Masaryk University

Faculty of Arts

Pedagogy

Mgr. Gabriela Pleschová, MSc., Ph.D.

The Long-Term Effects of Educational Development Programmes.

Collaboration, Trust, and Leadership

Habilitation thesis

2024

I declare that I prepared the habilitation thesis independently using the mentioned sources and literature.

……

Signature of the author of the thesis

Dedication

To the memory of Joanna Renc Roe, a strong advocate for student-centred learning, reflective teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Acknowledgements

Research for this work has been co-funded by the European Commission through the Erasmus+ Cooperation partnerships project BELONG: **B**etter **E**ducation through **Long**-term Investment into Inclusiveness and Student and Staff Wellbeing, 2021-1-SK01-KA220-HED-000023528: www.fphil.uniba.sk/belong

Data collection for this work was conducted by Matthew Mokhefi-Ashton, Agnes Simon, Mátyás Szabó, and Zuzana Vařejková. Data coding was performed by Lucia Hlavatá, Natalia Marakhovska, Paulo Nascimento Sousa, and Agnes Simon. Lynn McAlpine contributed substantially to the research design, along with Agnes Simon, Eszter Simon, Mátyás Szabó, Jitka Vidláková, and other collaborators of the BELONG project.

Eszter Simon managed this study's ethics approval process at Nottingham Trent University. John Peter Butler Barrer and Linda M. Steyne kindly reviewed my translations of interview quotes from Masaryk University programme graduates. Mikaela Auerbach from the University of California, Berkeley, provided assistance with English language proofreading, the funding for which was covered by the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University Bratislava.

The following colleagues reviewed and offered feedback on draft chapters: Nicholas Bremner, Huang Hoon Chng, Helga Dorner, Alexis Hart, Rachel Forsyth, Miriam Glessmer, Katarina Mårtensson, Lynn McAlpine, Anne Nevgi, Kathleen M. Quinlan, Marvi Remmik, Anna Serbati, Eszter Simon, Julie Timmermans, and Vanessa Woods. Any remaining errors or misinterpretations are my sole responsibility.

I extend special thanks to all the interviewed programme graduates and their colleagues for generously sharing their insights with the research team.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APA: American Psychological Association

APA/PCHTLE: Academic Professional Apprenticeship/Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education

BELONG: Better Education through Long-term Investment into Inclusiveness and Student and Staff Wellbeing

CEE: Central and Eastern Europe

CERPEK: The Center for the Development of Pedagogic Competences

CEU: Central European University

ED: educational development

ESG: European Standards and Guidelines

ESU: The European Students' Union

EUBA: The University of Economics Bratislava

FHEA: Fellow of the Higher Education Academy

HoD: head of department

MUNI: Masaryk University

NGO: non-governmental organisation

NTU: Nottingham Trent University

PASCL: Peer Assessment of Student-Centred Learning

SAS: The Slovak Academy of Sciences

SCL: student-centred learning

TILT: The Trent Institute for Learning and Teaching

UK: United Kingdom

UNESCO: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION I. EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES AND THE CHANGE THEY ARE HOPED TO FOSTER

Chapter 1. Student-centred learning and reflective teaching

Over recent decades, educational development (ED) has evolved from a practice limited to a small number of Anglo-Saxon countries into a global endeavour. Evidence of this shift is found in diverse contexts represented in articles published by the *International Journal for Academic Development*, as well as in the growth of the International Consortium of Educational Development, which in 2024 expanded to include 27 national and regional networks. At many institutions, teachers are now required to complete foundational programmes in higher education teaching and learning, with an expectation of ongoing professional development to improve their own teaching practices. Educational developers have been increasingly tasked with supporting the institutional transformations needed to address issues like racism, discrimination based on gender identity, and barriers to accessibility, fostering more inclusive environments and rethinking core values and practices in teaching and learning (Behari-Leak and Ellis, 2024).

ED programmes promoting student-centred learning have now been established across many regions worldwide, from Indonesia (Adiningrum, Budiono, and Lappalainen, 2021) to Sweden and Estonia (Simon et al., 2019), and as far as Chile (Moya, Turra, and Chalmers, 2019). International conferences focused on higher education teaching, learning, and ED are frequently held, and there are now peer-reviewed journals dedicated exclusively to teaching and learning at the tertiary level. Academic staff publish studies on a range of topics, from internationalising student learning (Hlavatá and Simon, 2023) to leveraging student diversity to enhance learning (Chovančík, 2024). Notably, there is already compelling evidence that ED initiatives, including those supporting student-centred learning, yield desirable changes in teaching practices in the short term (Ilie et al., 2020).

Despite this increased focus on and expertise in higher education teaching and ED, teaching is still often viewed as “a second cousin” to research in many research-intensive universities (Wu and Chng, 2023). Academics seeking to improve their teaching often lack sufficient institutional support, and excellence in teaching is usually recognised far less than excellence in research (Behari-Leak and Ellis, 2024). Numerous barriers discourage teachers from implementing and advancing what they have learned in ED programmes, and there are few incentives to encourage their efforts (Pleschová and Simon, 2021). As a result, questions remain regarding the long-term sustainability of the impacts of ED programmes.

While some studies have explored the long-term effects of ED initiatives (See Chapter 8 for a list), the empirical evidence remains limited. Such research is especially necessary because it takes time for programme graduates to fully integrate their learning from the programme into their teaching practice. Teachers returning to a microculture (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009) that does not support the key principles introduced in ED programmes may see minimal or no impact from their training. Efforts to improve teaching and learning are often described as “battles over institutional values, rewards, and behaviours” (Lazerson, Wagener and Shumantis, 2000), and educational developers may need to do more than simply run programmes and workshops. However, the most effective types of support to meet teachers’ needs and shape their institutional environments in ways that prioritise teaching enhancement remain uncertain. Identifying effective types of support for teachers is crucial, as universities increasingly strive to remain competitive—a goal that often requires long-term structural changes, typically evaluated over five years or more.

This work aims to investigate the long-term effects of programmes designed to enhance academic teachers' practices through student-centred and reflective teaching. It examines how graduates of ED programmes conceptualise their teaching and what practices they employ five and more years after completing their ED programme. Moreover, it looks at factors that enable graduates to teach in alignment with the programmes' goals for student-centred and reflective teaching, as well as those that constrain such practices. It also considers whether student-centred learning, often characterised as an Anglo-American pedagogical approach (Guthrie, 2021: 42), can be sustained in continental Europe and other regions where subject-centred pedagogy predominates.

The following sections of this introductory chapter explore student-centred learning and reflective teaching, two concepts that educational development programmes often aim to facilitate programme participants embrace and enact in their teaching practice, as is the case for the programmes explored in this study. The chapter then discusses the key aspects of student-centredness and reflective teaching that were used in this research to assess teaching-related perceptions and practice of 19 graduates from educational development programmes.

Student-centred learning

The definition and emergence of SCL as a concept

There is a variety of terms used to denote student-centredness, including learner-centred education, learning-centred teaching and learning-centred pedagogy/teaching approaches. This work uses the term student-centred learning (SCL) because it is the most frequently used term in Europe, where the four programmes are located. This chapter presents the origins of both concepts and their definitions on the basis of the literature not only on higher education but also on primary and secondary education, where SCL and reflective teaching are frequently discussed.

Student-centred learning is a broad approach to teaching and learning that emphasises the central role of students in both teaching practice and curriculum design; it can even represent a particular perspective or worldview on education (Trinidad, 2020). In classes, that implement SCL, students learn via active learning methods, such as case-based learning, project-based learning, problem-based learning (Baeten et al., 2010), role play, simulation, academic debate (Ballantyne, Bain and Packer, 1999), among others. The origins of SCL date back to Western philosophers and educationalists, including Socrates and, much later, Rousseau, Piaget, Vygotsky and Rogers, based on whose work the notion of student-centredness was first developed for primary education (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023; O'Neill and McMahon, 2005).

In the early 1990s, the higher education student body became significantly more diverse than before, and increased competition for students led to greater concern for student needs and the effectiveness of teaching at the tertiary level (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003). Classical approaches rooted in the transmission of information have repeatedly been questioned as optimal ways for university students to be educated. The concept of student-centred learning was introduced to higher education through the seminal article by U.S. scholars Barr and Tagg (1995), who argued the following: "A paradigm shift is taking hold in American higher education. In its briefest form, the paradigm that has governed our colleges is this: A college is an institution that exists to provide instruction. Subtly but profoundly, we are shifting to a new paradigm: A college is an institution that exists to produce learning. This shift changes everything. It is both needed and wanted" (Barr and Tagg, 1995: 13).

SCL, as the authors conceptualised it, implies that teachers are first and foremost the designers of student learning. Their role is to consider student needs and use the most effective methods that can produce learning and student success. In such a classroom, students often learn via teamwork with each other and other staff members, and teachers do not even need to participate in learning activities (Barr and Tagg, 1995).

Relevance of SCL

The concept of student-centred learning received important endorsement and became more popular when the American Psychological Association compiled and published a set of 14 learning-centred principles (APA, 1997; These principles related to education in general). Ten years after Barr and Tagg's article, O'Neill and McMahon (2005) described SCL as a widely-used concept in the teaching and learning literature. At the same time, they noted several fundamentally different interpretations of SCL: some authors perceived student-centredness as student choice in education, whereas others stressed the element of students taking a more active role in learning than the teacher, while a third group embraced both definitions and added the notion of a power shift between the teacher and the student. This broad and inconsistent understanding continues to be typical for SCL today (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023).

Despite these varied perspectives, the concept continued to grow in popularity, perhaps in part because it allows higher education teaching to be characterised using terminology other than the previously-used normative terms of good and bad teaching. Various donor agencies have established that curricula and learning materials should be student-centred, and the United Nations have promoted SCL, for example, through policy documents such as the Millennium Development Goals, Sustainable Development Goals and The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Futures of Education (Bremner, Sakata and Cameron, 2022). In Europe, SCL has entered leading EU funding programmes, including the Erasmus+ scheme, most notably in its call for proposals to establish European Universities that presumes that universities offer student-centred curricula (Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 11). Student-centred education has also started to be employed in the Global South, although with varied success (Tandamrong and Parr, 2022).

Importantly, students themselves campaigned for SCL and demanded that it become the dominant approach in higher education. The European Students' Union engaged in a Peer Assessment of Student-Centred Learning (PASCL) project and other initiatives that explored and advocated for SCL. Largely because of this student activism, SCL was recognised in 2015 as a standard for high-quality learning in the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.[1] The ESG introduced to the European higher education the following definition of SCL: "Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and the assessment of students reflects this approach" (ESG, 2015: Standard 1.3).

SCL, in students' own words, emphasises student involvement and responsibility for their own learning, including choosing the subjects they favour. Teachers should hold responsibility for facilitating the best ways of student learning through specifically formulated learning outcomes, interactive learning methods, modern teaching aids and developing students' practical and applied knowledge (ESU, 2015: 38). The European Students' Union presented SCL as an approach to learning

[1] I am grateful to Mátyás Szabó from Central European University, who partnered on the PASCL project, for sharing this insight with me.

supported by constructivist theories of education that employ innovative teaching methods, which foster communication with teachers and other learners, engage students as active participants in their own learning and enhance transferable skills, including problem-solving and critical and reflective thinking. At the same time, student-centred learning is, for students, "a mindset and a culture" within an HE institution (ESU, 2010: 5).

Contemporary authors such as Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė view SCL as an approach to designing learning and teaching in higher education that is founded on student agency: students are given chances to shape their own courses and to decide on their specific learning pathways. SCL refers to students' ability to participate in, impact and become responsible for their learning to achieve learning outcomes. This notion of SCL requires a change in focus from what teachers teach to what students learn. Moreover, it goes beyond classroom practice by requiring institutions to create conditions conducive to SCL, such as spaces for active learning, infrastructure for learning technologies, partnerships within learning communities, policies, regulations and the system of quality assurance (Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 8-10, 33).

Student-centred learning usually leads to better learning outcomes, but it often requires considerable fine-tuning, and sometimes, teachers cannot help students achieve better outcomes than they do in traditional teaching-centred classrooms, even if they carefully apply one or more aspects of SCL in the classroom (Grøndahl Glavind et al., 2023). Although some studies report that students value SCL approaches (Ballantyne, Bain and Packer, 1999), a significant minority of students are resistant to or disappointed with SCL (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003). These are likely among the reasons why the implementation of SCL suffers and remains an exception and not the norm in European higher education, alongside the rise in teachers' workload, demands that teachers prioritise research rather than teaching and a tradition of teacher-centred education (Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 11).

Evaluation of SCL in this research

For this study, we synthesised from the literature six main aspects of student-centred learning. They are not meant to be the only evidence for SCL, as the literature mentions more: for example, the American Psychological Association (1997) lists fourteen, Schweisfurth (2013) seven and Bremner (2021) refers to ten. However, the six aspects are presented here as a valid measure of the perceptions and practices of graduates from ED programmes, as they align with various sources and reflect how the educational development programmes evaluated in this work conceptualised SCL. These aspects of SCL refer to three broader categories: teachers' assumptions about teaching and learning (#1-2), teachers' attitudes towards students (#3) and teaching practices (#4-6), and they read as follows.

1. Embracing a constructivist view of learning

Most understandings of SCL are grounded in constructivist education theory (APA, 1997; O'Neill and McMahon, 2005; Bremner, 2021; Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 31). Barr and Tagg (1995) reiterated in their article that knowledge is unique to individuals' minds and is shaped by their experience. Specifically, learning complex concepts is assumed to be most effective when students create meaning from information and experience and establish connections between new and existing knowledge (APA, 1991). This clearly links to "unequivocal belief in students' ability" (Tangney, 2014: 271; see also the second principle of the APA). Teachers who use student-centred approaches therefore frequently posit that knowledge cannot be passed from one person to another but rather that each individual constructs their own, unique understanding.

2. Understanding the role of teacher as facilitator of student learning

Teachers who perceive learning as the process of constructing knowledge often view their role as a facilitator of student learning. They pay much attention to the needs of students (Bremner, 2021: 14) and adapt their teaching to students' prior knowledge, skills, and experiences as well as their needs and interests (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023). In other words, how teachers design learning should be informed by the learning context. For Jones (2007: 6), attention to needs refers to students both as a group and as individual students and may include teachers guiding and directing student learning from the position of a class member who participates in the learning process. Facilitating student learning implies designing meaningful learning outcomes, aligning learning methods with these outcomes and student needs and creating supportive learning environments (Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 33).

3. Recognising students as colleagues and equals

In SCL, the power of students and teachers is believed to be balanced (Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 34). The teacher repeatedly invites students to become involved in decision-making, for example, with respect to the learning content, methods and assessment, creating more democratic relationships and opportunities for choice and presenting knowledge as more fluid rather than fixed (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023). The teacher shows respect for students, treats them as adults, and recognises their prior knowledge and experience, admitting that teachers sometimes learn from their students (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003).

4. Using active learning strategies

Another defining aspect of student-centred learning is the active rather than passive role of the student in the learning process (Barr and Tagg, 1995; Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003). The active role implies that the teacher organises learning in a way that makes students participate, for example, through learning by doing (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023). Teachers who use active learning often assign students to learn in groups and encourage them to think and be creative (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003). A meta-analysis of 326 journal articles discussing SCL identified active participation as the most mentioned aspect of the SCL definition (Bremner, 2021). Active learning was also the most frequently cited aspect for English language teachers to include in the definition of SCL, although teacher practitioners clearly had a broader and more balanced view of SCL than how the literature presented it. English language teachers moreover considered practical aspects of SCL implementation more important than ideological aspects, for example, power sharing (Bremner, 2021 and 2022).

5. Assessing students continuously

When teachers employ a student-centred approach, they usually begin by defining learning outcomes, and they carefully monitor whether students achieved these outcomes (Ballantyne, Bain and Packer, 1999). In SCL courses, this does not imply assigning grades at the end of the learning process but rather using several smaller and varied assessments both during and at the end of learning (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003; Klemenčič, Pupinis and Kirdulytė, 2020: 34). This is because learning is seen as a process, not a product, in student-centred learning (Bremner, 2021: 14).

6. Employing authentic assessment or prompting students to demonstrate higher-order skills

Finally, in student-centred courses, students acquire skills relevant for and usable in the real world (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003). Assessment methods reflect this, and students are assessed

through tasks that align with what students will be doing in their future professions. This includes assignments that encourage students to develop and demonstrate analytical thinking, critical thinking, creativity and similar skills (Bremner, 2021: 14), i.e., competences associated with higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy. Today's era of artificial intelligence makes this way of assessing student work even more necessary than ever before.

Helping teachers teach in a student-centred way

Implementing active teaching strategies, challenging the notion that knowledgeable teachers hold more power than their much younger students, and designing assignments that allow students to demonstrate analytical and other complex skills clearly suggest that student-centred learning requires more effort than teacher-centred approaches (Lea, Stephenson and Troy, 2003). To introduce one or more aspects of SCL to students, teachers need significant planning, effort and skills (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023). Moreover, teachers' self-efficacy can decline significantly when they face challenges in implementing SCL; overcoming this requires support and a collective effort from teachers (Grøndahl Glavind et al., 2023). Here, educational development programmes play a major role in equipping teachers with the necessary knowledge, developing their competences and supporting their confidence.

The literature names other aspects of student-centredness, for example, teachers assisting students not only learn content but also develop lifelong learning skills (Bremner, Sakata and Cameron, 2022), caring about students as individuals (Tang and Walker-Gleaves, 2022), fostering trust-building among students and with teachers (Tangney, 2014), encouraging students to take a deep approach to learning (Baeten et al., 2010) or to make conceptual change (Ballantyne, Bain and Packer, 1999). Grøndahl Glavind et al. (2023) noted that the extensive focus that the literature (and teachers) pays to activating students goes against the goal of SCL, which is that students become agents of their own learning and autonomous learners.

Given the differences in understanding SCL and the variety of SCL aspects, it can be problematic to determine which aspects are most important. Do teachers need to enact all or most aspects of SCL for their classes to be considered student-centred? According to Bremner (2022), adapting to student needs could be considered an essence of SCL, but more research is needed to substantiate this and be rooted in teachers' perceptions. Elsewhere, Bremner has argued for flexibility in defining SCL when different aspects are used for different students, purposes and situations (Bremner, 2021). Oftentimes, teachers face important contextual restrictions, such as a centralised curriculum, which can limit their capacity to invite students to shape their own learning (Morris, Bremner and Sakata, 2023).

The approach chosen in this research is judging teaching in relation to its context and showing what teachers do when constrained by their environment, for example, when they are assigned to teach students who are accustomed to a teacher-centred approach, when students struggle to find time to prepare for the class because they are learning for assessment in other courses or when teachers are under strong pressure to meet performance targets, especially scholarly publications. Moreover, with respect to judgement of SCL, the team of researchers from this study strived to integrate the abovementioned six aspects of SCL to view student-centredness in its complexity.

This approach has led to formulating the following definition of SCL used in this research[2] to analyse collected data: The teacher's focus is on how their students learn rather than on their own performance in all activities related to teaching from curriculum design (aspects #1, 2), lesson planning (aspects #1, 2), leading learning sessions (aspects #2, 4), and student assessment (aspects #5, 6). Students' choice in their education is facilitated (aspect #3), students are encouraged to do more than the teacher (aspect #4), a shift in the power relationship between the student and the teacher can be observed (aspect #3) and the teacher pays attention to who their students are and how they learn so that high-quality learning can occur (a holistic view).

Reflective teaching

The definition and emergence of reflective teaching as a concept

Reflective teaching refers to deliberate thinking about past teaching with a view to its improvement (Hatton and Smith, 1995). The notion of reflective teaching was recognised in education in the late 1980s as a response to the very technical and simplistic perception of teaching that dominated that decade: through reflective practice, preservice teachers were not only able to learn new ideas but also to sustain professional growth after graduation (Lee, 2005). Because higher education teachers are also expected to continuously develop their teaching, many educational development programs aim to support reflective teaching among their participants (see, for example, McLean and Bullard, 2000; Hubbal, Collins and Pratt, 2005; Renc-Roe and Yarkova, 2013).

Specifically, in higher education, understanding of reflection has been shaped by several leading theorists, including John Dewey, Donald A. Schön, David Boud, Ellen J. Langer and Jack Mezirow (Rogers, 2001). Synthesising views of reflection from seven foundational works, Rogers (2001) proposed the following definition of reflection: it is a cognitive and affective process or activity that 1) necessitates teacher's active engagement; 2) is triggered by a situation or experience that goes beyond the typical; 3) leads teachers to examine their responses, beliefs and premises; and 4) results in a new understanding that is integrated into the previous one.

This definition reveals that reflection is different from thinking. Spending time thinking about what we have done and the effects this has had does not necessarily mean we reflect unless we think about what to do differently next time (Scales, 2008). Such a different, reflective way of thinking, if usually triggered by an experience that is surprising, perplexing, problematic, uncomfortable, complex or very novel and solving this situation, requires a change in thinking (Rogers, 2001). This new thinking is then deliberate and purposeful (not everyone decides to think differently); moreover, it is structured and links theory with practice (Scales, 2008). It implies a thoughtful consideration and questioning of past actions, including what worked and what did not, and the reasons and the premises that underlie the actions (Hubbal, Collins and Pratt, 2005).

Relevance of reflective teaching and the role of context in impacting reflection

Reflection can lead to a new understanding, specifically a deeper understanding of the concepts (Simon, 2020), which is a basis for improved performance (Poldner et al., 2014). Through reflection, individuals achieve new clarity that is rooted in their actions, and because they continue to encounter new situations, the process repeats (Jay and Johnson, 2002). This suggests that, in

[2] The full scheme for coding the interviews and syllabi—both for student-centredness and reflective teaching—is presented in Chapter 2.

reflective teaching, the process itself is important, rather than the outcomes alone (Ward and McCotter, 2004).

Context appears to fundamentally influence how higher education teachers reflect. The literature has identified a number of constraints that discourage teachers from reflection, including a lack of time, insufficient clarity and goals (for example, in reflective assignments or prompts) and a lack of cultural norms for reflective teaching (Hubbal, Collins and Pratt, 2005). In secondary school education, reported barriers also include a lack of recognition and reward for teachers' work (Zeichner and Liston, 1987), which appears relevant for higher education, too. Conversely, past studies have also identified enablers of reflection, such as faculty learning communities (Hubbal, Collins and Pratt, 2005). Because of the role of context in influencing reflection, this research aimed to depict the reflective practices of graduates from educational development programmes in the interplay with their context to determine how context informed, stimulated or constrained their reflection.

Reflection on teaching encompasses teachers' emotions, values, and beliefs (Bain et al., 2002), which contribute to their professional identity. Teachers' perceptions of their identity, career and the roles involved—such as teaching, research, community engagement and administration—shape their reflections on teaching and learning and influence their understanding of student identities (Ashwin et al., 2020: 4, 7). This development of identity and understanding typically occurs through interactions with others rather than in isolation (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009). Consequently, this work explores teaching collaboration, trusting relationships and educational leadership as potential factors stimulating reflective practice in higher education.

An important connection to highlight is the link between reflection and student-centred learning. Education that inspires student reflective thinking is student-centred (Mezirow, 1997; Grøndahl Glavind et al., 2023; see also APA's fifth principle). With respect to teachers' perceptions and practices, teachers first need to believe in the value of SCL to convert their beliefs into practice, i.e., to teach in a student-centred way (Bremner, Sakata and Cameron, 2022). Teachers' reflection on their gradual experiments with student-centred class design, including arriving at assumed reasons for successful and unsuccessful attempts and generating ideas for alternative practices, is therefore vital for student-centred learning practices. Specifically, in contexts where teachers report a lack of support from leadership, collegial interest and opportunities for professional development, reflection helps them enhance their knowledge of SCL and inspires further enhancement of their teaching practices (Tandamrong and Parr, 2022).

Ways to stimulate and assess reflective teaching

Because reflection is not intuitive and easy, it needs to be intentionally encouraged. This can be done, for example, through individual and group assignments that involve changing contexts and exploring multiple perspectives on issues (Rogers, 2001), reflective journals (Pleschová, 2020) or structured reflection papers with guided prompts and clear assessment rubrics (Ryan and Ryan, 2013). To address learners' different needs, assignments often vary (Hubbal, Collins and Pratt, 2005). Coaching and mentoring constitute another way to stimulate reflection. Coaches and mentors do so through, for example, thinking aloud to model reflection about their pedagogy, assigning teachers to solve realistic perplexing situations or sharing a reflective journal; in all cases, they ensure that they provide a good balance of challenge and support (Rogers, 2001).

A variety of models exist to assess reflection, some of which consider reflection on action, i.e., after teaching is over, while others consider reflection in action, i.e., during the process of teaching (Rogers, 2001). Many of these models have been developed to assess the reflective assignments of

preservice teachers. For example, Sparks-Langer et al. (1990) used a seven-level framework where the first level was characterised by a lack of descriptive language, and as the scale progressed, teachers demonstrated that they could describe and explain their teaching events while also considering the principles or theories underlying their practice, context, and ethical, moral and political issues.

Lee (2005) assessed the depth of preservice teachers' reflective thinking via a three-level scheme in which the recall level (R1) referred to how teachers can describe and interpret their teaching, the rationalisation level (R2) to the search for relationships between experiences, the presence of explanations and ideas that generalise these experiences, and finally, the reflectivity level (R3) corresponded with considering various perspectives, observing the impact of others on student learning and approaching their teaching experiences with a willingness to improve in the future. As another example, Davis (2006) distinguished between unproductive and productive reflection. Whereas unproductive reflection was mainly descriptive and implied listing ideas instead of connecting them, lacked focus and placed importance on teachers rather than learners, productive reflection was characterised by the integration and analysis of ideas, questioning of assumptions and the presence of various perspectives.

In the context of higher education, McAlpine et al. (1999) assessed the immediate (in-action) reflection of professors who had been awarded for their teaching. The authors examined how these professors attended to and evaluated verbal, temporal, general, and other cues from students, which the teachers monitored regardless of whether the class appeared problematic. The study revealed that teachers needed to have certain expectations of how students would react in their classes; without these expectations, teachers could sense when something was amiss but could not identify the specific issue. Hubbal, Collins and Pratt (2005) measured the reflection of participants in an educational development programme by applying an inventory with five perspectives: transmission, apprenticeship, developmental, nurturing, and social reform. Each perspective was a blend of actions, intentions, and beliefs about students and the learning process, content, and context. Building upon Mezirow's model, Kreber (2004) identified nine forms of reflection for higher education teachers: content, process, or premise reflection, each in the three domains of instructional, pedagogical, or curricular knowledge.

Evaluation of reflection in this research

Ward and Cotter (2004) noted one important feature of frameworks that assess reflection: some of them are designed to assess the process of reflection, whereas in outcome-based education (such as in educational development programmes), the intention is to identify the qualities of reflection that are connected to the enhancement of practice. In line with that, in this research, we did not assess all possible types of reflection but specifically reflective practices that referred to the expected programme outcomes (for a similar approach, see Poldner et al., 2014). Because a change in teachers' conceptual frameworks other than student-centred learning was not a programme outcome, we did not look at whether programme graduates were able to challenge and change their other premises related to teaching and learning.

To assess reflection as high, reflection and critical attitudes had to be demonstrated throughout the interviews and relate to all three aspects of teaching: planning, implementing and evaluating. Our overall approach was to evaluate teaching practices rather than to judge the graduate as a person. Insights from the literature and the above-described approach led the research team to distinguish four criteria for assessing reflection among the graduates of educational development programmes.

1. Exploring student learning

This criterion implies that teachers have considered the results of their own teaching and can provide evidence for their claims (Davis, 2006; Hubbal, Collins and Pratt, 2005), including the reasons why good and/or poor-quality learning occurs among their students (Wlodarsky and Walters, 2010). Moreover, these reasons we to be summarised in a clear and comprehensive way and seemed realistic.

2. Identifying positive and problematic aspects of teaching

Sparks-Langer et al. (1990) posit that asking "why" questions are crucial for developing reflection. In line with their research, the second indicator was whether teachers could identify not only positive but also negative or problematic aspects/outcomes of their own teaching and the assumed reasons for them.

3. Seeing connections between one's own research and teaching

Reflective teachers can consider associations between different aspects of teaching, including learners and subject knowledge (Davis, 2006). Because the ED programme graduates in this research were at the same time active researchers, examples that indicated that they had made connections between their own research and teaching were watched for as another sign of reflection.

4. Having a vision of improved teaching and learning in the future

Because reflection refers to systematic re-evaluations of teaching experience to enhance future teaching (Ashwin et al., 2020: ix), programme graduates were ultimately expected to propose changes based on newly developed insights into their teaching and the anticipated effects on student learning.

References

Adiningrum, Tatum S., Budiono, Tri A., Lappalainen, Harri (2021) "Students CAN be the center of their own learning": lessons learnt from a transnational collaborative academic development project. International Journal for Academic Development 28(1): 45-58: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1963256

Ashwin, Paul, Boud, David, Calkins, Susanna, Coate, Kelly, Hallet, Fiona, Light, Gregory, Mårtensson, Katarina, McArthur, Jan, McCune, Velda, McLean, Monica, Tooher, Michelle (2020) Reflective teaching in higher education. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury

Bain, John D., Ballantyne, Ray, Mills, Colleen, and Lester, Nita C. (2002) Reflecting on practice. Student teachers' perspectives. Flaxton: Post Pressed

Ballantyne, Ray, Bain, John D., Packer, Jan (1999) Researching university teaching in Australia: Themes and issues in academics' reflections. Studies in Higher Education 24(2): 237-257: 10.1080/03075079912331379918

Barr, Robert B., Tagg, John (1995) From teaching to learning - A new paradigm for undergraduate Education. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 27(6): 13-25: 10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672

Baeten, Marlies, Kyndt, Eva, Struyven, Katrien, Dochy, Filip (2010) Using student-centred learning environments to stimulate deep approaches to learning: Factors encouraging or discouraging their effectiveness. Educational Research Review 5: 243-260: 10.1016/j.edurev.2010.06.001

Behari-Leak, Kasturi, Ellis, Donna E. (2024) Commemorating 30 years of ICED: embracing academic development's rich past, challenging present, and emerging future(s), International Journal for Academic Development 29(1): 6-20: 10.1080/1360144X.2023.2298541

Bremner, Nicholas (2021) The multiple meanings of 'student-centred' or 'learner-centred' education, and the case for a more flexible approach to defining it. Comparative Education 57(2): 159-186: 10.1080/03050068.2020.1805863

Bremner, Nicholas (2022) What is learner-centred education? A qualitative study exploring the perspectives of English language teachers in Colombia. Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ) 25(4): https://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej100/a12.pdf

Bremner, Nicholas, Sakata, Nozomi, Cameron, Leanne (2022) The outcomes of learner-centred pedagogy: A systematic review. International Journal of Educational Development 94: 102649: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102649

Chovančík, Martin (2024) "Draw on your experience": student diversity-driven internationalisation in a diverse International Relations course. European Political Science: 10.1057/s41304-024-00474-9

Davis, Elizabeth A. (2006) Characterizing productive reflection among preservice elementary teachers: Seeing what matters. Teaching and Teacher Education 22: 281-301: 10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.005

European Students' Union (2010) Student-centred learning. Toolkit for students, staff and higher education institutions: https://esu-online.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/SCL_toolkit_ESU_EI.compressed.pdf

European Students' Union (2015) Overview on student - centred learning in higher education in Europe: Research study: https://esu-online.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Overview-on-Student-Centred-Learning-in-Higher-Education-in-Europe.pdf

Grøndahl Glavind, Johanne, Lis Montes De Oca, Philipp Pechmann, Dorthe Brauner Sejersen, Thomas Iskov (2023) Student-centred learning and teaching: a systematic mapping review of empirical research. Journal of Further and Higher Education 47(9): 1247-1261: 10.1080/0309877X.2023.2241391

Guthrie, Gerard (2021) Foundations of Classroom Change in Developing Countries. Volume 2: Synthesis: www.researchgate.net/publication/349679870

Hatton, Neville, Smith, David (1995) Reflection in teacher education: towards definition and implementation. Teaching and Teacher Education 11(1): 33-49: 10.1016/0742-051X(94)00012-U

Hlavatá, Lucia, Simon, Agnes (26 October 2023) Internationalisation without international students? Internationalising the curriculum and student experience during the COVID-19 pandemic in Slovakia. Innovations in Education and Teaching International 10.1080/14703297.2023.2274474

Hubbal, Harry, Collins, John, Pratt, Daniel (2005) Enhancing reflective teaching practices: Implications for faculty development programs. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education 35(3): 10.47678/cjhe.v35i3.183514

Ilie, Marian D., Maricuțoiu, Laurentiu, Iancu, Daniel E., Smarandache, Izabella G., Mladenovici, Velibor, Stoia, Dalia C. M., Toth, Silvia A. (2020) Reviewing the research on instructional development

programs for academics. Trying to tell a different story: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review 30: 100331: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100331

Jay, Joelle K., Johnson, Kerri, L. (2002) Capturing complexity: a typology of reflective practice for teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education 18: 73-85: 10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8

Jones, Leo (2007) The student-centred classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kember, David (1999) Determining the level of reflective thinking from students' written journals using a coding scheme based on the work of Mezirow. International Journal of Lifelong Education 18(1): 18-30: 10.1080/026013799293928

Klemenčič, Manja, Pupinis, Manta, Kirdulytė, Greta (2020) Mapping and analysis of student-centred learning and teaching practices: usable knowledge to support more inclusive, high-quality higher education, NESET report, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union: 10.2766/67668

Kreber, Carolin (2004) An analysis of two models of reflection and their implications for educational development. International Journal for Academic Development 9(1): 29-49: 10.1080/1360144042000296044

Lazerson, Marvin, Wagener Ursula, Shumanis, Nichole (2000) What makes a revolution? Teaching and learning in higher education, 1980–2000. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 32(3): 12-19: 10.1080/00091380009601731

Lea, Susan, G., Stephenson, David, Troy, Juliette (2003) Higher education students' attitudes to student centred learning: Beyond "educational bulimia." Studies in Higher Education 28(3): 321-334: 10.1080/03075070309293

Learner-centred psychological principles: A framework for school reform & redesign prepared by the Learner-centred principles work group of the American Psychological Association's (APA) Board of Educational Affairs, November 1997

Lee, Hea-Jin (2005) Understanding and assessing preservice teachers' reflective thinking. Teaching and Teacher Education 21(6): 699-715: 10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.007

McAlpine, Lynn, Weston, Cynthia B., Beauchamp, Jacinthe, Wiseman, Cynthia S., Beauchamp, Catherine (1999) Building a metacognitive model of reflection. Higher Education 37: 105-131: 10.1023/A:1003548425626

McLean, Monica, Bullard, Joanna E. (2000) Becoming a university teacher: evidence from teaching portfolios (how academics learn to teach). Teacher Development 4(1): 79-101: 10.1080/13664530000200104

Mezirow, Jack (1997) Transformative learning: Theory to practice. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education 74: 5-12: 10.1002/ace.7401

Morris, Howard Thomas, Bremner Nicholas, Sakata, Nozomi (10 Dec 2023) Self-directed learning and student-centred learning: a conceptual comparison. Pedagogy, Culture & Society: 10.1080/14681366.2023.2282439

Moya, Beatriz, Turra, Héctor, Chalmers Denise (2019) Developing and implementing a robust and flexible framework for the evaluation and impact of educational development in higher education in Chile. International Journal for Academic Development 24(2): 163-177: 10.1080/1360144X.2018.1555757

O'Neill, Geraldine, McMahon, Tim (2005) Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers? In O'Neill, Geraldine, Moore, Sarah, McMullin, Barry (Eds.) Emerging issues in the practice of university learning and teaching, Dublin: AISHE, 27-36.

