

Application for Teaching Merit Award ***(meritteringsstatus)***

Erika Kvistad
February 2023

Table of contents

0.1: Starting out	4
0.2: Hello! I'm Erika.	5
0.3: How this text works	5
0.4: Teaching chronology	6
0.5: Teaching philosophy	6
1: I have developed my teaching skills qualitatively over time with an emphasis on student learning.	8
1.1. I have varied experiences of teaching with an emphasis on student learning.	8
1.2. I have developed my teaching systematically over time, and have reflected on this development.	10
1.3. I have collaborated on developing teaching with students, colleagues, and the leadership.	12
1.4. I have plans to develop my own teaching skills further.	13
2: I have an exploratory and research-based approach to teaching and learning.	14
2.1 and 2.2: I have systematically tested and developed varied learning materials or teaching and assessment formats to support students' learning processes. I reflect on my teaching using relevant research and theory on teaching and learning in higher education, as well as within my own subject area.	14
2.3. I systematically work with feedback from students and colleagues to develop my teaching.	15
2.4. I have disseminated knowledge from my teaching work in a variety of ways, including conference presentations, reports, journal articles or internal forums.	16
3: I am an active pedagogical contributor to educational quality work in my academic community and institution.	18
3.1: I have initiated, taken part in, and led work on curriculum development, pedagogical and subject-didactic development, educational quality work, and/or knowledge base development relevant to education.	18
3.2. I frequently share my experiences with colleagues, and collaborate with leadership, colleagues and students to develop a culture of sharing around teaching quality.	19
3.3. I have plans for further strategic development work to increase the quality of education in our academic community.	20
References	21

There is no teaching, it may be said, without this experience of radical uncertainty about whom one is addressing and, by extension, who is teaching whom. The experience of such uncertainty is not a negative thing; it is rather the condition of teaching and learning.

Nicholas Royle, "Literature, teaching, psychoanalysis", in *The Uncanny* (2003)

...a spirit of joy, foolishness, exuberance, like the spirit behind all good games, including the game of trying to find out how the world works, which we call education.

John Holt, *How Children Learn* (1967, 1983)

Introduction

0.1: Starting out

It wasn't as if I had never been in front of a class before. In high school I had volunteered as a teaching assistant as part of my IB qualification, and after my BA I had tutored at a private girls' boarding school in England. But as I prepared to teach my first class at university level - a seminar on Dickens's *Our Mutual Friend* that my Ph.D supervisor was letting me borrow from his Victorian literature course — none of this experience was doing me any good; I felt terrified by the prospect of running a seminar for two hours. As I plotted out the class, my primary motivation was that I just didn't want the room to go silent. I included more activities than we could ever do in the time we had, and wrote down, word for word, the questions I wanted to ask during our discussion. On the day, as students started to come in, I wanted to hide behind my supervisor. He could probably tell. "Erika," he said, "you have to make them respect you."

And the class was great. I don't know if I made anyone respect me, but it became immediately clear that my plan had left out a central element: the students, with their perspectives, their energy, their own ideas and interpretations that they wanted to share. I hadn't needed to plan everything I was going to say in advance, I just had to listen and respond. If things ground to a halt, that was okay; sometimes - although this took much longer to learn - I might even want us to hit a stretch of silence, to take in an idea, to search for an answer, or to acknowledge that we had taken a wrong turning. The class was not an unreliable piece of machinery that I had to get to work; it was much closer to a dance.

In what follows, I'll reflect on some of the teaching experiences that followed this first one, and the ways in which my work, and I as a teacher, have changed between then and now.

0.2: Hello! I'm Erika.

Since 2019 I've been an associate professor in English at USN, working mostly in the primary and lower secondary (GLU) teacher education. My research background and doctorate are in nineteenth-century literature, and more recently I've primarily been a digital culture researcher working on different kinds of storytelling on the internet, with a particular interest in horror and Gothic narratives. But teaching has been a huge part of me since that first class (if not much earlier), and it's still the part of my academic work that's closest to my heart.

This year is the start of my thirteenth year of teaching in higher education, and as a passionate and deeply committed educator with twelve years of teaching, pedagogical learning, educational research, and policy work in higher education behind me, I'm glad to have this opportunity to summarise and reflect on my earlier work and my future plans. In applying for this merit award, I'm excited to hopefully become part of a new community of educators working to make higher education teaching better, and to create opportunities for more educational experimentation and collaboration in my own academic setting. Thank you for considering this application!

0.3: How this text works

In this application, I've tried to create a readable narrative that still makes it clear how my work corresponds to each of the criteria for the teaching merit award. To help situate you as a reader and avoid confusion, I start by laying out a **basic chronology** of my history as an educator (**0.4**). I then briefly lay out my **teaching philosophy (0.5)**, and address three central themes that will come up often in what follows: *the process of writing*, *student agency*, and *digital learning*.

