

Teaching portfolio

1. Teaching CV: A list of any lecturing and supervision tasks, including specification of academic fields, scope, level (bachelor, master, continuing education, PhD) as well as any external examiner tasks.

Fall 2022:

- Logic Sole, Applied Philosophy, 3rd semester: Sole responsibility
- Philosophy of Science, Applied Philosophy 3rd semester: 3 lectures, 100 hours of supervision
- Bachelor Projects, Applied Philosophy, 5th semester: 2 workshops supervised 9 students,

Spring 2022

- Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy, 8th semester: Sole responsibility for planning, teaching, supervision and grading
- Political philosophy, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 5 lectures, group formation, supervisor for 5 groups (20 students)

Fall 2021

- Philosophy of Science, Applied Philosophy 3rd semester: 3 lectures, 100 hours of supervision
- Bachelor Projects, Applied Philosophy, 5th semester: 2 workshops supervised 9 students,

Spring 2021

- Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy, 8th semester: Sole responsibility for planning, teaching, supervision and grading
- Political philosophy, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 3 lectures, supervisor for 5 groups (13 students)
- Supervision of master theses, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: supervision of 3 projects
- Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: Supervised 2 students

Fall 2020:

- Philosophy of Science, Applied Philosophy 3rd semester: 3 lectures, 100 hours of supervision
- Bachelor Projects, Applied Philosophy, 5th semester: 2 workshops supervised 12 students,
- Reading in Philosophy, Applied Philosophy, 7th semester: Sole responsibility
- Supervision of master theses, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: supervision of 3 projects
- Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 9th semester: Supervised 2 students

Spring 2020:

- Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy, 8th semester: Sole responsibility for planning, teaching, supervision and grading
- Political philosophy, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 3 lectures, supervisor for 7 groups (16 students)
- Supervision of master theses, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: supervision of 5 projects (6 students)
- Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: Supervised 2 students

Fall 2019:

- Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 9th semester: Supervised 8 students

Spring 2019

- Supervision of master theses, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: supervision of 4 projects
- Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy, 8th semester: Sole responsibility for planning, teaching, supervision and grading
- Argumentation theory, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 4 lectures, examination
- Political philosophy, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 3 lectures, supervisor for 5 projects (7 students)

Fall 2018:

- Philosophy of Science, Applied Philosophy 3rd semester: 3 lectures, supervised 2 groups
- Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 9th semester: Supervised 6 students

Spring 2018:

- Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy, 8th semester: Sole responsibility for planning, teaching, supervision and grading
- Argumentation theory, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 4 lectures, examination
- Political philosophy, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 1 lecture
- Supervision of master theses, Applied Philosophy 10th semester: supervision of 1 projects

Fall 2017

- Philosophy of Science, Applied Philosophy 3rd semester: 2 lectures, supervised 6 projects

Spring 2017

- Applied Ethics, Life philosophy, and political philosophy, Applied Philosophy 2nd semester: 1 lecture, supervised 5 projects

Spring 2015:

- Politics, Law, and Morality: Should immoral conduct be illegal?, Political Science, AU, 7-9th semester: Sole responsibility

2. Study administration: A list of any study administration tasks, e.g. study board membership, head of studies or semester or course coordinator, accreditation, etc.

Tasks as course coordinator:

Fall 2022:

Bachelor theses, Applied Philosophy 5th semester

Logic, Applied Philosophy, 3rd semester

Spring 2022:

Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy 8th semester

Bachelor theses, Applied Philosophy 6th semester

Fall 2021:

Bachelor theses, Applied Philosophy 5th semester

Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 9th semester

Spring 2020:

Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy 8th semester

Bachelor theses, Applied Philosophy 6th semester

Fall 2019

Bachelor theses, Applied Philosophy 5th semester

Political and economic philosophy in practice, Applied Philosophy 9th semester

Spring 2019:

Bachelor theses, Applied Philosophy 6th semester

Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy 8th semester

Argumentation theory, Applied Philosophy, 2nd semester

Spring 2018

Political and economic philosophy – theory and method, Applied Philosophy 8th semester

Argumentation theory, Applied Philosophy, 2nd semester

3. University pedagogy qualifications: A list of any completed courses in university pedagogy, PBL courses, workshops, academic development projects, collegial guidance and supervision, etc.

