With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union

„Identifying Barriers in Promoting the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at Institutional Level“

IBAR

Agreement number – 2010 – 4663/001 - 001

WP10

Quality and Teaching Staff

National study – The Netherlands

2012

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Project "Identifying barriers in promoting European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at institutional level" (IBAR)

IBAR WP10: The National study (Quality and Teaching Staff) The Netherlands

Authors: Leisyte, L, Epping, E.
Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)
University of Twente
P. O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede
The Netherlands

Center for
Higher Education
Policy Studies

Contents

Introduction 3

National policies regarding teachers in higher education 3

Findings 5

Q 1. What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff? How is it related to the national rules concerning quality assurance and employment? 5

Q 2. What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching? 9

Q3 How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performance? 13

Q4 How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment? 18

Q5 How teachers are motivated by the HEI to assure and improve the quality of teaching? ... 23

Q6 Who is (what does it mean to be) a good university teacher 25

Conclusions 28

Barriers and institutional good practices 30

Recommendations 31

References 32

Introduction

The ESG emphasizes the role of teachers in internal quality assurance explicitly in couple of standards. Teachers are seen as the most important learning resource to students (ESG1, ESG2 and ESG6). ESG 2 notes that the institutions should ensure that their staff recruitment and appointment procedures include means to ensure that the incoming teachers should have at least the minimum necessary level of competence. ESG 3 stresses that teaching staff should be given opportunities to develop and extend their teaching capacity and should be encouraged to value their skills. While ESG 4 and ESG 5 note that institutions should provide poor teachers with opportunities to improve their skills to an acceptable level and have the means to remove them from their teaching duties if they continue to be demonstrably ineffective. Further, the ESG 4 notes that teachers should have full knowledge and understanding of the subject they are teaching, have the necessary skills and experience to transmit their knowledge and understanding effectively to students in a range of teaching contexts and can access feedback on their own performance.

To study the implementation of the above mentioned ESG Standards the national and institutional policies and practices related to teacher qualifications, training and evaluation have been analysed. The report's aim is to highlight on the one hand barriers and on the other hand examples of good practice observed in the implementation of these standards in the selected Dutch higher education institutions.

In the following we present the findings of the four case studies (two universities A and C, and two HBO institutions B and D) on teacher quality and processes to sustain and enhance their quality. We conclude by identifying the key barriers to ESG implementation and good practices as found in our case studies. The main characteristics of Dutch cases were presented in WP 5. Within the institutions we have studied different faculties/schools – we chose faculties/schools focusing on 'hard' sciences, such as chemistry or life sciences and on the 'soft' sciences, such as business and management.

National policies regarding teachers in higher education

The past five years have been important period in the Dutch higher education policy scene when it comes to focusing on the quality of teaching and teacher preparation. Teacher quality is addressed in the main documents regarding higher education quality. Most importantly, the law on higher education as well as the national accreditation framework addresses the need to have qualified teachers in higher education. (WHW 2010). The NVAO Dutch accreditation framework sets the requirements for the professional development of teaching staff (Theme 3, *Staff commitment*). A particular focus is laid on staff quality in standard 14 *Staff quality*. The inspection and assessment body Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU) asks study programmes to demonstrate in their interim

assessment report that the teaching staff possesses the requisite subject-related, educational and organizational qualities and that the policy in this regard is structured in such a way that the programme can guarantee that this will remain the case. These requirements are very much in line with the ESG standards.

Teacher training has been taken increasingly serious by the Dutch universities. The University Association already in 2008 has signed general agreement for the recognition of the University Teaching Qualification. This allows the academic staff to take their acquired qualification from one university to the other without any restrictions. In the past years thus the universities have started to use increasingly the UTQ as an obligatory training for new academic staff. This process has been facilitated by the new institutional accreditation scheme as well as the study accreditation frameworks. The UTQ has become an indicator monitored in the institutions.

The number of teachers with UTQ training has as a result risen from 983 in 2007 to 2300 in 2011 (VSNU, 2012). Six universities in their internal quality audits have put special emphasis on improving the trajectories of academic staff professionalization. Next to the usual UTQ for starting teachers some universities have started with the new UTQ trajectories for experienced teachers[1]. In connection to this agreement the Dutch NVAO has redefined the quality indicators for academic higher education as the proportion of teachers with a basic, senior or extensive teaching qualification.

In 2011 the Dutch University Association (VSNU) and the Dutch Universities of Applied Sciences Board (HBORaad) have General agreement with the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture regarding performance agreements. It has been agreed that each university will present , discuss and sign a performance agreement with the Ministry for the coming five years. Among the performance indicators there are quality measures, such as quality of teachers and intensity of teaching. Thus, the indicators of performance agreements indirectly can be linked to the ESG standards.

The academic staff employment is negotiated and regulated nationally. The negotiations between the national representative organizations of universities, research institutes and universities of applied sciences take place with trade unions**.** The resulting collective labour agreement (CAO) defines the terms and conditions of employment of all those working in the sector and is binding to all parties. Universities, research institutes and UAS have their own separate agreements.

The national agreements include: the general salary development, function appraisal schemes, working hours, social security and "all that employers and unions decide among themselves". The agreement determines the duration of temporary contracts, general schemes for career development, allowances and fringe benefits, and parental schemes. Within the framework of these general conditions, individual institutions have flexibility to negotiate locally and allow for individual, subject or market differences.

[1] http://www.vsnu.nl/Beleidsterreinen/Onderwijs-1.htm#5._docentkwaliteit

An important development in the academic career system is that a growing part of new academics are offered a tenure-track position. This new system also may have implications for teaching quality as it is a strongly performance driven system. The Dutch tenure-track model has been connected with making the employment relationship more flexible and performance-oriented. Candidates have positive tenure prospects, but only on the basis of predetermined individual performance expectations and agreements, which if not met during the period of 5-6 years will mean outright discharge. Criteria include publications in authoritative journals, possessing teaching qualifications, and counseling doctoral students. They have to excel in their field by submitting successful research proposals and acquiring external research funding. The number of tenure tracks increased between 2000 and 2011 from 12 to 923 (de Weert, 2012).

The promotion from one stage to another is based on a university job ranking system (UFO) which distinguishes functional categories with regard to teaching and research. Specific competences can become manifest whereby the research performance is not the all-determining criterion for promotion and tenure. The system does not allow a career development on the basis of research performance only. The combination of competences in teaching and research are assessed higher than competencies in either research or teaching. Exclusive concentration on either teaching or research is possible, but only for the duration of a previously arranged period. Annually reviews are held and personal development plans (for example on the mix of teaching and research) agreed between employee and the superior for the coming period.

Findings

Q 1. What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff? How is it related to the national rules concerning quality assurance and employment?

Institution A

Up until 2011 the quality assurance was rather informal in the institution A and the first system description and analysis was produced in 2011. The quality of education is deemed to be determined by a number of factors, didactic skills of the lecturer and quality of the education facilities being some of them. The education vision of the university A thus acknowledges the need of excellent lecturers and facilities. The education modification cycle is used to signal if the professionalization of the academic staff is ensured and if the programmes are updated. This university aims to inspire students, where the contact between students and staff is promoted and individual student learning tracks are facilitated.

The university's policy views teachers as committed professionals and in this context the quality assurance system is there to support lecturers and to limit bureaucracy as much as possible. The main body coordinating the education programmes, teacher

training and quality of education programmes is the educational institute. As noted by the human resources officer *"There is a dedicated group of people that offers support to teachers and ensure that the teachers improve their skills by developing their strengths and weaknesses. This is an intense collectively run programme of 250 study hours. This is considered the key element regarding quality assurance of the teachers".*

The university teaching qualification (UTQ) is the basic qualification that is expected to be obtained by the new academic staff, especially those who enter a tenure track career paths at this institution. The tenure trackers have to obtain UTQ within a limited time period. As noted by one teacher, this system is new, as earlier UTQ was only advised, but not obligatory for promotion. Further, senior academics are also offered professional development courses. In the view of one teacher, this one size fits all policy is debatable, as in the case of extremely well performing teachers, they may not need to follow the courses, but are expected to. At the same time, a uniform policy is welcome.

