

University Teaching Qualification (UTQ, in Dutch: 'BKO') assessment tool for teaching staff at VU University Amsterdam

UTQ candidate (lecturer)	Fast-track UTQ Dr. Juan Rojo
assessors	Prof. dr. Piet Mulders, p.j.g.mulders@vu.nl Dr. Anja Swennen
decision: (to be indicated by the staff developer by removal of the element not applicable to this candidate by filling out the date of the decision)	obtained on 1 November 2017

In order to receive the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) for VU University Amsterdam, candidates are assessed on two types of teaching skills:

- 1) teaching practice: this includes everything that takes place in and in front of the group
- 2) course (re)design: creating an activating, cohesive, complete course or series of lectures, including an accompanying test with answer model(s)

This document sets out the assessment criteria for both types of teaching skills in the form of an assessment matrix, a rubric. In this matrix the assessors indicate the score assigned to the UTQ candidate for each criterion by shading the appropriate indicator(s), or the cell it is in. If appropriate, an explanation can be written below the shaded rubric in the selected column. This explanation will be entered using a colour other than black. In the last column it is indicated (if appropriate) how the candidate exceeds the requirements for the basic level. In this case this explanation, or the cell it is in, is shaded.

In order to obtain the UTQ qualification the candidate may receive no more than two scores in the category "This criterion is a point of attention" (the middle column of the matrix). It is not permissible for a candidate to receive a score in the category "The candidate does not meet this UTQ criterion" (the second column in the matrix).

Conditions

The following conditions must be met in order to pass the assessment.

The candidate has supplied the following documents:

The Course (re)design assignment, containing at least:

- A justification of the (re) designed course
- A reflection and view on the future

Evidence:

- A course guide
- An assessment matrix
- A test with accompanying grading form
- A course overview ('castle top plan')
- Two elaborate lesson plans

The Teaching practice assignment:

- A self-analysis
- An action plan with agreements
- A reflection and view on the future

Evidence:

- A video recording of 10-15 minutes of teaching practice clearly reflecting the teaching ability of the candidate
- Student evaluation/feedback from students on teaching practice
- Feedback from peers on teaching practice

General impression of the candidate (strengths and possible areas of improvement)

Juan is a very knowledgeable and academic teacher, who is able to instruct his students well in a theoretical subject.
He is also a very pleasant and dedicated teacher.

We appreciate the extensive and insightful descriptions of the assignment Course Design and Teaching Practice. A good example for future students.



Assessment matrix Teaching practice

<div> <div>Level</div> <div> </div> </div> <div> <div> </div> <div>Criterion</div> </div>	The candidate does not meet this UTQ criterion.	This criterion is a point of attention.	The candidate meets this UTQ criterion.	The qualities of the candidate exceed the basic qualification level for this criterion. <i>Here is explained (if appropriate) how the candidate surpasses the UTQ level.</i>
Approach to the subject matter				
1. The lecturer can clearly communicate the goal and relevance of the teaching session.	The lecturer does not make the goal and the relevance of the teaching session clear to the students.	The lecturer devotes attention to the goal and the relevance of the teaching session, but his or her behaviour lacks consistency.	The students understand why this subject matter is being dealt with in this teaching session. The academic and/or social relevance of the session are/is clear.	
2. The lecturer can indicate how the teaching session relates to previously acquired knowledge and how the session connects to earlier and later teaching sessions.	The lecturer does not put the teaching session in context, meaning that it is difficult for the students to relate the subject matter to previously acquired knowledge and to what will come later.	The lecturer provides an overview of the previously acquired knowledge and what is yet to come, but this overview can still be communicated better.	The lecturer helps the students to place the teaching session in context, to relate new concepts, ideas and skills to previously acquired knowledge, and to get an idea of what is still to come.	
3. The lecturer can clearly explain and/or provide instruction to the students.	The lecturer explains unclearly/provides unclear instructions to the students.	The lecturer can clearly explain/ provide clear instructions to the students (for instance by distinguishing between main issues and side issues, using lively examples, thinking out loud or making stages in reasoning explicit), but does not yet always succeed in doing this.	The lecturer clearly explains the subject matter/provides clear instructions to the students (for instance by distinguishing between main issues and side issues, using lively examples, thinking out loud or making stages in reasoning explicit), to check whether the instructions are sufficient for the students to get started.	++ Juan is able to explain the difficult subject very well.
4. The lecturer can teach the subject matter at an academic level and thus stimulates the students to think critically.	In the teaching session the lecturer appeals little to the students' ability to think critically, few links are established to academic insights and the lecturer does not demonstrate an academic approach.	The teaching session is at a sufficient academic level but the lecturer creates few links between his own expertise and research-based academic insights. OR: The lecturer exhibits his own expertise by giving details of scientific theories and research, but	The lecturer integrates his or her own expertise and academic skills in his or her teaching and is thus a role model for students. The lecturer is capable of getting the students to think critically.	Juan is an academic who is dedicated to teaching and his subject