After this, the text follows the criteria for the teaching merit award. I address and reflect on each criterion, and include examples and case studies from my work as illustrations. In some cases it made sense to address two criteria simultaneously; this is indicated in the heading. The criteria intersect with each other in many ways, and it's often hard to decide whether, for instance, a particular example of practice best illustrates 1.2 or 2.1. For this reason, under each criterion I include references to the other places in the text that also address the criterion. Where relevant, I include references to attachments with evidence and further details - the list of attachments are at the end of the application. External links to webpages are intended as evidentiary support for statements made in the text, and linked material doesn't need to be read in detail unless you're especially interested.

0.4. Teaching chronology

My pedagogical CV (**Attachment 1**) lays out my teaching history in more detail, but below is a recap of what I've done, where, and when:

YORK (2010-2013): I start teaching at university level in 2010, at age 24, while working on my Ph.D. in English at the University of York (see **0.1**). After an introductory university pedagogy course, I gain responsibility for my own courses.

OSLO (2014-2018): In late 2013 I move back to Norway to take up a three-year senior lecturer position at the University of Oslo. I lead, collaborate on, and create a series of courses from BA to MA level, organise a student research symposium (see **Case Study 1**), start writing on university pedagogy in collaboration with other researchers (see **2.4**), and supervise MA theses (see **Case Study 2**).

LYSAKER (2016-2018): In 2016, I take up an advisor role at NOKUT, keeping a part-time position at UiO to continue to supervise MA students and gain my university pedagogy *basiskompetanse*. At NOKUT I lead and work on projects to evaluate and develop teaching quality in higher education (see **3.1**). A project on teacher education sparks my interest in working in this field.

DRAMMEN (2019-present): I get an associate professor position in English at USN, and, after my maternity leave, start work in 2019. Over the next years, I teach on almost every GLU English course, and work with my colleagues to develop the programme into a coherent and effective whole. A colleague and I gain a grant to set up an international practice exchange (see **3.1**). My new focus on didactics inspires my own teaching, and I undertake further research into my own practice (see **2.4**).

Which brings us to the present, and to who I am as a teacher today.

0.5: Teaching philosophy

My work centres on building students' confidence in themselves as learners and encouraging them to be active and independent participants in learning; reflecting this, the most typical comment I get from students is "I feel comfortable talking in your class". Although my teaching history is varied, there are a few central themes in my work, each of which draws on pedagogical theory and classroom experience. This application will focus particularly on showing why I value them and how they are expressed in my teaching.

The process of writing. I follow the principles of Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing to Learn (Forsman (1985), McLeod and Soven (2000)) in seeing writing as a way of thinking, and for this reason student writing plays a central role in my classroom. The centrality of this theme to my work also means that I'm interested in how feedback on student writing works (see **Case Study 4**), and in the process of MA supervision (see **Case Study 2**).

Student agency and self-efficacy. Both in my discipline courses and in my work in teacher education, there are spaces for students to take an active role in exploring aspects of the material that interest them, developing their own questions, finding answers, and sharing their knowledge. The aim is that students will quickly gain a sense of ownership over what they learn, and strengthen their sense of self-efficacy (Ritchie (2015) operationalises this concept in student learning in higher education, but much of my sense of its importance comes from Holt (1967, 1983)).

Learning through digital elements. As a digital narrative researcher, I often include digital culture as a topic in my teaching, but I also work with digital tools in a variety of ways in learning and assessment practices, both to model these practices for GLU students and to give students new ways of developing and demonstrating their skills (see **Case Study 3**). My work in this area draws on the PfDK (*Profesjonsfaglig digital kompetanse*) framework for teacher education, and aims to give students a knowledgeable and, not least, critical approach to digital learning. Many of our MA students want to research digital culture in language learning, and I took a university pedagogy course on digital learning in part to make me better able to supervise on this topic.

As the first two of my themes suggest, my teaching is research-based particularly in the sense of the fourth of Healey, Jenkins and Lea's (2014) definitions of the concept: teaching in which the student becomes part of enquiry-based learning processes, and learns both through understanding the thought and work of others and through practical experimentation of their own. These elements in my teaching have become especially important in a teacher education programme where students often initially feel underprepared for the prospect of undertaking independent research.

That said, possibly the most important theoretical influence on my teaching practice comes out of child pedagogy — John Holt's *How Children Learn* (1967, 1983), a text that has been with me since I was a child myself (with a somewhat weird interest in educational psychology that never really went away). While direct instruction and cognitive load theory also play essential roles in my work, since students need a solid basis of knowledge in order to be able to reason in new and critical ways about a topic (a somewhat obvious but often-neglected point that Rosenshine, 2012 helped solidify for me), I also try to leave some room in all my teaching to apply Holt's "unschooling" principles. The idea that teachers should create conditions for students to learn through experience, experiment, self-directed inquiry, and even play applies, I believe, as much to a university seminar as to a pre-school classroom.

In what follows, I describe how my teaching philosophy emerges in my work, and how my experiences and development reflect the criteria for the merit award.

1: I have developed my teaching skills qualitatively over time with an emphasis on student learning.

