

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

THE IMPACT OF TRAINING FOR TEACHERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Bratislava (Slovak Republic), 18 - 20 March 2010

Convened by:
**Gabriela Pleschová ⁽¹⁾, Eszter Simon ⁽²⁾
and Joanna Renc-Roe ⁽³⁾**

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

⁽¹⁾ Eurea, NGO, SK
⁽²⁾ King Sigismund College, HU
⁽³⁾ Central European University, HU

1. Executive summary

The ESF exploratory workshop *The Impact of Training for Teachers in Higher Education* took place on 18-20 March 2010 in Bratislava at the premises of hotel Echo. Participation numbered 22 people from 13 countries (Slovakia, Hungary, Ireland, UK, Sweden, Finland, France, Estonia, Canada, Australia, Italy, Austria and Norway) who were either educationalists, staff developers, or experienced teachers interested in/ recognized for their educational work.

Main scientific objectives of the workshop included:

- introducing various existing teacher training programs and critically evaluate the impact of the programs on participants' teaching and their students' learning (based on empirical findings)
- suggesting a model strategy for teacher development in HE
- elaborating a collaborative research initiative that will focus on evaluating the impact of teacher training on student learning with a stress on methodology
- helping to design a teacher training program for a newly established training centre in Slovakia

Workshop Agenda

During the first two days the participants meet at three sessions with the aim to identify current state of affairs in teacher training, methods being used for measuring the effects of staff development and the role of IT in stimulating teachers' engagement and efficiency of teaching. The last day was reserved for preparing a collaborative research initiative that should focus on evaluating the impact of teacher training on student learning with a stress on methodology. On day 3 participants worked divided into three groups: one was discussing the new research proposal, another was debating contents of a/the possible Policy Paper which could be produced in collaboration with the ESF (based upon the suggestion of Dr. Balázs Kiss, ESF representative) and the third was discussing a design for a new teacher development program in Slovakia.

Surroundings permitted abundant informal interaction behind the formal workshop program and many participants remained discussing the workshop themes long after the workshop itself ended. General atmosphere was very productive, supportive for generating new ideas and for a free exchange of critical opinions. This kind of an environment also allowed participants discussing new approaches to teacher development together with ways of evaluating its effects.

Unfortunately, two colleagues could not be present at the workshop (K. Quinlan due to her sudden medical problems and P. Lauvas because of an accident experienced in Bratislava a day before the workshop started). However, we are in touch with them expecting a book contribution from both colleagues.

Overall conclusion(s)

The participants agreed that teacher development has been essential for continuous improvement of the quality of higher education in Europe and elsewhere. More attention should be paid for discussing different approaches to staff development, various methods of measuring its impact and for general collaboration among staff developers.

The participants concurred that the differences in measuring the effects of training programs result primarily from different purposes and objectives of these programs. While some programs wish to help participant teachers to become more reflective about their teaching and student learning, others aim to engage them in some kind of research into student learning. Alternatively, some programs aspire to change teacher's conceptions of teaching and conceptions of student learning, other courses aim to change teaching performance of participant teachers, etc. All programs should be therefore firstly assessed against their own objectives. Hence, it may be very difficult to simply compare various programs and to conclude which program results in better effects on participant teachers /their students, with the exception of comparing programs against their own goals.

However, comparison might be possible in case of programs with similar purposes, which would be one direction how to construct a methodology for measuring the effects of various teacher training programs.

Second possible direction of research suggested by Keith Trigwell is to examine factors why certain training programs have impact on participant teachers (or not), rather than investigating whether there is some impact or not. One of the main conclusions of our workshop has been that there has been abundant evidence that teacher development have positive impact on participant teachers and possibly on their students, too. Research should therefore shift its attention towards some deeper examination of determinants of impact of teacher training programs.

The evaluation question then becomes “What is it about an intervention that might work for certain people in certain circumstances?” rather than whether the overall score for teaching practice is improved by this intervention.

To answer this question an analysis is needed of the aims of the intervention, the reasons why those aims are expected to be achieved (i.e. what is the causal “theory” underlying the approach taken to achieve those aims) and what are the situations which may prevent those aims from being achieved.

Book from the workshop

As a result of the workshop, the book *Teacher development in Higher education. Existing programs, their effects and trends for the future* (working title) is being compiled containing contributions from the workshop.

The book under preparation serves a variety of purposes. The most important of them is to canvass the existing methods of measuring the impact of pedagogical training in higher education and suggest improvements upon them. This volume aspires to do so by moving from more traditional approaches through newer ones to an explicit discussion of methodological issues.

The book is made up of three sections. The first concentrates on more traditional measures of program impact, concerning the individual level (impact on trainees, students and trainers). The second part is built around a paper from the workshop, which calls attention to the broader institutional/organizational/cultural context. This section concludes with appraising the more general context of teaching at the national and international levels, the impact of which is often underestimated. The final – third – section attempts to suggest innovative approaches to pedagogical development and learning with the ultimate aim of trying to identify those areas and methods that could facilitate cross-sectional research on the impact of pedagogical training courses in higher education. It also suggests new areas for research into impact of teacher training programs as well as discussing the directions into which staff development programs might be developing in near future.

One of the most significant contributions of this book is that it allows for a canvassing of teaching programs from Europe (and beyond), including a unique study from Central and Eastern Europe (Estonia) and programs of international universities (located in Italy and Hungary). Besides measuring impact, it will allow the reader to become familiar with different training programs in various local, institutional, national and international settings.

