letter from the SI04s to the new participants in the SI05.

Summary of feed back cards

Feedback cards with different prompts were handed out approx 17.30 on the Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday. For the Wednesday feedback cards we wanted to change the routine a bit and allow for retrospective thinking about the day. Hence, the Thursday morning started with writing feedback cards about the Wednesday. We then replaced the feedback cards on the Thursday in favour of a project narrative that outlined how the project had evolved through and thanks to the week. Yet, there is a fifth set of feedback cards, covering the entire week, which were read at the January meeting in Stockholm at the Winter Institute.

Sunday June 6

After the first day the feedback cards were about the participants' expectations on the SI week and about how they thought they would be able to contribute to the SI during the week.

Expectations

The reflections after the first afternoon is that they expected to learn from each other – to share experiences, see similarities and differences etc. The SI was expected to influence both their teaching and their projects. Some of the participants also wrote that the SI provided time to concentrate on matters concerning learning and teaching, which they seldom have. One of the participants had a very pragmatic expectation – how to create a good course.

Contributions

Some of the participants wrote that it is hard to say what they can contribute with when they do not know the others. Others wrote that they can contribute with their experiences, questions and discussions. Two of the participants also wanted to contribute with their good sense of humour!

Monday June 7

The project group wanted to know what the participants' feelings were after the first day. The topics during the day were "inquiry" and "scholarship" and the group had a feeling that this might be new to most of the participants. The feedback after this day was about what the participants understood, liked, and wished.

I understand...

Most of the feedback cards concerned the terms "inquiry" and "scholarship". Some of the participants wrote that they understood more about the meaning of them, others that they understood that they did not understand them and the difficulties with them. Some of them expressed that they were not used to discussing learning and that they understand the importance of being able to express oneself within the field.

I like...

The participants liked a whole range of different things, for instance discussing with others, to get the possibility and time to reflect over different matters concerning teaching and learning, how the projects already had grown and the different ways in which they had worked during the day.

I wish...

Some of the participants wished we could go faster, others that we would slow down! Other reflections concerned more time for discussions and that the objectives with some discussions could be clearer. Some of the participants also wished that they would be able to bring these discussions back to their departments.

Tuesday June 8

The Tuesday started with a session on assessment. Then there was a short session about “critical friendship” when two of the facilitators offered constructive criticism to the third one. The last session was a workshop in painting with a Swedish artist. The different sessions consisted of quite a lot of different activities.

How did I learn in school today?

Some of the participants wrote that they learnt from the variety of activities during the day. Quite a lot of the participants wrote about the importance of the group discussions. The presentation of assessment made it possible to learn more about the subject and then, through reflection, made the participants more aware of their own assessment and possible changes.

How do I feel about that?

Here the participants displayed a remarkable command of adjectives for expressing that essentially they felt positive about this way of working, e.g. good, motivated, fulfilled, hungry for thinking about it, free!, positive!, great, excited, challenged.

Thursday June 9

On the Thursday the project group wanted to reflect on what the participants had learnt the day before. The first session on the Wednesday was a guest lecture about learning in higher education. During the afternoon there were two sessions: one about the higher education context and one about strategies for change.

What did I learn about my own learning yesterday?

Some of the participants wrote about different methods of learning: discussing, listening, reflecting, writing, in group, alone etc. Others mentioned for instance that there are different levels of learning – deep and surface learning. One of the participants wrote that he had realized that he reflects on and digests new information much better if he moves. He therefore needs to find ways to move for him and the students.

How might this insight help me improve my learning?

By being better to discuss and share with others, by reflecting on my learning process, avoiding lectures or at least more actively reflect on lecture contents were some of the reflections on the feed back cards.

Friday June 10

The Friday feedback card was different from the others in that it was the only time we read our own card. It was different also in that we focused on the entire week rather than a specific day. We read our feedback cards and then put them all into our ‘Winter Institute Box’ for re-reading at the Winter Institute.

What was the most important insight during the week?

Naturally comments varied greatly but many had a similar essence in focussing on how much can be achieved through more informed decisions and how they had achieved a

new perspective on learning and teaching. The participants also mention reflection on their own learning and that of their students and on how placing the learner at the centre changes almost everything in their courses. There are also comments to the effect of realising that they are good teachers and enjoy teaching.

What do I most appreciate about the week?

Many of the participants write in general terms to the effect that they enjoy the atmosphere of the SI and mention the joint effort, all permissive, open-minded and generative discussions and the subsequent changing of views. They also stress the inspiring feeling of the SI and all the fun as also channelling learning.

Tuesday January 11, 2005-03-03

This was the only feedback card of the Winter Institute and it was a variation on one of the SI feedback cards.

I like ...

Many participants mention enjoying being back in the group. However, they also talk of appreciating the time set aside to actually sit down and begin working on the documentation of the projects and to see the project grow. Not least important, some participants mention enjoying trying on new ideas for their projects and getting less confused about them. They also still like their projects.

I wish ...

Being back in the SI-group again, some participants wish they had more of the SI-atmosphere at home and more time for the types of discussions that such an environment generates. They also wish to focus their project more clearly and get feedback on that type of re-articulation of the projects. Another recurring feature is the need to spend more time in smaller groups to discuss projects.

I will ...

Many of the statements here are quite pragmatically focussed on the projects and the participants predictably state that they will document their projects but that they need feedback to make them grow and to keep improving the pedagogy in the projects. Some participants add that they will hopefully be able to inspire other teachers with their project and that they will not give up!

On closing the Winter Institute, participants also wrote a letter to the future SI05s. This letter is naturally of some interest from an evaluative perspective as the letter assignment asked for an informative letter to future participants in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the SI04, what to expect from the SI and how to make the most of SI05. These letters will be read during the introductory session for SI05 and will be accounted for in connection to that Summer Institute.

Project narratives and grid comments

Not all the participants bothered to comment on the **Sunday** but what they said is pretty much that it offered a nice start to the week. Nice with a concrete active start in other words. Similarly, the problem is a good way into the week. It offers focus and makes for a ‘natural’ way to meet the home teams. It is also said that it was actually good not spend a great deal of time with the problems at this point. The letter to themselves is also a positive experience—nice to have to go back to and it too provides good focus for the week.

The participants comments re **Monday** tend to verify our impression that Monday was too vague and lacking in clear enough objectives and instructions. This may have made Monday frightening even. So, the purpose may have to be made more obvious as well as the instructions. The confusion re concepts and purposes carried over from the morning to the afternoon. There are also many comments to the effect that the tempo was too high but the sessions, while confusing and hence frustrating, got thinking started and were found worthwhile in retrospect.

The **Tuesday** is a far less problematic day. Almost all comments about Neill’s session are positive both in terms of its being good and valuable as well as excellently delivered. In fact, many participants have this down as either a turning point or ‘the most important point’. Some participants see its modelling aspects (lecture elements and activities). Of course they also comment on the painting session. Most everyone seems to have liked it and a few mention it as a group process. Two comments are particularly interesting: “made it easier to choose a picture for learning => new angle on project” and “illustrates the week: starts with confusion...”