Completed courses in teaching, university pedagogy, PBL-courses etc.

2019:

-Completed adjunktpædagogikum at AAU,

2018:

-Teaching at a PBL university, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 3 hours + preparation

-Planning and Implementation of Group Instruction, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 2x3 hours + preparation

-The Use of IT and Media for Learning and Teaching, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 3 hours + preparation

-The PBL Group – Collaboration, Process and Supervision, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 2x3 hours + preparation

-Planning, Development and Quality Assurance of Study Programmes, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 3 hours + preparation

-Supervising groups in conflicts, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 3 hours + preparation

-PBL and sustainability, part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 3 hours + preparation

-Design of development projects to strengthen quality (quality assurance), part of adjunktpædagogikum at AAU: 3 hours + preparation

4. Other qualifications: Conference attendance, editorials, presentations, etc. relating to education, 'University Teaching Day', etc.

Type your answer here...

5. Teaching activity development and teaching materials: A list of any contributions to the development of new modules, teaching materials, study programmes, e-learning, collaboration with external business partners, etc.

Type your answer here...

6. Teaching awards you may have received or been nominated for.

Type your answer here...

7. Personal reflections and initiatives: Here you may state any personal deliberations as regards teaching and supervision, any wishes and plans for further pedagogic development, plans for following up on feedback/evaluations from students, etc.

Socrates famously said: "I cannot teach anybody anything, I can only make them think." Understood literally, this cannot be a viable teaching philosophy at the modern university. Nevertheless, I think Socrates' remark does capture something important about teaching in general, and teaching philosophy in particular. There are two reasons that a literal reading of Socrates' remark cannot be a viable teaching philosophy at the modern university. First, one cannot teach well at the modern university without teaching something. Courses at the modern university are structured by course plans and study regulations, which describe the content each class is supposed to cover, and which the student is expected to master (to some degree) at the exam. It is impossible to teach well, without teaching this content. Accordingly, my first (and primary) teaching objective is to facilitate student learning of the relevant content.

A second, related, teaching objective is to inspire the students by making it clear how the topics and theories covered in my teaching are relevant to the problems faced by contemporary societies (particularly, but not exclusively, when teaching political philosophy). Students deserve to know why I think they ought to spend several hours of their lives engaging with the topic. Moreover, I believe that making it clear to the students why each topic included on the course plan is worth engaging with will strengthen their motivation. This helps realize the first learning goal of actually facilitating student learning of the relevant content. Making it clear to the students why the topics I teach is worth engaging with is particularly important when teaching courses that I have planned myself. In that case, the course content has been chosen by me (within rather broad limits), and I could have chosen to not to include any particular topic. When I choose to include a session on, e.g. global justice, in 'my' course "Political philosophy – theory and method", I had better be sure that engaging with this topic is at least as important as engaging with topics within political philosophy that I left out. Since I reflect on why engaging with each topic on my course plan is important when planning the course anyway, I might as well tell the students why it is important to engage with each topic as part of the course.

The second reason that a literal reading of Socrates' remark cannot be a viable teaching philosophy at the modern university, is that students are obviously already able to think, in the literal sense, when they arrive at the university. When it seems to me that the quote nevertheless does capture something important, it is because teaching philosophy is teaching people to think, in the sense of making them question what they would not otherwise have questioned. When I teach political philosophy I thus consider it important to teach the relevant content in a way that invites the students to question and critically examine the features of political reality they normally take for granted. This is my third teaching objective. Realizing this third objective requires a learning-environment that invites the student to engage in critical inquiry, which in turn requires an environment where student feel comfortable enough to participate even though this entails the risk of being shown to be wrong.

Teaching strategies

I believe a structured presentation of the content is very important to student learning of the content. In order to pursue my first teaching objective, I therefore try to teach using a clearly structured presentation. The most important means to achieve this is having an agenda to which I return, whenever I move on to the next point. This is especially important when teaching a subject that is difficult or very abstract, as philosophy often is.