For more details, please see the Appendix.

2. Scientific content of the event

Day 1, Session 1: Approaches to training in European HE. National and international model

This first session of the workshop was devoted to presenting aspects of existing programs for teacher training in Higher Education in Europe, focusing on the models put in place by different institutions and outlining existing systems of their evaluation.

Purpose of the session: To find out

- 1) *what type of teacher training currently exists internationally (especially in Europe), and to what extent is such training research-based or “evidence-driven”*
- 2) *what evidence exists for the effectiveness of such programs,*
- 3) *what methods might be used to establish or investigate program effectiveness – e.g. their effects on teacher attitudes and teaching practices, on teacher effectiveness, and on student learning*

Summary of the papers:

The presentation by Anne Nevgi of Helsinki University concerned the pedagogical courses run at that university and their effects on educator's teaching. By now the University of Helsinki has created a sophisticated and multi-level set of courses for educators separated into basic level or introductory courses (University Pedagogy 1), and intermediate level courses (University Pedagogy 2).

Andreas Fridjal presented the EUI approach to training academics and doctoral students undertaken under his leadership in the Max Weber program. The workshops are designed to help prepare European and international doctoral students and postdocs in residence at the institute for their lives in current global academic market.

Joanna Renc-Roe from CEU presented two separate training approaches that her office – Curriculum Resource Center has developed over the years. One approach was developed in 2004 specifically for the needs of university doctoral students (with little teaching opportunities in their study) and takes the by now the 'classic' form of a certificate program. The second model encompasses multiple programs and focuses on the course as a unit of inquiry, and combines week-long course design sessions (with basic teaching methods training), a year long course innovation grant (with two ten day training workshops), and up to a year long scholarship of teaching and learning research project grant (with two intensive writing residencies).

Sarah Maguire from University of Ulster presented her program in the specific context of a community- oriented, dispersed university (several campuses as well as on-line courses) and with a specific policy agenda in teaching and learning. The program follows the existing British models of practice and is called a Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education.

Terry Barret's presentation concerned to models of practice in academic development that may be slightly alternative to usual teacher training courses but that could be used more widely. The first model is a summer school (several days long) in which faculty learn problem-based teaching approaches by being engaged in solving an educational case study as an experiential model of the pedagogy in question. The second model of academic development presented, is a writing retreat. It is an event organised in a country side with a group of faculty working on research project designed to create time, space, inspirational surroundings, and a critical peer circle in order to enhance the writer's effectiveness and sense of writer's identity.

Mari Karm's presentation introduced the programs that have now been in place at the University of Tartu for several years, and the existing evidence of impact and of effectiveness of such programs, and remaining questions.

Synopsis of the subsequent discussion:

The following discussion concerned mainly these questions:

- *What can be defined as a good practice and as a desirable strategy in educational development?*

Regarding the question of good practice, comments considered whom do we train and when do we train: do we mainly train incomers to the profession (using certificate and diploma or master's courses) hoping that in time as they mature they will become agents of change? Or

do we train all academics, with a menu of varied programs, allowing for entry at any point and based on personal characteristics and preferences (a modular flexible menu of programs). The need for engagement of senior teachers and the need for creating special spaces for development (liminal spaces) where new identities can be created were also discussed. The specific views of faculty members embedded in disciplinary contexts and with specific needs and identities need to be considered.

- *What methods might be used to establish or investigate program effectiveness?*

Since a number of studies exists examining the effectiveness of teacher development programs and there is some impact already established, and on the other hand, such studies are always extremely time consuming and difficult to run, the fundamental issue seems to be the impact of such programs on the teacher themselves rather than on the students. The responsibility of educational developers first and foremost is to create conditions under which educators can make informed decisions about their teaching, to empower them and to encourage them in their own development.

There were a number of discussions around these issues at the workshop as other participants pointed out that the bottom line of educational development is enhancing the student experience in the classroom, or at least ensuring that teachers 'do no harm' and make sure that students get the best they could currently get whilst at university.

A number of shared practices and underlying beliefs were also pointed out, while at the same time, it was acknowledged that educational developers come with a variety of institutional agendas and personal leadership styles.

Day 2 Morning session: Designing an effective teacher training program

Purpose of the session:

- 1) *Determining what requirements should a teacher-training programs live up to*
- 2) *discussing systemic effects of pedagogic training*

Summary of presentations:

Presenters discussed the current challenges of teaching in higher education with the aim of providing a point of departure for designing an effective teacher-training program. Berndtson focused on the challenges recent changes in higher education at the European level created. The most important development in European higher education was the introduction of the Bologna system. While it is rarely observed, it influenced the conditions and context of teaching not only learning. Such aims, as the comparability of degrees, transferable credits, employability of graduates, and the need to become the most competitive economy in the world, resulted in heightened expectations from professors to excel in both research and teaching. However, the vast majority of higher education institutions still use research as the primary criteria for promotion. Not to mention that research and teaching appear to require contradictory skills: theoretical and abstract thinking (research) and a more practical orientation (teaching) to produce employable graduates. As a side effect, quality assurance was brought to life, but its content is hotly debated. The smallest common denominator is that the aim is to maintain the reputation of a university as a good one. It is unclear, however, what expectations exist with regard to teaching in this quest.

