



## Centres of Excellence 2013

### 1. Introduction

This document records the assessment process for appointing Centres of Excellence in Education (Sentre for fremragende utdanning- SFU) in 2013. The SFU-process of 2013 is described: the call, expert committee, the applicants and the assessment process and the conclusion of which academic communities are awarded the status of SFU in 2013.

#### 1.1 The call and applicants

NOKUT issued a call for three Centres of Excellence in Education on March 4, 2013. The call was open to all academic communities (educational fields). There was a desire from the government, that given satisfactory quality, one centre would be in a health related area and that the centres should represent diversity in disciplines.

Twenty-four proposals were received by the deadline of May 12, 2013. Nine applications were from health and social care educations and eight were related to STEM-subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics). Other proposals came within music, architecture, teacher education. (For an overview of the applicants see attachment 1).

The following (higher education) institutions applied:

- Barratt Due Institute of Music
- Buskerud University College and Vestfold University College
- Hedmark University College
- Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
- Stord/Haugesund University College
- Sør-Trøndelag University College with Bergen University College and Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
- Norwegian Academy of Music (NAM)
- Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)



- Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) with University of Agder and Ålesund University College
- Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) with Nord-Trøndelag University College
- Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) with Sør-Trøndelag University College
- University of Agder
- University of Agder with University of Nordland and University of Stavanger
- University of Bergen
- University of Bergen, with Bergen University College
- University of Bergen with The University Centre in Svalbard (UNIS)
- University of Oslo
- University of Oslo with Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
- University of Oslo with Gjøvik University College and Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
- University of Tromsø

## 1.2 International expert committee and assessment process

NOKUT appointed an international expert committee to assess the proposals and advise NOKUT's board of directors on which academic communities should be awarded the status of Centres of Excellence in Education.

The international expert panel consisted of the following members:

- Professor Duncan Lawson, Newman University, Birmingham, Chair
- Director of Academic Affairs Jørgen Thorslund, University College Lillebælt
- Professor Trudie Roberts, Leeds University
- Professor Helena Gaunt, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, London
- Professor Mats Benner, Lund University
- Student Trine Oftedal, The National Union of Students in Norway (NSO)

Assessment of applications took place in two rounds. First the 24 proposals were assessed based on the written material. The applicants received written feedback with graded assessments on a scale from 1 - 6, where 1 denotes poor and 6 denotes excellent quality medio August. (See attachment 2: Feedback to applicants phase 1).

Eight applicants were selected to proceed to the final round. The eight shortlisted proposals were:



- Norwegian Academy of Music - Centre of Excellence in Music Performance Education (CEMPE)
- NTNU and Nord-Trøndelag University College - Innovative teaching in Information Technology (2IT)
- NTNU - Transformative Learning in Architectural Education (TransARK)
- University of Agder - Centre for Research, Innovation and Coordination of Mathematics Teaching (MatRIC)
- University of Bergen, Svalbard University Centre (UNIS) and Institute of Marine Research - Centre for Excellence in Biology Education (BioCEED)
- University of Oslo - Centre for Entrepreneurship
- University of Oslo, Gjøvik University College and Oslo and Akershus University College - Health and Social - Unlimited
- University of Tromsø, Tromsø Municipality and University Hospital North (UNN) – Centre for Inter-professional Education in Health (INTERPROF).

The shortlisted candidates were asked to supply additional information by September 1, 2013. All bidders were asked to send in a more detailed project plan, details of measures of success and how these would be monitored and a detailed dissemination plan. In addition, specific information relevant to each bid was requested where the proposal was not sufficiently detailed. Site visits were subsequently carried out to the eight finalists during September. Discipline experts were present at all site visits. Discipline experts covering architecture, biosciences, entrepreneurship and music were appointed to supplement the international expert panel: Dr. Anu Yanar, Dr. Jeremy Pritchard, Professor Mette Mønsted and Professor Rineke Smilde.