Park, Chris (2003) Engaging students in the learning process: the learning journal. Journal of Geography in Higher Education 27(2): 183-199: 10.1080/0309826032000107496

Pleschová, Gabriela (2020) Using reflective journals to improve learning through refection and conceptual change. European Political Science 19: 29-48: 10.1057/s41304-018-0184-5

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes (2021) Doctoral students as early career university teachers: What hinders and what helps them to embrace the essentials of good teaching? In Lee, Anne, Bongaardt, Bob (Eds.) The Future of doctoral research. Challenges and opportunities, pp. 182-194: 10.4324/9781003015383-20

Poldner, Eric, Van der Schaaf, Marieke, Simons, P. Robert-Jan, Van Tartwijk, Jan, Wijngaards, Guus (2014) Assessing student teachers' reflective writing through quantitative content analysis. European Journal of Teacher Education 37(3): 1-26: 10.1080/02619768.2014.892479

Renc-Roe, Joanna, Yarkova, Tatiana (2013) Preparing doctoral students for a teaching career: The case of an international university with a history of a regional engagement. In Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela (Eds.) Teacher development in higher education. Existing programs, program impact and future trends. New York and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 19-33

Rogers, Russell R. (2001) Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. Innovative Higher Education 26(1): 37-57: 10.1023/A:1010986404527

Roxå, Torgny, Mårtensson, Katarina (2015) Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. International Journal for Academic Development 20(2): 193-205: 10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929

Roxå, Torgny, Mårtensson, Katarina (2009) Significant conversations and significant networks – exploring the backstage of the teaching arena. Studies in Higher Education 34(5): 547-559: 10.1080/03075070802597200

Ryan, Mary, Ryan, Michael (2013) Theorising a model for teaching and assessing reflective learning in higher education, Higher Education Research & Development, 32(2): 244-257: 10.1080/07294360.2012.661704

Scales, Peter (2008) The Reflective teacher. In Teaching in the lifelong learning sector. Open University Press, Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, pp. 7-22.

Simon, Agnes (2020) Teaching and learning about foreign policy decision-making via board gaming and reflections. European Political Science 19(1): 9-28: 10.1057/s41304-018-0185-4

Simon, Agnes, Karm, Mari, Soomere, Triinu, Roxå, Torgny, Löfgreen, Jennifer, Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela (2019) A comparative study of three educational development courses for doctoral students and teaching and learning initiatives in higher education. A study prepared as part of the collaborative project Extending and reinforcing good practice in teacher development, 2016-1-SK01-KA203-022551: https://qualityteaching.euba.sk/www_write/files/project-outcomes/o4_study_with_supplements.pdf

Sparks-Langer, Georgea M., Simmons, Joanne M., Pasch, Marvin, Colton, Amy, Starko, Alane (1990) Reflective pedagogical thinking: How can we promote it and measure it? Journal of Teacher Education, 41(5): 23-32: 10.1177/002248719004100504

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). (2015). Brussels, Belgium: www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf

Tandamrongm Aunyarat, Parr, Graham (2022) Negotiating learner-centred education as a national mandate: a case study of EFL teachers in Thai universities. Pedagogy, Culture & Society 32(2): 1-17: 10.1080/14681366.2022.2025543

Tang, Anne L. L, Walker-Gleaves, Caroline (2022) Hong Kong university teachers' conceptions and articulation of teacher care: towards building a model of caring pedagogy. Higher Education 83: 503-526: 10.1007/s10734-020-00675-3

Tangney, Sue (2014) Student-centred learning: a humanist perspective. Teaching in Higher Education, 19(3): 266-275: 10.1080/13562517.2013.860099

Trinidad, Jose Eos (2020) Understanding student-centred learning in higher education: students' and teachers' perceptions, challenges, and cognitive gaps Journal of Further and Higher Education 44(8): 1013-1023: 10.1080/0309877X.2019.1636214

Ward, John R., McCotter, Suzanne (2004) Reflection as a visible outcome for preservice teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education 20, 243-257: 10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.004

Wlodarsky, Rachel, Walters, Howard (2010) Use of the reflective judgement model as a reference tool for assessing the reflective capacity of teacher educators in a college setting. Journal on Educational Psychology 4(1):13-20: 10.26634/jpsy.4.1.1219

Wu, Siew Mei, Chng, Huang Hoon (2023) Our Journeys through the Scholarship of Leading: What Matters and What Counts? In In Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa and Ian Kinchin (Eds.) Narratives of Academics' Personal Journeys in Contested Spaces: Leadership Identity in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 179-196

Zeichner, Kenneth M., Liston, Daniel P. (1987) Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review 56(1), 23-48: 10.17763/haer.57.1.j18v7162275t1w3w

Chapter 2. Design of research on the long-term impact of four educational development programmes

This work explores the long-term effects of programmes focused on enhancing academic teachers' teaching through student-centred learning and reflective teaching. Beyond investigating individual teachers' thoughts and practices, it captures the influence of contextual factors, such as teaching load, teaching, research and service responsibilities, student perceptions, colleagues' attitudes towards student-centred learning and reflective teaching, and interactions with colleagues over teaching. Specifically, the work aims to address the following research questions:

1. **Understanding of student-centred learning:** How do programme graduates understand and interpret student-centred learning five and more years after completing the educational development programme?
2. **Reflective teaching practices:** Do programme graduates continue to reflect on their teaching five and more years after graduation? If so, how can their reflections be categorised and described? Do they take action based on these reflections?
3. **Contextual influences:** What role do graduates' institutions and the broader national context play in shaping their ability to implement student-centred and reflective teaching practices? What are the supportive and constraining factors?

Research sites and collaborators

Data for this research was collected from four educational development programmes in Europe, specifically at:

- **Central European University** (previously in Budapest, Hungary, now in Vienna, Austria)
- **Masaryk University** (Brno, Czech Republic)
- **Slovak Academy of Sciences** (Bratislava, Slovakia)
- **Nottingham Trent University** (Nottingham, United Kingdom)

These programmes were selected due to their focus on student-centred learning and reflective teaching, their similar learning outcomes, methods, and participant numbers. Three of the programmes also included coaching/mentoring components, which allowed comparisons across the cases. From 2022 to 2025, the first three institutions partnered in the international collaborative Erasmus+ project BELONG, which aimed to enhance belonging and mental health among staff and students. This research was one of the project's activities, aimed at informing partner institutions and stakeholders about the long-term effects of educational development programmes, and identifying ways for participating institutions to better support programme graduates. Project partner institutions delegated contributors to this research, who were responsible for the research design, data collection, and data coding. Their names are listed in the Acknowledgements section of this work.

Collected data

This research collected five data sets:

1. **Interviews with programme graduates:** Interviews were conducted with five teaching faculty members (ED programme graduates) from each institution, resulting in a total of 19 interviews: four from Nottingham Trent University and five each from the other institutions.

2. **Pre-interview questionnaire survey:** Before the interview, each programme graduate completed a short online questionnaire. This survey collected information about the courses they teach and the programmes these courses are part of (undergraduate, graduate, PhD, or other). It also asked about their teaching responsibilities, such as whether they serve as a course leader, teaching assistant, primary grader, lecturer, or seminar leader. Additionally, the questionnaire enquired about the approximate number of students enrolled in their courses during the current academic year, whether they were the sole teacher for these courses, and if they were the lead teacher responsible for course design and assessment for the course for which they shared the syllabus with the research team. These details provided essential context for the subsequent interviews, ensuring that the interviewers had a clear understanding of each participant's teaching environment and responsibilities. This allowed the interviewers to tailor the interview questions and interpreting the responses within the appropriate contexts.

3. **Course syllabi or module handbooks:** Each programme graduate provided the research team with a current course syllabus (called module handbook in the United Kingdom), preferably for an undergraduate course taught within the last year. Again, the interviewer familiarised themselves with this material before starting the interview.

4. **Interviews with colleagues:** Interviews were also conducted with academic staff members recommended by the graduates as being most familiar with their teaching practices. These colleagues ideally worked in the same department or, if not, within the same faculty (school). Each graduate was asked to name one such colleague. Most graduates complied, except for a few cases: one graduate in Slovakia named two colleagues who were unavailable, another graduate from the Slovak Academy of Sciences who was teaching only one course could not identify a relevant colleague, and colleagues from two graduate from Central European University were also unavailable during the period of data collection. In total, 15 interviews with colleagues were completed.

5. **Institutional information:** A web search of the four participating institutions was conducted to gather information about their programmes, policies on teaching and learning, educational development, and the rewards and recognitions for teaching.

Sampling

Strategic and purposive sampling (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2020: 28) was used to identify research subjects. At all institutions, approached programme graduates included those having successfully finished the programme five to twelve years ago. Efforts were made to ensure diversity among the participants, including a range of disciplines, genders, and, for Central European University, a variety of current teaching contexts. For Nottingham Trent University and Masaryk University, all interviewed programme graduates were still teaching at the institution where they completed their programme. For the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which does not offer bachelor's or master's programmes, participants were teaching at four different institutions across Slovakia. When interviewed, programme graduates from Central European University were teaching in Central Asia, Denmark, Hungary, and the Middle East. Therefore, higher education contexts covered by this research include not only, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, and the United Kingdom but also other environments in and outside Europe.

Typically, each interviewed programme graduate teaches a variety of courses. Nine research subjects teach both at the undergraduate and graduate level; six at the undergraduate level; three at

undergraduate, graduate, and PhD levels; and one only at the graduate level. All but one (G5S) are course (module) leaders, which mostly includes responsibility for grading. Five have more than 90 students enrolled in their courses (modules) in the current academic year; four taught 21-30, 31-40, or 51-70 students respectively; one taught 41-50 students; and one 71-90 students. Whereas six are the only teacher on the courses they teach, the other informants co-teach with colleagues (4) or teach some courses with other colleagues and some alone (9). All but two have responsibility for course (module) design and assessment for the course (module) for which they shared the syllabus with the research team.

Convenience sampling allowed the research team to interview those academics who agreed to participate: occasionally it happened that the approached programme graduate declined participation because of being too busy with their responsibilities or simply preferring not to talk about their teaching. Detailed descriptions of the sampling methods for each institution are provided in Chapters 3 through 6. The comprehensive data collection and sampling methods ensure that the research captures a wide range of experiences and perspectives.

Approaches to interviewing

For convenience, all interviews with programme graduates and their colleagues were conducted online using MS Teams. The semi-structured interviews were recorded, and MS Teams' automatic transcription feature was utilised. Interviewers subsequently reviewed and corrected the transcripts for accuracy, ensuring the removal of any potential identifiers. Written consent for participation was obtained from each informant prior to the interviews.

The interview protocol for programme graduates started with questions to encourage them to talk about their teaching experience: how they got the current job and whether they enjoyed teaching at their current institution. The interview then revolved around how they design courses, what they do to evaluate and improve own teaching, if they recognise any breakpoints in their teaching career, what institutional and wider factors influence their teaching, whether they feel trusted as teachers by their superior, and if they take any leadership roles in teaching.

The protocol included questions specifically introduced to address student-centred learning and reflection. For student-centred learning, programme graduates were invited to share principles that they found principal for their teaching. They could name and detail as many as they wished. Prompt questions probed into whether the graduate mainly lectures or uses active learning exercises, what activities students complete, if they are assessed continuously or based on the final assignment, if assessments like multiple choice test are used or any other formats of assessment, etc. Other questions where graduates could reveal whether their practice is student-centred (or not) asked about whether the syllabus the programme graduate shared with the research team embodies the principles fundamental for their approach to teaching, how difficult they find to put into practice what they planned in the syllabus, and whether they enjoy teaching at their current institution.

Another set of questions was specifically designed to address reflectiveness in teaching. Programme graduates were encouraged to recall an example of a recent class that either went as planned or contradicted their expectations. They were probed to explain why they think the class was successful and for classes that did not go as planned also to elaborate on the possible reasons, what they plan to do differently next time, and why they think so (for a similar approach, see Sparks-Langer et al., 1990).

In the colleague interviews, colleagues were asked to report about programme graduates' teaching practice based on a teaching observation or co-teaching, student feedback and exchanges with students, discussing teaching and learning together, institutional recognition for teaching excellence and/or influencing others to develop as teachers.

Interview duration

Each interview with programme graduates lasted on average 55 minutes, while the interviews with colleagues averaged 16 minutes. By using a semi-structured format and a relatively long list of interview questions, the programme graduate interviews allowed for in-depth exploration of topics listed above while providing the flexibility to probe further based on participants' responses. This approach was used to ensure a comprehensive understanding of how research subjects conceive their teaching and what they do while planning, conducting, evaluating, enhancing, and innovating their teaching. Neither the programme graduates nor their colleagues were made aware that this research related to student-centred learning and reflective teaching.

Research ethics

The proposal for this research received approval from the Research Ethics Committee of Nottingham Trent University (NTU), ID 1830640. This ensured that the study adhered to ethical standards, including informed consent, confidentiality, and the right of participants to withdraw from the study at any time.

For the quotes throughout the work, the interviewed programme graduates provided secondary consent. Some quotes were lightly redacted to ensure the flow of expression and to meet the English language standards (for a similar approach see Felten and Lambert, 2020: 9). Quotes from the interviews with graduates and colleagues from Masaryk University that were undertaken in Czech language were translated to English by the author, and then checked for accuracy with an academic proficient in English and Czech/Slovak language.

This work was written solely by Gabriela Pleschová, but different academics contributed to data collection and analysis. During the writing process, the author utilised AJE Digital Editing service, software recommended by Palgrave, that is built for academic research and powered by artificial intelligence and ChatGPT to provide suggestions for edits and improvements. These tools served as aids in refining the content, but all ideas, arguments, and the final writing are author's. The use of artificial intelligence was limited to enhancing the clarity, coherence, and quality of the text.

Data coding and analysis

Despite the inclusion of specific questions targeting student-centredness and reflection in the interview protocols, this study adopted a holistic approach to data analysis, inspired by some past studies (Kember, 1999; Davis, 2006). Rather than coding individual text segments, the entire interview transcript was considered as a whole to capture the broader context and nuances of teaching perspectives and practice. This holistic approach aligns with the comprehensive nature of SCL and reflective teaching.

The work's author initially drafted a codebook for both interview protocols and course syllabi. This draft was reviewed and revised by the research team members. The coding process was deductive, using a-priori codes derived from existing literature. The programme graduate codebook included statements that asked the coders to express their judgement on a four-point Likaert scale: doesn't enjoy teaching in current institution, enjoys very little, enjoys quite a lot, and enjoys very much. Student-centredness was primarily assessed using the six criteria introduced in Chapter 1, namely: 1)

embracing constructivist view of learning, 2) understanding the role of teacher as a facilitator of student learning, 3) recognising students as colleagues and equals, 4) using active learning strategies, 5) assessing students continuously, and 6) employing authentic assessment or prompting students to demonstrate higher-order skills

Coders were asked to consider if the interview contained information suggesting that the research subject's description of their teaching practice met each criterion. Moreover, they were to note if the programme graduate referred to any other criteria for SCL that we knew from literature (and some graduates referred to far more than those six). Student-centredness was rated as high, mid, low, or none based on whether the interview demonstrated these six criteria and aligned with the following definition of student-centred learning: The teacher's focus is on how students learn rather than on their own performance. This encompasses all teaching-related activities, from curriculum design and lesson planning to leading learning sessions and assessing students. SCL involves facilitating student choice, encouraging students to take an active role, shifting the power dynamics between students and teachers, and considering students' identities and learning styles to promote effective learning.

The coding scheme used to assess SCL is based on previous studies by Pleschová and McAlpine (2016) and Pleschová and Simon (2021) and presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Coding scheme used in this research for assessing student-centred learning

High-level manifestation	Student-centredness as defined above is manifested in numerous parts of the interview, it shows that the programme graduate embraced student-centredness in a complex way, and there are not any parts where the graduate contradicts themselves using statements that demonstrate teacher-centred approach. The graduate pays a lot of attention to whom their students are and how they learn, so that good learning can occur.
Mid-level manifestation	Student-centredness as defined above is manifested in some parts of the interview, it documents that the graduate has embraced some elements of student-centredness; there are no parts where the graduate contradicts themselves using statements that demonstrate teacher-centred approach. The graduate only pays some attention to whom their students are and how they learn, so that good learning can occur.
Low-level manifestation	Some aspects of student-centredness as defined above are manifested in a few parts of the interview; there are parts where the graduate contradicts themselves using statements that demonstrate teacher-centred approach. The graduate pays little attention to whom their students are and how they learn.
No manifestation (teacher-centred teaching)	no evidence at all

As detailed in Chapter 1, reflectiveness in teaching was assessed based on four criteria developed from the literature: 1) exploratory approach to student learning (active investigation of results from

own teaching and student learning and offering evidence for claims), 2) recognition of both positive and problematic aspects of teaching (awareness and articulation of both the strengths and weaknesses in teaching practices), 3) integration of research and teaching (demonstration of connections between research and teaching, showing how one informs the other), 4) vision for improved teaching and learning (ways to improve teaching and student learning).

Reflectiveness was rated as high, mid, low, or no based on the extent to which the interview content met the four criteria summarised in Table 2. The coding scheme was already used in previous studies by Pleschová and McAlpine (2016) and Pleschová and Simon (2021).

Table 2. Coding scheme used in this research for assessing reflective teaching

High-level manifestation	Reflection and critical attitude as defined above is demonstrated throughout the interview and relates to planning, implementing, and evaluating own teaching.
Mid-level manifestation	The programme graduate demonstrates that they have thought about the reasons why good/poor quality learning occurs for students. The graduate analyses negative aspects/outcomes of own teaching and their reasons in only a limited way. The graduate can suggest some changes for future teaching but can not explain their expected effects on student learning well. Reflection and critical attitude is manifested throughout the interview but only relates to some of the following: planning, implementing and evaluating own teaching.
Low-level manifestation	The graduate demonstrates that they have thought about the reasons why good/poor quality learning occurs for students, but they could not summarise them in a clear and comprehensive way: they are only outlined and/or do not seem realistic. The graduate can not identify negative aspects/outcomes of own teaching and assumed reasons for them: the evaluation of effects of own teaching is uncritically positive. Based on this, the graduate can not suggest changes for future teaching and explain their expected effects on student learning. Reflection and critical attitude is demonstrated in a few parts of the interview, these are disconnected and related only to some stages of teaching (planning, implementing and evaluating own teaching).
No manifestation	no evidence at all

In addition to using one of the four codes, coders were asked to provide examples of statements from the interviews to illustrate their coding for both student-centred learning and reflectiveness in teaching.

Some items in the codebook required coders to summarise briefly in their own words, for instance, how the interviewee demonstrated reflectiveness or what they presented at a teaching and learning conference. Other items were yes/no questions, such as whether the graduate considered student feedback helpful for improving their teaching, whether they discussed teaching-related issues with colleagues, or if they kept a reflective journal. For these types of questions, coders also provided a one or two-sentence summary of the response. Additionally, there were items for which coders

listed all relevant points, such as institutional resources the interviewee identified as helpful in their teaching.

The codebook for colleague interviews included ten items. For some of them, coders provided a numerical code, such as the number of years the colleague had known the programme graduate or the frequency of their discussions about teaching. Coders typically summarised the interviewee's response, such as how the colleague characterised the programme graduate as a teacher, what students said about the graduate, or what the colleague could say about programme graduate's teaching based on observing their class.

Coders were also asked to holistically judge each colleague interview transcript using the same definitions of SCL and reflective teaching as for the programme graduate interviews. Possible codes for this holistic judgment of colleague interviews included yes, the graduate's teaching is student-centred/reflective; the graduate's teaching is not student-centred/reflective, the graduate's teaching is student-centred/reflective to some extent, and I cannot judge. This simpler coding scheme was employed because the colleague interviews were significantly shorter and did not permit the same level of discrimination as the graduate interviews. Coders explained their judgment and selected a quote that best captured the programme graduate's teaching based on the colleague's perspective.

The syllabus codebook listed 17 categories referring to course characteristics (course type, session length, frequency of classes per week, course for a small/large group of students) and the same six characteristics of SCL used for the programme graduate interview protocol. Additionally, the presence of assessment criteria and learning outcomes, for example those formulated using verbs from Bloom's taxonomy, was noted.

Each interview transcript and syllabus was independently coded by two researchers, with one researcher always being from the same institution as the participant to ensure familiarity with the context. To ensure consistency and accuracy in coding, the coders underwent training to familiarise themselves with the coding scheme and criteria. This included coding one interview transcript and one syllabus followed by discussions to align interpretations and resolve ambiguities. The coding scheme was refined based on feedback from the coders. Completed codebooks for each interview were always compared and remaining disagreements solved through a discussion. In three cases, the coders evaluated teaching as between high and mid-level and between mid and low-level.

Data analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excel, with a primary emphasis on addressing the research questions. Content analysis (Denscombe, 2010: 281-202): was used for identifying and examining contextual factors that influenced graduates positively and negatively in terms of their ability to think about and conduct teaching in a student-centred and reflective way. The three data sets were triangulated to see where findings from each set supported or contrasted with those from the other data sets.

Perspectives taken by the research team

The research team comprised educational developers with experience in designing, implementing, and evaluating educational development programmes for higher education teachers. Some team members have repeatedly led workshops on student-centredness and reflective teaching. Other team members were higher education teachers with extensive teaching experience, and some had expertise in both higher education teaching and educational development. One coder was a PhD student with limited teaching experience, whose recent undergraduate experience provided a perspective presumably close to that of current students. As proponents of SCL and reflective

teaching approaches, these perspectives informed the research team' approach to conducting the research.

Limitations of this research

The research team's commitment to student-centred learning and reflective teaching introduces a potential bias. Moreover, those involved in delivering the ED programmes have a vested interest in demonstrating that the programmes achieve their intended outcomes. To mitigate this bias, several measures were implemented. First, none of the researchers interviewed graduates from the programmes they were involved in. Second, blind double-coding was employed to ensure that one researcher's bias did not unduly influence the final coding. Third, each chapter underwent peer review by one or more academics not involved in the research or associated with any of the discussed programmes.

The research would have been more robust if more than one syllabus per program graduate was reviewed and if data had also been collected from students through class observations or student feedback. This limitation was somewhat addressed by capturing colleagues' views, many of whom were reportedly in frequent contact with students and familiar with their feedback, often gathered through institutional forms.

Despite these efforts, the work does not capture the views of a representative sample of programme graduates nor provides a comprehensive picture of any single ED programme and its impact. The aim of this research is not to present a comprehensive account of the long-term impacts of the selected programmes but to identify and describe possible trajectories of graduates from ED programmes, evaluate some key programme outcomes, and identify the enabling and constraining factors that affect this impact. In doing so, the research illustrates how higher education teachers might benefit from the ED programmes in the longer term and how institutions can support them in adopting student-centred and reflective teaching practices.

The limited scope of data collection, focusing on specific contexts, means the findings should be interpreted with caution when applying them to different environments. The results from this study are primarily applicable to similar contexts, such as programmes implemented at higher education institutions in the United Kingdom and Central and Eastern Europe with some relevance for institutions in Western Europe and those operated by Western providers in the Middle East and Central Asia. Further research is needed to evidence if the insights provided by this study offer guidance for understanding the long-term benefits and challenges by ED programmes graduates from elsewhere.

References

Davis, Elizabeth A. (2006) Characterizing productive reflection among preservice elementary teachers: Seeing what matters. Teaching and Teacher Education 22: 281-301: 10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.005

Denscombe, Martyn (2010) The good research guide. For small-scale social research projects. 4th edition. McGraw Hill and Open University Press

Felten, Peter, Lambert, Leo (2020) Relationship-rich education: How human connections drive success in college. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press

Kember, David (1999) Determining the level of reflective thinking from students' written journals using a coding scheme based on the work of Mezirow. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 18(1): 18-30: 10.1080/026013799293928

Miles, Matthew B., Huberman, A. Michael, Saldaña, Johny (2020) Qualitative data analysis. A methods sourcebook. 4th edition. Sage

Pleschová, Gabriela, McAlpine, Lynn (2016) Helping teachers to focus on learning and reflect on their teaching: What role does teaching context play? Studies in Educational Evaluation 48: 1–9: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.10.002

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes (2021) Doctoral students as early career university teachers: what hinders and what helps them to embrace the essentials of good teaching? In Lee, Anne, Bongaardt, Rob (Eds.) The future of doctoral research: challenges and opportunities. New York: Routledge, pp. 182-194: 10.4324/9781003015383-20

Sparks-Langer, Georgea M., Simmons, Joanne M., Pasch, Marvin, Colton, Amy, Starko, Alane (1990) Reflective pedagogical thinking: How can we promote it and measure it? Journal of Teacher Education 41(5), 23-32: 10.1177/002248719004100

SECTION II. FOUR CASE STUDIES

Chapter 3. A university committed to transforming how students learn in the region: Central European University

This chapter introduces the first case: Central European University (CEU), which is a front-runner in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) in offering educational development opportunities. For more than three decades, CEU has helped not only its own faculty members develop but also those teaching at many other institutions in the region, as well as in Central Asia and the Middle East (Renc-Roe, 2008; Renc-Roe and Yarkova, 2013). Established in 1991, Central European University set out to contribute to the transformation of CEE societies by providing students with an education stimulating both their intellectual growth and democratic values. In 2024, CEU had nearly 1,500 students and 500 faculty members and offered three bachelors, 42 master's programmes and 16 doctoral degree programmes. Many of these programmes scored highly in rankings such as the 2024 QS Global Subject Ranking, in which CEU ranked 32nd in Politics and International Relations and 37th in Philosophy (CEU Demonstrates Excellence in…, 2024). CEU ranked in the top 25 of the 2024 QS World University Ranking.

CEU's mission

Central European University stands out among similar higher education institutions in Central and Eastern Europe for at least four distinctive reasons. First, its mission and work are strongly value driven, which stems from having been established shortly after the change in the political regime in the region with the goal of training intellectual elites in transitioning societies. In recent years, CEU leadership, academics and students have challenged the regime of Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, including publishing studies documenting that Hungary can no longer be categorised as a democracy (Bozóki and Hegedüs, 2018; Krekó and Enyedi, 2018). A government campaign against CEU ultimately resulted in the university moving nearly all its operations from Budapest to Vienna in 2019 (Walker, 2019).

Second, as detailed in CEU mission, during its more than thirty years of existence, CEU has become a truly international university, with students coming from over hundred countries and staff members representing more than fifty countries. This makes CEU perhaps the most diverse university in the region. Third, after beginning with a small number of master's programmes in humanities and social science disciplines, CEU degree programmes have grown in number and scope to encompass a broad variety of fields. Although university's academic offerings continue to be anchored in the humanities and social sciences, learners can now also enrol in programmes such as environmental science, cognitive science and network science. Finally, as a university accredited both in the United States and in the European Union, CEU works to merge American and European intellectual traditions (CEU Mission, 2024). CEU's varied initiatives focused on learners and citizens from the non-Western world, for example, through CEU Summer University, which was introduced in 1996; the Open Society University Network, which Central European University co-established in 2020 with Bard College; and CIVICA, a consortium of ten leading European higher education institutions.

Institutional goals related to education and support of student-centredness

CEU is committed to promoting the values of an open society (Popper, 1994) and self-reflective critical thinking (CEU Mission, 2024). These two goals could hardly be achieved without CEU teachers valuing and practising a student-centred approach to teaching. CEU's 7:1 student–faculty ratio allows for small group learning in a seminar format, where students and teachers get to know each other, in contrast with frontal lecturing in lecture theatres, which makes an individualised approach difficult.

CEU's teaching development unit, the Yehuda Elkana Center for Teaching, Learning and Higher Education, supports academic teachers by offering development courses, workshops, consultations, mentoring, observations and resources (Yehuda Elkana Center, 2024). Over the years, the unit has undergone several transformations; however, since its very beginning, it has been a strong advocate and supporter of student-centred learning.

The educational development programme

The *Teaching in Higher Education 1 and 2* programme, from which graduates have been recruited for this research, is a voluntary two-semester-long programme offered mainly to PhD students from Central European University. Some of them were already serving as teaching assistants while attending the programme, whereas others undertook it to develop skills they would use later in their academic career. Because, initially, CEU offered degree programmes only in the social sciences and humanities, the participants in this programme came from these fields. Between 15 and 30 individuals complete the programme each year.

The programme's aims are were follows: a) to facilitate PhD students to prepare and revise their courses and teaching practices by providing them with an intellectual and practical grounding in the skills associated with major genres of academic teaching; b) to reflect on the link between the academic content of a discipline and teaching practices; and c) to develop participants' critical self-awareness regarding the complex requirements of high-quality university teaching through inquiry into the intellectual work of teaching in higher education and its links to other aspects of academic practice.

The programme learning outcomes were formulated independently for the first and second semesters. Semester 1 learning outcomes included the abilities of the participants to 1) formulate their own vision of teaching and student learning; 2) select and justify educational design choices for modules, workshops, training sessions or lectures; 3) clearly express and communicate intended learning outcomes to students; 4) integrate appropriate information, computer technology and/or digital tools into multimodal educational design; and 5) reflect on and improve their teaching based on student evaluations, teaching experience and recent educational insights.

Semester 2 outcomes listed competences such as 1) applying the educational principles of active, student-centred learning; 2) recognising and managing group dynamics in a professional, supportive and inclusive way; 3) using constructive alignment; 4) incorporating institutional assessment policy when planning and assessing student work; 5) creating appropriate assessment and feedback opportunities to support student learning; 6) using relevant assessment methods that meet the criteria of validity, reliability and transparency; and 7) considering methods of improving teaching on the basis of student feedback and evaluations, teaching experience and recent educational insights.

The programme's major assignments included a teaching philosophy statement, a plan for teaching a session, a teaching observation (could be a mock session), a design of an assessed task and rubric and a full course syllabus. The session plan and syllabus were both subject to peer feedback. The individuals supporting the participants while they worked on the assignments were academic developers with backgrounds in sociology and education. Their main roles were facilitating biweekly workshops on various topics related to teaching, learning, assessment and professional development in higher education; providing individual consultations; observing participant teaching; and providing feedback on participant assignments. With some modifications, the programme has been offered continuously since it was introduced in 2004. It has not been internationally accredited.

Academic developers from CEU played a key role in the design, facilitation and evaluation of the two other programmes described in this work. The programme team offered by the Slovak Academy of Sciences comprised two developers working in CEU educational development unit. A graduate of one of CEU's educational development programmes introduced a similar programme for junior teachers from Masaryk University.

Programme definitions of student-centredness and reflectiveness in teaching

When introduced, the programme initially did not use the term "student-centredness." It worked with the notions introduced by Barr and Tagg's article (1995), which advocated for a new paradigm for undergraduate education that sees higher education institutions as producers of learning through the setting of learning outcomes, creating an environment supportive of student learning and actively engaging learners.

Sampling strategy and sample characteristics

A CEU listing of all programme graduates by year was used for the selection of subjects for this research. The individual responsible for collecting data for this research convened with the current programme coordinator and past programme instructors and identified those graduates from various years who successfully finished the programme five and more years ago and currently had, according to their knowledge, a teaching assignment. This resulted in a list of seven teachers. Those willing and available for an interview between February and June 2024 were contacted, and interviews were performed.

The five teachers interviewed came from law, political science and philosophy and included both male and female academics. All come from countries other than Austria and teach at institutions other than Central European University, namely in Central Asia, Denmark, Hungary, and the Middle East. When they started their ED programme, the participants had varied teaching experience: two had no prior experience teaching in higher education (G4C, G5C), one had experience solely from facilitating sessions outside academia (G2C), and one had been teaching at a university for one year (G1C). The fifth graduate (G3C) had eight years of teaching experience before joining the ED programme.

References

Barr, Robert B., Tagg, John (1995) From teaching to learning - A new paradigm for undergraduate Education. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 27(6): 13-25: 10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672

Bozóki, András, Hegedüs Dániel (2018) An externally constrained hybrid regime: Hungary in the European Union. Democratization 25(7): 1173-1189. 10.1080/13510347.2018.1455664

CEU Facts and Figures (2024) www.ceu.edu/about/facts-figures

CEU Mission (2024): www.ceu.edu/about/our-mission

CEU Demonstrates Excellence in 2024 QS World University Rankings: www.ceu.edu/article/2024-04-10/ceu-demonstrates-excellence-2024-qs-world-university-rankings

Krekó, Péter, Enyedi, Zsolt (2018) Explaining Eastern Europe: Orbán's laboratory of illiberalism. Journal of Democracy 29(3): 39-51: 10.1353/jod.2018.0043

Popper, Karl (1994) The Open society and its enemies: New one-volume edition. With a new introduction by Alan Ryan. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 10.2307/j.ctt24hqxs

QS 2024 World University ranking: www.topuniversities.com

Renc-Roe, Joanna (2008). Changing trains: The story of SOTL in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. International Journal for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 2(2): 1-7. (Art. 3): 10.20429/ijsotl.2008.020203

Renc-Roe, Joanna, Yarkova, Tatiana (2013) Preparing doctoral students for a teaching career: The case of an international university with a history of a regional engagement. In Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela (Eds.) Teacher development in higher education. Existing programs, program impact and future trends. New York and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 19-33

The Yehuda Elkana Center for Teaching, Learning, and Higher Education: https://elkana.ceu.edu

Walker, Shaun (2019) Classes move to Vienna as Hungary makes rare decision to oust university. The Guardian, 16. November 2019

Chapter 4. A fast-growing, ambitious university: Masaryk University

Chapter four portrays an educational development programme at the second largest higher education institution in Czechia, Masaryk University. While Central European University, described in the previous chapter, is a relatively young university, Masaryk University (MUNI) was established more than a hundred years ago, in 1919. It was named after Czechoslovakia's first president and champion of democratic thought Tomáš Garigue Masaryk, so a democratic ethos is something it shares with CEU. The university offers about 150 degree programmes with an enrolment of approximately 33,000 students, around a quarter of whom (5,400) are international students. The student-to-faculty ratio has been steadily improving and currently stands at 18:1 (Masaryk University 2022 Annual Report). MUNI is ranked #=400 in the QS World University Rankings 2024.

MUNI's mission

As expressed in its 2022 Annual Report, MUNI's mission is to contribute, through its scholarly activities, to education of students and societal responsibility, to the quality of life of all generations and to a free, cohesive and secure society. The university prides itself on its broad range of student support services, which enhance its high retention rate, its 85% rate of graduate employment in their field, and its growing number of international students (Masaryk University 2022 Annual Report: 6, 21, 156).

Institutional goals related to education and support of student-centredness

MUNI's vision is to become, by 2028, a university that recognises students as colleagues, supports interdisciplinary and personalised learning and places high demands on them to ensure their career success. The notion of student-centred learning (SCL) is not referred to either in the university's vision or in its annual report (Masaryk University 2022 Annual Report: 7), but the notions of collegiality and personalised learning both align with a student-centred approach. By establishing an educational development unit, the Center for the Development of Pedagogic Competences (CERPEK), MUNI was reacting to a trend of valuing excellence in teaching similarly to excellence in research and was therefore willing to support both areas equally. CERPEK's vision is that all teachers from Masaryk University provide quality teaching that has a high impact on student achievement and that their teaching positively influences student well-being and their own well-being (Kročáková, Procházková and Vařejková, 2022).