The participants seem pretty decided about the **Wednesday**. They all detect the traditional delivery of the guest lecture but they all agree that the content was good, great, or important and that there may have been a point in using the traditional model. Similarly, many participants appreciate the modelling of activities after the lecture. The two sessions in combination worked well and gave perspectives. The afternoon is more problematic and the group is more divided. Yet, many participants list the session on ‘the higher education context’ as important or interesting but that it needs follow-up or clearer purpose since these are relevant issues to address. Those who mention the closing session on ‘strategies for change’ like it and some even mention its importance for morale and atmosphere. Participants who mention the learning picture exercise, which was meant to close the cycle on learning, like it as a way of reflecting on learning but suggest that it needs more time. Also note an important comment that Wednesday might be a typical ‘third-day-problems’ type-of-day and that SI-schedules should be planned accordingly.

Now, for the **Thursday**, which was a completely new type of SI-experiment, the participants tend to say that all the pieces fell in place (project/teaching/thinking) either during the morning ‘round-robin’ or during the afternoon project discussions with home teams. Specifically about the morning, some participants list it as that which gave the most or as generally good or excellent. Specific voices also mention the informative

aspect of getting the three perspectives on the same thing (deep learning). There are fewer specific comments about the afternoon. They seem to find the 'day' useful or even fantastic and the home team discussions particularly useful. It was good to have time now that they really knew what they wanted to do and had the tools for it.

Not very many explicit comments are made regarding the **Friday** but the project presentations were much appreciated. They provided many good comments and insights and were interesting. Furthermore, they provided a closure of sorts to the project dimension of SI04. For the closing, there are some comments to the effect of wanting more time to be a good critical friend.

Since projects or project related activities recur on the outline, there are comments about the **projects** also among the comments on the outline. Some participants point out that we need to be more deliberate when introducing the project. As such it is scary and needs to be introduced both as work in progress but maybe more importantly as a way of channelling some of their impressions during the week. The Tuesday session on the projects may need somewhat more time BUT it seems to have worked with a very limited amount of time (some participants changed their projects here). Regarding the Thursday session most participants found it perfect with more time during the Thursday afternoon and many pin-pointed their project here after the round-robin.

The commenting on the outline grid also entailed a comment on 'your own contribution'. With a few exceptions they all have difficulties pin-pointing their own contribution. An SI is a joint effort and they all mention their taking part in discussions in the respective constellations and sharing their experience. The discussions channelled reflection and application. Many participants also mention their having tried to be active. One or two are aware of not having contributed a great deal in plenum but claim to have been more active in learning partnerships and in the home teams.

Project narratives

The project narratives are more difficult to summarise in terms of SI-evaluation and I do not think they really need evaluating from a content/project point of view at this point. That type of perspective seems valid only in retrospect when the documentation process is further advanced. Nevertheless, reviewing the narratives for the January seminar provided a good starting point for planning and re-focussing prior to documenting the projects.

However, every single project narrative indicates that the week worked very well in terms of the learning processes involved. Many projects started out grand or vague and were gradually focused on more specific ISL issues and every narrative shows that the writer is 'more informed' and a few of the narratives also reflect writers having come out of the week empowered by it. There are also a few examples of a fairly anxious process -- 3-4 project never actually crystallised until Thursday. Other narratives show how the week worked well for 'divergent thinkers' who made good use of the mixture between sessions, learning partnerships, and home team discussions in combination with their own

reflection and experience. In short, we feel confident that our project set-up worked well and we are sure we can adjust it to whatever changes we make for next year.

SI04 – The future

The 2004 SI-week was unlike previous SI-weeks in that it was only meant as a first step in a three-step process towards completing a pedagogical development project. We worked the notion of learning and the importance of improving student learning as crucial aspects of all projects. We also closed the week with the knowledge that we had a supportive group around us to contact through the SI-network. On completing the WI-seminar in January 2005, we saw again how important the SI-atmosphere is for creative thinking and energising projects. We also saw the potential of the group and the collective knowledge of the SIs. Yet the work has to be done and the rest of the SI-network has to be incorporated into it.

The SI Alumni

The strength of the Swedish Summer Institute lies in its alumni and in its national networking capacity. However, there are not many ways for the alumni to get back into the momentum of the actual SI-week. Since 2004, we have the opportunity to invite alumni to an annual seminar. In 2005, the seminar will be hosted by Malmö-Lund SI-alumni and will be geared toward assessment and examination. As such the alumni seminars are absolutely crucial in providing some ground for the continued growth and increasing professionalism of SIs and the fact that the alumni seminars are organised by and for alumni is of course central to their continued relevance to the SI-network. Yet it seems too early to tell to what extent the seminars will work and how they are to be developed and fine-tuned. Unfortunately, as the number of alumni grows and the seminars eventually might get increasingly specific it seems we need additional ways to support the Summer Institute idea for the entire SI-community.

The SI-Web and Forum

For some years now, the Council for the renewal of higher education have supported a very basic web page for the SI. It contains some information about applications and a list of participants as well as the respective SI-reports. The council has also supported the forum for SI-alumni which, while it has been one of the active fora, remains a fairly silent forum. What is needed, it seems is first of all to combine these current resources and then develop an SI-web that would actually offer support and presentation other than administrative information and some logistics.

SI 04 – Financial report

The annual financial report for the summer institute was submitted to the council in December 2004 and was signed on January 12, 2005. For the 2004 financial situation, the summer institute budget was divided between Chalmers Lindholmen College University and the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education. Some financial costs were covered by Chalmers while the travel expenses for the participants and the cost of the SI venue

(Åkerby Mansion) were covered by the Council. As figure 1 below indicates, the financial report also includes costs for the Council during the fall of 2003 which is when the SI04 began to carry costs. However, there was no contract in 2003 requiring a financial report and therefore those items were included in the 2004 report.

Aktivitet	Medel till	Utfall SI2004		Utbetalningar gjorda	
	Chalmers	Chalmers	Rådet	av Rådet	
	031231			2 003	2 004
Internationellt planeringsmöte	60 000	9 081	56 042	56 042	0
Urvalskommitté			28 172	28 172	0
Referensgrupp	5 000	2 663	26 819	14 662	12 157
Kursgård (mat och uppehälle)			211 613	0	211 613
Resekostnader för deltagarna			22 954	0	22 954
Resekostnader för internationella	50 000	13 202	-	0	0
Arvode för internationella partners	20 000	45 390	-	0	0
Arvode för gästföreläsare	20 000	16 246	-	0	0
Litteratur för deltagarna	20 000	5 550	1 623	0	1 623
Information	5 000		8 200	8 200	0
Övrigt	45 000	24 075	20 675	8 176	12 499
Handläggare rådets kansli			400	0	400
Arvode svensk kursledare	40 000	37 782	25 317	0	25 317
Projektledare	61 049	95 199	452 619	412 953	39 666
Kompensation (lärosätet 35%)			154 071	140 188	13 883
Totalt	326 049	249 188			
Kompensation (lärosätet 35%)	114 117	114 117			
SUMMA:	440 166	363 305	1 008 506	668 393	340 113
Medel återförda från Chalmers till Rådet		76 861			
		(440 166)			
Kostnad för Sommarinstitutet bå 2004			703 418		
Total kostnad för Sommarinstitutet 2004*			931 645		

* Omfattar även lönekostnader för 4:e kvartalet 2004

Figure 1. Attachment from the financial report 2004. Excuses for not translating the Swedish

Concluding remarks

The two first parts of the 2004 Summer Institute are closed. The SI-week in June 2004 and the reunion seminar in January 2005 were both exciting and demanding on everyone involved and we were all to some extent transformed by them. Yet, the really demanding task is still to pursue the SI-momentum. For us, who took part in the two institutes and have started developing projects remain to pursue the projects and learn from them and eventually document them. For the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education and for us in the entire SI-community remain to find the most effective formats and activities that nurture and tend the network of SI-alumni.