The committee has conducted three full-day meetings and eight site visits with meetings before and after the visits. In addition, there have been two meetings with parts of the panel present, Skype-meetings and extensive contact by email and telephone. The committee handed in their recommendation to the NOKUT board of directors on October 15th. The committee was unanimous in its decision. NOKUTs board of directors met on October 31, and concluded as outlined below.

### 1.3 Selection criteria<sup>1</sup>

An SFU should be outstanding, both in terms of the documented quality of its established educational provision and in terms of its centre plan, i.e. its visions, strategies and plans for further development and innovation of its educational activities and for disseminating its acquired knowledge to other academic communities.

The applications are hence assessed by these main criteria:

---

<sup>1</sup> The standards and guidelines that regulate the SFU programme is described in the document “Standards and Guidelines for Centres and Criteria for the Assessment of Applications”. [http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/UA-enhet/SFU/SFU\\_Standards\\_Guidelines\\_and\\_Criteria\\_for\\_the\\_Assessment\\_of\\_Applications.pdf](http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/UA-enhet/SFU/SFU_Standards_Guidelines_and_Criteria_for_the_Assessment_of_Applications.pdf)



1. **'Educational Quality'**: The bidding academic community's documented strengths compared with other communities within the same educational area, nationally and internationally. The committee considered outcome, process and input factors. Feedback concerning educational quality from central stakeholders (students, alumni, employers, etc.) was also considered. Furthermore the academic community's R&D- base and how they incorporate R&D into the teaching and learning to offer excellent R&D-based education was important in the assessment.
2. **Centre plan**: the center vision, strategies for development and plans for further enhancement, educational innovation were considered. Further the committee has assessed how the centre status will trigger effects that would not be achieved without support (additionality) and likelihood of success.
3. **Dissemination**: Assessment of how the academic community will disseminate its own development of systematized knowledge about factors that contribute towards high quality education internally, to other educational communities, to target groups and the society in general regionally, nationally and internationally. The expert committee considered the centres' plans to support and stimulate educational enhancement both inside the host institutions and in other relevant communities.

The SFU arrangement is particularly aimed at stimulating and rewarding work involving interaction of students, teachers, support services and the knowledge base of the educational activities. Consequently great stress has been put on the R&D base for all types of educational provision. Relationships with the professional field and stakeholders have also been regarded as of great importance. In addition, elements such as international orientation, leadership, organisational structure and other infrastructural framework elements have counted in the assessments.

## 2. Conclusion and ranking of the bids

After careful consideration of the eight finalists, NOKUT concluded the assessment process as outlined below.

### 1st place CEMPE, Norwegian Academy of Music

This was an excellently written bid which was ranked first at the shortlisting stage. The site visit confirmed and strengthened this status. Existing excellence was clearly evidenced, the Centre has ambitious plans and full commitment at all levels within the institution to give the Panel great confidence that this will be a highly successful Centre. A diverse range of impressive stakeholders are strongly supportive of the proposal. The Panel recommends this proposal as being **of the highest quality**.



### 2nd place MatRIC, University of Agder

A well written proposal which gave a much better impression at the site visit. The written proposal was sound but the site visit made it inspiring. The students were eloquent advocates for the excellence of existing provision and the proposal has a very clear aim to be a truly national centre with well-developed plans for achieving this. The Panel regards this as a **high quality bid**. It would however make two recommendations for the proposers to consider when implementing their plans. Firstly, that the Centre may wish to expand its activities to include working with school teachers and, secondly, that the Centre should give thought to how to involve students more actively in the delivery of the Centre's activities.

### 3rd place BioCEED, University of Bergen

This proposal has ambitions to make an impact on the teaching of biosciences across Norway. A particular strength, that was developed after the proposal had been shortlisted, was to secure engagement from other higher education institutions across Norway involved in the teaching of biosciences. This proposal is from a consortium of three institutions which bring different strengths into the partnership: in research, in teaching and in stakeholder relationships. The Panel regards this as a **good quality bid**.

As the Centre progresses it will be important to see the differing strengths of the partners being shared across the consortium for their mutual benefit and development. The Panel would recommend that the Centre team be willing to take some risks in their activities to try to secure even greater achievements.