The educational development programme

The Foundations of University Teaching programme run by CERPEK was introduced in 2017 as part of the university's flagship publicly financed project MUNI 4.0 (Kročáková, Procházková and Vařejková, 2022), which aimed to increase the quality of education in connection with labour market trends, advanced technologies, student diversity and societal needs. A conceptual background of the programme has been presented by Šeďová et al. (2016) and Čejková (2017). The programme is open to all MUNI teachers, regardless of their field of study, tenure, teaching load or teaching experience. Doctoral students are also eligible. This diversity of participants is believed to contribute to creating a learning community (Kročáková, Procházková and Vařejková, 2022). Programme graduates are expected to 1) use a variety of teaching and assessment methods, 2) focus their teaching on students, 3) build and maintain good, respect-based relationships with students, 4) create conditions for learning in an inclusive environment, 5) support students in developing their potential and competences, 6) design courses in light of the principles of education for the 21st century, 7) reflect on their teaching through evidence and 8) engage in continued professional development (Diviš et al., 2022: 12-13).

The programme, when it was founded, was composed of four elements: fundamentals of higher education teaching, video feedback, a pedagogical methods workshop and mentoring. As part of the first element, the participants attended a series of workshops that introduced them to topics such as quality teaching, course design, assessment, evaluation and use of information and communication technologies. In this stage, the participants also set their own developmental goals related to teaching. During the second part, each teacher video recorded a class session that they taught, watched this recording and reflected on the teaching and student learning that had taken place. This reflection exercise was facilitated by a mentor.[3] In the third stage, the participants again attended workshops on topics such as engaging students, lecturing, visualising complex data, presenting difficult concepts, managing diversity in the classroom and using technology while teaching. In the last stage of the programme, each participant worked in collaboration with a mentor, like in team teaching. Moreover, mentors and mentees attended workshops to help them make the most of their collaboration, for example, by understanding nondirective and constructive feedback (Vanderziel et al., 2018).

The Foundation of University Teaching was originally designed as a year-long programme and was later cut to one semester. Enrolment in the programme is voluntary. Major programme assignment is a reflection on a recording of a class that the participant was teaching. The programme mentors usually have a degree in psychology or adult learning, and some are certified coaches/mentors or specialise in supporting students with special needs. Annually, approximately 25 university teachers from a variety of disciplines complete the programme. The programme has not been formally accredited.

Programme definitions of student-centredness and reflectiveness in teaching

Student-centred learning is one of four approaches the programme employs to help teachers grow, alongside participative teaching, productive teaching communication, constructivist learning principles, and using a range of teaching and assessment methods The programme defines SCL as an approach where teachers create learning environments that enable students to engage actively in their learning. Teachers work with students' preconceptions, experiences, beliefs, and current knowledge. Learning is not simply the accumulation of new knowledge but involves comparing and actively processing information to bring about conceptual change. This approach requires the use of teaching and learning strategies that activate the learning process. Teachers focus on students' understanding of what is to be learned, situating it within a broader context. In line with this approach, the teacher's role is to prepare the learning environment and act as a guide (Diviš et al., 2022: 12-13).

The programme understands reflectiveness as an effort to structure and analyse teaching experience in relation to planned goals and achieved outcomes, draw conclusions from them and create alternative approaches for similar future occasions. Through reflection, teachers can adjust to emerging situations and develop new strategies (Kročáková, Procházková and Vařejková, 2022).

Sampling strategy and sample characteristics

The subjects for this research were selected from among the 48 graduates of MUNI's educational development programme who had completed the programme in 2018, i.e., six years prior. From the list of graduates provided by the programme coordinator, a colleague responsible for data collection

[3] Although the programme uses the term *mentor,* the terms *coach* and *coaching* better align with the roles that *mentors* perform. For more, see Pleschová and McAlpine (2015).

at MUNI identified five teachers who met the following criteria: had a teaching assignment at MUNI; taught students of the undergraduate programme; and included both male (1) and female (4) graduates. Interviews with programme graduates were conducted between January and March 2024.

The interviewees work in education, law, linguistics, social work, and sociology, representing four of the ten faculties at Masaryk University. None held the rank of associate professor or professor. Three of the interviewees had relatively extensive teaching experience prior to enrolling in the ED programme: seven years (G4M), eight years (G3M) and eleven years (G5M), although this primarily involved teaching one or a few courses per academic year. The other programme graduates had approximately two to three years of teaching experience.

References

Čejková, Ingrid (2017) Vysokoškolský učitel bez učitelského vzdělání: Problém, nebo výzva? (A higher education teacher without a teaching qualification. A Problem or Challenge?) Pedagogická orientace 27(1): 160-180: 10.5817/PedOr2017-1-160

Diviš, Michal, Janča, Boris, Kročáková, Zuzana, Procházková, Ingrid, Vařejková, Zuzana (2022) Manuál pro Dílnu rozvoje pedagogických kompetencí (Guidebook for Workshop for development of pedagogical competences) 2nd edition

Kročáková, Zuzana, Procházková, Ingrid, Vařejková, Zuzana (2022) Vyučující na filmovém plátně: Videorelexe výuky jako nástroj rozvoje vysokoškolských vyučujících. (Teachers on a screen. A video reflection of teaching as a tool of educational development. Pedagogická orientace 32(3): 249-264: 10.5817/PedOr2022-3-249

Masaryk University 2022 Annual Report: www.muni.cz/en/about-us/official-notice-board/annual-reports#mu

Švaříček, Roman, Vanderziel, Jeffrey, Sucháček, Petr, Šeďová, Klára, Zounek, Jiří, Novotný, Petr, Čejková, Ingrid, Šmardová, Anna, Sedláčková, Jana (2018) Beginning university teachers and their approaches to teaching and professional self-perception. Conference presentation. University of Economics, 28 October 2018, Bratislava.

Vanderziel, Jeffrey A., Švaříček, Roman, Čejková, Ingrid, Sucháček, Petr (2018) Teaching university teachers to teach better: Program, prospects and challenges: Towards better university teaching. Prague, November 2018: https://cerpek.muni.cz/media/3112702/teaching-university-teachers-to-teach-better.pdf

Šeďová, Klára, Švaříček, Roman, Sedláčková, Jana, Čejková, Ingrid, Šmardová, Anna, Novotný, Peter, Zounek, Jiří (2016) Pojetí výuky a profesní identita začínajících vysokoškolských učitelů. (Conception of teaching and professional identity of early-career higher education teachers.) Studia paedagogica 21(1): 9-34: 10.5817/SP2016-1-2

Pleschová, Gabriela, McAlpine, Lynn (2015) Enhancing university teaching and learning through mentoring, International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education 4(2): 107-125: 10.1108/IJMCE-06-2014-0020

Chapter 5. An institution that trains both scholars and teachers: The Slovak Academy of Sciences

Chapter five details another programme offered in Central and Eastern Europe. The programme is distinct in its type of provider, which is predominantly a research institution. Because universities in Slovakia typically do not offer educational development opportunities to their doctoral students (nor to regular teaching staff members), a group of academics led by the author of this work secured funding for the Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS) to run a programme for early career academics with teaching responsibilities.

The Slovak Academy of Sciences is the principal public institution in Slovakia devoted primarily to scholarly research. As of 2024, it comprises 45 institutes that foster research in a wide range of disciplines, from physical, earth, space and engineering sciences to life sciences, medical chemistry and environmental sciences, social sciences, humanities, arts and culture. The origins of the SAS date back to 1942. The institution underwent major development in the period after 1953 and significant transformation after the change of political regimes in Central and Eastern Europe (SAS: History).

SAS mission

The mission of the SAS includes carrying out top-level basic research, creating the scientific infrastructure for technically demanding research and conducting long-term strategic and applied research and development in partnership with external stakeholders (SAS: Mission).

Institutional goals related to education and support of student-centredness

In addition to being a workplace for researchers, the SAS provides training to doctoral students. This is done in cooperation with eleven higher education institutions in Slovakia that typically serve as degree-awarding institutions and where PhD students complete some coursework (SAS: PhD studies). The SAS is responsible for supervising doctoral students during their research and dissertation writing, integrating them into teams implementing various research projects and, most recently, fostering their career development, for example, through training in transferable and other skills (SAS: Doctoral School).

The educational development programme

The design and implementation of the *Innovating Teaching and Student Learning* programme was supported by grants from the European Science Foundation and the European Social Fund. Educational developers working at universities where educational development was already an established area of practice teamed up, considered various models of educational development that were in place elsewhere (for an overview of the models considered, see Simon and Pleschová, 2013) and created the programme structure and requirements by adapting existing practice to local needs. Two of these five developers were working for Central European University, another institution whose programme is evaluated in this research. The author of this work served as the programme coordinator.

The purpose of the programme was to help beginner teachers enhance their teaching practices. This was to be achieved by the participant teachers to understand and implement the principles of student-centred education in their teaching; by improving their capacity to critically reflect on teaching and learning; and by applying educational theory when designing, implementing and evaluating their own courses. By the end of the programme, the participants were expected to demonstrate 1) a student-centred approach to teaching; reflective skills related to planning, conducting and evaluating their teaching and student learning; knowledge of a set of concepts, theories and principles related to various aspects of teaching and learning in higher education; and 4)

ability to design, present and write a study of the results of a teaching/learning innovation (Innovating Teaching and Student Learning. Programme Description 2012-2013).

The programme began with a 9-day summer school that introduced participants to the issues of course design and lesson planning, constructive alignment, facilitating small and large student groups, assessment, tutoring and supervision, supporting student pre-class preparation, dealing with teaching problems, reflection and scholarly approaches to teaching and other themes. In the latter part of the summer school, each participant designed and presented a plan for innovating student learning on the basis of what they had learned (Summer School Schedule 3–11 July 2011).

In the post-summer school phase, summer school graduates with teaching obligations in the following academic year prepared a design for a teaching innovation, a syllabus, a study into the results of innovation and a statement of teaching philosophy. During this stage, each participant was paired with a coach who had been one of the facilitators of the summer school. The coach's role was to guide the teacher, provide consultations and feedback and support the participant in achieving the programme outcomes. The communication between the coach and the participant was mostly conducted through electronic means because the coaches worked at institutions outside Slovakia. The programme was offered in English, which was also the language of communication between coaches and participants (Innovating Teaching and Student Learning. Programme Description 2012-2013).

The programme was implemented in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 for two cohorts of participants — doctoral students and junior teachers—from different higher education institutions across the country. The summer school part of the programme was attended by 82 individuals, and 27 successfully completed the one-year follow-up coaching phase. The programme was not accredited, but later, adaptation of the programme resulted in the design of a similar programme for the University of Economics Bratislava (EUBA), Slovakia, which was accredited locally (by the EUBA) and internationally (by the United Kingdom Staff and Educational Development Association). The programme design and short-term effects of *Innovating Teaching and Student Learning* on the first cohort of participants have been presented in studies by Pleschová (2012) and Pleschová and McAlpine (2016).

Programme definitions of student-centredness and reflectiveness in teaching

When offered for the first time, the programme did not explicitly define student-centredness nor reflection in its programme document. After the pilot year, the revised programme document defined student- and reflection based on assessing how the graduates of the first cohort (supported by the coaches/mentors) articulated the concepts in their programme assignments (Pleschová, 2012). Student-centred learning was expressed in the following way: the teacher's focus is on how their students learn, rather than on their own performance in all activities related to teaching, from curriculum design and lesson planning across leading learning sessions to student assessment. Student choice in their education is facilitated; the student is encouraged to do more than the teacher does, and/or a shift in the power relationship between the student and the teacher can be observed. The teacher pays attention to who their students are and how they learn so that high-quality learning can occur.

Reflective teaching, on the other hand, was understood in the ED programme offered by the Slovak Academy of Sciences as the ability to critically reflect on the context of a teaching situation, on the positive and problematic aspects and outcomes of the innovation, including identifying their possible

reasons and suggesting what could be done when teaching similar courses in the future (Innovating Teaching and Student Learning. Programme Description 2012-2013).

Sampling strategy and sample characteristics

Nearly twelve and eleven years after the first and second cohorts finished the programme, a sample of graduates provided data on their development as teachers. Among the 27 programme graduates, 11 were identified by an internet search to be working in academia with a current teaching assignment. The 11 graduates were invited by email to be interviewed, and interviews were performed with the five program graduates who responded and made themselves available for an interview. Interviews with programme graduates were conducted between January and March 2024.

Three male and two female teachers interviewed held senior teaching positions. They worked in diverse disciplines—biology, education, engineering, linguistics and medicine—at four different universities across Slovakia. Before enrolling in the ED programme, they had varying levels of teaching experience in higher education: G2S had taught for eleven years, G3S for four years, G1S for three years, and G4S and G5S for one to two years.

References

Innovating Teaching and Student Learning. Programme Description 2012-2013. Unpublished document

Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela, Eds. (2013) Teacher development in higher education. Existing Programs, program impact and future trends. New York and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge

Pleschová, Gabriela (2012) Coaching in teacher development. Case study of a teacher development program in Slovakia. Dissertation submitted in part-fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Science in Education (Higher Education) degree. Oxford University

Pleschová, Gabriela, McAlpine, Lynn (2016) Helping teachers to focus on learning and reflect on their teaching: What role does teaching context play? Studies in Educational Evaluation 48: 1-9: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.10.002

SAS: History: www.sav.sk/?lang=en&doc=sas-history

SAS: Mission: www.sav.sk/?lang=en&doc=sas-mission

SAS: PhD studies: www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=educ-phdstudy

SAS: Doctoral school: www.sav.sk/?lang=en&doc=educ-school

Summer School Schedule 3 - 11 July 2011. Document circulated with programme participants

Chapter 6. A university that holds the Gold for teaching: Nottingham Trent University

This chapter presents the fourth and final institution included in this research: Nottingham Trent University (NTU). NTU is one of the largest and most popular universities in the United Kingdom. Although its roots date back to 1843, NTU is a New University, a term that refers to British higher education institutions that became universities in 1992 or later by transforming from a Polytechnic or a College of Further Education. Currently, over 33,000 students are enrolled at the university—a comparable number to Masaryk University, described in an earlier chapter. More than 14% of the student bodies (4,700) are international students (Unichoices, 2024). According to the 2024 QS World University ranking, Nottingham Trent University, which offers 214 undergraduate and 181 graduate programmes, ranks 595th.

NTU's mission

Nottingham Trent University's strategy seeks to pursue personalisation of the student experience so that students develop knowledge, skills and resilience to create meaning in their lives. This is achieved by innovating teaching methods, offering both face-to-face and online provisions of courses to allow students to choose routes that fit their needs, encouraging lifelong learning habits and providing strong professional support services. Moreover, the university expresses a commitment to social mobility. Other elements of NTU strategy include valuing ideas, contributing to society, promoting sustainability, internationalising education and empowering people (University, Reimagined, 2024).

Institutional goals related to education and support of student-centredness

NTU places considerable stress on providing high-quality learning experiences to its students. The university has been the recipient of various awards recognising its teaching, such as first place in the Whatuni Student Choice 2023 Awards, five 'University of the Year' titles in six years and a gold rating in the 2023 Teaching Excellence Framework (NTU: Our achievements and successes, 2024). NTU also supports—including financially—the establishment and work of specialised groups within the university that can connect individuals interested in the advancement of teaching and learning. Currently, NTU has one such active group: Decolonising and internationalising the curriculum—a TILT Practice and Scholarship group. The group, launched in 2019, offers opportunities for colleagues to share ideas and approaches related to decolonisation and internationalisation. It has been endorsed by the Trent Institute for Learning and Teaching (TILT) and has 70 members from different schools in NTU (Decolonising and internationalising the curriculum…, n.d.).

The educational development programme

NTU's *Academic Professional Apprenticeship and Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* (APA/PCHTLE) has been in place since 2008. It helps teachers share in and contribute to the university's learning and teaching community of practice and to develop leadership approaches in education to disseminate innovative and sound practices within their schools, the wider institution and the external environment. The programme seeks to combine learning from best practices within the university, across the higher education sector and from the literature (APA/PCHTLE Course handbook for participants, September 2023). It has been accredited by Advance Higher Education, one of two United Kingdom (UK) institutions that accredit educational development programs offered in the UK as well as other countries. Programme graduates are recognised as Fellows of the Higher Education Academy (FHEA).

The programme aims to enable academics new to teaching to support learners by becoming informed, confident and critically reflective practitioners in higher education. Successful programme graduates are expected to 1) demonstrate a critical understanding of how current scholarship and theories (both pedagogic and subject-based) influence the way they are developing student learning; 2) demonstrate how systematic reflection upon developing knowledge of teaching and learning has influenced their practice, with specific reference to curriculum design, actual teaching and educational research; 3) critically employ an appropriate range of resources and technologies, including relevant professional frameworks, policies, processes, ethics and strategies; 4) communicate effectively and appropriately with diverse audiences (students, colleagues and stakeholders) using suitable media for the purposes of learning and dissemination of knowledge; and 5) demonstrate a commitment to ongoing personal professional development in relation to delivering informed and innovative learning, teaching, assessment and educational research (APA/PCHTLE Course handbook for participants, September 2023).

Approximately 30 junior academics and/or senior staff members across the fields of social sciences, arts and humanities, science, medicine and technology, and fashion and design enrol in the programme every year. In the programme, each participant works closely with two mentors: 1) a workplace mentor—normally an experienced member of the school team with relevant training to support staff—and 2) an academic mentor—a member of the course team with a background of higher education teaching and learning. Workplace mentors conduct teaching observations and provide feedback, whereas academic mentors focus on the academic aspects of coursework.

During the programme, the participants complete three major assignments. In Module 1, participants compile a portfolio demonstrating their ability to critically reflect on their own practice. The module assignment is a 4,000-word reflective report, and in Module 3, a 4,000-word research project focused on specific aspects of academic practice. Typically, programme completion takes one year and three months. All teachers new to NTU are required to complete this programme until a certain time, unless they have achieved an equivalent teaching qualification, as a condition of their continued employment at NTU.

Programme definitions of student-centredness and reflectiveness in teaching

For student-centredness, the role of teachers extends beyond instruction to encompass thorough planning, engaging students in classroom activities and careful assessment of student progress with a focus on personalisation, critical thinking, and active and collaborative learning. Students should be given a greater role in their learning journey on the basis of the recognition of each student's individuality.

In terms of reflection, the emphasis of the programme offered by Nottingham Trent University is on developing academic professionals who reflect routinely upon their own professional practice, whose conception of teaching is facilitating learning and who strive to increase the quality of their teaching, research and student learning (APA/PCHTLE Course handbook for participants, September 2023).

Sampling strategy and sample characteristics

The sampling strategy included selecting individuals who teach a variety of subjects in social science disciplines, including both male and female, home and international colleagues. A convenience sample has been used, selecting those who were willing and available to undergo an interview between January and May 2024.

The teachers recruited for this research had graduated from the teaching development programme approximately five to six years prior. All were drawn from the School of Social Sciences, one of NTU's six schools. They include three male teachers and one female lecturer, all of whom are now senior lecturers. Prior to enrolling in the programme, the participants had a maximum of two to three years of teaching experience, except for one interviewee (G2N) who had been teaching for up to five years. Three programme graduates were originally from the United Kingdom, whereas the fourth was an international academic.

References

Academic Professional Apprenticeship (APA)/Postgraduate Certificate in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education (PGCLTHE). Course Handbook for Participants. September 2023. Unpublished document

Decolonising and internationalising the curriculum — a TILT Practice and Scholarship group. NTU internal document

NTU: Our achievements and successes: www.ntu.ac.uk/about-us/achievements

Nottingham Trent University Course Handbook for Participants, September 2023

Unichoices, 2024: https://unichoices.co.uk/universities/the-nottingham-trent-university

University, Reimagined (2024): www.ntu.ac.uk/about-us/strategy/university-reimagined

2024 QS World University Rankings: www.topuniversities.com/universities/nottingham-trent-university

SECTION III. DIVERSE PATHS OF GRADUATES FROM ED PROGRAMMES

Chapter 7. Four paths of higher education teachers

This chapter explores how individuals who graduated five and more years ago from educational development (ED) programmes were influenced in their teaching practice by both institutional constraints and affordances, as well as their personal beliefs. The study draws on interviews with 19 graduates of the four ED programmes examined in this work, interviews with their colleagues, and the graduates' course syllabi. Two coders evaluated the principles guiding the graduate's approach to teaching, how the provided syllabi reflected these principles and the practical challenges they encountered in implementing their planned syllabi. Moreover, the coders examined what the graduates said about a specific class they considered memorable—whether due to successful student learning outcomes or challenges—and the strategies they planned for future classes in order to assess the graduates' reflective approach to teaching.

Additionally, the coders considered how feedback from students and colleagues influenced the graduate's course planning and whether the graduate employed tools such as reflective journals, conversations with colleagues, participation in conferences, and academic paper writing to enhance their teaching in a systematic and evidence-based way. Finally, the coders judged the contextual barriers and supportive factors that influenced the graduates' teaching practices, including whether they felt valued and recognised as a teacher, trusted by their superiors in their teaching approach, and supported by former coaches/mentors.

The codes related to these aspects of teaching were revisited and synthesized by the author to identify the range of distinct paths taken by graduates of these ED programmes and the factors influencing individuals to follow each path. This analysis revealed four distinct paths, which have been named:

1. **Pragmatic Teacher Path**
2. **Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator Path**
3. **Dedicated Teacher Frustrated with Their Institution Path**
4. **Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar Path**

These paths were distributed unevenly: one in six ED programme graduates followed the first path, two-thirds followed the second path, one in ten followed the third path, and only one graduate embodied the last path. For each path, a single cameo was selected to illustrate the lived experience of a graduate, allowing the reader to engage with their own words and reflecting the depth of the coding analysis. To maintain confidentiality, the cameos do not disclose graduate's gender or institutional affiliation. Each cameo is based solely on data from a single programme graduate rather than a composite of multiple graduates' experiences. The following sections explore each path in detail, providing insights into the challenges and successes encountered by graduates during their journeys.

The pragmatic teacher path

Path summary

Programme graduates on the Pragmatic Teacher path exhibit a strong commitment to teaching, which they genuinely enjoy. Their teaching practices are notably student-centred, ranging from high to mid-level, and their reflective practice is mid-level. Their syllabi highlight the core aspects they

think are essential to their teaching, and they report minimal difficulty in implementing these, although they adapt flexibly to meet student needs. They actively consider student feedback, reflecting on it and making adjustments to their classes accordingly. While their teaching is regularly observed, they may or may not incorporate the feedback they receive into future teaching. They feel a sense of trust from their superiors but acknowledge contextual limitations, such as heavy workloads, administrative burdens, and limited funding for professional development. They see little institutional support to overcome these constraints and aid their teaching. They feel constant time pressure from a heavy workload, which prevents them from maintaining a reflective journal, and they do not engage in presenting or publishing on teaching and student learning.

Alex

Characteristics and teaching approach

The first path, the Pragmatic Teacher path, is exemplified by Alex, a lecturer and seminar leader who teaches in an undergraduate programme with a total of over 90 students enrolled in their courses during the past academic year. Alex handles both solo and co-taught courses with other colleagues. Their full-time, permanent senior position was obtained following a standard job application process. Alex enjoys teaching due to the diverse backgrounds of the students in their classes, the opportunity to co-teach with colleagues, and being part of an excellent department. Key principles from their teaching approach include a strong focus on student engagement, incorporating a range of audio and visual sources and technologies to enhance the learning experience, assigning enough material to stimulate learning without overwhelming students, ensuring that as many student voices as possible are heard during class discussions and providing opportunities for both kinaesthetic and passive learning to cater to different learning styles.

Student-centredness

The analysis of the interview with Alex indicates a high level of student-centredness, as evidenced by their teaching principles, approach, and overall interview content. They mention four of the six key aspects of SCL as important for their teaching (for the list of these aspects, see Chapter 2), alongside additional aspects aligned with SCL. These include adapting the room to facilitate learning, encouraging contributions from many students, and assigning readings that stimulate student interest. Alex views themselves as inherently student-centred, a quality that has been consistent throughout their career, both as a junior and now: “That’s always been one of my strengths.”

Alex is responsible for the curriculum design and assessment for the course from which they shared their syllabus with the research team. The syllabus includes learning outcomes formulated using verbs that align with various levels from Bloom’s taxonomy. It outlines active learning exercises, indicating that Alex understands their role as a facilitator of student learning, and provides formative assessment throughout the course. However, the syllabus does not specify whether continuous assessment is planned or whether the assessment is authentic and requires students to demonstrate higher-order skills. There are no signs in the syllabus that Alex views students as colleagues of similar power, holds a constructivist view of learning, or considers students as individuals with diverse interests and needs. Additionally, assessment criteria are not listed in the syllabus.

Nevertheless, Alex argues that the syllabus embodies the principles fundamental for their teaching approach; this is especially true regarding the diversity of assessment methods and the freedom given to students to influence their learning within an overall framework. Alex believes that the syllabus covers a variety of content and adopts a non-colonising approach, which is important for their discipline: international relations.

Alex does not find it particularly difficult to implement the plans outlined in their syllabus, owing to their extensive teaching experience, including trying out a variety of ways of teaching the course. The syllabus intentionally tells little about teaching and learning methods, as its primary purpose is to stimulate interest in the course. As Alex explains, the syllabus is there "to promote module and its overall broad aims and the more information it gives, the more restrictive it is and the less adaptable it is to changing cohorts or situations or environments or latest news."

The classes are centred on helping students achieve the planned outcomes, with Alex noting, "I always end a session by saying, here are the learning outcomes. Have you learned? Do you do well? We've achieved these as far as I'm concerned. Do you feel that way? And then I end with how do you [feel?]; are you leaving the room knowing something you didn't know before you entered? And they say 'yes' and that's a successful session."

A colleague who has known Alex for fifteen years and has co-taught several courses with them believes that Alex fosters student interaction and is approachable, confident, passionate and genuinely interested in student contributions: Alex is "very good in reacting to what students say, which results in conversations with students when they exchange lots of great ideas and reflect." The colleague further characterised Alex as someone who "know[s] when to really invest a lot of time into something and when to be a bit more pragmatic. Because [Alex is] like a number of us, so busy that [they] got that experience and confidence to know that enough will do for a particular class if [they do not have] time to kind of make it perfect."

Reflective teaching

Alex's level of reflectiveness was categorised as mid-level. This was mainly because Alex chose to describe a class that went well, did not provide examples of instances where students might not have learned optimally, relied on their own observations rather than other evidence, and did not mention any potential areas for improvement. However, it is possible that the class was highly successful and did not offer many ways for enhancement.

Alex does not engage in the nonteaching activities espoused in the programme (reflective journal and dissemination), noting "We're overworked," and "I don't do anything revolutionary. I just do my job well, there's no paper for that." This may explain why Alex reported no significant specific teaching events that stand out in their academic career, given "It's not about a big event."

The interview with a colleague indicated that this graduate is reflective. When the two colleagues discuss teaching, they reportedly reflect on past classes and plan future classes. Additionally, the graduate encourages students to reflect. The colleague believes the graduate to be a reflective practitioner, citing their ability to think and adapt during class discussions.

Use of student and colleague feedback

With respect to student feedback, Alex prefers receiving ongoing feedback rather than waiting until the end of the semester to see student evaluations. Alex thus encourages students to share, for example, via a class representative, if there is anything that students do not like or if they have suggestions about what works well or not so well. Furthermore, if students feel confident, they voice their feedback in class. Alex then reflects, responds, and adapts the class accordingly. According to the colleague, students find Alex easy to talk to and are very happy to have discussions with them.

Alex also discusses teaching with colleagues. They talk about what went truly well and things that came as a surprise. If there are any particular issues, Alex seeks colleagues' advice, listens to their

opinions, and considers them, even if not always taking advice on board. Both a colleague and their superior have observed the Alex's classes. In their own words, discussions with observers prompted Alex to reflect and try to incorporate their suggestions into future sessions.

Influence from context

When comparing their teaching to that of other colleagues, Alex says succinctly: "I work with over twenty. Of course, I teach differently to some and similarly to others." Alex finds institutional resources for teaching development unhelpful and requiring extra work without a clear benefit. Instead, they value more focused options such as peer observation, feedback from superiors, and institutional student feedback forms: "Everything else that's offered feels like an activity for the sake of an activity that requires more work with no real benefit," this graduate claims.

Alex identified several factors that constrain their teaching, including administrative duties, unnecessary bureaucracy, and an inappropriate institutional focus on certain issues. They also mentioned a limited ability to act within their teaching role while being required to maintain academic integrity and judgment. Additionally, colleagues in administrative roles frequently refer students to teachers instead of addressing issues themselves as part of their job, leading to overworked teachers. Alex does not believe that the wider national context influences their teaching.

Alex feels trusted by their head of department to teach in a student-centred way and to innovate teaching because their superior has expressed trust in them. They also take on a leadership role within the institution and are involved in timetabling, the review of new degree programmes, and overall quality assurance. When asked about their coaching/mentoring experience during the ED programme, Alex said that they did not have a coach or mentor to work with.

Alex has not been recognised for their teaching, and their colleague admitted that the graduate would probably be embarrassed by such an award, as they do not seek recognition. "You know, it's just a genuine desire to do things in a particular way," the colleague explained. The colleague feels influenced by Alex's approach and mentioned that, during departmental meetings and other collaborative occasions, colleagues often adopt suggestions from Alex.

Overall characteristics

Alex focuses intensely on their responsibilities, ensuring that their teaching remains meaningful, student-centred and reflective, while also managing numerous other duties. At the same time, Alex appears very busy and conscious of time constraints, as reflected in the brevity of their interview, which lasted just 18 minutes compared to the average graduate interview length of 56 minutes. In their institutional context, completing an ED programme is mandatory, and continuous professional development is supported. Perhaps it is the mandatory nature of the programme that contributes to the Alex's sceptical view of the effectiveness of these opportunities, questioning whether they genuinely benefit their teaching practice or merely serve as a facade of institutional support.

The enthusiastic student-centred innovator path

Path summary

Graduates on the Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator path are deeply passionate about teaching. They embrace principles aligned with student-centred learning, and they believe that their syllabi largely reflect these foundational aspects of their approach. However, they sometimes encounter challenges in translating their syllabus into practice, primarily due to the diversity of their students and the need to collaborate with other teachers who have a variety of teaching styles. Their student-

centredness typically falls within the middle to high range, with reflectiveness also rated at middle to high levels. These graduates highly value discussions with colleagues regarding teaching practices. While their classes have been observed at least once, they do not always find feedback from observers to be beneficial. They may or may not maintain a reflective journal but often have experience in presenting or publishing on teaching-related topics.

Typically, graduates on this path experiment with new teaching methods. They teach differently than their colleagues do, although they may be unsure about their colleagues' practices due to a lack of familiarity with them. They appreciate several forms of institutional support for their teaching, yet they also identify one or two significant institutional constraints and recognise limitations imposed by the national educational environment. While they generally feel trusted by their department heads regarding their teaching methods, they sometimes experience ambivalence due to a perceived lack of interest from their superiors. Moreover, these graduates often assume a leadership role in teaching. The colleagues interviewed in this research hold these graduates in high regard, acknowledging their positive influence on others' teaching practices and noting that students appreciate their innovative approaches to education.

Bailey

Characteristics and teaching approach

The second path—that of the Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator—is embodied by Bailey. Bailey holds course leader responsibilities and teaches in undergraduate and graduate programmes. Their classes range from 21-30 students in the current academic year, and they teach both alone and together with colleagues. Bailey was initially engaged by their current institution through an external programme designed to facilitate teaching across multiple institutions. Their enthusiasm for teaching is driven largely by the diversity of students they encounter, which are drawn from various European backgrounds. Bailey finds great satisfaction in the learning opportunities that arise from interacting with students.

Student-centredness

The level of SCL was categorised as high for Bailey. During the interview, Bailey spontaneously referenced five of the six aspects of SCL presented in Chapter 2. Additionally, they mentioned two other principles: allowing students to consult materials in class and encouraging discussions on different views of problems. Bailey believes that their approach to SCL has remained consistent from their early career as a junior academic to their current role.

Bailey indicated that the syllabus submitted for this research largely embodies their teaching principles, although they find it somewhat challenging to implement in class because some students are shy to contribute. The syllabus is appropriately detailed and structured, featuring learning outcomes formulated using verbs that align with Bloom's taxonomy. It incorporates active learning exercises and continuous assessment, outlines assessment criteria, and includes authentic assessments that require students to demonstrate higher-order skills. The syllabus reflects a constructivist view of learning and underscores Bailey's role as a facilitator of learning. However, it does not specify whether students receive feedback on their assignments or indicate that Bailey views students as colleagues of similar power or as individuals with diverse interests and needs.

A colleague who has known Bailey for six years, and with whom they designed and taught a course for two years, holds a high opinion of Bailey's ability to stimulate engagement among students: "Even in a Bachelor's class and since it was a first year mandatory course, all the 28 or 30 students, which

for [this institution] is considered to be a large group of students, ... whenever there was a kind of silence or student not being aware how to initiate or start an exchange or a discussion, [Bailey] just reflected on their own experiences a couple of years ago when [Bailey] was on the other side of the classroom and that was a kind of icebreaker." Overall, an interview with the colleague indicated that Bailey is student-centred.

From discussions with students, the colleague discerns high levels of satisfaction with Bailey's performance and the course overall. As an innovative practice, the colleague highlighted the implementation of gamification in student learning. They explained, "Because the tutorial is the third hour, students become ever more tired. To make these more dynamic elements, taking them out of the main course, [Bailey] introduced a kind of group game into the tutorial. Twice I attended the tutorial as well, and indeed this kind of making it a more relaxed, entertaining, refreshing experience also worked very, very well."

Reflective teaching

The level of reflectiveness for Bailey was categorised as high. When prompted to recall a class that went well, Bailey described a session where the majority of students actively contributed and engaged in debates among themselves. Conversely, Bailey also described an instance of a class that did not go well, noting that no students volunteered to answer questions on the assigned readings. Reflecting on this, Bailey mentioned planning subquestions to encourage student participation in future similar situations, albeit acknowledging that this approach may not always succeed, especially during exam preparation periods when student capacity is limited. In such cases, Bailey considers allocating class time for group discussions and reevaluating the length and difficulty of assigned readings, which are actions that they have already implemented.

Bailey maintains a reflective journal to document participation levels, student contributions in class, copies of emails sent to students, and detailed class overviews. Bailey not only records these notes but also regularly refers to them for insights and improvements. The factors Bailey identified as influencing their practice include class size, student background, and experiences within the classroom. Although Bailey has not yet presented at conferences focused on teaching and learning, they should do so soon at Oxford University, where they have been invited to conduct a teaching workshop. Bailey hopes that their work will be published as a paper.

The colleague's perspective on Bailey's reflectiveness categorised as "to some extent," primarily because Bailey reflects more on their experiences as a student rather than on aspects directly related to their teaching and their current students' learning. The colleague recognised that self-reflection on their own student experience is something they learned from Bailey. The colleague also noted that Bailey shared their reflections with the teacher who would later be teaching the same course.

Use of student and colleague feedback

Bailey employs a systematic approach to gather feedback. They collect written feedback from students after each class in the form of a class overview, which serves as an assessment component. Bailey takes student critiques and suggestions for course improvement seriously, implementing changes in their teaching accordingly.