The Swedish Summer Institute is a learning experience for all of us and I hope we have been able to give the community another piece of the puzzle adding variation to the picture we have of learning and development work in higher education.

On behalf of the SI04 project team,

Tjörn, March 3, 2005.

Magnus Gustafsson, National project manager

Appendices

1. Invitation

INBJUDAN ATT SÖKA TILL

Sommarinstitutet 2004 –

Learners for Change

För fjärde gången erbjuder Rådet för högre utbildning 20 unga, välmeriterade och engagerade universitetslärare och tillika lovande forskare att under en intensiv internatvecka utveckla sitt pedagogiska förhållningssätt. Temat för årets Sommarinstitut är ”Learners for Change”.

Sommarinstitutet äger rum den 6-11 juni 2004 på en kursgård på en ”tågnära” plats i Sverige.

Syfte och mål

Ett övergripande syfte med Sommarinstitutet är att öka entusiasmen och intresset för lärande och undervisning och därmed höja undervisningens status. Syftet med Sommarinstitutet är också att deltagarna ska bli mer medvetna om den egna pedagogiska grundsynen. Sommarinstitutet är en unik möjlighet att utvecklas som ung universitetslärare i Sverige. Förhoppningen är att Sommarinstitutet skall ha sådan karaktär att det upplevs som ett tidigt pedagogiskt pris för deltagarna.

Målet är att ge unga universitetslärare, tillika lovande forskare, möjlighet att utveckla det egna pedagogiska förhållningssättet och bredda sina insikter om olika teorier kring lärande och undervisning. Målet är också att skapa ett nätverk för unga lärare.

En viktig uppgift för institutet är att förbereda deltagarna på de nya krav som ställs på universitets- och högskolelärare i dag och i morgon. Synen på kunskap och kunskapsbildning förändras i vår omvärld vilket påverkar högre utbildning. Dessutom blir studentgrupperna större och delvis nya men framförallt allt mer heterogena genom högskolans expansion, vilket ställer andra krav på pedagogiken. Samtidigt står stora pensionsavgångar i lärarkollektivet för dörren.

Denna förändring och expansion väcker många olika frågor som i varierande utsträckning påverkar aktiviteterna under internatveckan:

- Hur kan forskning och undervisning bedrivas parallellt utan att de konkurrerar med varandra?

- Vilka vägar kan man gå för att skapa bra lärande för studenterna och bra undervisningsarbete för läraren?
- Hur ser morgondagens universitet ut?
- Att utvecklas och lära som lärare.

Sommarinstitutet är bland annat genom sin internatsform, sitt upplevelsebaserade genomförande och sina internationella medverkande, en unik möjlighet att utvecklas som ung universitetslärare i Sverige.

Genomförande och innehåll

Eftersom Sommarinstitutet sätter lärandet i centrum, ägnas en stor del av tiden åt aktiverande och reflekterande pedagogiska arbetsformer enskilt, i par och i grupp. Kursledarna inleder många av aktiviteterna och agerar diskussionsledare i vissa, men deltar lika ofta som enskilda individer med erfarenhet av högre utbildning för att dela med sig av sina egna erfarenheter och sitt kunnande. Genom olika workshops och övningar erbjuder kursledarna även deltagarna en möjlighet att konstruera en teoretisk bas för lärandet. Deltagarna förväntas delta aktivt under veckan, men får även möjlighet till reflektion, såväl enskilt som med andra. Andra former för genomförande kan vara diskussionsseminarier, workshops och föreläsning/seminarium som hålls av någon för temat aktuell person.

Veckan leds av Magnus Gustafsson, universitetslektor, Chalmers Tekniska Högskola, Ph.D. Catherine Robinson, Hong Kong University, Charlotte Silén, pedagogisk konsult, Linköpings universitet samt Neill Thew, Head of the Teaching & Learning Development Unit, University of Sussex at Brighton.

Programmet för veckan fastställs normalt ett par månader innan genomförandet. För att starta deltagarnas tankeprocess innan internatveckan kommer deltagarna att få sig tillsänt en uppgift som berör veckans tema.

Observera att arbetspråket under veckan är engelska!

Finansiering

Rådet för högre utbildning står för kurskostnaden och resekostnaden för deltagarna.

Baskrav

Sök till Sommarinstitutet om du är i början av din lärargärning. Du ska ha undervisat minst 80 timmar vid högskola eller universitet och vara antagen till forskarutbildning eller ha disputerat.

Cirka 20 personer kommer att antas till internatveckan. Vid urvalet tas hänsyn till såväl undervisnings- som forskningsmeriter. För urvalet svarar en grupp med representanter från olika lärosäten. För att kunna erbjuda lärande över ämnes- och organisationsgränserna är ambitionen att ha deltagare som representerar en så stor ämnes- och lärosätesspridning som möjligt.

Ansökan

Ansökningshandlingar till Sommarinstitutet bifogas detta brev. Informationen och ansökningshandlingarna finns även att hämta på *Rådet för högre utbildnings* webbsida: <http://hgur.hsv.se/sommarinstitutet/index.htm>.

Till ansökan bör sökande även bifoga ett intyg/rekommendationsbrev om max en A4-sida från t.ex. prefekt, handledare, studierektor eller pedagogisk konsult.

Ansökan samt intyg/rekommendationsbrev skall vara Rådet för högre utbildning - Sommarinstitutet, Box 7285, 103 89 STOCKHOLM, till handa **senast den 17 oktober 2003**.

Kontaktpersoner

Har du frågor är du välkommen att kontakta Sommarinstitutets projektledare:

Magnus Gustafsson, universitetslektor, Chalmers Tekniska Högskola
tel: 031-772 58 15
e-post: magu@chl.chalmers.se

eller Rådets kansli:

Åsa Rurling, handläggare, Rådet för högre utbildning,
tel: 08 - 5630 88 67,
e-post: Asa.Rurling@hsv.se

2. Guidelines for admission

Om bedömningsprinciper Sommarinstitutet 2004

20 deltagare samt reserver till Sommarinstitutet 2004 skall utses och jag hoppas att dessa kriterier och erfarenheter kan vara till hjälp för er i ert arbete.

Steg 1 - Sortera bort!

Ansökningen skall vara ankomststämplad på rådet senast den 17/10.

Undervisningserfarenhet som är mindre än 80 tim då SI04 genomförs. Rena kontakttimmar är det primära men även kursutveckling bör tas med i beräkning vid enskilda fall.

Avsaknad av pedagogisk utbildning på högskolenivå.