One effect of the Bologna program is increased student (and faculty) mobility, which resulted in heretofore untackled new challenges, which are mostly related to the appearance of foreign exchange students from different teaching and learning cultures (often with wanting language skills) at universities. In other words, internationalization puts additional demands on the necessary skills of teaching in higher education.

Renc-Roe called attention to the fact that while teacher development is often seen as relating to a course or training program, substantial learning takes place outside the classroom. Although many faculty members are not open to the ideas of taking a training course, they find that going abroad helps them learn new teaching skills. However, when arriving back at their old (and often rigid) contexts, using newly acquired methods remains problematic.

Roxa stressed the difficulty to use new skills in the old context with regard to teaching programs. The problem of returning to one's original context is best ameliorated by doing something at the mezo level (i.e. departments, workgroups, significant networks). In addition, incentives for excellence in teaching should be encouraged and support from the

university leadership is essential for improving teaching practices. Support from the leadership, among others, helps allocate funds for faculty development. However, initial top-down encouragement and incentives are only meaningful in the long run if teacher development programs manage to gain a positive reputation. This takes time and the effect of teacher development takes a long time to materialize.

Synopsis of the subsequent discussion:

The first part of the discussion remained focused on challenges of teaching in higher education. University education and, thus, teaching have an artistic quality. While much can be learnt about teaching, it remains a creative process, which is essential in training individuals (graduates) who will be able to be innovative employees so as to help Europe become a competitive economy.

It appears that when we speak about internationalization of higher education, what is meant and what is happening is the Americanization of higher education. It is important to note, however, that other cultures can meaningfully contribute to the improvement of higher education. Their contribution can only be maintained if they are given voice in American dominated space. The same problem appears in different forms in local European context. Dialogue between Eastern and Western Europe should be a two-way process in which not only Easterners are open to Western ideas but Westerners take an interest of what might be valuable in the East.

Subsequent discussion directed attention to the general qualities a teacher training program must have in order to succeed in the short and long term. When creating training programs, it is vital to take into account the target population and the local context. First and foremost, the present situation must be appraised. The short-term aims are most likely to be modest, such as making people realize their lacks. At the same time, long-term planning must be kept in mind. The first step might be a voluntary training program that is envisioned to become an elective PhD course and then perhaps a degree requirement. One of the first tasks in setting aims is to decide whether training participants should take an active part in this process. Finally, pedagogical development in higher education may learn a great deal from training programs in the business world. They are regarded as highly successful, yet we know very little about them.

Afternoon session: Track 1: Measuring the impact of teacher development. Critical appraisal of existing methods

Purpose of the track: Critical assessment of existing methods for measuring the effects of staff development

Summary of presentations:

Chris Knapper outlined the existing knowledge on faculty teaching making ongoing professional development for all educators needed. Chris' presentation basically supported for us the view that there is agreement on what good practice is in teaching, at least among educationalists and educational developers, and that the ultimate aim for any training will be to help lecturers create better conditions for student learning.

Lin Norton presented the research design and some findings of her and her colleague's current research of new (trained) lecturers' views on student assessment. What this presentation stressed to us is the discrepancy between 'good practice' as conceived of and taught in professional development programs, and the perceived limiting factors of institutional regulation. This does not mean that training is not effective; rather it means that it needs to be but a part of a broader, strategic educational development in institutions.

Anne Nevgi reported on her own research in programs which examined self-efficacy dynamics in lecturers (their beliefs about their own teaching skills) and correlated these with their teaching orientations. Therefore, we need to conclude that programs of professional development could consider and research their own participants teaching self-concepts, self-efficacy beliefs, (e.g. pre- and post training) and should also correlate these with the teachers views on what constitutes best practice.

Keith Trigwell pointed out some approximate indicators of impact, for example numbers of recipients of teaching awards among trained faculty (versus other faculty), various levels of program effectiveness evaluation, but also showed that these can be misleading when taken to another context. He proceeded to say that since we have a number of studies already in existence on the positive impact of teacher training (from Stes, Norton, Ho, Prosser, Nevgi, Gibbs et al., etc.) we should not spend more time thinking about impact in the general

sense. Instead we need to rethink on what basis do we want to carry out further research into teacher training, with what assumptions and what starting points in mind?

Jennifer Murphy presented several sets of programs that have come into existence as a result of or parallel to the initiative of creating an Irish National Academy for the Integration of Teaching, Research and Learning. The expected impact of such programs was usually stipulated to be on the level of both knowledge and practice and the results were on the level of teacher's job satisfaction, students' satisfaction with courses, teacher's interest and preparation for doing further research and learning from their teaching.

Synopsis of the subsequent discussion:

The following discussion concerned the key area of:

- *What are the assumptions behind what we do, what do we know already about impact and what needs to be studied further?*

Regarding the second issue, a number of challenges were raised to all the presentations. These included the need to judge effectiveness or impact based on a specific set of assumptions and starting points. The starting point should be 'why are we doing this' and then only 'how can this be measured' and 'in relation to what should this impact be measured' (e.g., we can measure the fulfilment of explicit goals, the fulfilment of faculty's own goals, unintended consequences, changes in teaching attitudes, conceptions of learning, self-efficacy, production of new modules in teaching, etc). These questions need to be answered before we design further studies on the impact of teacher training on student learning.

It was also pointed out that existing programs often use a haphazard or not well-thought through evaluation tools which do not necessarily measure quality in relation to goals and in relation to the context of the program. Therefore, we may be able to use a whole array of methods of research and evaluation, roughly all methods identified in the field of higher education research are appropriate, and questionnaires, interviews and documentary analysis are the most widespread. It seems that what we need to study further are the program achievements in relation to the underlying goals, assumptions behind the whole intervention and institutional context of the program.