		he does not invite the students to think in a critical and/or scientific way.		
5. The lecturer can deal flexibly with the subject matter.	In response to questions the lecturer is unable to explain the subject matter in different ways. He continues to repeat his or her own account. When addressing the subject matter he focuses chiefly on facts and less on relationships and insights.	The lecturer is able to explain the subject matter in a clear way but has few alternative ways of explaining.	The lecturer demonstrates his or her command of the subject matter, and that he or she can vary their explanations and can adjust to the various learning preferences in the group.	His command of the subject matter is very well, but Juan wants to improve his repertoire of teaching.
Approach to students				
6. The lecturer establishes a good rapport (contact) with the students and is approachable to them.	The lecturer does not establish a good rapport (contact) with the students and/or is dismissive towards them.	The lecturer establishes a good rapport (contact) with the group, but sometimes the lecturer is still not fully accessible to students.	The lecturer establishes a good rapport (contact) with the group and has an open attitude, meaning that the students feel able to approach the lecturer and to ask questions.	
7. The lecturer can create a good working atmosphere.	A defensive, hostile or indifferent working atmosphere quickly arises and the lecturer does not feel able to deal with this.	The lecturer creates a good working atmosphere and conducts interventions, when necessary, to improve it. But these are not yet always the most effective interventions and/or these do not always take place at the right moment.	The lecturer creates a positive working atmosphere and, when necessary, conducts interventions to improve it, for instance by providing feedback in an effective way on students' behaviour.	Juan is able to create a good professional working atmosphere with his students to support their learning.
8. The lecturer encourages in-depth learning; setting up the teaching sessions in such a way that students process the subject matter, so that what they have learned can sink in.	The lecturer discusses the subject matter, but does not make appropriate use of modes of instruction that encourage students to process the subject matter.	The lecturer makes occasional use of modes of instruction that encourage the processing of the subject matter, but does not make optimal use of their potential.	The lecturer sets up the teaching sessions to encourage the students to pursue in-depth learning as much as possible; he or she makes effective use of modes of instruction that encourage students to process the subject matter, so that what they have learned can sink in more effectively.	

9. The lecturer can put questions to the group and can respond adequately to questions from the group.	The lecturer always tries to hold the floor, ignores questions, cuts them short and gets visibly into a panic by these and/or chiefly uses them as an opportunity to resume his or her own monologue.	The lecturer tries to put questions to the group, and answers most of the questions from the group, but does not yet always do so in the most effective way.	The lecturer often puts clear open and closed questions to the group, answers questions clearly, asks follow-up questions or redirects questions to others, thus keeping the group involved.	Juan is good in telling and explaining the context and wants to work on asking questions and responding to questions.
10. The lecturer can respond flexibly to unexpected situations.	The lecturer reacts rigidly and/or defensively to unexpected situations.	The lecturer is usually able to respond adequately to unexpected situations, but now and again he or she is still visibly caught off balance.	The lecturer keeps his or her poise in unexpected situations and can deal flexibly and inventively with these.	
Approach to one's own professionalization				
11. The lecturer can modify his or her own performance on the basis of self-reflection and feedback.	The lecturer adopts a defensive attitude to feedback and then ignores it.	The lecturer still finds it difficult to improve his or her own teaching in response to feedback, however, he has the will to do this.	The lecturer knows his or her own strengths and weaknesses on the basis of self-analysis and feedback and makes improvements when needed.	++ The assignment Teaching Practice is a fine example of Juan's ability to reflect.