Additionally, Bailey engages in discussions with colleagues about various aspects of teaching. These conversations cover topics such as student issues, specific teaching scenarios, innovative teaching methods, and mutual review of syllabi. Bailey also uses these discussions to share uncertainties and

confidential matters related to teaching. Although Bailey has not yet been formally observed while teaching, this should happen in the next two weeks.

Influence from context

According to Bailey, their journey towards becoming a higher education teacher was influenced significantly by encounters with two professors who embodied the type of educator they aspired to become. Bailey's previous career in the non-governmental organisation (NGO) sector, where they served as a workshop facilitator and very much enjoyed that role, also played a crucial role in shaping their desire to engage in teaching. These experiences not only supported Bailey's inclination towards SCL but also encouraged them to reflect on their role as an educator.

At their current institution, the prevailing teaching approach among colleagues involves lectures, with assessments typically conducted at the end of courses. However, Bailey's knowledge of this teaching style is based solely on student reports, as they have not directly observed any colleagues teaching or engaged in discussions about teaching practices within their current institution. Instead, they rely on talking to colleagues from their previous institution.

Bailey identified three institutional resources as particularly helpful for their teaching practice: learning platforms, plagiarism software, and a supportive departmental coordinator. However, they view mandatory assessment components as a constraint on their teaching. Given their role in teaching legal courses, Bailey also feels restricted by the national context, where readings often relate to sensitive local issues, necessitating student engagement with this context in their contributions.

In contrast to feeling trusted by the head of department at their previous institution, Bailey expresses ambivalence about being similarly trusted by the current departmental head. They do not currently hold any leadership roles in teaching, nor have they received recognition for their teaching efforts. Nonetheless, according to a colleague, their teaching methods have positively influenced others, including in the handover of a course to a subsequent teacher.

During their ED programme, Bailey did not have the opportunity to work with a coach/mentor. Despite this, they attributed significant value to the programme they had completed. They passionately endorse such programmes, suggesting that their educational foundation greatly contributed to their current capabilities as a teacher. They spontaneously say, "I think failure of young scholars in academia is sometimes because of lack of knowledge, and for us that was never a problem because we had access to this certificate programme for free."

Overall characteristics

Bailey exemplifies a programme graduate who is passionate about teaching, strongly committed to student-centred and reflective teaching practices, and who is constantly seeking opportunities to improve and innovate their classes. Bailey diligently monitors their teaching environments, drawing comparisons with other experiences to inform their approach. Even in less supportive educational settings, Bailey adeptly aligns their teaching with student-centred principles by maintaining connections with like-minded colleagues from other institutions and actively participating in teaching conferences. These efforts sustain Bailey's intrinsic motivation and foster ongoing development as an inspiring, student-centred educator. Reflecting on the significant positive impact of their ED programme experience, Bailey advocates for broader accessibility of such programmes for all HE teachers.

The dedicated teacher frustrated with their institution path

Path summary

ED programme graduates on this path genuinely enjoy teaching and adhere to many of the key student-centred aspects (five to six). However, they find it somehow difficult to put their syllabi into practice—either owing to perceived institutional constraints or the need to remain flexible in their approach. Their teaching is highly student-centred, with a mid-level of reflectiveness, as confirmed by their colleagues. These graduates use student feedback to understand which topics and learning methods resonate with students and to respond to their diverse needs. Although they lack the capacity to regularly keep a reflective journal, they may occasionally jot down notes, particularly to express their emotions after certain classes.

These graduates are intrinsically motivated to innovate in their teaching. They actively present and publish their work on teaching. Despite having only one or two colleagues with whom they share their teaching-related views, they seek out conversations with others and attend teaching workshops and lectures by invited speakers to inspire further change in their practice. While colleagues recognise these individuals as excellent teachers, they note a lack of departmental recognition. Additionally, colleagues have rarely observed them teaching—or the observations have been very limited—and have never spoken to their students, suggesting an environment where teachers work in isolation.

Programme graduates following this path can identify some institutional resources that support their teaching, but they also cite significant institutional constraints, including numerous nonteaching duties, a rigid course structure, prescribed assessment methods, and the institution's narrow view of academic outputs. They also believe that the wider national context imposes limits on their teaching. Furthermore, they are unsure if their head of department trusts them regarding their teaching. They attribute a foundational role to their programme coach or mentor in shaping their thinking about teaching, but they are no longer in contact.

Cameron

Characteristics and teaching approach

The third path is represented by Cameron, who is dedicated to their role but harbors frustration with their current institution. They primarily teach in the undergraduate programme, recently handling up to 40 students. Having earned all their degrees from the same institution, Cameron has a strong academic background rooted there. Cameron's journey through various academic programmes has been driven by their enjoyment of studying and the pursuit of advancing to higher levels of education.

Despite their affinity for teaching, Cameron is concerned with the teaching workload, which they sometimes feel hinders their ability to engage in research pursuits. Cameron makes efforts to employ diverse teaching methods, recognising the various backgrounds and learning styles within the student body. While Cameron acknowledges that not all students' needs can be fully met through these methods, they aim to satisfy at least some of the diverse learning needs present in their classes.

Student-centredness

Cameron exemplifies a highly student-centred approach to teaching. They articulated a comprehensive set of principles guiding their teaching, encompassing all six key student-centred

principles outlined in Chapter 2, along with additional principles such as regularly updating course content and fostering courageous and authentic class discussions. Cameron perceives that their support of students and student-centred instruction is comparable now to when they were more junior in their teaching career.

Cameron believes the syllabus they shared with the research team very much embodies these principles, enhancing student enjoyment of the learning process. Despite Cameron's commitment to student-centred learning, they find implementing the syllabus somewhat challenging, owing to the need for constant adaptation to student needs. Their syllabus is meticulously detailed, featuring learning outcomes framed within Bloom's taxonomy. Active learning tasks are integrated into the syllabus, which explicitly outlines how Cameron provides ongoing feedback on assignments. Assessment is characterised by its continuous nature, authenticity and requirement for students to engage with higher cognitive levels. The syllabus also reflects Cameron's constructivist view of learning, their role as a facilitator of learning, and their approach to students as individuals with diverse interests and needs, as well as colleagues of similar power. Notably, it includes practical details such as the graduate's contact information and office hours, distinguishing it from many other syllabi reviewed in the research. Overall, while the syllabus meets the criteria for a student-centred approach in most respects, it does not explicitly list assessment criteria, which is a minor deviation from ideal student-centred syllabus.

According to a colleague who has known Cameron for more than ten years, this graduate enjoys collaborating with students and encourages them to produce independent work. Cameron often engages students in team projects that involve working together both inside and outside of class. In the classroom, Cameron ensures that students are active participants, setting specific and challenging learning outcomes for each session. Cameron varies their teaching methods regularly and is known to experiment with new approaches.

When assessing student work, such as theses, Cameron maintains high standards and provides rigorous feedback. However, during defence sessions, they are supportive of students. Cameron's colleague perceives them as fair, consistently offering constructive feedback that focuses on solving problems rather than just identifying them and encouraging students to take responsibility for their work. While the colleague has not interacted directly with Cameron's students, they recall that Cameron's student evaluations are consistently positive. On the basis of this colleague's perspective, Cameron's approach to teaching is indeed student-centred.

Reflective teaching

When asked about a teaching situation that either met or fell short of their expectations, Cameron chose to describe an entire course for part-time students. In this course, only a very small number of students demonstrated the ways of thinking about the subject that Cameron aimed for. Despite their disappointment in the students' learning outcomes, which was possibly also a reflection on their own teaching skills, Cameron provided detailed feedback to the underachieving students in the hope that they would learn from it. Cameron attributed this shortfall to the students not reading the assigned preclass material and planned to find ways to motivate them to complete their readings, as they consider this foundational for effective learning in class. This example was categorised as a mid-level reflection because, although Cameron could identify potential reasons for the students' suboptimal learning, they were unable to specify strategies to encourage students to complete their preparation.

Cameron keeps a reflective journal, although not consistently after each class. In the journal, they note issues that made them angry, resulting in a collection of intuitive, emotional notes that are not

well organised and are scattered across multiple diaries. Cameron tends to review these notes as reminders of earlier ideas, many of which are yet to be fully processed. Cameron's primary sources of inspiration for changing their teaching methods include their own internal drive, conversations with others, and staying up to date with daily news. Cameron has already published a paper about their teaching, specifically focusing on student conceptual thinking. Although they have not yet presented at a teaching conference, they are scheduled to do so soon at a prestigious international conference outside Europe.

According to the colleague, Cameron is very careful in planning their teaching. Their willingness to experiment and improve student learning involves thoughtful deliberation of what to retain and what to change, indicating a reflective teaching practice. The colleague noted, "I see there some self-confidence. I feel like they know what they're doing and believe in it. Therefore, they then have no problem talking about what didn't go well and what they did not succeed at."

Use of student and colleague feedback

Cameron says that they try to learn from both critique and praise in their course evaluations. However, they also consider whether student feedback might be influenced by the ideology to which the students subscribe, which may not always provide constructive guidance for improving teaching. Sometimes, students surprise Cameron with their appreciation for the time spent together. They described one final exam when everyone had left except for one group of students who remained in the classroom. "I was in a hurry to get to the car and catch my train, and so I asked them: 'What's up? Why are you sitting here?' They said, 'We do not want to leave. It is so nice here.'"

Cameron discusses teaching with colleagues and believes these discussions are important, although they do not engage in these conversations with departmental colleagues. Cameron noted that departmental colleagues are generally not interested in discussing teaching, not even during departmental meetings. Instead, Cameron prefers talking about teaching methods with colleagues from other units who share similar views on teaching. The graduate has been observed only once, by a colleague from a different university. This observation was not a memorable experience, and no additional observations followed, as there is no standardised practice for teaching observations at their institution.

Influence from context

Cameron identified a formative moment in their teaching career when they became a course leader and gained the freedom to design their own courses. Since then, Cameron has been both the lead teacher and the sole teacher for all their courses. They believe that this leadership role granted them full autonomy to (re)design courses and align their teaching with what they perceive as graduates' needs. Cameron asserts that their teaching approach differs significantly from that of their colleagues, as Cameron's focus is on making students learn rather than just teaching. This philosophy includes avoiding traditional testing, redesigning classes each year to maximise their usefulness for students, and adhering to a constructivist approach to education. Cameron mentioned only two colleagues who share a similar teaching philosophy, both of whom have completed the ED programme. However, they are not in frequent contact, partly because one of these colleagues is currently on leave.

Cameron does not feel supported at all by their department or faculty, valuing only what the university's teaching and learning centre does. They feel significantly constrained by the institution's understanding of academics' roles, where one is either categorised as a researcher with teaching

obligations or a teacher with research obligations, both of which are burdened with excessive administrative duties. With respect to teaching social work, the national context dictates much of the content, leading to occasional struggles against it. Cameron, responsible for internationalisation in their unit, faces a lack of interest and support from colleagues in this area. This graduate does not feel trusted by their manager and characterises the work environment as possibly the worst ever, with the head of the department being more interested in discussing student issues and complaints than addressing teachers' situations.

The ED programme has played a foundational role in Cameron's teaching. It exposed them to diverse views, inspired their pedagogical thinking, and provided positive feedback on their teaching, which they find lacking elsewhere. The programme included a coaching/mentoring element, and Cameron used to communicate regularly with their coach/mentor. However, they are no longer in touch.

The colleague characterised Cameron as someone who stands out for doing things in the way they believe to be right, regardless of whether it is supported or not. Cameron reinforces the colleague's belief in active learning and the importance of taking responsibility for their work. However, departmental members rarely discuss what is important in teaching. The colleague said, "We are such a diverse group of colleagues that I truly don't have the feeling that some kind of organisational culture—or departmental culture—is being created, which would cultivate a specific vision of how to teach or what to do. And I miss that. So, I personally think that makes us inadequate to the task; it limits how much we could inspire each other. And that brings me to the conclusion that how we teach just isn't an important topic of discussion for us."

Although Cameron had been praised once at a departmental meeting for positive student evaluations, the colleague observes that there is weak recognition of teaching in the department and states: "Cameron strives to teach in the best way they believe possible, regardless of how much effort it costs and that no one truly recognises it. However, maybe I am wrong, and someone does appreciate it."

Overall characteristics

Cameron puts significant effort into preparing, conducting, and adjusting classes. Their own experience as a student and a teacher, along with the ED programme from which they graduated, has equipped them with a strong sense of responsibility for student learning. They aim to meet students' needs and prepare them well for their future profession. Cameron's teaching is student-centred, and they regularly trial new teaching methods, reflecting to some extent on what goes well and what goes wrong. Students seem to value learning in Cameron's courses. Nevertheless, Cameron's work and dedication are not institutionally recognised, and they rarely find allies in their department to support them in their mission. Cameron is very critical of the institution for not prioritising the teachers, teaching, and student learning.

The converted teacher-centred scholar path

Path summary

The last path described in this work—that of a Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar—is embodied by only one programme graduate. The path and cameo summaries are therefore the same.

Dylan

Characteristic and teaching approach

Dylan, who earned their PhD from the same institution where they currently teach, works part-time as an academic teacher while primarily serving as a researcher in another country. Dylan teaches just one course, academic writing, which is intended to prepare students for their bachelor's theses, albeit to a large group of three to four hundred undergraduates. Their responsibilities include both lecturing and facilitating seminars, as well as grading, although another individual leads the course overall. Dylan finds little enjoyment in teaching. While their level of reflection is moderate, their teaching approach remains largely teacher-centred. Dylan places little value on pedagogical conversations with colleagues and does not recall feedback from a teaching observer. They do not engage in presenting or publishing about teaching. Despite feeling trusted by the head of their department, Dylan lacks colleagues who share their approach to teaching and believes that there are no institutional resources available to support their teaching.

Teacher-centredness

Dylan's teaching approach was categorised as lacking manifestation of student-centredness, although they referred to three of the six main principles of SCL during their interview. These principles included making efforts to explain things in an accessible way (#1), helping students understand (#2), and using discussions or Socratic teaching as a method (#4). Shortly after undertaking the ED programme, they found it easier to teach in a student-centred manner than they do now. Previously, they had implemented SCL methods that they no longer use. "Teaching or learning something is not possible without students' internal motivation. If it's not there, I think it's a lost battle," Dylan says. Dylan believes that they have become a better teacher because they now understand what they teach in a way that they did not before.

The syllabus shared by Dylan reflects very few of the principles they consider important for teaching, and they struggle to implement it effectively, particularly because some students seem disengaged and Dylan does not see it as their role to motivate them. The syllabus is extremely brief and lacks essential information. It includes learning outcomes formulated using verbs that address some levels from Bloom's taxonomy. Active learning is planned, although it appears that this might be for sessions taught by other teachers. The syllabus mentions that students receive some feedback on their work. Assessment occurs only at the end of the course and does not include authentic assignments or the expectation for students to demonstrate higher-order skills. There are no indications that teachers view students as colleagues of similar power, recognise their diverse interests and needs, adopt a constructivist view of learning, or view their role as facilitating student learning. Furthermore, the syllabus does not list assessment criteria.

Dylan could not identify any colleague familiar with their teaching; thus, the information presented here is solely based on the survey, interview with Dylan and their syllabus. Dylan's teacher-centred approach contrasts significantly with the materials they submitted as part of their ED programme, as evaluated in a previous study (Pleschová, 2012). Almost twelve years ago, Dylan's final report on innovating student learning was categorised as highly student centred. Similarly, their draft report before receiving comments from their coach/mentor reflected a high-level student-centred approach. Their revised statement of teaching philosophy was judged to be mid-level SCL, as was the teaching philosophy they submitted as part of their application for the programme. Notably, that time, Dylan was selected by their coach/mentor as an example of one of the highest-achieving programme participants.

Reflective teaching

Dylan highlighted two memorable moments of their teaching: when students asked insightful questions and when they refrained from asking any questions at all. From these interactions, Dylan concludes that their lecture successfully stimulated interest and deep thinking. If the absence of questions or the nature of the questions indicates misunderstanding, Dylan infers that students likely lacked some foundational knowledge. In such cases, Dylan adjusts their teaching to ensure that foundational knowledge is covered in the following sessions. Additionally, Dylan experiments with explanatory methods, including the use of slides to pose questions to the students.

Dylan's reflections primarily concern content and methods of conveying information, focusing on what students know before starting the class session and what they are supposed to learn, without addressing teaching methods other than lectures or student learning strategies. This reflection was categorised as mid-level. When Dylan's current level of reflection is compared with their reflections at the end of the ED programme, the depth of their reflection has diminished. In their final and draft reports on innovating student learning, reflection was categorised as high, though this was not the case of another programme assignment, teaching philosophy, which was assessed as mid-level for reflection (Pleschová, 2012).

Use of student and colleague feedback

Dylan acknowledges student feedback in a minimalistic way. They rely on summaries rather than reading full student feedback forms. Dylan feels somewhat surprised that students had given positive feedback on their course last year—Dylan thought they had not accomplished the desired outcomes. Dylan felt disinterested in the course and believed that students must have sensed it. "Somehow, they thought it was fine, but I just don't know why. Maybe it's because some other classes are worse," Dylan posits. Previously, Dylan collected informal feedback during class sessions but discontinued this because of time constraints. Instead, they now gauge student engagement by monitoring questions asked during class.

Dylan engages in discussions about teaching with colleagues who co-teach their course. They focus primarily on assessing student knowledge levels, strategies to address learning outcome failures that are evident from student bachelor's exam performance, and ways to enhance student outcomes. They voice the concern that their difficulty to engage the current cohort of students could negatively affect the programme's ability to attract future students and that they may have no students to teach in the future. Despite these discussions, Dylan does not assign significant importance to them. A number of years ago, Dylan was observed by a colleague, but they do not recall the specifics of that observation.

A significant event that profoundly influenced Dylan's approach to teaching was watching online lectures by esteemed science educators such as Paul Meehl and Richard Feynman. These experiences led them to appreciate the intellectual rigor required in teaching. Dylan reported that even a traditional lecture format can be engaging if the knowledge presented academically stimulates the audience. This perspective shifted their teaching focus away from being student-centred. Active learning methods, such as those that invite students to move around the classroom, cannot achieve that aim, as Dylan had previously experienced as a student. Watching these lectures clearly made this graduate less student-centred, but at the same time they inspired some reflection on the effectiveness of various teaching methods.

Influence from context

Dylan admits teaching differently from colleagues who employ active learning methods. Dylan does not list any institutional resources that aid their teaching, and they identify large student numbers as a significant constraint. Although Dylan envisions taking another approach while teaching these students, such as dividing them into smaller groups, lack of time prevents them from doing so. Dylan perceives the wider national context as having minimal impact on their teaching. Furthermore, Dylan does not hold any leadership roles in teaching within their institution.

Dylan feels trusted by their superior, as they find the head of department to be supportive and appreciative of their efforts in teaching. During their ED programme, they worked closely with a coach/mentor who significantly influenced their pedagogical approach. Dylan still values and remembers the suggestions and principles imparted during their collaboration. However, they no longer maintain contact.

Overall characteristics

Dylan's path describes a converted teacher-centred scholar whose context does not allow them to implement the principles learned in the ED programme and now mostly rejects them in their teaching philosophy. Dylan identifies primarily as a scholar and aims to instil scholarly thinking in their students. Influenced by famous lecturers, Dylan strives to create similarly stimulating lectures, and frontal lecturing remains their primary teaching method. This approach is directly influenced by their institution's requirement to handle large student numbers without sufficient resources, support or encouragement to adopt alternative teaching methods.

Evaluation of the four paths

Among the four paths (Pragmatic Teacher, Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator, Dedicated Teacher Frustrated with Their Institution, and Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar), the Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator aligns most closely with the goals of ED programmes. Individuals in this group actively practice SCL, engage in reflection and trial new teaching methods, as seen in Bailey's example. They are able to maintain these practices even in environments where student-centred learning is not prevalent because of ongoing contact with colleagues, sometimes from previous universities where they either completed the ED programme and/or had found good teaching practices to be reinforced.

The Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator path is represented by two-thirds of graduates, with the remaining graduates falling into one of the other categories. For example, we see pragmatism reflected in Alex's cameo, whose classes align with SCL and who engages in reflective teaching but who feels pressured by work and sceptical of the institution's investment in teaching. If teachers constantly perceive their time to be scarce, they can hardly devote it to more complex forms of reflection such as journal writing, teaching innovation and dissemination.

Similarly, the Dedicated Teacher Frustrated with Their Institution path characterises constant struggle against challenges within their context: colleagues show disinterest in discussing teaching matters, the departmental head is unsupportive, their former coach/mentor is unavailable, and there is a very low recognition for teaching efforts. These factors collectively threaten to erode the ability to maintain a student-centred approach, engage in reflective practices regarding student learning or innovate classes.

Finally, the graduate on the Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar path, while citing inspiration from the online lectures of prominent scholars for their teaching methods, ultimately shifts away from

student-centred approaches due to contextual constraints and a lack of institutional support. Teaching large classes of three to four hundred students without institutional backing makes it exceedingly difficult to implement active learning and other student-centred practices. Although their ED programme included a workshop on teaching large classes, it did not adequately prepare them for the extreme challenges they faced in their current teaching environment.

When designing this research, the expectation was to uncover specific archetypes of ED programme graduates. However, data analysis has shown that it is more appropriate to discuss paths or practices rather than rigid graduate types. Notably, we found that the paths followed by graduates are not determined by their gender; the institution where they completed the programme; their discipline (whether they work in natural sciences, engineering, medicine, or humanities and social sciences); or the compulsory or voluntary nature of their educational development programme. Like the concepts of deep and surface approaches to teaching (Marton and Säljö, 1976a, b), the context in which graduates teach significantly shapes how teaching is conceptualised and enacted. Graduates and their teaching practices do not seem static but evolving depending on how they perceive and interact with their context.

These four paths are similar to the trajectories reported by Nevgi (2013) in a longitudinal study of three teachers from the University of Helsinki. The Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar path parallels that of a traditional teacher who focuses on transmitting information and believes that university teachers are primarily subject-matter experts, leaving it up to students to learn. In Nevgi's study, the ED programme provided only some teaching tips, and the teacher's practice soon reverted to being teacher-centred. In contrast, the Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar in this research was initially highly student-centred after completing the programme but became teacher-centred over time. The Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator path also shares similarities with the trajectory of a teacher motivated to develop as a student-centred practitioner. However, unlike the study from Helsinki, this research did not reveal a graduate who shifted from being teacher-centred to being student-centred and remained so (Nevgi, 2013).

References

Marton, Ference and Säljö, Roger (1976a) On qualitative differences in learning — 1: Outcome and process. British Journal of Educational Psychology 46: 4-11: 10.1111/J.2044-8279.1976.TB02980.X

Marton, Ference and Säljö, Roger (1976b) On qualitative differences in learning — 2: Outcome as a function of the learner's conception of the task. British Journal of Educational Psychology 46: 115-127: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02304.x

Nevgi, Anne (2013) The influence of the research philosophy and pedagogical management decisions of the University of Helsinki on university teaching. A longitudinal study. In Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela (Eds.) Teacher development in higher education. Existing programs, program impact and future trends. New York and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 170-190

Pleschová, Gabriela (2012) Coaching in teacher development. Case study of a teacher development program in Slovakia. Dissertation submitted in part-fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Science in Education (Higher Education) degree. Oxford University

Chapter 8. Student-centred and reflective teaching of ED programme graduates five and more years on

Studies investigating the teaching practices of graduates from educational development (ED) programmes years after completing the programme are relatively scarce. The limited research available makes it challenging to understand how graduates perceive teaching and what they do in relation to their participation in the ED programme. This difficulty largely arises because many studies report that the primary outcomes of their ED programmes include fostering more student-centred and reflective teaching practices, however, when the effects are evaluated, these specific outcomes often do not form the central focus of the study (Stes, Clement and van Petegem, 2007; Gale, 2011; Stewart, 2014). For research that has such a focus, the designs and methods used to research programme outcomes are so diverse that meaningful cross-case comparisons and generalisations are rare. Another challenge lies in defining what constitutes long-term impact. While some studies consider two years to represent a long-term effect (Stes, Clement and van Petegem, 2007), others argue that the long-term programme impact can only be assessed after five years or more (Cannon and Hore, 1997; Gale, 2011; Nevgi, 2012).

Some studies report long-term outcomes, but their samples often include a mix of graduates who completed the programme less than a year ago and those who finished between one and five years prior (Charlier and Lambert, 2019), or between two and six years after the programme (Giertz, 1996). Another challenge stems from comparing results between programmes of varying lengths, such as a three-week programme (Giertz, 1996) and a twenty-day programme (Cannon and Hore, 1997), with those of more standardised certificate programmes (Gale, 2011). Additionally, while valuable, some research presents case studies focused on a very small number of graduates (three), rather than providing results that reflect the overall programme impact (Nevgi, 2012). Most existing studies also rely heavily on self-reported outcomes (Stes, Clement and van Petegem, 2007; Gale, 2011; Stewart, 2014; Nevgi, 2012; Charlier and Lambert, 2019). Even when data are collected from other sources, such as directors of study, it is often unclear what these individuals based their judgments on (Giertz, 1996).

To address these gaps, the research team designed a study to investigate the long-term outcomes of programmes for higher education teachers offered by four different institutions. This study specifically focuses on programme graduates' conceptions and behaviours related to student-centredness and reflective teaching, which are shared aims across these ED programmes. It seeks to answer three key research questions:

1. Understanding of student-centred learning: How do programme graduates understand and interpret student-centred learning five and more years after completing the educational development programme?
2. Reflective teaching practices: Do programme graduates continue to reflect on their teaching five and more years after graduation? If so, how can their reflections be categorised and described? Do they take action based on these reflections?
3. Contextual influences: What role do graduates' institutions and the broader national context play in shaping their ability to implement student-centred and reflective teaching practices? What are the supportive and constraining factors?

This chapter begins by summarising existing literature on the effects of ED programmes, particularly in relation to student-centredness, reflective teaching, and the impact of institutional contexts on teaching practices. It then presents the findings from this research, integrating these with previous

studies where relevant, i.e., on the topic of contextual influences. The chapter concludes by offering recommendations to higher education institutions on how to maximise positive learning and teaching outcomes from ED programmes.

What literature reveals about long-term results from ED

Literature shows that teaching is extremely important for academic teachers, especially for the early career academics. For example, what early career academics report as critical incidents for their career path over the first five years overwhelmingly relates to students, teaching, and the management of teaching. These teachers moreover say that ED programme they had undergone had a significant and positive influence on them (Gale, 2011), a finding that resonates also in other studies (Stes, Clement, and Van Petegem, 2007). Deeper understanding of teaching and learning and new teaching skills are listed as major long-term programme outcomes (Giertz, 1996), together with enhanced self-confidence (Giertz, 1996, Stewart, 2014), as well as facilitating contact with colleagues from other departments and willingness to further develop as teachers (Stewart, 2014). Aside from these, literature also mentions increased student-centredness and high levels of reflectivity among notable long-term programme results (Stewart, 2014, Charlier and Lambert, 2019), although for research conducted by Stewart reflectivity mostly concerned reflecting back on the value of the programme.

However, some studies also highlight a lack of sustained outcomes over the longer term. Stewart (2014) reports that for four of the thirteen programme graduates, the programme eventually faded in significance and became less relevant to their current teaching practices. One graduate expressed regret over the limited opportunities to discuss teaching, while another voiced concerns about the risk of reverting to ineffective teaching methods. Similarly, Cannon and Hore (1997) were disappointed that twelve years after their programme, it had not achieved its desired impact—namely, the continued professional development of its graduates. It is worth noting that, like one of the programmes explored in the present study (specifically the one offered by the Slovak Academy of Sciences), this was a one-off programme delivered by a team of international educational developers in a context new to educational development.

Reflection allows teachers to draw upon and deepen their existing knowledge, thereby broadening their understanding and enhancing their teaching practice (McAlpine et al., 2004). With more teaching experience and consistent reflection, teachers are expected to improve their reflective skills. Stes, Clement, and Van Petegem (2007) found that increased reflective practice leads to significant changes in higher education teaching. However, productive reflection requires both time and the mental space to engage with the process. While teaching environments fifteen years ago may have been more conducive to reflection, contemporary pressures—such as higher student enrolment, the demand for publishing in prestigious journals, the expectation to teach both online and in person, and the need to juggle various other roles—can make it much harder for programme graduates to find the capacity to reflect. In such circumstances, coaches and mentors can play a crucial role in encouraging and sustaining reflective practice (Rogers, 2001).

Long-term outcomes are shaped not only by the educational development programme itself but also by external factors, particularly the graduates' working environment (Stes, Clement, and Van Petegem, 2007). A review of thirteen studies on contextual barriers that hinder the application of knowledge gained from ED programmes to teaching practice highlighted workload pressures and institutional demands prioritising research, administration, and service activities over teaching as the most commonly reported challenges (Pleschová and Simon, 2021; see also Giertz, 1996). These

findings suggest that when examining long-term outcomes of educational development, it is essential to consider how the context interferes with graduates' teaching. The influence of institutional and external factors determines whether the knowledge and skills gained from ED programmes can be effectively applied in practice.

Student-centred and reflective teaching of programme graduates from this research five and more years on

This chapter reports on the findings for each research question based on the analysis of data from survey, interviews and syllabi collected from 19 graduates of ED programmes at Central European University (CEU), Masaryk University, Slovak Academy of Sciences, and Nottingham Trent University. Additionally, insights were gathered from 15 colleagues of these graduates. As previously described, the graduates and their colleagues represented a diverse array of disciplines, including biology, education, engineering, linguistics, law, medicine, philosophy, political science, sociology, and social work, and encompassed both male and female academics. More details about research methods are presented in Chapter 2.

Understanding of student-centred learning

To repeat from Chapter 2, this study defined teaching as student-centred when programme graduate's focus was on how their students learn rather than on their own performance in all activities related to teaching including course and class design, class facilitation and student assessment (the later manifested, for example, through the employment of continuous assessment, authentic assessment or assessment that allows manifesting cognitively complex learning outcomes), moreover when students' choice in their education was facilitated, they were encouraged to do more than the teacher, students and the graduate were seen as equals in terms of power and the graduate paid attention to who their students are and how they learn.

The findings from the data analysis indicate that the graduates of ED programmes approach teaching in a student-centred way. As visualised in Table 1, the level of student-centred learning (SCL) among graduates, as coded from their interview transcripts, was high for 14 individuals (74%), mid-level for four individuals (21%), and no for one graduate (G5S, 5%). None of the graduates were judged to have a low level of student-centredness. Based on what colleagues said about the programme graduates, teaching of nine graduates (60%) was assessed as student-centred, while teaching of six graduates (40%) student-centred to some extent. None's practice was judged to be teacher-centred based on the colleague interviews. This may be because the graduate deemed teacher-centred from the interview did not have a colleague who would be knowledgeable about their teaching.[4]

Table 1. Teaching of programme graduates as judged from the interviews

Interviews with graduates			Interviews with colleagues		
Code	# of interviews	%	Code	# of interviews	%
High-level SCL	14	74%	Student-centred	9	60%
Mid-level SCL	4	21%	Student-centred to some extent	6	40%

[4] In case of other three teachers from this sample where the interview with their colleague did not take place (G2S, G1C, G5C), this was because the colleague was not available to talk, rather than that the graduate could not name anyone insightful into their teaching (For more details see Chapter 2).

Low-level SCL	0	0%			
Teaching-centred	1	5%	Not student-centred	0	0%
Total	19	100%	Total	15	100%

Typically, colleagues provided several reasons why they believed the programme graduates' perceptions and practices aligned with SCL principles. They mentioned that graduates had implemented active learning in their courses, attended to individual student needs, cared about students, provided individual consultations, put considerable effort into preparing classes, viewed students as colleagues, and embraced the constructivist concept. These examples were frequently cited across various interviews. Colleagues learned about these practices through co-teaching, discussions with graduates about teaching, talking to the graduates' students, reading student evaluations, or observing the graduates' teaching. Additionally, nine colleagues explicitly mentioned that students commend the graduates' teaching.

Interestingly, colleagues from Masaryk University and Central European University consistently held very high opinions of the programme graduates, with the coding of their interviews consistently resulting in a "graduate is student-centred" classification. In contrast, colleagues from Nottingham Trent University (NTU) described the programme graduates in a manner that was coded as "student-centred to some extent." For the graduates from the Slovak Academy of Sciences, two colleagues indicated that graduates were student-centred to some extent, while one colleague had a clear positive view of the graduate's student-centredness.

When asked about the principles central to their teaching, six graduates spontaneously mentioned all six aspects presented above (see Table 2.). Seven graduates described five aspects, three discussed four aspects, and two mentioned three aspects. The participant categorised as demonstrating no SCL at least implicitly referred to two aspects. The graduates were not primed that the research focused on SCL or reflectiveness in teaching.

Table 2. Student-centred aspects mentioned by ED programme graduates as principal for their teaching

Number of SCL aspects	Number of graduates referring to these aspects
6 aspects	6
5 aspects	7
4 aspects	3
3 aspects	2
2 aspects	1
Total number of graduates	19

In addition to these six aspects of student-centred learning, graduates listed a number of other SCL-aligned principles they follow in their teaching. These included creating a classroom climate that

encourages student contribution, supporting student interaction, teaching in a way that students enjoy learning, innovating teaching methods to fit student needs, and showing care for students. The average number of aspects mentioned—almost six without being prompted—indicates that the graduates have embraced SCL in its full complexity. Furthermore, the graduates expressed high levels of satisfaction with their teaching roles at their current institutions: 14 said they enjoyed teaching very much, four enjoyed teaching quite a lot, and only one (G5S) enjoyed teaching very little. This suggests a possible connection between student-centred teaching practices and teachers' satisfaction with their teaching roles.

Programme graduates' syllabi largely confirmed the findings related to student-centred learning, although the evidence of such practices was somewhat less clear from the syllabi alone (see Table 3.). Of the six key aspects previously identified, active learning methods were reflected in the majority of graduates' syllabi, with 16 out of 19 indicating this approach. Twelve syllabi incorporated authentic assessments or assessments that required students to demonstrate higher-order thinking skills. Eleven syllabi showed the use of continuous assessment, while ten suggested that the graduate viewed their role as facilitating student learning rather than delivering content. However, fewer syllabi aligned with other student-centred aspects. Seven reflected a constructivist view of learning, and just four indicated that the graduate regarded students as colleagues with comparable levels of influence.

The syllabi were also reviewed for adherence to other SCL criteria. Most were several pages long (13) and included learning outcomes (17), with 15 using Bloom's taxonomy to formulate those outcomes. On the other hand, only four syllabi demonstrated that students would receive feedback on their assignments. Similarly, only two reflected an awareness of students as individuals with diverse interests or needs, and no more than two included clear assessment criteria.

Notably, two syllabi (from G1S and G4M) did not appear to be student-centred, as they corresponded with none of the six key aspects of SCL and included only one and three additional aspects, respectively. In seven cases, coders identified at least four out of the six key SCL aspects, but this was observed in only one case when considering the additional criteria. This analysis highlights that while many programme graduates embrace SCL, there are gaps in how these practices are formalised in their syllabi.