Further, it is institutional policy that teachers spend time both on teaching and research, with at least 20% of teaching time as underscored by the HR officer. Finally, teachers are evaluated by the students via online student questionnaires by students and in their yearly performance reviews with their management.

Institution B

At this moment there is no institutional policy on assuring the quality of teaching staff, explained by the merger that took place earlier. Yet, the institution has a strategic personnel's plan expressing some fundamental core values and principles of institution B. The core values that should lead to excellence are: customer orientation, professionalism, fun, room for talent and development, working together. Furthermore, an essential principle of institution B is the idea of lifelong learning: the employees should not consider their employment at institution B for a life-time, but rather as a step towards further development. The flexibility of the employee shall be stimulated. Employees are in the first instance responsible for their self-development and get assisted by the institution where needed. Resources are made available at faculty level to allow for special courses or trainings.

Although it is not formalized in an institutional policy, Institution B is concerned with assuring the quality of its teaching staff to prepare students as good as possible for their future jobs. By means of doing so, the new performance agreements with the government specify that 70% of all lecturers should possess a PhD or Master degree. In the future this shall increase to 75%. Further the NVAO looks at the quality of lecturers when assessing the quality of a course. The human resource management team defines basic qualifications and competences for its teaching staff and stimulates them to obtain a master degree, next to their work. Next to good scientist, institution B strives to have 'inspiring teachers'. It thereby places emphasis on the didactical and professional development of teachers, as laid out in its strategic vision. Furthermore, the central management body wants to strategically position Institution B as an internationally attractive employer, and therefore increases its labor market awareness. Institution B is stronger implementing the so called 'new working methods'. These methods shall enable a better balance between private and working life, higher productivity and work

satisfaction. Thereby responsibilities are shifted and new IT facilities and social media used to support this.

An essential instrument when checking the personal development of teaching staff is the annual review of staff. During these, teachers discuss together with the team manager the functioning within the organization. Emphasis is placed on the teaching results (student evaluations) and the level of expertise the staff member possess. Usually, the team manager also talks to colleagues asking about the functioning of the colleague/ or visits a lecture as to get an impression about the collaboration within the team. This is considered to be essential for high quality teaching. The review talks yield the opportunity to discuss the further development of staff members in form of expertise or didactical skills (i.e.: courses should be taken), known as the POP (personal development plan). The human resource management team has developed policies regarding the POPs, but admits: "*we are not interfering sufficiently when it comes to the quality of teaching staff. The program directors are currently monitoring the knowledge of the staff, since they are specialists in the field*".

The institutional quality assurance policy does not explicitly link the skills and training of teaching staff to its quality assurance. Still a periodical staff satisfaction survey is done and taken into account for internal quality. At the school/faculty level the quality of teaching staff is measured by how well teaching staff is connected/embedded in the professional field.

Institution C

The general policy of institution C is that teachers possess sufficient subject-related and educational (didactic) expertise and sufficient enthusiasm for the teaching. It is expected that teachers will continually improve their subject-related and educational expertise and educational qualities as it is their responsibility. The Education Quality Handbook foresees the importance of the development of teaching staff and the need to professionalize teaching in cases where student evaluations are negative. Faculty management develop quality policy and also personnel policy plan which guarantee subject-related education expertise of its teaching staff and foresee the promotion of teacher professional development.

A number of structural arrangements at the institution C support the improvement of teaching quality. First of all, it is the responsibility of the departmental head and directors of education to oversee the performance of teachers in their yearly appraisal talks and in discussions on the improvement of teaching programmes. Further, a range of committees are responsible for advice and control of the teaching quality and performance. These include programme and examination committees (discussed in WP 8), committee for the teacher professional development, and the special unit providing university teacher training programmes. Lastly, the responsibility of the teaching quality lies with the Faculty management. The Committee for teacher professional development advices the University top management about the university teacher training programme. The unit providing university teacher training organizes courses to professionalize both new and experienced teachers. The UTQ is obligatory for new staff as following the VSNU agreement the university wants to ensure teaching proficiency

even with higher student numbers as underscored by the head of the teacher training unit. Thus, teachers need University basic teaching qualification (UTQ) to be promoted to the associate professor. Four years after receiving the UTQ, the teacher is invited by this unit to discuss the possibilities for further development.

The faculty management ensures that all relevant teachers obtain the teaching qualification. They have to provide time and funding to staff to be able to follow the teaching programme. In the view of the top management, the policy is to keep tight teaching-research nexus and not to interfere with the academics and not to take away their enthusiasm as the management believes that teachers most of all must have intrinsic motivation to teach. In the view of the management of the faculty of hard sciences, research is more important than teaching.

It is university wide requirement that the new teachers take the university teacher training programme at the special unit and the head of the department is responsible to ensure this requirement is met. The head is responsible for supervision and for allocating time for training while allocating teaching duties to the staff. Professional development courses can also be suggested to staff or to departments if the programme committees find negative student evaluations of particular programmes. They do so in consultation with the relevant teachers.

Teaching and its quality are taken seriously in the policy planning of this university. It is foreseen that faculties have a personnel policy which shows how the level and spread of educational expertise is guaranteed by staff planning and allocation of duties, recruitment and appointment, professional training, annual reviews and career guidance.

Upon hiring, the faculty assesses if the prospective employee fulfills the requirements of the UTQ. If not, then the faculty will ask the employee to undertake the teacher training programme. The programme will mean following courses and the supervision by an experienced colleague within an agreed time frame (usually one year).

Institution D

In the annual report of the human resource department, the investment in staff members is identified as a major priority. Institution D is looking for critical, creative and curious employees. The overall goal for the next years is to improve the academic level of the teaching staff. Thereby, since three years they aim that all teaching staff should obtain a Master's degrees by 2020 and 10% of all teaching staff should be in possession of a PhD. This goal is perceived challenging, as some schools (like school B) have quite a number of laboratory assistants, general support staff or part-time staff working in the business sector. Nevertheless, this is the overall target and is taken into consideration for new hiring. In order to reach this, institution D offers financial and time resources for teachers to attain a Master's degree or a PhD. Staff members can discuss their plan (for doing a Master/PhD) with their team leader and subsequently the decision is made. One of the criteria is that the employee continues working for

institution D. The employee might be exposed to certain effects if he/she leaves the institution earlier. Another distinct element of assuring quality of teaching staff relates to the strong connection with the professional field. This connection enables teaching staff to stay up to date with recent developments and also to maintain ties which they can use in their work with students later on. Institution D strives to have a good balance of full time staff members and part-time staff members, yet the schools are in charge to decide about it themselves.

An essential element for assuring quality of teaching staff is the annual review talk. During these, the team manager discusses together with the staff member his/her 'functioning' within the organisation. Subsequently development talks, progressing talks and evaluations talks take place. Institution D considers the annual review talk as very valuable to increase the quality and excellence of staff members and therefore strives to develop in the future evaluation criteria which allow personalisation and include the behaviour/attitude and development of staff members. In order to gain an overview about the general satisfaction of employees at institution D, a satisfaction survey is conducted and used for benchmarking.

The human resource department is responsible for and checks if teachers have basic pedagogical skills and if they have attained a certain educational level. The institutional policy of assuring quality of teaching staff is in line with the accreditation norms. In particular this includes that each programme (Bachelor/Master) has a staff policy that assures that teaching staff has the right qualifications and expertise in place (in terms of content, educational expertise and organization). Lifelong learning among staff members is identified as a core value and staff members are stimulated to use the facilities at the teacher training unit of the institution D. The unit offers several courses for development.

Q 2. What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching?

