Poster

Title: **SoTL based Curriculum Design: two examples from the Netherlands**

Presenter: **Irma Meijerman, Ferdi Engels**
Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Session Learning Outcomes

By the end of this session, delegates will be able to:

Use the provided examples as an inspiration and application to think about incorporating SoTL in designing and implementing an evidence based (undergraduate) curriculum

Session Outline

Many good practice examples of using Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) to develop evidence based teaching and learning at course level exist, however, examples on SoTL based curriculum design are scarce. The Utrecht University, Faculty of Science, recently has taken the initiative to (re)design two of their undergraduate curricula, using an evidence based approach. The curricula are fundamentally different in the fact that the first one is aimed at training undergraduate students to become pharmaceutical scientists, thereby focusing on scientific research skills. The second, redesigned, curriculum is that of the Pharmacy programme, which is mainly oriented towards the profession of pharmacists. Based on theories and evidence on teaching and learning the conceptual framework for the pharmaceutical science programme was decided to be: research-based, inquiry-based learning in an authentic context with autonomy for the students, using scaffolding to provide the right amount of teacher support at the right time (Herrington, Oliver 2000, Justice, Warry et al. 2002, Deci, Ryan 1987, Healey, Jenkins 2009, Healey 2005, Vermunt, Verloop 1999) For the Pharmacy programme active, student-centred learning in general was chosen as an approach, with special emphasis on differentiated instruction (Thomlinson 2003, Subban 2006). Furthermore, experiential education was implemented in the context of simulated and 'real life' health care (Cantor 1997, Boyle, Beardsley et al. 2007). In this study we will present the background, theory and design of the two undergraduate programmes and compare the deliberate choices that were made for both programmes.

References

BOYLE, C.J., BEARDSLEY, R.S., MORGAN, J.A., DE BITTNER, M.R., 2007. Professionalism: a determining factor in experiential learning. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education,* **71**(2), pp. 1-7

CANTOR, J.A., 1997. Experiential learning in higher education: linking classroom and community. *ERIC DIGEST, ED404948*

DECI, E.L. and RYAN, R.M., 1987. The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology,* **53**, pp. 1024-1037.

HEALEY, M., 2005. Linking Research and Teaching to Benefit Student Learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education,* **29**(2), pp. 183-201.

HEALEY, M. and JENKINS, A., 2009. *Linking discipline-based research and teaching through mainstreaming undergraduate research and inquiry.* http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/iatl/cetl/resources/linking_discipline-based_research_and_teaching_through...pdf, 20 July 2015

HERRINGTON, J. and OLIVER, R., 2000. An instructional design framework for authentic learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development,* **48**(3), pp. 23-48.

JUSTICE, C., WARRY, W., CUNEO, C., INGLIS, S., MILLER, S., RICE, J. and SAMMON, S., 2002. A grammar for inquiry: Linking goals and methods in a collaboratively taught social sciences inquiry course. *In Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, The Alan Blizzard award paper: The award winning papers.* Windsor, Ontario, Canada: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, .

SUBBAN, P., 2006. Differentiated instruction: A research basis. *International Education Journal,* **7**(7), pp. 935-947.

THOMLINSON, C.A., 2003. Deciding to teach them all. *Educational leadership,* **61**(2), pp. 6-11

VERMUNT, J.D. and VERLOOP, N., 1999. Congruence and friction between learning and teaching. *Learning and Instruction,* **9**(3), pp. 257-280.