Afternoon session: Track 2: Role of IT in stimulating teachers' engagement and efficiency of teaching

Purpose of the track: to answer following questions:

- 1) *To what extent might training, teaching and learning reflect the increasing variety of technologies students use in their daily lives, from I-pods to mobile phones?*
- 2) *How do teachers react to contemporary requirements and/or new possibilities offered by the introduction of advanced technology into the classroom?*
- 3) *Are teachers sufficiently equipped with IT skills? How might the introduction of technologies stimulate or detract from teachers' engagement and confidence in increased efficiency of teaching?*

Summary of papers:

Vicky Davies discussed in her presentation the gaps that exist while developing academics in their use of technologies for enhanced student learning. She has identified several barriers from the teachers' side, from students' side as well as from institutional side. Davis concluded that it is imperative therefore that teachers are provided with clear opportunities to engage with the technology outside the real teaching and learning situation, where they can experiment in a safe environment and that ongoing support is available.

The ideas presented in this paper well resonated in the contribution by Simon Kear (who could not attend the workshop but we whom connected online via Adobe). Kear introduced several techniques used by their unique institution (Media Zoo) which support teachers and students while learning through/with IT. Both contributions also presented some evidence that their development programs are having impact on participant teachers/their students. Goldsmith and LaBranche as practicing teachers (political scientists) discussed practical aspects of using ICT in teaching and learning inside and outside classroom.

Synopsis of the subsequent discussion:

Session participants discussed following issues:

- *To what extent might training, teaching and learning reflect the increasing variety of technologies students use in their daily lives, from iPods to mobile phones?*

It is clear that in today's teaching and learning environments there is a need to reflect where possible and/or practical the range of technologies that students currently use in their everyday lives may fit in. What is clear is that students welcome the use of technology within their studies in terms of the flexibility and autonomy that it offers them. Students are already experienced users of what might be termed "usual technologies" such as the Internet, Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs) etc., but sometimes the introduction of newer technologies, commonly used in their daily lives, into an educational context is viewed with mild suspicion, which is most often due to the use of a familiar technology in an unfamiliar context. Newer technologies such as animations, simulation, podcasting, collaborative/social networking and other Web 2.0 applications have been used with some success in higher education, but there are, however, a number of issues that influence the extent to which these can realistically be deployed to their full. Examples of these issues are as follows:

Student and/or staff familiarity with the technologies themselves either within an everyday context or in one that utilises the technologies in a more unfamiliar way

Parity of access to the technologies: the effective use of mobile technologies, particularly when these make use of personally owned devices, may be difficult to ensure across the student population unless all have access to the technologies required.

Associated costs to the institution in the deployment of these technologies in terms of additional licences, support and infrastructure costs.

The increased use of newer technologies is recognised as being an important aspect of teaching and learning in higher education, not only from a creative and innovative point of view, but also in response to external drivers such as the need for digital literacy and employment prospects. However there is a common view that face-to-face engagement in teaching and learning cannot be fully replaced by technology – both forms have their advantages and disadvantages, and the common consensus favours a blended approach.

- *How do teachers react to contemporary requirements and/or new possibilities offered by the introduction of advanced technology into the classroom?*

Teachers do not always react favourably to the introduction of new technologies in the classroom. Whilst most are keen to embrace change, there is a clear emphasis on "what's in it for me?", i.e. how will this enable the instructor to teach in a more efficient or interesting way. Often resistance to new technologies is influenced by the reasons presented for the change – when the change is seen as being driven from the senior management or has implications for budget tightening; the newer technologies are seen as being something imposed upon instructors which may threaten their academic freedom.

The typical scenario would seem to be that of enthusiastic champions, i.e. instructors who are keen to try out new things. This enthusiasm is then disseminated on a peer-to-peer basis. Interestingly, those who are more sceptical are more likely to try out new things. In institutions where opportunities are given for teachers to implement new technologies in a safe environment and with adequate technological and pedagogic support, the new technologies are more readily adopted and the former sceptics become champions in turn.

- *Are teachers sufficiently equipped with IT skills? How might the introduction of technologies stimulate or detract from teachers' engagement and confidence in increased efficiency of teaching?*

As mentioned in section above, teachers are often wary of new technologies and the enthusiasm with which they adopt these will depend on their level of competence and/or

confidence in the use thereof. Champions of technology are more likely to experiment without fear, since they have the confidence to know how/when to change things in order to optimise the learning experience. Those who are less confident and/or confident require a great deal of support in order to boost their engagement with technology. This support takes a variety of forms:

- Initial and ongoing training in the use of the technology
- Appreciation of how the technology may be used in the teaching and learning situation to best effect (examples of pedagogic practice)
- Ongoing exposure to new ways of using technologies with which they are familiar
- Ongoing exposure to ways in which existing pedagogic practices may be enhanced by emerging technologies
- Easily accessible support mechanisms in terms of practical and pedagogic queries, which may be provided centrally or as part of a more localised network

Therefore, it is imperative that teachers are provided with clear opportunities to engage with the technology outside the real teaching and learning situation so that they can experiment in a safe environment. The availability of ongoing support is equally important. It is also vital that the technology and the pedagogy are seen as going hand in hand with each other, so that technology is used in a fit-for-purpose way as an enhancement to the pedagogic aims of the teaching and learning situation.