Institution A

The University A takes teacher qualifications upon hiring and their professional training seriously as seen from their policies. The quality criteria used for recruitment include teaching, research, management and service and collaboration competencies. The policy documents state that the quality of teaching is as important as quality of research. The university management believes that academics should be inspiring teachers and good scientists and thus, the university stimulates the professional development of teachers upon appointment.

The university has recently started the tenure track system and most of new assistant professor appointments take place following this track. As part of the appointment contract, the candidates are expected to obtain basic University Teaching Qualification

and also to perform well in teaching. New assistant professors are required to have a PhD degree. The previous work is also weighted as noted by the HR officer. The UTQ qualification is required for all new permanent and tenure track staff. Quality criteria for appointment and promotion of staff are predetermined and may differ per subject domain. However, overall teachers are required to have necessary competencies upon the appointment or to be trained to achieve the required competencies within a certain period of time. The appointment committees do not include directors of studies, they mainly have a say if the teacher is performing badly as seen from the student course evaluations.

Institution B

The vision of lifelong learning and the assumption that employees should be flexible with regard to their career is mirrored in the recruitment and appointment procedures. New staff members are hired on a temporary basis for one year and subsequently can be offered another contract of two years. Permanent positions are given under certain circumstances, i.e.: if staff members are indispensable in terms of knowledge. The strategic personnel's plan stresses that during recruitment and selection procedures, the core values of a team shall be central. Prior to a recruitment the team shall enquire which competences and core values it possesses and which are needed to fulfil the new function. Thus the major criterion for staff recruitment and appointment procedures is that the job description and the discipline should match the profile of the candidate. Another requirement is that new staff members have a master degree.

Besides, social skills for interacting with students, skills to work in a team and English language proficiency are elements influencing the decision to hire a new staff member. Teachers should possess didactic skills and if they do not possess them in the first place, they are requested to undertake professional training. An equally strong point when hiring new staff members is professional experience. Because of the challenge to integrate knowledge from the professional side into the class room, a major employment requirement for future staff members of school B is professional experience, underscored by one team leader: "*one of the criteria that I use, is the experience in the outside world.[…] If you have teaching in your genes but no experiences, we can invest in it. But on top of my list is experience in the outside world*".

Whether a potential docent has the right competencies is checked at the school/faculty-level in form of a test lecture. A the central level there is no policy and instrument to test the teaching skills of new staff members. This will be institutionalized in the future policy.

Both schools within institution B stressed that practical experience is a very essential criterion when hiring new staff members: *"we don't hire a lot of personnel without experience, such as recent graduates*". Next to the in-depth knowledge they possess, it is the connection with the professional field that is interesting for institution B: their field is close to what happens in the professional field. This is highly valued, as employers are a crucial stakeholder for institution B (see also WP9) and this informal contact is needed.

The issue of multi-employment within institution B is not problematic. More than that, it is appreciated if teachers work part-time in the professional field and part-time at institution B. This is because strong ties are maintained with the sector and trends and innovations are fed into the curriculum immediately. Yet, there is another side of the coin if the two jobs interfere with each other. A manager within one school explained: *"I am in favor of multi-employment concerning the private sector, not having teachers teach here and elsewhere, as interests might get mixed up. It is an issue for me in our group. If I see a teacher doing things that are competitive to our business, I will discuss it in due time".*

Institution B does not have different application requirements for pure teaching or research staff (there are also no different appointments). In the future this area will be focal as well as the balance between temporary and permanent employment. Already now institution B has a 85% permanent employment, 15% temporary employment rule, whereas the latter is a minimum. Another distinct element of institution B is the project 'employees in movement'. The idea is that staff members gain insights in different aspects and functions inside and outside of the institution. It is, for instance, possible to join a colleague within the institution for one day to see what the daily tasks and structures are. Other options encompass a temporary replacement, an external internship or giving lessons at secondary school. Institution B intends to create a pool of staff members, where staff members are allocated according to functions. Also whenever there is a new vacancy available, it is checked internally whether there is a staff member who could carry out the function and be replaced in light of the personal development plan.

Institution C

The recruitment occurs normally through a public procedure although it happens that a promising student is offered a research training position through personal contact with the supervisor. Selection criteria are not merely based on the research qualities as such, but it is important if the candidates are able to bring their own research funding or the likelihood of being successful in acquiring their research funds through Dutch Research Council high. In the appointment criteria, education qualities are deemed important besides the other academic qualities. However, teaching experience and excellence is not central for the junior level appointments. No prior qualification in teaching is needed for the starting position. However, it is understood that the successful candidate will pursue professional teacher training at the university. Further, from 2010 meeting the requirements for basic teaching qualification is the condition of permanent employment contract. Teaching experience is more important for the Professoriate level appointments, as teaching and its management are usually part of the work portfolios of senior academics. As indicated by the university top management: *"Research and earning capacity are the most important. We believe that they do teaching as well and we find it important. You need all this to become a professor."* Despite the differences in the emphasis on teaching experience between different academic career levels, it is acknowledged that teaching and research nexus needs to be strong in this institution, especially witnessed in the hard sciences faculty. Practical experiences of working outside academia is not central for regulation academic appointments. However, the university has a system of special appointments for professors with professional

experience from industry or business world as well. They may participate in teaching in the disciplines which are close to application.

For the teaching at University C as an assistant professor, besides the PhD requirement other experience and competencies, such as funding acquisition, international publishing, expertise in a particular domain of knowledge are required. In the appointment procedures, teaching experience needs to be present in the membership of the appointment committees. In case of high level appointments, the director of education or the chair responsible for teaching should be part of the appointment committee. Professors are appointed by the university top management, while junior appointments are in the hands of the committees appointed by department chairs finalized by deans.

Further, according to the university policy, teachers after receiving UTQ can follow further training, such as senior teaching qualification or take a master's degree in higher education. In 2015 it is foreseen that 15% of academic staff who have already basic UTQ qualification will also have a follow-up qualification.

In the view of teachers from the soft sciences, teaching process is well organized and feedback loops are working well – so it is rather easy to understand what is important for promotion. Research, one the other hand, is a more difficult process to navigate and in the competitive environment research performance is very important for promotion.

Institution D

The standard criteria that are taken into account when hiring new staff members are: the academic level (Bachelor/Master/PhD), didactic skills, transfer competences to the market, assessment and research competences. Although a certain set of didactic skills and pedagogical skills is required for teaching positions, applicants not being equipped with these can make use of training facilities of institution D as to develop them through their employment. This might either be agreed in the personal development plan or as a condition tied to employment. In School A, members of the management team visit the lectures of newly appointed staff members to get an impression of the teaching skills and take subsequent action if needed. Two additional aspects are central: the experience the candidate has in the professional field and the academic degree the applicant possesses. In order to live up to the vision of excellence, institution D expresses in its future vision to upgrade the academic level of its employees as explained in the previous section. In line with this policy, institution D has a strong selection procedure in place. On the website with job openings, applicants have to fill in a checklist with certain criteria as to filter whether applicants match the job description. Applicants that for instance do not have a Master degree and also do not want to engage in a project to obtain a Master degree are not included in the further solicitation process and not invited for a solicitation talk.