The original call for papers indicated a desire that, as a follow up of the Ministry's White Paper No. 13 (2011-2012) Education for Welfare: Interaction as Key, one of the centres should be in the field of health and social care, with the caveat "given satisfactory quality". In making its recommendation to the NOKUT Board, the International Expert Panel was very aware of this ambition. Two bids in the field of health and social care were amongst the eight finalists and whilst both of these proposals had strengths and areas of potential, the International Expert Panel concluded that neither of them was yet of sufficient quality to merit being awarded an SFU.

However, the Panel would encourage the proposers of these bids to seek to further develop the ideas expressed in the proposals and initiate some work in these areas so that they will be in a strong position to apply for funding either from a future SFU call or another source.

## 2.1 Feedback to the finalists

In the following the feedback to the eight finalists is presented.



## Norwegian Academy of Music - Centre of Excellence in Music Performance Education, CEMPE

### Centre

The Centre of Excellence in Music Performance Education was proposed by the Norwegian Academy of Music (NAM). The declared aim of the centre is to educate excellent music performers in a rapidly changing globalised music community. This will be achieved through enhancing music performance teaching, enhancing the quality of the students' instrumental practice and preparing the students for proactive participation in the music community. These three objectives will be met through seven discrete research projects, involving students and teachers and utilising different methodologies.

### Strengths and weaknesses

This was an excellently written proposal which was ranked first at the shortlisting stage. The site visit confirmed and strengthened this status. Existing excellence was clearly evidenced. The centre is meeting important needs in the music community identified by students, teachers and stakeholders during the site visit. The Norwegian Academy is already preeminent for its research and development relating to pedagogy. The artistic research done in NAM is impressive. CEMPE hence has a strong R&D base already in place. The students were strong ambassadors of NAM and clearly thought that the goal of the centre would greatly improve their already excellent education.

The centre has ambitious plans and commitment at all levels in the organization and from stakeholders. The commitment of the institution's managers and leaders is impressive.

The institution is going through a generation shift, and this centre is a part of the future for NAM and will encourage a culture change in an excellent way. Given the nature of the centre, and its proposed activities, it will affect the whole institution. The proposed governance and management structures for the Centre appear to be sound. The skills of the members of the leadership group complement each other well.

It became clear during the site visit that NAM as a music institution affects the music community throughout the whole of Norway. However, as the students pointed out, there is scope for greater collaboration with the other institutions in Norway providing music education. The stakeholders of the centre are very interested in the centre's development and would like to have an important role in the execution and dissemination of the centre. Having already developed bilateral agreement with crucial stakeholders, receiving center status will help to expand these bilateral relationships into important networks. Innovation and creativity in the relationship of stakeholders will make this centre even more excellent. Existing international relations are very strong and these make the centre very likely to have an impact internationally as well as within Norway.



The means of dissemination is solid, although a little traditional. The site visit gave further insight into the strategies for dissemination, compared to the ones in the written bid. Centre management was clear on both internal and external dissemination. Dissemination strategies, implicit in the bid, should be systematized to capitalise on the centre's strong position nationally, internationally and in its relations to stakeholders. The NOKUT team would like to see even more focus on getting others to utilize the knowledge base created by the centre and contributing to it, in addition to the plans already made.

NAM has presented an excellent foundation for the proposed Centre which has the potential to deliver real value internally, nationally and in international contexts. Existing excellence was clearly evidenced, the Centre has ambitious plans and full commitment at all levels within the institution to give the Panel great confidence that this will be a highly successful Centre. A diverse range of impressive stakeholders are strongly supportive of the proposal. This proposal is of the highest quality and can be a real advantage for Norway in the international music community. The centre is truly excellent, and there is no doubt that CEMPE deserves to be awarded an SFU.