All Powerpoint presentations of workshop participants are available at:

http://www.teaching.eurea.sk/?category=2_Current_trainings

Some of the papers delivered within the Friday afternoon session will soon appear in the book Pleschová, G. (ed.): IT in Action. Stimulating Quality Learning at Undergraduate Students. Barbara Budrich Press, forthcoming

Day 3: Designing new research project (see also part 3 of this report)

As a result of the discussion we have established that there is no need for another quantitative study across contexts, as some positive impact of teacher training has been established already.

But we have posed a number of questions that practitioners may wish to ask in further research in order to reflect on what the field of practice has established already and what remains to be studied, for example:

-Why do we do the courses at the individual level? Why do we do the interventions, why do the teachers come, why we think it is effective?

-How do some programs succeed and others fail? Why do some trainees succeed and other fail in what we have trained them? The key question is not what methods we use to study impact but 'What is it about an intervention that might work for certain people in certain circumstances' and 'what the evaluation may need to do is to find out how the program enters the teachers' reasoning'.

-'what' questions- do we have an image on the kind of student we want?, what are we studying? Are we studying behaviour, attitudes, demonstrated effectiveness?

The importance of contextually grounded studies was established. There are not enough of such deeply reflective or 'thick' studies at the moment. For example, the differences between lengths, credits, participants own motivations for entering, participants career stage need to be carefully considered before embarking on any study. Therefore the conclusion of this should be that any method used in HE research could be used to study impact of teacher training, the decision will depend on what exactly we want to study and this is not a simple issue. Most existing quantitative studies have studied a single aim and applied a causal logic across different contexts. However, we would need more qualitative studies to really tell what interventions worked in what contexts.

We have found a very strong incentive from Keith Trigwell to formulate a new set of questions for research. The question should be not 'do we have impact' but 'what is it about an intervention that produces impact' and 'what kind of impact are we talking about in what contexts'. It would not be necessary for programs to have similar goals, but it would be necessary that their impact studies focus on the fulfilment of these goals and add some

'thick description' of their context (or contexts) - what makes different contexts ready or not, to absorb what is being attempted through teacher training. This is a combination of program evaluation approach with a consideration of the mezo level of the context. A study of this kind would be very innovative and is currently missing in literature.

However, this study is not possible to be at the current stage undertaken by the three convenors, most notably the new Slovak program would need to be well in place and have significant results before it could be even considered a basis for such a research, as initially planned. Other program participants may well be in a better position to lead such an international initiative. It is expected that the volume of papers to emerge out of the workshop will go some way to further conceptualising the possibilities of such a study.

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome

What was learned during the workshop

Here we come with brief summary of chief findings from the workshop:

- Existing literature provides compelling evidence that teaching development courses are having an impact.
- Many programs evaluate the impact solely on individual level of participant teachers and possibly of their students, however, it is important to investigate also other levels: the mezo level (department, workgroup, significant networks) and the macro level (institution, state, possibly above-state), too. Inhibitors at the other two levels may cause that trained teachers will not make substantial and desired change in their teaching or they will soon revert to usual practice. Successful training program should therefore possibly include impact not only on individual teachers and their students, but also involve departments, disciplinary communities, institutions, etc.
- Instead of using the term *teacher training* most staff developers prefer using the term *teacher development* (or even *inspirational programs*) because it seems to carry less negative implications for teachers themselves. Calling the programs teacher training carries the risk of discouraging teachers from participating in it.
- While measuring the impact using quantitative methods, those criteria should be used as measures which were among the course intended outcomes. Qualitative studies, however, should be used as well to survey unintended outcomes of development programs, too and to provide more accurate picture about the effects of teacher training.

Concrete actions

First, the workshop convenors are putting together a book which will include characteristics of various existing staff development courses, moreover it will present data on their impact, debate various possible ways of measuring the effects of teacher training courses and outline future trends of teacher development.

Second, we have discussed preparing a research proposal focusing on evaluating the impact of teacher training on student learning with a stress on methodology. The proposal for this research has been described by Keith Trigwell in his book contribution:

[Existing literature] "provide[s] compelling evidence that teaching development courses are having an impact. The methods that can be used to provide this evidence are also described in this literature. The most common methods being used are quantitative and involve comparing mean scores before and after interventions. The scores being compared can be from surveys of students, from the teachers' self reports and from peers. Other methods include measures of student performance in assessment or on approaches to learning inventories; and of teachers' performance in receiving awards and grants, or in promotions. The shortcomings of these approaches are (a) that the courses may not have the same aims and are therefore not comparable using indicators that bare no relation to those aims (for example using teaching awards as an indicator of success, as will be shown in the next section, is not appropriate in some continental European universities where the course aims are not oriented towards scholarly teaching outcomes), and (b) that the courses may be of quite different forms. Many types of courses are on offer, and they vary in length, content and mode of presentation. Analyses that aggregate results from these different courses may also mask the impact that individual courses, or even elements of courses, may be having. A qualitative method is almost always required if the evaluation is to be informative. As McArthur and colleagues show (McArthur, et al., 2004), quantitative studies of this sort can lead to misleading conclusions. In their study at one UK institution, the differences between a sample of staff who had completed a Graduate Certificate, and one who had not, on a range of measures, were very small. When the qualitative data were investigated, some of the more subtle distinctions between the groups became more apparent. In his descriptions of the research methods used in higher education research, Tight (2003) lists eight methods in common use (though some are used more frequently than others). They are: documentary analysis; comparative analysis; interviews; surveys and multivariate

analyses; conceptual analysis; phenomenography; critical and feminist perspectives; and auto/biographical and observational studies. All are similarly available for evaluation studies, and the methods chosen, as in any research approach, will depend on the question being addressed.