The overall position of institution D is, that employees having professional work experience outside of an education institution are interesting candidates. As has been illustrated in previous reports (read WP 8 & 9), the connection to the professional field has many benefits for institution D, as the experiences and knowledge are brought

directly into the curriculum and because : "*we want the staff to look outside of the institution*". Experiences in teaching are not too decisive when hiring a new person. Of course didactic and pedagogical skills are essential, but work experiences outside of academia is valued equally. This is because institution D wants to combine the theory with the practice and the connection to the professional field is essential here. This is best illustrated by a statement of the top manager of School A:

> "*It is about finding the balance between teaching experience and professional experience. Teaching staff always get temporary contract in the first place, to find out whether it is the right person for the right job. It might be considered whether the person is in need of a certificate from our academy. Currently two new teachers, are monitored very closely: we sit in classes, monitor how they deal with students and evaluate their performance".*

Yet the balance between work experience and teaching skills proves to be challenging, as illustrated in the case of School B: "*most of the applications for a job are not from the education field. It is therefore difficult to know in advance what their skills are. Of course we ask for their previous experiences in teaching, give them example cases and ask how they would deal with a situation like this. Yet at the end of the day it is more a feeling".*
All in all the specific skills a candidate should have, are linked to the curriculum and the courses: "*if the curriculum changes it is needed that the staff possess these new skills as well. This does not necessarily mean that we want other personnel but we give training/education to staff so they can acquire the skills*". The final decision for an applicant is made on basis of a solicitation talk, where usually someone from the human resource management team, from the management team and team members take part. In case there are still doubts about a candidate, they can be asked to hold guest lecture. This practice is confirmed by School A.

Institution D favours multi-employment as it yields benefits: if teaching staff is employed also in the professional sector, students learn about real life cases and are closer to developments in the professional field. This is also expressed and favoured by school A: "*a lot of our teachers have a part-time employment and work for the other half in the professional field. This is an ideal combination, as they use the experience and practice in the curriculum and when teaching the students. This gives a very up-to-date character*". The students considered this relation to the professional world as essential and valuable for their own development and as something beneficial within institution D. They confirmed that most teachers know their field and can add personal experiences during their lectures. Still, this is ambivalent, as sometimes "*teachers have the right knowledge, but they are more specialists than teachers*". Despite this, multi-employment remains challenging, particularly when teachers are also involved in teaching: "*part time teaching jobs never add up: 0.5 plus 0.5 is never one. And at a certain moment time is up".* Another downside is that teaching staff can only contribute to a limited extent to other goals of the academy. Still the experience shows that a double teaching employment does not negatively affect the quality of teaching.

Q3 How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performance?

Institution A

Structurally, the university offers an intensive programme for new lecturers within the institute of education to attain UTQ. This programme also offers advice, coaching and further optional courses for continuous improvement of didactic methods. The institute is responsible for the overall quality of education and for the teacher training unit.

Thus, the university encourages the development of teaching skills first of all through its strict requirements of the UTQ for permanent and tenure track staff. Its teaching center provides a range of courses leading to UTQ – some of them are obligatory, some-optional. Courses also are given outside the UTQ framework and include such topics as lecturing, supervising theses, designing a course, one to one guidance, designing group assignments. As indicated by interviewed teachers, course participants receive certificates after attending these courses. The ad-hoc informal courses are also organized during the summer or during lunch meetings to discuss teaching improvements and new applications such as Blackboard. These courses encourage different teaching methods. At the moment nearly a quarter of all teachers have obtained the UTQ.

Further, the university encourages the self-evaluation of teachers and discussion between peers through the feedback loop of the internal quality assurance cycle of the courses. The quality of teaching is important for the career progression – since teaching performance is an important criterion as set in the human resources policy of the university. The university encourages full professors to lecture in the programmes of all levels

According to some interviewed teachers the university does not pay sufficient attention to teaching as this is a continuous processes of improvement which cannot be learnt from books. This is a process in which guidance and supervision including feedback from experiences teachers are important. In the teacher's view, there could be more didactical training for PhD candidates. Further, participation in the didactic training courses of more experienced teachers is not very popular. From the point of view of the director of studies, attendance of courses also depends on the teacher's motivation. Well performing teachers want to improve, while low performing teachers *'often need to be encouraged'*. In interviewed students' opinion, teaching is improved if underperforming teachers attend the teacher training courses. In general, all interviewed students were satisfied with the teaching at this university and the level of knowledge and skills of their teachers.

The education modification cycle used at this university ensures a discussion among the programme committees and chair groups to seek for better delivery of teaching to students. The proposed innovations may include field trips, new IT tools, or format of

teaching. During the yearly cycle the budgets for teaching are approved, so the modifications can be made depending on the availability of the budget. The education facilities are provided by a special administrative department. The aim is to provide high quality teaching facilities with technical equipment that enables lecturers to teach using the best mix of teaching facilities available. These technical provisions are monitored and improved.

Institution B

Within institution B, there is no internal unit dedicated towards the skill development of teachers, because of size of institution B. Still, the strategic personnel's plan refers to an amount of budget which is available at school level, for further development of staff members in form of trainings. The goals for the development of employees are manifested in a personal development plan. The manager and the staff member discuss how the goals can be put in practice, whether certain training is needed. Further, the annual review talk serves as a basis for a new development plan. The human resource team can assist employees in preparing this plan. Furthermore, institution B employs a teaching expert, who assists in the set-up of a course and in the didactical skills of the personnel, particularly since the introduction for competence-based learning. Other courses offered encompass for instance a course on research skills. More specific courses on skill and knowledge attainment and additional trainings take usually place outside of institution B. The student interviewed within the frame of this project stressed that teachers are very competent to transmit the knowledge in a good way. Throughout her two years of study she only had one negative experience: "*people are hired for a good reason here*".

Within the schools, the quality of teaching staff and further development are divided in two categories: didactical skills and subject related expertise. Didactic skills training is particularly offered to new teachers will receive a training on their didactical skills in their second year of employment (only if they don't have these skills yet), valid in both school A and B. Particularly with the changing concept of competence-based learning, the teachers are trained how to facilitate this. Trainings in a subject area are agreed upon in the annual review talks.

A best practice is observed within school B, where teachers take initiatives for professional development if they think they lack some skills: "*when you have the feeling that you are not fulfilled and have the right overview of the subject you teach, you should do something [...] sometimes when it is interesting I am sitting in the practical classes of colleagues of mine. Mostly it is for learning myself, rather than in a structural way*". In addition, in school B there are training days twice a year. During these days, external professionals are working together with the employees and redefine certain skills. Within school A, the academic year has foreseen 10 days for staff members to share experiences and good practices and do team building activities.

Institution C

University C first of all has an overall personnel and quality assurance policies which note that the quality of teaching at the university also depends on the quality of teacher qualifications. As indicated earlier, the university has adopted the UTQ for new and tenure track staff. The university is ambitious in raising the percentage of staff with this qualification from 24 to 60%. This ambitious target can be reached also including continuous teacher training.

The university is well equipped to undertake this extensive professional development of its academic staff as it has a separate unit which is responsible for teacher training courses for new and experienced academic staff. It advises on teaching and provides coaching and recommendations on the individual as well as programme basis. It has a number of experienced staff who have worked in the unit for many years. The university pays for the costs of the courses. However, faculties have to pay for the costs for replacing the staff while they are studying.

The basic qualification training (UTQ) is offered as the whole programme. It focuses on the various roles fulfilled by the teacher: designer, practitioner, assessor and co-worker within the educational organization. For each role, aspects of competence have been formulated which correspond to the national basic qualification profile for teaching staff in higher education. The course covers 200 hours (spread over nine to twelve months) and consists of three parts: a course-based section, a development plan and a practical section, the results of which are recorded in a portfolio.

Four years after obtaining the qualification, teaching staff are also offered the professional development course by the same unit. They can attend the interview and discuss the wishes regarding further development, would it be taking a course, or coaching session.

Another facility available to staff is the master programme on teaching in higher education. In addition to the design and practice of teaching, this Master's also has a strong focus on the role of the teacher as a knowledge developer. Teachers carry out research into their own teaching practice and share the results with their colleagues. Teachers can also opt to take one or more modules from this Master's. Apart from the Master's in Teaching in Higher Education, the teacher training unit provides courses in support of new developments (e.g., the introduction of a new educational vision), coaching and made-to-measure advice on a wide range of subjects (assessment, IT, quality control). Although the offer of trainings is systematic and wide-spanning, in the view of university management, the professional development of more experienced teaching staff is not very systematic.