NB. Tidigare kunde vi krasst sortera bort sökande äldre än 35. Detta är idag ej längre möjligt. Den nya formuleringen är 'i början av din lärargärning'. Ansökningar där sökande inte är i början av sin lärargärning kan alltså sorteras bort. Här får en negativ definition tillämpas tror jag: SI behöver en förhållandevis homogen åldersfördelning samt inriktas i någon utsträckning på lärar-forskare som redan i början av sin karriär visar på potential för pedagogisk utveckling/ledarskap. Början på en lärargärning kan för all del vara senare än 35 men rimligtvis har vi ett utrymme mellan 25-40 där 35 är 'gamla' deltagare även framgent kommer att vara få. Jag föreslår att detta sorteringsalternativ används först då övrig fördelning gjorts (se nedan).

Steg 2 - Bedömningar av pedagogiska meriter och forskningsmeriter**Pedagogiska meriter**

Antalet undervisningstimmar är mindre viktigt än den pedagogiska grundsynen, dvs kvalitativa bedömningar är viktigare att göra - helst en holistisk bedömning där ni tar hänsyn till följande tre aspekter:

1) att deltagare meriterat sig genom att gå pedagogiska kurser för undervisning inom högre utbildning eller genomfört annan längre lärarutbildning på högskolenivå. Dock är det helt avgörande att de även reflekterat kring hur denna meritering påverkat deras verksamhet.

2) Motiveringen i ansökan till 'Varför ska du antas till SI2004?' kan ge värdefull information. Det verkar ju rimligt att man tänker över sina ord när man bara har fyra rader på sig och inte skall lämna med CV eller annan dokumentation. Samtidigt är det många som använder kodorden i inbjudan. Trots denna svårighet, som ni måste vara observanta på, tror jag att det går att göra en grovsortering här.

Vid Pedagogiska Akademin, LTH använder man sex bedömningskriterier som ni kanske kan ha glädje av att diskutera för er bedömning också:

- * i vilken utsträckning man utgår från ett lärandeperspektiv till skillnad från ett lärarperspektiv. NB. Att SI arbetar med ett lärandeperspektiv med att det primära ändå är att det finns ett formulerat perspektiv alls (se nästa punkt)
- * personlig pedagogisk filosofi
- * utveckling över tid genom pedagogiska kurser, kursutveckling etc
- * delat sina pedagogiska erfarenheter med andra
- * tvärvetenskaplig samverkan kring kursgivande och kursutveckling
- * personlig pedagogisk orientering mot framtiden - medvetna pedagogiska mål

En medvetenhet av det här slaget skulle jag gärna vilja se på de fyra raderna eller läsa om i rekommendationsbrevet.

3) Erfarenhet av undervisning och hur det påverkat deltagares grundsyn och utveckling bör ni naturligtvis också väga in—alltjämt med grundförutsättningen att det är en medveten lärar-forskare som söker sig till SI04.

4) Pedagogiskt intresse enligt rekommendationsbrevet, gärna utveckling enligt punkterna ovan i någon form.

5) En annan viktig dimension av ansökningshandlingarna är till vilken utsträckning deltagarna antyder eller för fram följande extra meriterande dimensioner:

uttryckt betydelse i rekommendationsbrevet från institutionens sida att få del av kandidatens erfarenheter från SI, meriter såsom förtroendeuppdrag i fakultet, internationella kontakter av betydelse, pedagogiskt pris eller forskarpris samt om sökande aktivt tagit initiativ till att utveckla kurser eller läromedel.

Med utgångspunkt från detta görs en helhetsbedömning på en tregradig skala enligt förslagsvis:

3 = välmeriterad

2 = meriterad

1 = mindre väl meriterad eller tveksamt underlag

Forskningsmeriter

1) Man skulle kunna ställa upp någon form av ålderskriterium, t ex ha disputerat före 34 års ålder eller ha antagits till forskarutbildningen före 26 års ålder och ej ha hållit på med avhandlingen längre än 6 år efter antagningen till forskarutbildningen och sedan använda det här kriteriet med försiktighet med tanke på skillnader mellan fakulteter i tid fram till disputation.

NB. Återigen är ålder inte längre möjlig som primär sorteringsfaktor men likväl värdefull som en fördelningsaspekt då ni ser över institutets sammansättning. Applicera ett

eventuellt ålderskriterium ni ställer upp med försiktighet på ett liknande sätt som det 'ålderskriterium' som gäller för hela SI (se ovan)-

2) Den uttryckta kopplingen mellan forskning och pedagogisk verksamhet är även den av stort intresse för SI-veckan. Även detta kriterium bör användas i andan att få reflekterande medvetna lärar-forskare till institutet.

3) Rekommendationsbrevet blir viktigt att luta sig mot - men validiteten i rekommendationsbrev är ju problematisk. Likväl är brevet en mycket viktig informationskälla. Se också speciella meriter under steg 2 punkt 4) som kan gälla forskningen.

Samma sammanvägning till en helhetsbedömning som ovan:

3 = välmeriterad

2 = meriterad

1 = mindre väl meriterad eller tveksamt underlag

Önskvärd spridning av bakgrundsvariabler

Utifrån de två bedömningar ovan, där båda bör väga in lika tungt, är det sedan fråga om att ta hänsyn till andra viktiga kriterier, så att det blir god spridning på deltagarna enligt vad som sägs i inbjudan, enligt denna rangordning, den viktigaste först:

1) gruppering av ansökningarna i fyra grupper: 1) kvinnliga disputerade, 2) kvinnliga doktorander, 3) manliga disputerade, 4) manliga doktorander

NB. Tidigare år har en 'perfekt' fördelning eftersträvats (alltså 5 deltagare ur varje kategori) Detta ser jag inte som ett primärt kriterium. SI04 kan inte hantera stora obalanser men meritering och gruppens potential måste gå före en sådan stenhård tillämpning av kvotering. Däremot finns det en poäng i att det finns reserver att ta från respektive kategori så att den balans ni kommit fram till i största möjliga mån kan bibehållas även då reserver antas.

2) rangordning inom respektive grupp ovan utifrån helhetsbedömningarna ovan där pedagogiska och forskningsmeriter bör väga in lika tungt

3) det har visat sig finnas en mycket traditionell koppling mellan genus och vetenskapligt ämnesområde. Här finns naturligtvis en möjlighet för er att motverka denna genom att lyfta in sökande med otraditionella ämnesval inom varje kategori sökande vid likvärdig meritering

4) vid likvärdig meritering bör ni eftersträva lärosätesspridning först och därefter spridning på antal ämnesområden.

Lycka till,
Magnus Gustafsson

3. List of participants

Anna Levén	Linköpings univ
Karina Tilling	Mälardalens högskola
Maria Nelson	Handelshögskolan i Stockholm
Karin Reuterswärd	Stockholms universitet
Kajsa Jerlinder	Högskolan i Gävle
Petra Ragnerstam	Lunds universitet
Maria Eriksson	Umeå universitet
Charlotta Movitz	Göteborgs universitet
Sigrid Agenäs	SLU
Marie Wiberg	Umeå universitet
Markus Sjöblom	Uppsala universitet
Johan Hansson	Luleå tekniska universitet
Hans E Andersson	Göteborgs universitet
Stephan Pomp	Uppsala universitet
Krister Larsson	Chalmers
Mattias Alveteg	Lunds universitet
Dan Borglund	KTH
Johan Svensson	Linköpings universitet

NB. Two delegates cancelled their participation on the opening day of SI04 and we made no attempt to replace them.