1.1. I have varied experiences of teaching with an emphasis on student learning.

As my pedagogical CV suggests, I have broad teaching experience (**Attachment 1**). My professional roles have often required me to be flexible in my teaching remit and pick up new courses and formats quickly to meet departmental needs. Because of this, my experience covers many different modalities and a wide range of topics in English literature, culture, and didactics.

In practice, to briefly give a flavour of the scope of my teaching work, this means that I have taught:

- students on their first day at university, and MA students in their final year
- native speakers in the UK, and EFL learners in Norway
- in discipline programmes and professional programmes
- historical periods from the 1300s to present-day digital culture
- survey courses where I led teams of instructors (*British Literature and Culture* at UiO), courses co-taught with other instructors (including *Victorian Literature* and *Britons at Work* at York and every course I've taught at USN), courses where I developed and taught the syllabus independently (including *Women Writing*, *The Romantic Period*, and *The Victorian Period* at UiO), and an MA course I created from scratch (*Horror Writing in English* at UiO)
- formats including workshops, seminars, lectures, small-group supervisions, and asynchronous sessions
- in-person courses, courses intended for online delivery, and, of course, courses hastily converted to online formats in March 2020
- how to construct paragraphs, how to expand middle-schoolers' vocabularies, how to recognize a hoax on the internet, how to analyse a poem, how feminist literary theory works - sometimes to the same people on the same day
- and I've supervised MA theses on topics ranging from gender roles in erotic fanfiction and Anglo-European relations in Charlotte Brontë's work to reader agency in horror literature and multilingualism in English textbooks.

The following case study describes an instance in which previous experience teaching in a different cultural context (UK higher education) allowed me to create a new learning opportunity for my students.

CASE STUDY 1: STUDENT RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM (2015)

Coming from York, where MA students often presented their research alongside Ph.D students and staff, I was surprised to find that there were few opportunities for students at UiO to present their research. I felt strongly about writing as an important element in student learning, and the importance of encouraging students to take on a researcher role. I also remembered how important it had been for me as a graduate student to share my work alongside that of other students and staff - it wasn't just a source of feedback and inspiration, it also made me feel like I was a genuine participant in a research community. Supporting this, research suggests it's beneficial for students both at and before HE level to write for authentic audiences other than their teachers (Keefe, 2020, and Eodice et al., 2016). Giving my students the chance to experience this too would, I hoped, empower them to think of themselves not only as learners, but as creators of knowledge.

My colleagues Tina Skouen, Rebecca Scherr and I decided to organise an open research symposium for that semester's *heisemne* courses, *Women Writing* (me) and *English Renaissance Literature* (Tina). A theme uniting both these courses was the link between sexuality and textuality, so we called the symposium "Sext: A Symposium on Sexuality and Literature". We gained funding from the Anders Jahre foundation, and since we wanted to have a mix of sharing ideas and taking in new ones, we secured two prominent outside speakers. Students in our courses could volunteer to give papers based on their assessed work in the course.

The symposium was a success: students happily signed up to speak, and perhaps the best part (as always at conferences) was the chat at the reception afterwards. Students expressed that although presenting their work in public had been a challenge to overcome for some of them, they felt that their work was taken seriously and even celebrated by the symposium format. The following year, other members of staff used the format to arrange a second student symposium.

More on this criterion: In **1.2**, I describe some of the ways in which I have developed my teaching over time. In **2.1**, I describe the development of specific teaching practices that demonstrate my focus on student learning.

1.2. I have developed my teaching systematically over time, and have reflected on this development.

Teaching in a variety of settings and contexts has been a major driver of my teaching development: different groups of students have different needs, and listening to their

feedback and responding to them has expanded my scope of techniques and practices. The developments I describe below, then, don't indicate that I've given up on one way of teaching and embraced another - rather, I've used student and colleague feedback to learn what works in a given situation, and, in this way, find new ways to be a teacher.

The primary way in which my teaching has developed is a progression from less structure to more structure. In my York teaching, once I got over the initial overplanning stage, my classes were quite lightly structured, and the students' input played a large part in the progress of the class (for instance, if they engaged strongly with one activity, I might drop one of the others). At UiO, I continued a practice I'd started at York: reading packs, which I sent out a week in advance of the class, introducing the primary class texts and optional or required secondary reading, and giving preparation tasks to complete ahead of the class (**Attachment 2**). This allowed me to focus the students' attention, and to differentiate by offering both extra explanatory material and more complex "stretch" reading and tasks. (Once I started my university pedagogy training at UiO I realised that this was a flipped classroom approach, where reading and reflection took place ahead of the class and the class itself was spent on collaborative discussion/problem-solving.) With limited seminar time, this worked well: the reading packs provided some structure, and the classes themselves were open and exploratory. The theme of student agency was reflected in my in-class focus on supporting students in exploring and expressing their ideas, and feedback reflected that this worked well: **[REDACTED FOR STUDENT PRIVACY]** (student midway evaluation comments from 2014-2015, see also **Attachment 4a**).