The university further contributes to improving its teaching quality by facilitating a discussion on teaching quality in the faculties. To this end, the academic staff teaching meetings are intended for junior and experienced teachers alike. Peer review is used in the programme development. In addition initiatives also exist at faculty level to support new teaching staff, such as systematically pairing up junior teachers with more senior members of academic staff as we have witnessed in the soft-sciences faculty.

Promotion depends on teaching performance. Thus, the yearly appraisal talks with the academic staff include the discussions about teaching quality. It is especially the case if

the student evaluations are below average. Then the teaching performance becomes an instrument for the Human Resources department The student evaluations via questionnaires have been used for the past 10 years to monitor teaching quality. It used to be a standardized questionnaire. Three years ago the administration has modified it by including a number of open questions which allow students to identify the problems within courses and to give suggestions to teachers.

The needed equipment is usually the responsibility of the programmes and the faculties. The teaching needs are discussed in programme reviews which are part of the quality PDCA cycle.

Institution D

Institution D has its own training unit, initiated and coordinated by the human resource department. Different kinds of courses are offered for staff members, ranging from didactical training to mind mapping courses, computer skills courses, language support and management courses. Other courses are meant to support teachers in developing skills to test and measure assessments of students (read WP 7) – these were positively accepted by the teaching staff. The impression of the different schools confirm that quite a number of activities exist to increase the quality and the skills of teaching staff. One teacher of school A, expressed the satisfaction and encouragement that he experiences for further development:

> "*There are excellent opportunities. A lot of courses are offered internally for further skill development. If I only had the time... In this school, the management is extremely open to further development/taking course. They encourage people to do so, for instance in international teaching exchange weeks (many universities have an international week where guest teachers from other universities come and teach during that week).*"

Also a teacher of school B confirms the impression:

> *"I think that I am encouraged to further develop my skills: I have the freedom to develop myself in this subject. I can go where I want to for further training. I did not attend courses at our own academy, but I did other courses in personal development, which was appreciated by institution D.*

On the other hand a teacher of school B stressed that s/he will not follow internal training courses anymore, as they experienced the quality inside institution D is perceived to be rather poor and rather go to other external trainings/conferences. Nevertheless s/he is stimulated by the team manager to do so.

In general, it can be concluded that institution D focusses a lot on staff development. As mentioned previously, if teachers do not possess the right didactical skills in the first place, they can follow a course at the training unit. Furthermore, the academic level of the teaching staff shall be improved, that is why staff members are encouraged and stimulated to reach a higher academic level, in form of master and PhD projects. Employees are granted financial resources and additional time next to their work to accomplish this. Currently 30 staff members follow the PhD project and 54 applied for the Master's programmes.

Also, the student evaluations which take place every quarter are a good indication for the quality of teaching staff. The member of the executive board stressed, that if the student evaluations show that the teachers have too little knowledge about, for instance, research skills, the human resource department will offer specific courses geared towards this skill development. In the annual review talk it might also be prescribed for teaching staff to follow this course in order for instance to keep on supervising students.

Q4 How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment?

Institution A

The teaching is assessed via student course evaluations of their courses via an online questionnaire. According to the study director, one advantage of this is digital system is that it provides reports instantaneously. Students can also place comments and teachers can see these comments. However, one disadvantage is that the response rate is very low. This leads to low levels of confidence and reliability, and it therefore becomes difficult for the teachers to be properly assessed. This is the main way of evaluating teachers performance. The student course evaluations are a means to monitor the quality of the courses and also of the teaching and they are seen as very important by the students and the programme directors. If there are signs that there are more or less consistent issues with a certain course, action is taken via the study program committee to tackle the issue. The results of the course evaluations are made available to the course coordinator, the teachers involved, the professor and the study programme director. In the educational committee (OC) the evaluations are discussed as well, but made anonymous as parts are considered confidential. After a month the programme director receives the evaluations and he/she organises a course evaluation with some students (2 to 3 per study year) to make sure that the results are reliable. After this, a plan is drawn if and what action is necessary (this may both be to improve things but also to compliment a teacher) and recommendations are made. A resulting report is discussed in the study programme committee and is approved by the programme director. This gives green light for the programme director to pay the teacher a visit.

The interviewed students think this procedure of course evaluation is effective. They have a signalling function with regard to teaching and in particular with regard to bad performance and the opportunity is taken to act upon this, to improve the quality of teaching. One of the student respondents notes that it also depends on how teachers perceive of the evaluation – if they do not take criticism seriously nothing may change and it can be observed that similar criticism is given by students in the following study year. Sometimes course evaluations over different years are compared to each other. If there are issues, solutions are sought for.

Next to the student course evaluations, there are no structural monitoring instruments at this institution. As indicated by interviewed teachers, in addition to regular student evaluations, courses are regularly discussed with smaller groups of students. This

practice is not obligatory, but occurs due to the initiatives of teachers themselves or coordinators of the courses.

The above discussed course evaluation system is increasingly linked to the performance measurement of academic staff and to the promotions in HR policies. For instance, the tenure track system foresees that staff should obtain certain scores on the student evaluations to be promoted. The teachers can score for their courses for each part between the grades 1 to 5. An overall score is calculated from this. For promotion, teachers have to score an overall average for all courses. As member of the study program committee notes that the student course evaluation has a signaling function. The results of course evaluations are discussed during yearly work appraisal talks as mentioned by interviewed teachers.

This policy of using the student evaluations for promotion is being criticized by some teachers. The argument is that the evaluations should be used for improving the courses whereas now they are being used to give or refrain from giving promotion to the staff. This is considered misuse of the evaluations by some. The student evaluations should be used with care. Teachers question if this approach would contribute positively to the educational / teaching quality at this university.

Further information gathered about teaching is also based on the level of qualifications. For example, the UTQ is a prerequisite for the permanent position. The scores contribute to the evaluation of staff when their promotion is discussed as noted by HR, quality assurance officers and teachers. For tenure track academic staff interim assessment is made after three years, and the assessment for the promotion is assessed after six years. Teaching performance is one of a few other criteria, such as research, teamwork and management. The results of assessment may have an important impact on the contract- its prolongation, receiving a permanent contract, or having to leave the institution.

The evaluation of staff performance is based on the credit point system. The efforts to obtain teaching and research credits are comparable. Obtained credits determine the admission to the academic evaluation procedure for promotion. The promotion committees will judge the individual performance and the result will be based on the performance and the assessment. If the advice of the committee is positive regarding all quality aspects, then the management has to decide upon the proposed promotion. Teachers argue that tenure track staff are supposed thus to act more strategically than the staff who already have permanent positions.

At the same time, an HR officer notes that a differentiation is made according to the performance of academic staff in teaching and in research. Both teaching and research and the connection between the two is promoted at the institution. The HR department however uses a differentiation and team oriented approach. They advise to promote the aspects in which someone is good at instead of improve the aspects that someone is bad at. In order to increase efficiency someone else who is then good at teaching can spent

60% of their time teaching instead of 40%. They look at the team efforts, not the individual weaknesses and try to combine their strengths to deliver a product as a team.

Institution B

At institution B, the quality of teaching performance is mainly assessed through student evaluations. As illustrated in previous reports (read WP 7), after every quarter students have the opportunity to give feedback about the course they attended. Thereby next to the content, the performance of the lecturer is central. The results of the assessment are subsequently available to the programme manager and form part of the annual review talks. During these talks the student assessment results are a central element of the discussion. The functioning of a teacher is linked by 80% to the results of the student assessment. Yet, also the collaboration of the teacher with other colleagues is an issue. Together with the manager and the staff member, POPs are developed to compensate for missing skills or support the continuous learning of the teachers. A good example of this is provided by a teacher from school A: "*For me personally, I have the annual appraisal talk and there they* [the student evaluations] *are a major part. You see it back and you discuss about the teaching skills and how to improve. I now for instance applied for a course on time management*".