4. Pre-thinking

Welcome to the Swedish Summer Institute 2004 – Learners for Change

The Summer Institute is approaching and we hope that you have made all your travel arrangements and you are looking forward to this event as much as we are. At the end of this letter you will find more information about how you will get from Örebro Station to our venue Åkerby Mansion (<http://www.edbergs.com/>). However, before we meet, there are six things we would like you to prepare for the Summer Institute week.

1. Introduce yourself at the Council's forum board
2. Bring a typical piece of research from your field
3. Read the enclosed article by Schön
4. Start your reflective journal
5. Bring a teacher/researcher related problem from your situation
6. Bring a picture of being a teacher/researcher in Higher Education

Preparations

To start with, there is a special forum only for you at the Council for Higher Education forum board. In order to speed up the process of getting to know each other at the SI, we would like you simply to post a brief introductory message in English; Who are you?; Where do you work?; What's your discipline?; How did you learn about the SI?; and why did you apply for it? Or, of course, any other less predictable information you would want to introduce yourself with.

You have already been registered as members at the “Inför SI 2004”-conference. To reach this forum, you have to login at the bottom of the page <http://www.rhu.nu/forum/> by using your e-mail address and the password “sommar”.

Secondly, we would like you to bring a sample of good research from your field -- other than you own ;-). What we would like you to do is to bring a research article, conference paper, or possibly a book chapter that illustrates how research is typically done well in your field. Pick a paper that has informed your own work for instance. We will not be expecting you to summarise this piece of good research but we will work with it in order to accentuate the limits of our respective fields in terms of ‘inquiry’.

The third thing we have in mind is for you to read the article that we enclose —“The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology”. This is an article by Donald F Schön, whom some of you might be familiar with. Nevertheless, we ask you to consider what he is proposing about ‘epistemology’ in Higher Education:

- Boyer's four scholarships are mentioned in the article and Schön claims that the notion of these four scholarships requires a new epistemology for HE, does this seem valid for you and your department? Do you see old and new epistemologies affecting you and your department? (If you feel you want to read up on Boyer's 'scholarships', you'll find Boyer's book available at the Council's forum <http://www.rhu.nu/forum/> but you'll need to be logged in to get it).
- How would you characterize the schools of thought and the praxis at your university?
- What do you think is your division of labour between the scholarships and the epistemologies five years from now?
- On reading the Schön article, you will be reminded of the importance of reflection and 'knowing-in-action'. To what extent is that part of your current practice and learning?

Now, we do not expect a five-page exam paper on these questions but we believe that these types of questions and this type of thinking will inform many of our sessions during the SI so it makes sense to spend some time thinking about how Schön's argument relates to your situation or should relate to your situation. Spend the time you find it worth – anything from 30 minutes to 30 hours!

Predictably, we encourage reflection and knowing-in-action and we have therefore enclosed also a log-book for your reflective journal. **Our fourth task for you**, then, is that we invite you to keep a journal to become more actively reflective about your practices and about ideas you come across. Use this journal before, during, and after the SI as a journal with which to keep track of thoughts, impressions, and ideas. We recommend you to write down your expectations about SI since it could be useful for you to go back to these notes during the week. Some writers prefer to columnise the journal and keep one column per page for 'input' or 'representations of events' and the other column for reflection about items in the first column. However, it is your journal and while we will be working with it during the SI at times, you use it as you see fit.

With Schön's notion of reflection and use of 'knowing-in-action' and your work with the journal, **our fifth assignment for you** is probably the most important one. We ask you to bring to SI a problem from your work as a teacher/researcher at course, department, or even programme or school level. The problem should be oriented somehow towards improved student learning. So, what is it you would like to change and why? How will it improve learning? Problems can range from session level via course level to issues like programme level and school policies. Problems could focus on any issue related to learning such as motivation, planning, assessment, methodologies, etc. Ask yourself, however, what kind of solution you are looking for ... Use your journal to write down your thoughts about what you want to change and why (don't write an essay) before coming to SI.

In one way or another, every session at the SI is connected to your work on this problem. Nevertheless, we do not expect that you will be able to solve your problem during the week. Therefore, this is a process, project if you like, that we expect to return to in our reunion during the Winter Institute -05. Our aim with this problem, thus, is to invite you to do some pedagogical development work during the fall based on your experience and your spending a week with like-minded in June. Then, we would like you to distribute your findings at the Winter Institute. Needless to say, this will be beneficial to everyone involved and you will hopefully want to use this publication in your pedagogical portfolio.

Finally, with some presentations on the forum, some thinking about your own research field and about epistemologies in HE as well as possible problems in your own situation in HE, we think a **final preparatory assignment** becomes rewarding. We would like you to choose a picture or image (could be a picture from a magazine or a photograph, not smaller than 10 x 10 cm) that somehow represents your understanding of working in HE. In the SI, we will use this picture for introductory purposes as a way of further getting to know each other.

Meeting point

When you arrive in Örebro on June 6, there will be buses/taxis picking you up at the Central station. Åsa will e-mail you information about when the buses/taxis will leave Örebro for Åkerby Mansion in good time before June 6. The drivers will have a sign saying Summer Institute and they should be notified about train delays and the like, so there should be no problems if your train is late.

In case you run in to problems anyway, it might be good for you to have these phone numbers handy

Åkerby Mansion: 0587-912 10
 Åsa: 073-968 10 89
 Magnus: 0709-68 79 82

Well, this was a long letter of preliminaries. We will probably have forgot something important, nevertheless, the most important thing is that we have a full week to spend together discussing higher education and what we can do in it in the future. We're really looking forward to seeing you in June! Don't hesitate to contact us if you have any questions!

All the best,

Magnus Gustafsson
 031-772 58 15

magusta@chl.chalmers.se

Åsa Rurling
 08-563 088 67

asa.rurling@rhu.se

Charlotte Silén
 013-22 86 70

chasi@imv.liu.se

Program and practicalities

As you will probably want to have some idea about what you will be doing during our week in June we have prepared an outline for the week. Please note that we know from past SIs that the initial program may have to be slightly adjusted during the week based on seminar activities and needs. You might find this program vague and confusing but please note that we allow, and to some extent invite, this vague character to the SI in order to allow you more room to maneuver and explore our various themes.

Time	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
08.30 – 09.00		Feedback Sunday	Feedback Monday	Feedback Tuesday	Feedback Wednesday	Project narrative
09.00 – 10.30		Inquiry in my field	Assessment	Learning in HE	Parallel sessions	Project presentations
11.00 – 12.30						Closing and summing up of SI04
12.30 – 14.00		Lunch / Reflection	Lunch / Reflection	Lunch / Reflection	Lunch / Reflection	Lunch and Diplomas
14.00 – 15.30	Welcome / Introduction	Inquiry into HE learning;	Project work	HE context and strategies for change	Project work	
16.00 – 17.30	The problem		Alternative Activity			
17.30 – 18.00	Feedback cards	Feedback cards	Feedback cards	Feedback cards	Project narrative	
19.00 - ?	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	SI04 Dinner	

- For one of our dinners we hope to be eating outdoors – bring clothes accordingly
- The environment allows walks and jogging in the surroundings as well as outings on the lake
- There is also a decent gym room, boule pitch etc.