What is not available through most of these methods, and what is needed in the evaluation of all interventions, is why it is that the courses are having any impact, whether that impact is subtle or obvious. To do this effectively requires an approach that has been described as realistic evaluation (Pawson & Tilley, 1997).

Realistic evaluation seeks to understand the cause of the outcomes observed. It is aimed at finding out why there is an impact rather than whether there is an impact, and to do so, some articulation of the change theory being employed is required. In addition we need to be able to articulate the type of intervention involved, the aims of the intervention, and the variation in the situations experienced by the participants in the program. If possible, what the evaluation may need to do is to find out how the program enters the teachers' reasoning. To do so clearly requires the use of qualitative methods as well as the quantitative approaches in most common use. It then does not matter what method(s) are used as long as what is used provides information about what it is that is trying to be achieved, and that the method(s) selected are used appropriately.

The evaluation question then becomes "What is it about an intervention that might work for certain people in certain circumstances?" rather than whether the overall score for teaching practice is improved by this intervention. To answer this question what is needed is an analysis of the aims of the intervention, the reasons why those aims are expected to be achieved (i.e. what is the causal "theory" underlying the approach taken to achieve those aims) and what are the situations which may prevent those aims from being achieved. [...]

If the evaluation of a program shows that the aims have been achieved through the cause selected, that program can be considered a success, and if the context or situation is similar elsewhere, it could be recommended for implementation in those other contexts. But even if the cause is directly related to the intervention aims, the aims might not be achieved. In either of the two situations described above for each aim, quite a different outcome could result. For example a program cannot be considered a success if it aims to develop teacher thinking from a student perspective, but the teachers aim only to achieve a higher rating from their students."

We are still discussing where to move with this research proposal. We wish to use the book under preparation as a Step 2 which should enable us (together with the newly designed program) to come with a full research proposal.

Thirdly, the workshop convenors, with the involvement of other workshop participants, are currently designing a new teacher training program which is being developed by the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The program should build on the results and conclusions of the ESF exploratory workshop *The impact of training for teachers in HE*.

To conclude, as the workshop convenors **we gratefully acknowledge support from the European Science Foundation** and look forward to further cooperation with the ESF, either at preparing the Policy Paper or through other initiatives.

4. Final programme

Day 1: Thursday, March 18, 2010

The scope and impact of existing training programs – an international survey:

Goals, content, participation and participants' motivation, subject-specific vs. interdisciplinary training, results and effects

14:00 welcome address, purpose of workshop: **G. Pleschova**

14:15 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**
B. Kiss (ESF Standing Committee for Social Sciences (SCSS))

Session 1: Approaches to training in European HE. National and international model

Purpose of the session: To find out

- 1) *what type of teacher training currently exists internationally (especially in Europe), and to what extent is such training research-based or "evidence-driven"*
- 2) *what evidence exists for the effectiveness of such programs,*
- 3) *what methods might be used to establish or investigate program effectiveness – e.g. their effects on teacher attitudes and teaching practices, on teacher effectiveness, and on student learning*

Chair **J. Murphy**

Record-keeper **J. Renc-Roe**

14:30 The influence of courses in university pedagogy at the University of Helsinki on educators' teaching and students' learning. 2001-2009 experience: **A. Nevgi**

14:50 Academic practice workshops at the European University Institute as a part of Max Weber Program. Evidence from the praxis: **A. Frijdal**

15:10 The design and effectiveness of CEU (Central European University) approach to teacher training- two models of practice: **J. Renc-Roe**

15:30 From beginning teachers to educational leaders: Tensions and possibilities in educational development from a career stage perspective: **K. Quinlan** (Oxford University)

15:50 *break*

16:10 'Fit-for-purpose': Designing and running an accredited CPD (Continuing Professional Development) route at University of Ulster to meet institutional and staff needs: **S. Maguire**

16:30 Two education development strategies: A Problem-based learning module and academic writers' retreats at University College Dublin: **T. Barrett**

16:50 The effects of different forms of educational courses on university teachers' teaching practice at the University of Tartu: **M. Karm**

17:10 Discussion resulting in a critical evaluation of the impact of existing programs on participants' teaching and their students' learning

18:45 *Dinner*

20:00 Glass of wine, informal discussions

Day 2: Friday, March 19, 2010

Effectiveness of training: impact on curriculum, on teacher effectiveness, on student learning.