## **NTNU and Nord-Trøndelag University College - Innovative teaching in information Technology, 2-IT**

### Centre

It is planned to establish the centre in early 2014 as a collaboration between NTNU and HiNT. The partnership between NTNU and HiNT is based on mutual interest in Project based Learning and complementary strengths: with NTNU having a strong research base and HiNT very close collaboration with industry. The centre will be organised as a unit under the ME faculty at the NTNU.

### Strengths and weaknesses

The vision for the 2-IT centre of excellence is to become a beacon for IT as an attractive study and career choice for both genders, communicating to Norwegian youth the many exciting opportunities of IT for jobs and society. This will be achieved by (1) making IT studies more motivating and yielding better learning by increased use of project-based teaching and by close collaboration with industry to demonstrate the relevance of all courses (project based and others); (2) making the studies and their motivational aspects visible to pupils in pre-university education to make them aware of IT as an attractive path before they make educational choices that exclude them from future study in many IT-related areas.



Initially, the work of the centre will focus on improving the partners' own study programs with respect to motivation and learning outcomes, but the results will be communicated to facilitate easy reuse and adaptation by other educational institutions, contributing to increased student satisfaction in IT studies in Norway.

The committee was impressed with examples of project-based teaching that are already taking place at HiNT with very close links to industry – particularly the newer parts of the IT sector which are typically smaller companies. At NTNU teaching is more traditional and theory focused, which suits many of the stakeholders who were met during the site visit. Although NTNU recruits students of high quality it has a relatively high drop-out rate. The students who were met during the site visit were guarded about the excellence of the teaching they received. Students from HiNT were generally very positive but students from NTNU reported a variable experience.

The Panel observed clear and relevant ambitions with a very strong commitment from both institutions. There is a clear rationale to the collaboration between two different institutions who both want to learn from each other. However, to some extent this might be seen as NTNU catching up with good international practice rather than the SFU forging ahead.

There is a strong commitment to the SFU from senior level within both institutions. At NTNU there is a particular desire to use the SFU to initiate a process of change across the university, although this was not clearly expressed within the written proposal. However, the challenges of changing the culture should not be underestimated. Although there is experience to draw on from a similar process in relation to research, the Panel encountered some very conservative views during the site visit which may impede the success of the Centre both in its own discipline area and across the institution. It appeared that this role as institutional change agent had been added after the proposal was written and it was not clear that the Centre leadership had clear plans in relation to this.

The Panel was not convinced that the project team had given sufficient consideration to its aim of making IT more popular with pre-university students and particularly did not have confidence that there were robust plans for attracting more female students.

The dissemination plan was rather weak and very traditional. It needs stronger external involvement from outside partners covering stakeholders from both involved institutions.





## NTNU- Transformative Learning in Architectural Education (TransARK)

### Centre

The declared aim of the Centre is to transform the learning experience when students are exposed to the complexity of the aesthetical, ethical, technical, economical, and functional challenges of becoming an architect. More specifically, the aim is to develop and redefine knowledge of transformational learning to a higher level of precision in methodology and practice, based on trans-disciplinary research.

### Strengths and weaknesses

The transformation of architectural education, where a master-apprentice model still dominates, is a daunting task. The planned activities and the organisation of the TransARK centre intend to address this task with the goal of transforming architectural training at NTNU and also to be part of a widespread change beyond NTNU. This is a fitting goal for an SFU.

A particular strength of the proposal is that it clearly addresses the future challenges of the profession. The proposal is highly relevant and addresses in an innovative way issues that shape interdisciplinary and synthetic educational fields such as architecture.

Evidence was presented that the educational provision in architecture at NTNU is among the leaders in Norway. The documentation and site visit did provide some evidence of educational excellence, but there were also some areas where this excellence was less clear, particularly in terms of R&D informing practice. There is some innovative project work in the first two years and these could be extended throughout the whole curriculum.

The NOKUT Team (NT) was impressed with the visions and leadership, including the commitment from university and faculty management, to realize the goals and aims of the proposal. The energy of the centre leader and the engagement of management at university and faculty levels, and the commitment of staff and students were promising.