5. Invitation to the Winter Institute 2005

We will meet for the Swedish Winter Institute 2005 in about a month! We are all looking forward to seeing you again and I hope we will be able to re-create some of the SI-atmosphere despite the fact that we only have two days and we will be facing the Stockholm winter. Getting back together again and getting a chance to share some of our post-SI experience will be great fun.

Nevertheless, there is also the perspective of continuing our projects irrespective of what stage they are currently at. Our aim is to be able to document the projects in an SI04 collection and therefore, our main objective with the WI is after all to begin that process of documentation. We will need to discuss very many aspects of such documentation even during the WI but we will also dedicate time to actually sit down to begin drafting the project documentation. Similarly, we will try to spend time reading each others' drafts and begin to work together to improve drafts and learn from each other.

To benefit from the WI, you will need to come well-prepared with a compilation of:

- Curricula and course memo(s)
- Course planning past and present
- Learning material past and present
- Relevant exercises and hand-outs
- Assessment material and principles
- Evaluation material and principles
- Theory or possible theoretical framework used (to be used)
- Your journal and your project narrative
- Any draft material that we have forgot to mention!

So, our ambition is that your projects be documented in a collection during 2005. While we will be discussing the format of this documentation during the WI, we have ventured to suggest some guidelines in terms of the functions the documentation needs to meet in the limited space of approximately 5000 words:

- Contextualisation in terms of background/setting/history
- Specification of the problem as narrowly as possible including a view to literature
- Presentation of factors or principles affecting possible solutions
- Brief description of the implemented change(s) and justifying it(them)
 - In planning
 - In delivery
 - In subsequent problem(s) and solutions(s)
- Evaluation of change
 - Teacher perspective
 - Student perspective
 - ISL perspective
- For the future
 - New problems
 - Recommendations
 - Implications

Outline

Monday January 10	
10.00 Coffee	
10.30 – 12.30	The Winter Institute Box and de-briefing our experience since SI04. Group discussion of recurring and central themes in the project narratives.
Lunch	
13.30 – 15.00	‘Aspects of the case study’ Discussion of how to document the projects as case studies. First WI05 writing session to begin re-drafting the project after the group discussions so far.
Coffee	
15.30 – 17.00	Writing session continued Project team introduction of common denominators / issues of the projects in relation to pedagogical research.
18.00 – 21.00	Dinner at the Royal Institute of Technology including a tour of the Learning Lab
Tuesday January 11	
08.30 – 10.00	Peer response on written drafts in groups of four guided by project team members
Coffee	
10.30 – 12.30	Discussing the level of ‘informedness’ of our drafts and projects. Revising criteria, level of ambition, degree of transferability, relation to research. Writing session - revision.
Lunch	
13.30 – 15.00	Reflection on project documentation so far. Closing of the WI05
Coffee	

A few comments about 'Aligning peer assessment with peer learning'

While we do not intend to suffer you some elaborate guidelines for the documentation of your projects we have agreed that the one genre most likely to accommodate the largest number of projects is the case study. We therefore aim towards some generic consistency in the documentation by suggesting an overall format. During the Winter Institute, we will obviously want and need to discuss how we are going to make the best of this format to make it fit our purposes. (I believe you may have already noticed that in the outline sent you previously).

You will all have read case studies from your own literature and you will probably have read a number of case studies from the literature related to pedagogical research. Nevertheless, we decided to send you one sample text all the same. There are a number of reasons for doing this. First, it might serve as good indication of the level of ambition we can feasibly aim for at this point. At this point in time, most likely, your projects do not lend themselves to full research articles of quality pedagogical research, or? Secondly, and related, the case study often has a stylistic register that is not extremely demanding on the writer and invites a large readership without requiring a great deal of field socialisation. It is often accessible. Thirdly, the case study often uses the simple yet dynamic basic structure of **Situation-Problem-Solution-Evaluation (SPSE)**. Consequently, and finally, the case study tends to allow for a fair balance between the descriptive and the analytical/theoretical.

Hopefully, you'll find some of these generic aspects of the case study in the sample we have chosen. Yet some specific comments might be called for. The project described has a longer history than yours and possibly a wider scope than some of your projects. In describing implementation, then, it relies on three cycles which does not seem to be possible for you (yet). Strictly speaking, as it is meant as a sample of the overall format, you ought to be able to disregard content but it is worth noting how closely it relates to course design; how the authors have chosen to incorporate and balance issues; how there is a large descriptive element in the presentation; how, for our concerns, it does cover some change-related issues and assessment; and how it is a case study in a thematic study of a specific phenomenon (peer learning as ISL).

So please read the sample with an eye to how your project could be presented in the form of a case study. Note strengths and weaknesses of the text in relation to what you want to convey. However, the text remains a mere example among many. We invite you to bring a sample you feel is more relevant to your writing or your project. Such additional samples would offer a great point of departure for discussing what we want the WI05 case studies to achieve and what they are to look like.

6. Minutes from meetings with the reference group

SI04 - Sammanfattningsvis efter två planeringsmöten och ett referensgruppsmöte

Några specifika frågor:

Vi har valt att inte bjuda in gästföreläsare. Dessutom har vi flyttat runt lite i schemat och kan behöva fortsätta göra det. Men ett förslag som dök upp i marsmötet var att bjuda in antingen 4 LPSare eller 4-5 alumner som resurspersoner i projektarbetet. De skulle då sannolikt bjudas in till torsdagen vilket kan komma att kräva lite schemaändringar. Vad säger ni? LPS eller SI-alumner?

Som 'vanligt' är inledningen intensiv och torsdagen och fredagen lämnar lite mera tid för eget arbete/reflektion. Upplever ni detta som problematiskt och en rest av tidigare SI eller bara nödvändigt och rent av kreativt?

I ett försök att ändra kvällsrutinerna har vi funderat lite kring aktiviteter redan på tisdagskvällen som avlastning till 'inledningsbördan'. Just nu kollar vi möjligheten att få en målar/skulptur workshop t ex. Vad tror ni—är det för mycket? Är det bättre att få 'egentid'?

Decembermötet

Vi inledde lite spontant om 'återträffsproblematiken' och det ansträngda att kastas in i en ny grupp som är mitt i en intensiv process. Samtidigt som SI03 inte var beredda på temat som kom att presenteras 'förändringsarbete' hade de andra förväntningar på mötet med SI01. Detta var ju inte helt nytt och jag påtalade det alternativ vi nu arbetar med där vi ser ett återträffsinstitut på vinterhalvåret istället. [Sedan dess har ju andra problem kring Vinterinstitut och återträffar påtalats med utformningen av VI05 lämnar vi därhän f n]

Vårt nästa ämne blev av allmän karaktär och inriktades på atmosfär/attityd. Per tyckte det är viktigt att SI inte blir 'att lära sig om något' men att lära sig om något genom att även bli 'utsatt' för det. I det här sammanhanget sa vi även att både dag ett och dag två är intensiva och i synnerhet om man 'utsätts' för mycket så behövs det mycket tid för individuell frihet. SI01/SI03 har inte i så stor utsträckning handlat om kvantifierbara 'färdigheter' och 'tips' som om attityder och upplevelser. Detta borde man försöka kommunicera på förhand; exempelvis i sista brevet innan SI04 eller på något sätt via 'barnkammaren' på forum.