Morning session: Designing an effective teacher training program

Purpose of the session:

- 1) *Determining what requirements should a teacher-training programs live up to*
- 2) *discussing systemic effects of pedagogic training*

Chair	Ch. Knapper
Record-keeper	E. Simon
8:40	The proof of the pudding: to make teachers actually change something to improve their own teaching practice: P. Lauvas (University of Oslo)
9:00	The impact of the integration and internationalization of HE systems on teaching and learning: E. Berndtson (University of Helsinki)
9:20	Eastern European Transformations in Academic Identity and Practice - the Internationalisation factor: J. Renc-Roe (Central European University)
9:40	<i>Break</i>
10:00	High quality learner-centred teaching, teamwork and aligned assessment. An opportunity for the students to become democratically engaged in learning: D. Jacques (Oxford Brookes University)
10:20	Systemic effect of pedagogic training: T. Roxa (Lund University)
10:40	Discussion resulting in suggesting a model strategy for teacher development in HE
12:00	<i>Lunch</i>

Afternoon session: two parallel tracks

Track 1: Measuring the impact of teacher development. Critical appraisal of existing methods

Purpose of the track: Critical assessment of existing methods for measuring the effects of staff development (SWOT analysis)

Chair	K. Quinlan
Record-keeper	J. Renc-Roe
13:40	Incorporating research on learning into teacher training programs: Ch. Knapper (Queen's University)
14:00	Accredited programmes in teaching and learning in higher education – some Irish perspectives on measuring impact: J. Murphy (University College Cork)
14:20	New lecturers' views of assessment: L. Norton (Hope University)
14:40	Quantitative and qualitative methods in examining the impact of teacher development: K. Triggwell (University of Sydney)
15:00	<i>Break</i>
15:20	Surveying self-efficacy of teachers using ATI questionnaire and interviews with educators: A. Nevgi (University of Helsinki)
15:40	Discussion resulting in SWOT analysis of existing methods measuring the effects of educational development
	Brainstorming about possible research projects

Track 2: Role of IT in stimulating teachers' engagement and efficiency of teaching

Purpose of the track: to answer following questions:

- 1) To what extent might training, teaching and learning reflect the increasing variety of technologies students use in their daily lives, from I-pods to mobile phones?
- 2) How do teachers react to contemporary requirements and/or new possibilities offered by the introduction of advanced technology into the classroom?
- 3) Are teachers sufficiently equipped with IT skills? How might the introduction of technologies stimulate or detract from teachers' engagement and confidence in increased efficiency of teaching?

Chair **Ch. Rabl**

Record-keeper **V. Davies**

- 14:00 Bridging the Gap: developing academic staff in Technology-enhanced Learning (TEL): **V. Davies** (University of Ulster)
- 14:20 Using Social Media to Enhance Student Learning in Political Science: **C. Goldsmith** (De Montfort University Leicester)
- 14:40 Advantages and weaknesses of ITCs in teaching and learning: **S. LaBranche** (Institute of Political Science Grenoble)
- 15:00 *Break*
- 15:20 Media Zoo as a Catalyst for Institutional Change: Introducing Learning Technologies to Teaching Staff at the University of: **S. Kear** - via Adobe (University of Leicester)
<https://connect.le.ac.uk/mediazoo/>
- 15:40 Discussion resulting in concluding how the introduction of IT can stimulate or detract from teachers' engagement and confidence in increased efficiency of teaching
- 17:00 Preparing draft proposal to be discussed next day (convenors)
- 18:30 Transfer to the city centre for the dinner (we meet at the hotel reception)
- 19:00 *Dinner*

Day 3: Saturday, March 20, 2010

Future directions: What makes teachers in HE to develop, what is the impact of teacher training

Format: *debate aimed at preparing research proposal(s), later work in groups if more than one research project is to be prepared*

Chair: **G. Pleschova**

Record-keeper: **E. Simon**

Session 1 scientific objectives of the research project, project methodology

Purpose of the session:

to elaborate a collaborative research initiative that will focus on evaluating the impact of teacher training on student learning with a stress on methodology

- 8:30 Presentation of draft proposal
- 9:00 Discussion
- 10:30 *Break*

Session 2: involved institutions and researchers, resources and research environment

- 10:50 Discussion
- 13:00 *Lunch*
- 14:30 Concluding remarks

5. Final list of participants including Statistical Information on Participants

Final list of participants

Convenor:

1. **Gabriela PLEŠCHOVÁ**
Eurea
Tupého 25/A
83101 Bratislava
Slovak Republic
pleschova@eurea.sk

6. **Erkki BERNDTSON**
Department of Political Science
University of Helsinki
Unioninkatu 37
(P.O. Box 54)
00014 Helsinki
Finland
erkki.berndtson@helsinki.fi

Co-Convenors:

2. **Eszter SIMON**
King Sigismund College
József Attila u. 44
2092 Budakeszi
Hungary
eszter_simon@yahoo.com

7. **Vicky DAVIES**
Magee campus
University of Ulster
Northland Road
Londonderry BT48 7JL
United Kingdom
v.davies@ulster.ac.uk

3. **Joanna RENC-ROE**
Central European University
Nádor utca 9
1051 Budapest
Hungary
rencroj@ceu.hu

8. **Andreas FRIJDAL**
European University Institute
Academic Service
Via dei Roccettini 9
50014 San Domenico di Fiesole
Italy
andreas.frijdal@eui.eu

ESF Representative:

4. **Dr. Balász Kiss**
Head of Social Sciences Unit
European Science Foundation
1 quai Lezay-Marnésia
67080 Strasbourg Cedex
France
bkiss@esf.org

9. **Chris GOLDSMITH**
Department of Historical and Social
Studies
Faculty of Humanities
De Montfort University
Leicester LE1 9BH
CGoldsmith@dmu.ac.uk

Participants:

5. **Terry BARRETT**
UCD School of Education & Lifelong
Learning
University College Dublin
College of Human Sciences
Centre For Teaching & Learning,
Woodview House
Belfield, Dublin 4
Ireland
terry.barrett@ucd.ie