Table 3. Student-centredness of programme graduates as judged from the syllabi

	# of syllabi			# of syllabi	
Six key aspects of SCL	Yes	No	Additional aspects of SCL	Yes	No
Active learning exercises are planned for students in this course	16	3	The syllabus contains learning outcomes	17	2
Assessment is authentic or the one that asks students to demonstrate higher-order skills	12	7	Learning outcomes are formulated using the verbs from the Bloom's taxonomy	15	4
Assessment is to be continuous	11	8	The syllabus is extremely short and some essential information is missing	6	13

Syllabus suggests that teacher understands their role as a facilitator of student learning	10	9	The syllabus describes that students receive feedback on their assignments	4	15
Syllabus suggests that teacher has constructivist view of learning	7	12	Syllabus suggests that teacher sees students as individuals with diverse interests and/or needs	2	17
Syllabus indicates that teacher takes students as colleagues of similar power	4	15	Assessment criteria are listed	2	17

This discrepancy may be explained by institutional mandates dictating how much and what to include in the syllabus. Programme graduates repeatedly mentioned that institutional requirements constrained them when writing their syllabi. In many cases, the coders initially marked criteria as "unclear," but later agreed that if a criterion was not demonstrated in the syllabus, it should be coded as "no presence." (For more on coding, see Chapter 2.) The influence of institutional expectations was especially evident when coding the additional criteria, as the codes were highly similar for syllabi from the same institution.

These findings on student-centredness were crosschecked with what graduates from ED programmes that included a coaching/mentoring component said. As displayed in Table 4., this group of graduates typically attributed significant value to the programme for impacting their teaching-related perceptions. Eight programme graduates recognised the formative role of the coach/mentor in shaping their thinking about teaching (67%), while three did not remember who their coach/mentor was (25%), and one admitted that the coach/mentor had some influence, but a departmental colleague had a bigger role (8%).

Table 4. Programme graduates' view of their coach/mentor influencing their thinking-related teaching

Response	# of responses	%
Coach/mentor shaping graduate's thinking about teaching	8	67%
Had some role but departmental colleague had a bigger role	1	8%
Does not remember who the coach/mentor was	3	25%
No coaching/mentoring element (CEU)	5	
Did not have a coach/mentor (G3N)	1	
Did not comment on the coach role in shaping thinking	1	
Those with coaching/mentoring experience and describing it	12	100%
Total number of programme graduates	19	

Programme graduates were also asked whether it was harder or easier for them to teach in a SCL way shortly after the programme or now. Graduates' views are presented in Table 5. Seven

individuals (37%) found it harder initially, as they had been taught using a teacher-centred approach and needed to develop competence and confidence in a completely different teaching method. Six graduates (36%) thought it was about the same, noting that they have simply gained more teaching experience over time. Three graduates (15%) found it easier earlier in their careers: one felt connected to the student generation and understood how they learn; another attributed their view to the rapid progress in teaching development due to initially small skills; the third used some SCL methods initially but no longer uses them (G5S). One graduate believed it was now easier in some aspects and harder in others. Initially, this graduate lacked the power and opportunities to effect change but had more capacity and enthusiasm to drive it. Now, they have the authority to change teaching in their courses but no longer feel enthusiastic about it. The views of two informants were difficult to discern.

Table 5. Programme graduates' views comparing the difficulty/easiness to teach in a student-centred way shortly after the ED programme and now

Response	# of responses	%
It was harder to teach in a student-centred way just after taking the programme	7	37%
It was about the same then as now	6	32%
It was easier to teach in a student-centred way just after taking the programme	3	16%
It is easier to teach in a student-centred way in some aspects now and harder in others	1	5%
Unclear	2	11%
Total	19	100%

Reflective teaching practices

As detailed in Chapter 2, reflective teaching has been understood in this research as a practice when ED programme graduate considers the results of their own teaching and can provide evidence for their claims, moreover they can identify positive and problematic aspects of own teaching, see connections between their research and teaching and has a vision of how they can improve teaching in the future.

As evident from the Table 6., five and more years since completing the ED programme, graduates are reflective about their teaching and student learning. Based on the graduate interviews, the level of reflectiveness about teaching was coded as high for 8 graduates, mid for 8 graduates, mid-low for one graduate, and low for 2 individuals. Findings from the interviews with colleagues supported what the programme graduates said. Colleagues' descriptions of graduates' teaching practices indicated that 8 graduates (53%) were reflective and 7 individuals (47%) were reflective to some extent.

Table 6. Teaching practice of programme graduates in terms of reflectiveness as judged from the interviews

Interviews with graduates			Interviews with colleagues		
Response	# of interviews	%	Response	# of interviews	%
High-level	8	42%	Reflective	8	53%
Mid-level	8	42%	Reflective to some extent	7	47%
Mid-low level	1	5%			
Low-level	2	0%			
No	0	0%	Is not reflective	0	0%
Total number of graduates	19	100%	Total number of colleagues	15	100%

Graduates demonstrated reflectiveness through various means, such as identifying reasons why students struggled in their learning, suggesting changes to the design of assignments, thinking of different ways to facilitate student learning, and attempting to foster more connections between what students learn in class and what they experience in their lives. Only one graduate referred to making a change in student assessment.

Some examples of how colleagues described graduates' reflective practices, without being primed that the research was about reflective practice, included the following: "We often tell each other, 'What do you think about this particular group of students and which exercise will work better for them?'" said one colleague (C1N). Another (C4C) characterised the graduate as "an incredibly thoughtful and reflective teacher" who spends almost all of their time thinking about teaching." A different colleague (C4M) commented: "[They] try to really think these things through, how it could work, how it could be done...they really are just so careful."

Similarly to student-centredness, colleagues from Masaryk University tended to judge the programme graduates most highly for reflectiveness: all five colleagues indicated in their interviews that graduates were reflective. Colleagues from the other three institutions were more reserved: only one colleague from each institution viewed the graduate as reflective, while three and two respectively suggested the graduates were reflective to some extent. These results therefore need to be interpreted with some caution because of a potential bias from MUNI colleagues in perceiving their graduates' teaching-related thinking and practice compared to colleagues from other institutions included in this research.

Literature recognises coaches and mentors as important for helping higher education teachers to reflect (Rogers, 2001). This research found a positive association between the programme graduates' level of reflection and the role attributed to the coach/mentor in shaping their thinking about teaching. In nine cases, either high levels of reflection corresponded with an influential role of the coach, or low reflection was linked to a lack of coaching or the graduate not remembering their coach. These nine cases also included the graduate who valued their coach/mentor but felt their colleague had a greater impact on their teaching. A mid-level of reflectiveness was associated three

times with the coach's/mentor's role in changing thinking about teaching and four times with no coaching/mentoring.

These results for mid-level reflection, however, may have been influenced by the fact that some graduates only chose examples of successful classes where it was difficult to manifest a high level of reflectiveness.[5] In two cases, graduates were coded high for reflection but reported having no coach/ mentor during the programme, indicating that some graduates might be strong in their reflective practice even without a coach/mentor.

The present study also set out to explore if programme graduates take any action based on the results of their reflection. Most graduates (12) had plans for future similar situations. For example, they mentioned gently encouraging students to talk to peers they do not usually converse with to foster interaction between international and home students during class or including more examples to make the class assignment less abstract for students. One out of these twelve teachers, however, did not primarily think about student needs but rather considered redesigning the class session based on her own interest and another one wanted to motivate students to do pre-class reading but could not name any way how they want to do that.

In some cases, however, reflection tended to slide into generalities and abstract thoughts without offering concrete examples. The graduate who described no fewer than four measures they had already undertaken to improve student learning in the next edition of the course was quite an exceptional case. These measures included making lectures interactive, introducing authentic assessment tasks, and asking students to write three shorter assignments connected to session topics instead of one extensive paper.

Contextual influences

Influence from the graduates' context stood out strongly in this study. Overload from numerous responsibilities outside of teaching was reported as the major constraining factor from the institution, and was mentioned by seven graduates. One graduate explicitly linked overwork to a lack of time for reflecting on and changing their teaching. Other frequently mentioned determinants included inappropriate classroom architecture including seating arrangements and classroom equipment (4 mentions), and institutionally determined ways of assessment (3 mentions). Additional pressures were felt due to stress from potentially poor student evaluations, limited funding for professional development, the need to secure external grants for course enhancement, and small institutional recognition of good teaching. Further perceived constraints included some colleagues not performing their duties properly, programmes failing to help students become proficient in English, institutions not adapting mandatory course selections to the changing job market, and high student numbers. Each of these factors was mentioned by only one graduate. Notably, three graduates did not name any constraining factors.

Almost all graduates (17) could identify institutional resources that assist them in teaching. The most frequently mentioned resource was the opportunities for further development as teachers offered by the ED unit, with topics such as using technology in teaching or preventing burnout (10 mentions).

[5] For example, one programme graduate (G4C) mentioned a class on conspiracy theories where students were to guess a rule for composing a sequence of words. The graduate described that it took students a long time to come up with the correct rule, though it was a simple one. This activity was judged as very effective in helping students learn that people often believe in conspiracy theories not because they have pathological thinking but due to cognitive bias. However, after describing the activity, the graduate did not reflect on how to further improve it in the future.

Graduates also referred to the availability of information technologies—both hardware and software—for use in teaching (6 mentions), provision of grants to develop teaching (3 mentions), funding for student field trips and trips that can be used to learn about teaching, supportive departmental heads, opportunities to have classes observed, and options to book classrooms with specific type of seating (2 mentions each). One respondent (G1M) was particularly enthusiastic about the institution providing grants for course development, considering it a great incentive to design new courses. Two graduates (see Chapter 7 for their profiles) could not identify any positive factors at the institutional level. The third one appreciated the opportunity to be observed while teaching and the circulation of student feedback forms but dismissed everything else as "useless."

Aside from their institution, twelve graduates felt that the wider national context also impacted their teaching, citing examples such as contemporary political situation framing in-class discussions, country-wide discourse about the graduates' skills influencing course learning outcomes, and governmental policies stipulating the number of theory-based and practice-based courses or student numbers in classes. In contrast, seven graduates denied that the wider national context had any role in their teaching.

Discussion

Student-centred learning

This study found that higher education teachers who graduated from an ED programme refer to active learning more frequently than to any other aspect of student-centred learning. This result is in line with findings from studies that examined English-language teachers' perceptions of SCL (Bremner, 2022), definitions of SCL in literature (Bremner, 2021) and views of SCL among students and teachers from a university in the Philippines (Trinidad, 2020). Unlike previous studies, this research demonstrates that, in the long term, ED programme graduates possess a relatively nuanced understanding of SCL, showing potential for a more thorough application of the concept in their course syllabi.

Reflective teaching

According to McAlpine et al. (2004), reflection enables teachers to access and build upon their prior knowledge, thereby expanding their understanding and improving their teaching practice. This implies that with increased teaching experience and regular reflection, teachers should develop greater skill in reflective practice. Findings from Stes, Clement, and Van Petegem (2007) suggest a feedback loop where greater teaching experience facilitates more effective reflection, and improved reflection, in turn, enhances teaching practice. This study shows that while all programme graduates demonstrate reflectiveness also over time, the reflective ability has not been uniform across all individuals.

Past research indicates that immediately after completing an ED programme, graduates tend to find it more challenging to demonstrate reflective practice compared to student-centredness (Pleschová and McAlpine, 2016). This study finds that five and more years after the programme, this pattern persists, as signalled by the balance of high and moderate ratings for student-centredness and reflective teaching. Therefore, continued support in these areas could be crucial for sustained growth in these teaching capacities.

Contextual factors

Existing literature underscores workload as a prime contextual factor that limits academic teachers from investing into enhancement of their teaching (Pleschová and Simon, 2021; see also Giertz,

1996; Cannon and Hore, 2007). This theme also featured in current research. Graduates consistently reported feeling not only pressured by research demands but also burdened by administrative and other responsibilities. Interestingly, programme graduates from this research mostly do not equal workload with having too many students enrolling their courses nor their complained about student resistance to student-centred approaches, though these stand out from literature review (Pleschová and Simon, 2021). In this research, only one graduate cited high student numbers as a constraint (GS5), and another mentioned students' passive attitudes (G3M). This seems to suggest that the ED programmes examined here provided graduates with strategies to effectively manage large class sizes and address initial student passivity.

Additionally, while the literature review identified negative attitudes from departmental colleagues and institutional leaders among major institutional barriers (Pleschová and Simon, 2021), this issue was raised by only one informant in this study (G3M). It seems that, with increased teaching experience, programme graduates are better equipped to navigate relationships with colleagues and mitigate the impact of unsupportive peers and superiors. Conversely, this study observed notable dissatisfaction with teaching spaces, an issue not prominently discussed in other research (e.g., Pleschová and Simon, 2021). Given the substantial investments in university campuses over the past fifteen years across all four institutions included in this study, it is surprising to see disappointment with the teaching spaces. This finding indicates that the investments might not have adequately met the requirements for environments conducive to student-centred teaching practices, such as classrooms designed for active learning and group work, which promote trustful and non-hierarchical relationships.

While a previous study into doctoral students' perceptions of an ED programme identified institutional teaching traditions as a major barrier to implementing student-centred learning (Pleschová and Simon, 2021), in this research programme graduates did not cite this factor. Possibly, because the graduates in the current study were in senior roles with decision-making authority over their courses, they had accumulated sufficient teaching experience to confidently diverge from traditional teaching methods.

In contrast to a different study (Stes, Clement and Van Petegem, 2007) that highlighted enthusiastic reactions from colleagues and students, collaboration with fellow graduates, and supportive institutional policies as key positive factors, this research did not confirm these. Instead, graduates predominantly spoke about positive influence of educational development centres. This may be because the current study was conducted nearly two decades later, when educational development centres had become more active and their role in influencing the ways of teaching was more prominent than before.

Conclusion

Changes in teaching resulting from educational development programmes often occur gradually, and the benefits may take time to become fully apparent (Stewart, 2014), providing a strong rationale for exploring the long-term impact of such programmes. This study uncovered that nearly all ED programme graduates adopted a student-centred approach both in their conception of teaching and in their practical teaching methods. However, there were notable variations in the depth of their student-centredness, as evidenced by interviews with the graduates, their colleagues, and their course materials. Similarly, while all graduates exhibited a capacity for reflective teaching, the level of reflectiveness varied across individuals. These results suggest that providing ongoing support for

programme graduates, such as through workshops and coaching/ mentoring, could further enhance programme graduates' student-centredness and reflective abilities.

Because finding related to reflectiveness may have been influenced by the research method (some programme graduates chose to reflect on a class that went well, others on a problematic session), for future research it is recommended to ask programme graduates to reflect on both a successful class and one that did not go as expected, or to focus specifically on a problematic session to encourage deeper reflection.

It also appears that some programme graduates developed strategies to cope better with contextual constraints or were more effective at utilising contextual enablers than others. However, institutions should not leave their teachers to manage these challenges alone. Two recommendations for higher education institutions emerge from this study. First, if institutions want the outcomes of ED programmes to be sustained over the long term, they should avoid setting unrealistic research publication targets for programme graduates or overburdening them with administrative and other duties. Second, institutions should pay careful attention to teaching spaces, ensuring that they support student-centred learning. Any investment in reconstructing premises or building new learning spaces should align with the principles of student-centred learning.

The following chapters of this work will delve further into specific contextual factors that affect academic teachers' teaching, particularly teaching collaboration, perception of trust in teaching approaches, and educational leadership.

References

Bremner, Nicholas (2021) The multiple meanings of 'student-centred' or 'learner-centred' education, and the case for a more flexible approach to defining it. Comparative Education 57(2): 159-186: 10.1080/03050068.2020.1805863

Bremner, Nicholas (2022) What is learner-centred education? A qualitative study exploring the perspectives of English language teachers in Colombia. Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ) 25(4): https://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej100/a12.pdf

Giertz, Birgitta (1996) Long-term effects of a programme for teacher training. International Journal for Academic Development 1(2): 62-72: 10.1080/1360144960010209

Cannon, Robert, Hore, Terry (1997) The long-term effects of 'one-shot' professional development courses: An Indonesian case study. International Journal for Academic Development 2(1): 35-42: 10.1080/1360144970020104

Gale, Helen (2011) The reluctant academic: early-career academics in a teaching-orientated university, International Journal for Academic Development 16(3): 215-227: 10.1080/1360144X.2011.596705

McAlpine, Lynn, Weston, Cynthia, Berthiaume, Denis, Fairbank-Roch, Gail, Owen, Michelle (2004) Reflection on teaching: Types and goals of reflection. Educational Research and Evaluation 10(4-6): 337-363: 10.1080/1380361051233138348 9

Nevgi, Anne (2013) The influence of the research philosophy and pedagogical management decisions of the University of Helsinki on university teaching. A longitudinal study. In Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela (Eds.) Teacher development in higher education. Existing programs, Program Impact and Future Trends. New York and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 170-190.

Stes, Ann, Clement, Mieke, Van Petegem, Peter (2007) The effectiveness of a faculty training programme: Long-term and institutional impact. International Journal for Academic Development 12(2): 99-109: 10.1080/13601440701604898

Pleschová, Gabriela, McAlpine, Lynn (2016) Helping teachers to focus on learning and reflect on their teaching: What role does teaching context play? Studies in Educational Evaluation 48: 1-9: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.10.002

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes (2021) Doctoral students as early career university teachers: What hinders and what helps them to embrace the essentials of good teaching? In Lee, Anne, Bongaardt, Bob (Eds.) The Future of doctoral research. Challenges and opportunities, pp. 182-194: 10.4324/9781003015383-20

Rogers, Russell R. (2001) Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. Innovative Higher Education 26(1): 37–57: 10.1023/A:1010986404527

Stewart, Martyn (2014) Making sense of a teaching programme for university academics: Exploring the longer-term effects. Teaching and Teacher Education 38: 89-98: 10.1016/j.tate.2013.11.006

Trinidad, Jose Eos (2020) Understanding student-centred learning in higher education: students' and teachers' perceptions, challenges, and cognitive gaps Journal of Further and Higher Education 44(8): 1013-1023: 10.1080/0309877X.2019.1636214

Chapter 9. Teaching collaboration

Collaboration with others has the potential to improve teaching, thereby sustaining and advancing what teachers learn from educational development (ED) programmes. Quinlan (1998) argues that higher education teachers learn best about teaching by working together and sharing experiences and insights with their colleagues. For Ashwin et al. (2020, p. x), teaching should be more of a collective endeavour than an individual one. Abegglen, Burns, and Sinfield (2023, p. 33) assert that "only through experiencing and enacting true collaboration" teachers can model and foster collaboration among their students. Felten and Lambert (2020) demonstrate that such collaborative relationships have ample benefits for students' learning, careers and lives. Steyne et al. (2023) observe that a high level of collegiality among co-teachers in a course encourages greater student participation.

These benefits of teaching collaboration are supported by the presence of academic teachers' networks, as reported in other literature. Interactions within these networks were found to significantly impact members' teaching (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2009), including how teachers understand teaching, what teaching methods they employ, and how teachers improve their practice (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010). According to McAlpine and Ashgar (2010), collegial interaction not only influences thinking and practice but also shapes identity through how others perceive academics as members of a community and who they aspire to become. Yet not all academic teachers engage in teaching collaboration, often simply due to lack of awareness of its importance (Åkerlind and Quinlan, 2001).

Building on these insights from the literature, this chapter explores the nature of teaching collaboration among graduates of the four educational development (ED) programmes examined in this study. The chapter begins by summarising what the literature says about teaching collaboration among higher education teachers, including how it relates to their development as teachers. It then presents findings from the current research, synthesised from interviews with programme graduates and their colleagues. The chapter concludes with recommendations for higher education institutions on how to foster teaching collaboration.

What counts as teaching collaboration and what the literature reports on it

This study uses the term "teaching collaboration" to denote the joint work of a teacher with one or more individuals to enhance higher education teaching and learning, extending beyond merely discussing teaching and learning. Often, such activities are mutual and reciprocal, where "problems are identified and solutions are developed collectively, and where contributions are equally valued and respected" (Abegglen, Burns and Sinfield, 2023: 33). In a teaching collaboration, teachers work as a team, building upon each other's strengths, compensating for individual weaknesses, and assisting one another, thereby fostering a belief in collective self-efficacy (Steyne et al., 2023).

Teaching collaboration, as understood in this study, therefore implies more than an exchange of ideas about what and how others teach, or the occasional seeking of advice on student issues, although it may include these aspects. In this sense, the difference between teaching collaboration and a regular teaching conversation is analogous to how Lewis and Ross (2012) differentiate between *Collaboration* and *collaboration* in research. While *Collaboration* involves researchers designing and/or undertaking a research project together and publishing the results jointly, *collaboration* encompasses the discussion of research and ideas, as well as the sharing of feedback on research work.

Roxå and Mårtensson argue that collaborating teachers create a "microculture"—a culturally formed organisational entity—within which everyday interactions shape the development of teaching habits, norms, traditions, and a shared identity among its members. Typically, a microculture is formed within a department, a part of one, a workgroup, or a disciplinary community. These microcultures tend to influence teachers towards certain behaviours, determining how teachers interact and which teaching ideas are implemented or discarded. In this way, microcultures act as gatekeepers for development and change (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2015).

The literature identifies various forms of teaching collaboration in higher education. Examples include collaborative course design (Harp, Ziegenfuss and Lawler, 2008; Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010), observation of teaching practice— live or video-recorded —followed by discussion or feedback (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000; Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010), informal or formal mentoring, syllabus review, joint design of a new evaluation form for specific courses (Quinlan, 1998), submitting an entire course for peer review (Iqbal and Vigna, 2021), and participation in a professional learning community (Cherrington et al., 2017).

Teaching collaboration can occur between two or more teachers, but it can also extend to partnerships with academic developers, staff members such as librarians, practitioners in the field, and even students—particularly when students are engaged as teaching consultants (for the latter, see, for example, Cook-Sather et al., 2011). This chapter focuses on collaboration among higher education teachers, as this is the type most frequently discussed in academic literature and was also the predominant form of collaboration reported by the ED programme graduates from this research.

Teachers may collaborate on teaching with colleagues within their own department or discipline (see, for example, Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000) as well as with those outside their discipline (O'Keeffe et al., 2021). A more advanced form of teaching collaboration is the professional learning community (PLC), which centres on developing teaching in a specific area or aspect, such as the integration of technology in teaching. This type of collaboration is typically structured and facilitated by educational developers, and it can involve a variety of activities, including sharing teaching practices through observations, joint reflection on teaching, collaborative research into teaching practices, attending teaching conferences, and exchanging ideas and experiences during a regular seminar series (Cherrington et al., 2017).

Self-reported gains from teaching collaboration include not only receiving praise but also valuable critiques of teaching practices, enhancing knowledge and skills relevant to teaching, gaining a deeper understanding of peers' teaching philosophies and methods, improving time management, boosting confidence in specific areas, and perceived benefits for students (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010). Teaching collaboration has also been found to bridge divisions within departments, helping to unify differing perspectives on teaching the discipline and fostering greater respect among colleagues (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000). Being part of a teaching team can alleviate stress by providing opportunities to collaboratively address challenges and develop solutions (Abegglen, Burns and Sinfield, 2023).

Higher education teachers value the opportunity that collaboration presents to connect with colleagues who are passionate about teaching (Cherrington et al., 2017) and to cultivate a sense of belonging within a learning community (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010). Participation in communities of practice, especially among new teachers engaged in an ED programme, has been shown to compensate for a lack of departmental support (Warhurst, 2006). Collaborations with colleagues from outside the institution can also introduce innovative teaching methods into the

home institution (Pleschová and Simon, 2024). The collegial nature of collaboration is evidenced in the fact that teachers often find it difficult to distinguish between benefits gained as individuals and those gained as part of a group (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010).

Some teachers acknowledge that hearing about others' experiences has inspired them to engage in greater reflection on their own teaching practices (Cherrington et al., 2017). This aligns with theoretical assumptions about the role of collaboration in fostering reflective practice. According to Schön's concept of the reflective practitioner, teachers are believed to learn most effectively when they can collaboratively construct knowledge with colleagues about problems that are directly relevant to their experiences (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000). The only disadvantage of teaching collaboration noted in the literature is the increased time demands; however, teachers involved in such collaborations generally believe that the lessons learnt outweigh the costs (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010).

The reported benefits of teaching collaboration indicate that it has the potential to encourage changes in teaching perceptions and practices, aligning with the objectives of ED programmes. However, evidence of such changes is limited. For example, a six-month teaching collaboration cited in Quinlan and Åkerlind (2000) resulted in suggestions for teaching practice, but the rationales behind different approaches were not explored. In a similar case, a teacher was merely inspired to consider adopting a more integrated model of team teaching from colleagues, without any substantial shift in teaching philosophy. Overall, researchers found little evidence that new practices were linked to changes in teaching philosophies, though these appeared needed. Moreover, only in a few instances were teachers prompted to rethink their core beliefs (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000).

In another example, a teaching collaboration encouraged departmental staff to frequently consult the director of studies and initiate informal discussions about teaching, yet no shared understanding of how to enhance teaching and learning within the department emerged (Bolander Laksov, Mann and Dahlgren, 2008). These gaps in our understanding of teaching collaboration have led Cherrington et al. (2017) to call for a more comprehensive exploration of its outcomes.

The lack of evidence showing teaching collaboration to consistently inspire change in thinking and practice may be due to the fact that impactful collaboration requires sustained engagement with specific aspects of teaching over time. This allows particular issues to be thoroughly explored, debated, and reflected upon (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Such a long-term commitment may be difficult to maintain without institutional support. This support can include the institution actively propagating collaboration as beneficial for academic teachers' development, legitimising the additional time required, monitoring the collaboration system, and encouraging the sharing of insights gained through collaborative efforts (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010). Teaching collaboration should also be recognised and rewarded in formal evaluations, creating incentives especially for early-career teachers who are facing imminent promotion decisions (Quinlan, 1998).

The financial costs of fostering teaching collaboration are generally minimal, and in some cases, no monetary investment is required—perhaps only covering refreshments during meetings (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000). There are several funding schemes available for international exchanges, such as the Erasmus+ programme in the European Union, which is already quite popular. However, institutional backing for teaching collaboration does not imply that such collaboration should be mandated. Teachers need to maintain personal autonomy within the process, and imposing rigid structures or guidelines or making collaboration compulsory would likely be counterproductive (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010; Mårtensson and Roxå, 2016).

Existing knowledge about teaching collaboration in higher education, as well as gaps in understanding, inspired the formulation of research questions for this study, which addresses the following six aspects of teaching collaboration:

1. How frequently do ED programme graduates engage in teaching collaboration?
2. With whom do graduates collaborate on teaching, and what benefits do they perceive from this collaboration? What types of teaching collaboration have they developed?
3. What role does collaboration with former coaches/mentors from the ED programme play in enhancing graduates' practice?
4. How does teaching collaboration influence graduates in terms of their reflectiveness and student-centred learning (SCL)?
5. Does teaching collaboration encourage changes in teaching perceptions and practice, and if so, which types of collaboration, and in what ways?
6. Are graduates possibly creating and fostering similar webs of collaborative relationships for their students?

Method

This section discusses the teaching collaboration of 19 graduates from four educational development programmes, based on interviews conducted as part of this research. The graduates were not asked directly about their teaching collaboration. Instead, they were prompted to reflect on whether their teaching practices align with those of their departmental colleagues, whether they have colleagues with whom they share a teaching approach, and what drives them to make changes in their teaching. These prompts invited graduates to consider whom they collaborate with in their teaching. The interviewers then delved deeper into the nature and perceived value of these collaborations.

Additionally, evidence of teaching collaboration was sought from those interview segments where graduates discussed their conversations with colleagues about teaching. Aside from general enquiries about their teaching practices, graduates from programmes with a coaching/mentoring component were asked whether they maintained contact with their coach/mentor and were encouraged to elaborate on their experiences with teaching collaboration.

Content analysis (Denscombe, 2010: 281-202) was performed to analyse collected data. The interviews were moreover analysed holistically; for example, it was also considered that some graduates described their teaching as a solitary endeavour, while others spoke of co-teaching and the impact of working with others on their teaching practices. The understanding of graduates' teaching collaboration was further enriched by interviews with their colleagues, including cases where the colleagues were asked to characterise the graduate as a teacher. In instances where it was unclear from the graduate's interview whether they had engaged in teaching collaboration (such as with graduates G4C, G3N, and G1M), the colleague interviews provided additional insights.

Teaching collaboration of graduates from ED programmes

Findings about graduates' teaching collaborations are clustered according to six research questions, from the frequency of teaching collaboration to whether it generates major conceptual changes or shifts in practice.

More than half of graduates engage in teaching collaboration

In this study, slightly more than half of the programme graduates (10 out of 19) had taken part in at least one form of teaching collaboration. Teaching collaboration was notably infrequent among graduates from the Slovak Academy of Sciences, where only one graduate reported engaging in such activities. In contrast, it was more prevalent among graduates from other institutions: three of the five graduates from both Central European University (CEU) and Masaryk University (MUNI) and three of the four graduates from Nottingham Trent University (NTU) reported participating in teaching collaborations.

Graduates collaborate with different individuals and in a variety of ways

Most of the programme graduates involved in teaching collaborations (seven) work with colleagues in their own departments. Two graduates partner with colleagues in the same discipline but outside their institutions (G1S, G2C), one served as a mentor for a new participant in a development programme from another department (G1M), and one continues to collaborate with their former coach/mentor from the ED programme (G2M). Some graduates referred to multiple teaching collaborations. The most common form of collaboration was co-teaching, reported by five graduates. Other forms included jointly designing class sessions and courses (C3N), advising colleagues who are developing new courses (G4N), offering guidance on teaching challenges (C2C, C4C), mentoring in an ED programme (G1M) and observing the classes of junior teachers to provide feedback (G5C).

The fact that programme graduates and their colleagues frequently mentioned offering ideas, advice, and feedback suggests that these graduates are valued by their peers for their teaching expertise. For example, one of the graduates' colleagues (C5M) referred to the extensive planning they did together with the graduate—discussing what to teach, why, and how—and noted the absence of similar planning when co-teaching with other colleagues. One graduate (C2C) was commended by a colleague for their proactive approach in meeting with their successor to share teaching experiences and materials for the same course—a practice that appears to be uncommon within their institution.

Another graduate (G1S) leads an international project that provides an opportunity to meet annually with disciplinary colleagues from other countries to exchange experiences with various teaching methods. Notably, students also participate in these meetings, contributing to the exchange. The graduate finds these meetings a valuable source of inspiration for teaching and subsequently tests some of presented methods in their own courses. Interestingly, only one graduate (G3N) mentioned collaboration in the context of assessing student learning, specifically through moderating each other's assessments. Additionally, despite Nottingham Trent University having a professional learning community dedicated to advancing practice and scholarship around decolonising and internationalising the curriculum, none of the NTU graduates involved in this study appear to be part of it.

Collaboration presumes a certain level of insight into each other's teaching practices. Graduates who were not engaged in any teaching collaboration often cited a lack of awareness of how their colleagues teach. This was particularly evident in institutions where there was no system of peer observation or where such observations were treated as mere formalities. For example, a colleague of one graduate (C4S) mentioned that, although they were good friends, the last time they had observed the graduate's teaching was ten years ago, and they had no knowledge of what students thought about the graduate's teaching. Unsurprisingly, this graduate did not participate in any teaching collaboration.

In contrast, another colleague (C4M) reported having a comprehensive understanding of what the graduate was doing, owing to co-teaching two courses, engaging in conversations with their students, and reviewing student feedback forms. One graduate (G2M) spoke positively about the institution's well-functioning peer observation system and was actively involved in various types of teaching collaboration.

Sporadic collaboration with coaches/mentors from ED programmes

Teaching collaboration with former coaches/mentors from educational development programmes appears to be rare. Although three of the four programmes included a coaching/mentoring component, only one graduate from Masaryk University (G2M) reported continuing to discuss teaching with their coach/mentor and attend their teaching development workshops. One graduate (G3M) highly valued cooperation with their coach/mentor during the programme in part because this person recognised their strengths in teaching, which normally does not happen in their department. Because the coach/mentor is now on parental leave, they do not maintain ongoing contact. Another graduate (G5M) remained connected with their coach/mentor through social media, but despite their intentions, they had not managed to meet for the past two years. Some graduates reported no ongoing exchange due to the passing of their former coach/mentor.

Programme graduates from Masaryk University and Nottingham Trent University did acknowledge that working together on class or course design and co-facilitating classes was a common practice, indicating that these institutions likely endorse teaching collaboration. For example, Masaryk University has an established system of funding that can be used to support team teaching. Different from that, none of the interviewed graduates or their colleagues mentioned specific institutional support for continued collaboration with a coach/mentor. This lack of institutional backing may explain why such collaborations are infrequent.

Graduates seek colleagues with similar values but learn from different styles and ideas

Some graduates openly spoke about teaching differently than departmental colleagues and criticised their teaching styles as teacher-centred and resistant to innovation. The views and behaviours of those departmental colleagues appear to discourage the graduates from collaborating on teaching. For example, one graduate (G5M) remarked that their departmental colleagues had not changed their teaching methods in over twenty years, using effectively the same approaches as when the graduate was a student. This lack of innovation in their colleagues' teaching styles made collaboration less appealing. Another graduate (G2M) attempted to introduce a list of recommended readings for a course they were co-teaching, inspired by practices observed at another institution. However, their departmental colleagues rejected the proposal, arguing that the course was at the higher education level, where students were expected to be autonomous learners. This resistance to new ideas from colleagues made it challenging for the graduate to collaborate effectively within their department.

Programme graduates seem to value different aspects of teaching collaboration. For example, one graduate (G2N) highlighted the learning experience gained from observing how organised their co-teacher was. They also hoped that their colleague had similarly benefited from the collaboration and noted that a comparable dynamic existed with two other colleagues. Another graduate (G4N) recognised the opportunity to exchange ideas with colleagues, particularly during the process of designing new courses. A different graduate (G2M) emphasised the importance of co-teaching whenever possible, as they can learn from others' teaching methods and engage in reflective discussions about their shared experiences. This same graduate also mentioned engaging a teaching

assistant who was open to experimenting, which allowed them to trial the innovation. According to the graduate, new approach was well-received by students, as reflected in their course feedback forms. Another graduate (G5M) noted that they enjoy co-teaching a class with a colleague, and students praise the experience, too.

Finding a colleague who teaches in the same way is not necessarily a prerequisite for entering into a teaching collaboration. For instance, one graduate (G2N) collaborates with colleagues who have different teaching styles and comfort levels with various methods, yet they maintain mutual respect for each other's approaches. Another graduate (G3M) seeks out colleagues who are motivated to teach and share similar values related to teaching, which fosters productive collaboration. However, when two colleagues co-teaching a course cannot find any common ground in their ways of teaching, they may opt to work independently. In such cases, according to the graduate (G1S), each teacher conducts their classes using their own approach and then informs the other of what they have covered with the students. Although teaching collaboration is lacking in this setup, continuity is at least maintained for the following session.

Unclear impact of teaching collaboration on reflectiveness

The existing literature suggests that teachers who engage in teaching collaboration might develop more advanced reflective practices compared to those who do not work with others in their teaching (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000; Cherrington et al., 2017). However, the data from this research show no consistent link between teaching collaboration and the level of reflective practice among graduates. As illustrated in the table below, while five programme graduates involved in teaching collaboration were rated highly for their reflective practices, four received mid-level ratings, and one was rated low. Conversely, two graduates who did not engage in any teaching collaboration were nonetheless assessed as demonstrating a high level of reflectiveness. Similarly, there was no clear association between teaching collaboration and the degree of student-centredness exhibited by the programme graduates.