Although the proposal set out a management and governance structure which seemed sensible, the NT was less impressed with the actual plans put forward to achieve the high level goals. Whilst accepting that it may not be possible to provide highly detailed plans to bring about changes of this scale, the proposed activities were too vague. Furthermore, the applicant should have developed a more coherent plan for the start-up phase (although it was agreed that this would be clarified if the centre is funded). The applicants were somewhat vague in outlining criteria for success or failure, and these needs to be clarified in order to develop a more evaluative project plan.



The international connections are strong overall with a prominent advisory board, which would be of great significance for the success of the centre.

There were weaknesses relating to dissemination and the somewhat routine mobilization of stakeholders – a centre with transformative visions should also develop visionary means to disseminate and interact with stakeholders, including non-traditional stakeholders. The stakeholders engaged did not transcend the traditional networks. It would have been useful to make an innovative stakeholder analysis that reflects the stated ideas of the architects' new and fundamentally revised role as "big thinkers in the extremely complex society". Recruitment policy for the staff could also reflect the aspirations to educate more broader minded future architects.

Although some reference was made to research literature, there was a lack of depth in the theoretical pedagogical underpinning of the proposed work packages. TransARK's proposal was weak in the articulation between education and research and hence failed regarding the NOKUT expectation of an SFU to 'provide excellent R&D-based education'.

An obvious strength of TransARK is the ongoing discussion and reflection on the embedded philosophical ideas. However, the philosophical foundation- especially from an ethical point of view, could be reinforced. More work is needed to convert philosophical thoughts into concrete pedagogical practices.

Overall, the NT felt that the implementation plans were less well developed than the strong high-level ambitions and therefore could not be confident that the Centre would deliver the far-reaching cultural and philosophical changes that it was setting out to achieve.



## University of Agder- Centre for Research, Innovation and Coordination of Mathematics Teaching (MATRIC)

### Centre

The declared aim of the Centre is to lead innovation and research in university mathematics teaching and learning within the programmes of other subjects such as engineering, natural sciences, economics and teacher education (so-called user programmes). The intention is to create a national rather than institutional centre of excellence by creating networks of colleagues involved in teaching mathematics within user programmes at institutions across Norway.

### Strengths and weaknesses

There is strong support from the senior management of the university for this proposal and a commitment to be involved in the governance of the centre. Furthermore, it became clear at the site visit that there is a committed team of many colleagues, in addition to the nominated Centre leader, who will be involved in the delivery of Centre activities.

In its written submission and more so at the site visit, existing excellence was clearly established. The students who spoke to the NOKUT team during the visit were outstanding advocates for the teaching they receive. They spoke in eloquent terms of the way they are taught and gave concrete examples of how they had been able to use their mathematical knowledge in applications within their “home” discipline.

The stakeholders, representing industry, national bodies and internal user departments, were also very positive about the proposal – both in terms of the need to work in this area and of the proposers’ abilities to deliver the programme successfully.

The centre’s aims are appropriately ambitious and it is clear that considerable thought and planning has gone into developing approaches that should enable the centre to succeed. Fundamental to success will be the creation of networks and special interest groups involving colleagues from institutions around Norway and across Scandinavia. A key strategy in achieving this is to ensure that the centre’s activities in terms of meetings, workshops, conferences, etc will mainly not take place at the University of Agder but in locations around Norway. In addition, to encouraging participation from others at the outset of the centre, this should also be an effective part of the centre’s dissemination



strategy. At the site visit, there was a discussion of additional ways of securing engagement of other institutions. These methods include staff from other universities leading some of the work packages (and being paid from SFU funds to do so), making the research “seed corn” funding available nationally and funding colleagues from other institutions to visit international centres of excellence. The proposers indicated that some of this was intended, although it is not explicit in the proposal.

Overall this was a strong, well-presented proposal with appropriate aims built on existing excellence and a clearly structured plan that gives confidence that there is a high likelihood of success.

There were two areas where the NOKUT team felt that the proposal could have been strengthened. The first area relates to involvement with schools. Issues around enjoyment and competence in mathematics do not start in higher education but have their roots earlier. The proposers already have strong links with many schools and teachers in the region. The Centre could build on these and share some of the resources it produces and its approaches with schools, running training events for teachers and “taster” events to enable school students to better engage with mathematics.