At USN, it quickly became clear that the changes in disciplinary context, student body, and course setup meant that I had to make my teaching more structured in several ways. As part of my reading on English didactics I was learning about cognitive approaches to teaching, in particular cognitive load theory (first developed by Sweller, 1988) and its operationalisation in Rosenshine (2012). This made me want to be more intentional about my students' cognitive load, especially because the learning outcome descriptors for USN GLU courses are so multifaceted and have a lot of potential for overload and confusion: students have to learn disciplinary, didactic, pedagogical and practical material, often all at the same time. I laid out the course structure, material, and process as explicitly as possible, reducing extraneous cognitive load so that students could focus on the serious challenges of the material itself. I included more teacher-led elements: since we had more seminar time, what I would previously have introduced in reading packs could now be worked through in the class itself in a guided way. I started to use powerpoints to make the structure of each class clear in advance, structured group-work classes more explicitly with pre-teaching, a process to follow, a clear output, and teacher follow-up, and spent more time on meta-discussion of what we were working on in class and why (this is vital for teacher students, who tend to want to translate learning into action as quickly as possible). I integrated the study and research skills students needed for the classes more deeply into the classes themselves; for instance, in my MA-level courses, where students experience a sharp increase in theoretical complexity from BA level, we explicitly discussed effective note-taking and set aside time for it throughout lectures.

Throughout my career I had valued and experimented with ways to increase student participation in class (see **2.3** for more on this), but I was increasingly aware of the need to check for understanding in ways other than direct verbal participation. I started to consistently use exit slips to consolidate learning, check for understanding, and find out what questions were still unresolved (**Attachment 3**). Often, I requested follow-up questions on a particular topic and responded to them either in the next class or on the course online platform. These changes have resulted in higher levels of participation, higher student motivation, and less time and energy spent on resolving confusions, and students report a sense of being in an accessible and responsive learning environment: **[REDACTED FOR STUDENT PRIVACY]** (Student comments from midway and end-of-semester feedback, 2022.) While this change in approach was spurred on by a new pedagogical context, I now believe that some of my current practices would have helped students in my earlier classes learn more, too.

The following case study describes how I work with MA supervision in a student-focused way, and how I've developed my supervision practices over time.

CASE STUDY 2: MA SUPERVISION (2014-present)

I have broad and varied experience with supervising MA theses; I'm currently supervising my fifteenth MA student. As the emphasis on writing processes and student agency in my teaching suggest, the process of MA supervision is a major interest for me. While my classroom teaching has developed and changed a lot over time, I found my role as a supervisor more quickly - in part, I think, because my work as a supervisor draws on my experiences as a student and as a Ph.D supervisee. As an undergraduate at university in the UK and during my graduate work, I often found research and writing intimidating, and had to work with my lecturers to find concrete ways around tendencies toward perfectionism and procrastination. This means that I'm aware of how important research supervisors are to their supervisees' progress (something I discuss in a Ph.D context in Kvistad, Aam and Aarstad, 2017). As a supervisor, I make use of these experiences to help supervisees structure their writing process, with the aim of giving them a sense of agency and making the thesis work a manageable and even enjoyable intellectual exploration. I'm also continually inspired by the example of my Ph.D supervisor, and try to embody his honesty, thoughtfulness, and respect for each student's thought and work.

Some of how this looks in practice: in my early meetings with a supervisee, we agree on a meeting frequency and amount and type of supervisor involvement that works for both of us. In line with Writing to Learn, I encourage students to write from the start, first in the form of discursive notes on their reading and then in rough sections of chapter drafts. I give detailed writing guidance and written and verbal feedback at a level appropriate to the writing stage (for instance, comments on the research question in the early stages, comments on style later on). Since the MA writing period can be hard on students, I create a continuing, nonjudgmental dialogue to let students share worries or things getting in the way of their writing, so we can plan around it and refocus. If a student is having writing

problems, we might make use of low-stakes writing techniques (like timed free-writing), but just talking through the argument and finding out which points feel unclear or unmanageable is often helpful. Most of all, I enter into and encourage the students' investment in their topic and argument, and aim for them to see themselves as genuine contributors to the knowledge pool of their academic community (which is, of course, what they are). (See **Attachments 4a and 4b** for perspectives from previous supervisees.)

Although I found my central supervision principles quickly, my process has developed over time. Supervising GLU students brings a new set of challenges: high student numbers, a much wider methodological range, a need to connect the research projects to the realities of school teaching in ways that make practical sense, and, not least, the lack of a comprehensive institution-level (or national) idea of what a GLU MA thesis can be. The last two of these are a longer-term priorities for me (see **3.3**), but as well as engaging in self-study to ground myself in social sciences research methodology, I work with my colleagues to share supervision work and best practices. In 2022, Jenny Duggan and I had a large group of MA students all working on digital topics, and as well as giving individual supervision, we arranged monthly group meetings to give guidance on each thesis section and allow students to share their progress and questions with us and each other. We arranged Zoom shut-up-and-write sessions with alternating writing and chatting/relaxing time, where everyone had the chance to work in company and had easy access to supervisors for in-the-moment help. I believe this both modelled effective writing practices, and helped students feel less isolated during an MA semester still affected by COVID. (On this and other collaborations with Jenny, see **Attachment 4c** for Jenny's reference.)