Some teachers across both schools expressed concerns about using only student assessment to assess the teaching performance:

> *"It is difficult to ask our students, because for them it is difficult to make the difference between their responsibility as a student and what the teacher has done. For instance the 'easy' classes about marketing are always very good evaluated by the students, whereas chemistry as one of the more difficult programmes does not score very high. This does not have to do with the teaching skills, but with the complexity of the subject. Asking students is tricky and we are aware of it, but we also do not have another choice".*

Alternatives/additions to this challenge were pointed out by two teachers as well. One suggestion is to receive feedback from external professionals on the skill development and formalise this. Another suggestions refers to certain standards that should be reached: "*I doubt to ask students about this, there should be some personal certification or similar for a teacher*".

This is confirmed by another teacher, who reported the experiences of bad student evaluations of his colleague: "*she was very disappointed and we told her that it is not true*". A point of action was identified by him as well: *"when something is structural, like the evaluations, there should be something structural with the persons not working alright. Because evaluations go up and down and the average is ok, still it is not good for the climate within an organisation if a teacher gets told by the team leader that s/he is not doing enough. When it is structural there should be actions*".

The student interviewed, was aware of the impact of the course evaluations and that they are used to assess the teaching performance.

Within institution B the communication is not idea when a teacher continues to perform ineffectively. Usually the human resource management team has limited information

about the results of the student assessments and the decisions the team manager takes. They do see if the coordinator has checked the evaluations and also assist the manager if a teacher performs ineffective. In case the manager asks for support, they have follow-up meetings every 3-4 months and make 'SMART' agreements (specific, measurable, acceptable, realistic and timely). Still, the human resource management realises that often these follow-up meetings do not take place, as it is problem of leadership style (managers are often also teachers, and have too many responsibilities to follow up consistently on issues like that). Therefore the human resource team offers trainings for managers to better deal with this.

A rather severe situation was explained by some of the interviewees (keeping in mind that in the meantime the teacher was fired):

> *"I am in the middle of such a process, where the students are really mad at a teacher. They write emails and say: I don't want to have this teacher anymore. This teacher has a case of nearly 10 years of bad evaluations. And despite this there is little we can do about this. We don't have a hard culture here. Formally there is nothing I can do besides persuading my supervisor to get things really going. I can't fire a teacher. The problem is that most of the staff has been working here for many years and are on a high salary scale permanently. It is costly to get rid of them. And that does not match with the high quality standards we want to have: practice what you preach*".

Institution C

As mentioned earlier, student evaluations of courses feed back into the evaluation of programmes and in case certain courses are negatively evaluated and if this happens on structural basis, then a discussion and an agreement of improvement is made with a concrete lecturer. With the very well performing teachers a career trajectories are discussed to see what are the future possibilities for promotion toward associated or full professor. In case of the promotion discussions the course evaluations serve as a proxy for the teacher quality evaluation. The teacher and programme manager get the results and discuss them. Teachers also write a self-evaluation report in preparation for the yearly performance reviews. The National Student Survey results further feed into discussions. The data is aggregated for the deans and they suggest what improvements need to be made for the quality of courses in the faculty.

A recent new practice of discussions in student panels has been introduced (as given in the example from the hard sciences faculty). The teaching evaluations are discussed with the student panel, a report is written and given back to teachers, and they write a final report which is then discussed in a meeting with the programme committee. As a student representative from hard sciences indicated, the procedure is very useful especially in the cases where the course is evaluated as very bad as then the teacher has an opportunity to give feedback to their critique on paper and this is discussed in the committee.

If the teaching performance continues to be bad and in case a teacher is on a temporary contract, the contract may not be prolonged. First of all the courses are discussed

between the teacher and the programme director. Then the teacher will give a reflection and say how he/she plans to improve the course and makes a proposal how to solve the problem identified in the evaluation. Sending teachers to professional training courses is one of the possible solutions.

If this is the case with the teacher on a permanent employment, the director of studies as well as the chair of department discusses the performance of the teacher and suggest to take teacher training courses offered by the university teacher training unit. They further monitor the performance and discuss this in the yearly appraisal reviews. A teacher replacement is possible in a particular course. However, it is not an easy procedure. As noted by the student representative of hard sciences: 'If the teacher is bad and does not improve the course -it is difficult. The Student Council initiated a website - what students think about the course – so students can share their opinions. It is a popular website where-2-3 evaluations are filled in per course in average. It is on the intranet – so not open to external people. It is the initiative of the Student Board – they use the feedback gathered to encourage the Faculty Board to change things and do something about the courses. So all faculty students with their login can access it.' In the view of the student representative, the Faculty Board is rather vague about measures taken as in his view, 'this is a painful subject for teachers and thus they don't want this information to be public. Work pressure is very high and Faculty Board does not want to push academic staff even further.'

At the same time, another student representative noted, that this university takes the quality improvement very seriously on a yearly basis and she sees it as a very important development.

On the other hand, if the performance of a teacher is very good, then there are measures to award the best teacher via giving them best teacher prizes. The promotion based on the best and very good teacher performance can happen, but for higher positions, performance in research and especially research project acquisition counts a lot in the view of interviewed teachers: *'You can be promoted as best teacher and a relatively good researcher, but not to full professorships'.*

All in all, the teaching evaluation scores as well as other performance measures are discussed between the heads of departments and the teachers in their yearly academic staff appraisal reviews and suggestions on improvement can be made there. Interviewed teachers noted that the current system is more fear based than geared towards improvement, thus academics do not favour it.

Institution D

Within institution D, the quality of teaching performance is assessed in different ways. First, the human resource office is checking and safeguarding basic qualifications in the process of appointment (Master's degree and didactic skills).

Second, through the National Student Survey (NSE) and institutional student evaluations, which take place after every study quarter (read WP 7 & 8). During these evaluations, students are asked to assess, among other things, the performance of

teachers. In school A the students are asked to do this via an online evaluation, and in school B, the students use a voting system on basis of a presentation with evaluative statements/judgements. The students interviewed for this study, participated in these evaluations, yet they all knew fellow students who did not. The students reported that they saw most of the times an analysis of the results, but were not aware what the results are used for and whether the results have an impact/lead to a change. One concern expressed by the students in relation to this evaluation is that the judgment "*is more about the teacher not about the content and the lessons*". This critique is perceived similarly by some members of the teachings staff in school B, preferring written reflections and personal talks better than just voting: "*they only say this was good, this was not so good- I did not like the book etc..- if you hear that you are bad, you cannot change anything about it, so you need to know how they experienced it and why they did not like it. This is the kind of information I am waiting for*". The member of the executive board expressed doubts as to what extent this evaluation is meaningful and contributes to the purpose it should reach.

With school B, the results of the evaluations are collected by the quality coordinator, who in turn analyses them and discusses them with the manager. The most critical cases are picked out and subsequently discussed in the team as how to solve/approach problems. One teacher in school B illustrated: "*The team members are keen to know how they performed during student evaluations – everybody wants to know how s/he is doing. I personally like to get an 8 better than a 6. If I get a 6, I will have to think how to work better with the students next time*". The student evaluations have a direct effect on HR policy: the results are discussed with the team manager, who in turn has to report to the central board again. Also the education and quality office knows about the outcomes. Presenting these results and dealing with them openly within the institution is considered essential in terms of quality for institution D: *"the most important aspect of quality assurance is transparency: show who you are, also if you are not good or if you are vulnerable or if the teaching population has a problem. From the moment that you point out what is not good, you are able to improve it".* A good practice is examined here among teaching staff members of school A: they visit each other's lectures and give feedback about the format/content.

A third way to assess the teaching performance is through the annual review talks, being part of the institutional policy. During these talks the student evaluations are discussed and the team manager tries to motivate teachers via these formal monitoring and assessment talks, taking place three times a year. The student evaluations account for 60% of the general assessment.

Fourth, through internal and external audits, the teaching quality is examined in form of size, qualifications (based on their CVs), trainings and the results of the student evaluations.

Q5 How teachers are motivated by the HEI to assure and improve the quality of teaching?