The second area relates to the involvement of students. The students the NOKUT team met were not only strong proponents of the quality of the teaching and learning at Agder, they were also enthusiastic to be involved in the activities of the Centre. This could take many forms such as a student user group to “beta test” new resources; students contributing to the development of resources under the guidance of staff; peer mentoring groups; students supporting the production of the proposed journal.

Notwithstanding these two suggestions, this was a very high quality proposal that merits being awarded an SFU.

## University of Bergen - Centre for Excellence in Biology Education (BioCEED)

### Centre

The declared aim of the Centre is to reform biology education in response to changes in the biological sciences, in higher education, and in society’s needs. BioCEED is built on the vision that the expanding role of biology – and biologists – places new demands on both the content of education provided and the training of tomorrow’s



biologists. Consequently, new approaches for integrating the learning of biological content, knowledge and skills with practical training in more generic skills will be developed.

### Strengths and weaknesses

BioCEED is an ambitious attempt at establishing an outstanding environment for education in a research-driven environment. The NOKUT Team (NT) was impressed with the visions and leadership, including the commitment from university leadership, to realize the aims of the proposal. The partnership between three different institutions appeared credible with each bringing complementary strengths (such as research, teaching and stakeholder relationships) to the consortium.

The centre leadership was energetic and visionary, however there were signs that the commitment to the centre idea varied among the wider staff body. While the plans were, by and large, convincing and feasible, the current status of biology education across the consortium partners is not uniformly outstanding. Strategies to deal with quality differences need further development. This is a key area for demonstrating the effectiveness of the Centre's dissemination.

The NT was impressed by the ambition behind the centre, the open and frank accounts of the challenges of biology education and the clear visions of education reform to align it better with the successful research environment.

A strength of the proposal was the ambition to collaborate with other biology environments in Norway to ensure a more widespread transformation of the relatively traditional structure of biology education in Norway. In the time between being short-listed and the site visit, the proposers had secured agreements to be engaged in the Centre's work from several providers of biology higher education in Norway and the NT regarded this as a strong indication of likely success in terms of the ambition to bring about change on a national scale.

Although some of the proposed innovations were promising and exciting, others appeared more routine. Efficient ways of monitoring progress and change were proposed and these should be effective. However, a stronger overarching plan may be needed, particularly to achieve some of the higher level goals.

The added value of the centre, beyond already ongoing work to reform the educational programme, could have been made clearer.

Overall, the NT were impressed with BioCEED's proposals and believes that the proposed organisational structure and work plan can succeed in bringing about some of the desired changes. The NT would encourage the team to be willing to take be adventurous and willing to take risks in testing new approaches.



## University of Oslo- Centre for Entrepreneurship

### Centre

This proposal seeks to build on an existing award-winning entrepreneurship initiative and to create a new pathway within the MSc in innovation and entrepreneurship. This pathway would incorporate a step change in pedagogical approach, responding to recent research in the field of entrepreneurship education that underlines the importance of learning by engaging in entrepreneurship as well as learning about it. Most importantly, the Centre would offer a clear proposition for students to develop their own entrepreneurial businesses rather than simply taking internships in other start-ups. During the site visit additional aims, which were not in the written proposal, were outlined. These related to including an element of Entrepreneurship education in all the programmes within the faculty.

### Strengths and weaknesses

The site visit confirmed that the existing Gründerskolen experience is outstanding. Gründerskolen has grown considerably in the last years and has forged excellent and sustained links to international innovation hubs with opportunities for students to take on internships in start-up companies in several countries. It received unanimous and enthusiastic support from students, staff and stakeholders. Alumni of the programme reported that they had been given real and challenging aspects of start-up businesses to work on, and had benefitted significantly from this.

