EUROPEAN CONSORTIUM OF INNOVATIVE UNIVERSITIES

2020 Team Award for Innovation in Teaching and Learning – practicalities and criteria

Practicalities

Per ECIU university only one proposal can be send in.

If the proposal is by a team of multiple institutes (eg multiple ECIU universities), please indicate who is the leader of the proposal.

Deadline of sending in the proposal is 1 September 2020.

All proposals should be send in either Word or PDF format to: teamaward@eciu.org

Announcement of the winner is shortly after 1 October 2020.

Please contact the local representative of the ECIU University Expert Group on Education for any questions:

Member University	Contact Person	Position	Email
Aalborg University	Inger Askehave	Pro-rector	prorektor@aau.dk
Universidade de Aveiro	Sandra Soares	Pro-Rector	sandra.soares@ua.pt
Universitat A. Barcelona	Anna Marbà	Vice-dean of studies at the faculty of Education	anna.marba@uab.cat
Dublin City University	Yseult Freeney	Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning for DCU's School of Business	
Hamburg University of Technology	Andrea Brose	Director Center for Teaching and Learning	a.brose@tuhh.de
Kaunas University of Technology	Asta Daunoriene	Head of EDU_Lab Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching	asta.daunoriene@ktu.lt
Linköping University	Svante Gunnarson	Professor at the Division of Automatic Control	
Tec. de Monterrey	Martín Velázquez	Academic Director for the TEC Central Region	mvelazqz@itesm.mx
University of Stavanger	Dag Husebø	Pro-Rector Education	dag.husebo@uis.no
Tampere University	Aino Sipari		aino.sipari@tuni.fi
University of Trento	Paola Lamiceli	Pro-Rector for Teaching and Learning	Paola.lamiceli@unitn.it
University of Twente	Frank van den Berg	Head Centre for Educational Support	f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl

1. Project Description (max 200 words; 2 points)

Please describe the goal(s) of your innovation project and the general set-up (eg what, how).

2. Transformative Aspect (max 250 words; 4 points)

Please explain what impact changing your education (including an online format as well) had for whom, and indicate why it was transformative for whom (teachers, students, discipline) and on what scale. If possible, please include (preliminary) results on this transformative aspect and/or refer to scientific theories and research to support your claims.

3. Long term application and replicability (max 200 words; 4 points)

Please explain how you will use (part of) the current set up of your (online) education in the future, why this part and why in this way. Please also explain whether and to what extent, in your view, some innovative aspects could be replicated in different types of programmes and teaching activities, regardless the subject-area or the programme-level (graduate, undergraduate).

4. Team working on the innovation (max 150 words, 3 points)

Please explain the composition of the team that worked on this innovation (both in the design, implementation, execution and evaluation of the innovation), and indicate what role each partner had. Especially a team consisting of people from multiple disciplines, different departments or even different organizations is appreciated, as well as teams that include students in the design of innovation.

5. Students as Partners (max 150 words; 3 points)

Please explain how students as active participants/change agents were involved in your innovation (in the design, implementation, execution and/or evaluation of the innovation).

6. Enhances student learning (max 250 words; 4 points)

Please explain how your innovation is enhancing the learning of the student, e.g. students learn more content, depth of learning increases, self-directedness of the student is improved etc. Again, if possible please substantiate your claim with reference to results and/or scientific literature.

Supporting materials

Please include links to (part of) your (online) education as an example. Please specify what can be seen, and if you refer to part of a video(lecture), indicate what timeslot the committee should look at. Please consider that the evaluation commission will not be able to watch extensive video materials; 10 total minutes could be a fair approximation of maximum duration of materials that the evaluation commission could consider.