More on this criterion: In **1.4**, I describe more of my current (and planned future) work to develop my teaching. In **2.3**, I discuss my use of feedback to develop my teaching. In **3.3**, I describe larger-scale plans for developing teaching quality involving the collegium more broadly.

1.3. I have collaborated on developing teaching with students, colleagues, and the leadership.

My collaborative approach to teaching is central to my work, especially in recent years at USN, where I continually work with colleagues to develop and revise our courses, which are almost all co-taught, and the programme as a whole. For this reason, several of the other sections cover this criterion. See **Case Study 1** (colleague collaboration on a project to support student research), **Case Study 2** (colleague collaboration on MA group supervision), **1.4** (working with my section to develop our teaching), **Case Study 3** (collaboration with students to develop feedback processes), **2.3** (using feedback from colleagues and students in teaching development), **3.1** (colleague collaboration on a student internationalisation project), and **3.3** (plans for developing teaching quality in the

wider academic community). See also **Attachments 3c-f** and **Attachment 11** for my colleagues' accounts of collaborating with me.

1.4. I have plans to develop my own teaching skills further.

Entering the field of teacher education has made it clear to me that I still have a lot to learn about teaching. At the same time, the fact that teaching at USN is so deeply collaborative means that I have been able to learn from and alongside my colleagues, and I hope I'll continue to do so in the future. My plans for developing my teaching skills over the next few years have been inspired by discussions with my colleagues, my reading of higher education research, and the university pedagogy courses I've taken. A couple of specific plans:

- *Early childhood education.* In 2022, I raised an issue with my section leader: that I'm less knowledgeable about early childhood education than about middle years and up, which can make it difficult to effectively differentiate my teaching for 1-7 and 5-10 students. (In GLU English, students learning to teach grades 1-7 and 5-10 are taught in one integrated class.) Other members of the section felt similarly, and with input from us, the section leader organised a series of seminars on this topic with outside instructors. These seminars are still ongoing, and while I already feel much more equipped to teach 1-7 students, I want to continue to learn more.
- *Aesthetic learning.* Jenny Duggan and I are currently in the early stages of planning a workshop on practical-aesthetic approaches to language teaching and learning, and through this project, I plan to develop my skills in using aesthetic, embodied, and creative practices in my classroom. I have already started to reflect on and write about my use of creative interactive fiction writing in the classroom (see **2.4**), and I want to engage with creative and aesthetic learning more deeply over the next years.

More on this criterion: In **3.3**, I describe larger-scale plans for developing teaching quality involving my wider academic community.

2: I have an exploratory and research-based approach to teaching and learning.

2.1 and 2.2: I have systematically tested and developed varied learning materials or teaching and assessment formats to support students' learning processes. I reflect on my teaching

using relevant research and theory on teaching and learning in higher education, as well as within my own subject area.

This section will discuss a few of the ways in which I have used others' research and theory on teaching and learning, as well as my own experience and action research, to develop my teaching. Since **sections 1.2** and **1.3** focus on the development of my classroom teaching over time, the two case studies below focus in particular on assessment practices.

CASE STUDY 3: DIGITAL AND MULTIMODAL ASSESSMENT (2019-present)

As a digital culture researcher and a teacher educator interested in digital aspects of learning, including digital and multimodal elements in both learning and assessment is important to me. Hundley et al (2019) make the argument that multimodal writing strategies are especially important for teacher students, noting that "the thoughtful and purposeful integration of digital, multimodal writing into teacher education courses can shift understandings of writing as a participatory practice and support teachers in successful classroom integration" (185). More than that, as a teacher I'm increasingly aware that letting students express ideas and create arguments in modes other than standard argumentative essays can increase their confidence and expressive skill (two studies I've found inspiring in this regard are Smythe and Neufeld, 2010, on podcasts, and Tran, 2016, on interactive fiction).

In recent years, this has led me to experiment with multimodal writing as a classroom activity (like interactive fiction - see **2.4**), but also with multimodal forms of formative assessment. In a podcast assignment (**Attachment 5**), students immersed themselves in the genre of literary discussion podcasts, then worked in pairs to create their own. This assignment drew on my experiences with oral examination, where students sometimes found it challenging (especially in this pressured situation) to develop ideas spontaneously in conversation. Since this is a key skill for teachers, I wanted to do an assignment that allowed students to explore and present ideas about literature in a more relaxed, spontaneous, and collaborative way than is possible in a written text or prepared oral presentation. The variety of playful and insightful podcasts the students produced showed that this worked well. In a multimodal assignment (**Attachment 6**), students were allowed to choose multiple modes to present their work in. The assignment text also reflects my incorporation of cognitive load theory: because the primary learning focus here is on form, the content requirements are kept fairly simple, and students are asked to reflect on and consolidate their learning without this reflection being assessed.