Members of the stakeholder group were all highly committed to innovation and put forward a united vision of the need to develop entrepreneurship in Norway as a way of preparing for future economic challenges. They expressed a clear imperative to increase the volume of entrepreneurs creating growth companies and hoped that a Centre of this kind would fulfill this challenge. There was, however, something of a disjuncture between these stakeholders' views of the purpose of the SFU and that of those who had actually written the proposal.

The value of building on the learning from Gründerskolen initiative was evident, particularly in the context of strategic thinking in Norway about entrepreneurship expressed by some of the stakeholders, and given that the current MSc in innovation and entrepreneurship is largely traditional and lecture-based pedagogically. It was disappointing, however, that the development focus through this centre was very narrow, essentially relating to a new pathway within the current MSc that will involve very few students (approximately 100 over 4 years), with no plans for expansion. Furthermore the current plan is to reform only a part of the MSc programme. The NT felt that this did not amount to the "paradigm shift" expressed in the proposal. Although the Faculty senior management eloquently expressed a vision for the wider contribution the Centre could make, this did not seem to align well with the aims of the Centre's proposers.



Specific objectives and plans articulated in the bid were weak, and unfortunately not adequately clarified during the site visit. There was considerable need for stronger pedagogical research networks to underpin the development process, and for stronger vision and collective leadership within the Centre team. The leadership team demonstrated commitment to active experimentation with pedagogy in order to move from a “discovery” to “creation” model for the discipline. However, beyond introducing the effectuation model of entrepreneurship (Sarasvathy, 2008), and an intention to build a pedagogy integrating reflection in and on action, the proposed paradigm shift was confused.

Furthermore discussion with the Centre management team revealed that the thinking and current process of development came almost entirely from the two co-Directors of the Centre, with other members of the team apparently marginal. In addition, the Centre proposal included using PhD students as a major teaching resource. Although they would be collaborating with more senior staff, the capability of such students to deliver innovative teaching whilst in the early stages of their research was unconvincing.

A further concern was that the work of the Centre would not be disseminated effectively. Proposed developments would impact very few students directly, and whilst there was much potential to spread the work to other programmes, there was little sense of this being realized in practice. Proposals for further dissemination through national and international networks were also weak. International dissemination relied too heavily on the doctoral consortium connected to the effectuation conference that will only reach around 50 students over five years.

In essence the high level vision of spreading developments from the Centre across the Faculty was strong, but implementation was not convincing. Initial ideas needed to be developed with stronger collective engagement. Management structures were over-reliant on the co-Directors and had not been systematically considered. There seemed little likelihood of the Centre working well in its current form. Significant added value from the Centre was hard to discern and it was difficult to see how the passionate vision for transforming entrepreneurship in Norway that was expressed in some of the site visit meetings would be delivered.

## University of Oslo - Health and Social - Unlimited

Centre

This potential Centre of Excellence in Education proposes innovations in health and social education through changes in curriculum, new teaching and learning methods, interprofessional education, and the reorganization of how educational institutions collaborate with the different institutions and professions in the sector.



### Strengths and weaknesses

Continued innovation in health and social care education is extremely important; this proposal is timely and potentially of significant strategic value. The integration of health and social care education is warmly welcomed. Everyone involved in delivering health and social care, works in teams and introducing undergraduate students to teamwork is vital.

However the NOKUT Team (NT) were not convinced of the ability of the applicants to work together in a truly collaborative partnership. The presentations from the respective partner leads generally focused on their own institution and its accomplishments rather than the added value of working together. None of the meetings or the presentations provided a direct indication of any truly cutting edge work that would be undertaken. The NT did not perceive energetic commitment to the planned programme from many of the meetings.

The NT was impressed by the knowledge and commitment of the Chair of the Leader group who had clearly had a major involvement in writing the proposal.

The NT was disappointed that two important stakeholder groups, ie patients and students, had either not been involved or not included in a meaningful way. Whilst most of the staff were enthusiastic about the plans, others from the specialized areas of practice did not seem as well connected to the bid as the NT had expected. Given the extent of the potential impact of this Centre, it is clearly important that a wide range of colleagues are fully aware of and committed to the goals of the SFU.

