



ERASMUS+ project "Transformative Digital Pedagogies for Higher Education" contract Nr. 2022-1-LV01-KA220-HED-000085277

WP2: Theoretical and empirical framework of transformative digital pedagogical competences

Activity 2.3: Creating a focus group for the co-construction of the new self-assessment framework on transformative digital pedagogies

SUMMARY

PARTICIPANTS: all partners took part in focus groups discussion: Riga Technical University (Latvia), Technological University Dublin (Ireland), University of Technology og Troyes (France), Cyprus University of Technology (Cyprus) and Polytechnic University of Cartagena (Spain)

The aim of the activity 2.3. - to entail reuniting teaching academic staff who will participate in the co-construction of the new self-assessment framework. This group will provide examples of 'real world' tasks from meaningful contexts, as well as direct, practical evidence of their knowledge, competence, and skill.

	Latvia	Ireland	France	Cyprus	Spain
Name of	Riga	Technological	University of	Cyprus	Polytechnic
University	Technical	University	Technology of	University of	University
	University	Dublin	Troyes	Technology	of Cartagena
Number of meetings	3	1	2	3	3
Type of meeting	online	online	online	online	online
Date	11.03.2023	30.05.2023	23.06.2023	8.05.2023	23.06.2023
	23.03.2023		9.00-10.30	10.00-11.00	03.07.2023
	29.03.2023		14.00-15.30	12.00-13.00	04.07.2023
				10.05.2023	
Total number of participants	27	10	10	11	27





	Latvia	Ireland	France	Cyprus	Spain
Presented	Construction,	Mechanical	Computer	Languages,	Engineering,
fields	management,	Engineering,	Science, Machine	Engineering,	architecture,
	mechanical	Construction	Learning	Architecture/	business
	engineering,	Management,	Nanotechnology,	Graphic Arts/	
	transportation,	Electrical	nano materials	Interaction	
	architecture,	Engineering,	Industrial	Design and	
	economics,	Mechanical	Engineering	Nursing	
	IT, electrical	Engineering	Humanities		
	and	& Quantity	Languages		
	environmental	Surveying	Department IT and IT		
	engineering, materials				
	sciences and		systems		
	applied				
	chemistry,				
	maritime				
	engineering				
Procedure of					
4 steps:					
1.Introduction					
2.Presentation					
of Theory	Followed	Followed	Followed	Followed	Followed
3.Presentation					
of TDP4HE					
Framework					
4.Discussion					

KEY FINDINGS of FRAMEWORK

	Latvia	Ireland	France	Cyprus	Spain
Bloom's Taxonomy	-fits quite well	- sufficient for those who are familiar with it	- For those who are acquainted too simple - appropriate more for assessment of students	-for familiar users fits well -used wording is clear	-consider it as useful
Three-level model	-is appropriate for mastery level evaluation	- six-level approach was proposed	-don't like naming of levels - consider teacher-profile (teacher-	-appropriate and sufficient - suggest to acknowledge some more levels for clear	-sufficient for majority - suggest to add more levels similar





			researcher, teacher-trainer, etc)to create sublevels similar to languages evaluation	transition from level to level	to language evaluation
Criteria of TDP4HE Framework	-more explanations needed	- more explanations needed -research – related to teaching or in general - same with digital	-three criteria acceptable; - more indicators for digital - to split first criterion into two: 1.teaching/lear ning and 2. assessment	-research related to teaching -digital enriched by more indicators -1.add word practices	-research- innovative and digital should be unpacked
Indicators/ Wording	-terminology explanation needed - to provide clear and simple explanations	-terminology explanation needed - flexible hierarchy - to provide more examples related to the fields	-to be associated with the discipline - individualizati on of the process (study environment) - to think carefully about the wording of each indicator for each level	-use of adverbs instead of verbs - detailed explanations needed -examples -to consider specific of fields	-statements appropriate, while some detailed explanations needed -examples should be provided -more statements for research- innovative and digital
Others	-cyclicity nature	- the need to understand the audience	confidentiality of results - evaluation of the results	- progress prove - reference to transformation needed	-to be grouped more effectively





RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION of FRAMEWORK

RTU

- detailed guidelines should be provided
- •timing of filling in should be considered
- the interpretation of results should be simple and clear
- the availability of tool should be provided accordingly
- based on the results the programs for self/professional development should be offered

TUDublin

- •to deliver training in how to use the framework and give guidance on what success should look like
- to support further study into the areas through reference material
- to socialise this information on a larger scale to bring more people into it
- to provide a clear toolkit so all staff can engage, regardless of level
- timing and deadlines should be flexible for individual needs
- •to link with existing Quality Assurance procedures, considering personal development

- to motivate and kindle interest as from staff as from institution
- self-assessment should remain the teacher's responsibility i.e., is not mandatory
- timing and confidentiality of results
- clear identification of the purpose of the self-assessment tool and the next steps following the assessment
- to organize training on how to use the self-assessment framework
- to itegrate into University Quality Assurance procedures, considering personal development and overall annual QA process in the institution

UII

- to be supported by institutions
- to be done on a regular and systematic way
- •to be accompanied with training in the pedagogical use of technology, teaching methodologies, assessment methods etc. (some members of the staff could be ambassadors/ mentors)
- to form a requirement for educators (part of a general evaluation process, acknowledged as a qualification, part of an academic profile)
- •to be be part of an academic's personal development plan

CUT

UPCT

• to be supported by institutions

- to be done on a regular and systematic way
- to be accompanied with training in the pedagogical use of technology, teaching methodologies, assessment methods etc. (some members of the staff could be ambassadors/ mentors)
- to form a requirement for educators (part of a general evaluation process, acknowledged as a qualification, part of an academic profile)
- to be be part of an academic's personal development plan and requirement for educators





CONCLUSIONS

- 1. Based on the results of focus group discussions there is a need to decide concerning the following points:
- number and names of criteria (or keep as it is teaching/learning and assessment; research-innovative and digital);
- number of indicators and the content (or keep as it is 12 indicators for the first criterion; and two for second and third);
- wording (follow Bloom's taxonomy);
- number of levels (keep three or more);
- to use verbs or adjectives;
- 2. Based on the finalization of the points to make the necessary amendments in the developed self-assessment tool.
- 3. To add necessary explanations and examples for each offered statement to make them clear and understandable.
- 4. To provide additional information about purpose of the tool, confidentiality of the results and further steps.
- 5. To follow cyclicity nature and suggest to organize the assessment of regular bases.
- 6. To consider the specific of the fields, to make the self-assessment tool appropriate.

Only the author's views are reflected, and the Commission is not responsible for any possible use of the information contained therein.