CASE STUDY 4: VIDEO FEEDBACK PROJECT (2021-present)

In 2021, wanting to learn more about the role of the digital in teacher education, I took a university pedagogy course on this topic at USN. The course became an opportunity to

learn a new way of reflecting on my practice, Exploratory Practice (Hanks 2015), and to use it to systematically investigate the topic of feedback on student work (**Attachment 7**). Following Exploratory Practice principles, I started with a practice-related puzzle - why is it so hard to write feedback? - and surveyed earlier work on feedback on student writing, learning that giving feedback in video form might be a way of getting around difficulties inherent in giving written feedback, like expressing tone.

I knew from my literature survey (see for instance Carless and Boud, 2018, Winstone et al., 2017, and McCarthy, 2015) that students also often find it difficult to take on board and make use of feedback, in part for emotional reasons, and had an instinct that video feedback (VF) might be a better emotional experience for students, too. To test this out, I made use of what Exploratory Practice calls a PEPA, or Potentially Exploitable Pedagogical Activity: I gave one of my classes VF on an assignment and, as well as studying my own experience, gave students the option to comment anonymously on their experience. The survey gave me a better understanding of the impact of VF on both me and the students (see **Attachment 7** for a detailed analysis), as well as indicating which assessment situations were more or less suitable for this kind of feedback, and has led to me incorporating VF on a regular basis in my assessment.

More on this criterion: **1.2** and **1.3** discuss some ways in which I have used teaching and learning theory to develop and test new teaching methods over time. **2.4** describes other research I've done on my teaching practice.

2.3. I systematically work with feedback from students and colleagues to develop my teaching.

I continually develop my teaching, both from class to class and from course to course, using both explicit student feedback and my informal and formal assessments of student learning.

At York and UiO, I learned a lot from having multiple parallel seminar groups and teaching the same class several times (at the most, I taught four parallel groups on a weekly basis in ENG1303 at UiO). This allowed me to iteratively "redraft" a single class over a short period of time, making quick changes in response to my evaluation of the effectiveness of each session, and tailoring my approach to each group as I got to know them.

In my current teaching I have less opportunity to repeat single classes but more opportunities to teach the same course repeatedly. For this reason, I've started to focus more on getting continual feedback over the course of the semester in the form of exit slips (**Attachment 3**), rather than relying solely on midway feedback - this also makes it easier to see what students are actually learning, which midway feedback can't fully capture (midway feedback does capture student *experience* well, which is also important (Warner and Simmons, 2015)). Asking for early feedback on specific issues as they arise also makes it easier for me to deal with learning environment problems early enough to make a real

difference to the students' experience. As an example, a recurring challenge in introductory courses at UiO was class participation. When asked to comment anonymously on this, some students described feeling worried about speaking up in class, for reasons including shyness or the perception that their language skills or subject knowledge were lacking. I increased class participation by drawing on ideas from Duckor (2014) to lower the bar for speaking, for instance by using smaller discussion groups, letting students pre-prepare written-down speaking points, and using wait-time to give students other than the most enthusiastic speakers a chance to gather their thoughts.

An important part of my teaching development is the end-of-semester course review, where I work with student feedback, my own observations, and (in collaborative courses) the other instructors to determine the details of what worked, what didn't, and what should be changed for next time. An example of a course review can be found in **Attachment 8**.

More on this criterion: **1.2** and **1.3** also discuss my use of feedback and in-class experience to develop my teaching.

2.4. I have disseminated knowledge from my teaching work in a variety of ways, including conference presentations, reports, journal articles or internal forums.

Higher education pedagogy is a central research interest for me, and in particular because this field is fairly social sciences-oriented I find it useful and important to approach it from my own disciplinary perspective, drawing on literary didactics and theory. My writing and dissemination on HE pedagogy is especially concerned with the role of affect and emotion in the classroom, drawing, for instance, on Sara Ahmed's work (2015). As a horror researcher, I often also draw on aspects of the Gothic, horror, and the uncanny in my pedagogical writing, using them to gain unexpected and innovative perspectives on classroom teaching.

I began to disseminate research on higher education pedagogy in 2016, when I presented the paper "The monster in the classroom: on uncanny teaching" (Kvistad 2016). Here, I used my own classroom experiences with teaching horror literature to explore the roles of failure, feelings, and the unexpected in higher education teaching. I picked up on these ideas in a collaboration with two colleagues, Sara Orning (UiO) and Line Henriksen (Copenhagen), to write the book chapter "Monster pedagogy: A failing approach to teaching and learning in the university" (2017, **Attachment 9**). In this experimental critical text, we use the framework of "monster studies" to discuss the roles of emotion, embodiment, and failure in higher education pedagogy.