Assessment matrix Course (re)design

<div> <div>Level</div> <div>  </div> </div> <div> <div>  </div> <div>Criterion</div> </div>	The candidate does not meet this UTQ criterion.	This criterion is a point of attention.	The candidate meets this UTQ criterion.	The qualities of the candidate exceed the basic qualification level for this criterion. <i>Here is explained (if appropriate) how the candidate surpasses the UTQ level.</i>
Integration in the context				
1. The lecturer can explain how the course relates to VU University Amsterdam's Vision for Education* and to his or her own vision of learning and teaching.	The lecturer is unable to articulate his or her vision, nor does course material clearly demonstrate the vision on which it is based and/or VU University Amsterdam's Vision for Education is insufficiently recognizable.	The lecturer can articulate the underlying educational vision but this is not properly expressed in the course material. OR: The design contains elements from VU University Amsterdam's Vision for Education but the lecturer is unable to articulate the underlying vision.	The lecturer can articulate his or her own vision in relation to VU University Amsterdam's Vision for Education and can indicate how this vision has been translated into the course material. The elements of the vision can be recognized in the course material.	
2. The lecturer can relate the course design to the other subjects, the final attainment levels, the curriculum as a whole and the graduation profile.	The lecturer cannot explain how the course relates to the other subjects, the final attainment levels, the curriculum as a whole and the graduation profile.	The lecturer can only partially explain how the course relates to the other subjects, the final attainment levels, the curriculum as a whole and the graduation profile. OR: In the explanation or the interview, the lecturer can explain how the course relates to other components, but does not make this clear to the students.	The lecturer can explain how the course relates to the other subjects, the final attainment levels, the curriculum as a whole and the graduation profile, and can make this clear to the students.	
3. The lecturer takes account of the diversity in the target group and consciously implements this when designing the course.	The course does not demonstrate whether and how the lecturer has taken into account the diversity of backgrounds of the students in the course.	The lecturer describes the diversity of backgrounds of the students, but it is not clear which conclusions he or she has drawn from this for the course. OR: The design decisions taken in the course are not yet optimally geared to the diversity of the backgrounds of the students.	When selecting elements such as literature, modes of instruction and suchlike for the course, the lecturer takes into account the diversity of the students.	++ This subject deals with Physics within medical sciences and as a result the students level of knowledge is very diverse. Juan has been able to design a curriculum that enables students to learn about the main concepts of quantum mechanics and at the same time helps them to understand how these work in the

* http://www.vu.nl/en/Images/VU-University-Amsterdam-Vision-for-Education_tcm12-383167.pdf (accessible through the website: <http://www.vu.nl/en/about-vu-amsterdam/mission-and-profile/educational-vision/index.asp>)