Additional data may be needed to explain the missing link between teaching collaborations and reflectiveness. Developing high reflectiveness may require ED programme graduates to sustain teaching collaboration over a longer period. Also, teaching collaborations which result in research publications or that strive to develop student reflective skills may be much more effective than other formats of teaching collaboration. Nevertheless, it is possible that teaching collaboration enhanced reflection in certain programme graduates in a situation when other supportive factors were lacking. This appears to be the case for graduates who expressed that their teaching contexts do not provide sufficient support, prompting them to seek collaboration with colleagues outside their department or institution (G1S, G2C, G3M).

Table. Teaching collaboration of programme graduates and their level of reflectiveness while teaching

	Slovak Academy of Sciences					Central European University					Nottingham Trent University					Masaryk University			
Graduate's code	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G1	G2	G3	G4	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5
Teaching collaboration	✓						✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Reflectiveness	high	low	mid	high	mid	high	high	low-mid	mid	mid	mid	mid	mid	high	low	high	mid	high	high
Collaborators	E						E		E	D		D	D	D	D, I	D, I			D

D = departmental colleagues, I = institutional colleagues (other than from the same department), E = colleagues external to the institution.

Unclear influence of teaching collaboration on major changes of thinking and practice

This research does not provide strong evidence that teaching collaboration prompts significant changes in teaching perceptions or practices. Instead, teaching collaboration seems to enhance or complement existing practices rather than fundamentally challenge or alter them. One notable exception comes from a colleague (C5M) who praised a graduate for consistently introducing new ideas into their teaching, innovating course content, and testing its effectiveness. This graduate was reportedly inspired by observing and interacting with experts in the field. However, this example pertains more to changes in teaching content rather than to the adoption of new teaching methods.

Teaching collaboration does not create collaborative relationships for students

This research did not find much evidence that programme graduates use their experiences from teaching collaboration to foster collaborative relationships among their students. In one instance, the graduate (G5M) spoke about role modelling cooperation during the class, which students appreciated in course evaluations. Another graduate (G1S) mentioned involving students in collaborative meetings with teachers from other institutions. However, neither the interviews with other graduates nor with their colleagues suggested that the graduates actively engage in, or even consider, this aspect of teaching. This could be due to a lack of an environment that encourages or supports the creation of student collaboration initiatives. It is important to note that the research subjects were not specifically asked about how they (might) translate their collaborative teaching experiences into facilitating student collaborations.

Discussion

Although there are some studies that delve into the social relations of ED programmes participants (Rienties and Hossein, 2015), the literature does not clearly address whether teaching collaboration is common or rare among graduates of ED programmes. In this research, it was found that a small majority of the graduates had indeed developed some form of teaching collaboration. The existence and extent of such collaborations appear to be influenced by institutional culture. Graduates at institutions with a well-functioning system of teaching observations and regular discussions about teaching tend to have more opportunities to gain insights into their colleagues' teaching-related

values, ideas, strengths, and weaknesses. This knowledge creates a foundation for developing teaching collaborations within the department or across the institution.

In contrast, at institutions lacking this culture, graduates are often left with no option but to seek teaching collaboration outside their institution. The fact that only three of those programme graduates who did not engage in teaching collaboration with departmental colleagues pursued external teaching collaboration suggests that cross-institutional collaboration is not sufficiently supported. This aligns with what Roxå and Mårtensson (2009) find in their study: when teachers perceive their departmental environment as supportive of conversations about teaching, they have about twice as many conversational partners as those who consider their department indifferent or even resistant to such conversations. This indicates that while teaching collaboration is possible and can be beneficial, its prevalence is largely determined by the institutional environment and available support structures.

ED programme graduates from this study were predominantly found to collaborate on teaching with peer teachers, rather than with other individuals mentioned in the literature, such as academic developers, coaches/mentors, or students. Most teaching collaborations involved working with departmental colleagues. Consistent with previous studies (Byrne, Brown and Challen, 2010; Cherrington et al., 2017), the graduates reported several positive outcomes from these collaborations. These included learning from the diverse teaching methods employed by their colleagues, improving course design through the exchange of ideas, finding allies with a similar teaching philosophy to drive innovation, and in one case role-modelling cooperation for students during the class.

Although the literature (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000; Cherrington et al., 2017) suggests that teaching collaboration can enhance reflection, this research did not find strong evidence to support that claim. The results align with previous studies indicating that achieving transformative change in teaching perceptions and practices through collaboration is challenging (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000; Bolander Laksov, Mann and Dahlgren, 2008), potentially requiring sustained engagement over time (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). This research did not specifically investigate the duration or evolution of teaching collaborations, limiting its ability to explain the relationship between collaboration and change.

The literature finds that effective teaching collaboration involves jointly identifying problems and solutions, with contributions being equally valued (Abegglen, Burns and Sinfield, 2023). This notion appears consistent with the experiences of the programme graduates in this research. The graduates often collaborated on class or course design, working together to address teaching challenges. While the graduates themselves did not explicitly discuss the mutual valuation of contributions, their colleagues acknowledged that other teachers greatly appreciate the graduates' contributions in these collaborative efforts.

Overall, microculture (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2015) within department seem to shape the teaching collaborations of graduates from ED programmes. When graduates return to their departments, which serve as their primary microcultures, they are likely to seek out colleagues who share similar teaching values and a commitment to innovation. If such alignment is found, graduates are inclined to engage in teaching collaborations within their departments. However, when departmental values and teaching approaches diverge from what the graduates learned in their ED programmes, these graduates tend to distance themselves from the departmental microculture. In such cases, to maintain their student-centred approach and continue innovating, they choose to collaborate with

individuals outside their department—such as disciplinary colleagues from other institutions, former colleagues, or fellow ED programme graduates—or teach independently.

In some context, like in the United Kingdom (UK), academic teachers are already expected to engage in teaching collaborations; for example, the 2023 edition of the UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching asks HE teachers to demonstrate they collaborate with others to enhance teaching practice. However, to foster long-term teaching innovation and student-centred approaches, institutions should not expect ED programme graduates to start collaborating from their own initiative—they should encourage and support teaching collaboration. Institutions can achieve this, for example, by enhancing existing systems of peer observations and facilitating regular discussions about teaching practices. Such initiatives can include cross-disciplinary observation and cross-institutional exchange, enabling teachers to easily connect with collaborators who share similar teaching philosophies and values consistent with those promoted by the ED programmes.

Conclusion

This research found that teaching collaboration is moderately common among graduates of educational development programmes. Most graduates collaborate with colleagues within their own departments, but some also extend their collaboration to academics from other disciplines, institutions, and practitioners in their fields. Collaboration with former coaches/mentors from their ED programmes is only occasional. The nature of teaching collaboration includes co-designing classes and courses, team teaching, providing advice on teaching challenges, and sharing teaching experiences to enhance effectiveness. When seeking out collaboration, graduates typically look for colleagues who share similar teaching-related values, but when working with those colleagues they find that engaging with diverse perspectives and ideas enriches their teaching practice.

Thanks to collaboration, graduates from ED programmes are able to experiment with new teaching methods and introduce innovative elements. Teaching collaboration also empowers graduates to resist departmental traditions, particularly when those traditions involve a teacher-centred approach or adherence to established practices. This resistance to compliance allows programme graduates to uphold and implement more progressive, student-centred approaches to teaching. Additionally, the research suggests that graduates are highly regarded by their peers for their expertise in teaching.

It is unclear if teaching collaboration enhances graduates' reflective capacities: this research did not find sufficient evidence to suggest that teachers involved in collaborations possess stronger reflective competences than those who do not engage in any teaching collaboration. However, collaboration might support better reflection on teaching for programme graduates, particularly when other incentives for reflection are lacking.

Similarly, this research did not find robust evidence that teaching collaboration has a transformative impact on graduates' teaching practices or their teaching-related thinking. Rather, teaching collaboration appears to contribute incrementally to graduates' teaching practices, leading to modifications in teaching methods or the introduction of new elements, such as a reading list. Furthermore, teaching collaboration does not inherently motivate teachers to encourage or foster collaborative relationships among their students.

Finally, teaching collaboration is more prevalent when institutions incentivise or support it. For example, only one graduate from the Slovak Academy of Sciences engaged in teaching collaboration, which was driven by their own initiative and funded through an outside grant. In contrast, graduates from other institutions frequently described teaching collaboration as a common practice in their

workplaces. These favourable conditions for collaboration were not the result of a specific scheme but emerged from a well-functioning system of teaching observation and ample opportunities for teachers to discuss their teaching practices. Such an environment allowed programme graduates to gain insight into colleagues' teaching styles and philosophies, facilitating the identification of suitable collaborators.

For programme graduates whose departments do not foster a microculture supportive of student-centred learning and innovation, seeking teaching collaboration outside their department or institution can be a practical solution. Without such external partnership, their teaching-related values and practices may be influenced by the prevailing departmental habits and traditions, potentially diverging from the student-centred approaches promoted in the ED programme. Institutions play a crucial role in promoting and recognising teaching collaboration more broadly, which can help maintain and reinforce the innovative teaching practices that ED programmes aim to encourage. For future research it is recommended to explore how can experience from teaching collaboration influence the creation of collaborative environments for students.

References

Åkerlind, Gerlese S., Quinlan, Kathleen M. (2001) Strengthening collegiality to enhance teaching, research, and scholarly practice: An untapped resource for faculty development. To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development: 10.1002/j.2334-4822.2001.tb00538.x

Ashwin, Paul, Boud, David, Calkins, Susanna, Coate, Kelly, Hallet, Fiona, Light, Gregory, Mårtensson, Katarina, McArthur, Jan, McCune, Velda, McLean, Monica, Tooher, Michelle (2020) Reflective teaching in higher education. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury

Bolander Laksov, Klara, Mann, Sarah, Dahlgren, Lars Owe (2008) Developing a community of practice around teaching: a case study. Higher Education Research and Development 27(2): 121-132: 10.1080/07294360701805259

Byrne, Jenny, Brown, Hazel, Challen, Doreen (2010) Peer development as an alternative to peer observation: a tool to enhance professional development. International Journal for Academic Development 15(3): 215-228: 10.1080/1360144X.2010.497685

Cherrington, Sue Anne, Macaskill, Rhian Salmon, Boniface, Suzanne, Shep, Sydney, Flutey, Jonny (2017) Developing a pan-university professional learning community. International Journal for Academic Development 23(4): 298-311: 10.1080/1360144X.2017.1399271

Cook-Sather, Alison, Hong, Emily, Moss, Tamarah, Williamson, Adam (2011) Developing new faculty voice and agency through trustful, overlapping, faculty-faculty and student-faculty conversations. International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 347-359: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1947296

Denscombe, Martyn (2010) The good research guide. For small-scale social research projects. 4th edition. McGraw Hill and Open University Press.

Feiman-Nemser, Sharon (2001) From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. Teachers College Record 103(6): 1013-1055 10.1111/0161-4681.00141

Felten, Peter, Lambert, Leo (2020) Relationship-rich education: How human connections drive success in college. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Iqbal, Isabeau, Vigna, John (2021) Care in collaborations: opening up conversations about teaching, International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 383-387: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1937183

Lewis, Jenny M, Ross, Sandy (2012) The how and why of academic collaboration: Disciplinary differences and policy implications. Higher Education 64(5): 693-708: 10.1007/s10734-012-9521-8

Mårtensson, Katarina, Roxå, Torgnz (2016) Peer engagement for teaching and learning: competence, autonomy and social solidarity in academic microcultures. Uniped 39(2): 131-143: 10.18261/issn.1893-8981-2016-02-04

McAlpine, Lynn, Asghar, Anila (2010) Enhancing academic climate: doctoral students as their own developers. International Journal for Academic Development 15(2): 167-178: 10.1080/13601441003738392

O'Keeffe, Muireann, Crehan, Martina, Munro, Morag, Logan, Anna, Farrell, Ann Marie, Clarke, Eric, Flood, Michelle, Ward, Monica, Andreeva, Tatiana, Van Egeraat, Chris, Heaney, Frances, Curran, Declan, Clinton, Eric (2021) Exploring the role of peer observation of teaching in facilitating cross-institutional professional conversations about teaching and learning. International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 266–278: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1954524

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes (2024) Internationalising student learning at the meso level: the impact of grassroots leadership in a university in Central Europe. European Political Science 1-19: 10.1057/s41304-024-00475-8

Quinlan, Kathleen M. (1998) Promoting faculty learning about collaborative teaching. College Teaching 46(2): 43-47: 10.1080/87567559809596233

Quinlan, Kathleen M, Åkerlind, Gerlese S. (2000) Factors affecting departmental peer collaboration for faculty development: Two cases in context. Higher Education 40(1): 23-52: 10.1023/A:1004096306094

Rienties, Bart, Hosein, Anesa (2015) Unpacking (in)formal learning in an academic development programme: a mixed-method social network perspective. International Journal for Academic Development 20(2): 163-177: 10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029928

Roxå, Torgny, Mårtensson, Katarina (2009) Significant conversations and significant networks: Exploring the backstage of the teaching arena. Studies in Higher Education 34(5): 547-559: 10.1080/03075070802597200

Roxå, Torgny, Mårtensson, Katarina (2015) Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. International Journal for Academic Development 20(2): 193-205: 10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929

Steyne, Lynn, Simon, Agnes, Kam, Angeniet, Timár, Eszter, Beneš, Jan (2023) Team up: Lessons from moving an academic writing course for university teachers in Slovakia and Czechia online. In Fenton, James, Gimenez, Julio, Mansfield, Katherine, Percy, Martin, Spinillo, Mariangela (Eds.) International perspectives on teaching and learning academic English in turbulent times. London: Routledge, pp. 155-167

UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education (2023) Advance Higher Education: www.advance-he.ac.uk/teaching-and-learning/psf

Warhurst, Russell P. (2006) "We really felt part of something": Participatory learning among peers within a university teaching-development community of practice. International Journal for Academic Development 11(2): 111-122: doi.org/10.1080/13601440600924462

Ziegenfuss, Donna Harp, Lawler, Patricia A. (2008) Collaborative course design: changing the process, acknowledging the context, and implications for academic development. International Journal for Academic Development 13(3): 151-160: 10.1080/13601440802242309

Chapter 10. Trusting relationships of ED programme graduates

The perception of being trusted by others, including students, is crucial for teachers in higher education to teach in a particular way (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2015; Simper, Maynard and Mårtensson, 2022; Hamshire and Forsyth, 2024). Trust also plays a vital role in fostering a culture where teachers feel comfortable in openly sharing the challenges they encounter (Stock and Trevitt, 2016). This openness enables teachers to reflect on problematic situations through conversations with others (Pleschová et al., 2021). Moreover, trust encourages higher education teachers to be receptive to new ideas (Iqbal and Vigna, 2021), especially in interactions with colleagues who hold differing perspectives (Simper, Maynard and Mårtensson, 2022).

Given the significance of trust as discussed in academic literature, as well as in the everyday interactions experienced by educational developers at the four institutions explored in this work, this chapter investigates the role of trust in influencing the teaching practice of graduates of educational development (ED) programmes. The chapter begins with an overview of findings from the trust literature, including studies that have explored trust in the context of educational development and higher education. It then details the methods and results of the current research. The chapter concludes with recommendations for heads of department on how they can better support programme graduates by expressing trust in them and fostering trustful relationships within the department.

Findings from the trust literature

The results of past research are relevant to this study as they help to explain how perceptions of being trusted influence programme graduates' teaching practice, reflectiveness, and capacity to innovate in their teaching. Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) define trust as a psychological state in which an actor (the trustor) holds positive expectations about the intentions and behaviour of another actor (the trustee). This state results in the trustor's willingness to accept vulnerability and take risks with the trustee. De Vries (2005) builds on this, adding that the trustor also expects the trustee to consider the trustor's interests in their actions.

Willis and Strivens (2015) distinguish between cognition-based trust that is rooted in beliefs about another person's reliability and dependability and affect-based trust grounded in reciprocal interpersonal care and concern. Glessmer, Persson, and Forsyth (in press) uncover that higher education teachers' trustworthiness, as perceived by students, is shaped by three main factors: cognition (demonstrating knowledge, skills, and competence), affect (showing interpersonal care and concern), and values (signalling a commitment to principles). Similarly, Kharouf, Sekhon and Kumar Roy (2015) report that students trust their higher education when it holds strong values that align with those of the students and if teachers show they value students, along with the institution manifesting ability, benevolence, integrity, reliability and openness.

Trust and teaching practice

Existing studies suggest that trust enables individuals within a group to engage in practice with a certain flexibility. In other words, when individuals feel trusted by their peers, they have the freedom to make decisions based on their specific experiences of situations, without the need to constantly renegotiate rules with other colleagues (Roxå and Mårtensson, 2015). Trust becomes particularly empowering when it is grounded in reciprocity and peer-based relationships (de Lange and Wittek, 2022).

Care plays a crucial role in fostering trust. When teachers show care for their students' experiences, for improving their own teaching practice, and for their colleagues, it helps build a foundation of trust (Timmermans et al., 2018; Iqbal and Vigna, 2021). Care is also closely linked to student-centred learning, as teachers' care for who students are as individuals and how and what they learn from each class has been identified as an important feature of student-centred practice (Tang and Walker-Gleaves, 2022).

Trust and reflectiveness

Trust fosters an environment conducive to reflection (Stocks and Trevitt, 2016). In situations where trust between teachers is lacking, discussions about teaching tend to be limited in both scope and frequency, addressing only the most essential topics (Simon and Pleschová, 2021). Trust not only facilitates these pedagogical conversations but also helps to generate or reinforce trust among participants (Stacey and Chan, 2021). This is particularly true when such dialogues occur between colleagues from different disciplines (Cook-Sather, Hong and Moss, 2021). Trusting colleagues with diverse viewpoints enables the exploration of assumptions, beliefs, and feelings about teaching, including uncertainties and challenges. This can lead to meaningful shifts in long-held perceptions of teaching (Iqbal and Vigna, 2021; Timmermans et al., 2018).

Trust and innovation of teaching

Trust fosters interactions between individuals with differing perspectives, allowing for the consideration and adoption of new ideas and concepts (Simper, Maynard and Mårtensson, 2022). This openness to innovation, which stems from trust, serves as a catalyst for risk-taking and professional growth (West et al., 2017: 24). In specific areas like assessment, trust-based relationships have been identified as drivers of quality-focused changes, particularly when teachers feel trusted by their superiors (Simper, Maynard and Mårtensson, 2022). Trust, therefore, seems to encourage teachers to experiment with new teaching practices and refine them to enhance student learning outcomes.

Based on what the literature posits on trust in higher education and educational development, the study chose to address the following research questions:

1. Is the ED programme graduates' perception of being trusted by a superior (head of department) associated with student-centred teaching practice?
2. Is this perception of being trusted by a superior related to reflective teaching?
3. Does the perception of being trusted lead to teaching innovation?
4. Is there a difference between how the superiors and colleagues trust programme graduates?

Methods

This chapter draws upon data collected from interviews with the 19 educational development programme graduates from four higher education institutions featured in this study, along with their colleagues. As a first step, the level of perceived trust in the programme graduates by their superiors was established. One set of interview questions centred on the graduates' perceptions of trust. They were asked whether they felt trusted by their superior to teach in a student-centred way and to innovate their teaching. Because all programme graduates had five and more years of teaching experience, this trust was based on their actual teaching practice. The head of department (HoD) was selected to represent the superior as HoDs usually have major decision-making powers over teaching

in the department. Graduates who indicated that they felt trusted were prompted to explain what led them to this perception. Those who signalled only some trust were asked to provide further detail on what made them think so.

As with other streams of this research, two coders independently reviewed the interview transcripts and assigned codes based on the responses. The coding framework included four potential categories: 1) the graduate feels trusted, 2) the graduate does not feel trusted, 3) the graduate feels ambivalent, i.e., perceives reasons both to feel trusted and not trusted, and 4) there is insufficient information to determine. The first round of coding was generally straightforward, as most graduates began their responses by explicitly stating whether or not they had sense of trust, followed by further explanation. In the few cases where the coders initially disagreed on the assigned code, they discussed their differences until they reached a consensus. For some codes, the coders noted that the graduates' perceptions of being trusted were linked to a lack of care and disinterest, prompting a review of the codes. This review revealed that some statements coded as "the graduate feels trusted" and "the graduate feels ambivalent" contained similar expressions indicating a lack of care or attention from the superior. Therefore, a new category was created: 5) the graduate feels indifference.

To address the first two research questions, each graduate's perception of trust was compared with their student-centeredness and reflective teaching, which had been coded based on the entire interview and the course syllabus submitted for this research (see Chapter 2 for details on the coding process). To answer the third question, information gathered from the trust-specific questions was cross-checked with what graduates said in other parts of the interview. Particular attention was given to responses where graduates were asked if they had presented at a teaching and learning conference or had published a paper on teaching and learning, because these typically aim to disseminate outcomes of teaching innovations or at least express interest in learning more about teaching and innovating it.

Further evidence of innovative teaching was sought from the interviews with the graduates' colleagues, particularly from the part where they were asked to characterise the graduate. Colleagues were left to define what innovative teaching meant to them, allowing innovation to be understood as context-bound, i.e., defined by how it was perceived within the institution. As for the fourth research question, the trust-related statements from the graduates and their colleagues were coded using deductive coding (Denscombe, 2010: 282) if they corresponded with cognition, affect or values. Resulting codes were then compared and contrasted.

Trust as a potential determinant of programme graduates' teaching practice

The results of the current study are organised around four key research questions: the implications of feeling trusted by a superior for graduates' 1) teaching practice, 2) reflectiveness, 3) innovation in teaching, and 4) a presentation of how superiors and colleagues voiced their trust in the graduate.

Trust and teaching practice

As summarised in the accompanying Table, slightly more than half of the programme graduates (10 out of 19) reported feeling trusted by their head of department to teach in a student-centred way and to innovate in their teaching. Six graduates expressed indifference, one was ambivalent about whether they were trusted by their HoD, and none reported feeling distrusted. In two cases (G2S, G3C), there was not enough information to make a definitive judgment about their perception of trust. These graduates had focused a considerable amount of time discussing their previous HoD, by

whom they did not feel trusted, and their responses did not clearly indicate whether they felt trusted by their current HoD.

For those graduates who perceived themselves as being trusted, this was because of shared teaching-related principles. For example, one graduate (G2N) remarked, “Yes, I feel trusted. I feel like the head of department shares my philosophy around some of the things that I teach.” Another graduate (G2C) stated, “I think that’s just the same vision that we share at the departmental level, and the department head always encourages our participation in workshops that are held. There is also the head of the centre for teaching, she also conducts training courses herself where she continuously talks about the importance of student-centred teaching. So that’s why I see that there’s complete trust when it comes to the way we teach.”

Another group of graduates (G1S, G3S, G1N, G1M, G3M, G5M) reported feeling trusted, but at the same time, they linked this perception to the considerable freedom they experienced in their teaching, a lack of care from their superior, or their superior’s indifference regarding their teaching practices. One graduate noted, “We have a kind of freedom. ...I would say that people [superiors] don’t care. If there is no specific problem, they do not pay too much attention to the quality of teaching. They would speak about the quality of teaching if there was some problem, let’s say there will be some negative feedback that teaching is bad.” Another graduate remarked, “They give us the freedom. The most important are the results. The way you teach doesn’t interest anybody.” A third graduate commented, “[The HoD] believes we are doing our work responsibly. ... it’s as if he doesn’t address the quality [of what we do] at all.” A different graduate shared, “I feel trusted. I don’t know why. They just let me get on with it, I suppose. I don’t cause any problems.” Another one expressed something similar, saying, “[I feel] completely trusted, completely. [But] I don’t know if it is trust or disinterest.”

Ambivalence was demonstrated through statements indicating both a perception of trust and distrust. That graduate (G4C) said, “I do feel like they respect me, but does they trust me concerning that? They don’t really give me a lot of space to be creative. When it comes to actually doing things, they are imposed on me. But at the same time, I’m being told that what I’m doing is very interesting. So, trust is a weird thing, right? It’s tied to respect, which I think is there, but there might be other reasons why a person might not give you the opportunity to spread your wings. It’s not necessarily a lack of trust in your skills; it could be a lack of trust in you as a person.”

When examining the relationship between the perception of being trusted and student-centred learning, nine of the ten graduates who felt trusted by their HoD were assessed as highly student-centred in their teaching. An exception was a graduate (G5S) who felt trusted but demonstrated a teacher-centred practice. This graduate appeared to interpret trust as permission to teach in a way they personally deemed appropriate. Graduates who expressed ambivalence or indifference were sometimes assessed high (3) and other times as mid or mid-high (3) for student-centredness.

Perceptions of being trusted to teach in a student-centred way and innovate teaching differed across the four institutions. Whereas at Nottingham Trent University, three of the four interviewed graduates felt trusted and one felt indifferent and at Central European University, three of the five graduates felt trusted and one was ambivalent, only two of the five graduates from both the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Masaryk University reported a trustful relationship with their superior. Although none of the graduates indicated feelings of distrust, the frequency of perceived indifference toward teaching is alarming.

Table. Programme graduates' perceptions of trust from their head of department, student-centredness, reflective practice, and teaching publications

	Slovakia					**CEU**					**Nottingham**				**Masaryk University**				
Graduate's code	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G1	G2	G3	G4	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5
Perception of being trusted by HoD	I	?	I	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	A	✓	I	✓	✓	✓	I	✓	I	✓	I
Student-centeredness	high	mid	high	high	no	high	high	mid	mid-high	high	mid	high	high	high	mid	high	high	high	high
Reflectiveness	high	low	mid	high	mid	high	high	low-mid	mid	mid	mid	mid	mid	high	low	high	mid	high	high
Paper presented		*	*			*			*	*	*				*			*	*
Paper published		*	*								*						*		

✓ = the graduate feels trusted, I = the graduate feels indifference, A = ambivalence, i.e. the graduate sees the reasons both to feel trusted and not, ? = there is insufficient information to determine, * = the graduate presented/published a paper about teaching and learning

Trust and reflectiveness

This research revealed a notable link between graduates' perception of being trusted to teach in a student-centred way and their reflective practice. While some graduates who felt trusted by their HoD were assessed as highly reflective and others demonstrated reflectiveness at a mid-level, when graduates sensed indifference or ambivalence from their superior, five out of seven (G3S, G4C, G1N, G1M, G3M) showed suboptimal levels of reflectiveness. Since trust was not always associated with reflectiveness, it is possible that trust from various sources—beyond just the HoD—may influence reflective practice. Colleagues, peers, or even students who express trust in the programme graduate, and in whom the graduate places trust when discussing teaching, are likely to contribute to fostering reflective practice. As noted in the previous chapter, the fact that some graduates chose to reflect on a class that went well rather than poorly may also have played some role here.

Trust and innovation of teaching

Of the 19 graduates interviewed, about a third (7) had presented a paper on teaching and learning, and four had published a teaching-related paper. One graduate, for example, presented at a departmental seminar on using freehand drawings as a way to express ideas that cannot easily be communicated orally. Further examples included presenting papers on techniques for engaging students in online settings and on the design of their own course, including syllabus development. As for publications, one graduate had a paper under review on the use of the Padlet app in teaching international relations. Another graduate had published two papers—one on developing student skills and another on their institution's approach to supporting diverse students. A final graduate had authored a paper on student conceptual thinking.

The data did not reveal any clear connection relating the presentation at pedagogical events or contributions to journals with the perception of feeling trusted by the head of department. Some graduates who felt trusted by their HoD actively presented at academic gatherings and/or published papers (G1C, G5C, G4M), while others had not done so (G4S, G5S, G2C, G2N, G3N, G4N). Similarly, in one case where it was difficult to determine if there was a perception of trust, the graduate was an active presenter and journal contributor (G2S). Graduates who expressed indifference also varied in their teaching events and journal contributions. This suggests that trust from the HoD may not be a significant factor in motivating presentations or publications about teaching. One graduate (G4C) explicitly linked their teaching conference presentation to encouragement from a colleague, stating that [colleague name] "was kind of prompting me to apply, and I was really happy about that because I wasn't really thinking about it before because I never really thought about myself as a, you know, education expert."

Other factors, such as intrinsic motivation, appear to play a more significant role in prompting graduates to engage in and share teaching-related innovations at pedagogical events and in journals. Another possible explanation for this finding is that some graduates present and publish on a range of issues related to teaching and learning—for example, institutional approaches to diverse students—rather than exclusively focusing on their own teaching innovations.

When evidence about graduates' innovative practice was sought through colleague interviews, several challenges emerged due to varying perceptions of innovative teaching across different institutions. For example, none of the four colleagues interviewed from Nottingham Trent University described the graduate as innovative—even if interviews with the graduates suggested they were using novel approaches. In contrast, with one exception (C3C), colleagues from other institutions generally spoke about the graduates as being innovative, praising them for using the latest technology in teaching, teaching via simulations or engaging practitioners as guest teachers.

Overall, the data collected indicate that a relatively small number of programme graduates present at teaching-related events or publish in journals. Many graduates attribute this to a lack of capacity due to competing academic duties. One graduate (G5M) explained, "I really enjoy it. There are always things to improve, but I can't manage it all within the context of other responsibilities as an academic."

Graduates' trustworthiness as perceived by superiors and colleagues

Data analysis revealed an important distinction between how programme graduates perceived trust from their head of department and how their colleagues described trusting them as teachers. While graduates' perceptions of trust from their HoD suggested a one-dimensional, cognition-based form of trust, the trust their colleagues placed in them appeared more complex, involving a combination of cognition-, affect-, and value-based trust.

Programme graduates often described the trust they felt from their HoD as being rooted in shared ideas, purposes, or visions about teaching, as well as in a mutual respect for skills and a confidence that their work would be completed to a high standard. This trust seemed to originate from knowledge, skills, and competences. For example, one graduate (G4N) explained, "I have been given quite a lot of freedom in terms of designing a number of courses, so the [course name] that I told you about—that's just been my idea, and I have got a lot of support with that." Another graduate (G2M) described how they and their superior inspire each other to use new materials or methods in their teaching.

In contrast, the trust expressed by colleagues was more nuanced, reflecting a blend of cognition-based trust (respect for skills and knowledge), affect-based trust (interpersonal care and concern), and value-based trust (shared principles or ethics). When colleagues were asked to characterise the graduates and report what students said about them, they frequently described the graduates as highly competent and organised, excelling in areas such as class structure, theory, real-world applications, and course design. The graduates were portrayed as effective in engaging students and focusing on what students need to learn. They were acknowledged for their skill in structuring materials and for being very professional in designing new courses.

At the same time, colleagues characterised ED programme graduates as empathetic and attentive to students' individual needs, and such descriptions featured even more prominently than respect for their skills and knowledge. Colleagues pointed to the graduates' ability to establish a close connection with students, showing kindness and care beyond the classroom. Care was repeatedly raised as something that increased the graduates' trustworthiness in the eyes of their colleagues. This care extended to supporting students personally and building relationships that went beyond traditional academic boundaries. One colleague mentioned how a programme graduate was not in a hurry to leave the classroom after a session ended, while another emphasised that students often saw the graduate in a more human, approachable role, as opposed to the typical "serious academic" persona. Another example highlighted how a graduate enjoyed collaborating with students, co-creating elements of the class with them. Graduates were also said to adjust their teaching dynamically based on student needs, such as modifying class plans to accommodate more discussion on a particular topic or starting each class by connecting with students and checking in on their progress.

One colleague (C2N) put it like this: "They [students] love it [the class]. I know it in some cases from first-hand experience because they [students] have told me, in other cases, we know it from feedback via the university evaluation system." A different colleague (C4C) remarked, "In terms of the social dynamics of the classroom, [they] are a very thoughtful teacher. And just given the fact that so many of [their] students are struggling right now with the intensification of the crisis in the Middle East, [they] really are somebody who thinks about how to support students beyond the classroom but for the purposes of academic development." Another colleague (C4N) highlighted a positive interaction between the graduate and their students, sharing a student's feedback: "He [a student] said: 'Oh, [graduate's name] is great. You know, like when [they] kind of walk around the room and talk to us.' And yeah, that [programme graduate] had a great attitude, and students really liked them." Similarly, a different colleague (C1N) noted, "[Graduate name] seems, yeah, very approachable by students. They like it. And it looks like [the graduate] is able to build a good rapport with them" [students].

Acting on principle, i.e., values-based trust was also mentioned, though only in two interviews. Both colleagues highlighted the graduates' fairness, particularly in their interactions with students. One colleague referred to the graduate being fair when assessing students (C3M), while another pointed out that the graduate demonstrated fairness in their overall treatment of students (C4S).

Discussion

The findings from this research align with existing literature, stressing the importance of trust in shaping teachers' practices. Specifically, the perception of being trusted by others matters for teaching practice, supporting the work of Roxå and Mårtensson (2015) and Simper, Maynard, and Mårtensson (2022). Although most programme graduates (10) believed their superior trusted them

to teach in a student-centred way and these were usually graduates with high student-centred teaching practices, in the case of seven graduates, trust was not established and their level of student-centredness differed. One possible factor explaining superiors' trust may be whether they actually valued student-centred learning or not.

In line with literature suggesting that trust fosters a culture conducive to discussing teaching struggles and engaging in reflection (Stocks and Trevitt, 2016; Timmermans et al., 2018; Pleschová et al., 2021), this study found the perception of trust from a superior being linked with reflective practices. In five out of seven cases, indifference from the HoD (unless there was a problem) was associated with a mid or low level of reflectiveness, indicating that a lack of trust seems to affect reflectiveness more significantly than the presence of trust.

Additionally, while trust is known to encourage openness to new ideas and innovation in teaching (Iqbal and Vigna, 2021; Simper, Maynard, and Mårtensson, 2022), this study did not confirm that trust from superiors correlates with innovative practices as measured by presentations and publications about teaching. This may be due to the study's reliance on these metrics as proxies for innovation, as well as the lack of direct inquiry into trust from colleagues, which might play a role in fostering innovation. Nevertheless, trust appears to be important for teaching innovation. Some programme graduates in this study perceived freedom to innovate because they felt trusted by their superior. Even if a teaching innovation failed and received poor feedback from students, the graduates felt secure that their superior would be understanding. Other graduates, however, perceived freedom due to their superior's indifference. These graduates, when innovating, had to be highly motivated and mindful of the risk involved. If an innovation proved unsuccessful, they risked facing some form of penalty.

The study also showed that perceptions of trust vary between graduates and colleagues. Graduates' feelings of being trusted by their HoD were mostly associated with cognition-based trust, focusing on competence. In contrast, colleagues' descriptions of trust in the graduates included elements of cognition-, affect-, and value-based trust, with affect-based trust being particularly prominent. This indicates that colleagues—whom graduates nominated for their insight into their teaching—have a more nuanced understanding of trust than the superiors. Care for student experience stood out as an affective feature of programme graduates that contributed towards colleagues viewing them as trustworthy, echoing the findings of Timmermans et al. (2018) and Iqbal and Vigna (2021).

To enhance the quality and impact of trust within academic departments, it is recommended that heads of department gain more insight into their faculty members' teaching practices. This can be achieved through inviting them to present on their teaching innovation during departmental meetings, undertaking a teaching observation, initiating discussions with other teachers and students, engaging in co-teaching or encouraging teachers to write papers on student learning. By cultivating a more comprehensive and informed understanding of teaching, heads of department can foster more complex and supportive trust relationships. This, combined with the trust of colleagues, could strengthen graduates' student-centred and reflective practices, as well as support innovation in teaching. This is important, as two of the programmes assessed in this study—those offered by Nottingham Trent University and the Slovak Academy of Sciences—expect their graduates to innovate in their teaching.