More recently, I've become interested in working on the possibilities of literary pedagogy in teacher education. In the conference paper "Feeling and writing otherness/togetherness in digital modes" (2022), Jenny Duggan and I used our shared interest in teaching digital narratives to explore "some of the ways in which digital creative writing can allow for collaborative, affective, and open-ended learning processes in the teacher education classroom". I returned to some of these ideas in a paper of my own early this year, "Horror and aesthetic learning in teacher education" at a symposium on horror and pedagogy (2023, **Attachment 10**), where I discussed what kind of place horror and Gothic narratives might have in language teacher education. In both papers, I focus on the genre of interactive fiction (digital choose-your-own-adventure stories), and discuss my classroom experiences of having students both play and write their own IF games using the Twine coding tool. Over the next couple of years I plan to develop these ideas into a publication, and to do more empirical research in this area using Exploratory Practice principles.

More on this criterion: **3.1** discusses my dissemination of pedagogical experience and knowledge in other arenas, like my work on knowledge bases for policy development at NOKUT and my programme sensor role at UiB.

3: I am an active pedagogical contributor to educational quality work in my academic community and institution.

3.1: I have initiated, taken part in, and led work on curriculum development, pedagogical and subject-didactic development, educational quality work, and/or knowledge base development relevant to education.

My time at NOKUT means that I have extensive experience with educational quality work and knowledge base development (note: this is the best translation I can find for *utredningsarbeid* in the original criteria). I chose to work in the then-new Evaluation and Development section at NOKUT because I wanted to be able to see higher education from a bigger-picture perspective. I loved teaching, but missed a sense of connection to a larger whole - it felt like everyone was coming up with individual solutions to pedagogical problems on a course-by-course basis. I wanted to know more about what students' journey through the higher education system was like and what affected it. As a lecturer in a pure teaching role, I was also aware of the imbalance between how higher education values teaching and research (something I'm glad is starting to be redressed by initiatives like this merit award), and I wanted to use my pedagogical and research skills to help create positive change.

At NOKUT I took part in and led a number of projects to develop and prioritise educational quality in higher education, including a research project on why Norwegian Ph.D. candidates drop out so often (Kvistad, Aam and Aarseth, 2017). The one that would become most important for my future work was the Advisory Panel in Teacher Education (APT). APT was an international panel of prominent teacher educators whose role was to advise the Ministry of Education and Research, NOKUT, and Norwegian teacher education institutions on the implementation of the new 5-year integrated MA programmes in primary and lower secondary teacher education (GLU). The panel's work culminated in a report with recommendations for the future. As co-leader of the APT project up to my maternity leave in 2018, my role was to select and recruit the panel, organise their work, and prepare a knowledge base of reports and presentations on political, historical, and institutional aspects of the new programmes. I also led many of our meetings, speaking to teacher educators around Norway about their work and the difficulties and opportunities they saw in the transition to a five-year programme.

When, inspired by this work, I went into GLU teaching, my experience from NOKUT gave me a valuable sense of the complexity of teacher education programmes and the kind of

collaboration they require. Having studied the pilot five-year GLU programme at UiT as part of APT, I was also very aware of the specific challenges involved in introducing MA theses to the GLU programme, and meeting these challenges is one of my priorities for the future (see **3.3**).

In 2021, I was asked to become the external programme auditor for the University of Bergen's English literature programme. This four-year role involves analysing and reporting on the academic and organisational aspects of the programme as part of UiB's external quality system, and both my NOKUT experience with programme-level quality analysis, and the greater understanding I've gained from USN of how different parts of an education fit together, have been invaluable here.

At USN, I have collaborated with my colleagues to develop the educational quality of our own programme. In 2021, Jenny Duggan and I applied for and were awarded a grant of ca 3 million kroner from UK-dir's NOTED programme; last year, our colleague Tom Bradstreet also joined the project. The project, English Collaboration between USN and York University (ECUYU), runs from 2022 to 2025 and is intended to establish an international exchange programme with York University in Toronto, Canada. The programme involves practicum exchanges for third-year English students, and will expand to include semester-long student exchanges and faculty exchanges. We developed the ECUYU project in response to the very low level of exchange participation among our teacher education students, a particular problem for future English teachers, for whom intercultural understanding and communication is central. Our aim is to give our English GLU students a chance to experience cultural and linguistic immersion and a diverse, multilingual school system. Through staff exchanges, we also want to introduce international perspectives to students who don't participate in the exchanges, and give staff members at York and USN the opportunity to create teaching collaborations and learn from each other.

3.2. I frequently share my experiences with colleagues, and collaborate with leadership, colleagues and students to develop a culture of sharing around teaching quality.

As for **1.3**, the inherently collaborative nature of much of my work means that several other sections cover this criterion. See **3.1** for more on specific quality-development projects I've led and worked on with colleagues in and outside the institution, **2.3** for more on my quality work with colleagues and students, **2.4** for my sharing of pedagogical knowledge in my academic community, and **Case Study 2** for a knowledge-sharing initiative on MA supervision.