Här nämnde Per även vikten av loggboken och förhållandet mellan kunskaps-, färdighets-, och attitydmål för honom i SI. I det här sammanhanget talde vi därför en del om de olika 'pre-thinking' material som använts. För SI01 var texten lite för 'enkel' och slog kanske mest in öppna dörrar; för SI03 användes utdrag ur Boyer som tydligen kom att kräva en del 'bearbetning' i seminariet för att nå fram(?).

Några direkta schemakommentarer från Per och Nikos

Kan man ha trådar till varje session på forum?

Bildövningen: Jättebra, men upprepa den på fredagen som en del i utvärderingsarbetet
Dag 1 och 'hemma discipliner': risk att hamna i fällan att utvecklingsarbete måste vara disciplinspecifikt.

Dag 2 och assessment: bara det inte blir för mycket 'teknik'. Mera 'varför' snarare än 'hur' samt betoning på konceptuella skillnader mellan processnivå, summativt, meta-kognitivt, och 'färdighetsinriktat'.

Dag 3 rollspel: Viktigt att 'tanka ur' ordentligt, både för observatörer och aktörer. Vikten av personlighet i all dessa möjliga situationer som kan tänkas utnyttjas i rollspelen. Då temat för SI04 rollspelen är tänkt att vara 'förändringsarbete' är det viktigt att komma ihåg att de flesta deltagare sannolikt inte har så stor erfarenhet av förändringsarbete på makronivå men väl på kursnivå. Detta kan användas för att kunna blomma ut i analys av olika möjliga rollspel.

Dag 4 och gäster: Här talade vi om möjliga gästföreläsare och Nikos framförde att han inte alls saknat gästföreläsare utan snarare egen tid. Likväl sas att det finns en styrka att kunna lyfta in ett främmande perspektiv som ändå anknyter till SI04 arbetet och kan förstärka det. John Bowden var ett namn som var på tapeten i december men som sedan dess sparats till VI. Några andra namn nämndes men den diskussionen kan vi ta upp i samband med våra frågor inför telefonkonferensen...

Dag 4 och parallella sessioner: Viktigt att inte försöka vara uttömmande, mera viktigt att försöka fånga upp behov som uppstått under veckan. Bland annat finns möjlighet att möta några önskemål om 'hur' angående assessment!

Dag 5: Utvärderingsidé – att utforma en presentation av SI04 på hemmaplan (manus till projektgruppen). I retrospekt ser det inte ut att bli fallet redan under SI04 men väl som del av utvärderingen av hela processen under VI05

Dag alla: Projektarbetet – viktig att se detta iterativt och att SI egentligen bara utgör en första fas. Forum och övrig handledning kommer att krävas för att föra projekten framåt.

Planeringsmöte för SI04 i 17-19 mars

Ja, vad ska rapporteras? Som ni ser är huvuddragen desamma och de flesta skillnader på genomförandenivå. Så t ex. kopplas de artiklar som ska arbetas med under måndag fm närmare till eftermiddagens problem som skrivs av Charlotte och även tangerar projektarbetet med problemen. Vidare stals en idé från det institut som planeras för Hong Kong i höst. Där har man kopplat problematiken med pedagogisk utveckling till problematiken att komma 'hem' till institutionen igen. Vilka strategier ska man då ha för sin 're-entry'. Vi har försökt koppla det här till vårt projektarbete genom att göra det till ett första steg. Vidare har vi försökt rikta utvärderingsarbetet mot det kommande Vinterinstitutet och ser därför mest SI-utvärderingen som formativ och vill visa på andra sätt att 'få in' information av 'utvärderingskaraktär'. Den andra läsningen av 'brevet' blir

en del av att skriva sin lilla projektutvecklingsberättelse till exempel. I presentationerna av projekten finns även ett utrymme för 'modifieringen' av bildövningen.

Vidare försöker vi bygga en 'pärm' till deltagarna där vi siktar på att ge 3-4 fyra kompletterande källor per session samt en litteraturlista. Av rent praktiska skäl vill vi kopiera så lite som möjligt på Åkerby så vi hoppas kunna fylla den här pärmen successivt med bakgrundsmaterial och diskussionsunderlag som vi använder i övningar och sessioner.

Nuvarande 'pre-think' förslag: [inte ännu formulerat...]

Loggbok [med betoning på att loggboken utgör del av utvärderingsprocessen]

Problem i nuvarande verksamhet som 'lärar/forskare' i 'högre utbildning'

Schön. "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology"

Change -95

Ta med en för ditt område typisk och bra artikel

Ta med en bild som representerar dig i ditt verk inom 'högre utbildning'

Efter telefonmöte 040503:

Schemaändringar med anledning av Catherines sjukdom, Dahlgren-Rosati lösningen för 'Learning in Higher education' fick stöd i gruppen. Det nämndes även att Dahlgrens gästföreläsning skulle fungera väl i kombination med tisdagens seminarium på examination. Men framförallt betonades vikten av att göra lite andra saker; SI är ej en traditionell kurs. Nya perspektiv via gäster är bra om det kan göras tematiskt relevant.

Återigen framfördes vikten av att alternera kvällar lite för att öppna upp för kortare middagar så att det finns en möjlighet att skaffa egentid. Vi enades även om att samla 'strategies for change' till onsdagen för att ge utrymme till projektarbete under torsdagen.

Angående frågeställningen om till vilken utsträckning man kan arbeta med schemat fick projektgruppen stöd för att använda ett tematiskt/ytligt på söndagen och i utskick för att sedan arbeta med schemat igen på fredag som en del av utvärderingsarbetet.

På förfrågan angående måndagens artiklar sades att de inte nödvändigtvis måste reflektera en svensk forsknings tradition men väl att en artikel borde representera svensk högre utbildningsbakgrund.

De 'pre-thinking' uppgifter vi tänkte oss fick stöd men man bör även nämna förvirring som del av en dynamisk flexibel plan som kan påverkas av deltagare och av veckans övriga seminarier. I övrigt föreslogs att vi skulle förmå deltagarna och oss själv att 'spänna bågen högre'. Viktigt att även komma ihåg att skriva ut deltagarnas presentationer och inkludera i pärmen.

Grupperna ansågs genomtänkta men vi föreslogs att även testa könshomogena grupper någon gång under veckan. Vi fick även stöd för idén att kalla in 4-5 SI-alumner som resurspersoner under torsdagen.

