



# LUND UNIVERSITY

## Scholarship of teaching and learning at the highest level? Experiences from a study program for doctoral supervisors

Sonesson, Anders; Ahlberg, Anders

2011

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. (2011). *Scholarship of teaching and learning at the highest level? Experiences from a study program for doctoral supervisors*. Abstract from International Society For The Scholarship Of Teaching & Learning.

*Total number of authors:*

2

### General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117  
221 00 Lund  
+46 46-222 00 00

# **Scholarship of teaching and learning at the highest level?**

## **Experiences from a study program for doctoral supervisors**

**Anders Sonesson & Anders Ahlberg  
Lund University, Sweden**

**anders.sonesson@ced.lu.se  
anders.ahlberg@genombrottet.lu.se**

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. ISSOTL-conference, October 2011,  
Milwaukee



# **Why Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in doctoral education and supervision?**

- 1. New demands for doctoral education**
- 2. Importance of doctoral education to academy and research**
- 3. Conflicts between 1 and 2**
- 4. Very little is known about doctoral education**
- 5. As a cultural driver for change**

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. ISSOTL-conference, October 2011,  
Milwaukee



## Supporting the development of SoTL in doctoral education

through a study program for doctoral  
supervisors?

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. ISSOTL-conference, October 2011,  
Milwaukee



## Lund University's new study program for doctoral supervisors

- Launched in spring 2010
- Three modules (A, B and C), equivalent of 1.5, 2 and 3 weeks, respectively
  - A: a general broad introduction
  - B: seminar-based
  - C: project
- Module A has been given 7 times, B has just begun and C has been given once

Workshop on Doctoral Learning and Supervision,  
Saturday 22 October, 4:30PM-5:30PM, Usinger Room

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. ISSOTL-conference, October 2011,  
Milwaukee



## Some important tensions in the design of the study program

Prescriptive	——	Discursive
Individual	——	Collegial
Know-How	——	Professional Competence
Verified by close peers	——	Verified by professional community
Individual transformation	——	Transformation of extended community

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. ISSOTL-conference, October 2011, Milwaukee



## Does the program contribute to SoTL? How could we find out?

One way is to look at the knowledge produced in the program.

Here we have analyzed participant's projects

Sonesson, A., & Ahlberg, A. ISSOTL-conference, October 2011, Milwaukee



## **In our participants' writing we have looked for (preliminary questions):**

### **1) Potential to transform local (or wider) practices**

- **Is the object of study local (or wider) practices or phenomena?**
- **Are the conclusions arrived at in scholarly way?**
- **Is the text written for peers?**

### **2) Learning between participants**

- **Cross-disciplinary learning?**
- **Cumulative knowledge building within program?**

## **Example 1 of participant writing (in first cohort)**

**Qualitative investigation into process of selection of doctoral candidates. Interviews with responsible persons. Finds several overlooked problems. Provides arguments to improve fairness, equal opportunities, heterogeneity, and openness to new perspectives and research proposals outside the regular scope of the department. (Literature)**

Is the object of study local (or wider) practices/phenomena?	Yes
Are the conclusions arrived at scholarly?	Yes
Is the text written for peers?	Yes
Cross-disciplinary learning displayed?	No
Cumulative knowledge building within program?	n/a

## Example 2 of participant writing

Ten item survey to probe doctoral student independence, from research idea to dissemination, for each piece of student's published work. Generates weighted "Publication Independence Index", PIX, longitudinally for each student in survey. Compares students from different subject fields. Compares survey with open-ended questions and interviews on independence. Discusses results, for practice as well as for reliability of survey. (Engineering, group project)

Is the object of study local (or wider) practices/phenomena?	Yes
Are the conclusions arrived at scholarly?	Yes
Is the text written for peers?	Yes
Cross-disciplinary learning displayed?	Yes
Cumulative knowledge building within program?	no

## Example 3 of participant writing

Reflective text on who to be and how to act, as supervisor for newly admitted doctoral student. Uses general advice in textbooks, ideas from workshops and a previous participant's work as inspiration. Relates supervision to student learning, but in very general manner. Describes hopes and anxieties. Does not pin out local practices, nor relates to them.

Is the object of study local (or wider) practices/phenomena?	No
Are the conclusions arrived at scholarly?	No
Is the text written for peers?	No
Cross-disciplinary learning displayed?	Yes
Cumulative knowledge building within program?	Yes