10. **David JAQUES**
Oxford Brookes University
7 Stanley Road
Oxford OX4 1QY
United Kingdom
davidjaques3@mac.com

11. **Mari KARM**
Faculty of Education
University of Tartu
Ülikooli 18
50090 Tartu
Estonia
mari.karm@ut.ee

ESF Exploratory Workshops

- 12. Christopher KNAPPER**
Psychology Department
Queen's University
62 Arch Street
Humphrey Hall Room 232
Kingston ON K7L 3N6
Canada
knapper@queensu.ca
- 13. Stéphane LABRANCHE**
Institute of Political Science
Pierre-Mendès-France University
BP 48
38040 Grenoble cedex 9
France
asosan95@hotmail.com
- 14. Per LAUVÅS**
Institute for Research in Education
The Faculty of Education
University of Oslo
P.O.Box 1161, Blindern
0318 Oslo
Norway
per.lauvas@hiof.no
- 15. Sarah MAGUIRE**
Coleraine campus
University of Ulster
Cromore Road
Coleraine BT52 1SA
United Kingdom
cs.maguire@ulster.ac.uk
- 16. Jennifer MURPHY**
National Academy for Integration of
Research, Teaching and Learning
Distillery House, North Mall
University College Cork
Cork
Ireland
jennifer.murphy@ucc.ie
- 17. Anne NEVGI**
Department of Education
University of Helsinki
PO Box 9
(Siltavuorenpenger 20)
00014 Helsinki
Finland
anne.nevgi@helsinki.fi
- 18. Lin NORTON**
Faculty of Education
Liverpool Hope University
Hope Park
Liverpool L16 9JD
United Kingdom
nortonl@hope.ac.uk
- 19. Christine RABL**
Department of Educational Sciences
Faculty of Philosophy and Educational
Sciences
University of Vienna
Garnisongasse 3/3
1090 Vienna, Austria
christine.rabl@univie.ac.at
- 20. Torgny ROXA**
Faculty of Engineering
Lund University
PO Box 118
22100 Lund
Sweden
Torgny.Roxa@genombrottet.lth.se
- 21. Keith TRIGWELL**
Institute for Teaching and Learning
University of Sydney
Level 3, Carlaw Building (F07)
Sydney NSW 2006
Australia
keith.trigwell@sydney.edu.au
- Local Organiser:**
- 22. Uršula SZABOOVÁ**
Institute of Physics
Slovak Academy of Science
Dúbravská cesta 9
845 11 Bratislava, Slovakia
ursula.szaboova@savba.sk

6. Statistical Information on Participants

Total number of participants: 20

Country of Origin:

Austria	1	Ireland	2
Australia	1	Norway	1
Belgium	1	Poland	1
Canada	2	Slovak Republic	1
Estonia	1	Sweden	1
Finland	2	United Kingdom	5
Hungary	1		

Gender:

Male: 9 Female: 11

Appendix

Book Plan

Working title: Teacher development in Higher education. Existing programs, their effects and trends for the future

The book under preparation serves a variety of purposes. The most important of them is to canvass the existing methods of measuring the impact of pedagogical training in higher education and suggest improvements upon them. This volume aspires to do so by moving from more traditional approaches through newer ones to an explicit discussion of methodological issues. The book is made up of three sections. The first concentrates on more traditional measures of program impact, concerning the individual level (impact on trainees, students and trainers). The second part is built around a paper from the workshop, which calls attention to the broader institutional/organizational/cultural context. This section concludes with appraising the more general context of teaching at the national and international levels, the impact of which is often underestimated. The final – third – section attempts to suggest innovative approaches to pedagogical development and learning with the ultimate aim of trying to identify those areas and methods that could facilitate cross-sectional research on the impact of pedagogical training courses in higher education. It also suggests new areas for research into impact of teacher training programs as well as discussing the directions into which staff development programs might be developing in near future.

One of the most significant contributions of this book is that it allows for a canvassing of teaching programs from Europe (and beyond), including a study from Central and Eastern Europe (Estonia) and programs of international universities (located in Italy and Hungary). Besides measuring impact, it will allow the reader to become familiar with different training programs in various local, institutional and national settings.

Introduction (Eszter Simon & Gabriela Pleschova)

Measuring Impact at the Individual level

University of Ulster (Sarah Maguire)

University of Helsinki (Anne Nevgi)

Central European University (Mátyás Szabó & Joanna Renc-Roe)

University of Toronto (Bryan Gopaul or Peer Lauvas)

Departments, Schools, and Significance Networks: The Impact of Pedagogical Development Courses at the Mezo Level

How effects of teacher training spread (Roxa & Martensson)

University of Tartu – Estonia (Marie Karm)

European University Institute (Andreas Frijdal)

Ireland (Jennifer Murphy)

Hongkong Polytechnic University (Angela Ho)

Going beyond the Mezo level: the Importance of International, Regional and National Trends (Erkki Berndston & Kate Quinlan)

Measuring the impact of teaching:

The impact of ad hoc learning (internationalization) on teachers (Joanna Renc-Roe)

Measuring the impact of academic (teacher) development: self-assessment through educational research as a way of measuring impact (Ch. Knapper and/or Lin Norton)

Multilevel measurement of the impact of teacher development and its implications for future research (Ann Stes & Peter von Petegem)

Evaluating the impact of university teaching development programs: methodologies (Keith Trigwell)

Conclusion (Eszter Simon & Gabriela Pleschová)