Conclusion

This chapter explored whether programme graduates feel trusted by their head of department to teach in a student-centred way and innovate teaching, and whether this perception translated into

student-centred, reflective, and innovative teaching practices. A majority of graduates (10 out of 19) felt trusted by their HoD and they typically attributed their sense of trust to shared ideas and values related to teaching. Six programme graduates felt that the freedom they experienced in their teaching stemmed more from indifference and lack of care than from genuine support and one was unsure about being trusted.

Graduates who believed their HoD trusted them were generally assessed as high in student-centred learning. At the same time, perceptions of indifference and ambivalence related to mid or low-level reflective teaching practices. Due to the small sample and a qualitative nature of this study, these findings should not be interpreted as statistically generalisable. The level of teaching innovation, measured through presentations and journal publications about teaching and learning, was relatively low, with only seven graduates presenting at teaching-related events and four publishing such papers.

Interviews with colleagues of the programme graduates indicated that they placed considerable trust in the graduates as teachers. This trust was described as more complex and multifaceted, encompassing cognition-, affect-, and value-based elements, with a predominance of affect-based trust. In contrast, graduates' perceptions of trust from their HoD were primarily cognition-based. This suggests that colleagues, with their closer and more nuanced understanding of graduates' teaching practices, may provide a more comprehensive view of trust compared to heads of department, who might need to invest more in understanding graduates' teaching-related perceptions and practices.

References

Cook-Sather, Alison, Hong, Emily, Moss, Tamarah (2021) Developing new faculty voice and agency through trustful, overlapping, faculty-faculty and student-faculty conversations. International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 347-359: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1947296

de Lange, Thomas, Wittek, Anne Line (2022) Analysing the constitution of trust in peer-based teacher mentoring groups – a sociocultural perspective. Teaching in Higher Education 27(3): 337-351: 10.1080/13562517.2020.1724936

de Vries, Michael S. (2005) Trust and governance practices among local leaders. International Review of Administrative Sciences 71(3): 405-424: 10.1177/0020852305057577

Denscombe, Martyn (2010) The good research guide. For small-scale social research projects. 4th edition. McGraw Hill and Open University Press

Glessmer, Mirjam, Persson, Peter, Forsyth Rachel (in press) Engineering students trust teachers who ask, listen, and respond. International Journal for Academic Development

Hamshire, Claire, Forsyth, Rachel (14 May 2024): Facilitating conversations about race: staff views on the importance of accountability and trust in a student-led project, International Journal for Academic Development: 10.1080/1360144X.2024.2349929

Iqbal, Isabeau, Vigna, John (2021) Care in collaborations: opening up conversations about teaching, International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 383-387: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1937183

Kharouf, Husni, Sekhon, Harjit, Kumar Roy, Sanjit (2015) The components of trustworthiness for higher education: a transnational perspective. Studies in Higher Education 40(7): 1239-1255: 10.1080/03075079.2014.881352

Mayer, Roger C., Davis, James H., Schoorman, David F. (1995) An integrative model of organizational trust. Academic Management Review 20(3): 709-734. 10.5465/AMR.2007.24348410

Pleschová, Gabriela, Roxå, Torgny, Thomson Kate Eileen, Felten, Peter (2021) Conversations that make meaningful change in teaching, teachers, and academic development, International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 201-209: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1958446

Roxå, Torgny, Mårtensson, Katarina (2015) Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. International Journal for Academic Development 20(2): 193-205: 10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929

Simon, Eszter; Pleschová, Gabriela (2021) PhD students, significant others, and pedagogical conversations. The importance of trusting relationships for academic development. International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 279-291: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1958446

Simper, Natalie, Maynard, Nicoleta, Mårtensson, Katarina (2022) Informal academic networks and the value of significant social interactions in supporting quality assessment practices. Higher Education Research & Development 41(4): 1277-1293: 10.1080/07294360.2021.1896481

Stacey, Pamela, Chan, KinHo (2021) Significant conversations at the intersection of co-teaching and student-faculty partnership. International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 360-372: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1941035

Stocks, Claire, Trevitt, Chris (2016) The place of trust in continuing professional learning programmes: supporting authentic reflection in portfolio assessment. International Journal for Academic Development 21(3): 219-229: 10.1080/1360144X.2016.1188819

Tang, Anne L. L, Walker-Gleaves, Caroline (2022) Hong Kong university teachers' conceptions and articulation of teacher care: towards building a model of caring pedagogy. Higher Education 83(2): 503-526: 10.1007/s10734-020-00675-3

Timmermans, Julie A., Bruni, Carmen, Gorbet, Rob, Moffatt, Barbara, Stubley, Gordon, Williams, Diane, Holmes, Trevor (2018) The flourishing of care in a multidisciplinary Faculty Learning Community. International Journal for Academic Development 23(4): 367-373: 10.1080/1360144X.2018.1521335

Tschannen-Moran, Megan, Hoy, Wayne K. (2000) A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. Review of Educational Research 70(4): 547-593: 10.2307/1170781

West, Kim, Hoessler, Carolyn, Bennetch, Rebekah, Ewert-Bauer, Tereigh, Wilson, Mary, Beaudoin, Jean-Pascal, Ellis, Donna E., Brown, Veronica M., Timmermans, Julie A., Verwoord, Roselynn, Kenny, Natasha A. (2017). Educational Development Guide Series: No. 2. Rapport-Building for Educational Developers. Ottawa, ON: Educational Developers Caucus: www.stlhe.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/EDC-Guide-No-2-FINAL.pdf

Chapter 11. ED programme graduates serving as educational leaders

Educational leaders play a crucial role in transforming teaching and learning practices in higher education. These leaders assist colleagues in creating impactful learning and teaching experiences (Laggini Fiore, 2023). They serve as a source of inspiration (Kelly, 2023) and enable the professional growth of others (Wu and Chng, 2023), often by initiating and nurturing teaching collaborations (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019). The influence of educational leaders is evident within their departments, whether they focus on a single issue, such as promoting innovative teaching methods, or address multiple concerns, such as gender equality and student-centred learning (Pleschová and Simon, 2024). Recent case studies (Lang, 2023) and the everyday experiences of educational developers and academic teachers across different contexts (Wu and Chng, 2023; Crone et al., 2024) demonstrate that without individuals willing to take responsibility, confront challenges, and guide others, little change would occur in established teaching and learning practices.

Given the significance placed on educational leadership, this chapter explores the role of graduates of educational development (ED) programmes as educational leaders in higher education. The chapter begins by defining educational leadership in higher education as it is understood in the literature and in this study. It then presents the research methods and summarises the findings related to the three research questions, situating them within the broader context of existing studies. The concluding section highlights the most significant results and offers recommendations for fostering educational leadership.

How the literature conceptualises educational leadership

Mighty (2013: 114) defines leadership as the "capacity to influence others to work towards a set of shared goals." While institutional managers are tasked with developing plans and budgets, organising staff, and engaging in control and problem-solving, educational leadership is more concerned with setting a direction, aligning individuals, inspiring others, and fostering their motivation (Kinchin, 2023). In higher education, Grunefeld et al. (2015) differentiate between academic leaders, who occupy formal roles with direct responsibility for teaching and learning, and educational leaders, who can hold both formal and informal positions and have the responsibility to influence these areas.

Given the complexity of the higher education environment, academic leaders often engage in sense-making (Lang and Hosein, 2023) and act as catalysts for new knowledge relevant to teaching and learning (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019). These findings suggests that educational leaders are frequently not part of senior management, but instead exert influence from middle positions within institutions (Kinchin, 2023). Various empirical studies documenting change in higher education teaching and learning support this view (Anakin et al., 2017; Pleschová and Simon, 2024) or at least indicate a willingness among middle managers to do so (Serbati et al., 2024).

The literature highlights one dominant theme associated with educational leadership: creating change to improve teaching and learning (Lang and Rao, 2023). Change in this sense implies changing more than certain aspects of teaching and learning: it means casting a significant impact on institutional teaching and learning practices (Grunefeld et al., 2015), cultures (Fields et al., 2019), the perceived value of teaching, and the provision of support for innovative teaching practices (Crone et al., 2024).

To achieve change, educational leaders frequently collaborate with colleagues across the institution. They mentor and empower others in the area of teaching and learning and they, too, are mentored or seek mentors to support them in their roles (Hathaway, 2018; Jankowska, 2018; Crone et al.,

2024). Educational leaders initiate connections and interdisciplinary teaching collaborations among colleagues who would not have otherwise met, in this way rapidly diffusing knowledge and also learning new things from diverse communities (Taylor, 2005; Grunefeld et al., 2015; Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019). Working with others gives educational leaders a sense of being identified, acknowledged and valued by others for fostering change in education (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019; Crone et al., 2024). One such form of recognition is a formal leadership position or committee membership related to teaching and learning (Amundsen and D'Amico, 2019).

On top of these qualities, educational leaders often need patience and resilience, fostering hope for desired change even when prospects for change seem limited or distant (McGowan and Felten, 2021). In their book, Rao, Hosein and Kinchin (2023) showcase educational leaders who were outsiders within their contexts, experiencing feelings of vulnerability, uncertainty, loneliness, marginalization, and lack of recognition from their institutions. Their reflections demonstrate that not all educational leaders have access to institutional resources and support to implement teaching and learning initiatives (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019); instead, they often need to secure their own resources.

Teaching collaboration—discussed in the previous chapter—influences the perceptions and practice of educational leadership. Collaboration leads to leadership where power is shared or distributed to nurture a new collegial culture that supports teaching innovation (Lang and Rao, 2023). In educational contexts with a dominant collegial culture, academic teachers tend to expect and appreciate leadership through consensus, not power (Wu and Chng, 2023). Educational leadership then takes the form of distributed or shared leadership, further promoting relationships and collaborations across different institutional levels (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019; Fossland and Sandvoll, 2023; Kinchin, 2023).

The following six characteristics are most frequently mentioned in the literature as distinguishing educational leaders, although they do not need to possess all of them at one particular time (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019). First, educational leaders have a theoretically sound and practice-oriented vision of student learning and higher education, and they often demonstrate excellence in teaching and/or in researching learning (Taylor, 2005; Grunefeld et al., 2015; Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019). Moreover, educational leaders have affective qualities such as the ability to listen, demonstrate empathy and establish trust (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019). Notably, educational leaders feel committed to change (Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019; Crone et al., 2024).

This work explores ED programmes that have student-centred learning and reflective teaching among the intended programme outcomes. A student-centred approach to teaching has been empirically documented to encourage students to focus on meaning and, moreover, to lead to better learning outcomes in terms of deeper understanding. In contrast, a teacher-centred approach has been shown to result in students focusing on mere reproduction of the material studied and achieving poorer learning outcomes than in a student-centred approach (Åkerlind, 2007). A reflective approach to teaching, on the other hand, allows higher education teachers to continuously enhance their practice through regularly considering how students learn in their courses and modifying their teaching approaches or methods in cases when students do not learn as expected (see Chapter 1 for more on reflective teaching).

The educational leadership literature connects educational leadership with both concepts—student-centred learning and reflective teaching. Fields, Kenny and Mueller (2019) found the narratives of educational leaders from a Canadian university strongly aligned with student-centred approaches to

teaching. At two higher education contexts— in the UK and again in Canada— teachers' awareness of the need for student-centredness as effective teaching practice was evidenced to be a strong enabling factor to change teaching practices. In contrast, teachers with a teacher-centred approach were found to inhibit change (Anakin et al., 2017). As for reflective teaching, various studies posit that being reflective is pivotal for any educational leader (Hosein, Rao and Kinchin, 2022: 2; Fossland and Sandvoll, 2023; Lang and Rao, 2023). Whereas established ways of teaching and learning do not prepare students for the changing world and its challenges, through reflection individuals can rethink meanings, transform schemes of thinking and formulate new perspectives (Mezirow, 1991 cited in Rogers, 2001; see Chapter 2 for more about reflection).

Many educational development programmes equip teachers to adopt student-centred and reflective teaching practices, positioning graduates to potentially serve as educational leaders within their institutions. However, the literature offers limited insight into whether these graduates actually step into educational leadership roles. Fossland and Sandvoll (2023) cite one educational leader (A4) from Norway and Sweden who noted: "I think there's ... a new generation of university teachers that have ... grown up with doing the teachers' training early in their career, getting interested in the learning issue, in the sense that they take new courses [and] work with their teaching formats in a very much more active way than was the situation a generation earlier." This implies that the new generation of programme graduates might be more willing and capable to serve as educational leaders than their predecessors.

Insights from the educational leadership literature, along with gaps in our understanding of educational leadership in higher education, inspired the formulation of three research questions for this study:

1. Do graduates of ED programmes assume leadership roles in teaching and learning five and more years after completing the programme? If so, what do these roles involve, and what are their perceived outcomes?

2. Is there a connection between programme graduates' student-centredness and reflectiveness and their engagement in formal leadership roles?

3. Are programme graduates recognised for their contributions to teaching?

Methods

To answer the first research question, graduates of ED programmes from the four higher education institutions explored in this study were asked as part of a broader interview whether they held any leadership roles in teaching at their institution. To enhance the study's validity, colleagues nominated by programme graduates as individuals highly knowledgeable about their teaching were asked if the graduate informally influenced others concerning teaching and learning. Additionally, colleagues' characterizations of the programme graduate as a teacher, gathered through the colleague interview protocol, were used to answer that question, too.

To explore the relationship between programme graduates' student-centredness and reflectiveness and their taking on formal leadership roles, this study cross-checked expert assessment of programme graduates' student-centredness and reflectiveness (see Chapter 6) with information about their formal leadership roles. Finally, to find out whether graduates were recognised for their teaching, for example, through teaching awards, this study drew from colleagues' statements about the graduates in the colleague interviews. Due to the sensitivity of issues discussed in this chapter, to

protect anonymity of the research subjects, interviewee codes were intentionality omitted in certain sections of the text.

ED programme graduates as educational leaders

This study understands educational leaders as individuals who either hold a formal position in the institution that allows them to influence teaching and learning, are informally recognised for impacting their colleagues' teaching practices, or both. Formal positions may include roles such as dean, vice-dean, provost, pro-vice chancellor, department chair, programme director, programme board member, course leader, or similar. The role of course leader refers to coordinating multiple colleagues who teach the same course, rather than solely designing, teaching and assessing a course as its primary instructor. The following sections present research findings related to the three research questions.

Educational leadership roles of graduates from ED programmes

Of the 19 programme graduates interviewed for this research, eleven (58%) hold formal educational leadership roles. The most common roles include programme lead or programme board member (5), course leader (4), and head (1) or deputy head (1) of the department. Programme graduates also serve in various other roles such as leader for e-learning and use of artificial intelligence in education (1), supervision of student work (1), course design (1), timetabling (1) and coordinating student placements (1). One graduate frequently facilitates training workshops on student-centred teaching methods.

In the case of three programme graduates, leadership entails membership in institutional bodies: a quality assurance committee, an exam committee, and the academic senate (institution's self-governing body). In one case, it was unclear whether the graduate was formally appointed or had any formal title associated with their role: that graduate serves as an example of good practice for new teachers who regularly came to observe their classes. Six graduates assume dual and one multiple leadership roles, for example combining course and programme leadership, leadership in supervision and in the design of new courses, or serving as deputy head of department together with being a course leader and an academic senate member.

As presented in the Table below, this study revealed notable differences between the four institutions in terms of assigning formal educational leadership roles to programme graduates. Whereas all four graduates from the Nottingham Trent University held a formal role and three out of five graduates from Central European University held such roles, only two out of five graduates from both Masaryk University and the Slovak Academy of Sciences were appointed to educational leadership positions.

At some of these institutions, graduates' experiences indicated that quality teaching received limited recognition. For instance, one graduate mentioned that teachers assigned to a course in their department are routinely given slides from the previous instructor and are expected to use them as-is, rather than redesigning the course and materials. Subject matter expertise, teaching methods, and the effort put into course planning receive little acknowledgment. It is then not surprising to hear the graduate saying, "Becoming a departmental member was a bad decision, I would say. This is the worst group of colleagues I have ever experienced, even though I do like teaching." Indeed, in this case, the graduate was not offered any formal leadership position in teaching.

Although not all of the programme graduates had a formal leadership role in education, their colleagues universally believed they influenced other teachers' teaching practice. Most colleagues

appreciated the influence the graduates had on their own teaching (C4S, C2C, C1N, C2N, C3N, C4N, C2M, C3M, C4M, C5M). For example, one colleague (C1N) noted, “I definitely learned quite a bit from them, because we come from very different perspectives. They know a lot about theories and philosophy and how to teach it in an accessible way.” Another colleague (C3N) commented, “Maybe he’s had an influence on me, and I think I’ve probably had an influence on him. Which is why we worked so well together and have done for a number of years now and continue to kind of choose to do so.” One colleague (C1M) explicitly mentioned that the graduate had influenced them to be more student-centred and innovative in their teaching. A different colleague attributed the graduate’ influence to enhancements in class planning and structuring (C5M).

The colleagues, moreover, gave a variety of examples illustrating how programme graduates impact others’ teaching. One colleague (C1S), for example, described that the graduate influences peers teaching the same subject, as well as a junior colleague who teaches a different subject. Another referred to the graduate inspiring colleagues to revise the kind of scientific problems assigned to students in class (C3S). The colleague of the graduate who was departmental head (C3C) shared that the graduate initiated discussions about teaching during departmental meetings, in this way influencing how departmental colleagues design courses and assess students. Another colleague praised the graduate for introducing regular teaching seminars in which departmental colleagues discuss teaching; previously, they only had research seminars (C2M). In a similar vein, a colleague (C1M) commended the graduate for being persistent in promoting consensus among the five teachers teaching a course, despite one senior teacher holding very different views of teaching.

Fostering other’s intrinsic motivation to teach emerged as a strong theme in how graduates from ED programmes influence other teachers. Two colleagues (C3M, C4M) stressed that they and the graduate regularly remind each other what they do in teaching, why they do so and why they believe in it. In one of these cases (C4M), this included encouragement during moments of frustration after reading student critiques on student feedback forms. Moral support was also mentioned by another colleague (C5M), who elaborated on how the graduate engages with teachers who feel disappointed by how their class went: “When they come to see [the graduate] and they’re in a bit of a bad mood, [the graduate] immediately starts to say that the next lesson can be better, that they can use this, instantly offering some kind of solution ... You can do it like this. Or wait, I’ve got a link here, have a look.”

Another recurrent theme was the impact on new colleagues. One colleague (C4M) emphasised that the graduate, now an established teacher in the department, influences newly hired colleagues, for example, by discussing teaching and learning with them. Another colleague (C2M) mentioned that the graduate works closely with a new departmental colleague who had recently arrived from abroad. “[They] are actually working a lot, sharing with her that experience in pedagogy and teaching, so I think they have a bit of momentum now and they can do that.”

Despite the generally positive sentiment of the colleagues’ statements summarising how graduates influence others’ teaching and student learning, one colleague mentioned that the graduate faces backlash for their activism due to resistance from some long-standing members of the department: “They are trying to innovate, but I think they are hitting a lot of obstacles where, well, it doesn’t quite work.”

Programme graduates’ reflectiveness and SCL versus their formal educational leadership

As visualised in the Table, only some programme graduates categorised by the research team as highly student-centred and highly reflective were appointed to formal educational leadership

positions. Specifically, eight out of 13 graduates (61%) evaluated as highly or between mid and highly student-centred currently occupy a formal educational leadership role. In the case of reflectiveness, five out of eight highly reflective graduates (63%) hold a formal educational leadership position. It should be noted, however, that three of the graduates assessed as low or mid for their SCL/reflectiveness also held formal educational leadership roles.

Table. Programme graduates' student-centred learning (SCL) and reflective teaching contrasted with their formal educational leadership roles

	Slovak Academy of Sciences					**Central European University**					**Nottingham Trent University**				**Masaryk University**				
Graduate's code	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G1	G2	G3	G4	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5
Formal leadership role in teaching		□		□		□		□		□	□	□	□	□				□	□
SCL	high	mid	high	high	no	high	high	mid	mid-high	high	mid	high	high	high	mid	high	high	high	high
Reflectiveness	high	low	mid	high	mid	high	high	low-mid	mid	mid	mid	mid	mid	high	low	high	mid	high	high

Recognition of programme graduates' teaching

Although about half of programme graduates in this research have formal educational leadership roles and their interviewed colleagues universally recognised them for impacting others' teaching, it was quite rare for graduates to be institutionally recognised for their teaching. Of the 15 colleagues of programme graduates that were interviewed, only one colleague (C4C) was aware of the graduate being acknowledged for their teaching, namely, being promoted from a fellow to a permanent lecturer position. One colleague (C3C) mentioned that the graduate was recognised but was unsure about the form of recognition. Another colleague (C2N) opined that the graduate was not recognised through an award but the fact that the institution continues employing the graduate signals they value their teaching.

As documented in previous chapters, ED programme graduates in this research are student-centred, reflective practitioners. They introduce innovative teaching methods, and students appreciate learning in their classes. Sometimes, they present at conferences about teaching and learning and publish teaching-related papers in peer-reviewed journals. Of the nine institutions where the programme graduates currently teach, seven have introduced a teaching award. However, none of the graduates' colleagues interviewed for this research could name a specific award that the graduate had received for teaching. This suggests that, between five and eleven years after finishing an educational development programme, graduates are typically not being recognised for teaching excellence or innovative teaching through an award or similar.

Two colleagues mentioned as an example of recognition that the graduate was commended at a departmental meeting for their innovative teaching approach. One of them (C5M), however, said

that such praise was sporadic and was later downplayed by a critique raised for issues unrelated to teaching. “There are some negative comments for other things because [the departmental chair] usually brings up what’s not been done on time and what’s not been done at all, which should be more the opposite for me.” Another colleague described that, in general, teaching receives very little acknowledgement in their department and said the following about the graduate: “They strive to teach in the best way they believe possible, regardless of how much effort it costs and that no one truly recognises it.”

Discussion

Results from this study align with findings from literature that suggest that the change process is often teacher-driven or bottom-up (Anakin et al., 2017) and that informal (grassroots) leaders can inspire change beyond individual courses (Pleschová and Simon, 2024). As emphasised in previous chapters, programme graduates possess a range of qualities of educational leaders, including trustworthiness (as perceived by their superiors and colleagues) and the ability to initiate and engage in teaching collaborations. However, this research also uncovered the vulnerability of some programme graduates, such as the one quoted above, who considered their department the worst group of colleagues they have ever experienced. These individuals feel disconnected with their pedagogical culture, despite teaching in the same context where they were educated, rather than having transitioned to another country as Hosein did (2018).

Although Fossland and Sandvoll (2023) suggest that ED programme graduates might be ready to undertake educational leadership roles, this research found that only in certain cases were programme graduates appointed into formal leadership positions with influence on teaching. In other contexts, graduates influenced teaching and learning within the institution only through informal means.

Existing literature directly links academic teachers’ leadership potential with their student-centred approach to teaching (Anakin et al., 2017; Fields, Kenny and Mueller, 2019) and their ability to reflect on teaching and learning (Hosein, Rao and Kinchin, 2022: 2; Fossland and Sandvoll, 2023; Lang and Rao, 2023). However, this research did not find sufficient support for the idea that highly student-centred and highly reflective teachers are more likely to be promoted to formal educational leadership positions. This link appears to be context-dependent. In some contexts, such as at Nottingham Trent University, all ED programme graduates held educational leadership positions, presumably because they have a teaching qualification, experience, and good reputation for their teaching. In contrast, at institutions like Masaryk University and the higher education institutions in Slovakia, where teaching qualifications and expertise are less recognised, only a few graduates were appointed to formal educational leadership roles. This aligns with Wu and Chng’s (2023) observations about their journey to becoming educational leaders: “While material rewards are not as crucial, we think *institutional* recognition of the work is essential because recognition is a form of endorsement and empowerment of the self. We feel empowered.”

Conclusion and recommendations

Leadership in educational change is considered an inherent role of academic development (Taylor 2005), and academic developers often foster change by identifying, educating and supporting leaders from the pool of academic teachers. Academic developers’ influence largely depends on how educational leaders perceive educational change, and how they position and value the work of academic developers in relation to that change (Fossland and Sandvoll, 2023). This chapter showed to what extent the four educational development programmes explored in this work succeeded in

nurturing educational leaders. While all programme graduates in this research were recognised by their colleagues as teachers who had a notable influence on the teaching and learning of other colleagues, only slightly more than half of the graduates combined these informal educational leadership roles with formal positions in the institution that allowed them to impact teaching and learning.

This research did not find a connection between the level of student-centredness or reflective teaching and appointment to formal educational leadership roles, but the results signal that formal leadership roles are context-dependent. In contexts where quality teaching gets recognised, programme graduates are more likely to be entrusted with formal leadership roles, whereas in the environments where student-centred and innovative teaching is less valued, such appointments are relatively rare.

Therefore, it is recommended that institutions investing in educational development programmes for their teachers also take appropriate measures to elevate the importance of teaching. Student-centred, reflective and innovative teaching needs to be recognised and rewarded; otherwise, the potential of programme graduates cannot be fully realised to exert the desired effect on their departments and institutions. Such recognition can take various forms, for example, awards for excellence and innovation in teaching, inviting these individuals to offer lectures and workshops showcasing good teaching practices, or offering teaching grants to drive further professional development and course design. Institutions should also facilitate pathways for successful programme graduates into formal positions that allow them to influence institutional teaching and learning through means other than informal channels. In doing so, institutions can leverage their champions for teaching and learning to contribute to the development of an institutional culture that cultivates quality teaching and learning.

References

Åkerlind, Gerlese S. (2007) Constraints on academics' potential for developing as a teacher. Studies in Higher Education 32(1): 21-37: 10.1080/03075070601099416

Amundsen, Cheryl, D'Amico, Laura (2019) Using theory of change to evaluate socially-situated, inquiry-based academic professional development. Studies in Educational Evaluation 61:196-208: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.04.002

Anakin, Megan, Spronken-Smith, Rachel, Healey, Mick, Vajoczki, Susan (2017) The contextual nature of university-wide curriculum change. International Journal for Academic Development 23(3): 206-218: 10.1080/1360144X.2017.1385464

Crone, Vincent, Prins, Frans, Lutz, Christel, Meijerman, Irma, Schutjens, Veronique, van der Smagt, Maarten, Wijngaards-de Meij, Leoniek, Bovenschen, Niels, Kluijtmans, Manon (2024): Strengthening educational leadership through a professional development programme in conjunction with a teaching-focused full professor career track: reflections of participants. International Journal for Academic Development 29(3): 366-378: 10.1080/1360144X.2023.2207309

Fields, Jacqueline, Kenny, Natasha Ann, Mueller, Robin Alison (2019) Conceptualizing educational leadership in an academic development program. International Journal for Academic Development 24:3, 218-231: 10.1080/1360144X.2019.1570211

Fossland, Trine, Sandvoll, Ragnhild (2023) Drivers for educational change? Educational leaders' perceptions of academic developers as change agents. International Journal for Academic Development 28(3): 305-318: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1941034

Grunefeld, Hetty, van Tartwijk, Jan, Jongen, Havva, Wubbels, Theo (2015) Design and effects of an academic development programme on leadership for educational change. International Journal for Academic Development 20(4): 306-318: 10.1080/1360144X.2015.1068779

Hathaway, Tanja (2018) Negotiating transitions to academic identity: teacher or researcher. In Hosein, Anesa, Rao, Namrata, Shu-Hua Yeh, Chloe, Kinchin, Ian M. (2018) Academics' international teaching journeys: Personal narratives of transitions in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 93-107

Hosein, Anesa, Rao, Namrata, Kinchin, Ian M., Eds. (2022) Narratives of becoming leaders in disciplinary and institutional contexts. Leadership identity in learning and teaching in higher education, Bloomsbury Publishing

Hosein, Anesa (2018) Examining pedagogical autonomy in international higher education systems. In In Hosein, Anesa, Rao, Namrata, Shu-Hua Yeh, Chloe, Kinchin, Ian M. (2018) Academics' international teaching journeys: Personal narratives of transitions in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 109-124

Jankowska, Maja (2018) Towards a 'pedagogy of connection': 'Home' academic not at home. In Hosein, Anesa, Rao, Namrata, Shu-Hua Yeh, Chloe, Kinchin, Ian M. (2018) Academics' international teaching journeys: Personal narratives of transitions in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 93-107

Kelly, Andrew (2023) Participative leadership as an early career academic. In Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa and Ian Kinchin (Eds.) Narratives of academics' personal journeys in contested spaces: leadership identity in learning and teaching in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 81-94

Kinchin, Ian M. (2023) Towards an ecological perspective: Reflections on leadership journeys. Introduction. In Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa and Ian Kinchin (Eds.) Narratives of academics' personal journeys in contested spaces: leadership identity in learning and teaching in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 197-213

Laggini Fiore, Stephanie (2023) Towards a community for teaching excellence at a research-intensive university. In Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa and Ian Kinchin (Eds.) Narratives of academics' personal journeys in contested spaces: leadership identity in learning and teaching in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 113-128

Lang, Josephine, Rao, Namrata (2023) Conclusion. Perspectives on teaching and learning leadership in higher education: implications. In Lang, Josephine, Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa (Eds.) Perspectives on teaching and learning leadership in higher education: Case studies from UK and Australia. Taylor & Francis Group

Lang, Josephine, Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa, Eds. (2023) Perspectives on teaching and learning leadership in higher education: Case studies from UK and Australia, Taylor & Francis Group

Lang, Josephine, Hosein, Anesa (2023) Teaching and learning leadership in higher education. An introduction. In Lang, Josephine, Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa (Eds.) Perspectives on Teaching and learning leadership in higher education: Case studies from UK and Australia. Taylor & Francis Group

McGowan, Sussanah, Felten, Peter (2021) On the necessity of hope in academic development. International Journal for Academic Development 26(4): 473-476: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1903902

Mezirow, Jack (1991) Transformative dimensions of adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey Bass cited in Rogers, Russell R. (2001) Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. Innovative Higher Education 26(1): 37-57: 10.1023/A:1010986404527

Mighty, Joy (2013) One important lesson I've learned from my involvement with SoTL. Teaching and Learning Inquiry 1(1): 113-116: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.113

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes (8 December 2023) Internationalising student learning at the meso level: the impact of grassroots leadership in a university in Central Europe. European Political Science: 10.1057/s41304-024-00475-8

Serbati, Anna, Agostini, Daniele, Maniero, Sabrina, Picasso, Federica, Venuti, Paola, Felisatti, Ettore (2024) Educational leadership for academic development: Practices and reflections at University of Trento. INTED Proceedings: 2212-2217.

Taylor, K. Lynn (2005) Academic development as institutional leadership: An interplay of person, role, strategy, and institution. International Journal for Academic Development 10(1): 31-46: 10.1080/13601440500099985

Wu, Siew Mei, Chng, Huang Hoon (2023) Our journeys through the Scholarship of Leading: What matters and what counts? In Rao, Namrata, Hosein, Anesa and Ian Kinchin (Eds.) Narratives of academics' personal journeys in contested spaces: Leadership identity in learning and teaching in higher education. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 179-196: 10.5040/9781350196988.ch-011

SECTION IV. CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 12. The implications of this study for educational development, institutional practice and research

Many higher education institutions around the world now offer programmes that equip academic teachers with the foundational knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching and learning in higher education. In countries where educational development (ED) has become an established field of practice, these programmes are often accredited, providing graduates with a standardised set of competencies that enable them to support student learning effectively (see, for example, UK Professional Standards Framework, 2023). While considerable evidence exists regarding the short-term outcomes of these programmes (Simon and Pleschová, 2012; Ilie et al., 2020), much less is known about how programme graduates conceptualise teaching and learning and what they actually do as teachers over the longer term.

Existing literature suggests that the workplace—whether it be a department, faculty, workgroup, or another unit—plays a significant role in shaping how academic teachers approach teaching (Roxå, Mårtensson and Alveteg, 2011). This influence can sometimes contradict what teachers have learned in ED programmes and what they genuinely aspire to implement in their classrooms (Remmik et al., 2011). Established teaching practices within the workplace, formal rules determining how teaching should be conducted, and informal relationships with colleagues all affect how teachers approach and carry out their teaching (Stewart, 2014; Remmik et al., 2011). This raises the question: what happens to programme graduates who leave their ED programme inspired and equipped to teach in a particular way?

This work set out to explore the long-term effects of ED programmes, which we defined as impacts five or more years after programme completion. In addition to examining individual teachers' perspectives and practices, it also delves into the role of contextual factors. Given that many ED programmes, across various contexts, have focused on fostering student-centred learning (SCL) and reflective teaching as key learning outcomes, this study selected four programmes with similar objectives. The research collected data to answer three primary questions:

- How do programme graduates understand and interpret student-centred learning five and more years after completing the ED programme?
- Do programme graduates continue to reflect on their teaching five and more years post-graduation? If so, how can these reflections be categorised and described, and do graduates take action based on their reflections?
- What role do graduates' institutions and the broader national context play in shaping their ability to implement student-centred and reflective teaching practices? What are the supportive and constraining factors?

To address these questions, a team of researchers analysed a survey and interviews with 19 graduates from four ED programmes: those offered by the Central European University (previously Hungary, now Austria), Masaryk University (Czechia), Slovak Academy of Sciences (Slovakia), and Nottingham Trent University (United Kingdom). The sample included female and male academics from the fields of biology, education, engineering, linguistics, law, medicine, philosophy, political science, sociology, and social work. Most of them had very limited teaching experience when they enrolled in the educational development programme. The graduates were asked about their teaching principles, how they gather information to enhance their teaching, teaching-related publications, key

events that influenced their teaching, colleagues with whom they share a teaching approach, and institutional factors impacting their teaching. They were also invited to reflect on a recently taught class session. Some interview questions related to the graduates' perceptions of being trusted as a teacher and their leadership roles in teaching.

In addition to interviews with the graduates, data were collected from colleagues recommended by the graduates as being familiar with their teaching, as well as from the syllabi of mostly undergraduate courses taught by these graduates. The analysis of this data led to a series of key findings, which are summarised in this concluding chapter, structured around four main themes: 1) student-centred learning and reflective teaching, 2) contextual factors that shape teaching—including teaching collaboration, trustful relationships, and educational leadership, 3) the role of coaching/mentoring in sustaining and advancing what academic teachers had learned on the ED programme and 4) the value that programme graduates attributed to their programme. After discussing these themes, this concluding chapter outlines the implications of this study for institutions, educational development programmes, and future research.

Student-centred learning and reflective teaching

This research identified four distinct paths that graduates from ED programmes tend to follow in their teaching practice: the Pragmatic Teacher, the Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator, the Dedicated Teacher Frustrated with Their Institution, and the Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar. The most prevalent path was that of the Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator, which aligns closely with the programme's aims of fostering student-centred and reflective teaching practices. Graduates on this path not only adopt SCL but also introduce teaching innovations. Importantly, they manage to maintain these approaches even in environments where SCL is not widely practiced, often by collaborating with colleagues who share similar teaching values.

However, while around two-thirds of the 19 programme graduates in this study followed this desired path, about a third took one of the other three paths. Those on the Pragmatic Teacher path displayed a student-centred approach and some level of reflectiveness. Yet, they were often overwhelmed by high workloads, limiting their ability to engage in deep reflection and innovate their teaching practices.