Implementing a programme such as outlined in the bid would mean major cultural change. The process of implementing such culture change should not be under-estimated. In response to direct questioning, the proposers were unable to give a clear explanation of how this process would be supported or brought about. The NT were left with little confidence that the SFU would be able to effect the significant culture change that will be necessary for this Centre to be successful.

The applicants acknowledged that they had not formulated a plan to evaluate the success or otherwise of the centre. This was perceived as a serious weakness of the bid by the NT. A strategy for evaluation needs to be present at the outset, so that the Centre leadership can be informed of progress towards goals and make necessary adjustments to planning and activities in order to ensure success.

Although the governance structure was set out in the bid it was not clear from the discussions that the applicants had delineated the responsibilities for the various groups.





In conclusion, the NT felt that although the proposal had significant merit, close scrutiny of the proposed implementation revealed that considerable further thinking and planning is necessary to produce a proposal that NOKUT could confidently expect to be successful.

## University of Tromsø- INTERPROF, Centre for Interprofessional Education in Health Sciences

### Centre

The declared aim of the centre is to educate health care students for future interprofessional collaboration in a transforming society and a transforming health care system. This proposal addresses the very important area of inter-professional education which is critical to the future development of health professionals of all specialties.

### Strengths and weaknesses

The NOKUT Team (NT) were pleased to see high level commitment within the University to this application. As there have been several previous successful mergers leading to the present configuration of the University (the last being completed in August 2013) the NT were confident that the applicants are well placed to deal with the issues around cultural change that would inevitably occur if the Centre were to be successful. It was disappointing that social work was not included in the applicants' plans and this needs to be rectified- the latest merger within the University should provide an opportunity for this to be facilitated.

The Faculty at all levels and the students were supportive of the bid. The stakeholders the NT met at the site visit were committed to the proposal and viewed the University as forward thinking and responsive. However, the stakeholder pool at the meeting was thought by the NT to be rather narrow and they would have expected a broader range of possible collaborators to be present.

Although, as noted above, there was widespread support for the proposal, there needs to be an agreed definition of interprofessional learning (IPL) which is shared by all the staff and students. In particular, there needs to be a differentiation between "common learning" and "interprofessional learning". In the opinion of the NT, much of what was being described was common rather than interprofessional learning.

The scale of change needed, both culturally and in terms of personal skills, to successfully embed inter-professional learning throughout the curriculum appeared to have been under-estimated. A major Faculty staff development programme needs to be planned to ensure that all staff are on board with the plans and trained to participate.



As the proposal stands, the applicants will only develop 2 weeks and 2 days of IPL. This does not appear to provide value for money. Furthermore, and more importantly, such a short period of IPL is unlikely to bring about the significant culture change that should be the goal of the SFU. The applicants need to give urgent thought to how the programme could be increased, whilst remaining cognisant of the difficulties encountered with timetabling and staffing. The NT would advise closer collaboration with clinicians from practice.

A research and evaluation strategy is lacking at present and needs to be urgently addressed so that it is available at the start of the programme. Any programme of this nature will need to readjust during its delivery to ensure that goals are successfully achieved – on-going evaluation, rather than simply end of programme evaluation, is therefore vital.

The area of interprofessional learning is regarded as increasingly important in European countries. Significant work has been undertaken in this area and a range of networks have been established, for example CAIPE, Nordic Inter-professional Network, European Inter-professional Education Network, and there is potential for the Centre to take advantage of advances that have already been made. The NT did not feel that the proposers were completely aware of their work and would recommend closer ties with at least some of these organisations.

The proposal addresses an area of fundamental importance to health education in the early part of the 21st century and therefore the Centre has the potential to be of considerable significance to higher education in Norway. The NT felt that although the proposal had significant merit (it would not have reached the Site Visit stage otherwise), however the close scrutiny permitted by the Site Visit revealed a number of flaws referred to above. These items need addressing through further reflection and planning in order to produce a proposal that NOKUT could confidently expect to succeed.