3.3. I have plans for further strategic development work to increase the quality of education in our academic community.

The GLU programme I teach in is still a new one, with course structures, practices, routines, and philosophies that are still being formed, giving me and my colleagues great opportunities to help it reach its full potential. As I mention in **3.3**, I'm interested in developing a collaboration between our section group of MA supervisors and researchers at other institutions, to explore the question of what it means to write a GLU English MA thesis that centres the student's development as a research-minded teacher. As *Transforming Norwegian Teacher Education* (2020) argues, there is no consensus on what it means for a thesis to be "professionally oriented and practice-based", and we should "allow room for variation and innovation in the focus, scope, and types of research student teachers undertake" (128) rather than funnelling students into a narrow conception of the thesis (for instance, that it must always involve empirical research in the classroom). I believe that an exploration of what this kind of research can be and how we can best prepare our students for it, drawing on knowledge from each other, from national centres of expertise like ProTed (UiT and UiO's Centre for Professional Learning in Teacher Education), and from international teacher educations, will be broadly useful for our academic community in the years to come.

More on this criterion: In **1.4**, I describe smaller-scale collaborative plans to develop the quality of teaching in our programme.

References

Advisory Panel for Teacher Education (2020). *Transforming Norwegian Teacher Education: The Final Report of the International Advisory Panel for Primary and Lower Secondary Teacher Education*. NOKUT.

Ahmed, S. (2015) Against Students. *The New Inquiry*. June 29.
<https://thenewinquiry.com/against-students/>

Carless, D. and Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 43, No. 8, 1315-1325.

Duckor, B. (2014) Formative Assessment in Seven Good Moves. *Educational Leadership: Journal of the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A.* Vol. 71, No. 6, 28-32.

Eodice, M., Geller, A. E. and Lerner, N. (2016) *The Meaningful Writing Project: Learning, Teaching and Writing in Higher Education*. University Press of Colorado.

Forsman, S. (1985) Writing to Learn Means Learning to Think. In *Roots in the Sawdust: Writing to Learn Across the Disciplines*. The WAC Clearinghouse.

Hanks, J. (2015). Language teachers making sense of Exploratory Practice. *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 19, No. 5, 612-633.

Healey, M., Jenkins, A. and Lea, J. (2014) Developing Research-Based Curricula in College-Based Higher Education. The Higher Education Academy.

Holt, J. (1967, 1983) *How Children Learn*. Penguin.

Hundley, M., Jocius, R. and Pendergrass, E. (2019). Rethinking Writing Pedagogy: Supporting Preservice and Inservice Teachers' Digital and Multimodal Writing Practices. In *Participatory Literacy Practices for P-12 Classrooms in the Digital Age*. IGI Global.

Keefe, C. (2020) The Need for Authentic Audiences: Students as Advocates for Change. *English Journal*, Vol. 109, No. 4, 101-103.

Kvistad, E. (2016) The monster in the classroom: on uncanny teaching. Paper presented at 'Promises of Monsters'.

Kvistad, E., Aam, P. and Aarstad, Å. (2017) The liminal professional: Quality indicators for the Ph.D. degree amidst high rates of attrition. Paper presented at EAIR Forum.

Kvistad, E., Orning, S. and Henriksen, L. (2017) Monster pedagogy: A failing approach to teaching and learning in the university. In *Adventurous Encounters: Theories of Affect and Concepts in Generic Skills Education*, ed. Edyta Just. Cambridge Scholars.

Kvistad, E. and Duggan, J. (2022) Feeling and writing otherness/togetherness in digital modes. Paper presented at Aesthetical learning processes and togetherness, University of South-Eastern Norway. <https://alt.usn.no/conference-booklet/>

Kvistad, E. (2023) Horror and aesthetic learning in EFL teacher education. Paper presented at Learning to Scream: A Horror Studies Screen Pedagogy Symposium.
https://baftsshorrort.weebly.com/uploads/1/3/9/0/139058225/learning_to_scream_full_programme.pdf

- McCarthy, J. (2015). Evaluating written, audio and video feedback in higher education summative assessment tasks. *Issues in Educational Research*, Vol 25, No. 2, 153-169.
- McLeod, S. and Soven, M. (2000.) *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*. The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Ritchie, L. (2015) *Fostering Self-Efficacy in Higher Education Students*. Red Globe Press.
- Rosenshine, B. (2012) Principles of Instruction: Research-Based Strategies That All Teachers Should Know. *American Educator*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 12-19.
- Royle, N. (2003) Literature, teaching, psychoanalysis. In *The Uncanny*. Manchester University Press.
- Smythe, S. and Neufeld, P. (2010) 'Podcast Time': Negotiating Digital Literacies and Communities of Learning in a Middle Years ELL Classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. Vol. 53, No. 6, 488-496.
- Sweller, J. (1988) Cognitive Load During Problem Solving: Effects on Learning. *Cognitive Science*, vol. 12, 257-285.
- Tran, K. M. (2016) 'Her story was complex': A Twine workshop for ten- to twelve-year-old girls. *E-learning and Digital Media*. Vol. 30, No. 5-6.
- Warner, J., and Simmons, A. (2015) Giving voice to students: A preliminary analysis of informal mid-term evaluations and procedural justice. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. Vol. 19, No. 1.
- Winstone, N., Nash, A., Rowntree, J. and Parker, M. (2017). 'It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it': barriers to university students' feedback seeking and recipience. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 2026-2041.