The Dedicated Teacher Frustrated with Their Institution path, on the other hand, was characterised by individuals deeply committed to student-centred learning and reflection, who actively sought to introduce innovations. Unfortunately, these programme graduates faced significant institutional barriers: lack of trust in their teaching from superiors, colleagues with opposing teaching values, and an overall institutional culture that undervalued teaching. Given the scope and number of restraints, the initial enthusiasm of these programme graduates is likely to diminish, potentially leading to a decline in student-centred, reflective, and innovative teaching over time.

Finally, the Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar path serves as a cautionary tale. Even programmes that successfully nurture student-centredness and reflective teaching may find that, five or more years later, some graduates have reverted to a teacher-centred approach. This shift appears to stem from institutional pressures, such as the requirement to teach large cohorts with little to no support.

A more detailed examination of programme graduates' student-centredness and reflectiveness revealed considerable variation. From the interviews with the graduates, about three-quarters were identified as highly student-centred, while one-fifth demonstrated mid-level SCL, and one individual was practising a teacher-centred approach. Colleague interviews corroborated these findings,

showing that approximately two-thirds of the graduates were perceived as student-centred, with the remaining third viewed as partially student-centred.

The evidence of SCL practices was less apparent in the syllabi than in the interviews. Two syllabi did not reflect any of the six primary aspects of SCL and included only one and three additional SCL aspects, respectively, suggesting a lack of student-centred focus. In seven cases, coders found at least four of the six key SCL aspects, though only in a small number of these cases were any additional SCL aspects also present. Ten syllabi demonstrated between one and three of the six primary student-centred practices, with the most common features being active learning, authentic assessment, tasks requiring students to demonstrate higher-order skills, and continuous assessment. In contrast, only four syllabi indicated that the graduates viewed students as colleagues with similar power, two syllabi recognised them as individuals with diverse interests and needs, and four mentioned that students would receive feedback on their assignments. This suggest that programme participants may need additional help to translate their student-centred views of teaching into their teaching materials.

The differences in reflective teaching among programme graduates were more pronounced than for student-centredness. Based on interviews with the graduates, about two-fifths (eight) were categorised as highly reflective, the same number showed mid-level reflection, and one graduate was between low and mid-level reflective. Colleague interviews aligned with these findings, with just over half of the graduates being described as reflective and the remainder as reflective to some extent. These variations indicate that, while educational development programmes can foster reflective practice, the extent to which it becomes embedded in teaching varies significantly.

A study into whether the graduates take action based on their reflections revealed that twelve of the nineteen had plans for addressing situations where students might not learn as intended. For example, some graduates noted that they would prompt students to interact with peers they do not typically engage with, aiming to improve interaction between international and home students. In other cases, however, reflections tended to remain general and abstract, lacking specific examples of actionable changes the programme graduate intended to implement.

It is also important to note that a classification of mid-level reflection was common among graduates who chose to share examples of classes they felt had gone well, leading them to see no need for change. In contrast, deeper reflection was observed in one graduate, who described no fewer than four concrete measures already adopted to enhance student learning in the next iteration of their course—a rare but valuable instance of reflective action.

Contextual factors that shape ED programme graduates' teaching

This section summarises the barriers that prevent programme graduates from engaging in student-centred, reflective, and innovative teaching, along with the enablers that encourage such practices. This study identified *a high workload* as the primary constraining factor. Graduates typically did not attribute their sense of being extremely busy to managing large student cohorts; instead, they reported feeling pressured by high expectations to produce research papers and fulfil various administrative and other duties. *The physical spaces for teaching and learning* were noted as the second most significant barrier to implementing student-centred learning, along with *institutional norms regarding student assessment*. Additionally, some programme graduates raised the *low value that the institution attributes to teaching* as a constraint on their practices.

In terms of supportive factors, most graduates acknowledged *the teaching and learning unit* as vital for them to sustain and develop their student-centred teaching practices, reflection, and innovation in teaching. They perceived departmental colleagues, students, institutional policies, and fellow graduates as neither supportive nor obstructive to their student-centred practices, reflective teaching, or innovation. In addition to identifying these constraining and supportive factors, this research specifically examined three further factors highlighted in existing literature as influential on higher education teaching practices: teaching collaboration, trustful relationships, and educational leadership.

Teaching collaboration

Teaching collaboration can significantly enhance teaching-related knowledge and abilities, inspire reflection on pedagogical practices, and foster innovation (Quinlan and Åkerlind, 2000). This study found that just over half of the ED programme graduates engaged in teaching collaboration. Those involved primarily worked with departmental colleagues who shared similar teaching values, often co-designing and co-teaching courses, helping colleagues develop new courses, advising on teaching challenges, and providing feedback on teaching via peer observation. In instances where colleagues with similar teaching-related values were unavailable, graduates participated in interdisciplinary and cross-institutional teaching partnerships. This latter type of collaboration proved particularly beneficial, enabling teachers to challenge traditional teaching practices dominant within their departments and adopt more student-centred approaches.

Additionally, teaching collaboration often provided programme graduates with recognition for their teaching-related expertise, which was not always evident in their everyday practice. Collaboration was more robust in institutions that actively supported it, typically through effective systems of teaching observation and conditions that fostered pedagogical conversations. These environments allowed programme graduates to learn from one another regarding their teaching values and practices.

Trustful relationships

The perception of being trusted by their superiors and colleagues in everyday teaching practice was found to significantly impact the teaching of ED programme graduates. Graduates who felt trusted by their head of department (HoD) to teach in a student-centred and innovative way tended to exhibit a high level of student-centredness. Whereas 10 graduates reported feeling trusted, six graduates perceived indifferent or uninvested attitudes about teaching from their HoDs. Furthermore, there were substantial institutional differences in whether graduates reported a sense of trust or indifference. Those who sensed ambivalence or indifference from their HoD generally displayed reflectiveness at low or mid-levels.

Interestingly, trust from HoDs did not appear to foster teaching innovation as measured by teaching-related presentations and publications, with contributions in these areas remaining generally low. The trust placed in graduates by their HoD differed from that expressed by their colleagues. The HoD's trust was primarily rooted in the graduates' knowledge and competence, whereas the trust from colleagues was more nuanced, encompassing cognitive, affective, and value-based dimensions.

Educational leadership

This research revealed that all programme graduates were recognised as educational leaders by their colleagues. This recognition was evident in the colleagues' descriptions of how the graduates had influenced their teaching, including by making it more student-centred. Graduates were

acknowledged for inspiring others to formulate research problems for students, initiating regular discussions about teaching within the department, and facilitating collaborative sessions among teachers on the same course. Additionally, they played a crucial role in integrating new colleagues into departmental teaching and providing motivation to others, especially during challenging periods in their teaching practice.

Despite this widespread recognition as informal educational leaders, only about three-fifths of the programme graduates held a formal educational leadership position within their institutions. Such roles included serving as course leaders, programme board members, (deputy) department heads, or having specific responsibilities such as advancing the use of artificial intelligence in education. The assignment of these leadership positions appeared to be context-specific; while nearly all graduates from Nottingham Trent University and Central European University held various formal leadership roles, this was true for only four of the ten interviewed graduates from Masaryk University and the Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS).

The research indicated a connection between the value an institution places on teaching and the likelihood of graduates being nominated for educational leadership positions. High levels of student-centredness or reflective teaching did not guarantee formal appointments as educational leaders unless the institution was perceived—by the interviewed graduates or their colleagues—as valuing quality teaching overall.

Even five years, and in some cases up to eleven years (SAS), after graduating from their ED programmes, and despite demonstrating exemplary levels of student-centredness and innovation in teaching, no colleague was aware of any graduate receiving an award or similar institutional recognition for their teaching. In contrast, some programme graduates expressed frustration over the low value attributed to teaching within their institutions. Although six of the nine institutions where programme graduates currently teach have introduced a teaching award, these accolades seem to go to others, possibly based on criteria other than student-centredness, reflective teaching, or teaching innovation.

The role of coaching and mentoring

The literature recognises coaches/mentors as crucial influences on teachers' practices and, more specifically, on their capacities for reflection (Rogers, 2001). This research found a connection between the level of reflection exhibited by programme graduates and the perceived role of coaches/ mentors from their ED programme in shaping their thinking about teaching. Nine of the twelve graduates who identified their coaches/mentors as influential in their teaching demonstrated high levels of reflection, with the level of reflectiveness of the other three assessed as mid-range. Conversely, those with low levels of reflection either reported having no coaching/mentoring support or could not recall who their coach/mentor was.

Programme graduates rarely collaborated on teaching with former coaches/mentors from their ED programmes. Even though three of the four programmes incorporated a coaching/mentoring component, only one graduate reported ongoing teaching collaboration with their programme coach/mentor. This collaboration primarily involved discussions about teaching and attendance at the graduate's teaching development workshops. The lack of continuity in these partnerships appears to result from a combination of insufficient institutional support for such collaborations and the previously mentioned perceptions of overwhelming workloads.

Value attributed to the ED programme

Even though this research was not designed to explore the subjective value that programme graduates attribute to their former ED programmes, it was evident that they remain aware of the influence of the programme, with many considering it highly beneficial. One graduate (G1C) remarked, "The certificate programme at Central European University has had a very significant impact on my approach to teaching, and I think all of the courses that I took served as a foundation on which I'm now building bricks."

Their colleague from the same institution (G2C) shared, "Without the programme, I wouldn't know half of the things that we have been talking about here today. That's for sure. And I think I wouldn't be even one third of the teacher that I am today. So just to put that out there, that programmes like this are absolutely necessary and they work. And if you ask me, it's something that everyone should have."

A different graduate (G1M) expressed, "I feel good here (in the teaching and learning unit). ... I call it an 'academic spa.' This space is perfectly created in the middle of your working time, which, I think, few people have. It is not symbolic but is a part of your work. I have undergone a number of these programmes, and I have not experienced that something would be repetitive." Another graduate (G3M) acknowledged their ED programme and other courses, stating, "It is good that [the teaching and learning unit] exists; I have learnt so many highly interesting things [from it] that I would otherwise have learnt by trial and error."

Some graduates spoke about the importance of their ED programme and follow-up courses specifically for stimulating their reflection on teaching and student learning. For example, one graduate (G3C) remarked, "First, I was thinking, why should I go there, because I have already been teaching for more than ten years. ... But I attended the first course, and I really enjoyed it and I realised that I do many things in teaching, but I'm not aware why I'm doing them."

Another programme graduate (G4C) stated, "It's great to have these opportunities where you really get to be a teacher not just practically teaching, but also just taking a step back and thinking about your teaching. Like, what do I do? Why do I do it? What else can I do? What is the context in which I'm doing this?"

A similar sentiment was echoed by a graduate (G1M), who recalled an educational developer giving an afternoon workshop about reflection: "I was telling myself: that is such a silly and small thing, but I cannot define it. Let's then [go and] learn something. And all of a sudden something was said and I experienced an existential breakpoint. Wait, I was doing this all the time with my best intentions and it was wrong? I had to recognise it. Then I felt a wave of excitement: I am far from perfect, and I have things to improve. ... Also someone who has taught for a number of years and gets nice feedback from students can advance in teaching through one small aspect."

Two other graduates recognised their ED programme as "the start of all my thinking about my educational role and activity" (G2M) and a kick-off for "realising some things that I wasn't doing well in my teaching" (G5S). One graduate (G2C) voiced concern that some teachers lack the opportunity to enrol in an ED programme, especially if they are required to pay for it.

Overall, the graduates from the programme offered by the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Nottingham Trent University (NTU) were less vocal about valuing the programme. None of the SAS graduates spontaneously mentioned the value of the ED programme. Of the NTU graduates, two recalled their programme. One noted that some of the educational development programmes they

undertook were “actually unhelpful,” though this was not the case for the general one. Another assessed the ED programme as “not helpful at all” in making them a more confident or better teacher. They stated they instead had to find the tools on their own, such as by participating in a programme during an international conference. This feedback suggests that the educational development programmes may not have fully addressed all participants’ needs. Additionally, for some graduates, circumstances may have evolved, presenting new challenges—such as the graduate who was tasked with teaching three to four hundred students without receiving extra support from their institution.

Implications from this study for institutions offering educational development

This concluding section highlights what higher education institutions can learn from the four institutions whose educational development programmes are analysed in this study. Six key lessons emerged from the research for institutions that provide ED programmes to their academic teachers.

Implications for institutional practices

1. **Provide programme graduates with opportunities for further development**. If institutions want the outcomes of ED programmes to be sustained over the long term, they should not leave the graduates of these programmes to cope alone with the challenges of everyday teaching. Offering workshops and follow-up courses on specific teaching and learning issues, along with coaching/mentoring, can further enhance programme graduates’ student-centredness and reflective abilities. The balance of high and moderate ratings for reflective teaching and student-centredness showed that five and more years after the programme, it continues to be more challenging for programme graduates to be reflective about teaching than to be student-centred. Therefore, reflection, in particular, requires structured support to develop. Without continued provision of educational development, there may be no sustained growth in these teaching capacities, or reflectiveness may even diminish, especially in situations where graduates face a lack of time to reflect, as some have admitted in a different study (Remmik, Karm and Lepp, 2013).

2. **Set realistic workload expectations**. Institutions should make realistic demands on programme graduates regarding their research publications, administrative tasks, and other outputs. Given that workload was identified as the primary constraint for enhanced teaching practice, this issue deserves much more attention than it currently receives. High expectations for non-teaching outputs at some institutions starkly contrast with low teaching-related expectations.

3. **Create supportive teaching spaces**. Higher education institutions should recognise the importance of teaching spaces that foster student-centred approaches. It is essential to ensure that newly reconstructed premises meet the expectations for active learning, as well as promote relationships of equity and trust among teachers and students.

4. **Facilitate teaching collaborations**. Given that teaching collaboration helps programme graduates sustain and advance their teaching practices, fostering such collaboration can be a relatively straightforward way for institutions to support ED programme graduates. This can be achieved by informing graduates about the benefits of teaching collaboration, promoting examples of good practice in this area, and, importantly, creating conditions that allow programme graduates to understand how their colleagues approach teaching and what they do with their students. A well-functioning system of peer observation and favourable

conditions for pedagogical conversations (see Pleschová et al., 2021) were identified in this research as two key factors that catalyse teaching collaboration. Additionally, institutions can support teaching collaboration through other initiatives, such as fostering communities of practice or caring communities, in which faculty members learn from failure through reflection and dialogue (Le-May Sheffield and Timmermans, 2021).

5. **Build trustful relationships**. Since trustful relationships significantly impact teaching and this research found that department heads are often less informed about programme graduates' teaching than their colleagues, HoDs should invest more time into learning about the teaching practices of programme graduates, for example by inviting them to present on their teaching innovations during departmental meetings or encouraging them to write papers on student learning. Greater insight into graduates' teaching approaches is essential for cultivating more multifaceted trusting relationships than those currently in place. Whereas superiors were reported to trust the graduates mainly in terms of the graduates' knowledge and skills, colleagues expressed trust in the graduates that encompassed their competences, their care for students and their learning, as well as their teaching-related values. Graduates need this complex trust to feel empowered to take risks when pioneering new teaching methods.

6. **Recognise quality teaching to leverage graduates as educational leaders**. Graduates of ED programmes possess substantial potential to serve as educational leaders; however, their institutions often fail to capitalise on this potential by not assigning them formal roles that would allow them to influence teaching practices. This oversight typically occurs in contexts with low recognition of teaching. Institutions that undervalue teaching often do not appreciate individual teachers, which can negatively affect their perceptions of achievement, as recognition has been identified as one of five key measures of success and failure in academia (Timmermans and Kumar, 2024). Those institutions should invest in enhancing the recognition of quality teaching and establish criteria that enable successful ED programme graduates to assume formal roles in educational leadership.

Implications for educational development

1. **Stimulate a comprehensive understanding of student-centred learning.** Research on perceptions of SCL among teachers (Trinidad, 2020; Bremner, 2022) shows that teachers commonly equate SCL with promoting active learning. Different from that, programme graduates from this research seem to view SCL in a relatively complex way. However, when it comes to their syllabi, they pay quite little attention to some important aspects of SCL, such as recognising diverse student needs, fostering balanced power dynamics between students and teachers, and using continuous assessment. This limited implementation aligns with the definitions of SCL in the four ED programmes examined in this study. Only the programme offered by the Slovak Academy of Sciences included in its definition of SCL the notion of students as colleagues and equals. No other programme than the one realised by Nottingham Trent University integrated the idea of students as individuals with diverse interests and needs. None of the programmes referred to the importance of students receiving grades and feedback as part of their vision of SCL. Programmes should ensure their articulation of SCL reflects a broad spectrum of its elements and provide sufficient opportunities for participants to put a nuanced understanding of student-centredness into practice.

2. **Make sure syllabi demonstrate SCL.** Teaching materials submitted by programme graduates from the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Masaryk University were typically only one or two pages long, making it difficult to consider them proper syllabi. In those documents they had little space to demonstrate the courses aligned with the principles of student-centred learning. Educational development programmes should help graduates learn to write syllabi that show SCL and use them in their courses. Teaching and learning units should advocate for specific standards for course syllabi to meet and promote examples of good practice, particularly among syllabi designed by programme graduates.

3. **Investigate what programme graduates find valuable about the programme.** Because graduates from the various programmes explored in this study attributed different kinds of value to their programme, programme convenors should collect data post-programme on which aspects graduates valued most and to understand any elements they felt were lacking.

4. **Foster partnerships among programme graduates.** Since some ED programme graduates may face challenges finding collaborators within their departments, collaboration with fellow graduates offers an alternative for sustaining and enhancing student-centred and reflective practices. For such partnerships to develop, graduates must be familiar with one another. Programmes should therefore create ample opportunities for participants to engage with each other's teaching ideas and approaches, such as through structured discussions, teaching observations, or peer review of assignments.

Implications for future research

1. **Ask teachers to reflect on a class that did not go well.** For future research into higher education teachers' reflective teaching, it is recommended that researchers prompt teachers to reflect on a class that did not go as planned, rather than focusing solely on sessions that went well. As indicated in other studies (McAlpine and Weston, 2000), suboptimal performance often encourages deeper, higher-level reflection compared to instances where the teacher is largely satisfied with the outcome of the class.

2. **Assess innovative teaching practices using a variety of measures.** Presentations from teaching conferences, publications of teaching-related papers, and colleague assessments can only provide a partial picture of innovative teaching approaches. If publications are to be included as a measure, it would be beneficial to collect those that detail programme graduates' teaching innovations. Preferably, researchers first establish a working definition of what constitutes innovative teaching and then evaluate individual cases against that definition. If researchers encounter challenges in achieving consensus on the meaning of innovation, an exploratory study should be conducted initially to define innovative teaching practices in higher education.

3. **Examine the duration and development of teaching collaborations**. Research aiming to uncover the impact of teaching collaboration should account for various aspects that help capture the quality of these collaborations, including their length, initial purpose, evolving nature, and perceived benefits.
4. **Explore how teaching collaboration may contribute to the development of collaborative environments for students.** None of the programme graduates or colleagues interviewed in this study described any spill-over effect from teaching collaboration to student collaboration. Such outcomes may exist, but without specifically asking about them, the research team did not uncover any evidence of this effect. In a future study, it would

moreover be important to gather sufficient data to determine whether the institutional environment encourages these types of partnerships.

Concluding thoughts

The programmes explored in this study have been preparing faculty members for their teaching roles for a number of years. In the cases of two institutions, there is evidence that these programmes achieve positive outcomes in the short term; after completing the programme, the graduates return to their departments committed and equipped to teach in a student-centred and reflective manner (Renc-Roe and Yarkova, 2013; Pleschová and McAlpine, 2016). Existing literature indicates that the workplace significantly influences how participants teach (Remmik et al., 2011; Roxå, Mårtensson, and Alveteg, 2011; Stewart, 2014). This was also evident in our research, where programme graduates reported various contextual constraints on their teaching practices. These included overwhelming workloads due to multiple responsibilities, working in spaces that did not support student-centred approaches, institutionally prescribed assessment formats, and a lack of recognition for quality teaching.

Despite this, all but one programme graduate in this research managed to teach in a student-centred way, albeit to varying degrees, and all demonstrated capacities for reflective teaching. Moreover, they were seen as educational leaders by their colleagues, and three fifths of them (11) were appointed by their institutions to formal leadership roles in education. These achievements were largely due to 10 out of the 19 graduates being engaged in teaching collaborations, same number feeling trusted by their departmental heads to teach in a student-centred manner and to innovate in their teaching, and all being regarded as trustworthy by colleagues familiar with their teaching practices.

However, it was not possible to precisely determine from data whether teaching collaboration, trusting relationships, and educational leadership were more the result of the programme graduates' individual efforts or institutionally created conditions. For about one-third of the graduates, it appeared that they strived to be student-centred and reflective practitioners despite contextual challenges. In one case, the influence of the context was so strong that the graduate reverted to a more teacher-centred approach.

Yet, the findings from this research make it clear: higher education institutions should not expect their academic teachers to perform at their best regardless of the suboptimal conditions they face. Based on the accounts of programme graduates and their colleagues, the title of this work could just as easily be "Teachers Excelling and Struggling: The Long-Term Effects of ED Programmes." In many cases, teachers acted as champions of student learning despite their working conditions, rather than because of them. It is evident that if teachers had more favourable conditions for student-centred and reflective teaching, as well as for teaching innovation, they would likely achieve even greater success in fostering student learning. Institutional contexts that are more supportive of these practices would enable teachers to fully realise their potential as teachers. Importantly, many of the desired changes require cultural shifts within institutions.

Previous research indicates that early-career academics are typically highly committed to being effective teachers, and their practice often reflects this dedication (Remmik, Karm, and Lepp, 2013; Stewart, 2014; Pleschová and Simon, 2018; Pleschová and Simon, 2022). However, Lewis (2010: 239) cautions that even if professors are currently teaching well, there is no assurance that they will maintain this level of quality throughout their careers. As already concluded long before this study:

increasing the relative value of teaching and offering rewards for good teaching is likely to have a significant impact on teaching quality (Giertz, 1996; Lewis, 2010).

Any professional development effort that is not paired with institutional support for change risks being a largely wasted activity (Cannon and Hore, 2006). In an environment that does not promote or support high-quality teaching, even the most committed educators may begin to invest less into preparing for and reflecting on their classes. This downward shift in effort and engagement—let alone a failure to rethink teaching practices—works against the purpose of ED programmes, as previously highlighted (Remmik, Karm and Lepp, 2013).

References

Bremner, Nicholas (2022) What is learner-centred education? A qualitative study exploring the perspectives of English language teachers in Colombia. Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ) 25(4): https://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej100/a12.pdf

Cannon, Robert, Hore, Terry (1997) The long-term effects of 'one-shot' professional development courses: An Indonesian case study. International Journal for Academic Development 2(1): 35-42: 10.1080/1360144970020104

Giertz, Birgitta (1996) Long-term effects of a programme for teacher training. The International Journal for Academic Development 1(2): 67-72: 10.1080/1360144960010209

Ilie, Marian D., Maricuțoiu, Laurentiu, Iancu, Daniel E., Smarandache, Izabella G., Mladenovici, Velibor, Stoia, Dalia C. M., Toth, Silvia A. (2020) Reviewing the research on instructional development programs for academics. Trying to tell a different story: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review 30: 100331: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100331

Le-May Sheffield, Suzanne, Timmermans, Julie A. (2021) Creating a collaborative community spirit for the future of academic development. International Journal for Academic Development 26(2): 117-120: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1918851

Lewis, Karron G. (2010) Pathways toward improving teaching and learning in higher education: International context and background. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 122: 10.1002/tl.394

McAlpine, Lynn, Weston, Cynthia (2000) Issues related to improving professors' teaching and students' learning. Instructional Science 28: 5-6: 363-385: 10.1023/A:1026583208230

Pleschová, Gabriela, McAlpine, Lynn (2016) Helping teachers to focus on learning and reflect on their teaching: What role does teaching context play? Studies in Educational Evaluation 48, 1-9: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.10.002

Pleschová, Gabriela, Roxå, Torgny, Thomson, Kate, Felten, Peter (2021) Conversations that make meaningful change in teaching, teachers, and academic development. International Journal for Academic Development 26(3): 201-209: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1958446

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes, Eds. (2018) Early career academics' reflections on learning to teach in Central Europe. London: SEDA: www.seda.ac.uk/resources/files/Early_career_academics_reflections_on_learning_to_teach_entire_book.pdf

Pleschová, Gabriela, Simon, Agnes, Eds. (2022) Internationalising teaching in higher education. Supporting peer learning. Delft: Delft University of Technology: https://impactportal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Internationalising_teaching_in_higher_education_whole_book.pdf

Remmik, Marvi, Karm, Mari, Lepp, Liina (2013) Learning and developing as a university teacher: narratives of early career academics in Estonia. European Educational Research Journal 12(3): 330-341: 10.2304/eerj.2013.12.3.3

Remmik, Marvi, Karm, Mari, Haamer, Anu, Lepp, Liina (2011) Early career academics' learning in academic communities. International Journal for Academic Development 16(3): 187-199: 10.1080/1360144X.2011.596702

Renc-Roe, Joanna, Yarkova, Tatiana (2013) Preparing doctoral students for a teaching career. The case of an international university with a history of regional engagement. In Simon, Eszter, Pleschová, Gabriela (Eds.) Teacher development in higher education. Existing programs, program impact, and future trends. New York and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 19-33.

Rogers, Russell R. (2001) Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. Innovative Higher Education 26(1): 37-57: 10.1023/A:1010986404527

Roxå, Torgny, Mårtensson, Katarina, Alveteg, Mattias (2011) Understanding and influencing teaching and learning cultures at university: A network approach. Higher Education 62(1): 99-111: 10.1007/s10734-010-9368-9

Stewart, Martyn (2014) Making sense of a teaching programme for university academics: Exploring the longer-term effects. Teaching and Teacher Education 38: 89-98: 10.1016/j.tate.2013.11.006

Timmermans, Julie A., Kumar, Vijay (2024) Learning from senior academics' perspectives of success and failure. Studies in Higher Education 49(8): 1317-1328: 10.1080/03075079.2023.2264864

Trinidad, Jose Eos (2020) Understanding student-centred learning in higher education: students' and teachers' perceptions, challenges, and cognitive gaps Journal of Further and Higher Education 44(8): 1013-1023: 10.1080/0309877X.2019.1636214

UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education (2023) Advance Higher Education: www.advance-he.ac.uk/teaching-and-learning/psf

ABSTRACT

ED programmes are now a standard way of enhancing quality teaching and learning; in some countries, they are even mandatory for all new lecturers. Even if there is compelling scholarly evidence that these programs can change the way lecturers teach, we still know little about their long-term effects. Such a perspective is crucial since intervening factors can influence graduates' efforts to change, including pressure to focus on research, major increase in student numbers, increasing student diversity or the attitudes of colleague lecturers. To effectively respond to changing student needs and the context of their learning, programme graduates often need more than involvement in regular initiatives of the educational development unit. Yet, it is unclear what type of support best addresses lecturers' needs and has the potential to influence their environment in a way that prioritises teaching enhancement, innovation and exchanges about good practice in education. These questions are important because universities strive to be competitive, which often requires structural changes evaluated over a five-year or longer span.

This work investigates the long-term effects of educational development (ED) programmes on teaching perceptions and practices five and more years later. The research draws comparisons between an ED programme at a university in the United Kingdom dedicated to advancing teaching, an international university where high-quality education is central to its mission, and two universities in Central and Eastern Europe with an ambition to rise in rankings and attract international students. It examines collaboration, trusting relationships and leadership as key drivers of effective practices. Data for this study were collected through semi-structured qualitative interviews with 19 graduates of the ED programmes and with 15 other individuals familiar with their teaching and other professional practice.

The work provides insights into factors that shape the effectiveness of educational development programmes, drawing on recent examples from diverse contexts. It adopts a holistic and critical approach to examining the long-term outcomes of ED programmes and it offers a strategic perspective that extends beyond the immediate and day-to-day work of higher education professionals. The work has an ambition to become a valuable resource for researchers, educational developers and higher education leaders.

This work is comprised of the following sections:

- Section I. Educational development programmes and the change they are hoped to foster (chapters 1 & 2)
- Section II. Four case studies (chapters 3-6)
- Section III. Diverse paths of graduates from ED programmes (chapters 7-11)
- Section IV. Conclusions (chapter 12)

Chapter 1. The rationale for researching long-term impact of ED programmes explains why this work set to explore the long-term effects of ED programmes taking the conceptual lens of student-centredness and reflective teaching. It clarifies how since the 1990s student-centred learning (SCL) that places importance on active learning, continuous assessment and more balanced power relationship in the classroom has become a predominantly used concept for desired learning in educational development. The chapter moreover introduces the concept of reflective teaching. It defines reflection and how it is different from, for example, thinking or deliberation. It details what reflective teaching means, how is it evidenced to impact student learning, in particular in higher education and why should teachers approach their practice in a reflective manner. The chapter offers examples how reflective approach to teaching have been assessed in published literature and it

specifies how both student-centred approach to teaching and reflectiveness are evaluated in this research.

Chapter 2. Design of research on long-term impact of four ED programmes outlines the research project, research sites where data was collected, collaborators and research methods together with the international collaborative project BELONG as part of which this research has been undertaken. It lists the research questions for the study and its purpose. It describes the perspectives taken by the research team and presents limitations of research that has been undertaken for the study.

Chapter 3. An international university committed to transforming how students learn in the region introduces the first case: Central European University (CEU). CEU is a front-runner in the region in offering educational development opportunities not only to its own teachers but also to those who now teach at many other institutions of Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia and Middle East. This chapter presents CEU's mission, highlighting its goals in terms of education and how they connect to CEU's educational development programme that supports teachers to foster student-centred learning. It moreover elucidates how CEU's initiatives cast legacy over the programmes at other institutions in the region, including two cases discussed later. The chapter presents CEU's programme, its definition of student-centredness and reflectiveness in teaching. It provides information on programme history, major programme assignments for participants to complete, ways of supporting the participants, and who the programme participants and graduates are, specifically those recruited for this research.

Chapter 4. A fast-growing, ambitious university portraits an educational development programme at the second largest higher education institution in Czechia, Masaryk University. The chapter provides background information about *The Foundations of University Teaching Excellence* programme run by Masaryk University's Center for the Development of Pedagogic Competences introduced in 2017 as part of a flagship project of Masaryk University. It presents the programme structure, approach and information about programme participants and graduates together with its understanding of student-centred learning and reflective teaching.

Chapter 5. An institution that trains scholars but also teachers details another programme offered in Central and Eastern Europe, at the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The programme is specific in the type of its provider, which is a predominantly a research institution. It explains that because universities in Slovakia typically do not provide educational development opportunities to their doctoral students, a group of academics secured in 2012 external funding to prepare an educational development programme for early career academics with teaching responsibilities and run it for the teachers from different institutions across the country. The chapter describes the design and conduct of the programme, it characterises its participants and the programme's conceptualisation of student-centredness and reflectiveness while teaching.

Chapter 6. A university that holds Gold for teaching presents a programme delivered by one of the largest and most influential higher education institutions in the United Kingdom, Nottingham Trent University. The chapter first characterises the university and then its educational development programme *Postgraduate Certificate Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* that has been in place since 2008. It describes the programme aims, methods, participants and views of student-centred learning and reflective teaching.

Chapter 7. Four paths of HE teachers uncovers four distinct paths that the teachers in this study have embarked on five and more years after completing an ED programme. These paths emerged from an analysis of interviews with the graduates and their colleagues and an examination of their

course syllabi related to the following themes: a) supporting student learning, b) engaging in teaching innovation, c) balancing various work responsibilities, and d) responding to contextual factors that impact teachers' willingness to teach in a student-centred and reflective way. The four paths synthesised from the data include 1) the Pragmatic Teacher Path, 2) the Enthusiastic Student-Centred Innovator Path, 3) the Dedicated Teacher Frustrated with Their Institution Path and 4) the Converted Teacher-Centred Scholar Path, with the second path being the most prevalent. Each of these paths has been characterised, and a cameo for each is presented to illustrate a variety of routes that graduates from ED programmes take.

Chapter 8. Student-centred and reflective teaching five and more years on starts by detailing what we know from literature about long-term outcomes of educational development programmes. It then presents the key findings from this research, with a focus on programme graduates' student-centred and reflective teaching practices. Drawing on interviews with programme graduates and their colleagues, as well as analysis of graduates' course materials, the study reveals that almost all teachers exhibit student-centred and reflective practices, though the degree to which they do so varies significantly. Moreover, the chapter underscores that reflective teaching remains more challenging for programme graduates to demonstrate than student-centred learning. The chapter also identifies and describes the factors that both positively and negatively influence graduates' ability to teach in a student-centred and reflective manner. Based on these findings, it recommends that higher education institutions set reasonable expectations for the productivity of academic teachers and ensure that learning spaces are designed to support student-centred learning.

Chapter 9. Teaching collaboration examines collaboration as a factor influencing how graduates apply their learning from educational development programmes and evolve as educators. It highlights that successful teaching collaboration relies on teachers' awareness of colleagues who share similar teaching philosophies. This awareness depends on having an effective system for teaching observations and ample opportunities for discussing teaching practices. Graduates who engage in teaching collaboration appreciate the opportunity to learn from diverse ideas and approaches, find allies for teaching innovation, and value the benefits of such collaboration for students. When graduates perceive their department as unsupportive of their teaching values, they seek collaborators outside their immediate environment. These external collaborations, though beneficial, are relatively uncommon, suggesting a need for additional institutional support.

Chapter 10. Trusting relationships of ED programme graduates investigates whether graduates feel trusted by their head of the department to teach in a student-centred and reflective way and innovate teaching and explores what makes them feel trusted or not. The findings reveal an association between graduates' perceptions of trust from their head of department and levels of student-centred learning and reflectiveness. Additionally, the chapter shows that only a small number of graduates engage in publicising and publishing their teaching practices, suggesting that trust from the superior may not translate into teaching innovation. The chapter also uncovers a contrasting nature of the perceived trust from the head of department, which tends to be primarily cognition-based, with the more nuanced, multi-dimensional trust expressed by colleagues, encompassing cognition-, affect-, and value-based trust. Finally, the study recognises that superiors sometimes express indifference about graduates' teaching, which may discourage them from innovating teaching as innovation involves risk-taking. The chapter concludes with recommendations for heads of department to cultivate trust across the unit.

Chapter 11. ED programme graduates serving as educational leaders maps the educational leadership roles that graduates from ED programmes hold within their institutions. First, the study

details the various formal leadership roles that programme graduates undertake and it explores the influence they have on teaching and learning informally, as reported by their colleagues. The chapter then discusses whether a relationship exists between graduates serving in leadership roles in teaching and learning and their student-centred approach to teaching and reflectiveness. It elaborates on whether programme graduates receive formal recognition for their teaching and how such recognition is linked to their leadership roles.

Chapter 12. The implications of this study for institutional practice, educational development, and research synthesises the key findings of this study and presents recommendations for higher education institutions on how to enhance support for graduates from educational development programs. Additionally, it offers suggestions for educational development programmes and for future research in this area. A critical task for higher education institutions is emphasised—namely, to enhance the institutional recognition of teaching. Without such recognition, these programmes face challenges in effectively promoting excellent teaching and improving student learning outcomes.