7. Literature

Reader

- Barnett, Ronald. (2000). "University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity". *Higher Education*. Vol. 40: 409-422.
- Boud, David & David Walker. (1998). "Promoting reflection in professional courses: the challenge of context". *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 23, No. 2: 191-206.
- Brew, Angela. (2003). "Teaching and Research: New relationships and their implications for inquiry-based teaching and learning in higher education". *Higher Education Research & Development*. Vol. 22, No. 1:3-18.
- Brockbank, Anne & Ian McGill. (1998). *Facilitating Reflective Learning in Higher Education*. SRHE & Open University Press. Chapter 3 'What is Learning? – A Review of Learning Theories' pp. 32-56
- Dahlin, Bo. (1999). "Ways of Coming to Understand: metacognitive awareness among first-year university students". *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. Vol. 43, No. 2: 191-208.
- Gibbs, Graham. (2003). "Using Assessment Strategically to Change the Way Students Learn". In Brown, Sally & Angela Glasner Eds. *Assessment Matters in Higher Education – Choosing and Using Diverse Approaches*. SRHE & Open University Press. pp. 41-53.
- Handal, Gunnar. (1999). "Consultations Using Critical Friends". *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. No. 79: 59-70.
- Kezar, Adrianna & Peter D. Eckel. (2002). "The Effect of Institutional Culture on Change Strategies in Higher Education – Universal Principles or Culturally Responsive Concepts". *The Journal of Higher Education*. Vol. 73, No. 4: 435-460.
- Prosser, Michael & Paul Ramsden, Keith Trigwell, Elaine Martin. (2003). "Dissonance in Experience of Teaching and its Relation to the Quality of Student Learning". *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 28, No. 1: 37- 61.
- Robinson, Catherine. (2003). "Academic Work Practices: Becoming a Critical Friend". University of Hong Kong, Faculty of Education.
- . (2003) "Learning about teaching: Some questions for discussion". University of Hong Kong, Faculty of Education.
- Silver, Harold. (2003). "Does a University Have a Culture?". *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 28, No. 2: 157-169.

Simmons, Jay. (2003). "Responders are taught, not born". *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. Vol. 46, No. 8: 684-693.

Smith, Ronald. (2001). "Formative Evaluation and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning". *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. No. 88: 51-62.

Tight, Malcolm. (2003). *Researching Higher Education*. SRHE & Open University Press. Chapter 12 'Method and methodology in researching higher education' pp. 183-201.

Trigwell, Keith. (2001). "Judging university teaching". *The International Journal for Academic Development*. Vol. 6, No. 1: 65-73.

Yorke, Mantz. (2003). "Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice". *Higher Education*. Vol. 45: 477-501.

Monday session articles

Harris, Howard and Tracey Bretag. (2002). "Reflective and collaborative teaching practice: Working towards quality student learning outcomes" *Seventh Quality in Higher Education International Seminar, Transforming Quality*, Melbourne, Australia 30th-31st October, 2002.

Nicholls, Gill. (2004). "Scholarship in teaching as core professional value: what does this mean to the academic?" *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 9, No. 1: 29-42.

Townend, Stewart. M. (2001). "Integrating Case Studies in Engineering Mathematics: a response to SARTOR 3". *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 6, No. 2: 204-215.

Book table

Anson, Chris, M. (Ed.). (2002). *The WAC Casebook: Scenes for Faculty Reflection and Program Development*. Oxford University Press, New York & Oxford.

Barnett, R. (1992). *The Idea of Higher Education*. SRHE and Open University Press, Buckingham.

Bengtsson U (Ed). (2000). *Goda exempel – Hur universitet och högskolor kan arbeta med jämställdhet, studentinflytande samt social och etnisk mångfald*. Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2000:9 R.

Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. SRHE & Open University Press.

Björk, Lennart, Gerd Brauer, Lotte Rienecker, and Peter Stray Jörgensen. (Eds.). (2003). *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Blükert, Ann. (2002). *Skrivarstugor och loggböcker*. Rapport 29 från Enheten för utveckling och utvärdering, Uppsala Universitet. Ekonomikum, Uppsala.

Bondestam F. (2003). *Könsmedveten pedagogik för universitetslärare – en introduktion och bibliografi*. Uppsala universitet.

Boud, David, Ruth Cohen and Jane Sampson. (2001). *Peer Learning in Higher Education*. Kogan Page, London.

Bowden, J., Marton, F. (1998). *The University of Learning. Beyond quality and competence in higher education*. Kogan Page, London.

Dysthe, Olga, Hertzberg, Frøydis & Løkenard Hoel, Torlaug. (2002). *Skriva för att Lära*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Freedman, Aviva & Medway Peter. (Eds.). (1994). *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Taylor & Francis, London.

Fulwiler, Toby & Art Young. (Eds.). (1990). *Programs that Work*. Boynton/Cook, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Furusten T (Ed.). (2002). *Perspektiv på högskolan i ett förändrat Sverige*. Högskoleverket.

Giertz, B. (2003). *Att bedöma pedagogisk skicklighet – går det?* Rapport 2, UPI, Uppsala universitet.

Gustavsson, B. (2000). *Kunskapsfilosofi – Tre kunskapsformer i historisk belysning*. W&W: Smedjebacken.

Hård af Segerstad, H., Klasson, A., Tebelius, U. (1996). *Vuxenpedagogik att iscensätta vuxnas lärande*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Illeris, K. (2001). *Lärande i mötet mellan Piaget, Freud och Marx*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Kvalitet och flexibel utbildning – En antologi. Distansutbildningsmyndighetens rapport 1:2002.

Lauvås, P., Hofgaard Lycke, K., Handal, G. (1997). *Kollegahandledning i skolan*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

- Leitch, Ruth & Christopher Day. (2000). "Action Research and Reflective Practice: towards a holistic view". *Educational Action Research*. Vol. 8, No. 1: 179-193.
- Liedman, S-E. (2002). *Ett oändligt äventyr – om människans kunskaper*. Stockholm: Bonnier.
- Martin, E. (1999). *Changing Academic Work. Developing the Learning University*. SRHE and Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Marton, F., Booth, S. (2000). *Om lärande*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.
- Marton F, Hounsell D, Entwistle N. (1984). *Hur vi lär*. Scottish Academic Press.
- McLeod, Susan H. Miraglia, Eric. Soven, Margot & Thaiss, Christopher. (Eds.). (2001). *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs*. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana Ill.
- Nordborg G, Ågren K, Burman M. (2002). *Jämställdhets- och genusperspektiv i juristutbildningen*. Skrift 6/2002, Juridiska institutionen vid Umeå universitet.
- Prosser, M., Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding Learning and Teaching*. Open University Press.
- Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Reynolds, Nedra, Patricia Bizzel & Bruce Herzberg. (2004). *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing*. Sixth edition. Bedford/St. Martin's, Boston. MA.
- Rovio-Johansson R, Tingbjörn, G. (2001). *Pedagogisk skicklighet och pedagogiska meriter – historik & praktik*. Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:18 R
- Skaffa dig en pedagogisk meritportfölj! Broschyr, Uppsala universitet, 2002 .
- Stensmo, C. (1994). *Pedagogisk filosofi. En introduktion*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.
- Säljö, R. (2000). *Lärande i praktiken. Ett sociokulturellt perspektiv*. Bokförlaget Prisma. Stockholm.
- Tynjälä, Päivi, Mason, Lucia & Lonka Kirsti. (Eds.). (2001). *Writing as a Learning Tool*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Uljen M. (Ed.), (1997). *Didaktik – teori, reflektion och praktik*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.
- Young, Art. (1999). *Teaching Writing Across the Curriculum*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.