In order to pursue my second teaching objective I ensure that my overall course plans are clearly structured and has a natural progression between topics. Moreover, each session on my course plans are prefaced by a brief introductory text that explains why the subject is important and should be part of a course in political philosophy (see example of course plan below), something to which students have responded very positively (see qualitative feedback on the 2020 course "Political and Economic Philosophy – Theory and Method" in the results section below). I also start each session with a few slides outlining a puzzle raised by today's subject, or explaining why no society can avoid facing the questions raised by today's subject, or at the very least, why such questions must be examined as part of the course. This is followed by a set of learning goals for today's session. This makes it explicit to students what they should learn from today's session and why. I include an example below from my political philosophy course below. As I teach in Danish, my example-material (including the course plan and evaluation attached later) is also in Danish.

Example: Slide from session on 'the concept and rule of law' explaining the relevance of this subject to the overall course

Example: Slide from session on 'the concept and rule of law' outlining the learning goals of this session.

In order to pursue the third teaching objective, I try to always include an exercise where the students must examine, apply the relevant theories to, and critically discuss the justifiability of concrete features of political reality (often recent legislation), when I teach political philosophy. I try to work with the students preconceptions (e.g. about what conduct should be criminalized) and problematize these in a respectful way that will make the students think about the basis for such preconceptions. In general, I think it is important that I leave space for classroom discussion and argument when teaching in order to inspire and stimulate the capacity for critical reflection in the students. I typically do this by giving the students some case-material –such as a recent newspaper article, or excerpt of a law code – and ask them to discuss a question that relates the case to the subject matter of the relevant session with the person sitting next to them. This is followed by classroom discussion of the question and what the various theoretical position in the debate about the subject matter of the session would say about the question and the case. I typically pick the case-material according to 1) its relation to the subject matter of the session and the course, 2) actuality, 3) representativeness of its arguments. The quality of the arguments employed in the case material is of less concern.

The use of case-material related to current debates gives students the opportunity to employ concepts and theories related to the course on complex cases that allows discussion of how these theories and concepts should be employed. It also serves to underscore the relevance of the overall course and specific subject by demonstrating how different answers

to the questions examined by the session have very concrete implications for how society should be structured. By also including case-material that contain bad arguments, the students are trained in critically assessing text and spotting flaws and common mistakes in argumentative texts. Because the students are typically asked to discuss the material with the person sitting next to them, every student becomes active and more students contribute to the classroom discussion, since they have discussed their thoughts with the person next to them, which has given them some assurance that what they want to say have merit.

Below is an example of the case-discussion from my course "Politics, Law and Morality", the course was about normative questions related to the justification of law with particular focus on the relationship between law and morality. The slide was used in connection with a session on legal moralism (the view that there is always a reason to criminalize wrongful conduct), and asked students to discuss whether animated child pornography should be criminalized, after reading: 1) a bill proposing the criminalization of animated child pornography (i.e. pornographic cartoon's depicting minors) in Denmark; 2) a newspaper opinion piece that argued that Denmark should not criminalize animated child pornography, and provided evidence that animated child pornography did not lead to abuse of actual children; 3) a blog post discussing the Australian law on animated child pornography in light of a (then) recent case, where the law had led to the conviction of man who looked at sexual depictions of characters from the Simpsons.

Slide exemplifying case-discussion:

The classroom discussion was a great success. The students quickly agreed that legal moralism can justify the criminalization of animated child pornography. They then moved on to a very fruitful discussion of whether a harm-based justification was possible, since many students were very skeptical of legal moralism, but very much in favor of a criminal ban on animated child pornography, and very much wanted to justify such legislation on harm-based grounds. During this discussion the students themselves raised the question of what constitutes 'a harm', and when laws are problematically over-inclusive. The use of case-material, thus led the students to actively and independently employ the central terms and theories of the course and activated a broad set of students, including students who did not normally participate in classroom discussions. Moreover, the case made many of them critically reflect on what they had hitherto taken for granted. For instance, one of the most active students had been dismissive of legal moralism throughout the course, but the discussion of animated child pornography finally made him realize why people who some people found legal moralism appealing. Conversely, the discussion led other students to reexamine their intuitive support for the criminalization of animated child pornography. In general, it was my impression that this case in particular caught the attention of my students, an impression supported by the fact that three of the term papers I received were about the legitimacy of criminalizing animated child pornography.

Type your answer here...

8. Any other information or comments.

Type your answer here...