The assessment of teaching competence of the applicant for a title of Docent in the faculty of Social Sciences

According to Section 89 of the Finnish Universities Act a Docent must have good teaching skills.

In the assessment of the teaching competence of a person applying for a title of docent, the President’s decision on the assessment of teaching competence at Tampere University (TAU/2559/501/2019) is applicable. Teaching competence of the applicants is assessed based on:

- A teaching portfolio drawn up according to the guidelines of the university
- A teaching demonstration

Guidelines for preparing a teaching portfolio:

1. Thoughts on teaching (pedagogical philosophy): applicant’s conception of learning and how teaching can support it
2. Pedagogical skills: pedagogical training and research, awards received for good teaching, other recognition and merits
3. Experience of teaching and supervision: courses taught, theses supervised, working as academic tutor, using different teaching methods and learning environments, teaching and supervision practices that promote learning and skills development
4. Development of teaching and supervision competence: development of and making use of teaching materials and learning environments, using students’ feedback to develop teaching, basing teaching on research
5. Social development of teaching: cooperation with teachers, students and employees, multidisciplinary cooperation, curriculum design, internationality, pedagogical leadership
6. Other teaching merits
7. Previous assessments of teaching competence

Teaching competence of an applicant is assessed as a whole and in relation to the requirements and criteria for a Docent. Required good teaching skills can also be demonstrated by a teaching demonstration lecture, that is assessed with at least grade good (equivalent with the level 3 of the assessment matrix).

Teaching demonstration is a 20-minute lecture and it is public. Lecture can be in Finnish or English.
Assessment of the teaching demonstration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1 (failed)</th>
<th>Level 2 (satisfied)</th>
<th>Level 3 (good)</th>
<th>Taso 4 (excellent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction of the teaching situation</strong></td>
<td>The learning and teaching goals are not evident; the teaching lacks a wider context. The teaching style is tentative and ill-suited. Ignores the starting level of the learners.</td>
<td>The learning and teaching objectives are expressed and the teaching situation has a connection to a wider whole. Clear deficits in time management (e.g., galloping through the final minutes or using too much time). Does not sufficiently consider the learners' starting level.</td>
<td>The learning outcomes are relevant and function as part of a larger whole. The teaching is well planned and fits the given timeframe. Considers the starting level of the learners in a good way.</td>
<td>The learning outcomes work excellently and they link up with a wider whole really well. The teaching is planned, structured and thought out in a way that suits the given timeframe excellently. The rhythm maintains the learners' interest. Considers the starting level of the learners' particularly well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structuring the content of teaching</strong></td>
<td>The context and the content of the teaching demonstration do not correspond to one another. The teaching does not have a research-based approach. Dissemination of information is the only thing to structure teaching.</td>
<td>The context and the content of the teaching demonstration corresponds to one another. The research basis of teaching is partly flawed. There is little guidance on active learning and critical thinking.</td>
<td>The objectives and the taught content are appropriately structured. Learning is convincingly based on research. The learners are guided to engage in active learning and critical thinking.</td>
<td>The content of teaching is perfectly structured in a manner that corresponds to the learning objectives. The learned content is based on versatile and central research, which is clearly opened and insightfully evaluated. Teaching motivates learners independently to go deeper into the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation, interaction and illustration</strong></td>
<td>The presentation methods are not clear and some aspects make understanding difficult. There is no interaction between the teacher and audience. The learners are not encouraged to learn. The use of observation tools and/or learning materials is inappropriate and detrimental to learning (e.g., too much material).</td>
<td>The presentation methods do not support reaching the goals. There is interaction between the teacher and the audience. The learners are activated to learn, but the methods used, the materials, use of technological tools or means of illustration are disjointed and do not support learning.</td>
<td>The presentation methods work well. The teacher makes contact with the audience in a natural way and encourages them to think, ask questions and talk. The learners are motivated to learn. Use of illustrations and examples clarifies the connection between theory and practice. The use of learning materials and the chosen teaching methods support learning.</td>
<td>The presentation methods support the achievement of goals. Interaction lasts through the teaching demonstration and the learners are encouraged to participate. The learners are motivated to expand their knowledge e.g., by using thinking and activation exercises. Versatile illustration and use of examples clarify the connection between theory and practice. The use of learning materials and the chosen teaching methods are pedagogically grounded and support the fulfillment of learning outcomes well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>