				medical practice.
Goals and working methods				
4. The lecturer can clearly formulate learning objectives of a sufficient level.	The learning objectives are unclearly formulated (too vague and/or from an incorrect perspective) for the students and/or the level is low or cannot be estimated.	The learning objectives are clearly formulated but the level is not appropriate. OR: The level seems appropriate but the learning objectives are not yet formulated clearly enough for the students.	The learning objectives are formulated in terms of observable behaviour and the level is appropriate to the place of the course in the programme.	++
5. The lecturer can design assignments and learning activities that are consistent with both the learning objectives and the summative assessment.	The teaching and learning activities are not consistent with the learning objectives and the summative assessment.	Some of the teaching and learning activities have no visible relationship to the learning objectives and/or summative assessment.	The teaching and learning activities contribute to the achievement of the learning objectives and are consistent with the summative assessment.	
6. The lecturer communicates clearly to students what is expected of them during class and in self-study periods.	It is not clear what is expected of students during class and/or in self-study periods.	It is not always clear what the lecturer expects of students during class. OR: It is clear which content the students should study throughout the course; However, it is less clear what preparation is expected before each class or how the content is to be studied.	The lecturer makes clear what he/she expects of students during class. The lecturer indicates which content students should study throughout the course and what preparation is expected for each class. The lecturer indicates how the content should be studied.	This is a point which Juan finds important and which he has given much attention in his design
7. The lecturer is able to use ICT applications in his or her teaching and can account for this use.	The lecturer does not use ICT applications properly: the use does not contribute to or even impedes learning.	The lecturer uses some ICT resources (such as PowerPoint), but could make greater use of these to enhance learning. OR: No use is made of ICT and no explanation is given for this.	The teacher makes well-considered and appropriate use of ICT and justifies this choice (partly) on didactic grounds. When the lecturer makes use of ICT, it is clear that this enhances learning.	

<div> <div>Level →</div> <div>↓ Criterium</div> </div>	The candidate does not meet this UTQ criterion.	This criterion is a point of attention.	The candidate meets this UTQ criterion.	The qualities of the candidate exceed the basic qualification level for this criterion. <i>Here is explained (if appropriate) how the candidate surpasses the UTQ level.</i>
Assessment and feedback				
8. The lecturer makes effective use of formative assessment.	The lecturer makes no use of formative assessment. The lecturer does not provide formative feedback to students or does this inadequately, which leads students to have insufficient insight into their progress.	The lecturer builds in little structural opportunities for formative feedback (teacher-, peer- and/or self-feedback) leading students to have only partial insight into their progress.	The lecturer makes effective use of formative assessment and builds in sufficient opportunities for formative feedback (teacher, peer and / or self-backing), leading students to have insight into their progress.	
9. The lecturer can select valid assessment methods.	The tests do not match the course goals; the subject matter is not representative for the studied subject matter and/or subjects are not tested at the stated level of expertise.	Not all course goals are tested. AND/OR: Subjects or skills are tested that are not stated in the course goals. AND/OR: The tests seem to match the goals, but this is not explained (for instance in a test plan or another form of explanation).	The lecturer can explain (for example, by means of a test plan or test matrix) how the tests match the course goals: all the course goals are tested and no subjects or skills are tested that are not stated in the course goals.	
10. The lecturer can select reliable assessment methods.	Coincidence and arbitrary decisions play too large a part in the assessment. The assignments or test questions are of insufficient quality, there are no assessment criteria and no measures have been taken to minimize assessor effects.	The chance of a student unjustly passing or failing is still too large, due to insufficient quality of the questions or assignments, unclear assessment criteria or the lack of a clear assessment procedure in which it is explained how assessor effects can be minimized.	The questions and assignments are of sufficient quality. There is a clear assessment tool in which it is explained how the final verdict is reached. It is explained how assessor effects can be minimized.	

11. The lecturer can render assessment processes transparent for students.	No practice tests or assessment criteria are provided beforehand, no clear assignment description is provided for an assignment, and the lecturer cannot properly explain afterwards how the verdict was reached.	A practice test, assignment description and/or assessment form are/is available, but this is not discussed with the students and the lecturer only decides during the marking process what the basis for assessment is.	Practice tests, assignment descriptions and assessment criteria are discussed with the students; students know in advance how assessments will be carried out and what the lecturer considers to be good and less good examples of work; and the lecturer can explain how the verdict on a summative test was reached.	
12. The lecturer can design assessment and grading methods that are practicable for both the student and the lecturer.	The lecturer designs assessment and/or grading methods that are not practicable for the student or the lecturer within the available time.	The teacher designs assessment and grading methods that are less practicable for the student and/or the lecturer.	The lecturer designs assessment and grading methods that are practicable for both the student and the lecturer within the available time.	