Institution A

Positive motivation of teachers at institution A includes a possibility to be nominated and win a best teacher year prize. Students are voting for the best teacher every year. Further motivation is the possibility for promotion if performing well continuously coupled with good performance in research. HR officer also noted that appreciation from students and colleagues is also considered important.

It is considered an advantage when the teachers receive a good score within the department. Groups receive bonuses if they provide good education and perform well. The university rewards teachers by giving out financial rewards up to 1 million Euros to their groups.. The bonus is awarded by the university executive board and money can be used to fund research conducted by the departments. The results of all the awards are published on the institution's intranet.

The main input for evaluating the teachers is the student evaluations (surveys and meetings) as presented earlier. When the teachers are underperforming they are provided with guidance and courses. The interviewed teachers were not aware of sanctions. In their view, it does not usually come to this stage as problems are addressed at an early stage, discussed and solutions sought.

Institution B

Institution B does not have a motivation system connected to financial aspects (positive or negative). The code of conduct (CAO) of universities of applied sciences does not allow for financial stimuli. A negative effect could be that the annual salary increase does not take place, but good reasons need to be in place to do so. Another negative financial incentive is to terminate an employment: *"only if you have bad evaluations year after year and you are not willing to improve, you could think about ending the contract. But it is really rare and hard*".

Generally, however, the interviewed persons did not perceive a problem with the motivation of teachers: "*they are professionals and they are very driven and intrinsically motivated"*. In School A and B it is mentioned that if teachers perform better than expected (in terms of student evaluations) they might get a bonus of 500 Euros.

Institution C

The institution C motivates teachers via the yearly teaching prizes, which are awarded based on the student votes in each faculty. These teaching awards are taken seriously as noted by the management. Teachers who have received these awards saw them as beneficial for their visibility. However, they did not contribute much towards the promotion to the highest level, as the whole performance is taken account for promotion towards professorship.

The newly promoted Honours' programme at the university with the best 10% students attending also chooses the best teachers. The management aims to increase teacher awareness that more is possible and also to create a quality culture where it is prestigious to be selected to teach in the Honours programme.

The sanctions have been discussed earlier – they can range from discussions to the management to not prolonging the employment contract in the case of continuous underperformance.

Institution D

During the annual review talks, the results of the student evaluations will be discussed between the team manager and the staff member. In case of a negative evaluation, the management team talks to the teacher and tries to disentangle whether and where help is needed and what the reasons are for the negative evaluation. Thereby the motivation of the teacher is central and the manager tries to address that. Subsequently it is checked, whether the teacher needs additional training to increase the performance and the motivation.

There are no significant financial incentives intended to motivate teachers and also not included in the code of conduct (CAO) of universities of applied sciences. If teachers gets an 'excellent' in this annual review, a raise in pay is granted. Equally, if a teacher gets a negative evaluation the annual salary increase might be skipped and after three bad evaluations the contract might be cancelled. Both cases, however, seldom happen at institution D. A bonus might be granted, if a teacher gets a big project or produces an innovation. This bonus is granted at the school level. Further the interviewees in institution D highlight that the own motivation is the most important aspect leading to quality: *"the most important for a student is a teacher who is involved, who is interested in the students".* Further, the working conditions have an essential impact on the motivation of teachers: *if you receive a good salary and the surrounding circumstances are good, this is important. Yet it starts with the intrinsic motivation".*

The human resource team writes every year a plan for the schools concerning the development of teachers, the functioning and the skills which are needed. Further at the moment, the possibilities for teaching certification are examined as it is considered beneficial that the teaching staff has a common standard level of qualification (these criteria are developed in addition to the general appointment criteria introduced above).

Q6 Who is (what does it mean to be) a good university teacher

Institution A

Here are the opinions from Institution A:

Teacher 1: 'The teacher should be able to enthusiast the students for a course. Maintaining a certain level of quality in the teaching, but taking into account that there are differences among the students. And hereby ensuring that students on a lower level perform on a higher level. The good students only need sufficient triggers for them to get going; the students who perform less should be given the right triggers to also perform well by working harder; not by downgrading the level of teaching.'

Teacher 2: 'A good teacher is enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and has personality. While the respondent believes that a good teacher should be aware and perhaps also involved in the scientific developments of the topic he specializes in, being a good researcher does not necessarily translate into being a good teacher. He feels that the emphasis is often being placed too much on research, and says that the title of PhD or Doctor is no indication for being a good teacher.'

Teacher 3: 'Enthusiasm is an important issue for a good teacher, next to this, insight and overview. But passion is important for how knowledge is taught to the students.'

Institution B

Here are the opinions from institution B:

Teacher 1: "A good teacher is aware of where you want to take the students, where the end station is, to know where they came from, link to them and try to guide them to the endpoint. It is really a group process, having some eye for the process, that makes a good teacher". It is not defined in the institution's own QA system what a good teacher is, he is not aware of it.

Teacher 2: "It's not easy to talk about yourself. It would be a shame if after 34 years I am not able to teach. What I hear from my colleagues and from the evaluations: I am not doing it very good not very bad.- I am doing average and rather enthusiastic. All my colleagues are very enthusiastic. When I see outside of our major, I see things that are not my responsibility, for instance people that don't work and are well paid, and sometimes for 25 % of the time not in the office . But I don't care, it's not my responsibility, or people when the nose is a bit cold, stay in bed. For me and my colleagues this is not a reason. We like our work, our students and colleagues. Another colleague will retire now and is 65..and that is telling something."

Manager 1: "I don't know what a good teacher is, I don't have fixed criteria, it is unclear to me. At the moment I also don't have criteria and instrument sot see whether the teaching staff has the right skills".

Institution C

Here are the opinions from Institution C:

Teacher 1: 'Education vision –we are all community of learners – collaborative activating education, life-long learning. So teaching is part of the job –too busy, you do it.

There is some reputational element in it, good assessment is important – it is important for promotion. For a full professor in this place you need to be an excellent teacher.'

Teacher 2: 'There are three main features of a good teacher: active involvement, conveying the material in an appealing way and contributing to the development of the overall programme.'

Student 1:'A good teacher knows how to motive you, the rest you can do yourself. They have fun doing their job.'

Manager 1: 'A good teacher is the teacher with intrinsic motivation.'

Institution D

Here are the opinions from institution D:

Teacher 1: "A good teacher enjoys teaching. I had a discussion with a colleague last week: a lesson only works if you enjoy yourself. If a teacher does not enjoy the lesson, the students will not take part. A professional attitude is important: for me it is overcoming any hurdles you may feel, even if you aren't best friends with a certain group of students; preparation should be there, you should know what you talk about; you also need to be honest: sometimes you have to say: „Guys I don't know how to answer that question, let's find out together". Always keep in mind the goal that students have and work towards that – as long as you are open and clear about what has to be done and know what your role is in this, this is an important part of teaching. Social skills (soft skills) are also important. If you ask students who are the most unpopular teachers, they would probably come with teachers, who are known to be a grumpy, a bit short-viewed. A good teacher should not act. A professional attitude is one, but if you start acting students will find out very quickly. Fining your style to work with the students, not teach frontally. There should be some cooperation between students and teachers, still maintain that thin line/hierarchy."

Teacher 2: "A good teacher knows what he talks about, and he loves to work with students/people, and wants to help them and participates with students".

Teacher 3: "The most important thing is that students find a job afterwards and that the working field says: 'I only want to have graduates from Institution D'. That is the main goal of a teacher".

Manager 1: "The most important for a student is a teacher who is involved, who is interested in the students".

Conclusions

Summary of findings

To summarize, we have observed that teaching quality and the quality of teachers have been closely monitored and linked in the four Dutch case study higher education institutions. In total, we can conclude that the institutional requirements and routines for staff appointment, staff appraisal and promotion as well as evaluation of teaching quality as largely in line with the ESG standards, although they are largely prescribed by the national institutional agreements, national regulation and the national qualification framework.

1. **Looking more concretely at ESG 2 stating that the institutions should ensure that their staff recruitment and appointment procedures include means to ensure that the incoming teachers should have at least the minimum necessary level of competence.**

We conclude, that all four cases studies have explicit requirements for the qualification of the new staff as well as continuous improvement of those qualifications while already employed in the institutions. A notable recent development at the universities has been the implementation of the university teaching qualification certificate which is used following the inter-university agreement. Newly appointed teachers must obtain UTQ in order to obtain a permanent position usually within a set period of time. In the universities of applied science there is no formal certification procedures for new teachers. However, in the yearly appraisal reviews they are encouraged to obtain further degree (such as Master's or PhD) and the institution provides space for pursuing this professional goal. We should also note the difference in the qualification for teacher appointment between the two types of universities. At universities, PhD is a usual requirements coupled with publications and the potential for research project acquisition. However, upon hiring it is required to give a lecture to ascertain pedagogic skills (case A). In the UAS, the main requirement is knowledge of the field preferably through practical experience and a basic degree, such as Master's coupled with didactic skills or willingness to acquire didactic skills. For example, in institution D the pedagogic experience upon hiring is valued equally as is the practical work experience in the professional field.

2. **Further, the ESG 3 stresses that teaching staff should be given opportunities to develop and extend their teaching capacity and should be encouraged to value their skills.**

As witnessed from the four case studies, teaching staff in all institutions are given opportunities to develop and are largely encouraged to value their teaching skills. The universities have set themselves to increase the targets of academic staff having UTQ qualifications. All four

institutions have dedicated units for teacher training at the central university level which provide short courses on professional skill development. Further in some cases, as for example at university C, motivated teachers can take models in a specific Master's programme or follow the whole programme to improve their teaching skills. hus in some institutions it is more formalized and institutionalized than in others.

When we consider the encouragement to value the teaching skills we can observe that more emphasis is laid on this issue in the UAS compared to universities. A further difference is the emphasis on teaching quality for promotion. UAS place more emphasis on teacher performance for their promotion- as well as the willingness of teachers to pursue higher qualification. At universities, the emphasis is either equality distributed on the performance in teaching and in research (case A), or research is more ultimately valued than teaching (case C).

In all institution the management responsible for teaching, usually at the faculty and departmental level encourage the self-evaluation of teachers and discussion between peers through the feedback loop of the internal quality assurance cycle of the courses. Although it seems to be more institutionalized in some institutions than others, the examples of peer review in teaching have been observed in all four cases. However, interviews noted that more peer coaching is needed. Moreover, it remains a challenge in all institutions, especially at universities to motivate senior teachers to upgrade their teaching skills, as there are no formal qualification requirements at that level of seniority and in case these academics already have permanent positions. However, the institutions do provide trainings for staff who are advanced in their teaching careers. So possibilities for professional development are there.

3. **ESG 4 notes that teachers should have full knowledge and understanding of the subject they are teaching, have the necessary skills and experience to transmit their knowledge and understanding effectively to students in a range of teaching contexts and can access feedback on their own performance**. **Both ESG 4 and ESG 5 note that institutions should have the means to remove poor teachers from their teaching duties if they continue to be demonstrably ineffective**.

The knowledge and understanding of the subject matter are the key prerequisites for the teachers in the four case study institutions. In the university's environment, the teaching is supposed to be informed by research carried out by the teachers- so a close teaching-research nexus is envisaged by the institutional rules. In the cases of UAS, the expert knowledge of the professional field is also a strong prerequisite for teachers. In fact, a high percentage of teachers in the UAS come from the professional field and therefore have practical experience of the subject matter they are teaching.

The performance is evaluated via student course evaluations usually carried out electronically. The teachers receive the scores of the evaluation. If negative, the results are

discussed with the superiors- be it education directors, or teaching coordinators, or department chairs. All four institutions take the low performance in teaching as a signal for discussion and review of the course or teaching methods. It is however challenging if the teaching performance continues to be bad. Both at universities and UAS changing teachers or in the extreme cases- firing them- is not a common practice. The issue here is that firing permanent staff can be very long, complicated and expensive procedure for the organization. Thus, in the extreme cases the institutional leaders try to find internal solutions for the continuous underperformance of such teachers. Besides yearly evaluation reviews and discussions of institutional directors with the problematic teacher, a possibility of changing the courses taught, further professional training or changing activity portfolios of these individuals are explored.

The course evaluation systems are increasingly linked to the performance measurement of academic staff in the promotion processes via human resources policies. In some cases, especially in universities, promotions depend on the performance in a variety of activities, such as teaching, research, collaboration and external funding acquisition. UTQ qualification is required for obtaining the permanent position. In case of tenure track participants, they need UTQ to obtain a tenure. In the UAS, teaching performance evaluation is nearly 80% based on teaching performance, which is mostly evaluated based on the student evaluations of the courses. In some cases, National student survey results are also taken into consideration.

Barriers and institutional good practices

This review has identified a couple of barriers for

1. Although in some cases we saw that officially bonuses to the salary were allowed and the staff was supposed to be fired after three negative evaluations (case D), it actually seldom happens. The current system assures only minimum standards of teaching.

2. Teaching is not always valued for promotion as much as research. Although this does not apply to UAS, it concerns university promotion policies. University A does treat teaching and research equally in their regulations. At university C however one will not be promoted being the best teacher- as research and external acquisition have very important value in promotion.

3. Peer coaching and continued professional development is not currently much in use in the studied institutions. The peer learning and advanced classes for teachers would help motivate teachers more to advance their performance in class and to pay more attention to up to date teaching methods.

4. The evaluation of teacher performance as institutionalized now in the case study institutions mainly take into account the results of student evaluations of the courses. However, this is a rather one sided view of the evaluation of teacher qualifications and their performance.

Good practices were also identified in the Dutch case studies:

1. In some cases, especially at UAS we have found informal practices of teacher peer review taking places, where teachers would discuss their courses in teams and senior teachers would help junior teachers. I addition to regular student evaluations, courses are also discussed with smaller groups of students. This practice is not obligatory, but occurs due to the initiatives of teachers themselves or coordinators of the courses as found in some cases.
2. The new development of obligatory UTQ qualification for university teachers following the VSNU agreement is a very positive development. The case studies provide time for the teachers to attend the UTQ classes. Especially plausible is the experience of university C, where besides the UTQ also Master's level courses are offered. In some cases, the whole Master's degree in pedagogy can be obtained. However, the teacher trainers and university administration should ensure a motivational and peer review element is present in these courses.

3. The case study institutions have all institutionalized course evaluation procedures and student feedback feeds into the performance reviews of teachers. The results are taken seriously into consideration by the educational committees, where both students, managers and teachers are represented. The action plans are drawn how to improve the courses and the teacher performance. If needed, individual discussions with teachers are scheduled to ensure the improvement of student satisfaction with the courses.

Recommendations

1. The better functioning performance and incentive systems, especially the financial bonus systems, should be more widespread and actually used to ensure teacher motivation.

2. Teaching should be valued for promotion as much as research in any time of higher education institution.

3. Peer coaching and continues professional development should be key practices added to the current array of teacher development practices available in the studied institutions.

4. The institutions should use peer review discussions as well as other possible means to evaluate the performance of teachers to avoid the one-sided view of teaching performance.

References

Higher Education Act (WHW), September 2010 Dutch Ministry of Education, the Hague: OCW.

NVAO (2011) Dutch Higher Education Qualification Framework: http://www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Nederlands_Kwalificatieraamwerk_Hoger_Onderwijs.pdf

VSNU (2012) Policy document on teaching quality. Available at http://www.vsnu.nl/Beleidsterreinen/Onderwijs-1.htm#5._docentkwaliteit.

de Weert, E. (2012) Working conditions of the academic staff in the Netherlands. Report for the MORE2 project.